

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN
Fourth Session — Fifteenth Legislature
15th Day

Thursday, February 23, 1967

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

WELCOME TO STUDENTS

Hon. D. Boldt (Minister of Highways): — Mr. Speaker, I would like to introduce to this House a group of students from the Prince Philip School of Hague, Saskatchewan. They are sitting in the east gallery and I'd like to inform the House that I'm quite sure that about 75 per cent of these students come from the farms in that area. This is a very highly developed agricultural community and I want to tell the students that the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. McFarlane) will speak in this debate this afternoon. I'm sure it will be very fitting and you will enjoy him. We all hope that you will have an enjoyable time here and a safe trip home.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. W. S. Lloyd (Leader of the Opposition): — Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased through you to introduce to the Members of the Legislature a group of students in the Speaker's gallery. They come from the town of Delisle. They are accompanied by Alex Postnikoff, their teacher. When a couple of days ago my honourable friend from Arm River (Mr. Pederson) was commenting on a certain winning curling team in competition, he omitted, I thought, one important fact. He should have expressed his thanks to the team from Delisle which didn't win for letting the team from Elbow win the competition. Delisle has a very good name in the field of athletics, and it also has a good name in many other ways. Certainly we are all pleased to welcome them here and wish them a pleasant stay and a good trip home.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. J. A. Pepper (Weyburn): — Mr. Speaker, I would like to again to welcome and to introduce to you and through you to the Members of the Assembly a group of students that I believe are sitting in the east gallery. They are about 41 in number and they are the final portion of the grade eight class of Weyburn Junior High which numbers roughly 200. They are accompanied here today by their two teachers again, Mr. Fletcher and Mr. Johnston, and their bus drivers who has been with them on all occasions, Mr. Tait. I'm sure that I am expressing the wishes of all when I say that we hope that their visit here has been both pleasant and profitable to them and we wish them a very pleasant and safe journey back home.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. T. M. Weatherald (Cannington): — Mr. Speaker, I would like on your behalf to welcome to this Assembly a group of students from St. Thomas School of Storthoaks, Saskatchewan and they are accompanied by Sister Marie Elezear of Alida. I am sure that they will have a very enjoyable stay here and I am sure that all Members hope that they improve and further their education by seeing the democratic procedures in this province.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. G. J. Trapp (Minister of Education): — Mr. Speaker, I would like to introduce and welcome to this House a group of grade 12 students from St. Thomas School of Storthoaks. They are accompanied by their teacher, Sister Marie Elezear. I would like to extend a special welcome to them because it was in this area that my Deputy Minister was superintendent for many years. He met the teacher at that time and knows many of the families. We welcome and hope you enjoy your visit here and a safe journey home.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

POINT OF PRIVILEGE RE: AMBULANCE SERVICE

Hon. D. G. Steuart (Minister of Natural Resources): — Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day on a point of privilege, I'd like to draw the attention of the House to an item that appeared in this morning's Leader Post. It's written out of Moose Jaw and it goes on to say:

Gordon Yates who operates the city's only ambulance service has emphatically denied an allegation by Gordon Snyder, MLA for Moose Jaw that he every refused to provide ambulance service to Central Park Lodge. It goes on to say that...

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Speaker: — Order, order! Go ahead, let's hear what you have to say.

Mr. Steuart: — Yes, well, if they'll be quiet they might hear the truth, but they may not recognize it. It says:

As a consequence of his denial and contention that the issue was being used as a political expedient, Mr. Yates had been phoned by Mr. Snyder and accused of playing Liberal politics. Mrs. Yates told the Leader Post that My Snyder phoned her husband long-distance Tuesday

evening and climbed up one side of him and down the other. Mr. Snyder accused her husband...

Mr. Lloyd: — On a point of order...

Mr. Speaker: — The Leader of the Opposition on a point of order.

Mr. Lloyd: — Well, one has to shout loud to penetrate some people. I ask you, Mr. Speaker, for a ruling as to whether this kind of comment on something said outside of the House by somebody who is not a Member of this House about a Member of this House is indeed permissible under the rules of this Legislature.

Mr. Steuart: — Mr. Speaker, my point of privilege was that Mr. Snyder said to the House the same thing and I just want to know if he is ready to apologize.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Lloyd: — I seems to me that the gentleman at this time is certainly out of order for getting on his feet and continuing a debate while Your Honour is looking for a ruling.

QUESTION RE: ORDER FOR RETURNS NOS. 6, 14, 77, 21

Mr. J. H. Brockelbank (Kelsey): — Before the Orders of the Day are proceeded with, I would like to ask the Government one or two questions. On the 10th of February, which is almost two weeks ago, an order of the House issued for a return showing amounts collected in taxes. It was Return No. 6 and I know that this is information that is readily at hand and it has not yet been produced. Then on February 13, an order was issued by this House asking for information in regard to the flights of the Beechcraft aeroplane. This was Order No. 14. And on the next day, the 14th, and that is more than a week ago now, an order was issued asking for details of the Primrose Forest Products. This was Question No. 77. Then on the 15th which is several days ago, an order was issued asking for the number of applications to construct natural gas pipelines. The number of this Order for Return was 21, on the orders issued of the 15th. None of these have come down and I hope that the proper Ministers will get after them and get this information.

Hon. W. Ross Thatcher (Premier): — The Hon. Member, I think, raised this yesterday or the day before, and I gave him assurance that these returns would be brought down before the end of the session and I will give him that assurance again.

Mr. Brockelbank (Kelsey): — I would like to say to the Premier that that's not nearly good enough. They were supposed to be brought down with reasonable

dispatch. We don't want to put them to too much inconvenience, but I know by experience that the Treasury Department has this information and it is no trouble to get it and put it together and bring it in.

Mr. Thatcher: — Mr. Speaker, our members of the Treasury are busy doing important things and these lesser priorities have to take their turn.

Mr. Speaker: — Order, order!

Mr. Brockelbank (Kelsey): — I want to rise on a new point of order. The new point of order, Mr. Speaker, is that I don't think it is right for a Member of this House to either say or infer that the questions asked by the Members of this House for information are not important business.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Speaker: — Order, order! Citation 157, Sub-section 5 and I read it to you as follows from Beauchesne's Parliamentary Rules and Forms:

It is not in order to read articles in newspapers, letters or communications emanating from persons outside of the House referring to or commenting on, or denying anything said by a Member or expressing any opinion or reflecting on proceedings within the House.

I think that covers the previous point of order.

Mr. Steuart: — I very gladly accept that point of order. I just wonder if he is ready to apologize.

Mr. Speaker: — Just a minute. I haven't finished — Order, order! The correct way for these things to be done is by a motion. When you do these things without a motion, you deny both those who support and those who oppose either side of the question the right to take part in the debate. I hope Members who have subjects of this nature to raise will in future raise them by motion, thereby giving every Member of the House an opportunity to say what he sees and thinks fit on either side of the question.

QUESTION RE: FIRING OF PHYSICIAN IN ILE-A-LA-CROSSE

Mr. A. E. Blakeney (Regina West) — Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, I wonder if I might direct a question to the Government, I believe to the Minister of Public Health (Mr. Grant). A report has come to my attention to the effect that the Department has decided to dispense with the services of the physician at Ile-A-La-Cross. I understand that from my information (for what it's worth) that

he has been given his notice and my further information is that this is causing some concern in that area. I am wondering whether the Minister can advise us, if that report is correct, and if it is so, whether steps will be taken to have another physician on hand before he leaves?

Hon. G. B. Grant (Minister of Public Health): — Mr. Speaker, I'll supply the Hon. Member with the answers to these questions within the next day or so.

ANNOUNCEMENT RE: PIN TO EACH OF MEMBERS FROM DIRECTORS OF EXPO

Hon. J. W. Gardiner (Melville): — Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, I would just like to let Hon. Members know in case they might have misplaced them on their desk, the Directors of Expo '67, who will be in the city tomorrow, have forwarded a pin for each of the Members of the Legislature, which you will find on your desks.

ADJOURNED DEBATE

BUDGET DEBATE

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

Hon. D. T. McFarlane (Minister of Agriculture): — Mr. Speaker, yesterday in my brief remarks I outlined some of the changes which are taking place within our Agricultural Department. This afternoon I would like to deal with a number of programs and policies of the Department of Agriculture which I feel are of great benefit to the people of Saskatchewan.

Before I go into this, Mr. Speaker, I would like to again say that I am particularly proud of the Budget that was just brought down by our Provincial Treasurer, the Hon. Premier. Not only has the Liberal Government reduced taxes by some \$20,000,000 over the past three years, but this year, while most other provincial legislatures are greatly increasing taxation, we are holding the line.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. McFarlane: — Expenditures are up to a record of \$302,700,000 yet the Provincial Treasurer does not raise taxes. he does not submit a deficit budget, he even predicts a modest surplus. This budget is a budget of a Government that recognizes the importance of youth in our province. This Government has given top priority to education. Mr. Speaker, the world as we knew it is a thing of the past. Today's youth learns more in a shorter space of time than any generation before it. We must provide facilities

for them. We must have modern technological equipment and advanced teaching methods. We must have adequate space and we must have the right attitude. It is not enough to say that education has a priority. This Government takes action. Some \$90,300,000 are budgeted for education next year. This represents an increase of \$17,800,000 over the past year. This represents 610 new rooms for our school system in the province. And this represents an increase in school grants. This represents a great expansion in our technical and vocational schools. It is interesting to note, Mr. Speaker, that the enrolment in the School of Agriculture this year has doubled two of the last years under the previous CCF Government. This represents Liberal philosophy, concern for our people. This year, Mr. Speaker, our Government is pioneering an Opportunity Caravan. This trailer will travel throughout our rural areas providing what our youth told us they badly needed, namely, counselling and guidance. This is a venture which has attracted the eyes of all Canada. It is a venture which causes us to be proud. No longer will it be a problem for our rural youth who do not want to remain on the farm to find alternate employment and receive the necessary training to apply new skills.

The Liberal Government has created an atmosphere in Saskatchewan conducive to industrial development. We are developing at a rapid pace. The demand for labour, skilled and unskilled, has far outstripped the supply. We hope to remedy that situation. We will keep our youth in the province only as long as they have opportunities. And we have recognized this, Mr. Speaker, and we are providing them with these opportunities, opportunities never before thought possible because for 20 years the Socialists had their little kingdom in Saskatchewan, a kingdom which would not tolerate development. Their philosophy seems to be "It is far better to leave our timber, our oil, our potash, our minerals untouched; for while we have these things, although we do not develop, we are always potentially wealthy." You know, Mr. Speaker, the Socialists accuse us of selling our natural resources. Well, that reminds me of a story. Leaving our natural resources in their natural state is very much like the farmer who is standing beside his field in the fall and thinking what a shame it would be to harvest his crop because it looks so fine and so potentially wealthy. Mr. Speaker, the Socialist kingdom in Saskatchewan did not offer jobs, it did not offer training, it did not offer a jobs, it did not offer training, it did not offer a future. The Socialists had 20 years to work out their experiment and it failed. Over the years, little by little they gnawed at the liberties of the individual. The state assumed more and more responsibility for the affairs of mankind until the people were almost mesmerized. They were almost a people devoid of pride of accomplishment, a people devoid of ambition. But, Mr. Speaker, the people of Saskatchewan were only bowed by the 20 Socialist years, they were far from beaten. Our people came from all over the world. They pioneered this province and built for us a strong heritage, and in 1964 they rid themselves of the threat of destruction. In 1964 they defeated the Socialist Government.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. McFarlane: — Saskatchewan could then go forward into her Diamond Jubilee and into her Centennial with the gloom of Socialism lifted under a sunny sky facing a bright and Liberal future. And we have come a long way in these three years.

The Member for Regina West said, “Dozens, yes hundreds of our villages are withering.” My colleague, the Hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. McIsaac) dealt with this at some length the other day. But I would like to add a few comments. I would like to know why the Opposition shows great concern now when they are in Opposition rather than having taken action while they were the Government for some 20 years. It was not the Liberals who were planning to close down rural hospitals. It was not the Liberals who were going to introduce the county system. No, Mr. Speaker, it was the Hon. Member (Mr. Blakeney) whom I have just quoted who was the Minister of Health when they were going to close down the hospitals in this province. Now he moans about the villages withering. Our Government does things differently, Mr. Speaker. As soon as we took office, we sat down with the hospital authorities and established a better spirit of cooperation. By working with these people we have been able to improve standards and slow down the rate of cost increase. And by this combined effort, we have preserved the hospitals in our rural areas that the NDP were going to close down. Some of these that come to mind are a few in my own area of the province, such as, Qu’Appelle, Montmartre, Maryfield and Lampman.

Our Government recognized the plight of the municipalities. When we met with them for the first time, we asked them what we could do to help them. They told us what they needed to solve their problems in regards to rising taxes, inadequate sources of revenue and every-increasing demands for services. We are making rapid strides to give them these things that they require. We have made monies available for snow removal on our municipal roads for the first time in the history of the province. Our Government provided assistance to municipalities for regravelling when they apply. And I am sure that I do not have to remind any of our municipal men of the tremendous increases in equalization payments which they received last year under a Liberal Government. Equalization grants in the last year of the CCF Government were about \$600,000. Last year, under a Liberal Government, they were close to \$2,500,000. This to me, Mr. Speaker, does not sound like a government watching our towns and our villages and our hamlets withering, as was stated by the Member from Regina West. Our Government has always and will continue to always work closely with the Governments at a municipal or local level. We are interested not just in their survival but in their growth and their prosperity.

In another field, this Government is building a network of highways, of grid and secondary roads that are second to none in all of Canada. We are building roads to small urban centres for the convenience of the farmers who trade in these centres. This year we will be paving, grading or oiling almost 1,500 miles. In our term of office we will have taken over 400 miles of grid

roads into our highway system. "Dozens, yes, hundreds of our villages are withering," says the Member for Regina West. Well, Mr. Speaker, since 1964 our Government has spent about \$2,000,000 enabling nearly 140 communities to install sewer and water in this province. This means that some 60,000 more people in our small urban communities have received the benefits of sewer and/or water since we took office. In our own Family Farm Improvement Branch, an additional number of hamlets and small villages of less than 200 people, and northern communities, have requested technical services on water and sewage systems. and this work under a Liberal Government, initiated under a Liberal Government of this department, has already been approved for 34 water and 17 sewage systems installed to date in these small urban centres. We plan to provide, to design services to about 30 additional small communities next year. It would seem to me then that the Member for Regina West (Mr. Blakeney) was speaking of his own administration when he spoke of withering communities, the small urban communities in this province. And then, Mr. Speaker, without having any regard to the fact, any regard to the annual report tabled by the Department of agriculture, he made the colossal statement that progress towards diversification was grinding to a halt in this province. "All production and marketing were down, livestock numbers were down, livestock marketings were down." Well, I'm sure if he had referred to any farmer in this province, they could have told him different. But for the records, Mr. Speaker, I am going to indicate to you the increase in livestock population, the increase immediately marketings and the increase in income to the farmers of Saskatchewan during the last three years of Liberal Government as compared to the previous 20 years of the CCF. The last three years under the Liberal Government have been of major benefit to farmers. Their income from cattle and calves established an all-time high for each of the three years, 1964, 1965, superseded in 1963 by an estimated \$153,000,000. Hog numbers rose from 22,000,000 in 1964, 25,000,000 in 1965 to 28,000,000 in 1966. Total income from livestock rose from \$160,000,000 in 1964 up to \$220,000,000 in 1966, an all-time record for our farmers in this province.

Let's look at the number of livestock on the farms that he referred to. He said they were dropping. In 1963 when he left office, there were 2,147,000 cattle in Saskatchewan. Last year this had risen to over 2,250,000 cattle in Saskatchewan. when the former Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Nollet) left, when this Government was defeated, there were about 423,000 hogs in this province. Last year this had risen to 428,000. Let's look at the marketings and this is where the farmers made their record as far as income is concerned. Cattle marketings rose from 467,000 under the NDP to 702,000 last year, an all-time record for the province. Marketing calves rose from 168,000 under the NDP to 272,000 last year, an all-time record set by our farmers. Hog marketings rose from 369,194 in the last year under the NDP to 466,000 last year, quite a sign increase, I suggest. If the Member from Regina West had consulted facts and figures put out by the Canada Meat Council, he would have seen that Canada's hog population on December 1 reached the highest number since 1959. The number is estimated at 5,800,000, 14 per cent

above the December, 1965 cont and 12 per cent over the 1961-65 average. And this is significant. The increase over the previous year was 17 per cent in Western Canada, 12 per cent in Eastern Canada. Saskatchewan hog numbers showed a gain of 23 per cent, the highest in all of Canada. Now I submit, Mr. Speaker, that, before the Member for Regina West makes any of these wild, unfounded statements, he should at least consult the annual report of the Department of Agriculture and some of the farm organizations in this province.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to go on and indicate to you some of the programs that are being carried out and expanded. Members of the Opposition have been critical of our spendings under the Agricultural Rehabilitation and Development Agreement. They claim that we have large sums available from Ottawa unexpended. This Mr. Speaker, is simply not the case. And I would like to advise this Legislature that under the first ARDA Agreement, 90 per cent of the monies available have been spent and during the next fiscal year, all or nearly all of the total claims will have been paid. Under the second ARDA Agreement, 47 projects have been submitted, approved or are in the process of being submitted. The shareable value of these projects is estimated at \$13,000,000 of which \$6,500,000 will be recovered from ARDA. In less than two years of the five-year agreement, 45 per cent of the total allotment has been committed or is in the process of being committed. These are the facts, Mr. Speaker. The money is not idle.

And I would like to briefly outline some of our projects undertaken with the assistance of ARDA. About 650 farmers benefited from assistance payments for sowing perennial forage crops on cultivated marginal land in the spring of 1966, a new program under this Government. This new policy was introduced in 1966 to encourage the change in the use of the poorer land and to increase pasture and winter fodder supplies. Under another policy established in 1966, financial assistance is now available to farmers with small units in the rural development area to clear their lands and thereby add to the productivity of their farms. There were 2,651 farmers authorized to clear their land and 1,158 farmers have cleared 35,102 acres at a cost to this Government of \$104,736. It is expected that another 6,000 acres will be cleared before March 31. In the coming fiscal year it is estimated that over 43,000 acres will be cleared on 1,300 farms in the rural development area of our province. This will mean an expenditure of \$130,000 for this program of assistance to our farmers.

Some of the other new projects and programs include irrigation for individual farmers, for water users' associations, and some aspects of the South Saskatchewan Irrigation Project.

Mr. Speaker, this Government is very much aware of the need for diversification in Saskatchewan agriculture. With this in mind, we have given top priority to our forage and our community pasture development. Over the past two or three years, under the ARDA land-use program, we have acquired title to a

fairly large number of marginal, low productivity land parcels which in general seem to be best suited for hay production. It is proposed to spend approximately \$410,000 on a program of clearing and breaking and seeding to develop these lands for forage purposes.

Reclamation operations are also under way in the Herbert-Morse area to endeavour to establish a forage project on Francis Lake. And I may point out that results to date have been most encouraging.

And we also propose to undertake development of two department-operated irrigated forage projects this year. One project comprising approximately 1,000 acres will be located on the South Saskatchewan River Irrigation Project in the Broderick area, and will be used for establishing and stocking a departmental hay bank. We expect to develop perhaps up to 600 acres in the southern part of the province, probably on a strictly sprinkler-type of operation.

I'd like to indicate to you, Mr. Speaker, some of the developments that are taking place in regards to community pastures in Saskatchewan. New pastures that'll be open this year, one the Grainland pastures with a carrying capacity of 2,000 head; Insinger Project with a carrying capacity of 3,400 head; Makwa Project with a carrying capacity of 1,000 head; Pathlow Project with a carrying capacity of 3,000 head; The Strawberry Lake Project with a carrying capacity of 700 head; the Swan Plain Project with a carrying capacity of 3,000 head, giving us an increased carrying capacity in these community pastures alone of an additional 13,100 head of cattle for this coming year.

Mr. Speaker, in order to diversify we have the Crooked River Sheep Pasture now in operation with 960 acres which accommodated 1,200 sheep. We're opening sheep pastures at Fairholme with an additional 2,240 acres, Meyronne 1,380 acres, and Mortlach with an additional 3,840 acres.

This means, Mr. Speaker, that between the Provincial community pastures and the PFRA community pastures, and the grazing associations in our province in 1967, this year we will be able to accommodate some 8,031 patrons who could pasture some 202,000 head of livestock in our province. And this is, indeed, of great assistance to the farmers of our province to further their general economy.

I mentioned briefly yesterday our policy in regards to the sale of Crown lands. This policy alone probably did more to add security to the farmers of our province than anything that has been done in the past. To date I am happy to say that contracts have been completed on 351,911 acres of cultivation lease lands. Agreements for sale of 142,200 acres of grazing lease lands in this province have been completed. In other words, since we became the Government we have sold almost half a million acres of Crown land to our farmers to give them added security in their farming enterprise.

