

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN
Fourth Session - Fifteenth Legislature
9th Day

Tuesday, February 14, 1967

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

WELCOME TO STUDENTS

MR. A.N. NICHOLSON (Saskatoon City): — I'd like to draw your attention, Members, that in the east gallery the students and teachers of the King Edward School are honoring us with their attendance. This is one of the older schools in Saskatoon and we are delighted that the pupils and teachers are visiting us. We hope that their visit to the capital city will be pleasant and profitable for them.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. A.E. BLAKENEY (Regina West): — I refer to the remarks from the Hon. Member for Prince Albert (Mr. Steuart) a couple of days ago and would just remind him that the young ladies of Regina yield nothing to the young ladies of Prince Albert in their charm and pulchritude. I think, Mr. Speaker, that that will be immediately obvious when we look up in the Speaker's gallery and in the east gallery and see some 120 charming young ladies from Sacred Heart Academy here in Regina. They are from grades 10, 11, and 12, and they are here under the guidance of Sister Winifred, Mr. Goski and Miss Dobben. They have had a tour of the Legislative Building and I'm sure that all of us through you, Mr. Speaker, express the hope that their stay with us will be pleasant and educational.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

QUESTION RE: PUBLIC HEARINGS OF MINIMUM WAGE BOARD

MR. W.G. DAVIES (Moose Jaw City): — Before the Orders of the Day, Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the Minister of Labour (Mr. Coderre) whether the public hearings of the Minimum Wage Board, announced last fall would take place and which have not yet taken place, are planned to be held shortly in view of the continued rise of living costs, especially for the people in low incomes and the consequent need to bring the minimum wage in Saskatchewan, at least to the \$1.25 federal level.

HON. L.P. CODERRE (Minister of Labour): — I would like to tell the Hon. Member that since this government has taken over, there have been two increases in the minimum wages and a question of whether the Minimum Wage Board is sitting is now under advisement.

QUESTION RE: CLOSING OF PANGMAN HOSPITAL

MR. G.T. SYNDER (Moose Jaw City): — Before the Orders of the Day are proceeded with, I'd like to direct a question to the Minister of Public Health (Mr. Grant)

in connection with the closing of the Pangman hospital. I think the Minister is aware of the closure and I understand that it was instigated by the Department of Health because of the shortage of staff. I'd like to ask the Minister what consideration has been given and what is being done by the Department in connection with providing hospital services to the people in the Pangman area of Saskatchewan?

HON. G.B. GRANT (Minister of Health): — Mr. Speaker, this hospital found it necessary to close because of the lack of nursing staff and notice was given that it would be necessary to have nursing staff. The Department is rendering every assistance possible to secure staff for the hospital.

QUESTION RE: RECIPIENTS OF OLD AGE SECURITY RECEIVE \$30 PER MONTH FROM THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT

MR. NICHOLSON (Saskatoon City): — Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Minister of Welfare (Mr. MacDonald). I wonder if the Cabinet has decided whether or not the recipients of old age security payments, who are receiving the supplementary payments from the government will be receiving the full \$30 a month from the Federal Government?

MR. C.P. MacDONALD (Minister of Welfare): — Mr. Speaker, that will be announced in due course.

QUESTION RE: CHINA PURCHASING SASKATCHEWAN PRODUCED POTASH:

MR. J.R. BROCKELBANK (Kelsey): — I would like to ask the government if it could tell the House if China has purchased or tried to purchase any Saskatchewan produced potash?

HON. W. ROSS THATCHER (Premier): — No, I'm unable to answer that question at this time, but I'll be glad to look into the matter and see if we can find out.

MR. BROCKELBANK (Kelsey): — I would appreciate it, Mr. Speaker. If the Premier would have that matter looked into because the question was raised in the House of Commons. It seems like fertilizer for the production of food is very important to those parts of the world where it is needed.

QUESTION RE: FILLING OUT FORMS FOR ADDITIONAL PAYMENTS OF PENSIONS:

MR. NICHOLSON (Saskatoon City): — Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a supplementary question to the Minister of Welfare (Mr. MacDonald). Are the recipients of supplementary pensions required to fill out new forms as they receive the additional payments from the Federal Government?

MR. C.P. MacDONALD (Minister of Welfare): — This will be announced very shortly.

MR. W.B. LLOYD (Leader of the Opposition): — Mr. Speaker, may I ask a supplementary question to the Minister of Welfare (Mr. MacDonald)? Since government policy

is going to be announced soon, could we at least have the forms which now some people are being asked to sign?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. MacDONALD: — What forms?

MR. LLOYD: — Doesn't the Minister know? In other words, people out in the country have access to forms but the Legislature doesn't have access to these forms.

MR. MacDONALD: — If the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Lloyd) will make a request for a specific form, I will be glad to table it in the House.

MR. LLOYD: — The specific request is for forms that persons in receipt of welfare are now being asked to sign in respect to supplementary assistance.

MR. MacDONALD: — I will give the Leader of the Opposition a copy.

MR. J.R. BROCKELBANK (Kelsey): — If the Minister can afford it.

ADJOURNED DEBATES: ADDRESS IN REPLY

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

HON. G.B. GRANT (Minister of Public Health): — Mr. Speaker, first I want to commend our Premier generally on the contents of the Throne Speech and also on the leadership which he has demonstrated during the past twelve months. All too frequently governments of this country and other countries are denied the services of such capable men. Premier Thatcher has demonstrated his dynamic abilities in the fields of not only salesmanship, but also business-like administration. His efforts have produced and re producing results in these areas and showing good results in industrial growth and employment levels.

Secondly, I would like to say a word about the finest constituency in Saskatchewan, namely Regina South. I am extremely fortunate in having such a constituency to represent. I am pleased to say that employment is at a high level. I have little or not highway problem, no lease land problems, no crop destruction by wild life. While I do not have some of the problems of a rural constituency, I do have constituents who are enjoying the fruits of a booming economy, constituents who appreciate the rapid building expansion taking place at the university, constituents who appreciate the homeowner grants, and constituents who welcome the Premier's announcement of plans to proceed with a base hospital in my constituency. It is a real pleasure, Mr. Speaker, to represent these people and I thank them for their cooperation during my term of office.

If it is true to say that variety is the spice of life, I suspect that I have had more than my share of spice in the past year or so. My experience in the Departments of Highways, Telephones, and Industry and Commerce have been most interesting and I trust this same experience will prove helpful in my present

position as Minister of Health. I find myself in a new role in a very important and large department, a department that at times seems to become involved in controversial matters, but this only makes it all the more stimulating and challenging. The people of Saskatchewan are fortunate to have many capable and dedicated employees and I thank them for the help they have been to me in the past three months. I want to pay credit to my predecessors who have established the department on such a sound basis and particularly the Hon. Dave Steuart for ironing out some controversial matters over the past three years. During his term he initiated several progressive programs, which are now well underway. He also sparked thinking in other areas that will soon show new developments or extended services.

I feel there has been a marked improvement in liaison with hospitals and professional groups involved in the province's health. This has been brought about through regular meetings with health regions, professional groups, hospital councils, as well as chairman and administrators of the 145 hospitals throughout the province. It would certainly be my plan to continue this close liaison and extend it wherever possible as I deem it highly essential for the proper and efficient operation of the department. I realized when I took in the Department of Health that it was a department with many problems, but I also recognized it as an opportunity to do everything I could to make the base hospital proposed for Regina a reality.

The Premier in his remarks last week certainly dispelled any question about the intent of this government in regards to a third hospital in Regina. I commend him for this announcement; it will mean so much not only to the people of Regina, but to people of southern Saskatchewan requiring the services and facilities provided by a hospital centre such as we have in Regina. It is quite evidence to me that much planning must go into the base hospital for Regina in order that the best possible facility will result and that the best possible one will be made of the new facilities as well as of the existing facilities. The area planning council will play a very important role in coordinating the services to be provided by the three hospitals. One might more properly refer to four hospitals since the combined Geriatric Centre and Rehabilitation Centre represent some 300 beds which must be coordinated with the other facilities in Regina. There will be many demands on the taxpayers' dollars as well as private sources to upgrade existing hospital facilities in the city. This makes it doubly necessary to see that the entire facilities available to are coordinated fully. Besides having inspected some interesting hospital complexes in the United States, I have personally checked the facilities provided by the Grey Nuns', the Regina General, and the Geriatric Centre and Rehabilitation Centre. Drawing from this experience, I will make it a point to work very closely with the Area Planning Council to see that the best possible hospital facilities are made available to the very competent and dedicated medical personnel available in Regina. Our government recognizes that good facilities are essential to hold and attract qualified and specialized medical people, and it will be our objective to make such facilities available rather than perpetuate the neglect fostered in the previous government. As things stand now, great credit must be given to the physicians and staff who have persevered despite outmoded facilities.

Mr. Speaker, I am sure that many people in Saskatchewan were shocked at the pictures and text in the Leader Post which only last week showed the deplorable conditions of the Munroe wing of the Regina General Hospital. Our government is extremely

disturbed at the neglect and unconcern that brought about this situation. Long before the Leader Post story appeared, we made provision for a grant in excess of \$100,000 to renovate that wing and extend facilities, and I can assure Members that far more extensive psychiatric facilities will be built into the third hospital

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. GRANT: — The same damning evidence of the D.V.A wing of the same hospital. Outdated bed accommodation for 146 patients was conveniently overlooked by our predecessors. The Liberal government has stopped this “overlooking” policy and is doing something about it. We provided \$460,000 for 80 new beds and a modern emergency department in the new MacPherson wing of the General. Another \$157,000 was provided for renovations to the D.V.A. wing. Add that to an estimated cost of \$104,000 for renovations to the Munroe Wing and there is a total of \$711,000 in three years of Liberal government. How does that compare to the CCF government which did not add a single bed from 1949 until it went out of power in 1964? Mr. Speaker, it just doesn’t compare. The Liberal government has been a government of action on provincial hospital problems and will aggressively continue its forward program in this regard. May I emphasize that a third hospital will not be a hospital serving only Regina, but will be a hospital situated in Regina which will serve both the people of Regina and of southern Saskatchewan.

I would emphasize that I will speak in terms of hospital services and point out that sound health planning does not see brick and steel construction or the number of beds provided as ends in themselves. True health planning consists of satisfying needs economically and without duplication. Our government is putting forth a health services plan for the southern part of Saskatchewan and a new hospital is only a physical manifestation of that overall planning. This hospital will be built after careful consideration of the present and future needs of the people it will serve and after a comprehensive study of our present resources. This sort of planning has been greatly facilitated by cooperation of Saskatchewan hospitals.

This year saw the formation of the Southeast Regional Hospital Council. Now there is an opportunity for every hospital in this province to participate in planning and thus coordinate its activities according to the needs of the area. There are 130 hospitals which are members of councils now, compared to less than 80 a year ago. Health services planning for the part of Saskatchewan served by Regina has been greatly facilitated by the Hartman Report. I feel, Mr. Speaker, that some credit should go to the CCF for having commissioned the report when they were in power. However, after 20 years of neglecting Regina’s health facilities, it was about time that some serious planning was done. The people of Saskatchewan can be thankful that under a Liberal government there will be some action taken.

Mr. Speaker, it has already been made clear by the Premier that Regina citizens must assume some financial responsibility for their own hospital needs. But our government also realizes that Regina facilities are used by the southern half of this province. The Hartman Report pointed out that in 1964 36 per cent were from outside the city. In all, people from 125 municipalities were using these facilities. However, if we consider hospital utilization in terms of patient days, the utilization rate of

people outside of Regina was even higher, because while it was possible for people to use local hospitals for minor illnesses, they needed the facilities of a larger hospital for more serious illnesses. For these reasons, our government feels that investing of provincial funds in Regina hospital facilities is an extremely legitimate undertaking. Now, Mr. Speaker, let me say something about the services we want to see provided.

Some of the members of the opposition have suddenly discovered that there is a waiting list of 2,000 for Regina hospitals although they were strangely oblivious to this fact when they were in power. To look after the needs of these people we do not just need more beds, we need more and better use of other hospital facilities. We have heard of cases of patients occupying a bed for several days while they wait for an operating room. We must take a look at full scheduling on a seven or at least a six-day week to ensure maximum use of our facilities. Staff holidays should be staggered so that we do not have slack periods during the summer when optimum use is not made of our hospitals. Again may I stress that the new hospital will have a close liaison with the university. It has been shown in the past that the best medical standards are maintained at those hospitals which are balanced in these areas: patient care, teaching, and research. Operating on this premise, we will work diligently toward making the hospital complex for Regina a teaching and research centre closely associated with the medical school of the University of Saskatchewan. We should make Regina attractive not only to medical personnel, but to all those other technically trained people so essential for the care of the sick. In effect we are setting up an overall health services program for the southern part of the province. The basis of the program is coordinating services and coordinated facilities.

Our government has already taken steps to merge the Regina Geriatric Centre and the Regina Physical Rehabilitation Centre into a single centre which will be part of the Regina-based health services complex. These two centres will be operated by the Department of Health from April 1st under the name of Wascana Hospital. We hope soon to announce an administrator for rehabilitation and chronic care aspects of a hospital program which is important if we are to operate a program which provides care according to needs. Such a program is called the "Levels of Care" concept. This concept proposed eight progressive levels of care which include such stages as intensive care, moderate care, home care, and out-patient care. In short, we would have a comprehensive program of progressive patient care. The advantage of this is that it assures that physical and staff resources are not wasted. I would like to point out, Mr. Speaker, that staff resources are even more critical than physical resources. There are indications now that our supply of physicians will not keep pace with the normal population expansion. Therefore, it is most important that our physical resources afford optimum use of these people. We realize that by supplying medical personnel with the best in physical resources, we have a better chance in drawing them to or keeping them in Saskatchewan. I have made these foregoing remarks so that the public can be kept fully aware, as is their right, of the hospital we are planning.

I would note for the record that the Hon. Member from Regina West, (Mr. Blakeney) stated in the Regina Leader Post on February 8th that he is pleased with the hospital announcement. He said also that he would be more pleased when he sees definite indications that the project is being proceeded with. Now, Mr.

Speaker, I am not one to deny the Hon. Member his pleasure, nor would I deny him having his pleasure intensified. Therefore I was most happy for him when I was able to announce last week that we were proclaiming the South Saskatchewan Hospital Centre Act, something the Hon. Member had never go around to when he was Minister.

I am also most happy for him today because I wish to announce the chairman for the base hospital. This is a great responsibility to place on any man's shoulders and I have extreme pleasure and satisfaction in announcing that Mr. John Rowand has agreed to accept this position. Mr. Rowand is a prominent young businessman who has much to offer this province, and has demonstrated his capability in many sectors and areas of community life. Before this session ends, Mr. Speaker, the government plans to announce the entire board for the hospital. It is to be hoped that then Mr. Blakeney's pleasure will be complete.

I can't miss this opportunity to make some observations on the words of the Hon. Member from Regina East (Mr. Smishek). I'm glad to see both Members are in their places this afternoon. The Hon. Member I refer to along with his colleagues, the Mayor, have so vocally blamed this government for all the hospital ills presently existing in Regina. They remind me somewhat of chameleons in that while only a few days ago they were clamoring in criticism, they suddenly changed color and jumped on the band wagon in an attempt to get some political mileage for the Premier's announcement of last week on the hospital. On a couple of occasions, the Hon. Member in question has insinuated that I have been sitting on my hands when I should have been doing something else. But let me point out to him that I wouldn't suggest he try sitting on his tongue since it would be quite an acrobatic act, but I would suggest he hold his tongue when he is not sure of his facts.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. GRANT: — He indicated that there is cause for skepticism because no date had been set for construction, no agreement announced with the Federal Government, no land purchased, no hospital board appointed, no architect hired, therefore, how could a cost figure be established? Let me point out that his colleague, Mayor Baker, and others seem to be having difficulties these days coming up with an accurate figure for an auditorium even with an architect. It does not require an architect to arrive at an estimated cost. I think my previous words indicate our seriousness in proceeding with this hospital, in that we have proclaimed the Act, we have named the chairman, we have designated the property and he's going to find out over the next few months that the Premier was not using any weasel words.

Mr. Speaker, I am sure that all those present will be familiar with the Saskatchewan plan for the mentally ill. It is a plan of great vision and I will always recall with pride the fact that I was a member of a government which had the courage to implement it. It is also a matter of pride to me that the citizens of Saskatchewan have endorsed this plan. Last summer we heard a great deal about the ad hoc committee on the resettlement of mental patients. Many of us wondered how favourable their report would be on the concepts of the Saskatchewan plan. It was an historic moment when the committee endorsed the concept of out-patient treatment and I can truthfully say that their backing gave the government the stimulus to continue implementing its recommendations.

Today I have the privilege to speak on a plan which will be for the retarded what the Saskatchewan plan has been for the mentally ill. Mr. Speaker, this is considered an age of enlightenment, almost everyone accepts the fact that mental illness is a disease that can be cured. Unfortunately too many of us consider that, while there can be hope for the mentally ill, there can be no hope for the mentally retarded. Mr. Speaker, this is not true. I am sure that many of us present watched the recent program on CBC television entitled "One in Every hundred." I am sure too that it opened up our minds to the problem of mental retardation. But I am sure that most of us said, "What does this mean to me?" let me say what this means. The title, "One in Every Hundred" referred to the fact that one in every hundred children is born mentally retarded. In fact, the figure is much closer to three in every hundred. This means that by the time the population of this province reaches a million we can estimate 30,000 adults and children will be impaired by some degree of mental retardation. Our government realizes, Mr. Speaker, that these people have as much rights to realize their full potential as any other citizen in this province. And we believe that rather than build huge institutions, the best way to improve their condition is by employing the out-patient approach as used in the Saskatchewan plan.

Many of us here, Mr. Speaker, may be shocked at the task of providing for 30,000 people. However, only one in a thousand of our population suffer such severe retardation that he must spend most of his life fully dependent. Approximately three person in every thousand suffer moderate retardation. With special training, they can acquire basic personal independence. The majority of the mentally retarded — 26 out of every thousand — can look forward to social and economic independence, if we provide the necessary vocational and educational opportunities. In the past, Mr. Speaker, and I lay no blame, it was that group of the mentally retarded that had the most potential that were discriminated against the most. In the future, Mr. Speaker, our government will ensure they have expanded opportunities. I feel that it is only right that we recognize the fact that private organizations such as the Saskatchewan Council for Crippled Children and adults and the Saskatchewan Association for Retarded Children have done commendable work in dealing with this problem. This year the Saskatchewan Association for Retarded Children is assuming the responsibilities of a service agency and is setting up a sheltered workshop in Prince Albert. Our government will provide a grant to aid them in getting staff. We feel that this is a step in the right direction because it aids those who are mildly or moderately retarded. The Department of Public Health in assessing the distribution and severity of mental retardation feels that the group most sadly neglected at present is the group composed of the mildly and moderately retarded. Mr. Speaker, we feel that community services rather than institutions are the best means to provide for their needs. We propose to divide the province into six mental retardation regions.

The centres for these regions will be in the Saskatchewan Training School at Moose Jaw, the Saskatchewan Training School at Prince Albert, and clinics in North Battleford, Yorkton, Weyburn, and Swift Current. Through these regions we will provide comprehensive diagnostic, out-patient treatment and counselling services. We will place special emphasis on the support and guidance of families. The program will be integrated with temporary or permanent in-patient care for those who require it.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to use the Moose Jaw Training School as an example of the way in which our government is

expanding the mental retardation program. To begin with we are substantially increasing the number of positions as well as modifying the role of existing staff. This will enable us to expand our intra-mural program in vocational rehabilitation. The Federal Manpower Department has given us grants in the past and has indicated that future grants will be forthcoming for an expanded program. This spring 60 women and girls of only moderate retardation will take part in an intensive program including counselling, training in social graces and vocational training. The program is aimed toward integrating the girls into the community.

Related to this is an extra-mural program. This will include resettlement of patients, follow-up and supportive services, and counselling for their families and employers.

Mr. Speaker, in the past, through neglect and ignorance, the mentally retarded have been allowed to become a social and financial burden. We must ensure in the future that they have every opportunity to develop themselves. Under our plan the initial responsibility for bringing this fulfilment is with the Department of Public Health. Eventually we hope for a closer liaison with the Department of Welfare, the Department of Education, and the Federal Manpower Department. I am convinced that the public will show the same acceptance of the program as was shown for the Saskatchewan plan and I would hope, Mr. Speaker, that Members of this Legislature will show the way with their leadership.

I would like to conclude, Mr. Speaker, with the observation that in the public health field in Saskatchewan there is an air of optimism which even socialist gloom cannot dispel. A Liberal government has expanded previous health programs and is introducing new ones. This session we will introduce a number of bills that will among other things increase the membership on the University Hospital Board, extend nursing home and medical representation to the Regional Hospital Councils, and set penalties for leaving unattended refrigerators in places accessible to children.

We have got things going on a base hospital. Within weeks we'll distribute almost \$400,000 to deserving hospitals throughout the province with money raised by the Hospital Revenue Act. Within the month a mass polio vaccine program will be carried out among pre-school children. In the past year, for the first time free measles vaccination has been offered to all pre-school children in Saskatchewan. Also in the past year an unprecedented number of scholarship and bursaries were awarded to Saskatchewan health workers. This spring the special Committee on Alcoholism will release its report and we can look forward to this government taking action that will further meet our province's problems in alcohol addiction.

One can only conclude, Mr. Speaker, that these have been exciting days in the public health field and that the future is even more promising.

I imagine it is quite evident, Mr. Speaker, that I will not support the amendment but I will support the motion.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MRS. SALLY MERCHANT (Saskatoon City): — Mr. Speaker I enter the debate at this point to

indicate my wholehearted support of the program that the government has put forward for consideration at this session and for the resolution that is before the House. Indeed, Mr. Speaker, I think I will find it hard to believe that Members opposite who have paid lip service to all that is contained in the outline of our legislation can now really vote against it as they indicate that they will. They who have so often talked of their dedication to education, to agriculture, to our youth, to our senior citizens, to our Indian population, now indicate that they will oppose a program of action on behalf of everyone of these. The who talk so much about their concern for the welfare of the people of Saskatchewan, now propose to vote against measure after measure that is designed with just that in mind, the welfare of the people of Saskatchewan. They are measures that are proof that this government is taking positive action that will benefit the people of this province.

