

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN
Fourth Session - Fifteenth Legislature
12th Day

Monday, February 20, 1967

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

WELCOME TO STUDENTS

HON. G.B. GRANT (Regina South): — Mr. Speaker, I'd like to introduce a group that are completely occupying the west gallery and have overflowed into the east gallery, 130 students from Massey School, one of the largest and best public schools in the province. In the west gallery with the students are Mrs. Newman and Mr. Braun, the teachers. In the east gallery, in the front portion in the centre, a group of students from the same school accompanied by Mr. Jantzen and Mr. Glaicar. We are very pleased to have these students with us today and I know the Hon. Members join with me in wishing them an enjoyable and interesting session.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. J.A. PEPPER (Weyburn): — Mr. Speaker, I would like to welcome and to introduce to you and through you to the Members of this Assembly, a group of students sitting in the top row of seats in the Speaker's gallery. They are about 40 in number and are a portion of the entire grade eight class of the Junior High School in Weyburn. This class totals about 200. They are accompanied here today by two of their teachers, Mr. Fletcher and Mr. Johnson and their bus driver Mr. Reg Twit. I am sure that their visit with us will be both pleasant and educational and that their journey home will also be pleasant and safe.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. R.A. WALKER (Hanley): — As the Member for Hanley, I want to welcome here, on your behalf, a group of students from the Holy Family School up in the Speaker's gallery, that bright-looking group that you see up there from Sutherland. These folks have journeyed all the way down from Sutherland today and will be going back. I have a fond recollection of Sutherland, that's where my youngsters got their education and Sutherland is a very prominent community and a very successful community. I'm sure that all of them here enjoy their afternoon and I predict that they will profit greatly from it. I hope they can stay for a good long time. I want, on behalf of Your Honour, to welcome them here and to wish them a safe and speedy voyage back.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

ANNOUNCEMENT RE: CURLING - SASKATCHEWAN PLAYDOWNS

MR. M.P. PEDERSON (Arm River): — Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, I'd like to draw the attention of the Legislature to a sporting event which took place here in Regina on Friday last and drew widespread attention and a good deal of interest and excitement. I'm referring of course, to the Saskatchewan playdowns of the Curling Championships which were won by a rink from the constituency of Arm River, something I believe that has not happened before. Before I express to this winning rink the congratulations of myself and I'm sure of all Hon. Members in the House, I would also like to express my congratulations to the rink from Delisle who played a magnificent game and kept the entire series very interesting and entertaining for everyone who followed the series. By a strange coincidence, all eight members of the two rinks happen to be personal friends of mine and so I would say to Harold Worth, Jimmy Hill, Bob Bentley and Gary Stevenson, better luck next time. To Doug Wankel and the three Knutson brothers, Art, Gay, and Elmer, all the very best. I'm sure that this House joins with me in wishing them success in bringing one more sporting trophy back to Saskatchewan when they complete their playdowns in Ottawa.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

QUESTION RE ORDERING OF NEW LICENCE FORMS

MR. E. WHELAN (Regina North): — Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, I would like to direct a question to the Attorney General (Mr. Heald). In view of the fact that half of the 1966 licence plates have deteriorated to a point which makes them useless as a means of certification, can the Minister in charge of the Highway Traffic Board assure us that specifications for the 1967 plates guarantee their legibility for at least 12 months?

HON. D.V. HEALD (Attorney General): — The Minister in charge of the Highway Traffic Board is not responsible for ordering the licence plates, but I will certainly get in touch with the responsible Minister and pass on your comments.

ADJOURNED DEBATES

BUDGET DEBATE

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Mr. Thatcher (Provincial Treasurer) that Mr. Speaker do now have the chair.

MR. A.E. BLAKENEY (Regina West): — Mr. Speaker, when I adjourned the debate on Friday, I had dealt in a summary way with a couple of topics, with the Government's dismal record in the area of Federal-Provincial relations

and with the Government's return to deficit financing for highways or, as the budget called it, of placing the cost of some highways into a capital non-budgetary account, and more particularly of the government's failure to tell the public that this is deficit financing. I said, Mr. Speaker, and I say again, that there may be a good case for deficit financing, but if there is, the government should make that case rather than pretend that deficit financing is not going on. The Government of Alberta is deficit financing, but it has the courage and the plain honesty to say so. It does not indulge in the fiction that deficit financing is not going on. What is required, Mr. Speaker, is not evasion from the Provincial Treasurer but some straightforward candor. The public of Saskatchewan are entitled to complete frankness on this subject and from the Provincial Treasurer they are not getting it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. BLAKENEY: — With respect to the government's dismal record in the Federal-Provincial field, I only repeat what I said last Friday. Our difficulties are due entirely to the failure of this government in its duty to negotiate with Ottawa. Our difficulties are due either to Mr. Sharp and his duplicity or the Premier and his incompetence or perhaps a little bit of both.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. BLAKENEY: — But at any rate, Mr. Speaker, it's the Liberal party's gift to Saskatchewan — a display of spite because Saskatchewan citizens have for so long and with such good sense rejected the Liberal party and all it stands for. Now if ever the people of Saskatchewan wondered whether the Liberal party either federally or provincially had anything to offer them, they know now. They know now after being roasted by Ross and skewered by Sharp.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. BLAKENEY: — Let me say once again, our loss is due entirely to action by Liberal governments — not as the Premier says in his budget speech "Because of our changed economic position." Not one penny was lost because of economic progress. It's not our economic situation that has change; it is our political situation. We have Liberal governments at Ottawa and Regina. That and that alone is the source of our problem. Now the myth that we are a have-province is just that — a myth. Compared with the rest of Canada we are a have-not province and as I said on Friday, top on the list of what we have not is a competent government.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. BLAKENEY: — I said, Mr. Speaker, that we are a have-not province and getting more so. I don't mean to say that we are

not enjoying some measure of prosperity. While not everyone is sharing in the prosperity, we can say and we are all very glad to say that Saskatchewan is enjoying a substantial measure of prosperity. It could hardly be otherwise. For one thing, we have had five successive better than average crops. For another, prosperity is general throughout the western world. In the United States, levels of employment and output are at record levels. This wartime activity is spilling over into Canada and into Saskatchewan. Our growth is continuing. But the figures clearly indicate two things.

First, our rate of growth is slowing down, and second, we are not keeping pace with the rest of Canada. Now let's look at some well known indicators that the Premier so often quotes, at least when they suit his purpose. Let's take oil production. Our increase in oil production has been this, and I comment this to the Minister of Mineral Resources (Mr. Cameron), in 1963, 7,000,000 barrels; 1964, 10,000,000 barrels; 1965, 7,000,000 barrels; 1966, 5,000,000 barrels. In 1964, 10,000,000 barrels' and in 1966 5,000,000 barrels. Good, good, but hardly spectacular.

Or take manufacturing. Our manufacturing growth, notwithstanding what the Premier says, is only fair. The value of shipments for the first 11 months of 1966, (and those are the latest figures that we have) shows this: Canada, up 8.4 per cent; Saskatchewan, up 7.9 per cent. And considering that we are working on such a small base, an increase of 7.9 per cent is certainly only fair. Much of this is accounted for simply by higher prices.

Or take personal income. The Premier boasts that the income per person in Saskatchewan is above the national average. In 1962 it was \$32 per person above the national average. In 1963 it was \$137 per person above the national average, over eight per cent. Last year in the budget debate I said that if our per capita income in Saskatchewan in 1964 was over the national average, I'd eat it. Well the DBS figures are in, and they show that in 1965 we were \$22 below the national average. Even with the greatest crop in history it looks as if in 1966, our income per capita will be just barely above the national average, maybe one per cent, two per cent if we are really lucky. This is a measure of just how far we have slipped compared with the rest of Canada. The facts are that if we had had a 20-bushel crop, an average crop, income in Saskatchewan would be well below the national average. A far, far cry from the healthy margin we had in 1962 and 1963.

Even retail trade, referred to by the Provincial Treasurer, is up less in 1966 in Saskatchewan than it is in the rest of Canada. If this can happen when we've had the crop of all crops, we know that we are certainly off the pace.

Or take electric power generation. This is a favourite indicator of prosperity. Here has been the growth. In 1963, up 11.3 per cent; 1964, up 9.6 per cent; 1965, up 8.2 per cent; and

1966, up an estimated five per cent. Hardly spectacular, in fact disquieting.

And while this evidence was mounting that industrial prosperity was levelling off, what was happening in agriculture? I'll tell you what was happening. The progress towards diversification of agriculture was grinding to a halt. Compared with 1965, cattle numbers in 1966 were down four per cent; cattle marketings, down two per cent; hog marketers, down seven per cent; sheep marketings, down 20 per cent; egg production, down nine per cent; milk production, down eight per cent. This is not a rosy picture, not one of which the government can be proud.

Or, Mr. Speaker, let's take population. Now that, Mr. Speaker, is supremely the indicator that the Premier has made his own. While in Opposition he went up and down this province saying, "There's a terrible lot of people going out of this province. If we only had a Liberal Government, all this would stop. All these people would stay home and more would flock in." In his first budget speech before he knew what the facts were he continued this theme. Here's what he said — in his first budget speech:

In the near future, the Government will endeavor to take action which will retain the natural increase of this province, and attract other citizens from Canada and other parts of the world.

Well, Mr. Speaker, that "near future," promised in 1965, has been fading like a desert mirage. And receding too into the twilight have been all the people leaving Saskatchewan and seeking opportunity in Alberta and British Columbia. Let's check the figures. In the year ended May 31, 1964, population rose by 10,000; in the year ended May 31, 1965, population rose by 8,000, and in the year ended May 31, 1966, population rose by 3,000. Last CCF year, 10,000; first Liberal year, 8,000; second Liberal year, 3,000. During the whole of the 1950s, during that period of dark stagnation which the Premier likes to talk about, preferably at points distant from Saskatchewan, during all this period, the population rose by an average of 10,000 a year. Compare that with last year's 3,000. The Premier apparently believed that the gusts of warm air issuing from his office would compensate for the disadvantages of our weather. He has tried hard. He's huffed and he's puffed, and the legislative chinook has been impressive, but it just has not done the trick.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. BLAKENEY: — The only result has been a continued exodus of our people. Perhaps some of the blame belongs to his advisors. Perhaps they haven't been devoting their attention in the field of population increase in the right quarters. But whatever the reason, Mr. Speaker, whatever the reason, we're losing our people young and old, at a rate which is unprecedented in the last 15 years. Mr. Speaker, you don't really need to look at the figures

to know this. All you need to do is look around. Rural depopulation is continuing as fast as it ever did. Dozens, yes, hundreds of our villages are shrinking. And I comment this to the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. McIsaac). He can look at his report and see that approximately 200 villages have gone down in population in the last few years. And even our cities have lost their rapid rate of growth. No longer are Saskatoon and Regina the third and fourth fastest-growing cities in Canada. The housing picture tells its own story. How many houses were started in Regina last year? Precious few. Less than 1000. Down 40 per cent over the figure for the previous year. Elsewhere in Saskatchewan it's pretty well as bad. Now, Mr. Speaker, with a cut of 40 per cent in housing, if Regina was growing rapidly, you'd think you couldn't buy a house for love nor money. But instead, hundreds of houses are displaying their For Sale signs. And I would like Members opposite to drive around the streets of Regina and they will see the For Sale signs. Population growth in Regina has definitely slowed. It's not only Regina, Labour Minister Nicholson when he was in Regina a few days ago said, "No province in Canada has suffered as bad as Saskatchewan in the 1966 slow-down of housing starts." In Saskatchewan housing fell off over 30 per cent; in the rest of Canada under 20 per cent.

So much for the idea that we are forging ahead. Mr. Speaker, in population, in housing, in development, we are falling further and further behind. The Premier can huff and he can puff and he can turn out press releases, but this does not deny the figures that we are falling further and further behind.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. BLAKENEY: — I now turn, Mr. Speaker, to some comments on Crown corporations. On Friday I had occasion to correct the Provincial Treasurer's remarks with respect to telephone financing. We agree with him that as a general rule, Government Telephones and the Power Corporation should not be used as a tax source, and you will recall that he belabored our government for using Telephones as a tax source. The reasons for taking dividends from Saskatchewan Government Telephones have been explained in this House a number of times, sound business reasons that meant extra hundreds of thousands of dollars for Saskatchewan. But after belaboring the CCF policy of taking dividends from Telephones even when there were sound business reasons, he then proceeds to take dividends from the Saskatchewan Power Corporation when there are no reasons sound or unsound except his need for money.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. BLAKENEY: — Stripped of all its verbiage, the Premier proposes to use power rates as a taxing device. Now this is a new policy and it's a bad policy. Under the previous government the Power Corporation has developed from a few scattered power plants to a great integrated power utility. And, Mr. Speaker, that

development took place on basis of service at cost, profits sufficient to cover interest costs; depreciation, a little margin. The rest was returned to the users in the form of rate reductions. Now that, Mr. Speaker, was done for two reasons.

First, probably more than any other thing, abundant cheap power encourages industrial growth. Great new industries like the steel mill would be responsible without abundant cheap power. It just did not seem to make sense to prejudice this sort of industrial development by trying to squeeze a few tax dollars out of power.

Second, probably more than any other one thing, abundant cheap power adds to the enjoyment of living. Anyone who can remember Saskatchewan before the Power Corporation knows well what I mean. And we still have a way to go to enjoy all the full benefits of electrical living for our people. We still are a high-cost power area and it just doesn't make too much sense to jeopardize this growth in real satisfaction for our citizens by trying to squeeze a few tax dollars out of power. But that's what the government proposes to do. In a budget which announces that no new taxes will be levied, it levies a tax on every power and gas user in this province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. BLAKENEY: — Mr. Speaker, just one more of the now impressive list of tax increases imposed by this Liberal government. Let me list once again some of the lengthening list of tax increases imposed or continued by this budget.