Now, Mr. Speaker, there is a great deal more that I would like to have had the time to discuss and to bring to your attention here this afternoon but as time does not permit, I want to close by indicating to you and to Members of this House a new program that has probably caused more interest and certainly will add to the process of diversification more than anything else that has been done in this province. I refer, of course, to the establishment of the new Soil Testing Laboratory at Saskatoon.

By now you will know the results. After soil tests were taken this past fall, we found that we had 22,000 soil samples sent in by some 7,000 farmers. As a result of this analysis, farmers purchased a record of 214,000 tons of fertilizer at an estimated cost of over \$21,000,000, which indicates, Mr. Speaker, the adaptability of our farmers to any new program that is brought out for their benefit.

Now in concluding to give ample time to some of the other Members who wish to take part in this Debate, I suggest this to you that the added expenditures for highways in Saskatchewan will substantially help our rural people. The added expenditures for health in our province will certainly help our people. The recognition that has been given to the municipalities through grid roads and increased equalization grants certainly will be of major benefit to agriculture and to our farmers. And today I am happy to say that through the efforts of the Provincial Treasurer this year after a record-high budget for agriculture last year, Saskatchewan will have the highest amount of money allocated for ordinary capital spending through the Department of Agriculture in the history of this province.

Mr. Speaker, you'll realize then, that I take great pleasure in supporting the original motion, I will vote against the amendment.

Mr. A. Mitchell (Bengough): — Mr. Speaker, I would like to take a few moments to comment on the new Airstrip Improvement Program of our present Liberal Government. This program is under the jurisdiction of the Department of Public Works.

Saskatchewan in recent years has had a marked increase in aviation activity. It is of interest to note that within our province we now have approximately 500 privately licensed aeroplanes and 140 commercially licensed. This does not include scheduled air carriers. In addition there are six aeroplanes operated by the Saskatchewan Air Ambulance.

In comparing Saskatchewan with other provinces of Canada and states of the U.S. it is worthy of mention that Saskatchewan has the largest membership of any chapter in the International Flying Farmers' Association which embraces Canada, the United States and Mexico. We now have an excess of 600 members in the Saskatchewan Association.

With the use of aircraft becoming increasingly popular and

in increasing numbers, both in commercial flying and in agricultural use, it points out the obvious necessity for a long overdue Airstrip Improvement Program. In addition to approximately 200 farm airstrips, we have at present, approximately 130 municipal-owned airstrips in our province. These municipal strips are adjacent to our towns and villages and many of them are in need of upgrading and improvement, particularly to be of service to the modern aeroplane. In 1966 the present Government, aware of this need, instituted the Airstrip Improvement Program allocating \$30,000 for the first year.

Mr. Speaker, the regulations governing this program are as follows: Financial assistance is provided to municipal governments for the construction or improvement of municipal-owned airstrips; assistance will not be provided for improvement of privately or company-owned airstrips. Minimum standards will be 2,640 feet in length and 100 feet in width. All programs must receive prior approval of the Department of Public Works. Upon approval, the Provincial Government will pay the full cost up to maximum of \$2,500.

Mr. Speaker, the following improvement projects will be eligible under the financial assistance program; relocation of electrical transmission lines, relocation of telephone or telegraph lines, removal or relocation of fences, removal of trees that obstruct the use of the airstrip, relocation of buildings that obstruct the use of the strip, grading, shaping, and compacting of earth surface including lengthening or widening of the airstrip, turfing and erosion control, providing and spreading of gravel on airstrip. No assistance will be available for operating or maintenance costs under this program.

During 1966 there were 15 projects approved at a total cost of \$30,064; in addition there were 13 projects deferred until 1967 with four additional applications for approval in 1967.

Mr. Speaker, I feel this is a much needed program and will certainly be appreciated by the pilots and business men of the province as well as being of great benefit to the air ambulance. The upgrading of the airstrips of our province will be an inducement to our tourist trade as many of our tourists today are travelling by private and commercial aircraft.

Within our province in the past year, there has been a 20 per cent increase in the sales of aviation fuel. This reflects the increased use of the aeroplane in just one year.

In the past year the 4 per cent E. and H. tax on aviation fuel, excluding military fuel, has amounted to over \$70,000. Mr. Speaker, I would like to see a greater portion of this revenue allocated to our Airstrip Improvement Program, to enable more of our towns and villages to take advantage of the program.

The Department of Industry and Commerce is presently in the process of producing a new aeronautical map of our province, in which all airports and airstrips will be designated. A beneficial

aspect to pilots, particularly in adverse weather conditions, would be the marking of our towns and villages by painting the name of the town on large buildings such as skating and curling rinks, water towers, etc. with a large arrow pointing towards the local airstrip, this being the responsibility of the town or village.

Mr. Speaker, in closing I would like to mention two booklets which are being compiled by the Saskatchewan Safety Council. One is a booklet which should prove helpful to any town or village contemplating the construction of an airstrip. This booklet lays out in detail such information as method of constructing and aligning runway, runway markers, windsock location, etc.

The second booklet is invaluable to airmen, hunters, and sportsmen as it is based on survival and rescue, containing many helpful suggestions on this subject. The address to obtain these booklets is; Saskatchewan Safety Council, 2149 Albert Street, Regina, Saskatchewan.

Mr. Speaker, in consideration of the benefits accorded to the Airstrip Improvement Program by the present Liberal Government, needless to say I support the motion but not the amendment.

Mr. H. D. Link (Saskatoon): — Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to have the privilege to participate in this Debate, as a representative for the city of Saskatoon. Due to the short time at my disposal I will only be able to deal with a few items contained in the Budget.

Mr. Speaker, it was just a year ago that the Premier was named Saskatchewan Salesman of the Year. I said at that time, and I repeat now, that you don't have to be a salesman to give away our natural resources, or sell our Crown corporations at a fraction of what they are worth. In fact a good salesman should be able to obtain the best possible price for the product that he sells.

Well, this year the Premier has proven beyond a shadow of a doubt that not only is he a poor salesman, he can't even retain that which he had. I am referring of course to his humiliating performance in trying to negotiate the tax-sharing, or equalization grant between Saskatchewan and the Federal-Liberal Government.

It is true, map that not everybody can sell. But when you cannot retain that which you have, then I suggest such a person is not capable of running the affairs for the people of this province.

Mr. Speaker, in my opinion there was one sentence in the Premier's Budget that speaks more eloquently than I can what the Government itself thinks of this Budget and the people of Saskatchewan.

In this Budget, I believe we have adhered to the principles

of the Saskatchewan Liberal Party.

Mr. Speaker, since when did the Saskatchewan Liberal party have any principles?

This sentence I submit, Mr. Speaker, better than anything else that the Premier could say tells a story. He is telling the people of Saskatchewan that this Budget is not tailored to meet the needs of the people of Saskatchewan, but rather it was designed to appeal to Members of the Liberal party. May I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that there is a difference.

If part of Liberal principles means that they keep election promises, then I submit they have been a dismal failure. Let me just mention a few of the more obvious.

The Liberal party during the last election promised that if they were elected, they would cover the cost of drugs under the medical care plan. They did not say they would consider doing this, they said they would. This was the first Liberal promise that was not kept.

The Liberal party promised 80,000 new jobs in four years, if they were elected. Well, Mr. Speaker, they were elected but did they keep their promise? They did not. Just another Liberal promise down the drain.

The Liberal party promised that if they were elected, that labour would have nothing to fear from the new Liberal Government. Well, Mr. Speaker, what happened? No sooner had this Government assumed power than we had Bill 79 forced onto the working people of this province. And then you will recall, Mr. Speaker, that we had a special session and Bill No. 2 was passed in this Legislature. I suggest to the Members of this House that these two Bills are the most vicious pieces of labour legislation ever passed in any Legislature in the Dominion of Canada. Another Liberal promise. Some more Liberal principles.

The Liberal party before the 1964 election promised more and better highways. What a joke, Mr. Speaker! I leave it to my audience to decide, but as far as I am concerned, I submit that never since 1943 have the highways in Saskatchewan been in a more deplorable condition. It doesn't matter whether you go north, east, south or west, the story is the same. The highways are simply not even being kept up, let alone new ones being constructed. Another Liberal promise, another Liberal failure.

Well, Mr. Speaker, one could go on and on, going over the list of Liberal promises and Liberal failures. Let me say at this time, if the Liberal Government had carried out even one of their election planks that I have referred to, namely, the introduction of drugs under the medical care plan, then they would not have had a surplus Budget even on paper. As it is, they are in actual fact presenting us with deficit financing, but they are not honest enough to admit it. You know, Mr. Speaker, many of the people of Saskatchewan are beginning to wonder

how much of this Liberal prosperity they can stand.

Let me turn for just a moment, Mr. Speaker, to the matter of housing in Saskatchewan. As has already been pointed out by previous speakers, housing in Saskatchewan during the past year has declined at an alarming rate. I believe the decline amounted to some 30 per cent. In Regina it was around 42 per cent. Saskatoon was not quite as bad, but bad enough. Mr. Speaker, Saskatoon and Regina are no longer the third and fourth fastest growing cities in Canada. Why the decline in house construction, Mr. Speaker? Well I'll tell you why.

It was because the financial institutions, the loan companies, the life insurance companies, the money lenders in this country went on strike. Oh yes, I know very well, Mr. Speaker, that the polite way of putting this is to refer to the tight money situation. Mr. Speaker, I am saying now that the withholding of money at a reasonable rate of interest by the financial institutions of this country is, and was, a strike for higher interest rates, nothing else. I dare the Premier to deny that the withholding of money for the building of homes for the people of Saskatchewan is any different than the withholding of services by doctors, teachers or trade unions.

Mr. Speaker, there is one difference. This difference, Mr. Speaker, became quite apparent a few months ago when in this Legislature the Liberals bulldozed through what my Leader referred to at that time as that evil Bill, Bill No. 2. This Bill compelled the workers of this province to go back to work or face the consequences. Mr. Speaker, what about the money lenders that are withholding their money in order to sell at a better price? Nothing happened to them. No legislation was passed any place to make them toe the line. One law for the poor, one law for the rich – Liberal policy, Liberal principles.

Mr. Speaker, during all this time when it was, and in many cases still is, difficult for a person in the low income bracket to get a loan to build himself a home, there was always money available to build another super market or other commercial building. But, for the poor, Mr. Speaker, the money strike still goes on.

Mr. Speaker, the Premier mentioned in the Budget Debate how disappointed he was that the Federal Liberals had not proceeded with the Medicare plan. Well this was news, coming as it did from a man who kicked on the door of this Legislature and did everything in his power to stop the implementation of the Medicare plan in this province.

Mr. Speaker, I challenge this noisy, free-wheeling, free enterprise Premier of Saskatchewan to take away this Socialist Medicare plan from the people of Saskatchewan. I challenge him to go to the people and tell them that he is opposed to this Socialist scheme. Mr. Speaker, he talks about free enterprise but he wouldn't dare do away with this plan. I suggest he has not got the courage to do so. He knows very well that this

would be the end of his political career unless he joined the Social Credit party.

Much has been said about the Liberal welfare program. No doubt others will speak on this topic. Let me just say, Mr. Speaker, that as far as the people of constituency are concerned, the best thing the Premier has done in this area has been to remove the Member for Rosthern, (Hon. D. Boldt) from this Department. I suppose one should be grateful even for this one small gesture.

Mr. Speaker, I notice that as usual the Premier and Provincial Treasurer had something to say about his favourite whipping boy, the Crown corporations. It is difficult to understand why the Premier is so intent on destroying Crown Corporations. Let me suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that this might well be a typical day in the Premier's life. When the Premier wakes up in the morning, he finds that his home is nice and warm, heated by gas from the Saskatchewan Power Corporation.

Mr. Brockelbank (Kelsey): — Socialism.

Mr. Link: — Slowly he gets out of bed and sinks his toes into a fur rug, no doubt handled by the Saskatchewan Fur Marketing Board. He walks over and switches on the lights supplied by a Socialist Crown corporation. He then turns on his radio and listens to a news report supplied by the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation. After hearing the latest news regarding how things are going in the private enterprise world of the Prudential Finance Corporation and Atlantic Acceptance Corporation, he reaches for his Saskatchewan Government telephone. This call might well be to a store in Regina owned and operated by the Saskatchewan Government. Now he is ready for breakfast. He picks up a report printed by the Saskatchewan Government Printing Company and prepares for the day's work.

When he is ready to leave for his office, he jumps into his Chrysler, insured by Saskatchewan Government Insurance Office, one of the largest Socialist Corporations in the province. Finally, after passing a Saskatchewan Government bus, he arrives at his office in a publicly-owned building. Now he is ready for the day's work which consists of trying to destroy or sell all the facilities he himself uses every day.

I often think, Mr. Speaker, that it would be amusing if it wasn't so pathetic when the Premier rants and raves about the Crown corporations that were not successful. He loves to shout and tell not only the people of Saskatchewan, but his Goldwater friends in the united States that here is absolute proof that Socialism does not work. He would have the people believe that even though after deducting any loss that was incurred by a Crown corporation, that some \$15,000,000 poured into the Provincial Treasury (and this doesn't include the SPC or Telephone Corporation) is a bad Socialist experiment and constitutes a failure. Well, Mr. Speaker, if a few failures in Crown corporations constitute a failure, why doesn't our Premier mention some of the

free enterprise institutions when they fail. Oh, no, he won't do this. Well, let me refresh his memory.

When the Atlantic Finance Corporation, no doubt owned and operated by his kind of friends in the free enterprise business world, gouged millions of dollars out of the people of Canada before it collapsed, does that mean that private enterprise is a failure? Thousands of Canadians no doubt lost their life savings through this wonderful institution. I repeat; does this mean all private business is a failure?

Mr. Speaker, how about a more recent one, the Prudential Finance Corporation. Does the Premier want us to believe that because here once again many Canadians lost their life savings to a free enterprise, organization, owned and operated by so-called business men, that the free enterprise system has failed? And, Mr. Speaker, how about the North American Finance Company, which was part of this free enterprise organization – just because this organization collapsed, does this constitute a failure of the whole system?

Well, Mr. Speaker, again I could give many more examples, but I suppose someone will say that took place in Eastern Canada. In good old Saskatchewan where Premier Thatcher is in charge, free enterprise is good, sound and stable. Unlike these terrible Socialist Crown corporations, private enterprise just keeps rolling along. Well, what are the facts, Mr. Speaker?

In Saskatchewan in 1966, over 30 businesses went bankrupt. Yes, Mr. Speaker, and 540 companies were struck off the register in 1966.

Mr. Speaker, these were not Crown corporations, these were private concerns. Does the Premier condemn a whole system because of the failure of a few?

If this is the basis on which he decides which system is the most successful, then I submit there is a lot to be said for the record of Crown corporations.

There's a lot that a person could say, Mr. Speaker, in particular about homeowner grants which in my constituency is a very unhappy situation, as about one-third of the people do not receive this so-called homeowner grant.

Hon. L. P. Coderre (Minister of Labour): — Which one is that?

Mr. Link: — Saskatoon, Mr. Speaker, from what I have said, I'm sure that you will gather that I will support the amendment, but oppose the motion.

Mr. A. M. Nicholson (Saskatoon City): — Mr. Speaker, I welcome the Budget as a document around

which a Provincial election will be fought during the next few weeks. While it provides for the raising and spending of more than \$300,000,000 during the next 12 months it will be condemned by the people of Saskatchewan for the omissions which have been mentioned by those who have spoken on this side of the House before me. There is very little good news for those who are responsible for operating municipal government in Saskatchewan, for those who are confronted with the needs of education, for those who were expecting a drug package provided by the Government before the next election and for those expecting one of the 20,000 new jobs per year promised by the Premier prior to the last election. I would like to note two serious omissions that have not yet been mentioned during the Debate, the needs of the University Hospital in Saskatoon and the plight of our old age pensioners.

Since the session started the Premier announced that there would be spent over the next few years in establishing a base hospital and facilities for the teaching and research on the Regina campus about \$16,000,000. This announcement was made without consultation with the University authorities or the Federal Government. Until these facilities have been built, the University Hospital and the Medical College in Saskatoon will continue to be the major health centre for almost one million people. Four years ago when the Member for Regina West (Mr. Blakeney) was the Minister of Health, he advised the secretary of the University hospital Board that the Cabinet had approved in general, the plans for important extensions at the University Hospital to provide a geriatric wing, a paediatric wing, additional psychiatric facilities at a total cost of approximately \$12,000,000. A year later, after the change of government, the Premier called a halt to the planning. Apparently the plans were scrapped and he ordered a reduction of 10 per cent in budgets across the board. For the University Hospital this meant a slash of about \$700,000. This important institution has not yet recovered from the impact of these improvident decisions. Mr. Speaker, I am sure that I can speak for the CCF Government which will be assuming office later this year when I say that immediately high priority will be given to making the University Hospital and Medical College centres which will again attract many of the brightest specialists from all over the world and provide for our people the high quality of health services they previously enjoyed.

Saskatchewan's old age pensioners who were expecting an additional \$30 per month commencing in January of this, our Centennial Year are greatly disappointed that no mention is made of them or their plight in the Budget. It is cool comfort for them to hear the Premier boast that 1966 has been the most affluent year in Saskatchewan's history; that liquor sales have reached an all-time high, more than \$1,000,000 per week; that we are to have additional miles of four-lane highways.

Although the Federal legislation for the guaranteed income supplement became law in December of last year, no one in Saskatchewan has yet received a cheque from Ottawa, and the Minister of Welfare (Mr. MacDonald) has not yet told the House or the old

age pensioners who are receiving supplementary allowances from the Provincial Government whether or not they will benefit in any way from the Federal legislation.

Last year the Dean of this House, the Member for Kelsey (Mr. J. H. Brockelbank), had a Resolution asking that this Assembly urge the Federal Government to increase the old age security benefits from \$75 to \$100 per month to everyone at the age of 65 without a means test. It was the present Minister of Welfare (Mr. MacDonald) who moved the amendment which asked the Assembly to urge the Federal Government to implement the extra \$30 per month with the income test.

Well, Mr. Speaker, the pensioners of Saskatchewan will blame the Liberal Government at Ottawa and the Liberal Government of Saskatchewan for introducing the income tax test which is going to be quite as obnoxious as the means and needs test which have been so offensive to so many elderly people in the past. It's 40 years ago this year, Mr. Speaker, - in 1927 - since Canadians received their first old age pensions, thanks to J. S. Woodsworth, the founder of the CCFs. True, the amount was very small, \$20 per month, and only paid after a very humiliating means test.

Fifteen years ago the Parliament of Canada accepted the principle of pensions to everyone at 70 without a means test. It is true that the present Premier of Saskatchewan, then a Member of the House of Commons, opposed the measure, though to the credit of the Canadian Parliament, he was the only Member among 265 who spoke against the legislation and wanted to retain the means test. The arguments he advanced at that time were not sound then, and they are not sound now. It has been clearly established that the wealthy contribute to the fund during their lifetime and it is an easy matter to adjust the income tax laws and other laws if necessary so that all or part of the pension can be recovered by means of these taxes.