There are particular aspects of our legislative program, Mr. Speaker, to which I would like to address myself today, but before I do I would like to vice again my own pride at being part of a government that is taking action on so many fronts. Mr. Speaker, when I first rose in this House two years ago to speak I recall expressing pride in the leadership of my party, that was at that time so new to government. The pride I felt then was in the leadership that had brought my party and my philosophy into government, and looking back upon it, it was a pride full of hope. But it was paled by comparison by the pride I can now feel in that same leadership when I can reflect on two years of accomplishment, an accomplishment, Mr. Speaker, that I would not have dared to hope for two years ago. My own city of Saskatoon is evidence of the change that has taken place in Saskatchewan in those two years. The economic advances, the growth, the enthusiasm, the buoyant outlook that are abroad, all are typical of changes that have been effected under this government and in due turn affect the welfare of our people.

I would be dishonest, I think, if I did not now pay tribute to the leadership that the Premier has given, leadership that has gone so vigorously and so directly to the heart of the problems that have for so long vexed this province. I take some pride, Mr. Speaker, too in the fact that the leader of my party, the Premier of this province, gives priority to the very things to which I, myself, give priority, to our youth, to their education and their welfare; to the development of our resources so that Saskatchewan will afford its people equal and better opportunity than exists elsewhere in Canada; to transportation facilities across this vast province to serve our people and the commerce that will serve our people; to our senior citizens who laid the foundations of this province, who developed institutions and patterns of life from which we now profit and which we now seek to hand on improved and extended to the generation that follow; to our native population whose problems compounded each year that they went unsolved. These are the priorities that the Premier has established and that this government has followed, and these are the priorities in which I and every one who has a sincere interest in the development of this province, heartily concur. There is no more, Mr. Speaker, I think to demand of government and its leadership than it have truly responsible concern for all of the people who chose it to govern. And, Mr. Speaker, I think a truly responsible opposition could in fact find no fault in the attitudes of this government, or in its accomplishments, or its aspirations for the people of this province. Within the total program that is before this House

for our consideration in this session, I would like to deal particularly today with what can be broadly classed as consumer protection.

In this area, I would like to say, Mr. Speaker, that I am one who believes very firmly that protection of the rights of one segment of society always carries danger of infringement upon rights of another segment. And for this reason, I regard this kind of legislation, as requiring the very highest degree of responsibility on the part of any government that would enact it, a responsibility that has regard for our duty to the entire population of the province, and all of the segments of the economy.

In the last 20 years, there has been increasing need for measures on behalf of the general buying public. Whether they are buying bacon, and soap flakes in a supermarket or vacuum cleaners, or house-siding from an itinerant salesman, or used cars, or buying burial plots against the day of their inevitable use, whether they are buying investment shares or scholarship plans, there is need for some protection. And I would be the last one in the world, Mr. Speaker, to advocate or even to support any kind of legislation that was so restricted as to remove from people the right to spend their own money as they see fit, or even remove from them the right to make a mistake, if they see fit. I feel that over-protection turns very easily into over-control. On the other hand, I would not be satisfied with a government that allowed sharp or misleading business practice to jeopardize the rights of the general public. As a government we have moved to protect those rights. In the last two years The Direct Sellers Act, The Cemeteries Act, The Motor Dealers Act, changes in the Investment Contracts Act all have been designed to this end. And not only with legislation passed but an investigation branch was established for the investigation of complaints and the enforcement of the laws.

Legislation that will come before this House will extend this protection. The Mortgage Brokers Act will require the licensing and the control of people who lend money or security involving land or real property. It will protect the public from misrepresentation and in some cases from outright fraud, from deceptive advertisement, or inducement to borrow money in this way. And it will ensure that only those who are honest and competent are allowed to engage in the business. It is only just that the public should have these protections and until now they have not been sufficiently. The unconscionable transaction legislation goes even further in that it provides for relief in cases where people have already borrowed money, or bought goods on credit to find later that the so-called fine print in the contract has placed them at the mercy of the creditor. The Act will provide a means whereby the courts may examine a contract suspected of being unfair in this way, and relieve the debtor of excessive payment or even order the return to him of money already paid that is judged to have been unfairly charged.

Financial failures in other provinces, and indeed problems in our own province in years gone by, have indicated a need, a very great need for protection where investments are concerned. Protection to ensure that people whose security rests on income from investment can be certain of its safety. Upon taking office this government moved immediately to improve the legislation that protects investment in companies licensed in Saskatchewan. And that move has proven most effective, Mr. Speaker. We have had in this province in the last two years none of the problems that

have occurred elsewhere. And we propose, this year, with The Securities Act to go even further. The Act will oblige the provisions of not only more information but of information on a continuing basis to investors and to shareholders. It will further provide for a two-day cooling-off period similar to that in The Direct Sellers Act that will apply in the case of primary distribution, which will be a measure of protection against the so-called fast-talking promoter.

The White Paper, the Citizen's Protection Code, that was tabled last week in this House, expresses concern at the inadequacy of our present Act, and indicates the government's determination to prevent undesirable business elements from moving into this province. These are the ways, Mr. Speaker, in which I am proud to say our government is moving to protect the rights of our people, not with impassioned speeches on civil liberties and individual rights, but with direct legislative action to support our belief that we have a responsibility to protect the rights of citizens and that is what we're doing.

There are other measures that we have taken that are related to what we generally classify as the consumer in the narrower sense of the person who controls the expenditure of the household budget. And two of these measures I would like to refer to briefly. Time does not permit the attention that their importance should really command. One is the Commission under the chairmanship of Judge Mary Batten, that is presently receiving submissions on the rising cost of living and the means to control it, particularly as it applies to the prairie provinces and to food costs specifically. Certainly it is a problem of such increasing proportions that it required the best means at our disposal to attempt a solution. Cooperation on a regional basis with Alberta and Manitoba appeared a superior approach to any investigation that might have been centred only in one province. What the recommendations of the Commission will be, no one can say. Whatever they are I would be prepared to press very vigorously for their implementation, if, in the Commission's burden on those whose incomes are not high, or those who live on fixed incomes. I would hope that the Commission might establish an area of study in which government can become involved; some areas in which consumer education can be effective; some areas where direct legislative action is called for. It is premature I know and perhaps out of order to discuss it at all in the House, but the urgency of the problem prompts me to voice my approval of the action that we have taken thus far, and my hope that direct measures may be applied to control the rising cost of living.

The second area relating to consumer problems to which I would like to refer is one way in which we are able to move with the assurance that it is a necessary and effective means to protection. And that is The Cost of Credit Disclosure Act, that will place Saskatchewan among the pioneer provinces in this kind of legislation. The amount of credit that is extended either in instalment buying or on revolving credit or budget accounts is staggering. It's almost impossible to discover just what proportion of goods and services are bought in this way each year. And it is right that people should have these goods and services available to them in these ways. But what is not right is that people find it almost impossible to discover what the cost of credit is. Costs are too often calculated only in terms of monthly payments, and the total cost, that is the value of the goods plus the interest on the loan to buy the goods, is

never or rarely available.

We propose to oblige disclosure of these costs, not in confusing percentages of interest, but in actual dollars and cents, and the actual percentage of the cost that is paid not for the goods but for the convenience of credit buying. It is not a measure, Mr. Speaker, designed to restrict credit buying, but it is a much needed measure to ensure an open understanding in any credit transaction of exactly what the purchaser is spending his money on. The purchaser, with all the facts clearly understood, makes in that way a better decision as to how he will spend his money. And it is to me the kind of legislation that carries no restrictions but obliges credit transactions to be conducted and advertise in ways that will protect the consumer.

Mr. Speaker, I cannot resume my place without commending the government for action that is proposed in two other acts which will come before this House, that will extend the rights of citizens. One is the proposal for a program of legal aid that puts Saskatchewan in the company of very few other provinces, who have moved to implement it. It is a start in a direction that I would hope to see before long include legal aid in civil matters as well as criminal. I think of the need for legal counsel for deserted wives in particular, for small landlords whose income is derived solely from rental income, and who are very often sorely tried by delinquent tenants. The scope of the program will, I am sure, be extended as time goes on and I urge the government to move as quickly and as far as necessity will demand. That we have made a start in this direction, Mr. Speaker, is an indication that it will be expanded. And in another area, Mr. Speaker, this government is the first on the North American continent to introduce compensation for victims of crimes. There are increasing numbers of cases where innocent victims have suffered physically and financially where families have been deprived through loss of a father or a husband, by death sometimes or even temporarily through injury. We propose a pattern of compensation to these victims of violence, to their families, which is only just, Mr. Speaker, and in my view long overdue. And I take great pride in the fact Saskatchewan takes the lead and shows the way to every jurisdiction on this continent in this regard. As I said at the beginning, Mr. Speaker, I am very proud to sit as a Member of a government that is taking action in so many ways that will benefit the people of Saskatchewan in whatever economic circumstance they find themselves, or in whatever corner of the province they live. I am very sincerely, Mr. Speaker, in support of all that this government is doing and will happily endorse the motion.

MR. E.I WOOD (Swift Current): — Mr. Speaker, one significant omission in the Speech from the Throne which was noted yesterday by the Hon. Member from Weyburn, (Mr. Pepper), and upon which I also wish to comment, is the lack of any mention of surface rights legislation.

Discussions over compensation to the farmer for the granting of surface rights to operators in the search and development of oil have been going on a good many years in Saskatchewan.

These started first in the Lloydminster area when oil was discovered there and farmers were not satisfied with what was being paid by the oil companies for the destruction of their topsoil and the inconvenience caused. After discussions with

the government and the oil companies a rather complicated formula was devised for arriving at what at that time was considered to be a comparatively satisfactory amount of compensation.

In January 1952, oil was discovered at Fosterton in the Swift Current area and discussions started all over again. I think there would not have been so much trouble if the oil companies had paid compensation in line with the Lloydminster formula, but they insisted on paying considerably lower amounts. Another association was formed of which Tom Garland (later President of the Saskatchewan Association of Rural Municipalities) was chairman, and I was Secretary-Treasurer. This association together with the Lloydminster and the South-East Surface Rights Associations, and the Saskatchewan Association of Rural Municipalities worked to achieve a better deal for the farmers.

We realized, Mr. Speaker, that the oil people had rights to search for the oil and to develop the oil, which must be recognized. We did not consider that the farmers had any special rights to the oil which lay under their land if they did not hold the mineral title; but we did believe that the farmer did own the surface of the land and his rights must also be recognized, and that he should be amply and generously compensated for the inconvenience to which he was subjected by the operations of the oil industry.

Several arbitration cases were heard and several meetings were held with the CCF government and the oil companies. The upshot was that the government brought out new regulations in the fall of 1953, that considerably raised the compensation payable under a more simple formula based on the municipal assessment of the land taken.

In our part of the province at least, the subject of surface rights was comparatively quiet for some years after the introduction of the new regulations in 1953. In fact, the first serious rumblings of discontent that I heard were down at Midale during the 1964 provincial election. I said at that time that so far as I was concerned, I felt that a good look should be taken at the matter just as soon as the election was over.

Well, you know what happened, and it was over a year later that the question came to the fore again. I feel that the farmers have a good case for the revision of surface rights regulations. In the intervening years since 1953, though the price of grain has not risen appreciably, the price of land has gone up drastically, especially in the past few years. So had the price of farm machinery which the farmers were forced to bum around and over the oil installations. The whole tempo of farming had increased. In 1953 oil development was in its infancy, especially in the southern part of the province, and those farming in the midst of oil development which were not realized when we were working on the formula in 1953. Some of these were noted by the Hon. Member from Weyburn (Mr. Pepper) when he spoke yesterday.

In the summer of 1965, the South-East Surface Rights Association was able to get the present government to take notice of their problem and the Friesen Commission was set up. Last year, Mr. Speaker, here in this House, and on other occasions I have commended the government on taking this step. Judge Friesen gave the matter objective study, heard scores of witnesses and

thousands of pages of briefs from all who wished to appear before him and he came up with a momentous report on the subject.

Now the government opposite is dragging their feet, for no apparent reason. The report was brought in last November with a proposed Act already drawn up by the Judge. But I see nothing in the Throne Speech about it at all.

I believe that they should cease this dilly dallying and bring down legislation that would mean something worthwhile to the farmers of this province, who are forced to put up with the development of the oil industry in the midst of their own operations. It is not just time to review the surface rights situation; it is time to do something about it.

Mr. Speaker, there is another thing I have noted in this debate that should have been left out but wasn't. The Liberals yelped and hollered for years about the population statistics while they were in opposition, but by the way these statistics are behaving since the Liberals became the government they should have the good sense to leave them alone. But the Members from Moosomin and Melville have brought them up in this debate. It is well known that between the years 1931 and 1944, under Liberal and Conservative governments, but mostly under Liberal administration, we lost not only our natural increase which would have amounted to some 251,000 people, but our population actually dropped by some 85,000 as well, even above the loss of our natural increase. Under the CCF administration, our population stopped falling and increased by some 107,000. In the years 1951 to 1964 our population increased at the rate of over 8500 per year. The last year we were in office it increased by 10,000 persons. The Premier says that our population is increasing under the Liberals. Well, maybe so, but by about half the rate it increased under the CCF. In fact in the last period for which we have Dominion Bureau of Statistic figures, from June 1, 1965 to June 1, 1966 our population increased, not by 10,000 and not even by 8,000, Mr. Speaker, but only by 3,000. And there is good reason to fear from the family allowance monthly reports of transfers from one province to another, that during the time from June 1 to December 31 of last year, our population has not increased at all, but has rather decreased. I think it is time the Liberals started to quit talking about population figures.

It is difficult to tell just what lies behind the slowing down of our population increase, but I believe that it backs up the findings of the Hillis and Partners Report which was tabled in this House last Friday and was spoken of earlier in this debate. This report shows that job opportunities are not emerging at as fast a rate in Saskatchewan under the Liberals as they were during the last three years under the CCF government.

In this debate, and many times outside the house, it has been indicated that Saskatchewan is now a have province since the Liberals took office because of a cutback of some \$10,000,000 this year in grants from the Federal Government. This is just not so. The reason the federal tax-sharing grants are being cut back is not because Saskatchewan has become more

prosperous under the Liberals, but because the Liberal government at Ottawa has changed the rules under which the grants are given.

Originally they promised that the receipts from income, corporation and estates taxes would be equalized among all the provinces up to the level of the one province receiving the most from these three taxes. In 1963 the grants were cut to a level equal to that of what was received by the top two provinces. But now they have been cut back to the level of the average of all the province. This is the main reason for the cutback in Federal grants to this province for next year. In fact if the formula had not been changed, Saskatchewan would have been eligible to receive not less but some \$4,000,00 more next year than it did during the present fiscal year.

I would also like to say something about grants to municipalities. I don't wish to pick on him but the Hon. Member from Moosomin (Mr. Gardner) made another statement in this debate to which I take some exception, and I quote:

I believe the benefits of this Program can best be illustrated by referring to the rural municipalities in my own constituency of Moosomin. In 1965 these 11 rural municipalities received provincial grants of only \$9,572. One year later in 1966 the same rural municipalities received \$119,992 in grants from this Provincial Government, an increase, Mr. Speaker, of approximately 12 ½ times as much in one year.

I have a copy here of the "Cabri Herald" of November 15, 1966, and in it there is a quotation very much along the same lines. This one is attributed to the Hon. Minister of Mineral Resources, the MLA from Maple Creek (Mr. Cameron) speaking at a Liberal Annual Meeting of the Maple Creek constituency in Fox Valley, and I quote:

Referring to municipal assessments he said the government now pays 50 per cent of the cost of regravelling and maintenance of grid roads. This, he said, together with the new Equalization Formula and assistance for snow removal increased the amount of money to the rural municipalities in the constituency to five fold what was given in 1965. In total, the 10 municipalities in the constituency this year will receive \$103,000 as compared to \$18,000 in 1965 under the old formula. He quoted the assistance to the following municipalities in 1966 as compared to 1965: Miry Creek from \$528 to \$4,500, Clinworth from nil to \$4,600, Happyland from \$800 to \$6,800, Deer Forks from \$2,700 to \$8,000.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we all know that Saskatchewan has been having a succession of prosperous years which got rolling under the CCF and even the Liberals have been unable to stop it. To these has been added last year the best crop in the history of Saskatchewan. Funds have been rolling into the government coffers and last session, out of its affluence, the government was able to raise the amount of the assistance given to rural municipalities. This is something for which they are to be commended and I am sure that the rural municipalities did appreciate it. Assistance to municipalities on roads was raised according to last year's estimates by some 36 per cent over the previous year but, Mr. Speaker, this is not 500 per cent as

claimed by the Hon. Member from Maple Creek nor 1250 per year as is claimed by the Hon. Member from Moosomin. What these Members have done in making their extravagant statements is to completely ignore the millions of dollars that have been spent by the Provincial Government for the last 10 years in assistance on the Grid Road Program and which has meant so much to the people of this province. The government in office is not to be criticized for having given added assistance to the rural municipalities but let us not be foolish and try for political reasons to make it appear to be 10 or 20 times as much as it really is.

These are really seriously important days for Canada, Mr. Speaker, both in our relationships abroad and out relationships between her National Government and the provinces, and between the provinces themselves, here at home. If we are able to have a worthwhile and meaningful Centennial year, there must be many problems for which answers must be found. There are many problems confronting the people, the local governments and the Provincial Government of Saskatchewan. These cannot be solved through political manoeuvrings and through trying to mislead the public. This is the truth that the government often seems unable to understand. Mr. Speaker, for this reason as well as for several others, I will not support the motion. I will support the amendment.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. G.T. SYNDER (Moose Jaw City): — Once again I welcome the opportunity to contribute a few words to this debate. The tolerance and the latitude allowed in this debate provides the temptation to discuss a wide range of topics and matters of consequence to the Saskatchewan people. On this occasion, however, I hope to devote the bulk of time at my disposal to matters of particular significance to the city of Moose Jaw which I am pleased and honored to represent in this House. Some of the areas of concern are local in nature while many more however, have a general application and they are festering sores which affect a large segment of Saskatchewan's population. The Throne Speech appears to provide little hope for a solution to many of those problems. Before I begin, Mr. Speaker, allow me to offer my congratulations to the Cabinet Ministers who are assuming new portfolios since the House last met. I want particularly to congratulate the Minister of Social Welfare (Mr. MacDonald) on his newly acquired portfolio. I hope that he will manifest the wisdom to contribute to the betterment of that department. How the change in ministerial responsibilities will affect the Department of Highways, I couldn't venture a guess, Mr. Speaker, but gratefully that is the government's problem and not ours. During the last announced Cabinet shuffle, Mr. Speaker, the Premier indicated that he would be willing at some time in the immediate future to forsake the Treasury portfolio. May we offer our condolences at this time to his successor whoever it may be.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. SNYDER: — Under the stewardship of the Member for Morse (Mr. Thatcher), Mr. Speaker, we have witnessed the extravagance of a person dedicated to image building at the expense of many vital programs. A half or three quarters of a million dollars worth of marble floors in this building and the four lane freeway connecting the

ranch at Caron with the friendly city of Moose Jaw are only two examples. There are a good many more that could be offered at this time. In recent months the Provincial Treasurer has drained money from the Student Aid Fund. He's taken \$1,000,000 from the Public Administration Foundation and I expect also, Mr. Speaker, that the surplus medical care and hospitalization funds have vanished by now. The inheritance which he received from the former administration is all gone; there are no more piggy banks to rob so now the Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Thatcher) stands prepared to vacate the Treasury portfolio to pass it on to one of his colleagues. This brings to mind, Mr. Speaker, an old adage which seems to fit the case very nicely. It goes something like this: "The man who builds and lacks wherewith to pay, provides a home from which to run away."

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. SNYDER: — Mr. Speaker, the Throne Speech which was delivered by His Honor on February 2, left many of us wondering how it would be possible to devote seven days to the discussion of such a hollow document. I expect that much of the time that is yet to be used by the Members will be devoted to the discussion of matters which were excluded from the Throne Speech. In that way I hope we will have justified the expenditure of that amount of time. The amendment that has been proposed by the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Lloyd) does a concise job in indicating the failings and the shortcoming in His Honor's Address. It makes clear the displeasure of the official opposition at the indifference of the government concerning matters of vital importance to Saskatchewan people. The failure of the government to recognize the need for inclusion of prescription drugs under the Medical Care Insurance Act, I believe, Mr. Speaker, represents the most obvious omission of all. I believe, Mr. Speaker, that we will not be able to lay claim to a complete health plan until this goal is reached. The service of the medical practitioner is available to all Saskatchewan people. However, care and diagnostic service means little if there remains the financial barrier with respect to the substantial cost of drugs, especially in the case of our low income people and especially our senior citizens. We are told, Mr. Speaker, that in many cases the physician is restricted in the proper care and treatment of his patient because he knows that much needed drugs are out of the reach of the patient because of high costs and low incomes. We on this side of the House, Mr. Speaker, offer no apology for introducing this amendment. It presents itself to us as the logical next step in providing services to the sick. A major hurdle was passed in 1962 over the protests and the obstructions of those who sit opposite. Today they claim to support comprehensive, universal, prepaid medical care. This amendment, I suggest, Mr. Speaker, provides the opportunity for them to indicate to the people of Saskatchewan just how genuine they really are. We had hoped, Mr. Speaker, that at the very least we would have seen the inclusion of terminal cancer patients under a drug program during this session. This would have been the bare minimum which would have been expected in view of the fact that the Liberals promised drug benefits to Saskatchewan people during the 1964 election campaign. There is little doubt that a great many people supported the Liberal party expecting that this pledge was given in good faith. We call upon the government, Mr. Speaker, to honor, not our promises, but their own. I was pleased last Thursday, Mr. Speaker, to hear the Minister of Labor and the Minister of Cooperatives (Mr. Cohere) speak in such glowing terms in reference to the cooperative movement. As

Members are aware, the aim and the objective of the cooperative movement is to provide goods and services at cost. The growth of the movement, I believe, Mr. Speaker, is evidence that this cardinal principle is being endorsed by increasing numbers of people, in spite of the road blocks, of the opposition, of the friends of the Members who sit opposite. They seem to believe that the amenities of life should not be enjoyed until they have had the opportunity of taking a profit out of the operation.