Hospital and medical care premium up \$20 or 40 per cent; auto licences increased; grazing lease fees increased; birth, marriage, death and many other certificates increased; sales tax on soaps and detergents, new tax, four per cent; hospital revenue tax, new tax, two mills; fire insurance premiums increased; liquor prices increased; telephone rates increased and now a tax on power rates. Mr. Speaker, the list grows more impressive every day and not only because of its length. It tells its own story about this government and its approach to the problem of the cost of living.

Mr. Speaker, on the issue of the cost of living, this government's record is shameful. It refused to discuss the issue last September when we met in this Chamber; it refused again to discuss the issue in December when we met in this Chamber; it refused to have any open debate on what the Provincial Government could do or should do with respect to the problem of the cost of living. Now, Mr. Speaker, this is a serious problem for a substantial group of our citizens. I know that many of us are in a position to pass on the increased cost of living because we can raise our own prices, or because prices of the things we sell are rising, or because we have a trade union to speak for us. But there are many people who are in a fixed income or who have no way of getting more for their labor

or their produce. These people are vulnerable and these people are indeed feeling the pinch.

Let's remind ourselves just how fast the cost of living has gone up. Between 1949 and 1965 food prices rose by an average of two index points a year. But between 1965 and 1966 — one year, food prices rose ten index points, five times as fast as during the previous 15 years. Similarly clothing rose three times as fast. In this sort of a situation what has the government done, particularly to help old age pensioners and other people who are living on a fixed income? Well, Mr. Speaker, it has appointed a Royal Commission. We all know the Liberal adage. When the public are demanding action and when you don't want to act and when you have no place else to run, you appoint a Royal Commission. Mr. Speaker, in the vast book of Liberal inaction, every second chapter is headed "Royal Commission."

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. BLAKENEY: — Royal Commission on prices, Royal Commission on price spreads, Royal Commission on farm machinery prices, Royal Commission on petroleum prices and so on and so on.

Mr. Speaker, it perhaps wouldn't be so bad if this government didn't do anything to help people on fixed incomes. I don't suppose any of them, even the most optimistic of them, expects the government opposite to help them, but they were disappointed when the Provincial Government joined the ranks of the wolves who were raiding their pocketbooks. Take a little pensioner living in a little house with a car, a second hand car in which he goes to visit the grandchildren now and then . . .

HON. D.G. STEUART (Minister of Natural Resources): — Little Red Riding Hood . . .

MR. BLAKENEY: — That's right, Little Red Riding Hood. Well, well, I know that the Member for Prince Albert doesn't have much sympathy for anybody who is little, even if it is Little Red Riding Hood.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. BLAKENEY: — But I want to say this. What situation has this fellow found himself in? His medical and hospital tax has gone up. His auto licence and gas tax have gone up. The tax on his pipe tobacco has doubled. His soap and detergent is now taxed. His insurance premiums have gone up. His telephone rates have gone up. It is not because his government had to put them up, profits are greater than ever, but the facts are that the greed is greater than ever. Now even his power bill is taxed. Now every time he pays his power bill he is making a payment of tribute to the Caesar of the Wascana.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. BLAKENEY: — Mr. Speaker, just woe betide him if he happens to like a glass of beer. Medical and hospital tax, gasoline, tobacco, soap, fire insurance, telephone, power, beer. Is it any wonder that this fellow has had just about all he can take of tax cuts, he can't stand much more?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. BLAKENEY: — He is waiting, Mr. Speaker, he's waiting for a chance to heap retribution on the government opposite. Retribution it richly deserves and retribution it's going to get.

Now, Mr. Speaker, returning to Crown corporations, the past year has seen the continued liquidation of these public enterprises. Since the last session we have seen the confirmation of the Saskair give-away; Estevan Clay Products apparently readied for sale; the continued erosion of Government Insurance.

I'll come to this brick plant later. I really want to say a word or two about that.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. BLAKENEY: — Let's first look at Saskair. Last year we protested this deal by which Saskair was sold to friends of the government opposite. We said that the deal was a bad one for Saskatchewan and for Prince Albert. We said jobs were threatened and we said that this guarantee by the government of \$2,750,000 of business at prices set by NorCanAir was a bad deal. The Minister replied that it was a good deal, that the jobs were safe, that the agreement guaranteed them. We warned that this didn't look quite as good as he said it was, but he scoffed. He said that we should look at the agreement. Look at what it says: The Company "agrees to maintain and operate the existing repair and maintenance shop at Prince Albert, Saskatchewan, continuously until the first day of March, 1975." The Company would "continuously until the first day of March, 1975, continue the operations of Vendor," Saskair. Here, we were told, was a guarantee of continued operations. This, Mr. Speaker, was in April, 1966. In June, 1966, less than two months after that agreement was signed, NorCanAir struck. A total of 42 men were laid off, over half the normal workforce. The repair and maintenance operations were almost entirely wiped out. Employees in that department were reduced from 50 to 15.

The only shop for repairing civilian aircraft in Saskatchewan was gone. Here was a shop which had done quite a bit of the business with out-of-province people, had done a nice job in Prince Albert, had operated for 20 years, gone. Now even our Saskatchewan people have to go to Edmonton or Winnipeg to get their job done. Another industry lost by this government. Now with this bare-faced breach of their shiny new agreement you would think the government would come out roaring and they would say, "If you break the agreement, you can't expect to have that

guarantee we gave you.” You would think they would come out in the strongest possible terms. Did they do so? As far as I know they haven’t issued a whimper. They have been, for perhaps the first time in history, without a press release.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. BLAKENEY: — It did nothing to save the 42 jobs. And so far as the public is concerned, it did nothing to cancel the guarantee of flying business. The bargain between NorCanAir and the government was this: The government would guarantee \$2,750,000 worth of flying business; NorCanAir would guarantee continued flying operations. NorCanAir broke the agreement. It has now no right to the guarantee of government business. And if the government continues the guarantee we can only assume that the government has more concern for the pocketbooks of the promoters of NorCanAir than it has for the dinner pails of the shop employees.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. BLAKENEY: — This dereliction of duty on the part of the government confirms our worst fears. We said that the sale to NorCanAir was a sell-out. Can anyone now doubt that we were right?

I will have some comments to make about the Estevan Brick Plant and the Insurance Office later in my remarks.

I now turn to the subject which the Premier referred to as No. 1 priority — education. Now we, Mr. Speaker, on this side of the House agree with him that education should be the No. 1 priority. We disagree with him when he says that he has made it so.

Now let’s look at this provision for school grants. The budget figures for school grants are revealing. They reveal the fact that education at least at the school level is far from No. 1 priority. They reveal too the contempt that this government has for the public of Saskatchewan.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I can just imagine the dialogue which went on when these budget figures were put together. I can imagine the Minister saying, “I’ve got to have some money for school grants,” and the Provincial Treasurer saying, “Well you can’t have any.”

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. BLAKENEY: — “But, Ross, what will I do? The figures will look so bad.” “That’s easy, juggle the figures. Surely there must be money around in other votes that can be called school grants. What about teachers’ superannuation?” Government has always paid teachers’ pension contributions. We’ll let the school boards do it and call it school grants.”

“But, Ross, we did that last year.”

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. BLAKENEY: — “Well what about grade ten textbooks? I know the CCF used to list these textbooks separately under another vote. But surely we can let the school board pay for them and call them school grants. Think that over, George, it may work.”

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. BLAKENEY: — “But Ross, we did that last year too . . .

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. BLAKENEY: — “But we’ll do it again this year. That will dress up the figures a bit. And then there is driver training.”

“Good thinking, George. Good thinking . . . “

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. BLAKENEY: — “Let’s see now. We pay for this now from the Insurance Office about \$130,000 a year. No reason why we can’t call that school grants. And better still, we can use it as an excuse for another school tax. That’s excellent. . . “

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. BLAKENEY: — “We’ll spend very little more. We’ll pad our school grants figure. Well get another \$100,000 in tax.” “Good thinking, George. Now isn’t there something else? Isn’t the Federal Government cutting off its grant to some of the smaller colleges — College Mathiu, Notre Dame. We’re going to have to make up this money, aren’t we? Aren’t we making a grant to Campion College? Can’t we call that school grants?”

“But, Ross, surely we can’t call this money to these colleges, and Campion College, surely you can’t call that school grants.”

“Don’t be so squeamish, George. Have a look at it.”

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. BLAKENEY: — “Well all right, Ross. But it still won’t be enough.”

“Well what about these composite high schools? I know the CCF paid for these technical high schools under the Public Works vote, 100 per cent. Surely we can get the school boards

to pay for them. All it school grants. Say maybe we won't have to pay 100 per cent. Maybe we can chisel ten per cent, maybe even 20 per cent."

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. BLAKENEY: — "But, Ross, we did that last year too . . . "

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. BLAKENEY: — "Don't you remember that's how we got our school grants figures looking respectable. Course, we didn't spend the money, but it looked good on paper."

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. BLAKENEY: — "Well, George, that's just what we'll have to do again. There is a few million for these composite schools. Mostly federal money anyhow and besides it'll never get spent now that we've got those projects at North Battleford and all those others safely stalled. Yes, George, that's what we'll do."

And, Mr. Speaker, by George, that's what they did do.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. BLAKENEY: — Look at the school grants figure — \$70,600,000. An increase of \$11,200,000. But of this \$11,200,000, the increase is this: for capital grants \$6,300,000, most of which will never be spent; northern education, \$400,000; textbooks, \$600,000 — totalling \$7,300,000. This leaves barely \$3,900,000 for increases in operating grants. Mr. Speaker, I suspect that even this niggardly figure of \$3,900,000 includes the extra costs of teachers' pensions under the Canada Pension Plan. And, I darkly suspect that it includes the money for driver training previously paid by the Government Insurance Office. Mr. Speaker, this probably doesn't mean any more than \$3,750,000 in regular school grants, and if so, this is far, far too small. It will not cover the increase in school costs. Contrast this, Mr. Speaker, with the figures in the last CCF budget, figures which just about covered the increase in school costs. This sort of thing — putting up a little more than \$3,000,000 in school grants — is the sort of thing that puts our school boards in an impossible situation.

They are losing teachers at an alarming rate as the teachers go to other more prosperous provinces to seek higher salaries. As the Saskatchewan Teachers Federation has shown, the drain of all qualified teachers has probably not been grater during the past 15 or 20 years than it has been in the last couple of years. The only alternative is for school boards to jack the mill rates, and this they are being forced to do. The tax shift is continuing

relentlessly. Mill rates both rural and urban are climbing. Let me give just one example which will appeal to the Members for Melville and Touchwood.

Talking about the Melville School Unit, I'll quote the rural mill rate and that for the village of Goodeve. During the ten years from 1955 to 1965, the mill rate rose this way: rural 31 to 32, one mill in ten years; village 36 to 37, one mill in ten years; and during the last two years of 1965 and 1966, the mill rate rose this way: rural 32 to 36, four mills in two years; village 37 to 41, four mills in two years, twenty times as fast and that's impressive even for the Liberals.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. BLAKENEY: — I could give this same story over and over again. Prince Albert, Saskatoon, dozens of RMs. So much for the Liberal boats that they are the friends of the local ratepayer.

Mr. Speaker, school grants at this level will increase taxes on local ratepayers, will lower our standards of school instruction, will increase the possibility of friction between trustees and teachers. There may be times when our economic condition is bad, when we'll have to force sharp cuts in school expenditures. But surely in relatively buoyant times we can afford to keep pace. Anything less, and we've had a great deal less this year, is to make a mockery of any claims that education is a No. 1 priority.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. BLAKENEY: — Just a word, Mr. Speaker, on some of the more flamboyant Thatcherisms in the budget speech concerning school grants. He says that in this current year the Federal and Provincial Governments spent \$6,150,000 on composite schools. This is simply false. That's what they budgeted. And with Liberal governments there is a vast difference between what is budgeted and what is spent for any public purpose. I doubt whether expenditures in the current year will exceed \$4,150,000 compared to the budget of \$6,150,000. Certainly to the end of January in the answer given to us in this House the other day, the gross figure for spending was well under the \$4,000,000 mark. He said also that the proportion of shared costs of school education borne by the Provincial Government will be 51.5 per cent. Well let's leave aside for a minute what the Premier says will be. In making promises for the future he is what you might call, accident prone.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. BLAKENEY: — Let's look at what has been during the last couple of years. Referring to the annual report of the Department of Education we note that all schools revenue fund receipts in 1964 were \$90,700,000; 1965, \$101,100,000. Grants in the two years

were respectively \$38,400,000 and \$42,800,000. I don't expect anyone to remember these figures. I just want to say that in 1964, grants provided 42.35 per cent of revenue; in 1965, grants provided 42.32 per cent of revenue. Just about the same. School grants are simply not paying any significantly larger proportion of school operating costs. And this means of course that the dollars which have to come out of local sources keep going up and up. In 1964, \$52,300,000 from the local people; in 1965, \$58,300,000, up \$6,000,000. And this, as we all know, Mr. Speaker, can only mean one thing, local mill rates must go up and local mill rates have gone up, and local mill rates will go up still further with this budget presented by the Provincial Treasurer.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. BLAKENEY: — Just before I leave school grants, may I congratulate the Premier in apparently abandoning the idea of paying out large grants on a basis which did not exist, or at last, was never revealed, and looked from where we sat, very much like a basis of pure political pressures, as bad from the beginning and should never have been started. I see the Minister shaking his head, but I say in all conscience to him, that when a school board asked for an explanation, when the Regina School Board asked for explanation, they got nothing but mumbo-jumbo, noting as to why one board got this much and another board got that much. If the Minister would be good enough to write to me what the explanation is, I'm sure both I and the school board would be delighted.