Since the Minister of Welfare (Mr. MacDonald) has refused to tell the pensioners or the Assembly what he proposes to do, we can draw no other conclusion than to assume that the pensioners who are not receiving a supplement of \$40 per month from the Provincial Government will have this reduced by \$30 when the Minister hears that they received \$30 from the Federal Government. I have in my hand the application for a guaranteed income supplement to the old age security pension. I can now understand why the Federal Minister of Welfare refused to give the Members of the House of Commons copies of these forms while this measure was being debated. I understand there are several Liberal Members in the House of Commons who will not be seeking office again, because they are unwilling to face the public and try to justify this type of treatment for our Canadian pensioners. Unfortunately there are many elderly people in Saskatchewan living in Saskatchewan who are living on the \$75 a month from the Federal Government and no more. They have no other income. They have been too proud to make application for supplementary allowances from the municipality or the Provincial Government. I am sure that they would have qualified had they applied. These people will

be able to complete these forms without very much trouble and they will qualify for an extra \$30 a month. This will immediately improve their position for which I am grateful. I understand that quite a number of Saskatchewan pensioners will receive cheques in march for \$90; \$30 for January, February and March. Others will receive cheques in April for \$120 for these four months. What about those who are receiving supplementary allowances from the Minister of Welfare. Since he has remained silent we must conclude that what one Scot gives, one MacEachen of Ottawa, another Scot, a MacDonald of Saskatchewan will take away. When Mr. MacEachen writes to the Saskatchewan Minister and tells him that my blind, 76-year-old friend who has been blind for 12 years has received an extra \$30 from Ottawa, the Saskatchewan Minister will slash the \$85 per month supplementary allowance my blind friend is getting to \$55 a month. No wonder the Minister of Welfare is able to reduce his expenditures for supplementary allowances during the next 12 months by more than 35 per cent, according to the Estimates. The Minister, I imagine, plans to stall until after the Provincial election on April 26, and certainly will not plan on slashing the Provincial supplementary allowances until May when I trust Saskatchewan will have a CCF Government again.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Nicholson: — But Mr. Speaker, the most objectionable feature is the introduction of what Mr. MacEachen prefers to call an income test. The Liberals in Ottawa and in Saskatchewan insist on putting people who have small, very small earnings through the wringer. I have the little booklet that is supplied to everyone entitled to the guaranteed income. On page four of this book, I note that if you earn less than \$24 a year, you'll get the full \$30 supplement. However, if you have the good fortune to earn 50 cents a week for 52 weeks in the year, they'll slash your allowance from \$30 to \$29 a month. If you were fortunate in getting two assignments so that you could earn \$1 per week your allowance would be cut to \$28 per month. If by any chance you got 50 cents a day for five days a week, every week of the year, your monthly supplement would be cut to \$25. And if you have very good luck and could get \$1 a day every day in the year and reported this earning, the Federal-Liberal Government would cut your supplement from \$30 to \$15 per month. If you have been receiving \$40 from the Saskatchewan Minister of Welfare (Mr. MacDonald) as a supplementary allowance, he would knock off \$29 from the \$40 if you had earned 50 cents a week. He would knock off \$28 if you were fortunate to earn a little more. I submit, Mr. Speaker, the shabby treatment of the elderly people in Saskatchewan and Canada during this our Centennial Year will result in the Liberal Government in Ottawa and the Liberal Government in Saskatchewan being defeated the next time the voters have a chance to go to the polls. Certainly in Saskatchewan, just as soon as the present Government is defeated, the CCF Government will again demonstrate in our elderly people that we believe we should mark the 100th anniversary of Canada becoming a nation by seeing to it that those who work so hard to change this frontier

area to such a desirable place to live in should be able to spend the balance of their years without the humiliation of this test. We do not suggest that \$105 a month at 65 without a means test will be adequate. At the recent Canadian Conference on Aging it was decided that an elderly person living alone needs a monthly income of at least \$138.96. Those who are in nursing homes and requiring special care would, of course, require and receive a good deal more.

On two occasions while I was Minister of Welfare, old age security benefits were increased by \$10 a month from \$55 to \$65 and again by \$10 a month from \$65 to \$75 to compensate for the increase in the cost of living. The CCF Government in Saskatchewan adjusted the schedules taking into account the increase in the cost of living so that the Provincial Government would not be taking from the elderly people the \$10 per month which had been given by the Federal Government. I wish to assure this House that what a CCF Government did in previous years for elderly will be done again. I will welcome the opportunity of having the people of Saskatchewan decide at the earliest possible date whether or not the Budget enjoys the confidence of the voters of Saskatchewan.

I will be voting for the amendment and against the main motion.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. M. P. Pederson (Arm River): — Mr. Speaker, I had thought up until 24 hours ago that the bringing down of the Budget and the debate that has followed the bringing down of that Budget, was very different than it had been in previous years. I thought there was a different tempo in the House. I felt that in sitting over on this side, I have been tossed into the bear pit, or at any rate, caught up in sort of a nut cracking process that seems to develop between the Liberal and the NDP parties just prior to an election. Well, I want to assure Hon. Members that I'm a pretty tough nut to crack. In my opinion, Mr. Speaker, there can be no doubt from the debate that has taken place that the Government's intention is to face the electorate at a very early date. It's equally obvious to me that the Opposition have launched their campaign and are prepared to go flat out from here until election day, certainly based on the criticism outlined by the Members from Regina West (Mr. Blakeney) the other day and the criticisms outlined by their Members since that time. One of the great problems, Mr. Speaker, that I find, is that, because the Provincial Treasurer and the financial critic for the official Opposition, in their speeches cover so many areas of the Budget, it makes it very difficult for people like myself and others who sit in the back benches to take part in the Debate without appearing to be repetitious. I hope that the comments that I have to make this afternoon on the Budget, of setting out my party's position and attitude insofar as the spending of public funds is concerned, will not appear to be merely a rubber stamp of the positions and

postures taken by Members who have spoken before me in this Debate.

I find however, Mr. Speaker, that in spite of the rather substantial bulk of the Provincial Treasurer, it is still impossible for me to stand in his shadow and sort of go along with him. It hardly seems necessary for me to comment on the fact that I couldn't stand in the shadow of the Member from Regina West (Mr. Blakeney) when one takes a look at my own ample girth. I'm afraid, Mr. Speaker, that in trying to seek a place for myself to stand or a position to take that I must leave a very substantial shadow of uncertainty that I feel surrounds the Budget handed down last Friday by the Provincial Treasurer. One of my first and immediate reactions to the Budget was that surely this was a document designed and dedicated to the principle of maintaining the status quo. It seemed to be an extension and a continuation of those programs which by and large over the years have proven to be successful in the past without giving recognition to the need, the type of major represented-assessment required to provide bold new stimulus to our economy, and through that stimulus, hope for the future. This I felt the Budget lacked. The Provincial Treasurer's address, I noticed, started out with a plea for sympathy for the Provincial Treasurer because of the terrible responsibilities he must carry in that capacity. He enumerated the fact that there were hundreds of requests that he receives for the spending of public funds. And then he interjected a sly little note that I thought is perhaps one of the most trite clichés of today, when he says that it's easy to spend money, particularly when it is someone else's. I think that everyone is aware of the truism involved in that statement, Mr. Speaker. In fact I believe that most husbands have had such a thought cross their mind, if in fact some of them weren't bold enough to voice them occasionally as they watch their wives spending hard-earned money, trying to make the outgo balance with the income, during these very difficult times. I'm not too sure if the Premier's reference to squeezing and trimming of costs is particularly borne out in some areas of the Budget, but it was my observation that in other areas of this Budget, not only was there a squeezing process, there was almost a snuffing-out process when he forgot to let go in the nick of time. And then further on, Mr. Speaker, in the Premier's preamble in the Budget, he gives official recognition to what he called the accepted, normal and I'm quoting from it now, the accepted, normal and necessary phenomenon of competition for electoral support, being transformed into an unseemly auction of favours. Well, laudable as that statement may be, implying as I presume it does, that the Premier wouldn't stoop to such low tactics, what are we to think about his ad-lib announcement surrounding the Regina Base Hospital? I took a close look at the printed text of the speech delivered by the Premier and nowhere did I find an announcement of the new plan for the Provincial Government to build a \$16,000,000 hospital to serve the southern part of the province. Instead, a very modest little statement appears in the printed text saying that \$750,000 had been provided in the supplementary estimates for this base hospital. Election bait, Mr. Speaker, it could hardly be otherwise. He threw that in, dangling it in

front of the people of the southern part of the province.

What about the rather prominent reference given in the Budget Speech to the homeowner grant? As I listened to the Premier, I thought, here it comes, this homeowner-grant carrot that he's been dangling for over a year is suddenly going to blossom into a bunch. Here comes a great big increase. Instead we were subjected to a rather lengthy discourse on the very obvious subject of how taxes have increased on land and property, and how necessary it is to take some course of action to relieve this pressure on the property owner. We heard words of praise, over the Premier's signature, together with a cute little letter from him, that many property owners received last year. He even had a selected letter to demonstrate how tremendously popular this move was with the people of our province. Now, Mr. Speaker, that this move was popular, there can be no doubt. It certainly was.

I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that anything that is done to start reducing in substantial form, the taxation carried by the property owner of Saskatchewan cannot help but be popular. But for the Premier to spend the amount of time that he did reminding us of how popular this was, only to wind up with a pitiful suggestion that he would continue it this coming year, surely cannot be interpreted in any other way than election bait. It was just thrown in there as a further reminder to put it on the record. There was no sign of increased tax relief on the property owner through increase of the homeowner grant that the Premier has promised for some time.

I say; where is the vigour and the courage to tackle this terrible problem of rising tax costs? Where are the bold new programs the Liberals led us to believe would be forthcoming that would cut deeply into this area of increasing costs that our taxpayers must face annually? I fail to see anything in this timid approach that will solve one of the major areas of increasing costs, costs, Mr. Speaker, which incidentally contribute very substantially to the high cost of living of our Saskatchewan residents. I could go on, Mr. Speaker, and enumerate many items that appeared in the Budget, items that are very normal, expected budgetary expenditures. But when they issued from the mouth of the Premier, they were pronounced with such earth-shattering force, that one might surmise that these were new programs designed to meet the needs of our people. I suggest that instead, these normal routine Budget items were being listed in such a fashion that they could be termed election gimmicks. There can be no other interpretation placed on that speech that was brought down last Friday.

Turning to the Premier's claim that for the third consecutive year this Government has balanced its Budget and produced a surplus, let's examine that statement just for a moment. Everyone knows that over the past six to eight months we've seen press releases, we read newspaper accounts of the Premier referring to "the cruel financial blow," as he called it, that was

dealt Saskatchewan by the Ottawa Liberals. Every time I heard that speech it seemed to me at any rate that he was issuing fair warning that the financial starvation diet, which has been Federal Liberal party policy since the early days in this province, insofar as Saskatchewan is concerned, would once again be the order of the day. The warning that the Premier has been issuing over the last several months and again in his speech was reminiscent of the days when a similar statement was made, several years, or quite a few years back as many Members will recall, a statement that went, "Not a five-cent piece would be forthcoming unless Liberal Members were sent from this province to Ottawa." I believe that this is the kind of warning that has been sounded. Reference has been made in this Debate of the Premier's inability to bring about a more satisfactory conclusion in the negotiations in which he engaged dealing with equalization grants. That he did fail is more than evident. Moreover that anyone should be surprised that he failed, can only mean that they haven't been witness to the tactics that have been used by the Premier in his negotiations and dealings with the Federal Government from time to time on many matters, not only in this particular area. I want to suggest, Mr. Speaker, that perhaps part of the problem is that the Premier was never a farm boy. Because if he had been, he would know that it is impossible to tame a horse and get him to stand still while you put a collar on him while you're hitting him over the head with the biggest club that you can find. And if you carry that a step further and give the poor horse a sneaky kick in the ribs, just about the time you're trying to slip the harness on him, you'll find out that not only will the harness not sit lightly, but there's a good chance that you'll be kicked out into the middle of the barn, if not in fact, right across to the other wall and smeared up against the barn wall. Mr. Speaker, in farm language, our Premier was smeared.

Let's return again now for a moment to the statement that the Budget would balance. I'm not going to belabour some of the points that were made by the Member from Regina West (Mr. Blakeney) when he pointed out that several aspects, the type of financing now being carried out by the Provincial Treasurer, is in fact, a type of deficit financing particularly as it applies to the Department of Highways. The Member from Regina West referred to and did make some points that I thought were points well made. Some other parts of his comments regarding deficit financing I wouldn't agree with, but nevertheless I think the central theme that he developed was that this was in fact not necessarily a balanced budget and that premise I buy. I think it is equally self-evident that, with an increase in the estimated budgetary revenues by some \$34,000,000, which represents a fairly substantial percentage increase in total revenues over 1966-67, the problem of what I call modest increases that were provided, and still balancing the budget, shouldn't in fact, have been too difficult a problem to solve. However, I believe that the speeches I've just referred to, the dire warnings that have been issued to our citizens, that we face difficult times, dire warnings incidentally, that are repeated in the preliminary to the Budget address, the casual hinting at the possibility of tax increases, and now the happy conclusion coming from the Premier

that he is able to balance the budget, means only one thing, Mr. Speaker. All of this was a carefully rehearsed and meticulously planned program, designed to impress on the voter just how skilful our Provincial Premier I in being able to manage the affairs of our province in what he calls such an exemplary fashion. He took great pains the other day, Mr. Speaker, to remind his radio audience and in turn to remind myself, by singling me out, that taxes in almost every other level of government in Canada had gone up over the past year. Heaven knows, Mr. Speaker, that I don't need to be reminded that the Liberal Government in Ottawa has instituted huge increases, to quote the Premier.

Hon. W. Ross Thatcher (Premier: — Ontario Government!

Mr. Pederson: — I also don't need to be reminded that the Liberal Government that sat in office in Quebec until recently instituted huge increases over the past several years as the Premier suggested. I don't have to be reminded that the Liberal Government in New Brunswick had brought in large increases.

Mr. Thatcher: — How about the Tories?

Mr. Pederson: — It is equally true that I don't need to be reminded that the Conservative Government in Ontario has increased taxes, nor that the Conservative Government in Manitoba recently brought in a sales tax to meet its fiscal problems. These are standard things and everyone knows them. It wasn't even necessary to remind the radio audience and myself that Alberta would have a deficit of almost \$100,000,000 this year. But what the Premier didn't emphasize is that the accumulated surplus in Alberta provided ample cushion to absorb the \$100,000,000 deficit or near \$100,000,000 that they will have.

Mr. Thatcher: — The Socialists didn't leave one!

Mr. Pederson: — Nor did he mention... Well, well, Mr. Premier, I'm not standing in my place to defend Socialism. I'm trying to place a Conservative point of view before this House. He didn't mention, of course, the fact that the Alberta Government was budgeting for approximately \$800,000,000, a sum nearly three times that of the Province of Saskatchewan. The only thing that he didn't neglect to say, in so many words, but by implication actually said them, is that in the face of all of these drastic steps, other Governments elsewhere in Canada have had to take, the Premier of Saskatchewan has been able to hold the line. In effect, he was saying, "Rise up, you trembling taxpayers and rejoice. Honour the all-wise being who has saved you from a similar fate." I'm not impressed, Mr. Speaker. I am sure, as the next few weeks unfold and the taxpayers become aware of the continuing burden of taxation that they will carry, that they too will not be impressed. And I suggest, Mr. Speaker, my honourable friend from Souris-Estevan (Mr. MacDonald) will find that out when he starts

to campaign and they start looking and asking what about the tax reductions insofar as Provincial Government spending is concerned, he will not have answers.

Mr. Thatcher: — Where are your candidates, Martin?

Mr. Pederson: — You'd be surprised, you'd be surprised.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Pederson: — Well, the Premier is worried about candidates and I presume he has reason when he eyed that situation in More.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Pederson: — No worries in Arm River anyway. Well, Mr. Speaker, I suggest that any time the Premier would like to discuss that situation further, that my office is in Room 227 just across, behind us here. The taxpayers, Mr. Speaker, I think have looked for positive evidence that this Government intends to spend in a reasonable fashion, in a fashion that will meet the growing demands of our society. I believe that they have also demanded at the same time that the Government should practise a wide husbandry of our fiscal resources, so that we may have some sort of a cushion to fall back on, a cushion to soften the blow in case the blessings of a record crop — which I might say incidentally isn't provided by the Liberal party — fail to materialize in the ensuing year and perhaps two or three years following this last one.

I believe, Mr. Speaker, that this is of very serious consequence as far as the future of agriculture is concerned in the province and certainly should have been recognized by the Government. It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that in view of the warnings that were issued last fall when this Legislature met to ratify the Federal-Provincial fiscal arrangements that had been signed on our behalf by the Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Thatcher) that the Premier would have taken stock of our position and decided to switch the emphasis of Government spending into those areas which are productive, those areas on which we are so heavily dependent for tax revenue. I refer as an example to the Department of Agriculture. Everyone is aware in this province and in this Chamber, of the Premier's determination to be known as the great highway builder. I suggest his fear that the Liberal party will be tagged once again, as they were in the past, as the party who failed to build roads, has sent him off on a crash program, a program that has left the spending of various departments of Government in a very lopsided position. No one quarrels with the Premier that our citizens require, want and need good roads, in fact no one will quarrel with the allocation of very substantial sums both for the building and maintenance of roads. However, I want to remind the Premier of one of the statements he

made in his Budget Speech when he referred to the fact that he sees no reason why people who use these road facilities in the future should not help pay for a portion of the cost of these roads. In other words he is projecting this program into the future. I believe he should keep that thought in mind and realize that, desirable though it may be, it is not necessary to complete a desired objective in a matter of just a few short years. I'm talking about the Premier's statement that he wants to project the costs into the future generations, but he is not prepared to project part of the building into a reasonable part of the future. No other department of government in my opinion is given this lopsided type of preferential treatment, the treatment that the Department of Highways gets. If it were we would have witnessed a crash program for the building of schools, crash program for building technical collegiates, crash program for building hospitals and crash program for providing incentives for agriculture. Instead, we have in some cases a modest increase, in others a one-shot jolt in the arm and yet in others just the maintenance of the status quo.

Highway building is another matter. Here the Premier goes flat out. He says in his speech that he's expressed his desire "to provide the finest roads in our nation." I'm quoting the Premier. He has called on the people of this province, only seven per cent of the population of Canada, to build to the finest standards in Canada, 30 per cent of the national highway system. Not only that but he is apparently calling on them to do this in a very few short years.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the productive revenue of these roads outside of the pleasure and the increased convenience that will accrue to our citizens, perhaps could be realized through their increased use by tourists. But with the relatively short tourist season that we experience in Saskatchewan, producing what I consider a rather modest revenue in the over-all picture means that we cannot justify the huge crash programs and huge expenditures on this particular basis. Instead, these immense increases of the past three years in road building have in my opinion, produced a lopsided budget. It seems to me at any rate that the Premier's road-building mania has starved other departments of the Government of a much needed fund and has left an imbalance in the usage of public funds for the provision of other public services.

Now, when I spoke in the Throne Speech Debate a few days ago, I attempted to bring to the attention of the Government the very real hidden problems that exist in agriculture in our province. I outlined several measures that I felt were necessary if we were to continue to enjoy record levels of tax revenues from this most productive of all enterprises in our province's business to farming. And now that the Budget has come down, fears that I expressed in that previous debate have been realized. This Government has no real conception of the hidden problems existing in agriculture today. I've had those fears confirmed, as I say, that I expressed in an earlier debate. In spite of the Premier's statement or admission that net farm income should

exceed \$600,000,000 there was no recognition that ways had to be found to maintain and increase this high level. Every Member of this House must surely know that those high levels were only there because of an incredible crop which may not be repeated. No real recognition is given to the necessity of providing what I would call aggressive programs for diversification, for incentives for increased production particularly in the livestock segment of our farm economy. I listened to the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. McFarlane) this afternoon searching for some of these new ideas, searching for some of these major incentives that are more than a continuation of what has been going on in the past, but I failed to find them. Certainly no recognition of the problem surrounding farmers obtaining trained help on the farm that I spoke of at some length the other day. I notice, Mr. Speaker, that the other day, both the Minister of Agriculture and the Minister of Education (Mr. Trapp) were very quick to comment after I had spoken on the fact that farm labour shortage existed. They intimated that something was going to be done but even the most careful scrutiny of the Budget fails to reveal any steps that are to be taken, and any funds that are to be allocated, for the establishment of what I had called for, technical training schools for farm labour. This is the only way, Mr. Speaker, that we are going to get skilled, trained young people to take jobs on farms. I must say, Mr. Speaker, in speaking of those who commented on that particular aspect of my address the other day, that I was rather highly amused as I sat in my place and listened to the Hon. Member for Rosthern (Mr. Boldt) who spoke within a day or so after me, quote my speech almost word for word in outlining what he obviously thought was some new idea about the necessity for training young people who wish to obtain skilled jobs as farm labourers. He altered only a word or two of the very thing that I had said only two days before, but uttered them as if this was some new great brain wave that he had suddenly come up with and that he wanted to get on the records. I hope, Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that he had to alter a few words, that he wouldn't mind if I sent him over an advance copy of my speech from now on so that he won't have to quote what I have to say about these things from memory because sometimes his memory doesn't serve him too well in this particular regard.

I made reference in my address the other day and I will again today, for the need of a fodder shelter program and pointed out that the program that was initiated by this Government had turned into a fiasco. Proof that this statement was correct was borne out by the Minister of Agriculture himself (Mr. McFarlane). He admits that only slightly over \$14,500 were expended to provide for a fodder shelter program, and that only 114 had in fact been built up to a few days ago. There was a postscript added that there were a few more applications and a little more money had been spent in the last day or two, but even this doesn't begin to make the program look as if it is meeting the needs of our farmers. There will be those who will be critical of programs, and I hear these criticisms voiced from time to time, critical of programs for farmers that seem to supply an undue amount of subsidization. My answer to those critics, Mr. Speaker, is if we as a Government are serious about increasing livestock

production in this province, if we are determined that there must be a greater diversification on farms, then steps towards a vast large scale subsidization must be undertaken in many areas of agriculture by way of an inducement to get farmers to move out into these fields of increased production. I believe that the Budget indicates that the Minister of agriculture has acknowledged that his fodder shelter program has failed completely, because he accepted a 50 per cent reduction in requested budgetary revenues to carry this program over the next year.