The conditions under which some of these cooperative organizations came into existence are well known to many people. Many can recall the day when it was claimed that wheat could not be sold without a future market. The farmer couldn't get his first load of grain out, Mr. Speaker, until the bottom had dropped out of the market and these conditions prevailed until all of the wheat was out of the farmer's hands and into the custody of the Winnipeg Grain Exchange. If the farmer found that after paying his debts he was broke, he could also borrow money from the free enterprisers who had bought his grain at bargain prices. They would loan him money at high interest rates, take a mortgage on his farm and if through some misfortune, the farmer found that he couldn't meet his obligations, then they of course could take his farm from him. There was no future market for farm machinery, Mr. Speaker. The farmer couldn't buy a December binder at half the price of a July binder.

The solutions to these problems were met, Mr. Speaker, by the farmer when the action was taken by the farmers of Saskatchewan and a cooperative organization was formed in the Saskatchewan Wheat Pool. When the Cooperative Oil Refinery in Regina was ready to go into operation in the early 1930s, they found that the free enterprisers would not sell them crude oil in the hope the refinery would be left with a million dollars worth of scrap iron on their hands. The refinery survived only by building their own wells and producing their own crude oil and they succeeded. Mr. Speaker, in spite of the efforts of the free enterprise buddies of those who sit opposite in this House. The cooperative movement, Mr. Speaker, has come a long way in recent years since the days when it was a virgin project pregnant with hope. There is still a good deal that needs to be done.

In the Moose Jaw Times Herald of December 28, 1966, there is a news item accompanied by a news map showing the corporation profits by Canadian companies increased by \$100,000,000 this past year. For 1966, it showed that corporate profits totalled \$5,300,000,000 before taxes, but after all wage bills had been paid. Liberals opposite, Mr. Speaker, malign labor at every opportunity. They blame labor for every one of our economic ills. They have chosen labor as their own individual whipping boy. They completely ignore the fact, however, Mr. Speaker that corporation profits took \$5,300,000,000 out of the economic blood stream during this past year. Canadian food processors and distributors, on a percentage basis, Mr. Speaker, took twice the net profit of their American counterparts last year. It's an established fact that Canadian citizens have the dubious distinction of paying more for drugs than citizens in any other country in the whole world. I suggest to you today, Mr. Speaker, that this represents a free enterprise luxury that Canadian people can no longer afford and they will not continue to pay for it indefinitely in an era of high consumer costs and unprecedented corporation profits.

It is by this process, Mr. Speaker, that this uncontrolled free enterprise system digs its own grave. These people, Mr. Speaker, the friends of those who sit opposite are no more human benefactors than those who manipulated the grain trade a few years ago. This is why, Mr. Speaker, it matters not how hard the crew may work on the pumps or how hard the captain may shout the old uncontrolled free enterprise ship is sinking. It may be, Mr. Speaker, when the Minister of Cooperatives, if he was sincere when he spoke last Thursday, has perhaps had a glimpse of the handwriting on the wall.

I would like to return at this moment, Mr. Speaker, to matters of specific interest and concern to the people of Moose Jaw whom I am pleased and honored to represent in this House. The Members are aware that the city of Moose Jaw has lived in the shadow of the capital city and has suffered a disadvantage because of this. The age of technological change and a change in industrial techniques have also taken their toll with a subsequent reduction in transportation industries and food processing in particular. One of the recent and outstanding incidents which affected Moose Jaw adversely involved the closing of the Robin Hood Flour Mills. It seems that after 50 years of successful operation the parent company in Minneapolis decided that Moose Jaw was no longer strategically located for their purpose. It is widely recognized, Mr. Speaker, that flour milling has become an extremely competitive business in recent years. Former customers have established their own operations and in many cases, former customers have become our competitors. But having said that, there are still a number of disturbing factors in relation to the closure of the Robin Hood Flour Mill.

A few weeks prior to the announcement that the mill was to close, a large order of flour destined for Cuba was not even bid on by the company and the reason for not bidding was, and I quote them: "We're satisfied with the business we have." It is now an established fact that the equivalent of \$15,000,000 bushels of grain as to be milled for delivery to Cuba. When faced with the charge that American policy decisions in keeping with the American Trading with the Enemy Act had influenced the company not to bid on this order. This was denied by the parent company in Minneapolis. I leave it to you, Mr. Speaker, and to Members of this House to make your own decisions. Now, Mr. Speaker, the immediate effect was to have 90 families in Moose Jaw denied a livelihood. A request by my colleague, Mr. Davies, and myself to delay the closing for a full investigation was denied. Since that time the closing of the mill has resulted in a subsequent reduction in employment at the Prairie Bag Factory which provided materials for the mill and a subsequent reduction in railway crews who performed switching operations at the mill and handled a good deal of the finished product.

The closing of the Robin Hood Flour Mills involved final negotiations with employees affected. Since that time the company has contended that employer contributions to the employees pension fund are not to be turned over to several employees but they are to be retained by management. They are held at the present time, I understand, in Montreal Trust, and the latest information that I have received in this connection is that the matter is still under discussion with the employees hopeful that they may be able to salvage something from a fund which they always regarded as their own and was deemed to be, by them, a deferred wage.

Now this whole matter is significant, Mr. Speaker, when viewed in the light of the continued declarations by our bouncy Premier that there is only one thing wrong with foreign investment in Canadian industry and that is we don't have enough of it. The Robin Hood incident, I think, Mr. Speaker, point up the fact that foreign control over Canadian industry places us in a subservient position where, if extended to the extreme, results in a situation where we are no longer masters of our own destiny; we are not in a position to make final decisions with respect to either foreign or domestic policy. Some enlightened people in the Liberal party in Ottawa have already reached this conclusion while others in Ottawa and here in Saskatchewan still prefer to view this whole matter with their head tucked away neatly in the sand.

Last evening when the Member for Rosthern (Mr. Boldt) had a few words to say with respect to his responsibility in connection with the Saskatchewan Government Insurance Office, Mr. Speaker, he remarked about the excellent year which SGIO had just enjoyed. It might be fitting to take note of the fact that October of 1966 was designed as Fire Prevention Month. At that time Members will recall newspaper, television and radio advertising pointed out to us that the incidence of fire was down in Saskatchewan, and people in Saskatchewan were encouraged to keep up the good work. The Minister (Mr. Boldt) mentioned yesterday evening and he has mentioned on other occasions that SGIO has just enjoyed the best year in its history. It's not my intention to quarrel with the statement of the Minister or with advertisements in the press or the radio. However, assuming that these statements are true, I think the people of my constituency and the people of Saskatchewan are deserving of an explanation concerning the general increase in rates throughout the province. The smug and arrogant remarks of the Minister last night to the effect that we were perhaps poor risks just doesn't wash, Mr. Speaker. In Moose Jaw the fire insurance rates jumped from \$2.50 to \$3.50 a thousand or a 40 per cent increase. At the same time the deductible for hail and windstorm damage was doubled from \$25 to \$50. In other categories, coverage for window glass was withdrawn completely and I understand that personal liability has been decreased on many of these policies also. It is worthwhile to read the fine print, Mr. Speaker. I believe that it is evident to most people that the gap between rates charged in neighboring provinces and those enjoyed by the residents of the Province of Saskatchewan is gradually narrowing. If this trend continues, Mr. Speaker, the advantage here will disappear and SGIO will assume the position of just another insurance agency and its reason for existence will become negligible and remote. This appears, Mr. Speaker, to be a calculated attempt to re-establish private insurance companies and allow them to be competitive without lowering their rates. At the same time, Mr. Speaker, the benefits which the people of Saskatchewan have experienced on their Government Insurance Plan will be sacrificed on the altar of free enterprise.

Now just a few words, Mr. Speaker, with reference to some of the policy decisions that this present government and their effect upon the lives and the futures of the young people of Moose Jaw and similarly the youth of Saskatchewan. The Members will recall overtures extended to young people by campaigning Liberals during the 1964 general election campaign. At that time Liberals represented themselves as the sole benefactor and the savior of youth. There is little doubt that the campaign had some effect on those young people who lacked the years that

would enable them to make an accurate judgment. The time interval since May of 1964, Mr. Speaker, has had the effect of exploding that myth with the departure of the dancing girls and the return of McLaren Advertising Agency to their Eastern Canadian home. At this point in time, Mr. Speaker, the young people of Saskatchewan have received shoddy treatment from this particular government. The very young experienced a taste of Liberal benevolence during the Christmas season which is just past. The traditional Christmas allowance, Mr. Speaker, to welfare families for extra Yuletide needs which has been traditional over the years was discontinued by this government. These big spenders opposite, Mr. Speaker, rationalize by claiming that the change over to the Saskatchewan Assistance Act made the Christmas bonus unnecessary. In fact, Mr. Speaker, the increased schedule for rent in Moose Jaw and other municipalities I expect is absolutely meaningless. The practice has been to allow recipients of social aid the amount necessary to provide accommodation for themselves and for their family. The slight increase puts no money whatsoever in the recipient's pocket.

Let's take a look at the schedule for food, the increased schedule with the introduction of the Saskatchewan Assistance Act. The increase for adults amounts to \$1.50 a month for food from \$22.50 to \$24. For children age one to six years, up from \$12.50 to \$13.50 or an increase of one dollar. Age six to seven years an increase from \$18 to \$19 or an increase of a dollar a month. Age 12 to 15, \$23 to \$23.50 or an increase of 50 cents. I won't go all the way down the list, Mr. Speaker, but this would mean that for an average family of four with two adults and two children, the increase for food per month amounts to about \$5.00.

I understand, Mr. Speaker, also that there was a slight additional allowance for telephone services but the Member for Maple Creek (Mr. Cameron) has taken care of that quite nicely by increasing rates for telephone subscribers in recent times. The increase allowed by the introduction of the Saskatchewan Assistance Act falls far short of increased costs and yet it provides the opportunity, the excuse, Mr. Speaker, to chisel and to cut corners on those people who are least able to defend themselves. Those people at the lower end of the economic ladder. To deny these people the traditional allowance, Mr. Speaker, was shabby and it was cheap and it is out of keeping with the spirit of the season which is devoted in the main to providing a happy atmosphere for the very young.

The attitude of the government with respect to other amenities for young people, Mr. Speaker, is also a matter for concern in the city of Moose Jaw. Some 30 years ago, when I attended the YMCA as a young boy, the facilities there were already inadequate and antiquated for a population of our city in the 1930s. Today the need for new accommodation here is immediate and there is no hope for expansion or renovation on the present site. A short while ago, the decision was made to provide new accommodation, to provide a new YMCA building. The approximate division for the financing for the project was detailed in this way. The YMCA was to raise some \$60,000 from the sale of the present site. The community was expected to raise \$445,000. The city of Moose Jaw was to raise \$340,000 and the Province of Saskatchewan in view of the fact it had contributed to Regina and Saskatoon was expected and hoped to provide

\$100,000. Once again, Mr. Speaker, the young people of Moose Jaw received a taste of the kind of benevolence and concern that this government is becoming known for. The Local Government Board denied the city of Moose Jaw the right to proceed with the necessary arrangements which would allow them to provide their \$340,000 for this essential project. If the Local Government Board was not acting upon the direction of the Premier, I hope he would make his position clear in the immediate future, because this is a matter of immediate concern to the people of Moose Jaw and surrounding district.

During the 1964 election campaign Liberal spokesmen pledged themselves, Mr. Speaker, to provide opportunities and unlimited horizons for young people. To most people, Mr. Speaker, opportunity is synonymous with education. It provides them with the springboard from which they progress and advance. What then of the educational opportunities provided for young people since the Liberal takeover in 1964? The government showed its colours pretty early in the game when it had a look at the allotment of Grade 12 scholarship. The allotment by the former CCF government when it left office in 1964 totalled 637. Liberals took quick action, Mr. Speaker, and reduced this figure to 609. By 1965, Grade 12 enrolment had increased by 2300 and yet entrance scholarships fell to a low of 481. In 1966 we saw a further increase in enrolment at the Grade 12 level and yet the scholarship figure didn't even total up to the 1964 figure and it arrived finally at a figure of 594. The end result, Mr. Speaker, of this kind of economy measure, is not easy to estimate. However, it is certain that it means a denial of opportunities for worthy young people, young students. It means fewer opportunities for young people, Mr. Speaker, and not more.

Saskatchewan institutions of higher learning are not receiving the attention that circumstances demand. Students from Moose Jaw and throughout the province have been made aware of the courses available to them at the Saskatchewan Technical Institutes as the Member for Moosomin (Mr. Gardner) mentioned when he was speaking in the Address in Reply. They have been made aware of them and yet, Mr. Speaker, the end result has been that some 880 students were turned away. A total of 880 young people according to your own Sessional Paper No. 288, have been turned away from our Technical and Vocational Schools during 1966. In the field of vocational and technical construction, Mr. Speaker, the Herculean Liberal effort seems to have been to convert a portion of the Old Weyburn Mental Institution for this purpose. The Throne Speech speaks of a high demand for skilled workers and it seems to us on this side of the House, Mr. Speaker. That we've heard this tune played on at least two other occasions during the 1965 and the 1966 Throne Speeches. We hope that 1967 will be more productive.

It would be untrue to say that advances have not been made in providing University facilities. However, it's not sufficient to say that more has been done this year than was done last year or that more was done last year than was done the year before. This is true in every province in Canada. To properly measure the progress that we are making, Mr. Speaker, it becomes necessary to examine what has been done in the light of what we must accomplish with the increased demand for higher learning. Dr. J.W.T. Spinks issued a warning of a further move towards controlled enrolment in the January the 7th issue of the Regina Leader Post. And this I think provides evidence of genuine concern by educators who recognize the need for increased

activity by the Government if Saskatchewan is to fulfil the requirements expected of it. The attitude of the government to encourage the postponement of capital spending on the university level as an anti-inflationary measure, as was explained by Mr. Sharpe and our Premier, can only have the effect of making the problem more critical and making it more difficult for young students seeking entrance to both the Regina and the Saskatoon campus.

I want to say a few words, Mr. Speaker, about another matter which is of particular concern to the constituents that I represent in this House. The people of Moose Jaw, with the possible exception of the residents of North Battleford and Weyburn, are probably the most interested and concerned with the respect to the progress and the problems of the mentally ill. The understanding and the concern of our people for this unfortunate group are directly related, I believe, to the existence of the Saskatchewan Training School in our community. Parents of retarded children bring the retarded child home often for weekends and for holidays and inject them into a community atmosphere. Mental retardation in the city of Moose Jaw no longer carries with it the stigma that was the case a matter of some years ago. Staff members who receive far too little recognition, staff members from the Saskatchewan Training School can be seen during off-duty hours with a child, a retarded child or two, with them. During the summer months it is a common sight to see training school staff with a half a dozen of these young retarded children at the wicket of a Fairy Queen or accompanying them on hikes in Moose Jaw parks. Volunteer workers play an active role in working with these patients, both in and out of the institution. I believe the Minister of Social Welfare (Mr. MacDonald) will recall a musical skit which was presented by patients of the Saskatchewan Training School at the Youth Showcase. It was sponsored by the John Howard Society in Moose Jaw during this past summer. A combination of all these things, I believe, Mr. Speaker, have made the people of Moose Jaw tolerant and concerned and compassionate for these unfortunate people and it is widely recognized by our people that mental deficiencies occur at random. There are no exemptions by reasons of intelligence or wealth or stature in the community. Normality is regarded as a matter of good luck rather than good management. Against this background, Mr. Speaker it is little wonder that Moose Jaw people were shocked and distressed at the treatment of some of the people that had formerly been confined to mental institutions. Is it any wonder that they were shocked and distressed at the closure of Embury House in 1964, one of the first official acts of this government? Families in Moose Jaw that I know well will testify to the spectacular success of Embury House in the treatment of emotionally disturbed children. Since I became a Member of this House in 1960, the institution was a perennial target for Liberal Members who sit opposite who claimed that the expenditure of approximately \$100,000 a year was an extravagance and a waste. So they took quick action, Mr. Speaker, to close Embury House dispersing these children to the four corners of the country. This left a void and a vacuum, Mr. Speaker, and it represented an abrogation of a responsibility which is justly the responsibility of any good government. Apparently in recent months the government has come to recognize the mistake which was made when Embury House was closed, but rather than take the logical step and reopen the facilities and enlarge and expand and nourish it, the choice was made to leave the job to free enterprise. In recent months, Mr. Speaker, we have seen an influx of private institutions into the province.

While this field is properly the responsibility of government, these private institutions provide the only alternative at this time and I think in the main they are doing the best job possible under the circumstances. They lack, however, qualified staff; they lack the services of psychiatric people from the Department of Public Health and I doubt, Mr. Speaker, if the government can shed a bit of testimony on this whole matter to indicate that love and devotion alone are suitable substitutes for concentrated psychiatric care. With respect to the cost of providing service for the emotionally disturbed, it would appear that the government has blundered badly. At a cost of \$26.30 per patient per day, they will be paying dearly for care which I'm afraid will not compare with that which was offered at Embury House. The cost per patient annually is over \$9,000 per patient. A dozen such patients would have justified keeping Embury House open. This is another example, Mr. Speaker, of financial folly and indicates that the government operated on the basis of a faulty, preconceived idea which has resulted in inferior service and increase cost to the public.

The Throne Speech, Mr. Speaker makes not one mention of the care of the mentally ill and I think this is somewhat strange and surprising in view of the fact that this is a matter which is very much in the spotlight in recent months.

The rapid discharge of Weyburn patients raised a public outcry from all corners of the province and prompted the former Minister to set up the "Ad Hoc Committee into the Resettlement of Hospital Patients". This committee investigated, made comments and recommended to the government. The committee noted that the Weyburn Institution, in reducing its population from 1,500 in 1963 to about 500 in the spring of 1966 had — and I quote the report — "shown a sharper decline than that achieved by any other hospital in North America or the United Kingdom." We on this side of the House, Mr. Speaker, agree with the observations of the Ad Hoc Committee when they said, "The Saskatchewan Plan provided for in legislation in 1961 would appear to be based on a sound principle, that of treating the mentally ill person in his own area of the province rather than removing him many miles to a large institution." Now this, Mr. Speaker, we regard as sound judgment but we respond to and subscribe to the recommendations of the committee and the opinion of the committee that in order for the plan to function successfully that it requires: (a) in-patient facilities in a number of areas of the province; (b) adequate numbers of trained staff for both in-patients and out-patient treatment and follow-up; (c) a good working relationship between staff and community medical practitioners; (d) adequate community support and understanding. The committee noted also,, Mr. Speaker, that with respect to foster homes — and I quote the report again — "The lack of objective standards with respect to licensing, supervision and the keeping of patients' records was felt to be highly unsatisfactory." The committee also observed, Mr. Speaker, that most of the proprietors interviewed had no prior training or related experience, and I think this emphasized quite clearly the need for the observance of the Ad Hoc Committee's report and that more use be made of psychiatric nurses in this regard. Other recommendations of significance involve the suggested uses of the Weyburn Mental Institution, the vacant portion of the Weyburn Mental Institution. These suggestions for the future use included:

1. a geriatric centre.

2. a nursing home.
3. a school for slow learners.
4. a sheltered workshop.
5. a centralized training program for psychiatric nurses.
6. a centre for alcoholics.
7. a method to relieve the overcrowding in the North Battleford institution.

It was recommended also that intensified and continuing research be conducted into the resettlement of mental patients. I've had the opportunity, Mr. Speaker, only to touch very briefly on some of the major recommendations of the Ad Hoc Committee. There is a good deal more which could and should be said on this very important topic.

I believe it's worthwhile to observe what attention has been paid by the government to the recommendations of the Ad Hoc Committee. I should mention first of all in the opinion of many, many people that, if the Saskatchewan Plan is to be a success and to perform the function that was intended by those who conceived it, it is apparent that more staff rather than less staff will be required. To be successful, the best interests of the patient must be primary for the government. The cost of such a program must be secondary, and it must not be regarded as the opportunity for the government to economize at the expense of the mentally ill. And it would appear, Mr. Speaker, that this government has used the Ad Hoc Committee as a device to get an irate public off its back. At this point in time there appears to be little evidence to indicate that any action has been taken which is consistent with the recommendations of the Ad Hoc Committee. My experience, my observation and the observations of others with respect to the activity of the government since the report was received show no significant change whatsoever.

Patients in Moose Jaw half-way houses and in half-way houses throughout the province are receiving no more care, no more consideration, no more visits, no more occupational therapy than was the case before. Former Weyburn mental patients, Mr. Speaker, have made conditions intolerable in some institutions for normal people who are not mentally disturbed. It's made it necessary for some of the normal patients to pack their bags and move elsewhere. The need for additional nursing home accommodation, Mr. Speaker, has become acute as a result of the government's rapid discharge policy from Weyburn. The Speech from the Throne points to increase the accommodation for senior citizens. I hope that this will manifest itself and this will prove to be some relief for overcrowded conditions so that some of our senior citizens can take advantage of that kind of a program. Of this we heartily approve. The Park Lodge Nursing Home in Moose Jaw is one which was welcome to the city a number of months ago when it appeared to represent a very valuable addition to the community. In recent months, it has become the home for many former Weyburn mental patients. I am sorry to say that it no longer serves the community in the way it was expected to do. Among the patients are those who are referred to by the staff as the "strippers", who remove their clothes regularly and parade in the nude. Others during winter months, Mr. Speaker, have been observed in their underclothes attempting to board passing buses operated by the Moose Jaw Transit system. The ambulance service in Moose Jaw which is subsidized by the city of Moose Jaw has found it necessary in recent days to refuse service to the institution as they feel they are ill-equipped to handle some of these patients, these former Weyburn mental patients at the Park Lodge Nursing

Home without restraining equipment. On many occasions it has been necessary for them to thoroughly clean and disinfect the ambulance and equipment following the delivery of a patient from the Park Lodge Home to the General Hospital. I submit, Mr. Speaker, that these policies responsible for conditions such as these stem from a callous disregard for the welfare of these unfortunate human beings, and it represents a new low in a civilized society. This retreat back into the Dark Ages can never be justified, Mr. Speaker, on the basis of business efficiency.