I say, Mr. Speaker, that this sort of thing is bad. School grants should be paid out on a formula which is known to everyone.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. BLAKENEY: — Not only should school grants be paid out honestly, fairly, and I'm not suggesting that they weren't, but it should appear to all that the method is honest and fair, and I say that it does not so appear. Incentive grants of this type should be buried, should be buried deep and I hope they are buried deep.

Mr. Speaker, I now turn to the University. The government's dealings with the University show up as clearly as anything could, what I might call the style of this government, its insensitivity, its downright crudeness on occasion. The previous government had to cardinal principles in dealing with the University: 1. Respect the autonomy of the University; 2. Provide the funds necessary so that facilities would e there for all comers.

I say that the government has dishonored both of these principles. Respecting autonomy we have seen the Premier making announcement after announcement from his office as if he were the president of the University. He has announced new building programs, he has announced academic programs; he announced a

building program for students the other day, which I am sure the University had not heard of.

MR. THATCHER: — Do you oppose?

MR. BLAKENEY: — Not at all. I'm just saying it should be done by the University. Just the other day in this House, in fact he announced that a hospital was going to be built affiliated with the University.

MR. THATCHER: — Were you disappointed?

MR. BLAKENEY: — No, I was not disappointed. As a matter of fact the only thing that will disappoint me is the fact that I'll never see that hospital.

MR. THATCHER: — Why, are you going away?

MR. BLAKENEY: — My bet, Mr. Speaker, is that this \$16,000,000 project which was supposed to be done in association with the University has never been formerly presented to the University Board of Governors. That's my bet. I bet that the academic program for teaching which it implies has never been presented to the Senate, let alone approved.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. BLAKENEY: — I bet this is true. Yes, that's right. But I say, Mr. Speaker, that these announcements of University policy from the government isn't the end of their pressure.

MR. THATCHER: — Liberal action.

MR. BLAKENEY: — That's right, Liberal action. That's right, this is action. I'll come to that. The students have also felt this sort of Liberal action. Let me tell you a little bit about this. They have been told that they must be dutiful and respectful or they too will feel the meat axe. When the Premier and the Deputy Premier met with a group of students not too long ago, they complained that the student newspapers had been saying nasty things about them.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. BLAKENEY: — Now to the obvious comment from the students that we still have freedom of the press — I think that comes as a surprise to the Members opposite . . .

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. BLAKENEY: — . . . but at least the students thought it was true — here's what the Premier and the Deputy Premier had to say: Mr. Steuart, "We have the freedom not to like it." Mr. Thatcher, "Yes, and we also have the freedom not to do anything, if we don't like it."

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. BLAKENEY: — So much for those who dare to criticize the Caesar of the Wascana.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. BLAKENEY: — Mr. Speaker, as for the second principle of providing funds so that there can be facilities for all comers, this has simply gone by the board. In the early 1960s when it was decided to build a new university at Regina, it was recognized that building both at Regina and Saskatoon would have to continue at a brisk pace if critical shortages of classroom and other space were to be avoided.

Realistic building programs both at Saskatoon and Regina were laid out. And then, Mr. Speaker, came 1964 and the Thatcher slow-down in capital construction — a near fatal blunder. As reported in the Leader Post of June 23, 1966, \$4,000,000 of the 1965-66 money was not spent and even after that, he directed that a further \$3,000,000 of the 1966-67 money be not spent. Seven million dollars saved. Now I think that if this \$7,000,000 had been spent, even if it were in the process of being spent, we would not be in this bind of building shortage which we are at both campuses. We would not now be dealing with critical shortages of space, harassed staff, disillusioned students. The facilities are going to have to be built anyhow. They are going to have to be built almost immediately. They are going to have to be built at higher costs. All that these so-called savings have produced are frustration and last opportunity for students, harassment for staff, higher costs for the taxpayer, and a sense of power for the Premier.

Let me quote from the Toronto Globe and Mail. Mr. Speaker, that is a well-known Toronto newspaper . . .

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. BLAKENEY: — . . . of February 11, 1967, under the headline "Slower growth by Request" referring to the University of Saskatchewan. It said:

Capital outlays for building in 1967 are estimated at \$12,500,000 compared with \$13,000,000 in 1966. The decrease indicates the University is trying to comply with Premier Ross Thatcher's request for some slowing down in

in all construction.

Mr. Speaker, the University, whatever the Premier says, is being told to slow down its building program. Killed dead, Mr. Speaker, has been any sensible planning by the University. Killed dead, too, has been the opportunity for university education for many Saskatchewan young people. For the first time in the over 50 years of the history of this University, the University has had to plan controlled student enrolment because of lack of facilities. Even after entrance requirements were raised, even after fees were upped, it was still necessary to announce that enrolment would be controlled.

Young people wanting to go to university are going to have to go to Alberta, British Columbia or Manitoba, some place where they have an enlightened government. This, Mr. Speaker is the first time that the door of the University will be shut in their faces. This is called retaining our young people.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. BLAKENEY: — This is what is called opportunity. We should send the Caravan up to the University to take a little opportunity up there.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. BLAKENEY: — Unless this policy of putting the screws on the University is reversed, many, many young people will be denied their fair chance in life. And unless this policy is reversed, we will do untold harm, not only to the University, but to many of our Saskatchewan young people. This, Mr. Speaker, is just one more reason why the government opposite must be defeated and will be defeated when it has the courage to face the electors.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. BLAKENEY: — Mr. Speaker, I now turn once again to the melancholy story of technical education under a Liberal government. Let me outline the background of this story. Immediately after the war we all know that we had practically nothing by way of an education system in Saskatchewan. This was reorganized into larger school units, into viable areas of student administration. And may I say, Mr. Speaker that it was reorganized over the fierce opposition of men like the Member from Melville (Mr. Gardiner) and the Member from Rosthern (Mr. Boldt).

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. BLAKENEY: — Composite schools were built to provide not only academic instruction, but also courses in domestic, secretarial and manual skills. Technical education was offered in the three largest

cities. But it was recognized that these schools would not do the whole job and that two groups seemed to be inadequately served; one, young people who could not or did not want to meet the academic requirements of the composite schools, but who wanted some technical training. Two, people older than high school age who for one reason or another had left the school system and who wanted to return and take technical training. So, two main steps were taken. First, technical institutes were established at Moose Jaw and Saskatoon, and these are schools offering first class technical education. Second, a system of technical high schools and local technical institutes was planned to give technical training not only to people of high school age but to older people as well. The first one of these was built at Prince Albert. It was designed to give technical high school training not only to people of high school age but also to adults who are outside the school system.

Then came 1964, the year of the meat axe, the year of the bull. The government completely abandoned the idea of technical high schools. And they've all but abandoned the technical institutes.

Two years went by, two years during which, as the figures will show, our young people flocked out of this province to seek opportunity in more enlightened climes, two years when even with skilled jobs waiting, the government opposite refused to move a muscle. I'll show you just what was spent at these technical institutes in two years under the benign guidance of the Minister of Labour (Mr. Coderre).

During this last year I will admit that the government has at least twitched. A small school was equipped at Weyburn. They have belatedly, and I say belatedly, embarked on a building program at Saskatoon. And even this is largely to provide space for training of nurses and nursing assistants, training which has already been provided for in hospitals throughout the province. Even here they are so tardy in paying their bills that contractors keep pulling off the job. This is an indication of their zeal in getting on with technical education.

And as for technical high schools, I say again that the program has been abandoned. There's been a return to composite schools. Members opposite act as if composite schools were something new. I say again, and I say with regret, that the composite schools while useful, and I am not here to deny their usefulness, cannot do the full job required. And I now put a couple of questions to the Minister. How many people who failed grade eight, academic grade eight, are to be found at Miller Composite School or the one at Yorkton? How many of that group are being served by his composite schools. How many people of 20 years of age and over are to be found at Miller Composite School or at the school at Yorkton? How many of these are being served by his new program?

What is to happen to these very groups, these two groups who were largely to be served by the technical high schools of

the type designed for Prince Albert. These people are forgotten groups under the Liberals. They are the people whom this government is condemning to a precarious life on the unskilled labor market. They, whatever the Ministers say, are being effectively denied technical training. Just one more list to be added on the group who are being felled by the Premier's meat axe.

But, Mr. Speaker, not content with operating an incomplete program, the government is even dragging its feet at getting on with even that program. My colleague from Regina East (Mr. Smishek) gave this sorry story in some detail a few days ago and I don't intend to repeat it all here. I will content myself with one all too typical an example. Last year's speech announced new program of expansion of the Technical Institute at Saskatoon — \$4,000,000, \$2,600,000 was budgeted for this work during the fiscal year. But ten months of the fiscal year has passed and how much has been spent of this \$2,600,000 — \$668,000 — 25 per cent. Even at this program, they're dragging their feet.

This year once again large sums are being budgeted for technical education, money which, as I say, to a very large extent will be spent, money which is there in the budget for window dressing and window dressing only, money which will be snatched back by the Provincial Treasurer once it has served its purpose of dressing up his inadequate educational program. I say again, Mr. Speaker, that savings measured in terms of young people who have missed their chance in life, in terms of skilled people we do not have, these savings are going to be among the most expensive in the history of Saskatchewan. They stand out to the everlasting shame of this Liberal Government.

Mr. Speaker, one of the most serious failures of this Budget is the absence of a program to assist local governments in coping with the problems of capital financing. Rarely indeed does the Premier err on the side of understatement. But listen, Mr. Speaker, to this gem from the budget speech:

During the year, because of the tight money situation, municipalities experienced some difficulty in obtaining funds, as was the case for other borrowers.

Some difficulty indeed. Very obviously, Mr. Speaker, Members opposite are rather sensitive on this point. First the government Member put on the Order Paper a Resolution asking the government to look into the desirability of a municipal financing fund. Why they need a resolution of this Legislature to look into this baffles me. And I'm sure it baffles the Member who put it on the Order Paper. But this is what he was asked to do. And then, Mr. Speaker, when the Premier announced that indeed the government might be looking into this in his budget speech, Members on that side of the House thumped their desks loudly, in the hope that the loud thumps would hide the obvious embarrassment.

Mr. Speaker, the Premier said that the Municipal Loan and Development fund was a good idea but the time was not right to set it up. Well, Mr. Speaker, well might the Members opposite be

sensitive and embarrassed. Over the past two years, the Government has allowed this problem to grow and fester and has done nothing - or at least nothing right. Everyone knows that municipal towns are growing, because we need new utilities, new hospitals. The problem is compounded by the increases in interest rates, increases which the Government at Ottawa has done nothing to control. The burden of tight money has been heaped on top of the burdens of urban growth.

And what has been the Government's approach to this problem. Well, first the Premier issued a virtual edict to the Local Government Board, a very questionable procedure in itself. And then the Local Government Board responded. And may I remind Members that the Local Government Board is the Provincial Government Agency which is designed to okay municipal finances. The Local Government Board acted with decisiveness. Here's how the headline in the Leader Post of October 15, 1966 put it: "Seventy per cent of debenture values refused by the Local Government Board." Projects which have been approved by the cities, passed by ratepayers with the full knowledge of high interest rates, were cut back, refused. Seventy per cent were refused. The Premier calls this "Some difficulty." Well now, Mr. Speaker, years ago over in Britain they used to call Harold MacMillan "Imperturbable Mac." When the problem is somebody else's he's got a rival, "Imperturbable Ross." But when the problem is his, contrast the difference. When about three percent of his Budget is affected by Sharp practice at Ottawa, oh the wails, and the breast beating, and the teeth gnashing. But when municipalities have 30 per cent of their capital cut off, the Premier's reaction — just relax, things might get better by and by. As he says in his budget speech, "Continue your planning and design."

Well now, Mr. Speaker, in Regina I can tell that what's needed is not planning and designing. It's a school for children at the Veterans' Settlement at Dieppe Place; it's an addition to Campbell Collegiate; it's technical facilities at Balfour Technical School. In North Battleford, I'm sure the Member for The Battlefords would say, "It's that much promised composite school that's needed." In Wynyard it was the hospital that felt the meat axe. In other places it was sewer systems, schools, streets, and I could go on listing the projects that were cut off, at Saskatoon, at Moose Jaw, at Prince Albert, and so on.

Now, Mr. Speaker, so far as I can find out the Local Government Board never in all the 20 years of CCF Government formally rejected a single debenture issue. And if I happen to be wrong and if it did happen once or twice, it is absolutely certain that never since the dark days of Liberalism in the 1930s has there been a wholesale thumbs down on municipal borrowing such as happened this year. Another first for Saskatchewan Liberal style.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the Premier knows, his colleagues know, we all know what the answer is. A Municipal Financing Corporation. The Premier refers to it in his speech. But he says:

In view of the current tight money and high interest rates, the Government does not feel that the time is yet opportune for such a fund.

Mr. Speaker, that one is worthy of Paul Martin. I ask you, Mr. Speaker, what sort of logic is this? The Premier says: "You need the money too badly right now, it's too tough, I'll come back later."

It's like a man who's sick and he calls a doctor. And the doctor comes, looks at him and says, "Oooooooo this man is sick. Oh, you're too sick right now. I'll come back next week. Maybe you'll be better. In the meantime, look after yourself." Well, this is Doctor Thatcher's prescription.