In his address this afternoon the Minister went on and recited a great long list of programs as if these were something new. But every one of them, Mr. Speaker, were merely a maintenance of what had been in some cases a slight reversal, but in most a small advance on old programs, that are not meeting the needs of today. Surely, Mr. Speaker, this is but one prime example that this Government is approaching problems of agriculture in a typical Liberal fashion of bygone years, a horse and buggy approach.

I had an opportunity the other morning when I came into the buildings to take a look at the Opportunity Caravan which will soon be seen in the rural areas of this province. But it struck me, Mr. Speaker, that this move is indicative of the continuing attitude insofar as agriculture is concerned, that the Liberal party has, that the best hope for our young people who are raised on our farms is to get them off the farm as quickly as they can. Put them into the labour market, allow the farms to become bigger and bigger. No thought and no planning of how we are to encourage our young people in particular and our family farm operators specifically to carry on in the face of increasing pressure for them to leave the farms. There is a growing school of thought in this province, Mr. Speaker, and I happen to be one of the leading exponents of this school of thought, that agricultural programs must be so designed that they will halt and ultimately reverse the tendency for larger and larger farm units to come into existence. I am, Mr. Speaker, a firm believer in the realities of encouraging farmers to expand within the boundaries of their present holdings rather than trying to increase their cash return by increasing the size of their holdings. I believe it is time, Mr. Speaker, that we, and the government in particular stop defining what is an economic farm unit. We're always hearing this question asked; what is an economic farm unit? And someone is always trying to supply the answer. Over and over again, reference to an economic farm unit is related to size rather than to productive value which has set up a sort of a false type of a standard or yardstick by which these things are measured. I believe that we should stop doing that. Economic farm units cannot be defined purely on size. It must be defined on productive value. I believe, Mr. Speaker, that modern technology combined with the latest advances in plant breeding, animal sciences, will enable farms, farms which by today's standards are very, very tiny indeed, will enable these farms to support not only a family but in fact one or two additional people who would assist in a production of the wealth on these small farms. Trained people to assist the farmer increase the production within the boundaries of what he now owns rather than going out and acquiring an

additional section, or two or three of land. However this cannot come about if agricultural policy is so designed that the trend is for the small farmer to quit and the large farmer to add to his present substantial holdings. This, Mr. Speaker, this is the type of a policy that I believe this Government is following and I believe that the Budget bears it out. I don't want to be repetitious but outline once again some of the measures that I feel would be a small start on the road to recovery, recovery not only for our family farm but also on the road to recovering the stabilization of our population and the retention of large numbers of that population who in spite of claims by the Liberal Government are continuing to leave our province. If there is one area in our economy where steps can be taken to halt the outward flow of population, to increase productive capacity, and to provide a stabilized base for our economy, that area is agriculture. It must have more attention than it is getting, certainly more attention than it is getting in this Budget.

Yet we find that this Government has allocated a bare \$11,500,000, as the Member from Pelly (Mr. Larson) commented on, I believe it was yesterday, \$11,500,000 by way of an expenditure in this most vital segment of our economy. Compare that, Mr. Speaker, to highway spending of \$54,000,000. However, it isn't surprising that this attitude is taken about agriculture, because the Liberal party never have been able to cope with the problems of agriculture; they have never come up with policies that recognized in an obvious fashion the understanding of the necessity to maintain a strong agricultural community in this area of our nation, an area that is blessed with abundant, productive soil, an area that will always provide a stable agricultural base, regardless of industrial development or mineral development that may take place in the future. They have never been able to understand this, that no matter how much industry comes in, no matter how much forest products are being developed, no matter how many mines are opening up, you must continue to keep a strong agricultural base in your economy if you have large numbers of acres of arable land. Because no nation, Mr. Speaker, that has as one of its greatest assets vast areas of productive soil, can ever divorce itself from being anything but an agriculturally based economy. Countries that have attempted to downgrade or neglect their agricultural economy where agriculture should be the mainstay of the society have very quickly run into fiscal difficulties. The end result of such short-sighted policy means that future governments are going to have to supply massive infusion of public funds into the agricultural system in order to resurrect and put it back on a paying basis, paying both in monetary terms and in terms of food production. Nothing as I say, Mr. Speaker, appears to this Budget that would indicate to me a recognition of these basic principles of what I call agriculturally orientated government. This Government does not appear to have grasped this most significant fact of life. Myriads of problems that face farmers in Saskatchewan today which have been carefully hidden by bumper crops, may very well become quite evident in the year of 1967 and more so in the year of 1968. We have had a series of excellent crops, above average crops. We have depleted our moisture reserves in this province to a very

dangerously low level. Even with the snow fall that we have, there is no assurance that this or next year and the year 1968 will give us anything but an average or below average crop.

Certainly not the least of these problems that I have mentioned the farmers are facing, the hazard of weather and so on, one that has been mentioned at some length in this House in previous debates, is the question of rail line abandonment and its effect on additional costs of farming. I believe, Mr. Speaker, that in cases of rail lines being operated, or where it is established, that they are being operated at a substantial deficit, where the Federal Government is providing subsidization in order to provide a needed service to keep the lines going, that thought should be given to a cost-sharing program between the Federal and Provincial Governments to provide roads of secondary highway standards from those communities affected, to the new market areas that must be used when some of these branch lines are abandoned. I believe that many communities would be better served with this type of a subsidized road-building program rather than to continue to subsidize branch lines that will ultimately have to collapse anyway. This is but one of the small suggestions of the type of searching thought that must be given by this Government to bolster the dwindling position of our agricultural economy in this province. It is obvious that the Federal Liberal party have a bare cupboard as far as agriculture is concerned, certainly bare as far as the concept of the problems that exist is concerned or solutions for those problems are concerned. This being the case, I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that the Saskatchewan Government take it upon itself to start initiating the type of joint programs that will be necessary if we are not to relegate the farming community in the next few years to a second or third-rate position in our economy. I maintain and hold with the theory that the agricultural community must rate number one in Saskatchewan all the time. That this Government failed to recognize that the programs they are continuing are completely inadequate is evident in many areas. I want to quote just one example, Mr. Speaker, to illustrate the point that I am trying to make.

Agricultural representatives can, as everyone knows, and do, perform a tremendous service to the farm communities that they are attempting to serve. However, how can any Government begin to consider that one agricultural representative for every 1,000 farmers in this province is sufficient to give the type of counselling and guidance that is so necessary in modern agriculture if farmers are to utilize every opportunity available to them, to increase their net cash income. It is just absolute nonsense to begin to expect that these men can cope with the tremendous task that they have to face. That is just one example, Mr. Speaker, of the attitude of maintaining the status quo that I was referring to earlier in my address. It seems to me that in dealing with agriculture, more time is wasted – I've noticed this in all the three years that I've been here- more time has been wasted on debating about which political party is the best friend to the farmer than there is in actually dealing with solutions to the problems that farmers face. There have been times in this House, Mr. Speaker, - and I want to deal with this just for a

moment – when it seemed that the settlement of whether grazing leases or agricultural leases have been handed out in a fair and unpolitical manner, would in some miraculous way, solve many of the problems of agriculture. This is the type of nonsensical debate that seems to surround this entire field and indicates only one thing to me that few, if any people, who should be responsible, are aware of the many things that must be done, if we are serious in our approach to stemming the decline in numbers of farmers, and the amount of net cash revenue available to them through their individual efforts.

Just in passing, Mr. Speaker, while I am mentioning the question of leases, I heard some debate in this House yesterday and I have heard some discussion of this from time to time over the last several years. I want to place on the record, and in doing so, register my distaste of this age-old debate surrounding political patronage insofar as lease allocations are concerned. I state, Mr. Speaker, that, if a lease is granted in a fashion other than prescribed by regulation, then most certainly that type of political interference must be exposed to the light of public scrutiny. But at the same time, Mr. Speaker, I can say that I am sick and tired of the suggestion, that a bona fide applicant for a lease should be subjected to public scrutiny and ridicule, because he happens to be the son of a Member of this Legislature. Each of us as Members is well aware of the fact that we must abide by certain unwritten rules, insofar as our dealings with the Government is concerned. And I would trust, Mr. Speaker, that all Hon. Members would bear in mind the fact that it is no crime to be the son of the Premier, or in fact the son of any other Member of this House, and it most certainly is no crime for that son to avail himself of the privileges of any other taxpaying citizen of this province in the acquisition of a portion of a publicly posted lease. I hope, Mr. Speaker, that this will settle once and for all the type of accusations and the type of chit chat that goes on surrounding these things, except in those cases where it is established that the public interest was not served and there were in fact wrong doings. I have hesitated mentioning this fact, Mr. Speaker, in this particular Debate, but I felt that perhaps it was time that someone who had not been involved in these things made that statement and set the record straight.

I should very much like, Mr. Speaker, to have spent some time dealing with the general area of education. However, I found that previous speakers have in fact touched on many of the points, and subjected to scrutiny many of the concepts of financing education which I would like to have dealt with myself. For this reason I am not going to deal so much with specifics as with some general observations in this area of education. It has occurred to me, Mr. Speaker, as I am sure it has to many others, that perhaps in our tremendous desire to provide not only adequate, but in some cases, the finest of facilities for the education of our young people, that we have become so engrossed in doing this that we have failed to take stock either of what we are doing, or where we are going. I should like to give an example, Mr. Speaker, of what I am referring to. We have, over the last several years, and indeed since the inception of the University of Saskatchewan,

expended literally hundreds of millions of dollars for the provision of adequate facilities for providing of university training for our young people. We are, in fact as all Members know, continuing on an expansion program in the University of Saskatchewan, specifically and particularly here on the Regina campus. Increased enrolment that is forecast makes it seem necessary to continue to provide more and more facilities on an every broadening scale, so that a greater spectrum of our educational field may be covered. However, I am wondering, Mr. Speaker, if the best use is being made of the facilities that we already have. In many parts of the world and particularly the United States, a tri-semester system university program is being carried on with tremendous success. Outside of some summer classes that I would refer to as a fill-in program, we are using our university facilities to a large extent for really only a few months out of the year. We hire staff and maintain them on a year round salary. It would seem to me at any rate that even on a two-semester system that we would be able to increase the capacity of our university without appreciably increasing our operation costs in the area of staff salaries, in other words, an official turnover to a tri-semester program. I believe that to convert to a tri-semester program of course would cost quite a bit more money as far as operational costs are concerned. But I do believe that these buildings could accommodate more students if they were utilized to the full extent on a year-round basis rather than under the present system of using them for a concentrated period and to a lesser degree in between. I am convinced, Mr. Speaker, that we should make a careful appraisal of these types of possibilities to make certain that the facilities we are providing are being used for the maximum benefit of our people. As everyone knows we are a province with a relatively small population. We are called upon to provide tremendously expensive and far-ranging facilities for our people. We have the problem of increasing costs. We have the problem of diminishing returns for our people because of the taxation load that these people experience. Surely, the phrase, economy in government, should include a careful appraisal of all of our systems, not merely the educational system, to make certain that adequate use is being made of the extremely costly facilities that are being provided by government today. I could mention highway use, as well as other public services, where a careful look should be taken to make certain that we do in fact need the quantity and the tremendous amount of facilities that we are attempting to provide for the people of this province through extracting taxes from their pocket books.

The new division system of education that is being introduced in our secondary educational system almost staggers the imagination when we contemplate the cost of this program. These are costs that must be borne by the taxpayers. And they must be borne, Mr. Speaker, at a time when these taxpayers are still carrying the heavy burden of debenture issues for change-over to the larger school unit system that they undertook a few years ago.

I believe, Mr. Speaker, that it is essential, as has been pointed out by the Government, that we provide an every increasing

scope of facilities, so that we can give our young people the type of specialized training that is suitable for the temperament and desires of these young people to fit them into this modern world.

I accept completely, as I'm sure all Hon. Members do, the concept that in this modern world it is not realistic to follow the program that we used to have of cramming an academic course of education down the throat of every young boy and girl who wishes to attain a certain educational standard whether that was suitable or not. We just crammed it down their throat and said "Take it or leave it." But in the acceptance of this premise, that we need something more, and in the provision of the facilities for this program, I believe that it behoves the Government to make absolutely certain that as far as possible, the elimination of duplicate services – I'm talking now about schools and so on – and the maximum use of publicly supported and publicly owned institutions is taking place. In other words, I am asking the Government to take a serious look at the concept, that a school standing empty for two months in the summer also bears scrutiny. The concept that we've had in this nation that when July comes all the kids get out and that's it and they lock the doors, I believe that it is time for us to take a realistic look at that system and see if we're making the best use of these schools.

My reference to the university buildings in this province is only one example of the thought that I believe must be directed to this very serious problem, if we aren't to get so involved in just providing more and more, and more that we lose sight of the fact the facilities that have been provided not only in education but in other areas of government are not being used to the maximum benefit for people in this province.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I only want to make one very brief generalized statement in conclusion. when the votes taken in this House, I mean coming Wednesday next and Members rise to indicate their support or their opposition of this Budget, I suppose when my voice is heard in the way I vote, that Members opposite will say that I oppose all of the individual items that are in the Budget. I state categorically that nothing could be further from the truth. I am however, Mr. Speaker, completely convinced that this Budget, like the Throne speech completely fails to realize the necessity for a drastic revision, in the attitude of the Government in dealing with the problems of Saskatchewan and the establishment of guidelines for the future. I have outlined, albeit briefly, my tremendous concern for the Government's failure to recognize and to take remedial steps to alleviate the problems of agriculture. The lopsided emphasis in budgetary expenditures also makes it possible for me to support this Budget.

I would have hoped that the amendment could have included some of these items that I have mentioned. However, it doesn't, and so I must be content to use the amendment to register my objections and my reservations.

For those reasons, Mr. Speaker, and again emphasizing the areas of disagreement that I have with the budget, I must support the amendment, but I will not support the Budget.

Mr. G. F. Loken (Rosetown): — Mr. Speaker, I'd just like to make a comment on the Hon. Member that just sat down. He mentioned candidates. I was wondering if he might have some problems, I don't hear of too many of them being nominated lately.

Mr. Pederson: — I'll get to you too, George.

Mr. Loken: — Mr. Speaker, I want to congratulate our Premier, the Provincial Treasurer, on his presentation of the Budget, a Budget with large increases in grants for education and Medicare, also increased grants for municipalities to hold the tax line, a Budget with no tax increases, a Budget the people of this province will readily accept.

I would also at this time like to congratulate the Hon. Member from Milestone (Mr. MacDonald) on his appointment to the Cabinet.

Mr. Speaker, I would also like to make a few comments about the Rosetown constituency which I have the honour to represent. Many of the long-wanted and needed facilities are now becoming a reality, a new hospital just completed in the village of Doddsland. This is a town where a previous Government condemned their old hospital and told them they did not need one. This is not the feeling in this community, and they are very happy about their new hospital. A new senior citizens home was just completed at Outlook or completed last summer and they are now operating to capacity. A new senior citizens home under construction in Rosetown will be completed this summer and a new nursing wing established in our hospital. These were made possible because of the guidance and financial assistance made available by Saskatchewan Government and the Government at Ottawa.

The streets in our business section in the town of Rosetown have been paved. It makes a wonderful improvement. A contract has been let for paving the business section in the town of Outlook. This again benefited because of the Government's program of paying half the cost of paving. A new library in the town of Rosetown is our Centennial project and among many other things a new industry, a new radio broadcasting station opened last September, employing 16 people, then new families moved in from the Province of Alberta and I'm very happy about this.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to say a few words concerning the Saskatchewan Power Corporation. In the year when the Liberal party was the official Opposition in this Legislature they told the Government of the day and the people of this province that SPC could be run more efficiently and could play a greater part in the development of our province and add comfort for our people. In 1964, the Liberals received the opportunity to prove these

claims. Today, all the people in the province are pleased with the new approach that the SPC has taken in its affairs. The Corporation has improved its debt situation. It has decreased its staff through better efficiency and it has expanded the services that it offers to the people of this province.

I'm particularly pleased with the new gas program. It has brought new life and new hope to our small towns. When our CCF friends were in power they had one answer for the small towns who wanted gas. The answer was no. Things have changed considerably since that date. On several occasions, delegations travelled to Regina to meet with SPC management to request gas for the town of Outlook and the answer they received was the same as given to all towns in the same situation. No gas. When the Liberals became the Government, we took a long, hard look at the gas program and decided that changes should be made. A short time after this decision was reached, a number of people from the Outlook area once again met with the SPC management and the Minister-in-Charge, and there was quite a difference. A whole new attitude toward a gas program had been developed.

How did this change take place that has meant so much to the way of life of our rural people? One of the first things we did was look at the rate structure of the gas division. We found the Socialists had decided that all towns of the same size, whether ten miles, 100 miles, or 500 miles, all had to pay the same rate for their gas. If the Corporation couldn't bring gas to a community for that price, then it was denied service. Town after town in this province unsuccessfully tried to talk the SPC into changing its policy. Neither Alberta nor Manitoba followed that policy. In Alberta for instance they had 45 different rates. While we had brought gas to 160 communities, Alberta serviced over 450 towns.

Mr. Speaker, while our CCF friends stuck stubbornly to this rate policy, denying our town, Alberta was pushing ahead with their program. It takes little imagination to realize that in a province as vast as ours, the costs of providing natural gas to different areas in the province are different. It follows if these costs are different, perhaps the rates should be different to cover these costs.

Last year the SPC decided to try out this scheme on a trial basis in the Rosthern-Duck Lake area. The rate for gas that the people in Rosthern and Duck Lake paid was higher than for the other communities but it was still cheaper than any other form of fuel. The experiment was a resounding success. The people are happy and the Corporation is receiving additional revenue.

Today the Corporation has received requests from hundreds of towns asking to be included in the program, towns that were a short time ago denied the service.

Just a short time ago, the Minister-in-Charge of SPC, the Hon. D. G. Steuart, announced a three-year program for bringing

gas to more than 90 towns that the CCF said would never receive the service. I am sure that more towns will be added as the program is developed.

By 1969, just five years after the Liberal Government came to power, we will have seen gas service brought to over 100 new towns serving over 11,000 new homes. This will bring the total to almost 300 communities and over 132,000 customers.

As a direct result of Liberal action, over 10,000 people will be receiving cheaper, cleaner fuel. This is a program of which I, as a Liberal and as a Member of this Assembly, am truly proud. The inclusion of natural gas brought new life and new hope to many small towns that had given up all hope when our NDP friends were in power.

I am very happy to say at this time that a sign-up campaign has just been completed at Outlook for natural gas. The response was almost 100 per cent and they will be using gas for heating their homes and places of business by next fall. This program also includes five other villages; Sovereign, Milden, Conquest, in the Rosetown constituency; and Wiseton and Dinsmore in the Elrose constituency.

I'd also like to comment a little on the rural telephone companies, Mr. Speaker. I wish to commend the Minister and Saskatchewan Government Telephones for the approach being taken in telephone service to rural areas. The unserved area program announced by the Minister (Mr. Cameron) last year is certainly one that was long past due. Wide gaps existed in the rural areas where farmers were unable to secure telephones. These gaps are there because there are areas in which construction of lines and installation of service is just too expensive for rural telephone companies to handle. It was a welcome move when a decision was made to take some of the Corporation's profits and use them to bring service to rural areas.

We realize that the \$400 charged the farmer is must less than the actual cost. This cost is within a range the farmer can afford to pay. I was happy to hear the Minister announce that the farmer may now elect to pay the \$400 in instalments rather than cash. This change in policy gives an opportunity to every farmer to secure a telephone.

The Government is to be commended also for increasing the grants to rural telephone companies, particularly the grant for installing underground wiring. These rural telephone companies continue to play a vital role in supplying service to the rural areas. There are 950 rural telephone companies in Saskatchewan serving some 5,600 rural subscribers. These companies maintain some 55,000 pole-miles and 95,000 circuit-miles.

Many of the smaller companies find it increasingly difficult to continue to supply service. I believe the amalgamation of smaller companies is one answer to this problem. I notice the Department of Telephones assisted with the amalgamation of 12

companies during the past year. And I would suggest that where there is an exceptionally small company bordering an area where Saskatchewan Government Telephones is bringing in service under the unserved area program, that these companies be absorbed into the rural program. I am sure these extremely small companies would welcome such a move. Rural subscribers have welcomed SGTs stepped-up program of providing switching service for the rural companies. The CDO program has made it possible for some 34,000 rural subscribers to enjoy dial telephones the same as the urban centres.

Rural people today for the first time, are witnessing a deep concern for their problems by both the Department of Telephones and the Saskatchewan Government Telephones. This concern is backed up by cash to get the job done, backed-up programs designed to bring telephone service to rural areas equal to that of the urban centres of the province. Rural telephone subscribers have no reason to believe that they are any longer the forgotten people.

Mr. Speaker, I will support the motion.

An Hon. Member: — Atta boy, George.