I wish the Minister of Health (Mr. Grant) was here, but I would like to invite him to visit the nursing homes in Moose Jaw, in particular the Park Lodge Nursing Home which is regarded as the best structurally, the most modern and the most expensive in our city. I would like him to satisfy himself as to the standard of care that is being offered to patients there. I would like to have him decide for himself the extent to which former Weyburn mental patients are contributing to an intolerable condition for other normal patients in that nursing home. I would invite the Minister also to examine the records of Moose Jaw's two hospital and ascertain for himself how many long-stay patients are being detained in hospitals because no nursing home accommodation is available to them, when they might be discharged to the community to take advantage of home care services and the care of the Victorian Order of Nurses, thus freeing much needed hospital bed space for people in need of hospital care. The mention of more senior citizens homes, as I suggested earlier, Mr. Speaker, in the Throne Speech, provides some hope, I hope for an improvement in a very bad situation. The Minister of Health (Mr. Grant) and the Minister of Welfare (Mr. MacDonald) I think might very well consider it to be a good joint exercise to work out a reasonable standard with respect to the quality and the standard in nursing homes throughout the province and decide on a minimum of training for proprietors for these people and make it their business to see that regular follow-up visits are made to insure that minimum standards of decency are observed. Of the seven recommended uses to which the vacant space in the Weyburn Institution might be put, which included a geriatric centre, a nursing home, a school for slow learners, a sheltered workshop, a centralized training program for psychiatric nurses, a centre for alcoholics, or even a method to relieve overcrowded conditions in North Battleford, not one of these recommendations, Mr. Speaker, was regarded as being worthy of consideration by the government. But instead it chose to renovate and convert it into a technical school and in so doing, Mr. Speaker, it ignored its responsibility in the field of education as well as in the area of health and welfare of government activities.

In recent months, since the report of the Ad Hoc Committee was received, Mr. Speaker, many reports are still rampant with respect to patient neglect, with respect to inadequate heat, food and clothes. I wish the Minister would make it his business to see that these matters are checked out and some conclusion is drawn. One of the most outstanding and one of the most recent brought to my attention involves a former Weyburn patient who was admitted to the Union Hospital during the Christmas season. She was described as a person having the mental ability of a four or five year old. She was found, according to reports, trying on newspapers in a half-way house and was admitted to the hospital in an absolutely disgraceful state, Mr. Speaker covered from head to foot with her own body waste. A major clean-up was necessary before this woman could be admitted to the hospital and placed in a hospital bed. This is a grizzly

story, Mr. Speaker, to place before this Legislature and I can assure you that I receive no pleasure in drawing it to the attention of this House. But I can assure the Members of this House as to the condition she was in when she was admitted to hospital. I am sure that the records of the hospital would be more readily available to the Minister than they are to myself, and I would encourage his interest in matters of this sort. This happened, Mr. Speaker, not in the Dark Ages. It happened in the last half of the 20th century. It happened in the province of Saskatchewan, where only a short while ago we were described as having the most advanced mental health program in the whole of North America and where research and care and treatment of the mentally ill were an outstanding part of that program.

I intend, Mr. Speaker, to vote against this motion because in essence a vote against the motion on the Throne Speech is an indication of no confidence in this government and I need no better reason, Mr. Speaker. This government has failed to meet the needs of Saskatchewan people, it has failed to meet the minimum requirements in the fields of health, education, and welfare. In so doing it has failed the general public and it has failed the youth of our province in particular in many, many ways. I intend, Mr. Speaker. To vote against the motion and to support the amendment.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. K. G. ROMULD (Canora): — Mr. Speaker, first I would like to associate myself with the Members who spoke yesterday on the passing of John Cuelenaere. I know that we will all miss him in this House. Not only have we lost a great parliamentarian but the province has lost a great citizen.

Now like the speakers who spoke before me, I would like to congratulate the mover and the seconder of the Speech from the Throne. I think they did a tremendous job and I know that they were well received throughout the province. When I was home over the weekend several people came up to me and said how much they appreciated hearing the information from the mover and the seconder. I would also like to congratulate the Hon. Member from Milestone (Mr. MacDonald) on being appointed to the Cabinet. I now that he will bring a great deal of distinction to the Department of Welfare. I think I would be remiss if I did not commend the Premier for his explanation of the Speech from the Throne and I now that in this province, the people are beginning to look to Premier Thatcher as being one of the greatest leaders of all times.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. ROMULD: — I think we must remember that he's probably the only Premier in the provinces or in Canada that had to lead a province out of the state of wilderness that the socialists left it in.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. ROMULD: — And in the short period of less than three years he has made it a progressive province and a prosperous one.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. ROMULD: — And now, sir, I would like to say a few words to my hon. friends who sit across the way. I am very surprised at the treatment that they have given me this year; it's much kinder than it was two years before. None of them have made any comment about my sitting in the House this time. Of course before, you know, I was subject to their snide, their sneering, and their insulting remarks that I was not the Member of the Canora constituency. And I suppose that had they known the Election Act they would not have been so persistent in trying to unseat me. It is quite evidence now that even the people who wrote the Election Act didn't know it or they perhaps would have been successful in unseating me in Canora. But at least I appreciate their kindness in this session so far and I think that one good turn deserves another, so today I'm going to be as kind and gentle as I possible can be . . .

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. ROMULD: — . . . but still stay within the truth and the facts that are before us. Now, at this time, Mr. Speaker, I intend to comment on the Essential Services Act, a Bill brought before this House at our third session. The primary purpose of this Act was to ensure the people of this province that minority groups, encouraged by power hungry and ambitious labor leaders, would not be permitted to discontinue essential services through strike action, which could result in extreme hardships for our citizens and in fact, cause a real disaster in large areas of this province. When this government was faced with a strike by members of the OCAW union against the Saskatchewan Power Corporation that could have resulted in complete stoppage of our gas supply, Members on this side of the House, after long hours of deliberation, decided that a course of action must be taken to ensure the continuation of the essential services of our province, which are absolutely necessary for our day to day operations. For an example, if the gas supply was shut off many industries would be forced to close down, causing large numbers of our working force to be laid off. This would be the start of a chain reaction that would end in the closing of hospitals, schools, hotels, garages. Practically any business or institution you care to name could not escape the effects of such a strike.

MR. I.C. NOLLET (Cutknife): — Had that debate last September.

MR. ROMULD: — If the Member from Cutknife (Mr. Nollet) will either contain himself or go to the bathroom he'll have his chance to get up and say something after.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. ROMULD: — To the Members of this House it became crystal clear that we had an obligation to the citizens of Saskatchewan. Their welfare must be our primary concern. What reaction this legislation would have on our political future was never considered. Mr. Speaker, we take full responsibility for this Bill. In my opinion, a responsible and reliable government must be prepared to protect its people from strike action that could result in the province becoming next thing to a disaster area.

Our Administration believes in protecting all classes of people and we are the defenders of labor and not their persecutors. When faced with a near crisis such as we were, the course of action to be taken is never any easy one. There are always alternatives that can be considered.

Of course, we could have been like the previous administration burying our heads in the sand like the ostrich and refusing to face up to reality and the complex problems that come before us from time to time. This was not our intention last fall, and I can readily assure you that we on this side of the House will not shirk our responsibilities to our respective constituencies and to the people of this province.

When the Essential Services Act was placed before this Assembly to receive approval, and during the debate that followed Members of the opposite side accused us of dragging our feet for five months. We were criticized for not taking the negotiations out of the hands of management and placing them into the hands of the government.

However, the past performances of the old CCF administration do not coincide with the remarks expressed now that they are sitting in the opposition.

Let us review the 1954-55 dispute which lasted well over one year. And it is most apparent now that the Members who sit opposite, the self-styled, the self-appointed experts of labor and management, can readily offer advice, but when they were in the responsible position of being a government, they could not keep their own house in order.

It is interesting to note that the Saskatchewan Federation of Labor, which at the present time appear to be kissing cousins of the NDP, did not share the viewpoint of the socialists at that time. And here is what the union had to say and I have taken this from the Labor Gazette Volume 55, 1955, page 28.

A demand that the Provincial Government rescind an order "freezing" the wages of unionized employees of Crown Corporations highlighted the 11th annual convention of the Saskatchewan Federation of Labour in Prince Albert, November 26-27. The convention, attended by 196 delegates, passes an emergency resolution noting that all negotiations were deadlocked between the employees of Saskatchewan Power Corporation, Saskatchewan Government Telephones, Saskatchewan Government Insurance Office and other Crown Agencies.

The resolution said that this exists because of a decree by the Provincial Cabinet instructing all management groups bargaining on behalf of the Government that they have no power to bargain on wages.

This wage freeze decreed by the Cabinet Members nullifies the rights of free collective bargaining and lends support to the anti-labour forces throughout the nation.

Sir, I ask you to hear what they had to say, and this is the attitude of the government: "In addition the Provincial Cabinet's action was condemned as being anti-labour, reactionary and completely dictatorial".

This was the government that sat in this House in 1955, and

this is the reaction of the Saskatchewan Federation of Labor at that time. This was the attitude of the government at that time. Now it amazes me that a party with that vicious attitude displayed in 1955 could be successful in hoodwinking our innocent working people, and leaving the impression that the NDP party have their interests at heart. You can cover a wolf with lamb's wool, but you cannot change the cunning and characteristics of the animal and I offer a warning to the friends in the labor unions. Do not be taken in by this wolf in lamb's clothing. Their actions in the past have indicated a split personality, a real Jekyll and Hyde, and I maintain it still exists.

Now where was the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Lloyd) and his colleagues in 1955, the same people who stand in their virtuous manner and claim themselves to be the only defender of human rights? Where was their compassion for their employees of all the Crown Corporations at that time/ did they hear the cries and the pleas of the working forces then? No, they turned a deaf ear and closed the door in their face.

MR. W. DAVIES (Moose Jaw): — Signed agreements.

MR. ROMULD: — The great socialist humanitarians didn't seem to mind freezing the wages at that time. I think they enjoyed it. The wage freeze nullified the rights of collective bargaining. Now one can only assume that such action was taken for one or two purposes.

First, that the government realized the importance of continuation of essential services or it wished to warn the employees of the great power it had in its hands.

Whatever the reasons were, let us not forget that their friends, the Saskatchewan Federation of Labor, dubbed them as anti-labor reactionaries and completely dictatorial.

Mr. Speaker, we are often told that time is a great healer, and it seems that the scorn and resentment displayed at the convention of the Saskatchewan Federation of Labor was soon forgotten, and those terrible villains of the CCF government were to become the idols of the Saskatchewan Federation of Labor.

In the February 8, 1967 issue of the Commonwealth, that noted news media that has the reputation of having a staff that sees all, hears all, and reports nothing, had this to say.

'During the years of the CCF Government the support of the Saskatchewan Federation of Labor was a pillar of strength in building public support for the new landmarks of progress that stand today as a testimony to the government that was provided.'

Of course, sir, we must remember that in 1955 they were the old CCF party, and it appears they had more freedom to express their opinion as to what was good for Saskatchewan than they do since becoming affiliated with some of the largest labor unions. It is most evident now the unions who became affiliated with the NDP are the dictating force of that same party.

To back this theory, I cannot think of a better expression than the famous words of the former Premier (Mr. Douglas) of this province, which on many occasions I have heard him say, "He who pays the piper calls the tune." There is no doubt in my mind who

will be calling the tune for my hon. friends who sit across from us. And I, Sir, cannot help but pity them more than I condemn them. It is obvious now, in their state of confusion, their complete lack of constructive criticism, they knew not what they were getting into when they granted permission for the marriage of the CCF party and the labor unions. Now it has become a tragic union and it is plain to see the bride was old, the groom was weak, and the offspring appear pathetic.

However while I can sympathize with them, their future of doom is their own creation. Whenever the obsession for power becomes so great that a party will forsake the principle that they once stood for, they are headed for trouble. For the NDP it is only a matter of time till history repeats itself and like splinter parties before, will pass into oblivion.

Mr. Speaker, I'm sure we all remember how the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Lloyd) described Bill 2 as a compost heap. He went on at great length saying how it was contrary to the Bill of Rights. We on this side believe in a Bill of Rights, but we also believe in the rights of people. We believe our citizens have the right to expect that their power will not be cut off. We believe they have the right to a continued supply of gas, and last but not least, we believe that the sick and aged have the right to continued care.

I, sir, shudder to think what would have happened if the NDP had been in power in Saskatchewan last fall, as they are no longer the voice of the people being dominated by the unions. The howls and the protests that emanated from Members opposite were not the views shared by other Canadians. And I would like to quote from a few of the newspapers throughout Canada:

A Vancouver daily has this to say:

It is probably too much to expect Ottawa to do tomorrow what Saskatchewan has done today. Saskatchewan's Premier Ross Thatcher has pointed the way towards possible new Federal legislation with a law that provides for compulsory legislation for labor disputes in essential industries, where health, life and property are jeopardized.

Now I will turn to the Edmonton Journal.

The only thing wrong with Premier Thatcher's bill for compulsory arbitration in labor disputes that jeopardize life, health and property in Saskatchewan is that it does not go far enough.

MR. W.E. SMISHEK (Regina East): — Turn to Canadian.

MR. ROMULD:

Saskatchewan's proposed legislation appears very similar to that which has been in effect in Alberta since 1960.

From the Montreal Gazette:

The CCF Opposition Leader, Woodrow Lloyd called it a compost heap of many of the most vicious, least democratic statutes in Canada. But as he knows this Bill is patterned on similar laws now in effect in Ontario, Manitoba and British Columbia and the laws of these provinces have been accepted even if grudgingly. It is

interesting to note that Mr. Thatcher said the Government would not proclaim this Act, unless it was absolutely necessary to get the workers back at the Saskatchewan Power Corporation. The Government left the door open for a settlement to be reached by the usual collective bargaining process.

As you will note, sir, I have taken the viewpoint of three of our daily papers, and I could have quoted from many more. At this time, I want to point out that our government would not have proclaimed this Act had we not been forced to. As the Montreal Gazette points out, we left the door open for settlement by collective bargaining.

When you review the facts, one can question who was responsible for the strike by the OCAW union against the Saskatchewan Power Corporation. Incredible as it may seem, it is very easy to cast a suspicious finger at the Members who sit opposite to this Assembly. I'm not saying they promoted the strike, but I am saying there is a possibility, and, Sir, I do not say this without a reason.

MR. D.W. MICHAYLUK (Redberry): — Are you sleeping?

MR. ROMULD: — I'm not sleeping but you have been. Apparently the Member from Redberry (Mr. Michayluk) thinks he is a real wit. Well I have news for you, you're only a half wit.

First, I would like to quote from the editorial page of the Leader Post, and of course, you know this isn't a biased paper, of September 10, 1966.

The SFL put 13 organizers into the field to work for the re-election of the CCF Government. Now that should have read the NDP Government. The OCAW provided the services of five. One of these was Mr. Basken.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I want you to pay particular attention to the next paragraph.

It was also disclosed the OCAW union donated \$2,000 to the SFL for political action on behalf of the CCF against other parties in the campaign including the victorious Liberal party.

These shocking statements should leave no doubt where the OCAW stands politically as reported by the Leader Post. But in case there is doubt in the minds of those who sit across, I want to quote from page 53 of the Fact Book published by the OCAW:

In Canada, the OCAW has encouraged support of the New Democratic Party and has been carrying on a program of expanded political action somewhat comparable to that of the CUPE in the United States.

From these facts, sir, you can see why I question who was responsible for the strike. The close affiliation of the SFL and the OCAW union local indicates that strong political overtones evident in the strike are more real than imagined.

As for the Essential Services Act, we on this side feel we were fully justified in our action. It was gratifying to see

in the February 9th edition of the Leader Post, that the Saskatchewan Wheat Pool endorses a form of labor management court to provide for compulsory arbitration where an agreement cannot be reached in labor management disputes of industry which have special national importance.

Now, Sir, being a Member from a rural constituency, I would like to turn to my own constituency and make reference to the Municipal Department, and how it has helped the various constituencies throughout the province. Now, the rural constituency of Canora, like several others in the province, does not have any cities within its boundaries; we do not have any large industries to bolster the revenue of our local governments. The taxes collected are from the proprietors of various types of business and the working people employed in these different towns. Our rural area is heavily populated by comparison to the prairie regions of our province; generally speaking, it is mixed farm operation.

During the years of the socialist government, the people in my constituency and the citizens throughout this province saw their taxes increased by four and five times. Property tax was approaching a danger point for the small business man and the small farmer.

When we became the government, we recognized the burden of high taxation. One major program we instituted to reduce the impact of property taxation was the homeowner grants, a program that has been widely accepted by the people of this province. I am sure we all remember how the opposition fought this legislation in this House, and we are all familiar with the comments about the homeowner grants during the recent convention of the NDP. The people of Saskatchewan must be made aware of the fact that if the NDP are returned to office the homeowner grants will be done away with, regardless of their promises before election. This government has eased the burden of property taxation by making increased financial assistance to municipal governments.

We all know that municipal governments have two major sources of revenue. One is the property tax. The other is the grants from senior levels of government. The more in the way of grants, the less that has to come from the local taxpayer. And it's as simple as that. Yet the former socialists could not see it.

One of the programs which have been of great assistance to the rural municipalities, and consequently of benefit to the rural taxpayer, has been the equalization grant program.

Of great importance is the fact that last year we increased the equalization grants from \$600,000 to \$2,000,000. In addition to this, a new formula was devised for the distribution of these grants to ensure that they were channelled primarily to the less wealthy municipalities. After all, the purpose of the program is presumably to help the less wealthy municipalities.

Now, I am told by my colleague, the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. McIsaac) that no one in the Department of Municipal Road Assistance Authority has been able to determine the formula that was used by the previous administration. The same amounts had been paid to the rural municipalities, year after year, regardless of changing circumstances. In many cases, little or not relationship seemed to hold between the amount of the

grants and the need for them. In other words, the grants, besides being small in average amount, were not being channelled to the municipalities according to the program's objectives.

Now I say, Sir, that this type of confusion was not surprising, it is typical socialist planning.

Last year, Dr. McIsaac instructed the Research Branch of the Department of Municipal Affairs and the Municipal Road Assistance Authority to derive a new formula for the distribution of equalization grants to ensure that the grant would be distributed in accordance with the program's objectives. In cooperation with the SARM a new formula was devised.

The approach taken in this new formula was first to acknowledge by far the largest item of expense for rural municipalities was for road construction and maintenance. In order to estimate the final burden faced by each municipality on a standard basis, a complete road system was mapped out by the road authority for each rural municipality. This consisted of three classes: grid roads, primary access road, and secondary access roads. To determine this road system, factors such as location of highways, the location of farm residences and the situation of trading areas were considered. Basically this system provides for an all-weather road system for every farm residence.

After mapping out this proposed road system the next step was to calculate the cost that the individual rural municipality would face to construct this road system over a period of years and to maintain it. Annual costs and maintenance costs were estimated. In addition, provisions were made for administration costs for each municipality. The result was a standardized measure of long-term financial responsibilities with the municipality's ability to pay. A less wealth municipality could be defined as one which had a low assessment in relationship to the long run financial responsibility. The largest equalization grants accordingly had been paid to those municipalities whose assessment was low in relationship to cost of service it must provide over a long period. As I mentioned previously not only a new formula derived but the size of the grants were increased to a very great extent.

Now I use some examples from my own riding. The RM of Good Lake No. 274 received a grant in 1966 of \$13,312. This compared to a grant of only \$2,159 in previous years. Likewise the RM of Buchanan No. 304 received an equalization grant of \$1,301 in previous years whereas last year it received a grant of \$11,215, an increase of close to \$10,000. The RM where my farm is located, Preeceville No. 334, received an equalization grant of \$17,752 compared to a grant of \$3,009 in previous years, an increase of close to \$15,000. They are 10 municipalities either partly or entirely within the boundaries of my constituency.

The total equalization grants for these municipalities under the previous administration amounted to \$25,226. Last year the same municipalities received \$126,570, an increase of over 500 per cent.

When we add the snow removal grants which these municipalities have received and the grid road maintenance grants which they could receive under the program, we find that these municipalities have received, or are eligible to receive, \$181,242 in assistance.

Under the previous administration amounts going to the same municipalities for the same programs, as I mentioned before, was only \$25,226. Of course, the grid road and maintenance and snow removal program were just instituted last year.

In other words these municipalities that I have mentioned could have received an increase in provincial assistance of well over 700 per cent. Sir, I can assure you that this additional assistance has been well received by the various municipal councils. And they are most pleased that we have taken politics out of the distribution of grants. This has been expressed to me by councils of the rural municipalities, on many different occasions.

Just consider what this grant means to the local taxpayers in these municipalities. The grant for the RM of Preeceville No. 334 is the equivalent of over seven mills on their assessment. When you add the homeowner grant to this amount you can readily see what we have done. A great deal to ease the burden of property taxation, in spite of what the opposition says. The homeowner grant has been of real value to the municipal and town councils. It has created an incentive for the residents to pay their taxes in order to qualify for the grant. In fact, the reeve of one municipality told me their taxes had never been paid before at the rate they were being paid this year, and it was the first time in history that the municipality was operating without borrowing money from the bank.