Mr. Speaker, over the years the previous Government did what was necessary to enable local governments to sell their debentures. And during the last year or two that system has broken down. Nothing is more obvious. We need a new system. And the time is opportune, right now, when there's a lull in Provincial Government capital borrowing for Power, for Telephones and the South Saskatchewan project. What is needed and what our Party advocates is a Municipal Finance Corporation.

MR. THATCHER: — When did you start advocating?

MR. BLAKENEY: — When the need arose, the need only arose under a Liberal Government.

AN HON. MEMBER: — That isn't what the municipalities said.

MR. THATCHER: — They were all against it.

MR. BLAKENEY: — A Corporation which would borrow money guaranteed by the Provincial Government and lend money to municipalities.

MR. THATCHER: — They're all against it in Opposition.

MR. BLAKENEY: — Alberta has such a Corporation. British Columbia has one for school financing. These could serve as a model for us. We could adapt it to our local conditions and adopt it for the benefit of our municipalities.

Just what this Corporation could mean in savings for our local ratepayers was dramatically illustrated last fall. It couldn't have been more dramatic. In October, 1966, in Saskatchewan, the Local Government Board had to turn down 70 per cent of debenture requests and local governments who were borrowing were paying 7 ½ per cent. That's in October, 1966, in Saskatchewan.

Meanwhile at the same time, in October, 1966, Alberta as reported in the Leader Post of October 8, the Alberta Municipal Financing Corporation was raising in one issue \$25,000,000 for municipalities and paying 6.34 per cent.

The evidence could not be clearer that the Government should act and act now. Instead we're told, "In view of the tight money the time is not opportune." Such words, Mr. Speaker, could come only from a Government that's suffering from a premature aging and is due for an early demise.

Mr. Speaker, I want to congratulate the Premier in announcing the construction of a new base hospital for Regina at Provincial expense. I think we're all happy to see repentance and conversion. It was only last year that he boomed out in this Legislature that there be no provincial base hospital in Regina, unless Regina taxpayers put up the money. Now he tells us that this is all over. He's converted. It was just a bad dream. But I know it was a bad dream for the Member for Regina South (Mr. Grant) last year, because I could see it on his face. But what we would like to know is this; is the conversion real? I'm sure the people of Regina will be forgiven if they are just a little bit sceptical.

In 1964 the Liberal candidates promised unequivocally that a Liberal Government would "proceed immediately to correct the hospital problem in Regina by building a base hospital at Provincial cost."

Almost three years have elapsed. So far we have nothing but announcements. But the problem is this; when we have a Liberal Government, and the problem is health, we're never short of pronouncements, we're always short of performance.

Liberals have always displayed a great facility at making announcements. But of course, they come cheap. If absolutely pressed they will pass an Act. And if really pushed to the wall, they'll budget some money. But their record is one of categorically refusing to spend any money.

In 1944 the Liberal Government promised free cancer treatment, passed an act, but didn't spend a five-cent piece. In 1944 a Liberal Government promised health regions, passed an Act, but didn't spend a five-cent piece. In 1957 a Federal Liberal Government passed an Act to bring in a national hospital plan, but didn't spend a five-cent piece. Not until the Tories were elected. In 1966 a Federal Liberal Government passed an Act to bring in national medicare. And I predict that it too will dwell long in that special never-never land where Liberals keep their health legislation.

You know, Mr. Speaker, that they found the Eldorado, the secret of eternal life, Liberal promises of health benefits. They're like the old soldiers; they never die, they just keep fighting campaign after campaign.

I wouldn't be surprised, Mr. Speaker, if when the Liberal Government next faces the electors of Canada, not a five-cent piece will have been paid out under national medicare. Nor, Mr. Speaker, would I be surprised if when the Government opposite faces the electors of Saskatchewan, we have no base hospital in Regina, or no start on a base hospital in Regina.

In concrete terms, what have they done? Have they bought the land? — No. They have an option on some land. Now if they are really going ahead with this project, why wouldn't they exercise the option?

Have they engaged an architect? — No. Strange, going to build a \$16,000,000 hospital, no land, no architect.

Have they the money for the project? — No. They're going to get 50 per cent from the Federal Government because it's affiliated with the University. Well now, has this new program been checked by the Senate of the University? — No. Has it been submitted and approved by the Board of Governors of the University? — No. Has the Federal Government agreed to share the cost? — No.

We're told that the Government opposite is going to get down to Ottawa, and it's going to — listen to this — it's going to negotiate with the Government at Ottawa to get this money. Considering the Premier's record as a negotiator at Ottawa, we can hardly regard that money as safe in the sock. So we have one or two little things lacking, land, architect, plans, university approval, money. Now can you wonder that the people in Regina are just a little sceptical?

Can you wonder, particularly when we hear Mr. Donald M. McPherson, the candidate for Liberal nomination in Regina Southwest, tell us that the hospital will take two years to plan and five years to build. This is a recent statement of his. Now this has an ominous Liberal ring. Who knows, maybe by that time we'll have depression and we won't be able to build it or inflation and we won't be able to build it. Liberals have used one both excuses in the past. So tight money, loose money, either one is absolutely fatal. So when it's all boiled down, we have one thing and one thing only — a Liberal promise. And we had that three years ago.

Now, I sincerely hope that the mounting pressure of public opinion has finally got to this Government and that they will take immediate steps to buy the land, commission an architect and get on with the job. Anything short of this will be wholly unacceptable to the people of Southern Saskatchewan.

Mr. Speaker, as the Member for Regina West, I was somewhat less than overjoyed by this budget. There are a few crumbs; 15 cents per capita for libraries, and, as I have said, a re-issue of the promise of a base hospital. But this hardly constitutes coming to grips with the problems of Regina or other major cities.

Mr. Speaker, I urge this Government to come forward with a realistic program for our growing Saskatchewan cities. Our cities are growing, not at the previous rate but still growing. And with this growth come the problems of growth, traffic, law enforcement, housing and the rest. The time is here now when our major cities must proceed with by-pass and ring-road projects. We in Regina urgently need to complete planning for the ring-road project so that civic development can proceed on a firm basis. This requires assistance by the Provincial Government with planning and with finances. And I urge the government, let's get this job under way before the traffic creates a crisis.

The cities bear a heavy burden of law enforcement. To a large extent they are providing courtrooms and police personnel at the expense of the local taxpayers. Smaller communities have both of these services provided largely or entirely at provincial expense.

I suggest that a program of urban assistance for Regina and other major cities should include as a start — I admit that this is not a full program — but I think it's a realistic start. First, action and greater financial help with city by-pass and ring-road problems. Second, construction of a civic court building for a magistrate's court, deserted wives' court, juvenile court, and which could act as a headquarters for the probation, parole, and social work services which are associated with courts. Third, some help with police protection, somewhere comparable to that given to smaller centres. Fourth, a share of the gas tax to help finance city streets. I think these are realistic first steps to helping our cities.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to mention the two auditorium projects in Saskatoon and Regina. These are supposedly our major centennial projects. It's a measure of the appreciation of the concept of our centennial year that one project is plodding ahead under great financial stress, the other is completely stalled and the Provincial Government is sitting on its hands doing nothing except holding the odd banquet.

Now, Mr. Speaker, this auditorium out east of this Legislative Building, like some grotesque creation of modern sculptors, stands as a monument to a Provincial Government which in Centennial projects prefers bejazz to buildings. Be jazz and bellyhoo are so much cheaper.

The Regina project made its fatal error when it was forced to call the tenders in two stages rather than in one. And anyone who doesn't know this, doesn't know anything about the Regina project — I'm sure, Mr. Speaker, that that includes the Member for Athabasca (Mr. Guy) — that I would hope that some others opposite might have got some small grasp of this problem. Now, Mr. Speaker, the calling for tenders in two stages rather than one was forced upon the Regina Committee when it was faced with a 1967 completion deadline imposed by the Federal Liberals and a

ceiling of \$1,000,000 on a provincial assistance clamped on when the Thatcher Government assumed power. The Government later realized that this was a bad decision and it relented. But the damage was done. Those monkey bars are a monument to the impetuous action of the Premier in cutting off the assurance of provincial help when he hit the Premier's chair in 1964. If that had not been done, the committee would have called for tenders in one tender, not in two, and if that had been done, the difficulties would have been realized before it was too late.

But now it is too late. And the only sane thing to do is to complete that auditorium and to complete it as a provincial project. The auditorium is just one more piece of the debris strewn about when the Premier began to apply his meat axe in 1964. Two years ago I said with respect to technical schools, these cuts would be some of the costliest savings ever seen by Saskatchewan. Well the auditorium in Regina is just another victim of that meat axe. The meat axe is going to cost someone another extra \$1,000,000 or \$2,000,000. Everybody can see that now. The shame of it is that the Premier is trying to pile extra costs on the ratepayers of Regina. The Premier should pay for his own mistakes. The auditorium should be completed as a provincial project.

Just before leaving the problems of Regina, may I say that Regina citizens are still waiting for action on two of three more Liberal promises of 1964. The Minister of Public Health in his election pamphlet said he would do this: Provide immediately a 500-bed geriatric centre." Well, Mr. Minister, we're waiting. He said that he would provide aid from provincial funds, 50 per cent of Regina educational costs. Well, the figure is now about 34 per cent and, Mr. Minister, we're waiting. He said that he would provide an equitable share of gas tax for Regina road construction. Well, Mr. Ex-Minister of Highways, we're waiting rather impatiently.

Mr. Speaker, the Liberals were elected on a promise to create 80,000 new jobs in four years. They will be defeated because they haven't come within a country mile of doing so.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. BLAKENEY: — The Manpower Survey Report, tabled in this House, shows this as clearly as anything can. Indeed the net growth in jobs in Saskatchewan for the ten years from 1961 to 1971 is predicted to be 35,000 jobs, in ten years. And 18,000 or one-half of those jobs had already been created in the three CUFF years. It would take the Liberals seven years to do what the CUFF did in three. These predictions have already been borne out. The only reason that there are now jobs available in Saskatchewan is that people are leaving the province in almost unprecedented numbers. The population figures show this. Mr. Speaker, this report was commissioned by the Liberal government and commended to this Legislature by the Premier in his words: "It shows such a healthy position for the future of Saskatchewan."

Well, let's look at this healthy future this report holds out for us. Let's take this statement: "It has been estimated that upwards of 30,000 persons would be released from the agricultural labour force without impairing productivity." Stripping 30,000 people off our farms, out of our hamlets and villages. Does this sound very healthy to you? Are these the words of growth or of decay? Or this statement?" "Previous investigations have found that the intelligence of rural populations is significantly lower than the I.Q of the general population." Mr. Speaker, I doubt that statement. It's a silly statement. It's not a healthy statement. It's a sick statements. Mr. Speaker, I could go on. But some of my colleagues will deal more fully with this report later in the debate. But the report does say two things and two things clearly. First, that the Liberals will not increase jobs by 80,000 in their four years nor 60,000, not 40,000, not even 20,000. They are going to be very, very lucky if they increase them by 15,000 — a much poorer performance than that of the CCF. Secondly, the report commended to us by the Premier proposes that we continue to strip the countryside, that farms get bigger and bigger, that hamlets and villages should shrivel and die, that the smaller family farm should be ruthlessly eliminated. This the Premier says is healthy. Mr. Speaker, we on this side of the House say it is not healthy. It is counsel of despair. It shows the bankruptcy of policy of the government opposite.

Mr. Speaker, I just want to touch on one of two things before I resume my seat. I as struck by a comment made a few days ago by one of the Members opposite when he was talking about the business of a Labor Court. I don't intend to deal with this fully at this late hour, but do want to say this. I don't know what Liberals are talking bout when they talk about a Labor Court. I'm not too sure what is meant by a Labor Court so I can't express any considered opinion on the proposal. But I know one thing, Mr. Speaker, it would mean, at minimum, this. It would mean a judge chosen impartially and not by one of the sides to a dispute. And I know another thing, whatever Members opposite are for, they are not for a Labor Court. They had a chance to show this last fall and they showed it all too clearly. When Bill No. 2, the compulsory arbitration Bill was before this House we on this side of the house moved to provide that the chairman of any arbitration board would be selected by the Chief Justice of Saskatchewan. That, Mr. Speaker, was voted down by Members opposite. Instead the Government insisted that, even though it is one of the parties to the dispute, it must choose the chairman. Whatever also that is, Mr. Speaker, it is not a Labor Court. It's a Kangaroo Court, a Thatcher Court, and a travesty of the judicial process.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

HON. L.P. CODERRE (Minister of Labour): — You should be ashamed of yourself.

MR. BLAKENEY: — I'm not at all ashamed of

myself. And let me say this, if I were one of the Members opposite, I would be ashamed of myself to think that I would not take the Chief Justice of Saskatchewan or the Chief Justice of the Queen's Bench of Saskatchewan as the chairman of that arbitration tribunal, I would hang my head in shame. I would hang my head in shame to think that of all these . . .

MR. THATCHER: — Mr. Speaker, the Chief Justice refused to act.

MR. BLAKENEY: — Mr. Speaker, I would be very much more convinced if that statement had been made at the time. I would be very . . .

MR. R.A. WALKER (Hanley): — That's a lie.

MR. SPEAKER: — Order, order!

MR. BLAKENEY: — . . . I would very, very much . . .

MR. SPEAKER: — Order! I think we've heard about enough of this word "liar" going back and forth across this House. Now it was done by a Member who is sitting down in his seat and I know who he was and so does everybody else. And I think the people of this House and I'm sure the people of the Province of Saskatchewan have a right and do expect a little better decorum than this. I don't ask the Member to withdraw it, I leave that to the House.