Mr. I. C. Nollet (Cutknife): — Mr. Speaker, I wish first of all to make some comment on the remarks made to this House by the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. McFarlane). He seemed to take credit for a lot of things; he made a very poor case. This is possibly due to the fact that he didn't have much to report in terms of new programs or extensive progress in the field of agriculture.

He made some very peculiar observations and one was that it was a policy of the Socialists to leave the mineral resources of the province undeveloped. And they did this, he said for the past 20 years. I would suggest to him, Mr. Speaker, that he read this particular publication put out by the Minister of the Department of Mineral Resources (Mr. Cameron) under the signatures of the Minister and the Deputy Minister, and read, and find out for yourself, Sir, as to whether there was any regression or any reluctance to develop the mineral resources of this province.

Mr. Speaker, I get a little sick and tired of this kind of talk which is simple nonsense coming from the Members opposite, Mr. Speaker. He also took great credit for the water and sewage program for our villages, towns, and hamlets under the Family Farm Improvement Branch which as everyone knows was not initiated by this Administration. We were extending our services right along not only from the farmsteads but to the hamlets and I am glad to know that this program is expanding. I compliment the Minister for this and I also compliment him for not abolishing the Family Farm Improvement Branch as his Administration abolished Agricultural Machinery Testing. He doesn't talk about those things, Mr. Speaker.

He spoke a good deal about diversification, read a few

figures regarding increases in livestock population and the value of marketings and so on. There was nothing substantial in terms of increases in livestock, as the annual report of the Department of Agriculture will testify to. We all know that the value of livestock marketings are based on price and similarly livestock population changes, particularly sheep and hogs are based on the price of those products. When the prices are reasonably good you'll find an increase in production, but when the prices are bad, you'll find a sharp decrease in hog production particularly.

The trends downward were arrested. As a matter of fact, the hog population of this province was higher in 1964 than it was in 1965. We've had our ups and downs. But these are not major points at all that determine over a long-term period whether or not we are in fact achieving some success in diversifying our agricultural economy. And I will deal with that in greater detail further along in my remarks.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to take a look at the Budget delivered by the Premier and refer to some of the passages contained in the Budget Address. They are quite outstanding passages. One says and the Premier states:

It has been my experience that in government there is no more difficult or frustrating task than preparation of the Budget.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I sympathize with him in his frustration. I hear that he is now going to get someone else to do this chore. Finally, at long last the Premier realizes the difficulties in preparing the Budget, particularly a Budget that would call, as he promised, for reductions in taxation and increases in services at the same time.

In another interesting passage, the Premier states:

In the process, any responsible Treasurer must remember that every dollar he spends must first be taken from the taxpayer whether individual or corporate.

Now, Mr. Speaker, may I add a word for the housewives too. Nothing has been done about children's clothing, children's shoes, but the sales tax has been raised on soaps, detergents and many other items that the housewife requires. He should bear this in mind.

He states further:

The Government, therefore, initially must make very effort to curtail unnecessary or unessential spending.

Now under this heading, I wondered if he would include marble floors for the Legislative Buildings, which certainly could have been deferred for a long, long time, or the purchase of an executive-type aircraft; all of this was unnecessary at the time. If the Premier really meant what he said when he went

to the electorate at the last general election, he would not have spent money in these particular directions.

I have something more to say a bit further on in regard to other expenditures.

I quote now, Mr. Speaker, from the Premier's Budget Address on page one when he says:

It is always easy to spend money particularly when it's someone else's.

This Budget certainly fits this observation. Spending someone else's money comes easily to the Premier. A year ago in a similar debate, I mentioned that, after promising the electorate he would reduce taxes by eliminating waste and providing administrative efficiency, the Premier has instead gone all out on a spending spree, such as this province has never previously experienced. This spending binge continues at an accelerated rate.

Mr. Speaker, in three short years, 1965-66, 1966-67, and now 1967-68, exclusive of supplementary estimates, the regular annual expenditure budget went up from \$214,400,000 in the 1964-65 fiscal year to approximately \$303,000,000 for this fiscal year, 1967-68, an increase of nearly \$90,000,000 or an average of \$30,000,000 a year.

The Premier has often stated that we should have a proper economic base to support substantial increases in our Budget. He also stated that private enterprise would provide this economic base from which the public treasurer would derive great revenue benefits. This has certainly not been realized. When one adds the supplementary Budget for the particular years which I mentioned, we find an increase of over \$95,000,000. I'm saying to this House that this kind of an unprecedented increase in expenditure is questionable in terms of whether the economy can support these huge increases. This no doubt is an election Budget and of this there is no doubt whatever. But if we have even an average crop year, next year, there is no doubt that substantial tax increases will be forthcoming. He's made an all-out effort, apparently on the eve of what many believe to be a general election to make it appear as though the entire economy of Saskatchewan can now provide not only the increased cost of services without substantial tax increases, but he has also proven in this Budget that no substantial tax reductions have as yet taken place.

Mr. Speaker, one relatively small item in the Budget speaks eloquently for the Premier's cavalier ability to promise one thing and then to do the direct opposite. After announcing a cut in expenditures in the Executive Council vote by reducing the number of Cabinet Ministers when he assumed office, he immediately proceeded to appoint a half a dozen or so additional understudies for each Minister plus additional staff for each Minister. In addition, he provides executive-type aircrafts and other frills for his own office in the traditional style of a true private

enterprise. So what do we find in the Executive Council vote? You guessed it, Mr. Speaker, an increase of \$665,000. Again I say that if the Premier was serious in his contentions that he would reduce expenditure and reduce taxes as a result of greater administrative efficiency, this has not been done. And the Executive Council vote itself bears eloquent witness to this fact.

A further interesting quote from the Premier's Budget Address is the following:

In this day and age we seem to have reached the point where the accepted normal and necessary phenomenon of competition for electoral support has been transformed into an unseemingly auction of favours.

This observation comes strangely from a man who has a special flare for auction of favours, when he auctioned off some \$8,000,000 of the taxpayers' money in homeowner grants in an apparent attempt to gain electoral support. He seems to like auctions. He also auctioned his campaign shoes during the last general election in Lloydminster as a political gimmick without any expected beneficial results. I doubt if he will have any more political success with his auction of homeowner grants, especially in the Lloydminster area where he arbitrarily denied these grants to homeowners in this particular area of the province, Mr. Speaker. All of this comes very peculiarly from a man who apparently frowns on putting out electoral auction appeals to the electors.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I do want to deal, to some extent, with agriculture. The contention has been that previously, little was done regarding this whole question of diversifying our agricultural economy. Hon. Members on the government side know full well that it was the policy of the previous Administration to bend every effort to not only diversify our agricultural economy, but our economy in general as well. I begin, Mr. Speaker, by stating, and I hope that the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. McFarlane) will take note of these observations and not continue his silly monotone, mumble-jumble, repetition of irrelevant facts and often distorted facts, more often making statements that have no foundation in fact whatever.

I begin, Mr. Speaker, by stating that in 1946 when I assumed the portfolio of Agriculture, the total budget of that department was \$800,000. In 1959 and 1960 this budget went up to \$11,000,000, still higher than the present agricultural budget being presented to this Legislature. The Minister of Agriculture doesn't need to get up and say that new records were established. New records were not established in this new Budget. As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, the percentage share of the budget to agriculture this year, is the lowest in years. And the Hon. Members opposite say agriculture has a priority. I should draw attention to the fact that in 1963, the budget for agriculture from revenue and capital expenditures, you will find nearly \$13,000,000. And we could add an item in the Budget

at the time of \$1,000,000 for the Veterinary College which would bring the budget up again. I haven't even counted that in because it's an allocation to the University of Saskatchewan. Now for some of the developments that took place since 1946, when the agriculture budget was \$800,000, land administration was transferred to Agriculture in 1947, after which these lands for the first time were classified for proper use involving classification of over 10,000,000 acres of Crown land, of which three and a quarter million acres were vacant in 1949. Since 1949, two and a quarter million acres of this vacant Crown land have been brought into use by long-term disposition, either for grazing or cultivation and at a nominal rental to encourage and improve production. In the case of grazing land, leases were encouraged to improve carrying capacity by rental and crop-share concessions. As a result of classification, all rentals were based on land productivity, and in the case of cultivation leases, the rental ranged from one-sixth to one-tenth crop share, depending on soil productivity. I say this is a very nominal rental in the interest of improving general agricultural income. Over 17,000 farmers benefited by acquiring Crown land on an individual lease basis. The individual lease policy played a significant role in encouraging cattle production.

I wish to make further observation, further comparative reference to the Liberal agricultural policy to promote diversification and expansion of the livestock industry. It was mentioned in the platform that special incentives would be provided in this direction. No real genuine incentives of any kind have taken place. The incentives have been directed towards the factory-type establishments by loans from SEDCO. Now may I observe here, Mr. Speaker, that I have some very sincere questions as to the value of providing loans to establish this type of industry in direct competition with what is termed the family farm unit. If we really mean that the family farm unit is a desirable type of productive unit, then I would think that we would give more emphasis to encouraging more production from the family farm unit.

I wish to make reference, Mr. Speaker, to the second plank of the Liberal agricultural platform, to revise existing farm legislation to provide more generous long-term loans at low interest rates for young farmers to begin farming. Where is that legislation? I haven't seen it. But there was legislation placed on the books of this province in 1964 which among other things provided a working agreement with Ottawa, but above all else, provided credit for small farmers to enable them to properly utilize community pasture and fodder projects made available specifically for their use. Not one cent has been loaned to these unfortunate farmers, particularly in the fringe areas of settlement in northern Saskatchewan and especially in northwest Saskatchewan to help them purchase livestock to place in these pastures. And I would hope that action will be taken in this direction. It was a most valuable adjunct to the entire program as well as the provincial pasture and fodder program and other programs as well. Another credit source made available under the previous Administration was under the Family Farm Credit

Agency. To be sure there weren't many loans made, but some 450 loans were made under that policy chiefly because the Federal Credit Corporation came into the field in a more realistic manner than previously to provide loans to farmers.

But, Mr. Speaker, there was a different type of credit made available, a very unique type of credit, to lessees of Crown land. In 1952 a new policy of making cash payments to the Crown lessees for clearing and breaking new land was introduced. Under this policy, well over \$10,000,000 was paid in cash and crop-share rental credits to assist a total of 5,164 Crown lessees in developing over 600,000 acres of land. This has proven to be one of the finest programs ever designed to enable young people of limited finances to become established on the land. In addition, Mr. Speaker, - and this is often not spoken of either - some \$10,000,000 of credit was advanced by the Saskatchewan Power corporation to help farmers finance their 50 per cent cost of rural power installation. This is not talked about much, but this was an excellent way of improving living conditions on the farm by assisting farmers to obtain electrical services. I don't hear anymore about that. Instead, Mr. Speaker, it is now indicated in this Budget, that instead of reducing power rates as was the case of the previous Administration, power rates will likely go up, because the Power Corporation is now considered to be a source of revenue, to finance some of the extravagant expenditures being made by the Premier of this province.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Nollet: — Oh, I can remember the Hon. Member for Gravelbourg (Mr. Coderre) standing up in this House, Mr. Speaker, and condemning the rural electrification program. He had the audacity, or should I say, if it's not unparliamentary, stupidity, Mr. Speaker,...

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Nollet: — ...to say to the farmers of this province, "Beware of these power lines. You might all get electrocuted."

Mr. Coderre: — I call you a liar on that subject, my friend.

Mr. Nollet: — In case of a sleet storm...

Mr. Coderre: — I call you a liar.

Mr. Speaker: — Order, order! Now I think we've about all we want of people calling each other liars in this Chamber and I ask the Member to withdraw the statement.

Mr. Coderre: — I withdraw the statement but I would like him to stick to the facts.

Mr. Nollet: — Well, Mr. Speaker, I wouldn't...

Mr. Coderre: — If you say it again, I'll say the same.

Mr. Nollet: — Mr. Speaker, he has repeated that if I...

Mr. Coderre: — If it makes you happy, I'll still withdraw it.

Mr. Nollet: — It is nice to see the Hon. Member for Gravelbourg disciplined one in a while.

Mr. Coderre: — Stick to the facts.

Mr. Nollet: — He did. He made the statement that there was every possibility of danger as a result of rural electrification.

Mr. Coderre: — I never have.

Mr. Nollet: — You go back in your speeches and look at your speeches and you will find that the...

Mr. Speaker: — Now I just hope that there won't be any more interjections. The Member for Gravelbourg hasn't spoken, but can refute the arguments of others when they come up in the debate in the proper way. This is the proper way to do this.

Mr. Nollet: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Well, I speak the truth and if you want to refute it, let the Hon. Member come up with some facts.

Mr. Coderre: — It is written on a balloon, it stretches.

Mr. Nollet: — Oh yes, it is written on the records of this House, Mr. Speaker. Now, Mr. Speaker, as my old friend, Mr. Danielson used to say, "Now then." In addition, Mr. Speaker, in six new settlement areas alone up to 1964, nearly \$2,000,000 was spent by the Department by way of loans and development under other policies to assist and establish young settlers in these new settlement areas. This program received more than its fair share of criticism from the Opposition during the period of development. Outside of these areas, Mr. Speaker, several million dollars were spent for drainage and flood control principally in the fringe areas of settlement to protect farmers against water damage. This was particularly pronounced in the middle and latter part of the 1950's.

In the Throne Speech of 1964, a new source of credit was made available which I have already mentioned under the Agriculture Rehabilitation and Development Act, in association with our pasture and fodder programs. This has not been implemented. I would ask the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. McFarlane) to tell the people of this province why it has not implemented this program, because in your platform you stated that low interest credit would be made available to young farmers to become established on the land. Here was an opportunity to provide, by means of loans, assistance to farmers to remain on the land who are already there and to also improve their income position in the process.

Well, the Minister made reference to the land sale policy. Again, Mr. Speaker, this is not new. My friends opposite are 20 years behind the times. Do they not know that in 1946 when the veterans lease agreement was instituted, it contained by tenure. Veteran lessees became eligible to purchase in 1956 and some 1,250 veterans have purchased their farm units totalling some 400,000 acres of land. The Minister doesn't need to release a press statement saying that now they have something great and new in having sold some 500,000 acres of Crown lands. The only thing new in their sale policy is the fact that the price of land was raised and the terms of the purchase agreement was made more difficult; higher interest rates, less favourable terms throughout. Regarding the veteran's lease, Mr. Speaker, there was never at any time, in the history of this province, a sale policy offered to Crown lessees on more favourable terms. It was offered with a provision of 10 per cent down, 3 ½ per cent simple interest. Let the Hon. Members opposite on the Government benches, match that if they are sincere in implementing their election promise of long-term credit at low-interest-rate loans to farmers.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Nollet: — In July, 1961, the option to purchase was extended to all Crown lessees, who held cultivation leases. In this regard my Liberal friends are behind three years. So there is nothing new in the area of providing the lessee with an opportunity to purchase his land holdings. Again, under this policy, sale prices were established on an equitable production valuation formula far below current land values. And as I said previously, the only difference now is the farmer must pay more, or the Crown lessee must pay more for the land he purchases. I'm not going to deal with land allocation policy. I think the Hon. Member for Arm River (Mr. Pederson) made a pretty good point.

But I would like to make an observation at this time on a remark made by the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. McFarlane) yesterday when he rose to speak and also made by the Hon. Member for Prince Albert (Mr. Steuart) when he stood up and said, "Toby, you had 2,500 acres or so of Crown land under lease," as though there was something sinister about this. The suggestion seemed to be – or you wouldn't have said it – that there was something

wrong about it.

Mr. D. G. Stuart (Minister of Natural Resources): — Just wanted...

Mr. Nollet: — May I inform the House Mr. Speaker, that this land that he speaks of was leased originally from the Dominion Government when it had control over land resources, back in 1922. And why he makes reference to this, I don't know, unless it's somehow to try to involve me with having done something that wasn't quite right. Well, Mr. Speaker, everyone knows throughout Saskatchewan that I had Crown land. Practically every livestock man knows that. I made no secret of it, so why should the Hon. Minister raise a matter of this kind in the House. And I would suggest to you people opposite, you should be the last ones to try to whitewash the Premier for an article appearing in the Canadian. You are experts at throwing mud. I have heard more mud thrown on Members on this side of the House, both when we were in the Government and now when we are the Opposition than that coming from this particular type of article. There was no comparison in the kind of character assassination carried on over the years, in this House, by Hon. Members opposite. You should be the last ones to try to whitewash your Premier, you should whitewash yourself and this goes for the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. McFarlane) too.

Mr. McFarlane: — You...

Mr. Nollet: — Never, yet, Mr. Speaker, have I reflected in this House on anyone's personal character, but I have had it done repeatedly by Hon. Members opposite.

Mr. McFarlane: — Well you...

Mr. Nollet: — What I said about land allocation are facts, Mr. Speaker. And when I spoke with regret, I said I spoke with regret, that one Member of this Legislature, before he was elected and when he was running as a candidate, endeavoured to get a piece of Crown land away from two of his neighbours who needed it very badly and I repeat that.

Mr. McFarlane: — He withdrew.

Mr. Nollet: — Yes he withdrew, but you withheld that lease from these two brothers...

Mr. McFarlane: — I wasn't the Minister.

Mr. Nollet: — Good excuse. Your predecessor admitted he had interfered...

Mr. McFarlane: — Your article inferred that.

Mr. Nollet: — ...and had it not been, Mr. Speaker, for the fact that the Department finally realized and the Minister finally realized that a legally binding commitment was made to those two your men, which couldn't be altered, that they had the right to go to any court in the land. You held it up for a year before the two successful lessees could utilize that land for grazing and they needed it very badly. Now, Mr. Speaker, this is no reflection, I made it very clear. It was just very wrong for anyone in the position of the Hon. Member to try and take a small quarter section of grazing land away from two or his neighbours who needed it so badly. I don't know what politics these two men were, I still don't. I never questioned anyone's politics, Mr. Speaker, when people came to me on appeals. Never once. But I can say this, that had these two men been the rankest Liberals in Saskatchewan, and active in the cause of the Liberal party, I would have certainly said they are the ones that should have had the land. There was no question about it.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Steuart: — Toby, the White Knight.

Mr. Nollet: — Mr. Speaker, now with reference to the Delta area, that is the Saskatchewan River Delta area often referred to as the Carrot River triangle. It has been referred to quite often in this House. As everyone knows, the initial steps for the development of this area were taken by the previous Administration in 1964 and they were taken then because they could not have been taken previously because the future development of this area depended on river control which was provided by the Squaw Rapids project, supplemented by the South Saskatchewan River Dam. After that it was generally accepted that a good look might be taken at this huge area of land as to possible development, both for agriculture and for wild life and other alternative uses. There is nothing new there at all, Mr. Speaker.

I wish to refer to another program in the election platform of the Liberal party at the last general election, which says they would inaugurate a vigorous program to build up feed and fodder reserves in wet years and to provide insurance against drought years. Well, we worked in both wet years and dry years, Mr. Speaker, in this particular direction. But again my Liberal friends are perhaps unaware that the objective expressed had been the basic policy of the Department of agriculture over the years, in fact for 18 years prior to 1964. And that innumerable financial incentive programs had been provided for and achieved a more stable agriculture economy and not without a good measure of success. For example, Mr. Speaker, we were able to surmount unharmed, the effects of one of the most severe droughts in Saskatchewan's history, in 1961. We not only maintained our basic cattle population, but have since continued to increase our cattle population. The income from livestock and livestock products in the drought year, 1961, reach \$185,000,000 or nearly 50 per cent of the cash income received from cereal grain. This

income insurance in the bad 1961 crop-failure year fully justified the expenditures made for developing increased acreages for pasture, fodder and fodder supplies to meet both the problem of drought and expanding cattle population.

May I just mention a few other incentive programs, that have accomplished this basic objective. I refer, for example, to the Department's forage crop program. Inaugurated in 1947 and up to 1964 some 63,000 orders were received from farmers for nearly 11,000,000 pounds of forage seed or enough to seed nearly 1,250,000 acres. A real accomplishment. In order to provide alfalfa seed of a suitable variety for Saskatchewan conditions, arrangements were made to develop seed and multiply seed in California, with great success, Mr. Speaker. I don't know if this program is being continued or not. It probably went by the wayside as many others have. This was for the purpose of producing Rambler alfalfa and our farmers made very good use of it. An earned assistance program for forage and pasture cooperatives was initiated, shortly after I assumed the portfolio of Agriculture. Under this policy, the Department pays 50 per cent of the development costs for cooperative or municipal pastures, including fencing, forage and water development. The total cost at March, 1963, was \$1,000,000 of which the Department paid over \$600,000. When I assumed the portfolio there were only three Provincial pastures when I left office, with a prediction that by 1966 there would be 51 pastures to provide grazing for 57,000 cattle and services for nearly 4,000 patrons. I hope this objective is reached, and I am pleased to note that this program is being proceeded with. I note when the Minister announced the opening of new pastures, I think all but one of them were pastures developed under the CCF Administration.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Nollet: — There were three sheep pastures mentioned. All three of them were in operation for cattle previously, and I welcome the idea of providing pastures exclusively for sheep. This is not to say that sheep have not been grazed in community pastures before. They have been. This is not new. I would hope that by now the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. McFarlane) has corrected the Premier when he said in his Budget Address that they had received 7,000 applications from sheep farmers to put sheep in community pastures. When I questioned him on that figure, he repeated it again. What he meant to say, I think, was 7,000 sheep, Mr. Speaker. If he is that far wrong on a simple statistic, how far out can he be on the Budget?