With this increased assistance the opposition still insist that this government has made an effort to ease the burden of property taxation. They are either blind or are not aware of the true facts or perhaps a combination of both. Mr. Speaker, we are providing more assistance to local governments than ever before in the history of the province. Let us examine the socialist's record and their attitude.

Their attitude has never been more clearly displayed than at the Provincial Local Government Conference in 1956. At that time they were taking the first in a series of steps designed to force the county system down the throats of the people of this province.

In speaking of grants to local governments, the former Provincial Treasurer stated, "Further financial relief, however should only be made to local government which is soundly organized and effectively administered. We cannot afford to waste the taxpayer's hard earned dollars."

This was the thanks the rural councils received for their many years of devoted service to their respective communities. They were told, "If you yield to our demands and from the county system more assistance may be forthcoming." This was told to the members of rural municipalities by a man who was busy gathering his own bundle of loot which would later provide him with a generous retirement fund that is now being spent in the far south, to the best of my knowledge.

This attitude is completely foreign to Liberal government. We do believe that there are ways in which local government could be improved, but we do not believe that local councils are wasting our money, such as the CCF laid the blame at the councillors' door. On the whole, our local government officials are doing a commendable job, and the Provincial Government can

best help them in their efforts by providing increased financial assistance.

Mr. Speaker, there are a great number of points mentioned in the Throne Speech that I could comment on. However, it has been explained by my colleagues on this side of the House. The Throne Speech indicates another year of action under the capable leadership of our Premier.

In view of my remarks I am sure, Sir, you are aware that I support the motion and vote against the amendment.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. W.A. ROBBINS (Saskatoon City): — Mr. Speaker, I would like to preface my remarks with a brief expression of sympathy and regret at the passing of John Cuelenaere, former Minister of Natural Resources, and Member for Shellbrook, in this Assembly. He was a sincere person; he was a thoroughly approachable person; he was a tolerant person. Saskatchewan was the better for his passing this way, and suffers from his early departure. My condolences, Mr. Speaker, to his family and his friends.

Mr. Speaker, I don't know how it happens, but every year it seems that I follow the Member from Canora (Mr. Romuld), via the Court of Appeal. He is a rather tardy member. It took him two and a half years to get here, and he is a bit tardy in the debate as well because he was in the debate of last September in the September session throughout his discourse this afternoon.

Mr. Speaker, it is not my intention to engage in prolonged debate related to the Speech from the Throne. However, there are a number of items which I would like to comment on specifically. Before doing so, I wish to commend the mover, the Hon. Member from Notukeu-Willowbunch (Mr. Hooker) and the seconder the Hon. Member from Moosomin (Mr. Gardner). They spoke well and one might easily be tempted to place confidence in their statements if one was not already aware of the facts. The Hon. Member from Biggar (Mr. Lloyd) commented in his participation in the debate that the government was in a rather shaky position with its backbenchers apparently believing its own propaganda. Evidently, Mr. Speaker, Hooker has been hooked.

I would like also, Mr. Speaker to offer congratulations to Cabinet Ministers appointed to new portfolios since the conclusion of the spring session of the Legislature. I would like to congratulate the new Minister of Highways (Mr. Boldt). I am reasonably certain that the appointment of the Minister of Highways was very much appreciated by everyone associated in any way with the Department of Welfare. This, I suspect, would apply to employee and recipient of social assistance alike. Yesterday in this House, Mr. Speaker, the Minister contributed to the Throne Speech Debate. I believe the Hon. Member for Cumberland (Mr. Berezowsky) described this contribution as entertaining. Well, perhaps portions of it could be so classified, but I believe, Mr. Speaker, it could be more aptly described as a massive malfunction of parliamentary procedure. One often hears comments today with respect to highway and traffic problems, interspersed with quotations like this: "Well one of the major problems we have is that we have a lot of nuts on the road." I suppose that, in line with this logic, Mr. Speaker, there is nothing really wrong with having the "odd bolt"

in highways as well. The Hon. Member for Rosthern (Mr. Boldt) currently Minister of Highways is also the Minister in charge of the Saskatchewan Government Insurance Office. Political appointments result in rather strange anomalies. Here we have a Member of a party which condemned for almost 20 years the Saskatchewan Government Insurance Office and the Automobile Insurance Act which it administers. It was in the words of one prominent former Liberal of this House: "the greatest fraud ever perpetrated on the people of Saskatchewan." The Debates and the Proceedings of this House are replete, Mr. Speaker, with numerous speeches by Liberal Members when in opposition, including he Minister now in charge of the Government Insurance Office. Now, he defends it. Formerly he condemned it because it was compulsory and socialistic. It is still compulsory; it is still socialist, but now they say they operate it more efficiently. Mr. Speaker, had we not had a CCF government in Saskatchewan, there would not be a Government Insurance Office and there would never have been an Automobile Accident Insurance Fund.

Now, the Minister defends it even against the remarks of eastern insurance executives. He says he invited insurance companies to come up with a better plan. They couldn't do it. He says we run this office more efficiently. Well, one may well ask: how much more efficiently? He asserts the insurer has a greater proportion of his insurance dollar spent on claims than was the case when the previous government administered the insurance office. He neglects, accidentally of course to inform the House that legal and adjustment costs were previously part of the claims cost structure, and now these are farmed out to private adjusters and legal firms. The costs are still carried by the insurance office but they do not appear in the claims statistics. He boasts about the reductions in the insurance costs of public buildings, schools, hospitals, effected according to him by winds of competition. He asserts the insurance office profits are greater than ever. He neglects of course to inform the House that while some reductions occur in insurance costs in relatively few commercial insurance policies issued on schools, hospitals and public buildings, they increase the rates by some 40 to 50 per cent and higher by raising the rates on tens of thousands of individually issued policies, and through the insertion of a number of clauses, such as removal of glass coverages, and the raising of deductibles, have eliminated numerous potential claims which naturally enough result in increased earnings. Does one use efficiency to achieve these results? One does not. All one requires is, (1) a ruthless disregard of the consumer of insurance; (2) an agreement with other insurers to remove the embarrassment of real competitive rates; (3) a capability of disdainful distortion of the facts of the case.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. ROBBINS: — The Hon. Member for Rosthern (Mr. Boldt) quotes a Saskatchewan Government Insurance bid for the Saskatchewan Government Telephones insurance contract of \$229,000 and states that a competitor submitted a bid of \$56,000, winning the contract and thereby saving Saskatchewan Government Telephones \$172,000. Mr. Speaker, even the mathematics in this case do not add up. I do not know whether the Hon. Member was using the new mathematics or the old. I would ask Members to note the obvious value and the tremendous saving that was afforded to the Saskatchewan Government Telephones by the competitive insurance bid. The

Hon. Member's desk mate, the Hon. Member for Maple Creek (Mr. Cameron) and the Minister in charge of Saskatchewan Government Telephones, not to be outdone by his colleague, has announced that on March 1 next, Saskatchewan Government Telephones will institute appreciably higher rates for telephone service. Mr. Speaker, with friends like these, who needs enemies?

Mr. Speaker, I would like to congratulate the new Minister of Welfare (Mr. MacDonald) on his appointment. I'm afraid however the Hon. Member's tenure in this office will not last very long. The Premier of this province has made it crystal clear that he is anxious to get all transients off the welfare role. We must reasonably assume that this is an ironclad rule and therefore applicable to all transients. The Hon. Minister may be classified as a transient. If you doubt this, look at the record. One year as the legislative secretary to the Minister of Health, two to three months as the Minister of Industry and now a few short months on Welfare until the Premier passes him on to some other transitory role with the transitory government.

I would like to congratulate the Minister of Health (Mr. Grant). The Minister of Health got his picture in the paper today. I don't know whether you saw it or not. Quite a good picture. I congratulate him on it. I don't know whether it's to indicate that he is an industrious Minister of Health or a healthy Minister of Industry. I'd like to challenge the Hon. Minister of Health to a mile race, but I want to warn him in advance that unless he can do it under five minutes, he had better leave his togs in the locker room. The Minister of Industry (Mr. Grant) is a person for whom I have considerable respect but I find it strange indeed that he argues in the Throne Speech Debate that this government has changed the investment in the industrial climate of this province. Here is an item issued by his own Department, called Index 67. May I read briefly from it? The petroleum industry has since the late '40s continued to grow. We had a CCF government in the '40s. It talks about sodium sulphate. We had this development under a CCF government. The Beaverlodge area north of Lake Athabasca famous for its uranium mines during the late '40s and early '50s when we had a CCF government. It talks about a large iron ore deposit located at Choiceland, east of Prince Albert. It talks about three companies producing potash and they were producing potash or capable of producing potash when we had a CCF government in this province. It goes on to talk about the largest potash mine in the world at Esterhazy and I notice in today's Leader Post, an article, Thatcher Gives Strong Lead by Peter Newman. Now I now that government Members opposite are not too pleased with some writers, although I haven't heard any criticism of Mr. Newman. He is supposed to be a fairly astute political writer. And here is a comment in this particular item which reads as follows:

The most dramatic surge in the province is still in potash. That's a significant statement with a dozen mines expected to be operating by 1970. AT Esterhazy for example potash has changed a sleepy settlement of 350 into a thriving community of 3,500 since 1965.

The fact is that mine produced a million tons of potash in 1962 when we had a CCF government in this province.

We note again, Mr. Speaker, changes in the legislative

secretarial appointments. It is interesting to note that only four government members out of 32 elected have not to date been favored with legislative secretarial appointments, Cabinet posts, Speaker or Deputy Speaker, jurisdiction. Only the Members from Rosetown, Bengough, Moosomin and Cannington have not as yet been provided with additional enrolments over and above the indemnity of an ordinary legislative Member. Mr. Speaker, this merely reinforces our contention on this side of the House that the legislative secretarial appointment were merely a gimmick for raising the indemnity of government members in this Legislature, in some cases along with other political plums to rather ridiculously high annual figures. I think it was the Hon. Member for Athabasca (Mr. Guy) who said something about socialists not earning their keep. The Hon. Member for Athabasca according to a return in response to an inquiry by the Hon. Member for Kelsey (Mr. J.H. Brockelbank) received in the last year, the following incomes: as an MLA 4,335 plus \$2,165 in expense allowance as MLA, plus \$24 as a travelling allowance, plus \$8,284 for his position as a co-ordinator or supervisor of Northern Education, plus \$879.50 as travelling allowance and expense for his duties as a supervisor or co-ordinator of Northern Education, plus \$2,000 as a legislative secretary, plus \$500 as a legislative secretary expense allowance; a total of \$18,187.50. If you want to leave the room, sir, put up your hand and snap your fingers. Mr. Speaker, I am not in disagreement with this pay scale for the gentleman from Athabasca provided the decimal is moved two places to the left. The resultant \$181.875 per annum would, Mr. Speaker, be a reasonable measure of his worth to the public life and the people of this province. Even that figure seems high, but taking into consideration, Mr. Speaker, the impact of inflationary tendencies in the economy, it may be a permissible level. Fortunately, Mr. Speaker, any change in legislative secretaries holds out some hope of improvement, if not in the new appointments, at least in the removal of the dead wood that was there. For who could mourn the passing of Members from legislative secretarial appointments such as the Member for Souris-Estevan (Mr. MacDougal). Heavy water MacDougal, Nipawin (Mr. Radloff), up-the-creek Radloff, and Athabasca, the \$18,000 plus per year MLA. The only possible reason one could have for mourning their demise would have to be in the prospect presented by the Members who now succeed them. The Hon. Member from Meadow Lake (Mr. Coupland) has been appointed the legislative secretary for the Minister of Natural Resources. The only possible logic in this appointment must rest with the conclusion that the Department of Natural Resources should have both "the long" and "the short" of it. It is not one may reasonably conclude mere coincidence that one legislative secretary retains his position through all the change and decay taking place about him. The Hon. Member for Last Mountain (Mr. MacLennan) Mack the Knife, reigns supreme and untouchable.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. ROBBINS: — Mr. Speaker, the Throne Speech observes and comments on the economic prosperity in our province. Essentially this stems from the largest wheat crop in our history, 546,000,000 bushels with corresponding heavy yields in other crop categories. The impact of a buoyant Canadian economy also had major impact on our provincial economy, both in terms of revenue and general economic conditions. There is really nothing new on the Saskatchewan economic horizon since the election of this

government with one exception, the Pulp Mill development at Prince Albert. The Oil and Potash Development, the Electrification Program, the Farm Sewer and Water Installation, the Sodium Sulphate Production were all here and have merely been extended and would have been extended under the previous government. The pulp mill complex will have an economic impact on the North, but no one can say at this point of time that it will be economically successful. Mr. Speaker, there is considerable evidence in relation to pulp mills located both in Alberta and Manitoba that there will be some economic difficulties for a pulp mill.

HON. D.G. STEUART (Minister of Natural Resources): — You sure hope there will be, don't you?

MR. ROBBINS: — No, I do not, Sir.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. ROBBINS: — Being completely logical in terms of economics, everyone knows that the pulp mill at Hinton, Alberta and the one located in Manitoba have had some difficulties, both in terms of the matter of freight rates and secondly in terms of the matter of markets. And the fact remains that the pulp mill located in Prince Albert is in a worse position both in relation to freight rates and in its relationship to markets. If the Hon. Member from Prince Albert (Mr. Steuart) just can't see that, I suggest he get his glasses changed.

Mr. Speaker, the government has announced its intention through the Throne Speech of enacting some protective legislation for consumers. Although I am interested in all the proposals, I am particularly interested in the one related to disclosure of the cost of credit. I have read the government's White Paper very carefully. I cannot clearly determine whether or not it is the intention of the legislation to require full disclosure of credit costs at an annual interest rate as well as the dollar and cents figures. If it does not, it will fail to a considerable degree to alert borrowers to the real costs involved. It is obvious that the purchase of a \$100 item at one place of business at a credit cost of \$12 over a period of six months is less than the dollar credit cost for the similar \$100 item at a second business establishment at a cost of \$18 spread over 12 months. It is not nearly as obvious that the actual annual interest rate in the second example is one third greater than in the first. It is just this kind of disclosure down the proverbial garden path and result in imprudent utilization of credit. I sincerely hope the proposed legislation will take this kind of thing into consideration.

I am interested in any proposed legislation related to improved highway safety. Our record increase in highway fatalities in 1966 was the most disastrous and the most disgraceful in Canada. Mr. Speaker, I believe that this is related in no small measure to the large increase in government liquor profits to a total of \$19,290,809.97 in the fiscal year ending March 31, 1966. Judge Haines of the Manitoba Court has asserted that 80 per cent of all of the traffic accidents that come before him are attributable to some degree to the use of liquor. We are given to understand that the legislation will give a greater

measure of control over the driver and that an alcoholic content in the blood of .08 will constitute impairment. I note, Mr. Speaker, that recent tightening of traffic laws in the State of Victoria, Australia, rules that a .08 alcoholic content in the blood content constitutes impairment. I believe this is a preferable level of measurement. Accidents are caused by varying factors, and I am well aware that, for example, an extremely tired driver can be just as potentially dangerous as a partially impaired one. Nevertheless the partially impaired driver is a much more prevalent person on our highways and this requires rigorous law enforcement.

The Throne Speech comments on homeowner grants and states they have brought a measure of relief to taxpayers during the past years. While no one will dispute this, one may logically ask if it was the best utilization of the resources at the government's comment. Would it not have been much less expensive had the grant been a deductible item from one's tax bill, with submissions of tax payments and grant reduction made from some 800 municipal offices and cheques mailed to them for reimbursement rather than the issuing of 150,000 to 200,000 cheques to individuals? Of course there would not have been the opportunity, Mr. Speaker, and the cost of 150,000 to 200,000 newsy and expensive little propaganda sheets for mailing, blessed with the name of W. Ross Thatcher in no less than three locations. Mr. Speaker, one may also ask what impact the eight to nine million dollars homeowner grants payment might have made if it had been made available in municipal grants rather than paid directly to the individual. One wonder what impact this might have had in preventing mill rate increases in property taxes which were prevalent on a province-wide basis.

Mr. Speaker, pension benefits legislation is mentioned in the Throne Speech. It stresses the fact that it will give portability to a number of plans common to other provinces. It is to be sincerely hoped that the legislation will be preferred on the Ontario Pension Benefits Act which came into force in January 1, 1965. Quebec has passed a supplementary pension Act permitting a reciprocal agreement with Ontario. Some 80 per cent of the private pension plans in Canada are located in Quebec and Ontario. Alberta has initiated legislation of a similar nature effective January 1 this year, and although I haven't as yet had the opportunity to peruse it completely, I am given to understand it is essentially similar to the Ontario Act. I hope Saskatchewan legislation will be instrumental in widening the uniformity which is desirable in increasing portability of pensions. I will have more to say with respect to this matter, Mr. Speaker, when the legislation is before the House.

Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Gardiner) the Hon. Member for Melville, speaking in this debate on Friday last stated that water pollution has not yet become a serious problem in Saskatchewan. He mentioned my home city of Saskatoon and the problem associated with the discharging of untreated sewage into the river. It is becoming an increasingly difficult and serious problem. The city of Saskatoon has three times the population that it had 25 years ago. Mr. Speaker, most of that population growth occurred during that imaginary period of economic stagnation that the Premier is so fond of repetitiously relating. Reduced stream flows on the river because of the South Saskatchewan River Project have accentuated the problem. I plead with this government. Mr. Speaker,

as I did in 1965 and 1966 to realize the increasing seriousness of this problem. The Throne Speech states that serious problems of water pollution will arise if preventative measures are not taken. I appreciate it that at long last there is some recognition of the problem. It has already arisen in my city of Saskatoon. Mr. F.M. Atton, the Chief Fisheries Biologist, of the Department of Natural Resources confirmed this during the last year, and this has been prevalent for the last three to four years in the area, particularly north of the city in relation to the sewage disposal from the city of Saskatoon and the discharge of chemical plants into the river. An ounce of prevention, Mr. Speaker, is worth a pound of cure. I welcome proposed action no matter how belated.

The conclusion of the Speech from the Throne, Mr. Speaker, accentuated the barrenness of the Premier's argument that his government has somehow changed Saskatchewan from a have not to a have province. Alteration of the formula to measure income from person income taxes, corporation income taxes, and estate taxes to bring those provinces below the national average up to such an average, rather than the average of the two highest provinces formerly used is the primary and the paramount reason for the change in the Federal-Provincial arrangements, and its implication for our provincial revenue picture. Now I know that some people take exception to the image that the Premier gets in relation to newspaper coverage but here is further indication of what we might anticipate in this regard. I recall the Member for Regina West (Mr. Blakeney) in the debate last December accusing the government in terms of its negotiation with the Federal Government and using the argument that the whole problem arose, or basically arose from the fact that the present government had in fact forced out of the civil service, the people with the capabilities to do the negotiating with those in Ottawa. It is confirmed in this newspaper article, confirmed by a person of no less stature than the Premier of this province. And what does he say?

We were just taken to the cleaners. I don't think our people will ever forgive Ottawa. I have enough grief out here without shooting off any more about Ottawa. They just send us up the wall, and the more I say the more indignant they become. Then when we go to the conference, they just murder us.

That's the Premier of the province speaking and confirming the fact that they just didn't have the horses to carry out the proper negotiations in relation to provincial-Dominion agreement. Mr. Speaker, the Provincial Treasurer's post will not have to be passed on to someone else, to save the Premier from the tarnishment and the embarrassment of pending tax increases which are certainly now in the offing. Who will get the job? Will it be Mack the Knife or will the transitory Minister in the position of the Welfare role be moved over to the Provincial Treasurer's position. Mr. Speaker, I shall support the amendment to the Speech from the Throne and vote against the main motion.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. R.H. WOUFF (Turtleford): — I would like at this time to identify myself with those who have expressed their sympathy toward Mr. Cuelenaere's family and friends.

I would also like to extend my congratulations to the mover and the seconder, to the Ministers on their appointments. At the moment, Mr. Speaker, may I call it 5:30.

MR. SPEAKER: — The Hon. Members are asked leave to call it 5:30. Agreed?

MR. C.P. MacDONALD (Minister of Welfare): — Mr. Speaker, just before we call it 5:30 in reply to the question asked to me by the senior Member for Saskatoon (Mr. Nicholson) and the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Lloyd) I would like to just pont out that the senior Member for Saskatoon is not only confused but has succeeded in confusing the Leader of the Opposition. There was no form sent out by the Provincial Department of Welfare. However, the Federal Old age Security Administration is now sending out application forms for guaranteed income supplement.

The Assembly recessed until 7:30 p.m.

MR. WOUFF: — It is y intention to deal with what I believe to be a very important problem in our part of the country, the problem that I consider the government has failed to deal with in an adequate manner. However, before I proceed I would like to preface my remarks by referring to some of the statements that have already been made during this debate. At the outset the Premier spoke in glowing terms of the 1966 lop. By the time he was through we were inclined to believe it was the Liberal party and not the farmers who had produced the bumper crop. He went on to eulogize the Liberal party in Ottawa and Regina for the marvelous job that they had done of selling wheat. He said:

Why, if this wonderful party had not made such an outstanding job of selling our wheat, the farmers of the province would not be in the prosperous position in which they find themselves today.