MR. THATCHER: — Mr. Speaker, I would ask the Hon. Member to withdraw. I said as Premier that the Chief Justice who was approached in this connection refused to be a member of this Commission. He had other duties and I ask the Hon. Member to withdraw what he said, "That's a lie."

MR. WALKER: — Mr. Speaker, I'll withdraw. I've made one interjection and I've had to withdraw it. I ask the Speaker to consider what treatment I go when I spoke in this House last Wednesday night.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: — Order, order! And that's a reflection on the Chair and I ask that you withdraw that. Anything that's to be done in this House has to be done at the time. If the Members was dissatisfied with the treatment that he got at the time, he should have spoken at the time. May I ask the Member to withdraw that statement also. That's a reflection on the Chair.

MR. WALKER: — If the Chair says that the reflection is undeserved, I'll withdraw it.

MR. SPEAKER: — Thank you

MR. E. KRAMER (The Battlefords): — Mr. Speaker, may I point out that you rose this time of your own volition.

MR. SPEAKER: — And Now I've got another reflection on the Chair, but seeing where it came from, I'll forgive it. Go ahead.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. BLAKENEY: — Mr. Speaker, I repeat that I would be very much more convinced by the statement just made if it had been made at the time and not some six months after the occasion arose. Mind you, Mr. Speaker, there were very many other eminent judges who were turned down by the Government opposite and if I were Minister of Labour, I would hang my head in shame to think that I would not accept those eminent judges in the Court of Queen's Bench, who he apparently decided were not suitable to be chairman.

MR. THATCHER: — On a point of privilege again, Mr. Speaker. Ottawa made a ruling some time ago that even my hon. friend should know, that they did not wish judges of the Queen's bench or the Court of Appeal to be sitting on these kind of appeals. And that is the major reason why this Government didn't choose them. There was nothing sinister about it, as my hon. friend suggests.

AN HON. MEMBER: — Is this a point?

MR. BLAKENEY: — Mr. Speaker, I'll resume my . . . If the Speaker says that it was an appropriate interjection on a point of privilege, then I am amazed. The Premier is using his position to answer the debate.

MR. SPEAKER: — Order, order! If the Hon. Member hadn't been willing to accept the interjection, he shouldn't have taken his seat as it was not a point of order.

MR. BLAKENEY: — All right, if this is the way we are going to run it, this is the way we are going to run it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

HON. D. T. MCFARLANE (Minister of Agriculture): — Is that a threat to the Chair?

MR. SPEAKER: — Order, order!

MR. BLAKENEY: — Of course not. Not at all. I'm resuming my remarks and

if anyone else wishes to make a point of order, I will defer.

MR. SPEAKER: — Point of order from the Member of Qu'Appelle-Wolseley (Mr. McFarlane). Order, point of order from the Member of Qu'Appelle-Wolseley.

MR. MCFARLANE: — I just asked if the remarks from the Member for Regina West (Mr. Blakeney) were a threat to the Chair? He said, "If that's the way it is going to be run, that's the way we are going to run it."

MR. BLAKENEY: — That's right! And I would have thought that this remark spoke for itself. I need hardly say that it's not a threat to the Chair. I need hardly say that is' an indication to Members opposite that apparently we are to ask for our rights and we will accordingly do so. Now, Mr. Speaker, I say once again it's all very well for the Premier, who doubtless will answer these remarks when he closes this debate, to say that the Attorney General for Canada has said that these judges shall not participate in this arbitration. We all know that many of them are participating in places elsewhere in Canada. We also all know other District Court judges were approached, and were refused by Members opposite. I think of His Honor Judge Hughes. There were probably some others. Whatever else the Premier says without reflecting on the judge who was chosen I would have thought that it reflected seriously on this government to think that they had to go through six or seven or eight judges in Saskatchewan before they would find one whose impartiality presumably they were prepared to rely on.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I now want to return to a consideration at Estevan Clay Products and the Government Insurance Office. Just a few words about the brick plant. And this really is a strange story. I really don't know that's going on down there.

AN HON. MEMBER: — . . . Don't know what's going . . .

MR. BLAKENEY: — Ah, that's right, maybe, but I'll be happy. I know all Members of the House will be happy, that they're going to be enlightened by the Member for Prince Albert, (Mr. Steuart). Now, after years of telling us that the brick plant at Estevan was a dud and a socialist blunder, and all the rest of it, the government has apparently sold this brick plant for a handsome profit of about \$400,000 on my calculation. Now, Mr. Speaker, I say apparently, because the plant appears to be sold to a company of which the government owns all the shares. Considering the Premier's many boasts of business know-how, it is pretty difficult to see why a corporation of which he is the chairman would buy a plant for more than its worth. Well, either he's made a bad business deal or this brick plant was a first class brick plant all along, or else there's some other reason for

this deal which hasn't been revealed. Maybe the purpose is to keep the Legislature from examining the affairs of this corporation in the Crowns Corporation Committee. I don't know. Perhaps the Government wants it hidden. Certainly the whole transaction is shrouded in secrecy. On the records of the Registrar of Companies, Estevan Brick Limited stands as a company with two issued shares, one standing in the name of a Mrs. Cook and the other standing in the name of a Mr. Edward Odishaw and with two directors, a Mr. Kwong and Mr. Odishaw. Yet, they appear to be carrying on the business of the plant. They couldn't have bought it with these two shares. Now, has the Government bought some more shares? If so, why haven't they filed the return showing that the shares are allotted as required by Section 130 of The Companies Act. Or is the Government saying that it doesn't have to reveal the information which ordinary private companies have to reveal. And what about the directors? Is this company being directed by this Mr. Odishaw along with his other important duties in preparation for the election? Or have other directors been appointed? If other directors have been appointed why hasn't notice of appointment been filed as required by Section 115 of The Companies Act? Or did the Government say that this law too does not apply to them? Now, if this Government has nothing to hide, why doesn't it file the returns required by law? But perhaps I've reached the wrong conclusion. Perhaps, it is has something to hide. We'll have to wait. Doubtless, the Government will at least show part of its hand. If not, we'll find out immediately after the next election.

AN HON. MEMBER: — And we will!

MR. THATCHER: — You won't be around.

MR. BLAKENEY: — Mr. Speaker, I don't want to leave the subject of Crown corporations without a reference to the Saskatchewan Government Insurance Office. The Insurance Office has four main purposes: to operate the Automobile Insurance Plan; to provide lower fire and other insurance rates and broader coverages for Saskatchewan citizens; to keep Saskatchewan money here at home and provide jobs for Saskatchewan people; and to yield profits for the government. Now, the government seems to have lost sight of the aim of providing lower rates and broader coverages for Saskatchewan citizens. Since the Member for Rosthern (Mr. Boldt) has assumed the direction of this office he seems to have set out to do two things: to reduce the protection offered by the policies and to charge more money for the policies.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. BLAKENEY: — In fact, it seems to me that he has set out to trim the SGIO policies back to the skeleton policies features by many line companies. Let me give you one example. The owner of a house in Regina insured for fire and for extended coverage just renewed his three-year policy. The premium was raised from \$27.50 to \$38.50 — 40 per cent. And the deductible on the

extended cover part of the policy was increased from \$25 to \$50. Now, this gouging of the policy holders to make an extra buck is wholly unjustified in view of the profit position of SGIO. Now, it's particularly unfortunate that extra profits are being sought by putting exclusion and escape clauses into the contracts, a shoddy way to increase rebates without admitting it. The whole scheme is part of a systematic campaign to undermine and subvert one of the basic principles in the Insurance Office. It's a retreat from broad protection. It's a return to gimmicks, deductibles and exclusions. It's a slow strangulation of a great and good concept of broad coverage which was pioneered so successfully by the Insurance Office.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. BLAKENEY: — Its one more striking evidence of the new slogan of the Liberal Party. Profit be worshipped; people be damned.

Mr. Speaker, I've spoken at length. I want to mention one or two other matters. We made one main point. We argued that while we were as pleased as anyone in Saskatchewan that it was possible to cut down the number of patients in our two big hospitals at Weyburn and North Battleford, we were pleased only when this meant that the people that were discharged had found a home where there was good physical surroundings and proper medical and nursing care. We said that the evidence was overwhelming that in many cases this was not so; that many of the places where mental patients had been placed had poor facilities; that many of the people looking after mental patients lack the training or the experience necessary to do the job. The ex-Minister, and may I digress for a moment to repeat the statement I made on an earlier occasion that just because Ross did it, it isn't all bad. And may I say that certainly that statement is verified by the fact that he hanged the Minister of Public Health. That's certainly not all bad, it was all good.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. BLAKENEY: — Now, the ex-Minister stood in his place and said that these charges were false, that we were raising them for purely political purposes. The events of last year have told their story. The report of the Ad Hoc Committee to study the Resettlement of Mental Patients, a committee appointed by the government itself substantiated everything that we had said and which the Minister had denied.

MR. STEUART: — Nonsense!

MR. BLAKENEY: — We said facilities were often poor. The Minister said they were fine. The committee said they were poor. In their words, a majority, not a few, but a majority of the homes where these patients were placed were structurally of low standard. Worse than that, there were no set standards as to what the facilities

should be like, none with regard to licensing or supervision or even with respect to keeping patient records. That's what the committee said.

MR. STEUART: — What else did they say?

MR. BLAKENEY: — The committee called this highly unsatisfactory and so do we. We said that the people who looked after these patients often did not have the experience and the training to do the job. The Minister said, "Not so, these people are perfectly well qualified." The committee recommended trained courses for the operators of these nursing homes. We said that the patients once out of the hospital, lack enough medical supervision. We said there wasn't enough follow-up. The Minister said, "Three's all the follow-up needed." The committee said, "The follow-up was not good enough and that more was needed." We questioned whether all the patients discharged should be discharged not because it was for their benefit but because the hospital simply didn't want to keep chronic patients. The Minister said, "Not so, this sort of talk is an insult to the medical staff." Well, the committee said — and there were some doctors on the committee — that some of the patients released were not benefitting from the placement.

Now, the Minister obviously felt sensitive about these revelations. We made our position clear in the House. He had a full opportunity to answer us and he had his try. I suppose he recognized that it was a little inadequate. But I know that just as soon as the House rose one of his employees was going about the province attacking anyone who dared to criticize the Minister or his program. I was one whose integrity was attacked. I wasn't very concerned about that. I didn't really expect anything better from the Member from Prince Albert. But when the Minister's employees began attacking the city of Weyburn and its mayor it seems to me that action by the government was required. Fortunately, Mayor Laing of Weyburn, as he then was, is well able to look after himself. And here's what he said in answer to the department official who claimed there were 100 homes in Weyburn worse than the foster homes that boarding-out patients were living in. And I'm quoting from the Leader Post, May 9, 1966. Here's what May Tommy Laing says:

'I have personally seen many of the foster homes into which patients have been placed. I would challenge Doctor . . .

I won't mention his name

'to show me the 100 homes in Weyburn that are worse than the foster homes the boarding-out patients live in.

'There are boarding-out patients in homes that have no sewer or water facilities, in homes where a rope is used for a bannister for the patients to pull themselves up

and down the stairs, where the hot air registers had to be boarded up because the patients urinated in them, where there are 22 patients in a home that would normally accommodate a family of six or seven, where there are five beds in one room with a sanitary pail but two feet from the head of the bed.’

Now this is Tommy Laing, not my words.

‘I resent (the doctor’s) reference to homes in the city of Weyburn. It seems to me that such a reference was uncalled for and is absolutely unfounded and not in accordance with fact.

‘In any event, his comparison of the type of home into which the hospital is discharging patients to homes in the city is of not relevance. We, who are making representations to the committee, are concerned with the conditions of the homes into which these patients are placed. We are concerned with the apparent lack of care and treatment the patients receive in these homes,’ Mayor Laing said.

Mayor Laing said he would suggest (the doctor) should make his representations to the committee rather than through public statements at this time while the committee is deliberating.

So said Mayor Laing to the Minister’s employees. But the seriousness of the whole question is shown by the dramatic events in Willowbunch in October. And I quote from the Leader Post of October 22: “Man Held in Weyburn, Constable Lay Dead Seven Hours.” And the story tells of a constable being shot dead by gunfire coming from a house. And the owner of the house was remanded to the Saskatchewan Hospital at Weyburn on a charge of capital murder. And the story goes on, quote:

Neighbours called the RCMP but when the officers arrived, they drew fire from the house whenever they came within range. They did not retaliate because of the presence of a number of other persons, including children, in the house. Police said they included a number of elderly patients who were being cared for by the accused and his wife on release from the Saskatchewan Hospital at Weyburn.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I charge that there was inadequate checking done before patients were placed in this nursing home. I charge that this is just one of several cases where people who lack training or experience or suitability have been given the care of discharged mental patients. I call upon the government to lose no time in remedying these deplorable conditions. I note that the new Minister — and I congratulate him for this — has taken some steps to clean up the mess left by the former Minister.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. BLAKENEY: — I urge him to waste no time

in rooting out the deplorable conditions confirmed by the Ad Hoc Committee.