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Nollet: — Yes, well, it was a case that the farmer had to submit a separate application for each sheep. Shall I call it 5:30, Mr. Speaker?

The Assembly recessed at 5:30 o'clock until 7:30 o'clock p.m.

Mr. Nollet: — Mr. Speaker, before I called it 5:30, I was speaking about various earned assistance policies in the Department of Agriculture. When I was Minister of that Department, I especially mentioned the earned assistance program for the establishment of cooperative and municipal and provincial pastures. I mentioned that there were only about three of such pastures in the province to begin with and to date as a result of that assistance there are now some 120 cooperative and municipally operated community pastures. I mentioned that these cooperative pastures provided grazing facilities for some 20,000 head of livestock and serviced some 1,600 patrons. I also mentioned that, in addition to the earned assistance program for the establishment of cooperative pastures, the Agricultural Representative Branch had spent, up to 1964, over \$2,000,00 on other types of earned assistance policies; weed control, regrassing of road sides, erosion-control projects and what have you. I also referred to the part played by the Lands Branch itself in the establishment of Provincial pastures. I mentioned there were only one or two pastures of this kind in the province that are through the portfolio of agriculture, including the big Matador pasture and I mentioned that the Lands Branch itself since our community pasture program was instituted had spent well over \$2,700,000 to help establish and operate Provincial pastures. I mentioned that there were over 40,000 head of cattle grazed in such pastures serving some 2,600 patrons, which makes a total of well over 6,000 patrons provided with pasture facilities by way of cooperative or provincial pastures. I mentioned that when I left the Department we had already established some 35 Provincial pastures and that we anticipated that under the ARDA program, the expansion in the years ahead would by 1965 increase the number of pastures to some 44 and the number of cattle to be grazed in such pastures to 51,000 and that by 1966, there would be 51 pastures to provide grazing for 57,000 head of cattle. I don't think that this objective has as yet been reached. I hope that the Department of Agriculture will reach this objective.

Mr. E. Kramer (The Battlefords): — Slow'em down, slow'em down.

Mr. Nollet: — We will not slow down this program but expand it so that full advantage can be taken of the ARDA assistance available. Previously if land purchase was made, the province had to assume the total cost responsibility. Where pasture improvement, water development and fencing headquarters were involved, the Province had to pay the full cost. Under the ARDA agreement as everyone knows, the Federal Government's share of the cost of land acquisition and share of the cost of development are on a fifty-fifty basis with the Province. Incidentally, Mr. Speaker, I think that I can take some credit for convincing the ARDA people at that time, the Hon. A. Hamilton, that the ARDA program should be extended to this type of assistance and that any other application of the ARDA program as then existed, would not be adequate to the situation here in Saskatchewan. We were also able to obtain assistance from ARDA for drainage development and other types of land reclamation as well. This has all been to the good, and I hope the programs will be continued.

Now in addition to the monies spent under earned assistance for cooperative pastures within the Land Branch itself, the Conservation and Development Branch also gave a major contribution towards the diversification of our agricultural economy. This branch was set up in 1949 and the primary purpose was to reclaim and utilize land for increased agricultural production by drainage, by irrigation and dryland development. Its primary activities were directed towards expanding livestock production. From 1949 to March 31, 1963 (I'm modestly leaving off one year, Mr. Speaker,) this Branch alone spent very nearly \$20,000,000 for the purpose of irrigation development, dryland reclamation and drainage reclamation. In addition, this Branch cleared and broke some 96,000 acres of land contained with Provincial community pastures. It constructed very nearly 1,400 miles of fences and construction well over 1,300 miles of irrigation and drainage ditches in that period of time. So it can't be said that these programs were not beneficial or that the previous Administration turned a deaf ear to diversifying our agricultural economy. I should mention in respect to drainage and irrigation reclamation, some 209,000 acres of land were slated for or assisted for irrigation development alone. This area of irrigation acreage was contained within the boundaries of some 46 water users' districts located throughout the province.

In addition we had a tree-planting program carried out by the Conservation and Development Branch. It had planted very nearly 800,000 trees to control soil erosion. And of course one of the earned assistance programs was our tree-planting program for road side, farmstead shelter belts as well as for field shelter belts. I can recall that in one district alone, over 800 miles of trees were planted in one season.

In respect to veterinary services, Mr. Speaker, the Veterinary Service District Act was padded in 1945. There were two districts in operation in 1945-46, but there are now over 47 districts in operation. And, I wish to say, however, if the CCF are as I hope they will be, represented-elected to be the Government of this province, further financial assistance will be made available to veterinary service districts to establish veterinary clinics within these districts, all of which we feel would more adequately service the needs of our livestock industry. Veterinary scholarships, Mr. Speaker, were commenced in the year 1945-46 and the total bursaries paid to Saskatchewan students attending the Veterinary College at Guelph were well over the \$100,000 mark by 1943. And this of course is by no means completely adequate. In 1963, we announced that a Veterinary College would be established on the university campus at Saskatoon and this is now being proceeded with. I do hope that the Government in the interval between now and the next Provincial election will endeavour to have the Federal Government establish a Federal Animal Disease Laboratory in conjunction with the Veterinary College on the Saskatoon campus. This would be an ideal location for it since the Federal Health of Animals Branch has anticipated the need for another animal diseases laboratory for Western Canada. Surely no more suitable place could be found in relation to livestock population than on the campus at the

University of Saskatoon where the Veterinary College is located. In animal disease control, we made good progress. We became one of the first TB-free provinces and one of the first Bangs-Free provinces, Mr. Speaker, in the ten years of my office as Minister when the CCF Government is represented-elected to be the Government of this province, we will represented-establish the agricultural machinery testing service.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Nollet: — I'm glad to get the applause from the Hon. Member for Prince Albert (Mr. Steuart) and I hope that he can influence the Premier in beating us to the draw, so to speak, and represented-establish this very valuable service.

Mr. Steuart: — It's all your imagination, Toby.

Mr. Nollet: — Mr. Speaker, we will certainly endeavour once again to have the other provinces cooperate with us as well as the Federal Government in the establishment of an adequate farm machinery testing service. I take some encouragement in the fact that the Manitoba Legislature is now investigating the possibility of establishing a testing service in the Province of Manitoba, so I would hope that this type of service will be represented-established. I can say this that, if the CCF Government is elected again, it will be represented-established, Mr. Speaker.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Nollet: — We also undertook, as every one knows, the establishment of a finishing feedlot on the university campus of Saskatoon, a feed-testing station and had planned on the testing station for purebred cattle. This has now been done. I appreciate this very much as I know the farmers of these provinces do, and more particularly the soil-testing service, which was a pet project of mine. I think had we been represented-elected in 1964, the soil-testing service would definitely have taken shape because we had it in our books to establish such a service, a most valuable service, one in which Saskatchewan lagged a bit — Alberta was a bit ahead of us on this — but I do hope that we rapidly catch up in this particular field of activity. But I would not agree with the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. McFarlane) too much that one of the most beneficial results of this soil-testing service will be increased fertilizer sales. I would hope that improved knowledge to the farmer of the type and quantity of fertilizer he needs for a given type of soil would be far more beneficial as far as the farmer is concerned.

There was established in the Department of agriculture in 1964, a new Economy and Research Branch, and I'm glad to see that this service has been continued. As everyone knows too,

the Department of agriculture provided research assistance to the University by the way of grants and for other fields of agricultural production research.

Mr. Speaker, there are two programs which were instituted by the previous Administration under so-called Socialist stagnation and regimentation and all the rest of it. These were the Family Farm Improvement Branch which together with the rural electrification program has done more than anything else to keep farmers on the land, to make rural life more pleasant, to make the work of the farmers much more easy, particularly during this period of labour shortages than any other factor that I can think of. And, Mr. Speaker, I would say now again that, if the CCF is represented-elected to be the Government of the province, we will expand the activities of the Family Farm improvement Branch to consist of assisting farmers in the design of homes, the design of the farmstead layout and more particularly, the design and financial assistance for the establishment of specialized family farm production units, either for hog production, poultry production or dairy production.

We know, Mr. Speaker, that agriculture is becoming more and more specialized, but we are concerned as to how it will become specialized. We feel that the best and most efficient and most desirable type of specialized production unit should be the Family Farm Unit. If, Mr. Speaker, we do not accept that kind of policy and go on giving financial assistance to huge specialized factory-type production units, we are going not only to destroy to a greater degree the family farm, but we are going to make it impossible for the family farm to compete. The family farm will then merely be the chores boy for providing feed stuffs to the factory-type production establishment. And I don't think that's good. I don't think it will be good at all for local urban communities who already have great fears as to their future. One can speak to any small town businessman and he will tell you that he is more worried about rural depopulation than even the farmer himself is worried. I'm told by small businessmen who wish to sell out their establishments in small towns they can't find a buyer because any prospective buyer can't get credit to buy a store, a garage, or a business of any kind in some of our rural centres because of the adverse trend of rural depopulation.

An Hon. Member: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Nollet: — In regard to crop insurance, this was also inaugurated by the previous Administration and I was happy when the Federal Government came into the picture and accepted the responsibility for assuming some of the losses incurred as well as paying towards the premiums. This permitted a more rapid expansion of crop insurance. I can say this, that, if and when the CCF Government is represented-elected to be the Government of this province, we will expand the crop insurance program still further to include livestock, Mr. Speaker, in such a program.

Mr. Steuart: — ...20 years.

Mr. Nollet: — It won't be 20 years. I don't think it will be too long. That all depends upon the judgement of the Hon. Members opposite.

An Hon. Member: — Forty years.

Mr. I. H. MacDougall (Souris-Estevan): — How long do you expect to live, Toby?

Mr. Nollet: — Well whenever it comes. I never speculate, Mr. Speaker, about elections as to when they will take place or what the outcome might be. I'm concerned about providing the people of this province with a realistic program that will continue the progressive development that has taken place, as my friends opposite say, "in the 20-year period from 1944-64." We will continue that kind of progressive economic development and social progress for our province. I believe, Mr. Speaker, when you cast aside all of the political shouting, no one can deny that those 20 years were the best years of balanced progress in the history of Saskatchewan and we will again provide the people of this province with a similar responsible progressive government, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. MacDougall: — Mr. Speaker, I didn't agree with you.

Mr. Nollet: — Mr. Speaker, there's another field that is most vital to agricultural diversification and agricultural prosperity and also the related matter of rural depopulation, and that's the big problem of farm income. I admit when I talk about it that this area belongs primarily to the Federal field. When we have a CCF Government in this province again, Mr. Speaker, we will urge upon the Federal Government a realistic and practical marketing and farm income policy for the entire Canadian agricultural industry. We will ask that this problem be dealt with in total and we will extend our willingness to cooperate in this area. We know, Mr. Speaker, that never as yet, in this so-called prosperous period, has the total put into the agricultural industry in terms of expenses balanced with the total income that should have gone into this industry. In order to balance the books for the agricultural industry to place it on a paying basis, it will be necessary, in my view, that the Federal Government itself assume its responsibility for fixing farm prices for all farm commodities and maintain them in proper relationship to one another, particularly feed prices in relation to the price of livestock, dairy, and poultry products. If such a policy were implemented, we would have no difficulty at all in diversifying and balancing out our agricultural production program. The bug-bear is fluctuating prices, lower prices and high farm costs. This must be corrected and I'm convinced, Mr. Speaker, that before long, as a result of pressure from the farm organizations

and others. I note with a degree of encouragement that the Premier of the Province of Manitoba has also urged a Federal-Provincial conference to pound out a sound agricultural policy for Canada – it's long overdue.

For too long have the farmers of this country subsidized cheap products for the benefit of processors, distributors and monopoly profit-seeking enterprises so there has not been any great benefit to the consumer because of the growing gap between what the farmer gets and what the consumer pays. This area will certainly have to be regulated. I can see no justification in modern society for any commercial firm engaging in the enterprise of making huge profits on a commodity that is so vital to human life. In the case of fluid milk control of prices and industry regulatory control too are well established because milk is a vital food substance. This was done in order to guarantee an ample supply and to also guarantee that the consumers would not be paying an exorbitant price for it. I think the same must be done for all foods, there's really no difference. Instead of wide open commercial competition, therefore governments in terms of economic planning must set desirable social objectives. I can't see how we can avoid having the Government engage more and more in protecting the interest of other people. When I say people in this context, I think primarily of farmers and consumers and this includes all of us. It seems to me that anyone that goes out on a limb under the circumstances that exist today and says we are going to have all-out unrestricted private enterprise is barking up the wrong tree, Mr. Speaker. There are many business organizations and businessmen that realize the need for economic planning and, Mr. Speaker, this is not Socialism. I nor anyone else should be doctrinaire about anything. This is just good common sense and I get a little weary and tired of our friends opposite trying to frighten people away by using the word "Socialism" in a manner that is derogatory and thus try to make it appear to be something dangerous. It's not Socialism, it's not any other 'ism, but just common sense that we do some planning in the interests of all our people.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Nollet: — So we will press the Government at Ottawa for a farm marketing and income policy that will guarantee the farmers an assured income much the same as some of the workers are getting now in terms of minimum wage and also give them a form of workmen's compensation benefits. Why should the farmer because he is self-employed be denied these rights? There's no good legitimate reason, Mr. Speaker. I've mentioned that we would expand the Family Farm Improvement Branch and we would also urge the Federal Government and extend our cooperation for a low-cost housing program which is greatly needed, Mr. Speaker, and a housing program for the small urban centres as well, and also in the interest of our young farmer who wish to go on the land where because of high prices they are unable to buy. We would propose the creation of a public agency to purchase, when available, farm lands for subsequent resale or lease to farmers

requiring more land or to develop an economic unit or for the establishment of a complete farm unit. This type of action is long overdue. Instead of selling a lot of these lands and taking pride in it, I think we should be thinking more in terms of letting the farmer decide without encouraging him as to whether he wants to lease or whether he wants to buy. I think this should be in the judgement of the farmer himself. We would also certainly provide greater encouragement for the cooperative use of farm machinery, Mr. Speaker. It's in this area that great improvement can be made by farmers in terms of improving their income position and at the same time having all the benefits of modern mechanization. As I mentioned already, we would establish at once credit for the sub-marginal farmers, particularly on the fringes of settlement, a credit program that would enable them to buy livestock to place in provincial pastures, and to also clear and break more land on their own farmstead. We would also provide credit programs for the establishment of young farmers where other credit programs do not fulfil the needs. In the case of irrigation, we would certainly assume greater responsibility for the costs of initial development of irrigation over the first ten or twenty years. This is a slow and expensive process and we know to that if proper incentive programs are given, farmers will irrigate willingly. We would as soon as possible do away with a dictatorship-type of irrigation district and add majority farmer representation on the District Irrigation Boards as quickly as possible. And we would provide long-term credit and proper farm irrigation management services for the development of irrigation farms. Much of this has probably been said by other political parties, but I can say, Mr. Speaker, when we make these statements and commitments, we will fulfil them. This is the difference.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Nollet: — There's also the Delta area or the Carrot River triangle, as it is often referred to and which I have already mentioned. We would proceed with this development but in a manner that would provide the native people with the first opportunity of deriving benefits either from agricultural development or improved fur production in that area. We would very meticulously see to it that no land misuse takes place, that no lands would be drained or developed that are absolutely not suitable for agricultural production. I think this would be a serious mistake. I've had some experience in the development of new settlement projects in that area of the province, and I know some of the hardships that can be created by improper drainage, premature settlement before good drainage is provided and even after drainage is provided. So, we would have to proceed carefully with all information available in order that no mistakes are made in the development of this total area. There's another field in which expansion can take place and that is specialized crop growing — I'm thinking here of vegetable production. We would certainly give assistance, special assistance to those farmers who want to engage in vegetable production in a specialized way and do, and take such other measures, financial and otherwise, which will

provide the consumers of Saskatchewan with Saskatchewan-grown vegetable products.

The matter of rail line abandonment is urgent too. And here, Mr. Speaker, if we are elected to be the Government of this province, we would strongly urge and fight for a proper assessment before any abandonment whatever takes place, not only an examination of the criteria useful to the railroads, but criteria that are useful in terms of local community benefits. And where rail lines are abandoned, Mr. Speaker, we would insist that the Federal Government pay some of the alternative costs or some of the costs of alternative types of communication, Mr. Speaker, even to the extent of compensating the farmer for extra costs in connection with hauling his produce to the market. Again, I'm afraid, Mr. Speaker, that this will be an area where the farmer will again bear all the costs. It might be more economical from the railroad's point of view, perhaps from the national point of view, but for heaven's sake, let's not develop a kind of policy and reluctance to fight any kind of program that will injure the farmer and handicap him more than he has been handicapped already.

I bear in mind here, Mr. Speaker, that these railway companies have received very generous subsidies initially. They were given a great portion of the land and natural resources of Western Canada to provide these services. They built these lines and, believe me, if there's any subsidy required, it should be taken from some of these resources that are a major source of revenue to the railway companies concerned, Mr. Speaker.

I'm reminded again, Mr. Speaker, of a matter which I referred to once and I shall refer to again, to a statement made by the Hon. Minister of Agriculture (Mr. McFarlane). He made this outlandish statement which was a repetition of similar statements constantly made by the Members opposite in regard to Socialist stagnation. He actually had the audacity and the nerve, Mr. Speaker, to stand up and say I wouldn't say something because of stupidity, because I think the man has a reasonable degree of intelligence but he uses it very poorly at times. And I think he's a bit extravagant with the use of his intelligence.

I have here in my hand a chronological record of mining events in Saskatchewan put out by the Department of Mineral Resources by Hon. A. C. Cameron and his Deputy Minister. It makes interesting reading and I commend it to the Hon. Members opposite. I hope that when you read this that you will not go about and say that the Socialists deliberately refrained from encouraging the development of our natural resources. Anyone would of course be absolutely stupid to want to do a think like that. He suggested that we prefer to have these resources remain under the ground. Mr. Speaker, nothing could be further from the truth or further from an intelligent judgement. In 1944, the first oil discovery in commercial quantities was made in the Lloydminster area. In 1945 National Grant No. 1 was spudded in at Lloydminster in April of that year. Gas was discovered at Unity in the same year. In 1945 the first commercial oil production took place in this first

discovery well in the Lloydminster area. The Unity gas utility commenced operation in November of that year. In 1946, potash was discovered at a dept of 3,466 feet in the Unity area. In 1947, Prairie Salt (Domtar) commenced exploration for salt in the Unity area. The south main shaft of the Hudson Bay Mining and Smelting Company in Saskatchewan was completed to the 4,075 foot level and yes, and they did this despite the fact that we raised royalty. The royalty previously was a give-away, and royalty should have been raised. There were no objections by the company. A new oil producing field was discovered in the Lone Rock area in 1947. In 1948, the Federal ban on uranium staking was lifted. The Eldorado Mining and Refining Company's Martin Lake mine became the first underground operation for the development of uranium in Saskatchewan. In 1948 – I hope the Minister when he takes his seat will listen to this – the first shipment of sodium sulphate from the Saskatchewan Mineral Plant at Chaplin took place, a plant that even the Premier would like to dispose of although he announced in his Budget Address that it had made a good profit. It's strange, Mr. Speaker, that he should take this nasty Socialist revenue from such a thing as a sulphate plant established by a previous so-called Socialist government. In 1949, Prairie Salt commenced production at Unity. In 1950, Eldorado Mining and Refining Company announced a plan for a 500-ton mill to process uranium ore. In 1951, Coleville No. 1 discovered oil in the Coleville-Smiley area, and the first production took place later that year. Coleville No. 1 discovered gas, September 4, 1951. A new oil-producing field was located in the Coleville-Smiley area. The first potash exploration permit was awarded to Western Potash Corporation away back in 1951. They weren't afraid of the Socialists. None of them were. Saskatoon Pipe Line, Interprovincial Pipe Line laid to Saskatoon was constructed in 1952. And the first production of Imperial-Wapella occurred in 1952 in Section 9, Township 33, Range 14, west of the first. Gunnar Mines also found uranium at Beaver Lodge. Western Potash Continental commenced shaft construction at Unity and as it was proceeded with they encountered difficulties but it was commenced in 1952.

An Hon. Member: — ...but the Liberals...