To whom, Mr. Speaker, did he sell the wheat? To the communist countries, those terrible socialists that he is always talking about. And I'm all for it, Mr. Speaker, but let me say this. If the communists had not bought our wheat, the Premier would have been up to his neck in wheat and he would have been shouting and waving his arms for a very different reason than he was during the opening of the House. Just where the Minister of Natural Resources (Mr. Steuart) could have been in that pile of wheat, I'm not sure.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. WOUFF: — Necessity makes very strange bed fellows. It seems that some can change their bed fellows just as easily as they can change their shirt. There is one other matter I would like to clear up before I go on with the main part of my address. For some months past, we have heard over and over again on radio and television what a wonderful, final wheat payment we got and, Mr. Speaker, it was pretty good. But it's not good enough to keep with the constant rise in the cost of farming. The constant rise that has taken place ever since 1945 when this wonderful Liberal party lifted the controls and let prices keep on spiralling. Just where prices are going to finish, I'm not

sure. Again, it seemed there was the attempt to leave the impression that the final grain payment was good or that we got it at all because of the Liberal government. The fact is, Mr. Speaker, the final payment came to the farmers of Saskatchewan like all the other final payments, for one reason and for one reason only, because the farmers fought like tigers, back in the '30s to get the Wheat Board. And they got it, not because of the Liberal party; we got it in spite of them.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. WOOFF: — The Wheat Board came under the R.B. Bennett Government and then we fought the Liberal government for ten years to get them to take coarse grains under the Wheat Board. The Liberal party has fought against more good legislation from coast to coast than all the other parties put together. Although we had a record crop over almost the entire province, yet ironically enough there was one area in the province that had a consecutive crop failure. This Mr. Speaker, was the third consecutive crop failure in a row. Drought and flood have plagued this corner of Saskatchewan for three successive seasons. I farm myself on the edge of this area and came all together too close for comfort in sharing the fate of the northwest as a whole. I am interested in the welfare of these people: first, because they are fellow human beings in need of help; secondly, because this area forms a part of my own constituency; and thirdly, at one time it was my privilege to represent almost all this drought area, during the first Legislature which it was my privilege to sit in, roughly an area north of St. Walburg and east of Meadow Lake. I said roughly. I wrote to the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. McFarlane) long before harvest, warning him of the situation and I will say this much for the Minister, he answered my letter which is more than I can say for some of his colleagues.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. WOOFF: — As early as July 18, about 100 farmers met at Peerless. Mr. Coupland, MLA from Meadow Lake was present, but, Mr. Speaker, nothing happened as a follow-up. Again, August 5, Mr. Roy Atkinson, president of the Farm Union, et with the same group of farmer s at peerless and a survey was organized which eventually covered 260 farms and turned out to be very accurate. The Minister received this report along with the Farm Union brief about January 17. Again, on August 17, the Federal MP, Mr. Bert Codieu, met the Peerless farmers once more. Mr. Codieu contacted the federal Minister of Agriculture, Mr. Greene but again, Mr. Speaker, nothing happened. Mr. Lloyd wrote to the Minister on September 28 drawing his attention to the existing problem and asking for any government policy that would meet and deal with this serious situation. On October 18, the Minister replied to Mr. Lloyd's letter stating that late rains had averted a feed shortage. This, Mr. Speaker, is true. This was in evidence as early as the 1st of September. Though there is enough feed in the area, I think, to meet all needs, there may be a few farmers short of their requirements, who will find it very difficult to finance the purchase of sufficient food supplies to see them through the winter. In his letter to Mr. Lloyd, the Minister goes on to discuss the debt situation in the area, and I'd just like to read the paragraph dealing with the debt problem:

A check regarding the debt situation has also been made. You'll appreciate that this is an area of small farms, but our information, at least as far as bank loans are concerned, is that there are fewer farmers in arrears and less total arrears than existed in December of 1964 and 1965.

I don't know what kind of a check was made of the debt situation. I have a letter from a farmer in that area under date of September 20, in which he says there is about 90 per cent of the farmers who were in debt difficulties. If we turn to the Farm Union survey, we find that out of 260 farms checked, 198 were having debt problems. On November 30 a mine-farmer delegation met the Minister in Saskatoon and presented him with a memorandum. Here again, the debt problem was pointed out to the Minister. These farmers told him that even the credit union inspector had advised the board to collect overdue accounts. It was pointed out to the Minister that this meant land would have to be taken where titles were involved, that livestock that was security for loans would have to be sold. The Minister did speak of moratorium protecting for farmers faced with debt collections. Just how firm this commitment is, I cannot say at the moment. I hope, Mr. Speaker, that it is adequate. What I am saying is that the only real point in the Minister's letter to Mr. Lloyd regarding debt was to minimize the seriousness of the situation, and this is not borne out by careful investigation. Now I would like to turn to the Minister's statement at the opening of the Legislature when questioned by the Hon. Member from Cutknife (Mr. Nollet) regarding crop failure in the northwest.

Firstly, Mr. Speaker, regarding PFAA payment, I commend the Minister (Mr. McFarlane) for assisting in getting these payments into the area at an early date. Secondly, the gesture of free hay permits was a step in the right direction. However, Mr. Speaker, the Minister's remarks on both these items must have been made to some extent with his tongue in his cheek. That he made headlines in a friendly reactionary Press was to be expected. What the Minister did not reveal was just how much in dollars and cents the government would have contributed if all the hay in the country had been cut. Neither did he tell the House over how large an area the \$200,000 was spread. If you little more than double the number of farm units surveyed by the Farm Union, which I am sure is a very, very conservative estimate, it would amount to about \$300 per farm. It looks like an attempt once again to hide provincial responsibility behind a federal program which to a large extent, Mr. Speaker, the farmers pay for themselves.

Let us look a little closer at PFAA payments, good as they are, and necessary as they are. Because of the method of administration, there are many who do not qualify as individuals to receive payment, while the reverse is also true that many who qualify as individuals receive nothing. The complaint that is being made up there in the area is that, for some unknown reason, some with the better crops received a larger amount per acre than some of the ones with the poorer crops who got little, and in some cases nothing. The first statement the Minister made was to the effect that it was not true that there was a three-year crop failure, that some people had 20 bushels to the acre. There is just enough truth in this remark to allow a callous and unexplained statement like that to be made. Certainly there were wheat fields that yielded 20 bushes to the acre. There

were wheat fields where showers crossed and re-crossed, there were fields on the lower ground where spring water and runoff collected. However, Mr. Speaker, I would like to refer the Minister to the Farm Union survey report, page 2, appendix A, on 1414 farms, a total of 7.700 acres were plowed down, an average of 55 acres per farm. The Minister well knows that on the average farm of 158 acres of cultivated land, what a total loss of 55 acres of wheat means. On many farms it was the entire wheat crop. What is more, the Minister knows as well as anyone of us knows, that 20 bushels to the acre only pays the cost of operation. Just in case the reactionary gentleman opposite should ask the question, "What did the socialists do?", I would just like to read you some excerpts from Debates and Proceedings, volume 5, page 4, 1955:

We also carried on a program of work and wages to take care of people in those areas that were badly flooded. Even before the rust was apparent, there were areas in the province which had had no crop for two, and in some cases three successive years because of flooding. A Special Cabinet Committee was established last July and they set up a work and wages program, most of which was carried out in the northeast and across northern Saskatchewan.

These programs, Mr. Speaker, make up an estimated expenditure, which the government could not possibly foresee of \$1,600,310, and again volume 15, page 17, Debates and Proceedings, part 1, 1955. I should like to draw your attention to the particular case of the estimates of the Department of Agriculture.

The revenue account budget shows a drop from \$3,400,000 to \$2,900,000. In actual fact, however, this has been brought about because of the emergency steps taken by the government during the current year to pay out in cash the full credits earned by settlers in northeastern Saskatchewan, thus help to relieve a very serious situation which exists in that area. This is an expenditure brought forward as an emergency relief measure during the current year. The capital account vote for agriculture has been increased from \$1,700,000 to \$2,000,000 with the major increases going to finance clearing and breaking improvements on Crown lands leased to farmers. The additional funds provided will, in general, make it possible for settlers to receive payments in cash as rapidly as they are able to progress. This will be a particular benefit to the northeastern area and given a break from the weather, we hope that the new system of payments will aid greatly in stabilizing this modern-day settlement program.

Again in the Budget Debate of 1960, February 26, on the expenditure side, substantial increases in appropriation must be obtained. The largest is \$3,000,00 for making the acreage payments to farmers who had more than half of their crop under the snow at December 15. To date, some 18,000 farmers have already received payments under this program involving some 3,000,000 acres.

And again, in the 1960 Budget Debate, the Department of Agricultural Annual report mentions programs carried out under the supervision of the Plant Inspection Branch and it goes on and uncovers what has been done in this area also.

I'm starting to read now something that one of the

opposition Members (Mr. McNutt) had to say during the 1955 Budget Debate:

Now I am fast coming to the conclusion that as long as this government is in power, we in northeastern Saskatchewan will not get what we've been asking for and fighting for, more aid to farmers with no crops. It will not be until the Liberal government gets back in power and takes over the reigns of government, that northeastern Saskatchewan will come into its own.

It would be interesting to know how many farmers in northeastern Saskatchewan have come into their own since the Liberal party got to power. And I would add the northwest area of Saskatchewan to that. Let us turn to what at present is the final act in this six-month-old multiple act drama. January 27 saw the Minister (Mr. McFarlane) himself on the stage in Goodsoil with an assembly of 200 farmers present. These farmers were offered a \$70,000 Work and Wages Program, which sounds pretty good as headlines again in a friendly reactionary press. I have here on my desk, Mr. Speaker, a news clipping of the Minister's remarks. However, let us look at the program through the eyes of the people of that area before we too quickly applaud the scheme. Work and wage is quite commendable and I believe in it; it's a good approach under reasonable circumstances and conditions.

I am now going to tell you what the people pointed out to the Ministers: firstly, that quite a sizeable amount of the \$70,000 would go for administration and these costs are bound to increase in cold weather; secondly, farmers would have to drive from a few miles up to twenty or twenty-five at their own expense to take part in this program; thirdly, clothing of all kinds would suffer and need replacing as bush work is one of the toughest jobs on clothes, you can go to. Again looking at the Farm Union report, I see that 225 farmers were asked about work away from the farm. Some 46 said they could go, and 179 of these mixed-farm farmers said they could not. It was pointed out to the Minister that once again the program had drifted into the depth of winter, with cold weather and deep snow along the roads and lake shores, making work difficult for the men and costly for administration. However, there is no doubt in my mind that such a program will help with living expenses to those who can take part in it. But remember again, this government is not spending \$70,000. Much of this money again is coming from Ottawa. The Provincial Government also had something to say about SEDCO policy. He expounded it to his audience but it seemed to fall on a deaf ear, not because SEDCO is not good from many angles, but it was like offering a drowning man a house instead of a life buoy. Good for the future but nothing for the immediate present. SEDCO just meant more borrowed money. Social aid was offered as a way out for those in the worse circumstances, those who could not take part in the work and wages program. The Minister was told in no uncertain terms that liberty they lost was relief by a former Liberal government. What help will social aid be in keeping a farm operating as a going concern.

MR. STEUART: — They offered them work.

MR. WOOFF: — Government policy has been that of near destitution

before any one qualifies for social aid. There were other government policies outlined, but the officials admitted there had not been enough money allocated to get them off the ground. The Minister was asked about poplar wood as pulp for the Prince Albert mill. Again he was forced into the future. The mill is not operating as yet and so far there is no formula for using poplar that is practical. Then he was told there was a good market for pine poles for special fences and corrals that there was a good stand of pine poles not too far from Goodsoil, but it appeared that a contractor as far away as Prince Albert held a permit on this timber.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. WOOFF: — In fact, Mr. Speaker, the timber business has just about disappeared in my constituency, both at Leoville and other areas like Goodsoil since 1964. And with the loss of the timber, many people not only left the area, but they left the province also. A representative of Social Welfare suggested that had Department or Branch of the Department could help with the education of the children. Good but not good enough to meet the present need and again it was in the future. The Minister mentioned debt moratorium, as I said a little while ago and I hope that it's going to be effective. I think the climax came when the Minister finally summed up the afternoon's discussion and brought the meeting to a close. He said, admittedly the area in the northwest was having difficulty at the moment at least, but assured those present that government policies would benefit the area in the long run. He didn't even express the hope that those in deep trouble would find a way to survive until that bright morning in the future dawned. He comforted them with the suggestion that the south country had had its troubled periods too.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. WOOFF: — The whole approach was one of precious little but advice. Pretty cold comfort at anytime, never to talk about the middle of winter. The Minister knows there is no comparison between the thirties and today. He knows the day is gone when just free hay leases, or even assistance of a seed program, or debt moratorium, is enough. Agriculture tolls today on oil, and rubber, and machine repairs, if not new machines, or it doesn't roll at all. In other words, agriculture is motivated by cash like any other modern business or it is a black outlook.

For someone like the Minister who in opposition was vociferous, voluble, and often vitriolic, but evidently volatile as well, the performance was rather dismal. I am sorry for the Minister. He was shadow-boxing behind the colossus who sits magnificently astride the treasury chest of the province. However, this is where the Minister chose to be and says he likes it.

I am sure, Mr. Speaker, that the people in the northwest were happy that the Minister could visit them in a \$90,000 plane, even if he only got as far as Meadow Lake in it. I am sure that they will sleep sounder and rise in better spirits to shovel snow and cut brush, because they know we MLAs are walking on \$500,000 to \$750,000 worth of new marble floors. I'm sure, Mr. Speaker. They will fight harder to survive because the Provincial Treasurer in a fit of temper, threw over a

million dollars down the drain in last summer's bond sale. They won't have to worry about money-lenders having to cut brush to make up a deficit.

Last night in this House, the Members for Rosthern (Mr. Boldt), the Hon. Minister for Highways, was making almost an emotional appeal for young farmers and training of farm help. Mr. Speaker, there has been very little emotion lost by this government or the people in northwestern Saskatchewan to help keep them on the farms that they've put, in many cases, half a lifetime into building.

It's rather ironic that it took a Liberal government of 35 years ago to throw many people back into the bush to exist as best they could, that it takes another Liberal government to almost abandon the next generation in another drought extremity.

I see nothing in the Throne Speech, Mr. Speaker, that is going to bring immediate relief to this area in the province. And as you no doubt realize by this time, I am not going to support the motion. I will support the amendment.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. C.P. MacDONALD (Minister of Welfare): — Mr. Speaker, my first remarks on the Throne Speech, tonight must be to associate myself with the remarks of other Members in this Assembly, in an expression of sympathy over the passing of one of our highly respected Members of this House, the Hon. John Cuelenaere. I did not have the opportunity of knowing Mr. Cuelenaere before he was elected, but in his very short stay in this Assembly, he certainly earned the respect and admiration of all of us. I want to express my sympathy to the member of his family, and certainly I can say that all Members of this Assembly will miss the Hon. John Cuelenaere.

I also want to take this opportunity to congratulate the mover and seconder of the Address in Reply to the Throne Speech. Certainly they did a commendable job in keeping with the traditions of this House.

It is my intention this evening, Mr. Speaker, to give a report on the Department of Welfare. However, before doing so I cannot refrain from making a few comments and observations about my department that have been made by the Members of the opposition.

First of all, like all of us in the House, I've listened to this Debate to date, with interest. However, one significant fact has stood out this year in this Assembly. There seems to be a complete lack of argument, debate, or controversy by the Labour party across the way.

The Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Lloyd) gave an ineffective speech. He concentrated on individuals, geography, Federal affairs, and justified his policy on labor. I cannot help but also compliment the Member from Cumberland (Mr. Berezowsky). I want to say that all of us in this Assembly enjoyed his speech last night. He should certainly consider running for the Leader of the opposition after their next defeat at the polls, when the member for Biggar (Mr. Lloyd) may go the way all losing

politicians do, into obscurity. I cannot help but contrast this with the Premier's remarks. In clear, concise language, he outlined the policy and the programs for the future and development of this province. I have never heard him as effective in outlining the achievements and contributions of this government. It was an outline that should have made him proud to see the results of his personal leadership. Certainly his drive, his dedication, and his determination to see Saskatchewan march ahead, were very clearly evident in his remarks.

First of all, Mr. Speaker, I want to comment on the remark by the Member from Moose Jaw (Mr. Davies), in relation to Christmas bonuses. I think it's time once and for all this House cleared up the policy of Christmas bonuses. First of all I would say that this party believes that any additional revenue provided must be given to welfare recipients on a continuing basis. It should be reflected in the monthly budget, and that public funds should never be used for a one-shot effort. The Provincial Municipal Committee, which reviewed financial assistance, recommended the doing away with Christmas bonuses.

I also want to clear several misconceptions now held by the general public and other members of this House regarding Christmas bonuses. First of all, the former government never at any time initiated Christmas bonuses for any program which they directly administered. The former Minister never initiated Christmas bonuses for any program that he directly administered.

AN HON. MEMBER: — They never had a program.

MR. MacDONALD: — Yes, they did participate in payments by a few municipalities who administered the social aid programs. A year ago, the cities of Regina, Saskatoon, and Moose Jaw gave Christmas bonuses, I would like to say that the total amount came to approximately \$30,000. I also want to say that no other municipality in the province received Christmas bonuses. If there is one single factor about welfare, it must be that it must be administered with uniformity and equality right across the province. I also want to point out that even in the cities of Regina, Saskatoon, and Moose Jaw, all welfare recipients did not receive a Christmas bonus. For example, in the city of Regina, one year ago, 830 people received Christmas bonuses. There was a total of 1,853 social welfare recipients who did not receive a Christmas bonus. People who are disabled, widows, mothers, people that are blind, senior citizens, were not getting Christmas bonuses. People that lived next door to another person on social aid did not receive a Christmas bonus. I fail to see the difference in need between a person who is seriously disabled a person that is blind, a widow, and a person who receive social aid. And certainly, Mr. Speaker, it is the proper role of government to administer Christmas bonuses, or social aid with equality and uniformity. I also want to say that the Member from Moose Jaw (Mr. Davies) indicated that this government turned around and gave a \$5 increase to a family of four, through the Saskatchewan Assistance Plan. I would ask him to check over the regulations. An individual receives \$5 a month, a total of \$ 54.10 a year. A family of three receives \$16.95 a month or a total of \$203, as compared to a \$24 annual Christmas bonus. I want to point out that the former government at Christmas gave \$30,000 to the social aid recipients in the three cities. This government passed on and increased allowances over the past year, a total of over \$1,000,000 in increased allowances. We believe in a Christmas bonus every

month that is reflected in the monthly payments.

AN HON. MEMBER: — Where's your socialist arithmetic now?

MR. MacDONALD: — I also want to say a word to the Junior Member from Saskatoon (Mr. J.E. Brockelbank). I would suggest that perhaps the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Lloyd) turned to the Junior Member and said that because he was the youngest Member of the opposition perhaps he should be the critic of the youth agency. After reading his transcript I failed to find any criticism. The only two points I could find were: First of all, he didn't like my picture on the front. Well, unfortunately I can't help the face that I was given. However, I would like to suggest he's no Marilyn Monroe.

I also want to point out that the second thing he did was to quote a sentence referring to the Youth Representative Council. He said:

So far as I know this is the first time that any government has officially recognized youth.

Then he went on to say that this government and other governments in Agriculture and other departments in Education recognized youth. Well, gentlemen, I have heard of a lot of people taking a sentence out of a paragraph, a paragraph out of a page, but that's the first time I've ever seen a part of a sentence taken out of context. Let me read the complete sentence:

So far as I know this is the first time that any government has officially recognized youth, the first time that young people have been given a direct and active goal, and the operation of a government agency concerned with the interests of youth.

If he had bothered to read the rest of the sentence to the House perhaps they would have all understood. I would also like to say that of all the departments in this government that have been most subject to attack and abuse by the Members of the party opposite, that has been the Department of Welfare. First of all they have criticized the Minister, second they have criticized the policy, third they have criticized civil servants. The man who led this attack was the senior Member from Saskatoon (Mr. Nicholson) and usually the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Lloyd). Yet this year, in a year of the greatest change perhaps in the history of this department, in a year of complete reorganization, in a year of new policies, they had nothing to say about what went on in the Department in the past year. These remarks, his remarks have been centered around criticisms of issues two and a half years old.

First of all the problem in the city of Saskatoon. I don't know what he's going to do this year. I don't know what this House would do without having to listen to him challenging the policy of the city of Saskatoon. It is now settled. It is now completed to the satisfaction of this government and the city of Saskatoon. The second thing he brought up was the Embury House and of course, the problem of emotionally disturbed children. I will have a little more to say about that later on. But he made the remark, why should they be ignored? I might say that his

attack was very weak and ineffectual. He was no longer crying about the lack of humanitarianism on this side of the House. He was no longer crying that dollars come before people. Why, Mr. Speaker? Because our record of achievement in this field is very, very clear. For example in 1964, when they were the government, and when we took over there was only one resource for emotionally disturbed children in this province. That was the Embury House. They looked after nine emotionally disturbed children. This was the only answer to this problem, this was their only excuse for failure to take further action. Two and a half years later, what have we got in the Province of Saskatchewan? Five resources: Kiwanis Group Home, Victoria House, Ranch Ehrlo, Brown's Camp, and the Saskatchewan Group Home, resources for 47 children right here in the province. In addition, a new Dales' House more than doubling the capacity to 8 boys. On top of that the Boys' School is used to the maximum. In addition to that we are now sending \$750,000 more on child welfare than at any time in the past. Then the next point of criticism. He suggested that these were bad resources because they were private resources. He said that we should return to the public approach.

It is a little strange, Mr. Speaker, to hear those kind of remarks when I look back at 1964 to find that they had exactly the same approach. They used four private resources outside the province. Our Lady of Charity Home in Edmonton, Marymount School in Winnipeg, St. Angus School in Winnipeg, and the Knowles School for Boys in Winnipeg. There was only one basic difference between their policy and ours. We brought these resources to the Province of Saskatchewan where we would have a better opportunity to supervise and observe their actions and their treatment.

The next thing he did he turned around and challenged the fact that the child welfare director was on the board of directors of Ranch Ehrlo. Mr. Speaker, this is exactly the same philosophy as the former government used when it put Members of their government on the board of directors of such private concerns as IPSCO. Why? So that we would have an opportunity to view, first hand, to supervise first hand, or to participate in any discussion of policies and future arrangements. Then he turned around and suggested that in the city of Saskatoon, welfare was costing a great deal more, because we had 81 people employed in the Department of Welfare as compared to 47 when he was there. I'm sure, Mr. Speaker, the former Minister and the Member from Saskatoon (Mr. Nicholson) recognizes that now there's been a reorganization of welfare in Saskatchewan, that it is now done in a regional basis, and that it is no longer the city of Saskatoon, but the Saskatoon Region which comprises more than the city of Saskatoon. I'm sure he also realizes that his includes all the people on the welfare staff. Those on child welfare, those that look after the categorical program and so forth, as well as the social aid program. The only increase in staff in the city of Saskatoon has been four workers. These four were hired in order to provide a better service in proportion to the ratio of caseload.