Now, I want to put forward one suggestion as to what might be done. I suggest to the government that they in cooperation with Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation might build a number of small nursing homes, throughout the province for operation by others. Some of these would undoubtedly be operated by charitable or religious organizations. Some might be operated by private individuals. I see no reason why there could not be small nursing homes in dozens of smaller centres. This would ensure that facilities were reasonably adequate. The government could then promote the training of people to operate these homes. We already have a number of trained psychiatric nurses who are perhaps not fully used. These people could be used both as persons to operate homes and as social workers to supervise the operations. Let me once again state the stand of Members of this side of the House with respect to this whole matter. Certainly where a patient would be better off outside a mental hospital, let him be discharged. We fully support the plan to reduce the number of patients in the big hospitals. What we do not support is the almost indiscriminate placing of these patients into places where staff is inadequate or where facilities are poor. Now, this has been done. We are fearful that it is still being done. And if the Minister (Mr. Grant) can assure us that this is not so, we will be very relieved. We say that even if it's still being done, it should be corrected and corrected at once.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. BLAKENEY: — Now, Mr. Speaker, I've spoken at some length. I wanted to mention some other matters. I wanted to restate the proposal outlined last year for Saskatchewan Development Corporation. I wanted to say something of the failure of this government to include Treaty Indians under the medicare plan. I wanted to talk about the cooperative movement. I wanted to talk about drugs — and I'm sure Members opposite would just as soon I didn't talk about drugs — I wanted to talk about the inclusion of chiropractic under the Medical Care Insurance Plan. But, Mr. Speaker, there will be other Members from our side in this debate and the topics I have touched on should make it clear to you and to this House that I cannot support this budget. My objection is not so much as to what is proposed; I say this is unobjectionable. My objection is to what is not proposed. No drug program, no remotely adequate program for technical education, no program for urban centres, no policies to cope with our population drain, no adequate assistance for our school boards, no recognition of the capital financing problems of our local government and on top of that, Mr. Speaker, a big new tax on power bills and gas bills.

Accordingly, Mr. Speaker, I have no alternative but to move, seconded by the Member for Biggar (Mr. Lloyd) that all the words after "that" be deleted and the following substituted therefor:

this Assembly regrets that the Government has decided to extract even more taxes from citizens through higher-than-necessary power rates, rather than continuing the policy of cheap abundant power with all the benefits of rapid industrial development and improved living standards which such a policy allows.

Mr. Speaker, I so move.

MR. B.D. GALLAGHER (Yorkton): — Mr. Speaker, I haven't got a copy of the amendment from the Member for Regina West (Mr. Blakeney) just yet. I would appreciate that he would have a copy given to me. I will not comment on that copy at this time but I will later in my remarks. I am not surprised that the Member from Regina West is not supporting the budget motion. My first remarks must be, Mr. Speaker, to congratulate the Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Thatcher).

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. GALLAGHER: — As he mentioned the other day, it takes many days and many weeks and many months in preparation of the annual budget. It is a job that is certainly not an easy one. There are thousands of demands that must be considered, as he mentioned the other day. The Provincial Treasurer must see to it that the government does not spend money where it is poorly spent and at the same time it must not curtail services where the government feels that services should be continued or expanded. I believe that the Provincial Treasurer did this in bringing down this budget. But not only that, Mr. Speaker, in his usual forthright manner, he did an excellent job of both preparing and delivering the budget speech that he brought down the other day. This is of course, characteristic of the Provincial Treasurer of this province. I want also, Mr. Speaker, to congratulate the Members for Regina West (Mr. Blakeney) who spoke just this afternoon. Mr. Winston Churchill once said, "It is the duty of the Opposition to oppose," certainly the Member for Regina West did this in his remarks this afternoon. In the budget debate, it is the duty of the Opposition to point out to the government any weaknesses or flaws in the budget. Certainly the Member for Regina West did not have his duty made any easier by the fact that this was a pretty hard budget to criticize. I think, Mr. Speaker, that he demonstrated in no uncertain terms this afternoon, particularly to people in the galleries, who didn't know the difference, that his practice in the legal profession was quite an asset to him at this time. I am sure that any Member, who was caught stealing sheep after the job he did this afternoon, would be sure to get the Hon. Member for Regina West to defend them in court if they didn't want to go to jail. And I think, Mr. Speaker, that the Member for Regina West did a very good job for a man handling the weak side of a case, and I want to congratulate him on this.

I mentioned a moment ago, Mr. Speaker, that many things must be considered in preparing the budget and I want to repeat what the Provincial Treasurer said the other day in opening his remarks.

This is what the Provincial Treasurer said the other day: "In this day and age we seem to have reached a point where the accepted necessary and normal phenomenon of competition for electoral support has been transformed into an unseemly auction of favors." Mr. Speaker, truer words were never spoken. And I am going to say at this time that the few people there are in a position of authority in government across Canada, who can say that they are honest with the electors that send them to office, whether they be in Provincial Governments or whether they be in Federal Governments. When I make this statement I am not excluding politicians of my own party because I think they are probably almost as guilty as the NDP or the Conservatives or the Social Credit Party. We have these kind of politicians in all parties.

I want to continue, Mr. Speaker, by saying that, in the next few days or the next six or seven days during this debate on the budget we are going to hear many people from the Opposition who are going to tell us in this House and in this debate, that this government is doing wrong, what this government should be doing and what their party, if they were on this side of the House, would be doing in the way of more benefits to the people of this province for free. You know there is not a party in this country, I don't think, Mr. Speaker, who have had more promises of something for nothing. I recall back before I as old enough to vote, Mr. Speaker, listening many times to one who was a professional at promising something for nothing. That man became the Premier of this province in 1944, and after 17 years when he thought the people were going to catch up to him on his promises of something for nothing, he left the province. He is still making these promises, in fact making bigger ones and better ones than ever of something for nothing. He left this province a few years ago when he sensed the people of Saskatchewan had caught up to him and were wising up to the promise of something for nothing. And I was very pleased the other day, Mr. Speaker, to hear the Premier say, what he has said on many occasions before, "There is no magic in government finance," because when I make the statement that there are too few politicians who are honest with the electors who send them to office, Mr. Speaker, among the leading politicians in Canada today who have some authority, the Premier of this province, the Provincial Treasurer who brought down the budget the other day stands out as a bright light because he his forthright and honest with the people who elected him to office.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. GALLAGHER: — Yes, Mr. Speaker, the Premier of Saskatchewan will make promises the same as other politicians, but one thing we can be sure about, our Premier and Provincial Treasurer, when he makes you a promise, will give you the price tag with the promise. And few there are in public office today, Mr. Speaker, who are honest enough to do that.

Contrasting him, Mr. Speaker, with our chubby friend, the Member for Regina East (Mr. Baker) the Mayor of this city, unless it is my old friend, Alvin Hamilton, I don't think there's

a man in public life that could beat our friend, the Mayor for having grandiose programs for the people of this province. Every time he stands up in this House or out of this House, he has a seven-point program or an eleven-point program or a fifteen-point program or something, and it's always something for nothing. In the last program I heard him bring to this House, he had everything I think promised but the pins for the baby's diapers. I hope that the next time that he brings down a program that he wears his red and white suit and has his white beard and has the sleigh bells, because, Mr. Speaker, people like him and their programs are no more a myth than the myth of Santa Claus. I think that the time has come when Saskatchewan people are fed up to the ears with this kind of politician holding public office. I just shudder to think of what would happen to this country or to this province if the government was elected with a majority of people who were as irresponsible as the Member for Regina East, the Mayor. It's no wonder, Mr. Speaker, that Regina City finds itself in the shape that it's in today and I hate to think of what they would find themselves in if they had a majority in council who thought along the same lines as this fellow. And of course, he is a real good fellow, there's no doubt about that, and he's trying to make himself a better fellow by making more promises of something for nothing.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I would like to turn my remarks today to some of the things that were said the other afternoon and again this afternoon by the Member for Regina West (Mr. Blakeney), the financial critic for the Opposition. He mentioned something about taxes during the rest of this debate. There is the hospital and medical care tax, that \$72 that this government was supposed to have increased from 1964 to 1965, which we did admittedly. There was the hospital revenue tax that we imposed last year; there was the liquor tax and the tobacco tax, the gas tax and all the rest of the taxes. And I am going to have a few words to say about those taxes here this afternoon.

First of all, with respect to the hospitalization and medical care tax. Mr. Speaker, I think the Member for Regina West shouldn't have said too much about the hospitalization and medical care tax. This is a tax that was imposed by the former government as a hospitalization head tax back when the first hospitalization plan was passed in this Legislature back in about 1947, I think, and it has steadily risen from that time on. But from the time that this tax was imposed on the people of this province, it followed one form. Immediately before an election, the hospital tax was lowered. Immediately after an election the hospital tax was raised. And the same thing I suppose would have happened if the CCF had been fortunate enough to be elected in 1964. Five years ago, in 1962, the hospital head tax was \$72. I was in the Legislature, a Member of the opposition, when the head tax was raised to \$72. Now, I think that every Member of this Legislature, including my socialist friends, must realize that the cost of medical care and the cost of hospitalization has risen considerably. We all know that construction costs have risen considerably in the last five years, but five years ago, the Members who sit to your left increased the hospitalization

and medical care tax to \$72 per family and that's exactly where it is today.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. GALLAGHER: — This Government, Mr. Speaker, did exactly what the former Government had done for four elections and no doubt they intended to do the same thing if they had been elected in 1964, but the people of Saskatchewan decided that they couldn't trust them any longer. They reduced the medical care insurance premium in 1963 expecting to win an election because they had done it before, intending to raise it back to where it should have been in 1964 if they could have won the election. One thing that I recall, Mr. Speaker, a former Provincial Treasurer of this House, and the former Premier, Mr. Douglas, saying when the medical care insurance tax was raised to \$72 was that the medical care insurance head tax should bear a small portion of the total cost of medical care and hospitalization. I have on my desk here, Mr. Speaker, the statistics showing the proportion of the total cost of medical care and hospitalization that the head tax represented in 1972 when this opposition that were at the time in government imposed the \$72 head tax. At that time it represented 33.2 per cent of the total cost of medical care and hospitalization. They cry today because the medical care tax was raised between 1963 and 1965 to \$72, exactly where it was in 1962 when they imposed the tax. And let me remind them, Mr. Speaker, that today the percentage, the total percentage of the cost of hospitalization and medical care that the \$72 represents is only 20 per cent. Five years ago it represented 33 per cent. I remember the lady Member for Regina West (Mrs. Hunt) crying about the head tax being so high. This lady thought it was all right in 1962 for the people of the province to pay a head tax that represented one-third of the cost of hospitalization and medical care in this province. Today, Mr. Speaker, they're paying a head tax that represents just one-fifth of the total cost of medical care and hospitalization in Saskatchewan.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. GALLAGHER: — There is another tax that we will no doubt hear about; we've heard it in news reports and from reports of meetings by the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Lloyd). I don't think the Member from Regina West did mention this one today, but we have heard about it on many occasions since this tax was imposed a year ago, that is the hospital revenue tax. Last year as you all recall, Mr. Speaker, the government passed an Act that enabled local governments to collect a tax that would be contributing to the cost of hospital revenue to this province, and I think even the people that are paying this tax, Mr. Speaker, think that this is a fair tax. There are areas of this province which are serviced by hospitals and never paid five cents hospital tax on their property. This has been going on for many years. I will say this, Mr. Speaker, that if it is good enough for somebody out in

the west side of my constituency on poor land or on some of the better land to pay two, three or four mills or whatever mill rate is imposed for a hospital revenue tax, then surely the people out at Pense or the people in other parts of this province who are getting the same hospital services, should have the duty to pay for part of the cost of building hospitals in this province. So as far as I am concerned, Mr. Speaker, there is no argument against the hospital revenue tax. Everybody in this province is provided with hospital services, therefore if we believe in economic equity, the pet phrase of my friends opposite, then everybody should help to pay for the hospitals that we are building.

Some of these people have been crying about the tobacco tax and the liquor tax. Well, Mr. Speaker, I think even the people who smoke and the people who like alcoholic beverages know that if there is any fairness in taxes, the people who use luxuries should be the people who pay the most taxes. Surely the people who sit to your left and who are so sanctimonious on occasion, should appreciate the fact that this government believes that tobacco and liquor are a luxury and they should be taxed and they should be well taxed because the monies that are derived from the tobacco and the liquor tax are paying for services to the people of this province.

Now what about the gasoline tax? We've heard a lot about the gasoline tax and my friend from Regina West (Mr. Blakeney) wasn't in the House in 1944 but I believe at that time there was a gasoline tax in this province of about seven cents a gallon. He forgets that the former government increased this tax about four or five times in its term of office. And, Mr. Speaker, this tax was increased by one cent per gallon last year. I think that probably when you consider the amount of money that we've increased spending on highways, the amount of money that we have increased spending on rural municipalities, we should have increased it a couple of cents. But we increased it one cent a gallon, and Mr. Speaker, of that one cent a gallon, every dollar of that was earmarked to go to the rural municipal people of this province. You can't tell any rural municipal councillor or reeve that this wasn't a tax that certainly helped the rural people of this province. I think, Mr. Speaker, further that the people of Regina and the people of Saskatoon and the people of larger cities who drive more cars and have better highways adjacent and through their cities have some obligation to the people in rural Saskatchewan who have poorer highways and some of them who don't live on highways at all. I don't think that these people should feel too badly about spending \$2,400,000 for the rural people and this was the amount that was collected from the increase on the gasoline tax. There was one and a half times as much more spent last year to rural municipalities in this province. Surely these people shouldn't take objection to this tax.

But this is not all, Mr. Speaker, when I talk about the gasoline tax, I want to remind people who sit on the other side of this House that when they were the Government of Saskatchewan

the taxes that were derived out of motor vehicle licences and gasoline taxes and diesel taxes, the combined total of these was not spent on our highways. Last year consider the amount that was spent on our highway system in comparison with the total tax that was collected in gasoline, diesel, and motor vehicle licences, far more money spent, Mr. Speaker, on our highway system alone than what was collected on these particular taxes. And so I don't think, Mr. Speaker, that too many people in this province, when you compare the performance of our friends opposite who are making the criticism with the performance of this government today and the millions of dollars that we are spending on local government and construction of highways in this province, I don't think that most people in this province are going to be too critical of this particular tax.