Mr. Nollet: — New oil-producing fields established were Fosterton, Eastend, Hoosier, Midway and Wapella in 1952. Some 7,000 mineral claims were recorded in the Lake Athabasca area. Uranium City was surveyed and designated. In 1953, the Saskatchewan Power Corporation's Gas Pipe Line from Brock to Saskatoon was completed in October. The Department of Mineral Resources was established as a result of this progress in 1953. The South Saskatchewan Pipe Line from Fosterton to Regina was constructed in 1953. In 1953, Eldorado Mining and Refining commenced production in the Uranium Act Mine. New producing oil fields at Cantuar, Dollard, Forget, Gull Lake, Java, Leon Lake, Midale, Rapdon, Radcliffe, and Success were established. It doesn't look like Socialist stagnation. My friend the Minister of agriculture (Mr. McFarlane) said when, this type of regression took place, we weren't interested in having development take place. And in 1952, some 7,000

mining claims were recorded in the Lake Athabasca area. No mineral interest in the North? Of course there was mineral interest in the North, in 1953, 14,000 claims were recorded in the Lake Athabasca area. In 1954, Hoosier No. 6-31 discovered gas on March 27th and mid-Saskatchewan pipeline, Smiley to Interprovincial Pipeline was constructed. Gunnar was developing open pit and stock piling of uranium ore in the North. The Hudson Bay Mining and Smelting Company commenced the shaft on the Coronation Mine, southwest of Flin Flon in Saskatchewan. They weren't afraid. And I could go on and on, Mr. Speaker, to list chronologically the development of mineral and oil resources in this province from the period 1944 to 1964.

We did make great progress. How else could we have expanded the services to Saskatchewan people in terms of rebuilding hospitals, rebuilding the little red schoolhouses all over the province? And in the North, schoolhouses and hospitals for the first time. How could we have built the University Hospital, Mr. Speaker,? How could we have provided the hospitalisation plan and the Medicare plan if there was stagnation in Saskatchewan. I would hope that the Liberals continue this talk because the people of Saskatchewan are getting sick and tired of it, Mr. Speaker. And now, Mr. Speaker, we have the example of the Premier of this province trying to continue this fabrication that we had Socialist stagnation, now instant prosperity, a man who wanted to save money, economize, reduce taxes. What do we find? Well, I have a high note to close on here, Mr. Speaker, by a quotation from his Address, when he says this – it's on Page 2:

It is the belief of the Government that after 20 years of Socialism, taxes in Saskatchewan are still dangerously high as compared to other parts of Canada.

Mr. Speaker, this statement is a complete admission of failure. After three years, on the contrary, Mr. Speaker, of so-called Liberal Administration, taxes are still higher.

Mr. Thatcher: — You had 20 years...

Mr. Nollet: — ...taxes are still higher and a record increase in expenditures of nearly over \$90,000,000. This is the answer, Mr. Speaker.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Coderre: — Before the Hon. Member (Mr. Nollet) sits down, I was wondering if he would permit a question?

An Hon. Member: — He'll louse us all up and talk for another hour.

Mr. Coderre: — Would the hon. gentlemen quote me the date, the time and the place in regard to the statement that I was purported to have made in regards to the Power Corporation?

Mr. Nollet: — I'll have to look up the record. When I find it, I'll present it to him, Mr. Speaker,

Mr. Coderre: — Will the hon. gentlemen permit another question? Do you admit that you were stretching the truth a moment ago?

Mr. Nollet: — No, absolutely not. If this particular speech was recorded I'll find it. This is the statement the Hon. Member made and I am very delighted that he refers to me now as the Hon. Member and not a damned liar. No, I'll try and find it, but the Hon. Member stood in his place, with a little fear. I am wondering and for some reason...

Mr. Steuart: — Did you go to confession?

Mr. Nollet: — I am answering his question. Go ahead, Minister of Public Health.

Hon. G. B. Grant (Minister of Public Health): — Mr. Speaker, I would like to convey my thanks to the Hon. Member from Cutknife (Mr. Nollet) for making it possible for me to appear on tonight's program.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Grant: — I just trust that my delay was not such that he invaded the field of health because I would hate to miss any remarks he would have made in this regard. But earlier this afternoon in his reference to the Department of Agriculture, he did question whether SEDCO was making any loans to small hog farmers or operators and I can assure him that we are. SEDCO met this morning, we approved three hog loans, one was in the area of \$4,000. I think that is about as small a loan as one could expect in a hog operation so we are considering the small farmer who is interested in producing hogs.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Grant: — Mr. Speaker, I thought that in connection with the base hospital I had adequately spoken on this subject, but the Hon. Members from Regina West, North and East, seem to be born

pessimists and I am very sorry that the Hon. Members for Regina West, both Members, are unavoidably detained this evening as well, but he said that he will never see this base hospital. Well, I am very sorry that he is predicting his early demise because only his death or permanent removal from the city if going to prevent him from seeing this hospital. I can assure him that, even if he does move away from Regina, if he comes back, he will certainly see it in not too many years. The Hon. Lady Member (Mrs. Hunt) cited the Hartman report and indicated that her party, if in power, would have had the hospital built by now. I would remind the Opposition that I gave credit where credit was due in connection with the Hartman report. I would also remind the Hon. Members that while the report is most helpful there are several debatable recommendations which must be reconciled before construction commences. If our predecessors had barged ahead as the Hon. Lady Member indicated, it would not be the fine, coordinated, teaching, specialized hospital that is currently being planned. The Hon. Member from Arm River (Mr. Pederson) also suggested that he wasn't too optimistic because in the Budget Speech there was only mention made of some \$750,000 allocated for this project, but I would point out to him that, it has been \$1,450,000 that had been allocated in the last two years, and I personally am confident that funds will be available as the need develops.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Grant: — Mr. Speaker, 1966 has been a good year for the Province of Saskatchewan and its people. Many new records and new highs were achieved in almost all sectors of the Provincial economy. It amazes me to hear the Members opposite scrambling for statistics, percentages and facts to try to show that the Saskatchewan economy is not forging ahead. They rather remind me of a group of ostriches with their heads stuck in the sand, hoping that the developments taking place will magically disappear. I am sure that they are not fooling the people of Saskatchewan who can see for themselves the developments which are taking place.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to take a look at some of these steps forward which were taken in the Provincial economy during 1966. Now we won't take credit for the largest wheat crop in the history of the province, but we will admit that this certainly had something to do with the economy of the province. It is unfortunate that we can't take credit for it; if we could, we probably would. The personal income has reached a new level of \$2,000,000,000 compared with \$1,800,000,000 in 1965. Per capita personal income of \$2,178, the first time in the province's history that it has exceeded \$2,000. The previous high was in 1965 when the figure was \$1,931.

Mr. Steuart: — Toby, stay and hear the truth.

Mr. Grant: — Projected value of factory shipments were \$462,000,000 compared to \$428,000,000 the previous year. New capital

expenditures of \$891,000,000 compared with \$876,000,000 in 1965, and the total for new and repair capital expenditures is projected in excess of \$1,000,000,000 compared with \$977,000,000 in 1965. Value of construction work performed is expected to be up by \$73,000,000 over the 1965 figure. The total for 1965 was \$574,000,000. For 1966 it is estimated at \$647,000,000. Mineral production in 1966 estimated at \$360,600,000 compared to \$332,000,000 in 1965. Another new high in retail sales, \$1,312,000,000 in 1966, compared with \$1,239,000,000 in 1965.

All of these figures, Mr. Speaker, represent new highs in the province's economic history. Certainly this shows the economy of our province is surging ahead and the future even looks brighter.

But let's look at some of the specifics in resource and industrial development during the past year. Oil production, in 1966, 92,500,000 barrels, up from 87,789,000 the year before. Potash in 1966 is estimated at 3,300,000 tons of potash with a dollar value of \$83,000,000 from the three mines and refineries presently in production. Another five companies have initiated development projects, all of which will be in operation by 1970. We are confident that the near future will see more projects started, adding to this dynamic Provincial industry. The year, 1966 was a turning point for production of metallic minerals. This figure declined steadily during the 1960's but is now on an upswing. The total forecast for 1966 is \$40,000,000, compared with \$37,000,000 for 1965. The activity which is going on in this sector certainly indicates that this upturn will continue. I think it bears repeating that in forest production, the construction of the province's first pulp mill began in 1966, with initial production. This is a development which will make Prince Albert a major traffic, industrial and commercial centre of the North. Sodium sulphate, the past year has been a good one for the sodium sulphate processors. Sodium Sulphate Saskatchewan Limited, which late in 1965 announced establishment of a 50,000-ton operation at Alsask, carried out harvesting operations in 1966. Construction of the processing plant is well under way, equipment is being installed, and production is scheduled to commence early this year. Tombill Mines Limited, which in the spring of 1966 announced the establishment of a 100,000-ton facility at Cabri, also carried out harvesting operations last year and plans to be processing in 1968. A 150,000-ton operation is being established by Saskatchewan Minerals at Ingebright Lake, where two years harvesting has been completed. Production in the processing plant is to commence this year. Canada's only helium plant is expanding to triple its capacity in the Swift Current area.

In the field of secondary industry, Mr. Speaker, activity on this front has been equally vigorous during 1966. Some of the major developments during the year included a \$2,000,000 expansion at Interprovincial Steel, increasing the finished product capacity by 30,000 tons a year. In Saskatoon, to service the potash and mining industry, a company called Industrial Motor (Electric) Limited was established to rewind and service electric

motors used in these commercial enterprises. In Saskatoon also a \$5,500,000 project by British American Construction and Materials Limited to produce gypsum wall board and pre-cast and pre-stressed concrete products. Production commenced in Saskatchewan's first winery in the new \$750,000 plant of Castle Wines at Moose Jaw. An expansion program which doubled the size of its operation was completed by Saskatchewan Steel Fabricators in Regina. International Telephone and Telegraph commenced operations in a Regina plant. At Tree Island Steel, a wire plant announced for Moose Jaw, construction is to commence this spring and be in operation before the year-end. There have been many smaller manufacturing operations commenced or expanded, creating employment and adding to our economy.

Just a word about the Department of Industry and Commerce. Mr. Speaker, even with the major resource developments taking place in Saskatchewan, and this in turn opening up new secondary manufacturing and service industry possibilities, we cannot expect that these will be automatically filled by either new or existing industries in Saskatchewan. Competition for industrial development in North America is extremely fierce. New industry must be actively sought out and thoroughly convinced of the economics of a new location, as well as of the fact that the area has the right atmosphere and the right conditions for growth. Also existing local industry must be made aware of and fully informed on the opportunities which exist. The prime purpose of any industrial development program is that of attracting investment capital to the area through the expansion of existing and creation of new enterprises. The Government's role in this endeavour should be that of a catalyst, facilitating development through the creation of a proper investment climate, the provision of justifiable incentives, the identification and documentation of investment opportunities, and the active promotion of these opportunities to potential investors.

The Department of Industry and Commerce plays a vital role in ensuring that opportunities are identified and actively brought to the attention of existing industry and potential investors in Saskatchewan. The overall represented-organization of the Department has been in effect for the past year, with the Department acting as the prime point of contact between the Government and industry. In addition to aggressively promote the further development of industry, business and tourism in Saskatchewan, a major program to be undertaken by the Department this year, Mr. Speaker, is entitled "Index '67", an industrial exposition and mineral symposium, scheduled for Regina this fall. This will be an industrial show and conference encompassing the entire mineral, secondary and service industries in the province. This conference being planned on an even more ambitious scale than the Potash Show in 1965, will be compulsory-hosted by the city of Regina. Indications to date show that delegates will be represented from many countries and will even exceed the registration of the Potash Show which was in excess of 1,100.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Grant: — Hotel accommodation in the

city is already pretty solidly booked and enquiries for display footage are in the hundreds and pre-registration response is excellent. I believe, Mr. Speaker, that the response which we are receiving for this conference and show is a further indication of the interest being shown in the industrial and economic growth of Saskatchewan. Realizing the importance of regional and community development, the Department has launched a wide-spread campaign aimed at expanding the industrial, commercial and tourist potential of more than 100 smaller communities across the province. Department consultants have met with civic and local business leaders advising on the setting up of industrial development committees. They have addressed community meetings, where requested, outlining guide lines in community economic expansion.

A comprehensive survey of centres having populations over 1,200 was undertaken by the Department. These surveys include information on facilities presently available, projects planned for community development, labour force, highways, distribution facilities, markets, educational, cultural and recreational facilities. This data is made available to the respective communities to assist with their own promotion, as well as providing guide lines in their development plans. In addition, they are made available to all industries expressing interest in a Saskatchewan location. It is planned to continue updating and broadening these surveys to include other communities, as well as adding more detailed information of value to the communities and to industry.

The Department also plans, during the coming year, to initiate a number of regional studies of various areas in the province. These studies will be designed to assess the economic opportunities in the area, as well as to serve as guide lines for communities in their economic development plans.

Mr. Speaker, tourism is fastly becoming one of Canada's major industries, in spite of what the Hon. Member from Cutknife (Mr. Nollet) had to say about it this afternoon. But like any industrial development, it is one of the most competitive businesses in north America with every state, province and community competing for the tourist dollar. Saskatchewan has much to offer the vacationer, whatever his taste might be, in vacation entertainment. It is becoming apparent, Mr. Speaker, from the increasing interest being expressed at sportsmen's shows across Canada and the united States, from the considerably increased volume of tourist information requests received by the Department, and by the number of articles carried in magazines and periodicals that Saskatchewan today is recognized as a major vacation centre. but we know there is much to be done before our full tourist potential is realized, and the Department, along with the private tourist sector, intends to continue accelerating new and existing promotional programs towards this end. In line with this, The Saskatchewan Tourist Association, yesterday in Saskatoon, and the day before in Regina, announced an aggressive program of promotion as far as the private tourist sector is concerned. We are fortunate, this year, Mr. Speaker, in having

obtained the Outdoor Writers of America Convention, which will be held in Waskesiu in June. This convention will bring to our province a large number of top tourist and outdoor writers, photographers and broadcasters, from all over the North American continent to see for themselves the tremendous beauty and scope of Saskatchewan vacation spots. We are confident that, through the stories, articles, TV programs and so on, that these people will produce from this convention, it will result in incalculable good publicity for this province. This is the first time since 1945 that this Association has held its convention outside the United States, and the first time it has been held at other than a major resort hotel. So we think this is pretty important to attract this influential group to our province in our Centennial Year.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Grant: — Mr. Speaker, I would like to give credit to the Department staff, the Tourism Department, who actively went after, promoted and sold the Association on holding their convention in Saskatchewan and I look forward to great results from this.

Mr. Speaker, the Department is engaged in many other programs aimed at achieving the maximum industrial and tourist development in our province. Some of these programs include, a recent British Trade Conference promoted by the Department which was not only a first but proved most successful. This conference brought together British suppliers and British agents and prospective Western Canada purchasers. I am optimistic that much good will result from this detailed examination of ways and means of increasing the purchase of British goods. We received excellent cooperation from our neighbouring province on this promotion, promotion of increased trade through the Port of Churchill. In this regard, Mr. Speaker, we are confident that the increased flow of traffic through this port, the improvement of facilities and the introduction of more realistic freight rates on the route, will greatly assist Western Canadian markets. The Department has taken the lead, joined by Alberta and Manitoba, in actively and aggressively working toward this end. Export assistance by the Department is being accelerated to assist local manufacturers in broadening their market horizons through personal contact, external exhibits and industry tours. The Department is constantly reviewing and recommending programs designed to assist the establishment of new and continued growth of existing industry.

Mr. Speaker, the development of Saskatchewan's industrial and tourist potential, the attraction of new industry, and the continued expansion of existing industry, is understandably a continuing and long-term program. I have pointed out that it is a highly competitive area, but one in which the Department of Industry and Commerce is geared to operate.

Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Provincial Treasurer (Premier Thatcher) has presented a Budget that is in keeping with the needs of our

province at this time. While Hon. Members of the Opposition sadly say that this Government has not provided leadership, what are the facts?

Taking our own Department, I cannot quote figures for 1963 because of the changed nature of the Department, but I can quote the tourism figures for 1963. The Department had a budget of \$110,000. The budget today is \$244,000.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Grant: — In 1964 the budget was less than \$300,000, but as I explained, it is difficult to break it down because of the difference of the nature in the Department. I'm sorry, it was less than \$500,000, correction there. In 1967, the entire budget for the Department is \$846,000, some increase of \$300,000 in two years, which I think speaks well of the Treasurer's Budget.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Grant: — The years 1965-66 and 1966-67 witnessed not only reduced taxes in this province, but expanded services. In 1967-68, while other provinces such as Ontario, Manitoba and others are increasing taxes in the major way, Saskatchewan is holding the line.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Grant: — While Ontario and Alberta, that prosperous province to the west, present deficit budgets, Saskatchewan presents a balanced Budget.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Grant: — Mr. Speaker, I contend that this Government has provided leadership in aid to education, leadership in an aggressive highway program, leadership in encouragement of industrial and business growth. The Budget as presented is what the people of this province want.

Mr. Speaker, I will be supporting the motion.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. R. H. Wooff (Turtleford): — It is not my intention to monopolize any great amount of time tonight. I do wish to spend a few moments on my own constituency and some of the problems that we still have in spite of the glowing story that we have just been listening to. Year by year, since the present Government came into office, I have written the Minister of Highways (Mr. Boldt) to remind him of the needs of our particular area. I will say this, Mr.

Speaker, that I have had courteous replies from the Minister on all occasions.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Wooff: — I do thank the former Minister for his courteous replies and attention to various matters that I have brought up. I am happy that No. 3 Highway was oiled last summer from Shellbrook to Spiritwood. I believe that I gave my thanks to the Minister, in one of my letters. However, Mr. Speaker, there is much in the boundaries of Turtleford constituency that still needs attention. Surely the oiling of No. 26 Highway should be on the schedule for this year of our Lord, 1967. Highway No. 24, north from Spiritwood to Leoville has been due for rebuilding for some time. It was on the list of the former Government. I would also like to raise the question of connecting roads from Leoville north to the Green Lake or Meadow Lake areas. This is another project that I have mentioned from time to time, Mr. Speaker. It would be a wonderful boost to the tourist trade to this particular region and it would add tremendously to the revenue for all those people who cater to this trade during the summer months.

I am sorry that I have to report Government timber policies have simply wiped out the timber business in the Leoville and many other local areas. Not only, Mr. Speaker, is the timber business and the revenue that it brought in gone, but many of the fringe areas farmers who supplemented their farm operation from the timber business, have also gone. Not just out of the community, Mr. Speaker, many of them have gone out of the province.

I have always been fascinated with the Premier's fallacious and oft repeated statements on the labour situation throughout our province. He repeats over and over again the same figures endeavouring to convince himself and his own group that they have used up the entire surplus labour force. And yet, Mr. Speaker, by the figures of its own Department of Labour there are some 7,000 people on unemployment insurance in the province at the present time. It is also a fact that once again teachers, nurses, and labouring people have annually left the province by thousands.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Wooff: — It is just as true that the Premier's tight construction policy has driven many of the skilled labour force outside our own borders. I say, let us fact it. It just means, Mr. Speaker, that we have a Liberal repetition of previous Liberal Administrations, with many of our people having left Saskatchewan. Then, Mr. Speaker, there is this small matter concerning our area of a bridge across the North Saskatchewan River, somewhere in the Lloydminster area. I'm not too clear yet as to just where. But you know this isn't the first Liberal bridge that we've had in sight up in that area.

Mr. Brockelbank (Kelsey): — Built of soap.

Mr. Wooff: — I remember some years ago we had a sort of commitment from the Federal Government that there would be some assistance forthcoming to put a bridge over the river at the Meridian. The then Minister of Agriculture had quite a little to do with it. He said he was quite willing to go ahead if one end of the bridge could be put in Alberta and the other end in Saskatchewan. Did you ever hear of such a fantastic way of saying “No.” We had a very clear and a very firm commitment that a bridge would be built, in the 1964 election, and construction would be in the fall of 1965. I hope, Mr. Speaker, after listening to the Hon. Minister of Public Health (Mr. Grant) that he has a much better record with his base hospital than he has had with the bridge in our part of the country.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Grant: — What bridge is this

Mr. W. J. Berezowsky (Cumberland): — East of Prince Albert.