I would also say that he asked why there was no report on the number of employable people in the city of Saskatoon. I might also like to point out that he knows as well as I do and as well as the Members of this House, that previously the social aid was administered for the city of Saskatoon. The city of Saskatoon was a unit. Today the Saskatoon region includes far more than the city itself. All the records as far as the computer is concerned are for the Saskatoon Region, which includes the

rural areas as well as the city of Saskatoon. There is no computer data for the city of Saskatoon. It is all based on the Saskatoon Region. I just wanted to make those comments, Mr. Speaker, because I feel that of all the departments in the government that has made a record of achievement over the past year, certainly it is the Department of Welfare.

The year 1966-67 has seen remarkably progress in this department. The implementation of the Saskatchewan Assistance Plan, the expansion of benefits to clients, the expansion of child welfare resources, increased federal participation, initiation of new programs, are only a few of the major achievements over the past year.

Perhaps the most significant factor has been the substantial reduction in the number of people receiving assistance. The total case load in both the needs and means tested programs has been reduced by an astounding 30 per cent from the end of March 1964, to the beginning of November 1966, the data of implementation of the Saskatchewan Assistance Act. The number of recipients has declined by an equally astounding figure of 27 per cent during the same period.

I want to discuss very briefly each of those topics.

The people of Saskatchewan and of Canada as a whole have long been concerned with the rising costs of welfare and the shortcomings of our social security approaches. For too long the obsolescent idea that welfare was a form of relief has dominated Canadian thinking. Failure to provide services to overcome the problems which create financial need has resulted in increasing expenditures and generations of people depending on the state for a livelihood. Factors other than need have often been the criteria of benefits. This trend has been reversed in Saskatchewan.

Eliminating all duplication of caseload when we became the government in 1964, the total number of recipients was 5,543. The caseload was slightly greater. At the end of October 1966, the total number of recipients had been reduced to 38,011. This included all means-tested and means-tested programs in Saskatchewan, a total reduction of 14,532 in the number of recipients.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. MacDONALD: — The most significant reduction in the total caseload has occurred since the implementation of the Saskatchewan Assistance Plan passed by this Assembly one year ago.

In the seven months following, the total recipient had been reduced from 45,725 to 38,011, a reduction of 7,714 recipients. One of the basic purposes of the Saskatchewan Assistance Plan was to eliminate duplication of cases by initiating one uniform program. This is now a practical reality.

What does it mean to the people of Saskatchewan? It means that in Saskatchewan. We estimate that less than 2 per cent of our total caseload are individuals who could be employed. The majority of this 2 per cent are emergency or temporary clients caused by seasonal employment.

It means that people receiving assistance in Saskatchewan

today are the needy, the aged, the blind, the widow, the physically and socially handicapped people. They are the people who need assistance and to whom all of us cheerfully render the help they require.

I might point out that we would expect that over the winter months when seasonal employment is normally at its worst, that an additional estimated 1,500 cases will be added to our files on a temporary basis. There are many reasons for this reduction. First, the buoyancy of the Saskatchewan economy has provided jobs for everyone who wants to work. In many cases these are most difficult to place in the workforce. Despite this, jobs have been found. It is a positive indicator of the health of our economy. The Liberal government's claim of a job for everyone is a practical reality.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. MacDONALD: — To give a positive illustration of this trend, would point to the city of Prince Albert, a community that has always been an area of chronic unemployment.

The overall number of persons on assistance has declined from a monthly average of 503 in 1964, to 368 in 1965-66. The monthly average of persons removed from assistance because they were known to have found work or didn't return and were presumed to have found work, rose from 29.8 in 1965 to 38 in 1966.

The second cause for this reduction can be attributed to the change in the minimum age of the Federal old age security program. Because of the change in eligibility, 2,287 of our senior citizens qualified last year. I want to point out that this change in the minimum age requirement has not had as great an impact on the reduction in caseload as originally anticipated. A very high percentage qualify for additional assistance under the Saskatchewan Assistance Plan, once they transfer to the old age security pension. We still provide help for a very high percentage. They remain on our rolls.

Third, the implementation of the Saskatchewan Assistance Plan with uniform assessment and administration by a single agency has reduced the duplication in all programs by approximately 2,000 cases. This includes everyone receiving aid from one program and supplemented by another. This transition throughout Saskatchewan has been accomplished with little difficulty. It is amazing that, since the introduction of the Saskatchewan Assistance Plan, there have been only 12 appeals against decisions made by regional offices of the department and four against decisions of the local units of Prince Albert and Moose Jaw. Of these, four were further appealed to the Welfare Board.

This speaks very highly for the treatment of the public by the social workers in the field. It also speaks highly for the calibre of the assessments made.

Fourth, the emphasis on rehabilitation included in the Saskatchewan Assistance Plan has resulted in many clients resuming a productive role in the community. The Saskatchewan Assistance Plan is a program based on the needs of the individual or his family. Need is the criterion of eligibility. It accepts the principle that the level of assistance must be sufficient for them to live decently.

In keeping with these two principles, benefits under the plan have been substantially increased. Special priority was given health. For example?

First, an increase in the allowances of over \$1,000,00 was provided to keep pace with the rising cost of living. The increase in schedules are as follows: Food 12 per cent; fuel, 12 per cent; power 25 per cent; and minor adjustments in personal and household incidentals. This was the first increase in these allowances since 1959, with the exception of a small increase in clothing allowances in 1966. How much we have heard from the opposition about the cost to the consumer, the rising cost of living. Yet only once when they were the government in five years from 1959-1964 did they both to raise the social aid allowances.

Second, in the field of health, all persons formerly on the social aid program receive two cards, one for insured services and one for non-insured services. These non-insured services include a percentage of drugs, dental, optical and other necessary service. Before the Saskatchewan Assistance Plan, these people were the responsibility of the municipalities or the vendor of the service. Over 20,000 people now receive the benefit of this extension. The Saskatchewan Assistance Plan also provides for a procedure to provide the type of health service needed by people who can live on a day-to-day basis and are not welfare recipients, but are unable to meet health needs. These people can now receive health benefits without receiving financial assistance.

Fourth, effective July 1st, all children recipients of the program under the age of 18 receive 100 per cent of drug coverage.

Fifth, grants for dentures have been increased this fall from \$30 for a single denture and \$50 for upper and lower to \$50 and \$100 respectively.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. MacDONALD: — I am sure that all Members of this House are interested in the progress to date of the Saskatchewan Assistance Plan. Under the new legislation which came into force in April 1966, municipalities can elect to administer assistance programs provided accreditation standards are met relative to quality of staff, caseload per worker and number of workers per supervisor. After the Act was passed, senior staff of the department discussed with municipalities concerned, the implication of the new plan. All municipalities except four, elected to have welfare services provided by provincially administered units. The city of Prince Albert and the RM of Prince Albert, the city of Moose Jaw and the RM of Moose Jaw elected to form their own unit. During the transition period from April to November, the municipal welfare cases were transferred to the Department of Welfare.

Services are presently rendered by 11 provincial regional welfare offices located in all the cities except Estevan and Lloydminster and the towns of Melfort and Meadow Lake. Sub-offices are located in Estevan, Creighton and La Ronge and one will be opened very shortly in Buffalo Narrows.

Under the new Act provincial public assistance and municipal social aid are being amalgamated into a coordinated program. It has resulted in better service to our clients. A worker can now visit any client in his region, conduct an interview and provide assistance immediately if necessary. Previously, the provincial public assistance cases had to wait a considerable length of time for the first cheque unless the municipal welfare official was prepared to grant emergency aid. Now, under the Saskatchewan Assistance Plan, payments for all recipients are made in advance, on the day he becomes eligible with no waiting. A good example of the emergency service is the city of Saskatoon. A total of 860 emergency cheques were issued in that city during the month of January from the department's regional services account.

A recruiting program was also initiated to fill additional positions required for the new program and to replace workers who left the department. A total of 152 new people were recruited, 107 with B.A. or equivalent university degrees; 37 with grade 12 with related training; eight B.S.W. or M.S.W. people. This latter group of eight were recipients of bursaries from the department. The increasing demand for social workers across Canada requires intensified recruiting. The department has sponsored 18 persons, who are presently away at professional schools of social work. A total of 12 persons returned to their jobs after sponsored training in the summer of 1966.

The real answer to this problem lies in the establishment of a professional school of social work in Saskatchewan. This now appears to be a reality in the near future. The Senate of the University of Saskatchewan has approved plans for such a school. The fall of 1968 is a target date for enrolling students. I would also like to report on the services of the Saskatchewan Assistance Plan.

Most of the energies of the department during this first year of operation of the Saskatchewan Assistance Plan were absorbed by the administrative task of taking over cases formerly handled by municipalities. Nevertheless a beginning has been made on extending services to recipients. Since April 1, 1966, according to all estimates from our regions, some 1,400 recipients have received some type of rehabilitative service. Many of these were brief contact but a good many of them involved extensive service. Typical services were: vocational assessment and counselling, assistance to secure educational upgrading, assistance to secure vocational training, making arrangements for training on the job, referrals to Manpower for employment placement, sheltered workshop placements, referrals to Agriculture representatives for counselling. Recipients undertook training in such courses as hairdressing, business courses, teaching, nursing assistance, X-ray technology and other trade training. Perhaps one of the most positive approaches that has been inaugurated in Welfare in Canada for many years.

In addition, preventive services were given to some estimated 1,500 recipients. Services provided included: counselling regarding budgeting and home management, individual and family counselling, including counselling in relation to problems of alcoholism, marital problems and parent-child relationship, homemaker services, assistance to secure improved housing, assistance to find nursing home care, legal assistance, encouragement of children to continue to return to school, vocational counselling of children in assisting families, referrals to

mental health services, encouraging recipients to participate in community activities. A further 600 cases were reported for various types of medical care. In summary, rehabilitative and preventive services were extended to between six and 13 per cent of the caseload. This represents a significant investment in developing the human resources of the province.

I want to comment on the Canada Assistance Plan and Federal participation in our program. Without doubt this national plan of the national Liberal government has provided outstanding leadership and impetus to the entire scope of welfare programs across Canada. It complements the Saskatchewan Assistance Plan. It will pay 50 per cent of the cost of assistance provided by the province, municipalities and any provincially approved agencies. It will pay 50 per cent of the increased cost of services based on the '64-65 fiscal year. Shareable welfare costs do not include capital costs or equipment operating costs. Services that are shared include: rehabilitation, casework, counselling, assessment, referral services, homemaker and day care, community development services, consultant and research, staff training, administration and clerical. Child welfare is also now included in the shareable items for the first time due to the vigorous negotiation by our department and other provincial departments. This will return approximately \$1,000,000 in the present fiscal year. Instead of the province paying 88 per cent of child welfare services in 1964, we will pay 47 per cent in 1966-67.

In the field of child welfare, several significant advances have taken place in the past year. The most significant is the expansion of resources in Saskatchewan for the care of emotionally disturbed children. Emotionally disturbed children continue to be a major problem facing society today. Little is known about the methods of treatment or the results achieved. Many new methods of treatment are currently being experimented with. Here in Saskatchewan the Department of Welfare is encouraging the establishment of private resources in this province to offer treatment in this area. In 1964 when we took office only one resource was available — Embury House, a government-operated institution that provided service for up to nine children. Today in Saskatchewan. Private resources available to the Department of Welfare now provide treatment for 47 children in this category, and this number will increase by 11 in the near future and thus bring resources for a total of 58 children in this province. In addition, out of the province institutions have been used for approximately 21 children per year in addition to the above figures. Another valuable addition to the resources of the child welfare branch is the new Dale's House which will accommodate 38 children.

With these new resources and the program developed, we now have a grater variety of institutions available for children. We can place children more appropriate into the kind of facilities they need. On November the 30, 1966, there were some 80 children in treatment centres compared to 39 on April 30, 1964. In November the total number of children in care was 3,273 with 2,150 of these in boarding homes. A total of 543 children were in adoption homes on that date. The major challenge facing the child welfare branch is the adoption of Indian and Métis children. It is with increasing concern that we have noticed the number of Indian and Métis children in care has been rising annually by approximately 150 to its present figure of 1,150 children. About 35 of these children are placed for adoption each year, the rest remain in foster homes. This problem must

receive top priority in the months ahead.

In addition, Mr. Speaker, I want to say just a few words about several programs operated by private agencies and special aid programs within our department. First, work activity projects to supply work as well as guidance in social orientation for people in low skill level and limited job experience are now being developed. One opened in Prince Albert on January 9th and a second in Lebret will begin shortly. Strong representation by the Hon. D. Boldt, my predecessor, succeeded in having these included in cost-sharing with Ottawa. Second, a special \$30,000 construction grant was made by this government to the Saskatchewan Council for Crippled Children and Adults towards their new sheltered workshop in Saskatoon. It opened in September and accommodates up to 150 workers. Another sheltered workshop was opened in Yorkton to make a total of four in the province, employing approximately 220 mentally, physically and socially handicapped persons. We hope to see a continued expansion in this field in the coming year. Three, a new program for vocational rehabilitation of legal offenders is being initiated and will be fully operational by 1967. The John Howard Society is the agency which will administer this program. It too will be cost-shared with Ottawa. Mr. Speaker, I do not at this time intend to mention corrections. I will have something to say about this later on in this House. I'm also not going to speak about the Youth Agency at this time. It will also be mentioned in a further debate. I would like to say, Mr. Speaker, that I do not support the amendment and I support the motion.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. A.N. NICHOLSON (Saskatoon): — Mr. Speaker, if the Hon. Member would permit a question before he sits down. I wonder did he indicate that the Decision Sheet has the square for the municipal quoted at the top. In a place like Saskatoon where I understand there are 34 municipalities, is there no difference between the citizen who is from Langham, Asquith, or Colonsay as compared with Saskatoon? Does this form not indicate where the person lives, where the code is for the municipality?

MR. MacDONALD: — All the computer data is based on a region not on an individual municipality.

MR. NICHOLSON: — But is there not a place for on the code, for the number of the municipality where the person lives?

MR. MacDONALD: — yes, there is, but every town in the Province of Saskatchewan here an individual lives, is not programmed in the computer.

MR. R.A. WALKER (Hanley): — Mr. Speaker, I presume though that Saskatoon is one of those places and I think that the Minister has demonstrated such a facility and grasp of the affairs of his department, that it wouldn't be beyond the realm of his capability to find some way of taking from the computer these very interesting figures about the city of Saskatoon.

I want in opening my remarks, Mr. Speaker, to congratulate the Member for Milestone (Mr. MacDonald) first of all on his elevation to the Cabinet and to congratulate the Premier on having found a replacement who presumably and to all appearances will be able to bring order out of the Department of Welfare, but I would point out to him that he won't, he needn't expect to be able to make such competent replacements every day. What he'll do with the Department of Highways in another year challenges the imagination. He pulled a rabbit out of the hat but whether he can do it a second time I don't know.

The Minister of Welfare ought to be emulated and copied by some of his senior colleagues. He has given us a factual statement of the operations of his department replete with a great deal of useful information and I hope that when he is making up his list, his mailing list for his speech, he will be kind enough to include me and send me one because there is a lot of information in it which I find useful. I think that like all Ministers who give a lot of factual information in their speeches, he undoubtedly had to rely heavily on his expert staff in compiling it. The only thing I'm sorry about is that he didn't channel it all through some single person because he started out by quoting figures at length to show how the department had curtailed and restricted and restrained its activities. I had the impression that the Department of Welfare was about to wither away in the prosperous Province of Saskatchewan in 1967. The next four-fifths of his speech seemed to be devoted to figures which expanded the operations of the department. I suppose it's all right to curtail some activities and increase others, but it seems to me that there was a bit of a split in personality involved in the person who composed the figures. The point of view seemed to change drastically after he left Saskatoon.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I have mentioned the Minister of Highways (Mr. Boldt). Before I leave him I want to congratulate him on one thing. I notice from the Saskatoon Star-Phoenix of Wednesday, February 8, that one Milton C. Hogan, who was said to be President of Wawanesa Insurance Company, made a speech in Victoria. He devoted his speech to an analysis of the Saskatchewan Government Insurance Plan and the House might be interested in some of the things he said. He described the Saskatchewan scheme as an "iniquitous and unprofitable state monopoly."

The Minister has assured the House that the profits of the insurance office are reaching an all-time high but in addition to a continuous string of profits for some twenty years, the insurance office has had another extremely profitable year. I hope that somehow this man Hogan will hear about the statement of the Minister.

Hogan also told the commission:

that the Saskatchewan Plan denies the car owners freedom of choice, subjects them to politically motivated rate-fixing and denies them the services of a sympathetic agent.

Well I know a great many people in Saskatchewan who have exercised their freedom of choice in the purchasing of automobile insurance, and so I am sure that the Minister recognizes that statement as being completely false.

Mr. Hogan labelled a false claim that the Saskatchewan Plan

insures everyone and offers low-cost insurance. As far as I know the Saskatchewan Plan does insure everyone and does offer low cost insurance. I am sure the Minister could easily refute that statement.

Then, Mr. Hogan said:

The fact that Saskatchewan had created an unsatisfied judgement fund from which to compensate victims of insured drivers proves that the claim is false.

I'm not aware that Saskatchewan has instituted an unsatisfied judgement fund and therefore it doesn't prove anything of the kind. As far as I know there is no unsatisfied judgement fund in Saskatchewan and therefore his under-pinning of proof just doesn't exist.

Then he said:

By the flat-rate original premium of \$17.50 the Saskatchewan taxpayer was subsidizing the scheme.

As far as I know during the years that I was in the Government, the province did not subsidize the scheme and so far as I know the present Government doesn't subsidize the scheme nor did it prior to my entering the Government. There is no truth whatever in the statement that the Government subsidized the scheme. As a matter of fact the levies collected into the fund have paid all the benefits that have been paid out. It may be in the last few months the fund has had to go slightly in the red to be recovered from succeeding income, but these benefits are charged against the new year's premiums and not paid out of Consolidated Funds of the Province. And so far as I know not a single five cent piece has been appropriated from the public treasury to this purpose. So that there is just no truth in this statement at all.

Now, I wish I could congratulate the Minister on the fiery and spirited reply he gave to Mr. Hogan. A least I congratulate him on the fact that he did not agree with Mr. Hogan or that he didn't encourage Mr. Hogan in these false notions and on the restraint he showed, knowing the feeling of the Liberal party toward the Insurance Plan. The fact that the Minister exercised restraint not to add to the confusion deserves congratulations and I make that statement sincerely.

Mr. Speaker, I said a moment ago that some of the senior Ministers ought to emulate or try to emulate the new Minister of Welfare (Mr. MacDonald) in reporting on their Department. I think that the best example of where this advice could have been used to advantage was in the address made by the Attorney General (Hon. D. V. Heald) the other day. The Attorney General departed from his prepared text and read from another prepared text in which he lamented in wailing moans a statement or an article which apparently had been written in some yellow journalism, some magazine or newspaper published down at the Lead Post Building and issued from the Leader Post Building. He took great umbrage at this and called this a reflection on the Province of Saskatchewan. Well, I got home last night and I said to my wife that the Hon. Attorney General considered that she had a reflection cast upon her by something that appeared in the Leader Post. But she told me that she didn't feel any guilt about this at all, because she took no responsibility whatever for the

choice of the present Premier, the present Premier being in office. As a matter of fact the number of people who need to feel any resentment about that . . .

MR. STEUART: — Are you sure, Bob?

MR. WALKER: — . . . Those people who supported the present Premier's election to office are actually smaller than the people who opposed his election to office. I suggest that the resentment may be confined to a much narrower circle than the Attorney General indicated.

As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, when it comes to casting reflections upon the Province of Saskatchewan there is a past master of that art and he sits in this House and he sits in the Premier's chair. I'm going to do my best to confine myself to the use of parliamentary language, Mr. Speaker. I wouldn't want to have it thought that this innocuous little article that appeared in the Canadian the other day was the grossest example of slander against the Province of Saskatchewan, not by a long shot. I've been getting clippings from newspapers all over the United States for the last several months and some of these are shocking indeed.

Mr. Speaker, I should say that I rode down to the depot last night in a taxi, and I said to the taxi driver who didn't recognize me,

I understand there's a great fracas going on up at the Legislature this afternoon. The Attorney General was complaining about something that appeared in the paper here in Regina over the weekend. Did you see anything in the papers?

He said, "Well, there was an article", and I said, "What was it about?" "Well, it was a very poorly written article," he said. "There were a lot of swear words in it" and he thought it was a very poorly written article. He didn't like his youngsters to read this, every sentence starting with "Jeez" and "blankety blank damn socialists". He didn't like his kids seeing the language. I asked him whether he objected to the article and he said he certainly did. I asked him why, and he said because of all the bad language and that he didn't blame the Premier for being angry about it, if he was angry about it, because he said, "He did say a lot of nasty things about the Premier." And I said, "Well, did you think any of them were untrue?" "Oh, no," he said, "I don't think any of them were untrue, but it is a reflection on the Premier." And I said, "In what way?" "Well, that he would allow such a thing to be published in Saskatchewan." I don't know whether . . .

HON. D.V. HEALD (Attorney General): — Have fun, you like that.

MR. WALKER: — I'm not finished with you.

MR. A.R. GUY (Athabasca): — Same thing as in the Commonwealth garbage from the word go.

MR. WALKER: — Now, Mr. Speaker, I have clippings and I'm only going to refer to one or two of them and I can understand the Member

February 14, 1967

from Athabasca (Mr. Guy) being uneasy about these because these clipping and these statements emanate from the biggest liar since the Baron Munchausen.