Mr. Speaker, so many people in the opposition have said both in and out of this House, and no doubt will say so again, that the Government of Saskatchewan is extracting so many more millions of dollars from the people of Saskatchewan in taxes than they were when they were the government. Let me remind my friends that sit opposite, Mr. Speaker, that never was there a year from 1944 until 1964 when the government who sat on this side of the House at that time didn't extract more tax dollars from the people of this province than they did the previous years.

But there is one notable difference, Mr. Speaker, in what that government did and what this government does. Between 1944 and 1964 the reduction in the tax rate was something that was absolutely unheard of in this province and in the last two years, Mr. Speaker, on numerous occasions the Provincial Treasurer has announced tax cuts or the rate of taxes being cut. I don't have to remind this House of all the tax cuts that we have had in the past two years. Just one simple item, the 20 per cent reduction in the sales tax. Consider that, Mr. Speaker, that \$12,000,000 were save in this particular year. Did the party who sat on this side of the House for 20 years ever have anything to boast about in this regard, Mr. Speaker? They are the last people that should talk about tax increases. The other day, Mr. Speaker, I think the Member for Regina West (Mr. Blakeney) mentioned something and I thought he had a pretty good argument. He said the Provincial Treasurer was faced with one of three or four things. He said he could cut back on services or he could increase taxes or he could get by by deficit financing. And he went on to state that he took exception, I believe, to one thing that the Provincial Treasurer decided to do and he said that he would be deficit financing. Well, Mr. Speaker, if the Member for Regina West takes any exception to what the Provincial Treasurer did in bringing down this budget, then he should have taken exception to what his own party did in government many, many times. He took particular exception to the fact that this government was going to finance some of its highways, just some of its highway construction by deficit financing. And I have a financial statement, Mr. Speaker . . .

AN HON. MEMBER: — Don't read them.

MR. GALLAGHER: — . . . Oh, I'll get them, don't get excited — which gives us figures for the many years that the former Government of Saskatchewan borrowed money to finance the building of highways. I just run across it about six o'clock this morning when I was thinking about the things that the Member for Regina West (Mr. Blakeney) had said the other evening in his remarks. And I was reading an old speech that he made and I happened to run through this little blue-covered book. I find here that they were quite notable for amortizing the money that was being spent on highways. For example they had 16-year debentures in 1949 of \$530,000, \$600,000 in 1951, and \$4,520,000 in 1956 in 10-year debentures, \$590,000 in 1950 in 18-year debentures, \$323,000 in 20-year debentures in 1948. I haven't marked them all, Mr. Speaker. There's another 16-year one in 1953 for \$680,000 and a 20-year one in 1951 for \$1,000,000. All these, Mr. Speaker, are monies that they were going to spend on the Department of Highways. These are not borrowings for the Crown corporations. There's another one here for 20 years for \$5,000,000 in 1961, just six years ago, Mr. Speaker. And these, Mr. Speaker, are the people who are criticizing the Government for amortizing the cost of building their highways.

But I want to say further, Mr. Speaker, in all the time that these people were in office they never built any highways that amounted to the highways that are being built today. Today, Mr. Speaker, this government is spending double the amount of money that the former government over spent on highways, and say, Mr. Speaker, that the kind of highways that we are building, and in particular our four-lane program, costs an amount of money or is going to take a length of time that we can afford, not to take 20-year loans on them but to take a shorter term. And it's certainly a small percentage of the highway budget as compared to the \$5,000,000 that my friends who criticize us today, amortized in 1961.

I think, Mr. Speaker, that the Member for Regina West (Mr. Blakeney) had something to say in his remarks this afternoon in respect to education; in fact he had quite a bit to say about education and some I intend to deal with tomorrow. But I would like to say a word or two about this, Mr. Speaker. He talked about technical and vocational education, and I believe he talked about how the government that sits to your right was trying to hide sums of money in the school grants vote, and how we were reneging on our promise to look after education as a first priority. Mr. Speaker, surely the Member for Regina has gone through the Estimates for the last ten years. The total Estimates for the last year that the former government was in office for education — and there could be no juggling of figures here — were around between \$45,000,000 and \$50,000,000. This year it is about \$90,000,000, just about double. But, Mr. Speaker, he talks about technical education. I want to repeat what was said in this House before in respect to technical education. Last year there were 50 per cent more people trained in the Moose Jaw and Saskatchewan technical schools than were trained in the best years of the socialist government. The figures, Mr. Speaker, are 3,310

compared to 2,303. And when he talked about school grants — and he talked about school grants quite a bit this afternoon, the fact is, Mr. Speaker, if he breaks it down to a per pupil ratio to start with, the figure, the bulk figure is much, much longer than it ever was under a socialist government. Then he tried to build a pretty good case and no doubt to the people in the galleries who didn't know the difference, who didn't have at their fingertips the facts, no doubt he made a pretty good case. But the fact remains, Mr. Speaker, that this year we will be paying \$66 per pupil more in school grants than the best year that the socialists had. I'm going to have more to say about this a little later on, Mr. Speaker, in my remarks as far as education is concerned. I'm going to have a great deal more to say, Mr. Speaker, on the budget and some comments to make on the remarks from the Member for Regina West (Mr. Blakeney). I would beg leave to adjourn the debate.

Debate adjourned.

SECOND READINGS

HON. D.G. STEUART (Minister of Natural Resources) moved second reading of Bill No. 1 — **An Act to amend The Fur Act.**

He said: Mr. Speaker, this Act that is proposed here merely suggests some amendments to those sections of The Fur Act that are applicable to fur farms because the Department of Agriculture after April 1 will be in charge of private fur-farming and will be looking after its own legislation in that regard. By changing the meaning of fur animals to exclude tame fur while on fur farms, we are removing the operation of The Fur Act in the farm industry. I'm told that the Department of Agriculture can supply veterinarian services to meet their needs, for example, while the D.N.R. is not equipped to supply this service. This has been discussed with the Saskatchewan Fur Breeders' Association and it has their full agreement and consent. With those few words of explanation on the principle of this short Bill, I would move second reading.

Motion agreed to and Bill read a second time.

HON. D.G. STEUART (Minister of Natural Resources) moved second reading of Bill No. 2 — **An Act to amend The Power Corporation Superannuation Act.**

He said: Mr. Speaker, this is an Act to amend the Power Corporation Superannuation Act. As the situation now stands, the money that accrues under the Power Corporation because of Superannuation Fund is invested, but the restrictions on this investment are much narrower than the restrictions on the investment by the Treasury Department. It is suggested in this Act that they be broadened and they be tied to the same act and the same regulations that control the investments under The Treasury Department Act. I think that the safeguards will be here, the safeguards that we find in The Treasury Department Act and I would

recommend the passing of this Bill to the House.

Motion agreed to and Bill read a second time.

HON. L.P. CODERRE (Minister of Labour and Minister of Co-operation and Co-operative Development) moved second reading of Bill No. 3 — **An Act to amend The Co-operative Associations Act.**

He said: Mr. Speaker, in proposing Bill No. 3 to amend The Co-operative Associations Act, the main purpose of the Bill is to clarify certain sections including some detailed information about the duties of auditors, giving an association the power to require its directors and officers to sign a declaration regarding the faithful performance of duties as required in the case of credit unions, deleting certain sections of the Act which would be no longer required because of other legislation, of which I think some announcement has been made in regard to the Co-operative Production Association Act, and particularly to make some changes in part five which deals with housing associations which I think is a major cross section. For example, the amendment to the housing section would make it possible for some of the larger cooperatives such as the Wheat Pool, Federated Co-op or others to join a housing association in a federation for a purpose of promoting cooperative housing, for example, student housing cooperatives or other cooperative housing projects. In addition to that, the period for which a housing association, such as a student housing cooperative, may borrow money has been increased from the usual maximum of 30 years now to 50 years, as is now possible for that type of housing from Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation. It is believed that the amendment to part five, though not as extensive, will assist the development of cooperative housing on a mutual basis. All the amendments to this Act, Mr. Speaker, have been discussed with the Co-Operative Development Association, the co-op which was formerly the Co-operative Union of Saskatchewan. With these few words, Mr. Speaker, I move that Bill No. 3 be now read the second time.

Motion agreed to and Bill read a second time.

MR. CODERRE moved second reading of Bill No. 4 — **An Act to amend The Northern Co-operative Trading Services Act, 1959.**

He said: The purpose of Bill No. 4, amendments to The Northern Co-operative Trading Associations Act, the purpose of the revision is to make it clear that the Board, as defined in Section 4, has the power to mortgage their fixed assets, lands, building, and equipment as well as current assets for the purpose of borrowing money for expansion purposes. This change is necessary because since the former government trading stores were turned over to the people as cooperatives, there has been generated in the members a pride of ownership and an interest that was lacking when

the stores were merely state controlled. This renewed interest, I think, plus the economic growth which the policies, of course, of the present government have stimulated, has required the doubling of facilities in one store, and that's the one in La Ronge particularly, and will also in most, if not all the other stores require similar expansions. With these few words, Mr. Speaker, I move that Bill No. 4 be now read the second time.

MR. BLAKENEY: — I wonder if when closing the debate, the Minister would be good enough to advise why these cooperatives which, as he has advised, are now off on their own and enjoying the fruits of independence require the consent of the Provincial Treasurer to hypothecate or mortgage any of their property and to execute bills, notes, contracts and other evidences of security for money borrowed or to be borrowed for that purpose: that is, if strikes me as being a very wide provision. If they want event a little credit at a bank or credit union it looks to me as if they require the consent of the Provincial Treasurer. That sort of paternalism may be necessary and undoubtedly was in the beginning because of the fact that they were heavily indebted to the Provincial Government, and that may be the reason now and may be a good and sufficient reason for simply enquiring of the Minister why that particular principle is included in the Bill.

MR. CODERRE: — The Hon. Member will remember that when the Northern Trading Stores were turned over to the local people at that particular time that the Board of Directors were appointed by the Government and as time goes on they will be taken over. But actually two stores have completely paid their indebtedness. They owe nothing to the Government and last year, if you remember, we had a provision brought in to change this Act which would make them somewhat autonomous. Still for some reason or the other, they were unable to borrow money on their own to operate as an independent organization should. This is only making that provision a little more clear. I hope that this has answered the question.

Motion agreed to and Bill read a second time.

MR. CODERRE moved second reading of Bill No. 5 — **An Act to amend The Co-operative Guarantee Act.**

He said: In proposing this Bill, Mr. Speaker, the purpose of the amendment of this Bill is to make clear that the Saskatchewan Co-operative Credit Society may make loans to housing associations which may be guaranteed in whole or in part by the Provincial Treasurer. I think that is quite clear in itself that at one time they just could not do it. And with these few words, Mr. Speaker, I move that Bill No. 5 be now read a second time.

Motion agreed to and Bill read a second time.

MR. CODERRE moved second reading of Bill No. 6 — **An Act to amend The Workmen's Compensation Board Superannuation Act.**

He said: In moving that Bill No. 6 be read a second time, Mr. Speaker, I would like to say that it is very similar to the Saskatchewan Power Superannuation Act that has just been mentioned. It's just enlarging the permissible investment that the Workmen's Compensation Superannuation Fund Board is allow to make, With these few words, Mr. Speaker, I move that Bill No. 6 be now read the second time.

MR. W.G. DAVIES (Moose Jaw City): — Mr. Speaker, I think that the Bill does appear to speak for itself in the terms that the Minister has just told us . But I'm puzzled by the explanatory notes that were sent along with the Bill and I think they are just about as irrelevant as some of the remarks that he made on another matter earlier, because the explanatory notes refer to the age limit of a child being extended to 21, refers to the minimum compensation payable to individuals, I think perhaps he has his signals mixed here somewhere and that this is to be another revelation to come before the House in terms of another Bill. I wonder if you would tell me if this is correct or not?

MR. CODERRE: — I can assure the honorable gentleman that the notes he is reading certainly don't belong to this Bill.

Motion agreed to and Bill read a second time.

MR. CODERRE moved second reading of Bill No. 7 — **An Act to amend The Gas Inspection and Licensing Act.**

He said: In proposing the amendment to The Gas Inspection and Licensing Act, Mr. Speaker, there are just a couple of changes. The question is it is very difficult to say what is a supply house as compared to the normal retail outlet and it's very specifically outlining what a supply house is. The question very often is an inspector may inspect a place and consider it okay and for some reason others absolving the inspector of any liabilities in his inspection program. With these few words, Mr. Speaker, I move that Bill No. 7 be now read the second time.