MR. GUY: — Commonwealth!

MR. WALKER: — I can understand that he might be a little uneasy . . .

MR. GUY: — Commonwealth!

MR. WALKER: — . . . and the article is printed from the PG and E Progress published by the Pacific Gas and Electrical Company, San Francisco, California and it is called “Socialism in Saskatchewan”. Now, Mr. Speaker, this is the kind of article which has been appearing in practically every newspaper in the United States and I say this article is defamatory; it is a slander of the Province of Saskatchewan.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. WALKER: — I will put this article up against the one that Mr. Heald was complaining about any time. More people in Saskatchewan will object to the tone and the contents of this article than will ever object to the tone and the contents of the article that he drew attention to.

MR. GUY: — No question about it.

MR. WALKER: — Well, the Members for Athabasca may not like this but he’s just going to have to listen to it.

MR. GUY: — I won’t. I’ll get up and leave.

MR. WALKER: — Perhaps if the Hon. Member can’t behave himself he should go to the bathroom.

MR. GUY: — I don’t have to go.

HON. L.P. CODERRE (Minister of Labour): — That’s right, you go there.

MR. WALKER: — There’s a place for that sort of thing. Mr. Speaker, this article starts out:

Saskatchewan, for 20 years from 1944 to 1964, had a socialist government about the only one in North America except Castro’s.

As a matter of fact his geography must have been neglected when he went to school and that’s not the only thing that was neglected because as far as I know Cuba is not part of continental North America, never was and still isn’t. Secondly, well it’s just a statement of fact, Mr. Speaker. Of course, if every misstatement of fact the Premier makes is going to arouse his attempt to try to prevent it being refuted, then he’s going to have a busy time. This statement . . .

MR. GUY: — . . . the Chinese Communists.

MR. I.C. NOLLET (Cutknife): — Aw, this is good, go and wash your mouth out.

MR. WALKER: — The very first statement, the very first sentence, Mr. Speaker, is untrue and I suggest that if the Premier made this statement he knew that it was untrue. If he didn't make this statement he should complain about being misrepresented.

About the second statement, sir, that in 1944 the socialists promised to solve the unemployment problem by building government factories. Now, Mr. Speaker, I never heard of a socialist making that kind of a statement. I never heard of a CCF speaker making that kind of a statement in 1944. I don't know what the present Premier was saying around the province in 1944 but if he was as careless then as he is now about the things he says, he may have said this. But it wasn't being said by any socialist that I know or that you know, Mr. Speaker.

MR. STEUART: — Tommy Douglas and Clarence Fines.

MR. WALKER: — They said that this would solve the unemployment problem. They promised to use the profits to build highways, school, hospitals, and to finance better social welfare measures generally. Mr. Speaker, the records of the government show that in every single year under CCF administration, over \$500,000 and sometimes up to \$1,000,000, was put into the revenues of this province out of the profits of Crown corporations. And I speak of the Crown corporations which are not the traditional power and telephone corporations, but these new CCF Crown corporations. Money was in fact taken from the profits of those Crown corporations and was taken into the revenues of this province and was used for highways, schools, hospital, and better social welfare measures. And any Member who takes the trouble to look at the official records knows that's true, Mr. Speaker, and the Hon. Premier couldn't possibly have made that statement without knowing better.

Then he went on to say:

At the time we had taken over the government 24 months ago, 12 of the Crown corporations had gone bankrupt or have been disposed of.

Now some of them have had their names changed, but disposed of! Gone bankrupt! There is just no truth in that. The Premier can make up a list of the Crown corporations, a list of the 12 that went bankrupt, and then I'd like to see the list because it is impossible.

MR. STEUART: — Tommy lost the debate!

MR. WALKER: — It is impossible.

MR. GUY: — Tommy lost the debate!

MR. WALKER: — Then he says others were kept . . .

At 9:30 p.m. Mr. Speaker interrupted the proceedings under

Standing Order 30(03) and put the question on the amendment.

Amendment negatived on the following recorded division.

YEAS — 27

Lloyd	Whelan	Snyder
Hunt (Mrs.)	Nicholson	Broten
Wood	Kramer	Larson
Nollet	Dewhurst	Robbins
Walker	Berezowsky	Pepper
Brockelbank (Kelsey)	Michayluk	Brockelbank
Blakeney	Smishek	(Saskatoon City)
Davies	Link	Pederson
Thibault	Baker	
Willis	Wooff	

NAYS — 30

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

The Assembly resumed the interrupted debate on the proposed motion by Mr. J.B. Hooker (Notukeu-Willowbunch).

MR. WALKER: — Your Honour, I shall now try to confine myself to the motion, the amendment having been disposed of. I'd like to just draw attention to the next statement contained in this perfidious report. He's speaking about Crown corporations. He said, "Others were kept operating by repeated and substantial government grants." Mr. Speaker, there were in some years, subsidies paid to fishermen to supplement the price that the Fish Board was able to obtain by the sale of their fish, but there were no subsidies or grants made to Crown corporations for the purpose of keeping them out of bankruptcy or anything else. There were no grants paid and the Premier knows it.

HON. W. ROSS THATCHER (Premier): — Saskatchewan Guarantee and Fidelity. You put millions . . .

MR. WALKER: — Mr. Speaker The Hon. Member knows very well that any funds that are required to take care of deficits by Crown corporations were used out of the surpluses of other Crown corporations and that notwithstanding the fact that there were some losses by some Crown corporations and that those losses were recouped and that . . .

MR. THATCHER: — Some?

MR. WALKER: — . . . those losses were taken

out of the profits of other Crown corporations. Nevertheless, the Crown corporations of this province turned back to the people of Saskatchewan \$16,000,000 in the 20 years of the CCF government.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. WALKER: — They absorbed every single loss by any Crown corporation.

MR. THATCHER: — Socialist arithmetic.

MR. WALKER: — Well, the Hon. Premier I'm sure doesn't . . .

MR. THATCHER: — You are worse than Tommy!

MR. WALKER: — I am sure the Hon. Premier didn't use that kind of arithmetic in running his hardware store, the kind he uses when he is talking politics down in United States where nobody who knows better can hear him.

Mr. Speaker, there just is no truth in this story that others were kept operating by repeated and substantial government grants. Any funds that went to any Crown corporation came out of surplus funds of other Crown corporations and not out of the Treasury funds. The Hon. Premier knows this, but by saying this he thinks he can create the impression of . . .

MR. THATCHER: — You kept pouring it down like it was going down the sink.

MR. WALKER: — Then he went on to say, Mr. Speaker . . .

AN HON. MEMBER: — How about Government Airlines?

MR. WALKER: — . . . “During the whole period the socialists waged war against private business.” Now as a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, the socialists have a better record of enticing private business into Saskatchewan than the Liberals have.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. WALKER: — Now, Mr. Speaker, the echoing of those various laughs reflects nothing but the contents of the heads. Mr. Speaker, the plain fact is the Liberals prior to 1944 had a dismal record of attracting industry into this province and since 1964, Mr. Speaker, their record is still not as good as it was under the CCF administration, and the figures show it. He said, “The making of profits was condemned as an unforgivable sin.” Well he used to say too, that, “The making of profits was condemned as an unforgivable sin”, but that doesn't make it so. He is not able to find any instance where the making of profit was condemned by the CCF government or any CCfer as an unforgivable sin. So he says, what is the results, “Investors simply turned their back on the socialists.” They fact is, Mr. Speaker, the burgeoning development of industry that occurred in this province during the regime of the CCF government put to shame the record of this Liberal government or the previous Liberal government.

February 14, 1967

He said, "Dozens of oil companies pulled up stakes and moved out." Mr. Speaker how ignorant and backward did he think his listeners were? Maybe there were people there who didn't know any better. The fact of the matter is there wasn't a single barrel of oil produced in this province until after the CCF government attracted oil industry to this province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. J.R. BROCKELBANK (Kelsey): — . . . 330 barrels.

MR. WALKER: — My desk mate here says that there were 300 barrels produced prior to 1944. Just enough to grease the skids to put them out in 1944.

MR. STEUART: — We were too busy fighting the war.

MR. WALKER: — This is so obviously and patently untrue to any person in Saskatchewan who saw the number of oil wells in this province rise from none, or practically none to over 5,000 during the regime of the CCF government that it is incredible that the Premier would make these statements knowing that they would get back and be seen by the people of Saskatchewan. Surely he has a complete and utter disregard for what honest people think of him. Look at the next one, "After 18 years of socialism there were fewer jobs in manufacturing than existed in 1945."

MR. THATCHER: — True . . .

MR. WALKER: — He says it's true. Well I suppose the Bureau of Statistics doesn't know as much about these things as the Premier does. I admit there are some things the Premier does know more about than the Bureau of Statistics but facts isn't one of them.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. WALKER: — I have here the report of the Dominion Bureau of Statistics and the Premier won't like these facts but they are facts. In 1945 the number of jobs in manufacturing industry in Saskatchewan was 11,617. In 1964 it was 14,100. Now that might be socialist arithmetic. I don't know, but it is a plain fact that the Bureau of Statistics shows that there was an increase there of over 20 per cent during the period that the CCF party was in power. And as a matter of fact if he will look — let's disillusion some of these jackdaws on the other side — to show them that the Premier isn't always right and infallible in the statements that he makes. As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, if you look at the last years from 1958 to 1965, here they are: 1958, 11,774; 1959, 12,009; 1960, 12,267; 1961, 13,539; 1962, 13,679; 1963, 13,830; 1964, 14,100; 1965, 14,400. So that it increased continually. As a matter of fact the total increase in the last two years has been lower than it was during some of the years when the CCF were in power.

As a matter of fact in the last two years the number had increased by only 1,200 and if you take off the steel mill which was built in this city over the dead body of the Premier, you

cut that in half because half of that increase of 1,200, there are at least 600 people working out there and I don't know how many there are in the cement plant.

The plain fact is that the record of this government is not a record of industrial success or successful industrial expansion. But this doesn't stop this Premier from going to San Francisco and making statements which are completely contrary to the facts. Then he says . . .

MR. THATCHER: — Not one was contrary to the facts.

MR. WALKER: — The Premier may think they are true in the world he lives in. They may appear true to him but the fact is that they don't conform to the statistics put out by any public or officials body in Canada.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. STEUART: — What about the pulp mill?

MR. WALKER: — “After 18 years” — I'll come to the pulp mill.

MR. STEUART: — I'll bet you will.

MR. WALKER: — He says, “After 18 years of socialism there were fewer jobs than existed in 1945, this despite the investment of \$500,000,000 in Crown corporations.

MR. THATCHER: — True facts again.

MR. WALKER: — These 22 Crown corporations that he spoke about, he said there were 22, had an investment of less than \$10,000,000, it never reached \$10,000,000.

AN HON. MEMBER: — What about the Power Corporation?

MR. WALKER: — Oh, but the Premier wasn't talking about the Power Corporation.

MR. THATCHER: — You're worse than Douglas was.

MR. WALKER: — If you include the Power Corporation then it is more than 22. Well, I'm prepared to be compared with Douglas any time. Then he says:

The socialists promised a greatly expanded program of social welfare measures, there was to be free medical care.

Well I recall this Premier kicking on the door of the Legislature trying to prevent the implementation of a free medical care plan. I can remember the Liberal party opposing the free hospitalization plan. I suppose that down in San Francisco they don't know about these facts. Then he says, “free drugs and so on.” Well the free drugs was something that he promised in 1964 and

February 14, 1967

which he now repudiates.

MR. GUY: — What are you reading from?

MR. WALKER: — If my hon. friend had been listening he would have heard what I was reading from. Of course, he says, in the overall picture there were no profits, rather there were colossal losses.

MR. THATCHER: — True.

MR. WALKER: — The plain fact is, Mr. Speaker, that these Crown corporations produced as I have already said over \$15,000,000 in profits excluding Power and Telephones after allowing for the losses of those Corporations which made no profits. Then he says, "There were 600 completely new taxes." Well, all one has to do is look at the estimates, Mr. Speaker. There are only eight or ten or a dozen taxes altogether in the whole budget of the Province of Saskatchewan.

Now the Premier says that because there was a licence fee put on gas inspection services this was a new tax. But there was no gas system in Saskatchewan prior to 1944, so that there were a lot of services that were provided for which there was a fee for service which the Premier chose to call new taxes. The mere fact that he recites this round figure of 600 completely new taxes shows that he doesn't surely mean to be taken literally in anything he says.

Then he says;

Twenty years ago the socialists promised to make Saskatchewan a Mecca for the working man instead we saw the greatest mass exodus of people out of an area since Moses led the Jews out of Egypt.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. WALKER: — That's really a gem. "Since the war 270,000 of our citizens left Saskatchewan to find employment elsewhere." Now if this is true, Mr. Speaker, it has only been exceeded by the record of that government in the last two years.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. WALKER: — Because the population growth in this province has been depressed to the lowest level in years as a matter of fact with a new increase in population of only 3,000 in the last year compared with an average of 10,000 increase in each of the last ten years of CCF government. This government has suffered a 70 per cent decline in population increase since it took office. That is a fact which the Bureau of Statistics reports.

Now, Mr. Speaker here is a funny one — 1962, Estevan, Saskatchewan, a clipping from the Leader Post, December 29, 1962:

Giving an example, Mr. Thatcher pointed out that the gross public debt of the province as at March 31, 1962 was nearly \$533, 000,000 including funded debt, treasury bills and contingent liabilities.

The headline says "Thatcher Deplores Increasing Debt." Well his own statement issued in December, 1966 points out that while the debt in Saskatchewan in 1964 was \$587,000,000 it is now \$652,000,000.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. WALKER: — Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to take a look at a statement which was published in 1964. This government is to be condemned, I submit, on two grounds. First of all its Leader cannot be trusted. He not only cannot be trusted with the affairs of the province, he can't be trusted to tell a simple straight-forward fact. The government ought also to be condemned because it has broken its promises; it has flagrantly broken its promises. I am reading from a pamphlet published by the Saskatchewan Liberal Association of Regina:

They promise the creation of 20,000 new jobs in manufacturing in its first four years of office.

In two years 1,400, he has only 18,600 more to go.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. WALKER: — Then he say he will reduce hydro power and natural gas rates to levels comparable with other provinces. Has there been any reduction in power, hydro or natural gas rates? None at all. The only places where they have changed rates are to increase them. They have increased the rates on my constituents in Warman and in Martensville and so he obviously doesn't mean to keep these promises . . .

MR. STEUART: — Ten per cent in the city of Regina, Bob, you better smarten up.

MR. WALKER: — . . . when he is moving in the other direction. He says:

It will provide land at cost to new industries and provide sewer and water on the local improvement basis.

This government is conspicuous for doing one thing about sewer and water and that is turning down bylaws passed by municipalities to build sewer and water systems. I say, Mr. Speaker, that this government has subverted the Local Government Board. This government has told that Board what it must do. This government has told it that it must put a freeze on construction, and I ask the Premier to deny it, if not true. The fact is, Mr. Speaker, that this Board has taken upon itself the job of trying to prevent local governments from providing themselves with the things they need. Why? I suppose, for the ulterior purpose of trying to prevent local tax rates from increasing, to try to make the Premier's government's failure to restrain the level of local tax rates less conspicuous than it is now.

Then he says:

The new Liberal government will first set up an independent body to uncover the inefficiencies in the operation of the Saskatchewan government and its agencies and

recommend the ways of saving valuable tax money.

MR. STEUART: — Who did that?

MR. WALKER: — Look at the floors in the Legislative Buildings. Well, Mr. Speaker, if this commission of inquiry was supposed to eliminate any inefficiencies and save valuable tax monies which are now being wasted, then the Premier had better do some explaining as to why the budget of this province has risen from about \$225,000,000 to \$300,000,000 in a space of only three years. As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, this government is extracting more money from the people of Saskatchewan than any government in this province has ever taken . . .

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. WALKER: — . . . and is doing it by taxing the people who can least afford to pay. This government hasn't found any inefficiencies or found any more efficient ways of doing things.

AN HON. MEMBER: — . . . an airplane.

MR. WALKER: — Well, yes, a \$200,000 airplane which takes the Premier off on his \$50 a day jaunts to San Francisco, to make these statements about our province.

AN HON. MEMBER: — Bob, your facts are . . .

MR. WALKER: — This is what the platform says:

It will then extend the list of goods now exempt from the sales tax to include such essentials as children's clothing and shoes.

MR. STEUART: — Turkey saddles.

MR. WALKER: — No performance at all, Mr. Speaker. It's a government that has inherited the richest exchequer of any government in the history of this province and has failed to implement these simple little pledges that it made to the voters. "It will initiate a study to find way of reducing land and property taxes." Well, if it initiated the study, the study came to naught. If the study had come to anything, the government didn't pay any attention to the study, as nothing has happened.

MR. THATCHER: — . . . Homeowner Grants.

MR. WALKER: — Property taxes in my constituency are up an average of 20 per cent since this government was elected.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. WALKER: — He says that it will establish means of reducing personal income taxes to a level comparable to those paid by Canadians in other provinces. No performance, in spite of the most buoyant revenues in our history.

AN HON. MEMBER: — Bob, did you get your taxes?

MR. WALKER: — Then it goes on to say:

A new Liberal government will immediately enact short and long-term measures to give Saskatchewan farmers a fair share of the income in a new and invigorating economy.

AN HON. MEMBER: — Hear, hear!

MR. WALKER: — So \$15 a year, tax free gas, Mr. Speaker.

MR. STEUART: — The people like it, Bob.

MR. WALKER: — The day is past, Mr. Speaker, in my opinion, when people can run on an election platform of a hamper for Christmas from the Tammany Hall bunch. The day has passed when a \$15 hamper will buy any votes.

He says:

It will immediately revise the present legislation restricting farm credit to give a square deal to young people wishing to start farming and to small farmers wishing to enlarge their farm operations.

Where is it, Mr. Speaker? It will make loans to these people at low rates of interest covering 80 per cent of the farm value with 30 years to repay. I have a farmer who wants to buy a grazing lease. Six years to pay, one third cash, six per cent. Where are those famous Liberal promises?

At the present time Saskatchewan farmers are forced to — this was written in 1964 — pay the highest interest rates of farmers anywhere in Canada.

The interest rates have only gone up, Mr. Speaker, since 1964 because of the tight money policies of the Liberal government down at Ottawa.

AN HON. MEMBER: — Hear, hear!

MR. WALKER: — He says, “It will remove grazing leases from the political arena.”

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. WALKER: — I wish Mr. Lewry was sitting here.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. WALKER: — We’ll hear all about these grazing leases removed from political interference.

MR. STEUART: — Tell us about Toby’s leases.

MR. WALKER: — “It will . . .

February 14, 1967

MR. STEUART: — . . . up your elbow.

MR. WALKER: —

. . . It will greatly reduce taxes on farmlands and property. It will establish a formula to reduce the unfair burden of taxation which farmers now pay. It will halt the flow of farmers from the land. It will work to improve and expand the Medical Health Program. It will institute a Drug Insurance Program to care for major drugs, work to improve the Health Insurance Plan.

Well, Mr. Speaker, in June 1964, a scant 90 days after these people came into office, here is the headline in the Leader Post — “Canada Cannot Afford Medicare”, in quoting Health Minister, David Steuart, from Saskatoon — Canada cannot afford it. As a matter of fact part of the reason for the complaints which the Premier now voices about his money, the tight money situation, is because his Minister of Public Health persuaded the Government of Canada to delay the implementation of the Canadian Medical Care Plan.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. WALKER: — This government, Mr. Speaker, cannot get away from it by laughing. This government deprived the people in the Province of Saskatchewan by at least \$12,000,000 of cost sharing on the Medical Care Plan if this government had done its duty by the people of Saskatchewan. They are so imbued with their Goldwaterism, their retrenchment theories of politics that they are willing to saddle the people of Saskatchewan with an extra burden of \$12,000,000 by delaying their Medical Care Plan by a year.

He says:

A new government will overhaul and quickly step up Saskatchewan's road building program throughout the entire province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. MacDONALD (Minister of Welfare): — That's because they are being built probably.

MR. STEUART: — What's the matter, were you lost?

MR. WALKER: — As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, anybody who takes the trouble to drive on Saskatchewan's highways knows that it has been decades since the highways of this province have been in as bad shape, as poorly maintained as they have been in the last year and a half.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. WALKER: — Everybody in Saskatchewan knows it and is talking about it, Mr. Speaker. This was the government that was going to modernize and streamline our highways. Well, sure they spent \$40,000,000, Mr. Speaker, they pour out the money but it takes more than money. It takes a little bit of planning, a little bit

of concise thinking by the government in power to have that money spent to good advantage instead of pouring it out in bucketfuls. I understand they get a percentage of it back like they used to do before 1944, but this is one of the things, Mr. Speaker, which the CCF government after the next election will do. It will put an end to this old system of going around and tapping the contractors for part of their contract money to finance the party. It will put an end to that.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. WALKER: — Now, Mr. Speaker, I don't want to read the whole of this dismal tract, but this contained the keynote speech of the Premier, speaking in his first campaign speech, on March 23rd, to officially open his party's campaign. (I think he was speaking in Gravelbourg, although the report doesn't say so). Mr. Thatcher told his cheering audience:

It is time for political parties to get their votes by assuring thrift, economy and efficiency and not by outbidding and out-promising each other.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. WALKER: — Well I can read you the rest of these promises, Mr. Speaker, but I point out that this document, while it says it is published by the Saskatchewan Liberal Association, does qualify that. In the next line it says, it is "authorized as second class mail."

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. STEUART: — How did you make out on that platform?

MR. WALKER: — Well, as a matter of fact you made out not so well. You got ninety-three votes less than this side of the House got on that election.

MR. STEUART: — We got the government, eh, Buddy?

MR. WALKER: — Mr. Speaker, now it being almost ten o'clock, I'd like to adjourn the debate. I wasn't quite finished however.

Debate adjourned.

The Assembly adjourned at 10:00 o'clock p.m.