MR. DAVIES: — Mr. Speaker, I first of all must say that the Minister has told us about only one principle that appears in this Bill and that is the reference here to retail as I understand it. It seems to me that this removes retail vendors from the inspection and licensing provisions of this Act. I think we'll all want to know in some detail why this step is being taken, if not here

later on in committee. It may be that the Minister this afternoon will want to be slightly more explanatory in reference to this part. But secondly, the new section in the Act appears to rule out any action taken against the Department of Labour for anything that is done or is omitted to be done by the Department or any of its agents if this, as the change says, and I am quoting here, "is done in good faith." This is the part, Mr. Speaker, that I suggest the Minister has not made even bare reference to and I believe should have come prepared to have made some reference to this afternoon. Now, Mr. Speaker, I feel the employees of the Department need the kind of protection that is suggested and perhaps the department may need some reasonable protection as well, but I am in very considerable doubt at this point about what happens to the right of the user or the consumer of services. How are they to be protected here? Now if the department is absolved of all responsibility in the event that involves some error or omission of the department whether or not this is done in good faith, Mr. Speaker. Who protects the person who is injured, killed or who compensates for loss of property, that again, in the language of the Bill, is damaged or destroyed? It may be that the initial part of the section — I'm now referring to the Section 38 which contains the second principle that I am referring to — is intended to supply the protection that I say here must always be provided by the public and I say again, Mr. Speaker, this is not at all clear from what is said by the language of the Bill. Now I hope that the Minister will be able to supply the assurances that I don't detect at all in the first reading of the Bill. I hope that if there are not sufficient measures for protection that he will agree to do all that which must be done to correct any omissions in this principle in Committee. At this point, the Minister might be able to answer some of the questions that I have raised.

MR. CODERRE: — Mr. Speaker, to be quite brief about it I think that most of this stuff can be dealt more completely in Committee. The Section 38 may be new insofar as the gas branch is concerned. We have the same provisions under the Electrical Inspection Act and we have the same provisions under the Boiler and Vessel Pressure Act or any of the other safety acts concerned. It's just a question that there are cases and times where it does put the inspector in a spot. However, the consumer is always protected. The consumer is always protected by the contractor's bonds. As you know all contractors are bonded. In other words, this gives complete protection to the consumer. But the question is this, that we in the Gas Branch in this particular case, or the Electrical Inspection Branch, in looking over the jobs will pass them as in good shape. There can be deteriorating factors that take place and sometimes they can come back on the inspector but we can always get back on the contractor in that particular case. I think these matters can be dealt with much more thoroughly in Committee.

Motion agreed to and Bill read a second time.

HON. G.B. GRANT (Minister of Public Health and Minister of Industry and Commerce) moved second reading of Bill No. 8 — **An Act respecting unattended and uncrated Refrigerators outside a Building or Dwelling in a Place accessible to Children**

He said: This refers to a subject that has been before the public for some considerable time involving the tragic consequences of young children playing in abandoned refrigerators and ice boxes. The most recent one that has come to my knowledge involved three children in Prince Albert, I believe. While there has been a public education program emphasizing these hazards, nevertheless it does not seem to have been sufficient. There are certain bylaws in Regina, Moose Jaw, and Saskatoon. It is felt that few municipalities have the necessary bylaws and that this Act should be enacted. While it may be difficult to administer, it seems that the most valuable feature may be the dissemination of information about the dangers of abandoned refrigerators and the penalties that may be directed to anyone involved in this.

It refers not only to an abandoned refrigerator or ice-box outside of a building or dwelling made accessible to children, but it also gives permission to Provincial Government employees who are authorized to remove doors and hinges from the fridges, and also covers fridges that may be left in abandoned buildings. We feel that this is important because there is a temptation on the part of children to play in these abandoned buildings and quite often there are abandoned fridges in these premises.

Mr. Speaker, I would recommend this legislation to this House and move the second reading.

MR. BLAKENEY: — I certainly don't want to prolong this debate. Just two very brief comments. My quick reading of it didn't suggest that it applied to refrigerators and ice-boxes in abandoned or unoccupied buildings. I may have not read it quite right in that regard. And we can check that in Committee. Secondly, I just want to voice again a little objection I have to Bills which provide penalties with a minimum fine. They are very small here and I don't make any issue on this Bill. I simply want to record my continuing opinion that that legislation is undesirable.

MR. GRANT: — In reply to the first portion, I believe it's Section 5 that covers the abandoned house.

Motion agreed to and Bill read a second time.

MR. GRANT moved second reading of Bill No. 9 — **An Act to amend The Anatomy Act.**

He said: The Anatomy Act provides legal authority to the Deputy Minister of Public Health to deal with certain unclaimed bodies that may be used for scientific purposes. In Saskatchewan these are

directed to the University of Saskatchewan, the College of Medicine.

At the present time the Act is somewhat out-dated or out-moded because it provides for the disposition of a body of a deceased person found publicly exposed, or who has been supported in and by a hospital. We have no charity hospitals in Saskatchewan and we feel that it's desirable to amend this Act so as to provide access to these bodies in any hospital.

The main element that seems to be involved here, not only in this Act but in other provincial Acts is the fact that the body is unclaimed. This proposed amendment would make it apply to an unclaimed body of a person who has been a patient in any hospital.

At present there is a requirement that the body cannot be disposed of until the usual period of internment has expired. The postponement of any order by the Deputy Minister does not seem to be necessary because in the first place the death cannot be reported to him unless the body has not been claimed within 24 hours after the death. In the second place the Anatomy Lab is required to hold the body for a much longer period of time than that required under the usual period of internment. We suggest that the Act be amended to extend the period from 14 days to 30 days before the body can be turned over to the College. I recommend this Bill to the House and I now move that the Bill be read a second time.

MR. DAVIES: — I think at this point, a question. I think I understand what the Minister has told us about this Bill. As I note in the explanatory note, it says that the principle of the amendment is to remove the restriction with respect to the failure of a relative or friend to claim the body, with the result that the Deputy Minister can dispose of the body subject only to any instruction that the deceased may have left regarding disposal of his body. Now the only reservation I have at this point, Mr. Minister, is this. What if the deceased may not have been acquainted with his rights, if this is the proper term to use at this time, with respect to this Bill, that is he may not have left any instructions thinking that he would be buried in the usual fashion. But it seems to me that, before a body should be claimed for the purposes that you have been speaking about, there should be some understanding before the death of the person whose body is used for medical purposes, that his body would be used in that fashion.

I don't know if I'm quite clear about this, or if you are yourself, but I would like to pose this question to you.

MR. GRANT: — Mr. Speaker, I can appreciate the Hon. Member's interest in this particular question, but I really don't know how you'd overcome that difficulty because it's purely and simply a case of public information. It's very difficult to publicize this. I'm

afraid that after the person is deceased he really doesn't have much choice if no one claims his body. This could very easily happen even though in life he may have been opposed to it. Mr. Speaker, I recommend the Bill to this House and I move that the Bill be read a second time.

Motion agreed to and Bill read a second time.

MR. GRANT moved second reading of Bill No. 10 — **An Act to amend The University Hospital Act/**

He said: Mr. Speaker, all of the amendments contained in this Bill have been recommended by the University Hospital Board and have been proposed for administrative reasons. At the present time the Board consists of seven members and it's been suggested to be increased to nine, so as to provide more flexibility for committee purposes. This of necessity would require us to change the quorum from four to five. At the present time the Act makes reference to the bursar of the University Hospital Board. We reference to the bursar of the University Hospital Board. We suggest that this be replaced by the title Executive Director. The title bursar is applicable to a university but not a hospital. At the present time the Act provides for regulations made by the university board to be subject to approval by the Lieutenant Governor in Council. All the other hospitals in the province must provide bylaws, rules and regulations but these are all subject to the approval of the Minister of Public Health. We feel that the Hospital Standards Act should be consistent and that the University Hospital should be included and that their regulations and bylaws should be subject to approval by the Minister of Public Health rather than the Lieutenant Governor in Council. I recommend the Bill to this House and move that it now be read a second time.

Motion agreed to and Bill read a second time.

MR. GRANT moved second reading of Bill No. 11 — **An Act respecting the Repeal of the Centralized Teaching Program for Nursing Students Act.**

He said: Mr. Speaker, I think the Hon. Members are pretty well acquainted with the purpose of this Act. It provides for the repeal of the Centralized Teaching Program which started about 1950. As recently as 1963, difficulties were encountered with the schools that were in operation. One in Regina ceased to operate in 1963. The Saskatoon school carried on but under limited circumstances. In 1965, a special committee appointed by the Minister of Public Health brought in certain recommendations, among these that education of nurses should be placed in an education rather than a service setting. As a result, the Department of Education has announced that it is establishing a School of Nursing in Saskatoon. They will be starting this fall and a later one in a second location. The Board of Administration has requested that legislation be enacted to provide for the repeal of this Act as soon as the present courses conclude and its affairs wound up.

At the present time there could be a surplus to be paid out by the board in accordance with the directions of the Minister of Public Health. We think that we have a legitimate interest in the disposition of any surplus, because the Department of Public Health arranged, through the Saskatchewan Hospital Services Plan, payments for the Centralized Teaching Program to be given that amount of a working capital when the schools first went into operation. Any remaining surplus would only represent a portion of the sums originally advanced for the working capital purposes.

MR. DAVIES: — Mr. Speaker, I'd like to ask the Minister whether — he may have mentioned this in his remarks, if he did I didn't catch it — all of the interested organizations and bodies concerned have been consulted.

MR. GRANT: — Yes, Mr. Speaker, they have all been consulted, either through the committee that was set up by the Minister or in subsequent representation to the department.

Motion agreed to and Bill read a second time.

HON. G.J. TRAPP (Minister of Education) moved second reading of Bill No. 12 — **An Act to amend the Secondary Education Act.**

He said: This amendment has two things, Mr. Speaker. First if a high school district is disorganized as the present time, it reverts to the public school system. Now since we have separate high schools in the province, if a separate high school is disorganized according to the Act as it now reads, it should revert to the public school system. This is to clarify that it should revert back to the separate school system. It just clarifies a part in the Act. And the other point it makes is that agreements can be made with various school systems to provide high school education. This would make it possible to also provide elementary education. Those are the two points. I would move the second reading of this Bill.

Motion agreed to and Bill read a second time.

MR. TRAPP moved second reading of Bill No. 13 — **An Act to amend the School Secretary Treasurers Act.**

He said: This is a minor amendment which was requested by the School Secretary Treasurers Association and supported by the trustees. It would change the name of the School Secretary Treasurers' Association to the School Business Association of Saskatchewan. I move second reading of this Bill.

Motion agreed to and Bill read a second time.

February 20, 1967

MR. TRAPP moved second reading of Bill No.14 — **An Act to amend the Teachers' Life Insurance Act.**

He said: This would make it possible for school systems to pay the insurance premiums either by having it deducted from the grant or by paying it in cash

MR. J.R. BROCKELBANK (Kelsey): — . . . make it possible to count that as school grants too?

MR. TRAPP: — I hope so.

MR. BROCKELBANK (Kelsey): — I thought so.

Motion agreed to and Bill read a second time.

HON. D. T. MCFARLANE (Minister of Agriculture) moved second reading of Bill No. 15 — **An Act to amend the Noxious Weeds Act.**

He said: Mr. Speaker, the Section 2(i) of The Noxious Weeds Act now excepts *Berberis Thunbergii*, a variety of Barberry from declaration as a noxious weed. This variety is known to be susceptible to rust races prevalent in certain parts of the world. And many susceptible varieties listed under this term are indistinguishable from resistant varieties that have been substituted in nursery stock shipments from some countries. This variety hybridizes readily with other varieties and some seed resegregates to each parent. The stem rusts are in a highly mutant state of evolution and it is logical to assume then that a rust race might develop in Canada which could attack this variety of Barberry *Thunbergii*. I might point out that the Destructive Insect and pest Act administered by the Canadian Department of Agriculture has been tightened to refuse importation and interprovincial movement of all deciduous varieties of Barberry when currently outstanding permits expire. In order to protect our farmers and our varieties of cereal grains from threats of rust, I recommend that this Act be amended and I move the second reading.

Motion agreed to and Bill read a second time.

MR. MCFARLANE moved second reading of Bill No. 16 — **An Act to amend The Conservation and Development Act.**

He said: Mr. Speaker, Section 30 of the Conservation Area Authority provides the right to assess and tax benefiting lands to set up funds for the construction of future construction and the maintenance of projects and for the administration of the area. The repeal of subsection 5 is proposed because in practice this subsection has become superfluous and confusing to the area authority and to the public in general in applying the

provisions of the Conservation and Development Act. This subsection refers to indirect benefit where it has been found impossible to describe clearly what indirect benefits mean. A research made by the Saskatchewan Assessment Commission as to its proper interpretation resulted in the finding that no clear interpretation can be found with reference to drainage work. The Commission therefore agreed that the original intent of the subsection 5 as being of the nature of delayed or future benefits is sufficiently provided under subsection 7 under the wording "that may be benefited." The ceiling of five cents per acre as provided under subsection 5 has also been found confusing as several area authorities are imposing higher levies under subsection 7 in which no ceiling is stipulated. The matter of determining the yearly tax levies is the responsibility of area authorities, and they in turn consult with their ratepayers when the required levies would appear to be too high. High levies are only imposed to repay debenture loans. These levies however are subject to the provisions of the Conservation and Development Act as to the issue of debentures, and under these provisions the ratepayers are given the opportunity to vote for or against the issue prior to the sale. I might point out, Mr. Speaker, that I will be bringing in further House amendments dealing with subsection 6 which were omitted when the draft was prepared. I may point out to the Members that these are required with references made in this respect in Section 5 which is being repealed. In practice, rural municipalities are presently making grants in lieu of assessments levied under all relevant provisions under Section 30, in subsections 1, 4, and 7. And, Mr. Speaker, with these remarks I move the second reading of Bill No. 16.

Motion agreed to and Bill read a second time.

HON. G.J. TRAPP (Minister of Education) moved second reading of Bill No. 17 — **An Act to amend The School Attendance Act.**

He said: The Act presently mentions attendance officer but it does not mention attendance officer of a school unit. This would clarify the situation that he also has the same responsibilities as a local attendance officer. This is what is meant by an attendance officer. I move the second reading of this Bill.

Motion agreed to and Bill read a second time.

The Assembly adjourned at 6:01 o'clock p.m.