Mr. Wooff: — I think once again, Mr. Speaker, we on this side of the House are going to be right. Promises such as this bridge are going to be good, for more than one Liberal election.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Wooff: — The Liberal party has been in power now in the Province of Saskatchewan for almost forty years and they haven't quite completed the first bridge paid for entirely out of Provincial funds under Liberal administration.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Wooff: — The Liberal party has been in power some 40 years and under its guidance the burden of debt has constantly been increased. Even, Mr. Speaker, when they got it handed to them on a platter like they did in 1964, they couldn't hold the line. But in spite of all that has been said, from the Government's side of the House, taxes and debt have both continued to rise. The Premier's housekeeping, Mr. Speaker, has been so bad, he now had to confiscate money out of the Power Corporation to bolster a deficit budget. Instead of reducing power rates, paying off the borrowings of this self-liquidating corporation, he now uses it for tax purposes. Mr. Speaker, ever since April, 1964, I have said that this was going to happen. My forecast was based entirely on the past performance of all reactionary groups who seem to have a grasping feeling when there is any money that they can't quite get their fingers into.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Wooff: — We had almost 50 years now of Liberal promises in the field of health services. Now when so much of what they promised has come to fruition, by other than Liberal Governments, the Premier could not keep his drug promise, even as a Centennial gift to the people of Saskatchewan. It is useless for the Premier to stand up and try to hide behind the cost of such a program, for an excuse. He knows perfectly well that the people of this province are paying for drugs every day. I have on my desk, Mr. Speaker, a little tube of salve as big as a cigar, that I paid \$4.45 for only the other day. And I submit, Mr. Speaker, that the Premier knew what the situation was when he made the commitment and he knew what he was going to do about it, simply nothing.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Wooff: — Some Liberals have dared to say that election promises are not necessarily made to keep. All I have to say is that this group is just a little more arrogant than the rest. It must be true, for this is the way they play it. But how much better, Mr. Speaker, is a Liberal promise in black and white over the signature of the Minister of the Crown.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Wooff: — Two years ago this spring, the Turtleford Hospital Board undertook to build an addition and renovate the old structure. They had a grant from the Provincial Government. They were allowed to sell a certain number of debentures and they had a grant from the National Department of Health, at that time under Miss Judy LaMarsh. This promise from the Federal Government was made in the spring of 1965. The Board on the strength of this commitment, by writing over the signature of the Minister, went ahead with their construction. One year later when it was necessary to get money to meet the contractor's account, they wrote asking for a percentage of it. And you can imagine how they felt when they received a reply stating that there had been an error in the amount that was supposed to have been stated in the Minister's letter, that the amount was some \$43,000 less than what it promised in the first place. By pressure, Mr. Speaker, they finally brought the figure down to \$23,000 from which the present Minister refuses to move. On top of this, because of the pressure by the Premier of Saskatchewan on the Local Government Board to refuse more debentures, unless he has relented on this lately, the Hospital Board find themselves in a very, very difficult position. In fact you can imagine the position any Hospital Board in a small community finds itself in facing such a situation. Such, Mr. Speaker, are the values of Liberal promises and commitments on the hustings or off the hustings verbal or in black and white.

I listened with some apprehensions, Mr. Speaker, to remarks regarding the draining of the Saskatchewan River Delta

Program. I have on my desk, here, a letter from a gentleman up in our part of the country, together with a clipping from the Western Producer of February 16, 1967. Both these people are very much concerned with this drainage program, just as I have been myself. The simple reason is this area of course is the habitat of much of our wildlife, and much of the area in the province that has shelter and feeding grounds for the wildlife, and is gradually disappearing. There is another question that comes into my mind. I'm not doubting that there may be several thousand acres of this land that can be legitimately transformed into agricultural land, but I just wonder on what basis, on what policy, and to whom this land would be made available by the present Government. To some American syndicate? Perhaps while the Premier is down across the line, telling them what the Socialists do in Saskatchewan. Who knows? I am just making one plea, Mr. Speaker, that is for extreme care and caution in draining this land and in setting up any kind of an agricultural program. As I said at the outset, Mr. Speaker, it is not my intention to speak at any great length tonight. I am sure by this time you are well aware that I am not supporting the motion but I am supporting the amendment.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. C. G. Willis (Melfort-Tisdale): — Mr. Speaker, this evening I wish to make a few comments in the Budget Debate before adjourning tonight. First I want to congratulate the Provincial Treasurer (Premier Thatcher) who has left his seat, I see. I want to congratulate him upon his delivery of his Budget Speech. I think he tried hard to convince the people of Saskatchewan that his main interest as Provincial Treasurer is to operate the affairs of the province in an economical and efficient manner. My first reaction when I heard him was to feel sorry for the Ministers whose programs had been squeezed and trimmed until it hurt. But, Mr. Speaker, upon examining the Budget, I found that not much squeezing or trimming had been done, at least not when this Budget was compared with last year's Estimates. The programs were trimmed in two instances only. First, less is being spent on behalf of the farming industry; and second, less for the welfare of the unfortunate people in our society, two classes, Mr. Speaker, the farmers and the needy, who couldn't expect a fair deal from this Government. I must say, too, Mr. Speaker, that I like the frankness of the Provincial Treasurer when he stated it is always easy to spend money especially when it is someone else's.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Willis: — A study of his behaviour as Provincial Treasurer reveals that there is more truth than humour in that statement. Budgetary revenue for 1967-68, are estimated at an all-time high, as was to be expected, following the largest crop in our history. It is interesting to note that revenue from taxes has again increased by \$25,000,000 over the 1966-67 estimates, while the total Budget is increased by \$34,000,00 to a record high of

\$303,000,000. Most of the increase in tax revenue is accounted for by an increase in the individual income tax whereby the Province expects to receive next year \$46,900,000 as compared to \$32,500,000 for the present year. Another major tax increase is a new tax imposed, Mr. Speaker, with a minimum of fanfare. Users of power will contribute to Government revenue this year for the first time. This new tax is expected to provide \$3,000,000 in revenue. Calling this a dividend doesn't hide the fact that a new method of taxation has been imposed on the people of Saskatchewan. If the Provincial Treasurer had been sincere in his trimming and squeezing exercise, he should have been able to forego this extra tax. Surely the people of Saskatchewan are burdened enough with rising costs of living without being burdened with extra taxes or with this the greatest tax Budget in our history. Surely if the people of Saskatchewan were over-taxed in 1963, they are doubly so now.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Willis: — Mr. Speaker, I would like to review the list of tax increases for the edification of the Members opposite. It is a list of tax increases which have been imposed by the Government opposite in the last three years. I have a list here of 14 new taxes or tax increases, Mr. Speaker. In 1965, the first tax that was increased by the Government was the Medicare premium. The second tax was a compulsory arbitration insurance premium, increased both in 1965 and again in 1966. And in 1965, grazing leases were increased and the fourth increase in 1965 was an increase in vital statistic fees and besides this, other fees and licenses too numerous to mention, Mr. Speaker. And the fifth tax in 1965 was a new tax, the tobacco tax. In 1966, there were three tax increases. Soap and detergents, etc. were added to the education and health tax extension. And the second tax increase in 1966 was the gasoline tax. The third tax was the hospital revenue tax imposed for the first time by the Government opposite. And in 1967, Members opposite have been repeating that there have been no new tax increases, Mr. Speaker. However, I have here a list of six new taxes imposed on the people of Saskatchewan by the Government opposite in the year 1967. The first one, individual income tax, up four percentage points from 29 to 33 per cent; second tax, corporation income tax, up one per cent from 10 to 11 per cent, the third tax, one per cent surcharge on all auto insurance premiums, Mr. Speaker, the fourth tax increase, telephone rates up — this was a tax too, Mr. Speaker. And the next tax — liquor prices up, certainly this is a tax too, Mr. Speaker. And the last, at least to our knowledge — I'm sure there must be some other hidden taxes but the last I have on this list for 1967, the fourteenth for the three years is a \$3,000,000 tax on power. And these tax increases, Mr. Speaker, from a person who promised tax relief, not tax increase.

And besides the above, this Government must assume some of the blame for the alarming increase of municipal taxation throughout the province. The \$303,000,000 Budget for 1967-68, Mr. Speaker, means that for every man, woman and child in Saskatchewan,

this Government will collect just over \$300. The \$300 per capita means an average family four will be expected to pay into the coffers of this Government \$1,200 before the end of this fiscal year. This tax increase is a heavy burden. Surely consideration could have been given to some kind of tax relief instead of increased taxes. Wouldn't it have been better, if the Saskatchewan Power Commission instead of paying this so-called dividend to the Government, has made to the people a rate reduction, a sort of dividend in reverse.

It is interesting to note the manner in which the Provincial Treasurer operates, Mr. Speaker. Last year there was a so-called dividend, a payment of \$50 to every home owner, a tax reduction so claimed.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Willis: — This year there is another so-called dividend, a \$4,000,000 payment by users of power, a tax increase. There is this difference, however, Mr. Speaker, only 75 per cent of the residents of the province qualify for the homeowner grants. All users of power, practically all residents of the province pay the new tax. Not only does the Provincial Treasurer find it necessary to increase taxes, he also finds it necessary to borrow to carry out his highway programs. In the long run this borrowing is going to add to the already high cost of highway construction. With interest payment, the taxpayers of tomorrow will be paying about \$10,000,000 for the \$6,500,00 spent today. This, Mr. Speaker, is bad financing and in buoyant times such as these, there is no excuse for such a practice. The people of Saskatchewan have learned the hard way that high taxation talk by the Liberals before 1964 was all-window-dressing. They haven't attempted to lower taxes, as I showed taxes have been increased.

I make a further reference to the homeowner grant, Mr. Speaker. Many of us with the announcement earlier in the session thought that the Government was going to remove the discrimination from regulations as to who received the grants, but very little has been done in this regard. It is almost as discriminatory as before, certainly very inadequate. It doesn't cover the case of the older farmer in my constituency who has moved to the village and lives in a rented house. He still pays taxes on his small farm and continues to farm from the village. He received the \$50 grant last year but he doesn't expect to receive any tax reimbursement in 1967 even though he continues to pay his farm taxes the same as in 1966. He wrote me a letter, Mr. Speaker, which I would like to read into the records, stating the case of this smaller farmer in the Melfort-Tisdale constituency. He talks about Mr. Thatcher giving him \$50 last year for those that lived on their farms. He has now moved away because of poor health and the cold winters. Taxes on the farm were over \$200 last year. "We can do with a \$50 grant next year, we are old timers," he said, "for 52 years in the country. I understand we can't get the \$50 grant anymore. Why not," he asked, "when we pay taxes? He has taken the bread out of our

mouths and other people's besides. If he thinks he'll get our votes, he is wrong. He is a big windblower. If he had said if the farmer sold, it would be different, but we have not sold our farm." That is one case, Mr. Speaker, where there certainly is discrimination in regards to the homeowner grants, indiscrimination which is not...

Mr. A. R. Guy (Athabasca): — I wonder if the Member would table the document that he was reading from...

Hon. C. P. MacDonald (Minister of Welfare): — Table it.

Mr. Willis: — If the Member wishes, I'll table it. There's no signature on it.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

An Hon. Member: — Where did you get it, George? Would you sign it? He tried to get away with it, he tried to get away with it. Isn't that a dandy.

Mr. Willis: — Before I adjourn, Mr. Speaker, I wish to return again in this House to the infamous address given by the Provincial Treasurer in Los Angeles. I don't wish to review this at any length. Such would be an anticlimax to the excitement which the House has already had over this masterpiece. The Premier is reported to have said:

During the 20 years the CCF were in power, they waged war against private businesses. The making of profit was condemned as an unforgivable sin. What was the result? Investors simply turned their backs on the Socialists.

The whole statement is an underserved libel on the people of a province who pulled themselves up by their boot straps, Mr. Speaker, from the stagnation brought about by the 30's, by the Second World War, and by the then Liberal Government which sat seemingly helpless in the backwash of the Canadian economy. From 1944 to 1964 the people of this province achieved much under a progressive government of the people, by the people and for the people. Twenty years of stagnation indeed. This statement is an insult to the Saskatchewan citizens and, Mr. Speaker, the Member for Morse (Mr. Thatcher) is not the only person who has been guilty of making statements of this kind. Others just as irresponsible have said the same thing during the CCF term of office with more or less sincerity. A candidate for office in one of our cities was quoted as saying:

So long as our civic administration is tied to the coat-tails of a Socialist party, no outside investor will risk

his capital into this city.

This, Mr. Speaker, was spoken in 1953. A prominent businessman defended the Government. He in turn was quoted as saying:

As a businessman, I am getting tired of intimidations from our Liberal and Conservative friends that the CCF scares away investors.

He went on to say that "since 1945, private capital was invested in our city and province at an unprecedented rate. Never has Moose Jaw been so prosperous." The businessman so quoted, Mr. Speaker, was the then Federal CCF Member for Moose Jaw Lake Centre, Mr. Ross Thatcher. Today after expanding his father's single hardware store into five stores and retiring comfortably well off, he has become a Liberal and is now repeating that old worn out cliché of which he was so tired in 1953. He says today, Mr. Speaker:

New industries and new capital will be hesitant to come to Saskatchewan as long as a threat of another Socialist administration hangs over the head of this province.

Rubbish, garbage, Mr. Speaker, and just as much rubbish and just as much garbage as it was in 1953. The Hon. Member for Morse, (I should refer to the Premier, Mr. Speaker, as the last Member for Morse, as I hear rumours that he is withdrawing from that constituency. Reason? The political climate is too hot, I'm informed.) The Hon. Member for Morse's statements in Los Angeles have backfired on him. The people of Saskatchewan will render a verdict on him at the next election. Surely one who is so obviously incapable of speaking for the majority of the Saskatchewan citizens should be replaced. Mr. Speaker, this is all I wish to say tonight on the Budget Debate. I be leave to adjourn the debate.

Debate adjourned.

RESOLUTIONS

RESOLUTION NO. 11 RE: ABANDONMENT OF VIOLENCE AND WAR

Mr. J. H. Brockelbank (Kelsey) moved, seconded by Mr. R. A. Walker (Hanley):

That this Assembly is of the opinion that the use of violence and war as a means of settling international disputes should be abandoned, and further, recommends the urgent need for greater development and use of the United Nations as a democratic form of world government.

He said: Now, Mr. Speaker, I think it is fitting and proper that the Legislature should consider this kind of a Resolution. I tried to draft it in such a way that there will be little or no question about the Members of the Legislature agreeing with it. But I think it is important that we discuss it and that we express

ourselves on it. It has been said in the past that the greatest danger in the world is not the bad people, but the greatest danger is the good people who keep silent. So I think it is important that on an issue like this we do take a stand. In Saskatchewan, we have of course many Provincial problems. These are important, and we discussed those Provincial and local problems in this House at very considerable length and it is quite fitting and proper that we should do so. But I think also that we should not neglect the much more important questions, some of which are in the international field.

We have reached a stage in our history where no area in the world can actually live in isolation unaffected by what is going on in the rest of the world. This idea of retreat away from the affairs of the world at one time probably was a practical escape from those problems, but it is no longer an escape because war or violence or for that matter, poverty or starvation, on the other side of the world, is in fact a threat to our security and to our welfare and to our peach here right in the Province of Saskatchewan. It will not be much profit to the Province of Saskatchewan either, even if we are able to develop here one of the finest economies, a fine social system, if the world is going to come to destruction, because we have failed to pay attention to these international problems.

There are at least three major world problems which we should consider. The first one of course is the question of war. I have lived all through this century. I have seen two World Wars and a whole lot of little wars and I have seen after every one of them disappointment because these wars never did bring to the people of the world, to the people of our country, the kind of results that they hoped for and expected. The First World War in which I took a little part was one to make the world safe for democracy. We know what happened to democracy after that. The Second World War was to make countries fit for heroes to live in, and in many of the countries it takes heroes to live.

War has been a disappointment, but the two other very important questions, first the question of population and food much receive attention, because at the present time a great portion of the world's population never really gets enough to eat. If this situation is not cured, if it continues to get worse – and it can get worse – then this too could lead to another war. The third problem, the problem of race and colour of our skin, today is a problem that is pushing upon us for a solution and pushing upon us with very great force. When we look back in our history, we cannot be very proud of the behaviour of our forebearers of one, two, three, five, six generations ago in regard to the coloured people of the world.

The white man whose home was in Europe has been a very efficient exploiter of people and resources all over the world. In fact it was this efficient exploitation that made Europe rich for a very long period of time by bringing wealth from India, from the far East, from Africa. The white man enslaved the coloured people either by making actual slaves of them or by going into their

countries and building an economic system which in fact meant these coloured people were slaves of the foreign ruler. There are more coloured people in the world today, many more than white people. These coloured people in the world today occupy somewhat more than half of the world's land surface and they are fast catching up in the matters of science and technology. If I have no other reason for wanting to solve this problem of race and colour. I have at least one selfish reason and that is because I hope that 20, 40, or 50 years from now, the coloured people of the world will not be dealing out to the white people of the world the same kind of treatment that the white people handed to the coloured people over the centuries of the past. So if for no other reason we should now be trying to solve this problem because if it goes unsolved, if we do not do more than preach the brotherhood of man, if we do not practise the brotherhood of man, then this problem is very likely to lead to war as well. So it is up to us and very important to us that we do face these problems honestly, that we do not shrink from them, that we face them humbly, for humble we should be. We can ignore these problems only at our own peril, at the peril of all humanity in the world today.

A week ago last Friday, I think it was, an event worthy of note took place. It was the opening of the new Legislature at Nassau in the Bahama Islands. It was the first time in the history of modern times in these Islands that the coloured people had a majority in the Legislature. This is something of which we should take note and in which we should rejoice. We should congratulate the Bahamas and we should wish their new government well. For 300 years these Islands have been ruled by white people.

Mr. Speaker, the problem of world population which I mentioned is pressing us now. We are told that there will be possibly 7,000,000,000 people in the world in the year 2000 A.D. and that's only 33 years from now. For many of you young people that isn't very far to look ahead. The increase in the world's population now is about 70,000,000 a year, three and a half times the population of Canada every year. Sir Julian Huxley said – and I would like to inform the House that I got this quotation out of the speech made by Dr. Menzies in the Plain Talk series here in Regina – “If we do not act soon, man will become the cancer of the planet, destroying its resources and eventually his own future.”

We have got a problem to face if this situation goes on as it is at the present time for the increase of population in the world today is vaster than the increase in food production. For sometime after the Second World War food production increased faster than world population but it only lasted for a few years, then it began to go the other way and it is at the present time going the other way. Dr. Menzies said in that address, “It is not only the bomb but the bassinet that threatens the future of the human race.” And no matter what we may think and what our ideas may be, it is high time that we stopped, took a look and took stock of this situation. Again I quote from Sir Julian Huxley, “Everyone will agree that in itself death control is desirable and good.” What he means of course by death control is

that babies should not die in infancy, that men and women should enjoy longer life. Dr. Menzies commenting on that said, "But if death control is not balanced by birth control what other brakes are there on a disastrous population explosion but the cruel Malthusian checks of famine, pestilence and war?"

So as I see it these problems are tied together. The question of population and food, the question of race and colour and the question of war, these can very well mean the destruction of the human race. In this age we should be conscious of our surroundings. We do live in an age of science and technology like we have never had before. Of these things we can be a little bit proud. We have greater power at our disposal than ever before. The units of power each individual in our country has at his or her command is astounding compared to what it was only a couple of hundred years ago.

For the first time in the history of the world it is possible, not easy, but possible for all people in the world to live reasonably well, that is provided that we will continue to step up food production. Even here in our country we are likely going to need every acre of land that we can get for food production within the next ten years. There will be a tremendous need and demand for every bit of food that we can produce. And at the same time the problem is to be solved in those countries where there is a terrific high birth-rate, a great increase in population. In some countries, some of the poorest developed countries, the increase in population is three or four times as fast as it is here in our country and they have the least resources to supply their needs.

Sure, this is an age of science when it is possible for the first time for our people to live well. But we also have something else and that is the power to destroy. I don't need to tell you, everybody is conversant with it. There are enough explosives in the form of hydrogen bombs to destroy the world many times over, to kill all life in the world, and there is too the means to deliver those bombs. So we have not only the possibilities of a good world but also the possibilities of a world which may be destroyed. As I said at the beginning of my speech, one cannot live in isolation now. Our world is a world of one community. We can't escape, we have a choice and the choice is very simple. It is either that we will live as brothers or die as enemies. But violence is no longer tolerable as a way to settle international disputes. As a matter of fact, it never was a good way; it was a practical way but never a good way to settle disputes. And of course violence was used in the history of mankind for a great many things besides settling disputes. Violence was used to convert people to one faith or another faith, and this has been used by different peoples all over the world. But violence was never good to improve man; it couldn't do anything for him except to make him dead.

Another thing that we should remember is that with violence you can't kill ideas. You kill people. You can't stop the propagation of an idea by killing people. True, you may delay it but quite likely the causes that brought on the idea in the first

place will be aggravated and you will be more sure than ever that those ideas will grow. It is time that we remembered that you can't kill ideas. You only kill people. Violence is also terribly wasteful. Dr. Menzies in the Plain Talk series last November said: "This century has not for a single year been free of wars whether civil, colonial, international or global." That's a pretty sad story when we realize that here we are in the year 1967 of this century, and there hasn't been one year free of war and some pretty big and serious wars were included in those 67 years.

War is wasteful, the First World War caused nearly 40,000,000 casualties, as many people as live in Canada were killed by the First World War. It cost nearly \$350,000,000,000. That isn't very impressive today, in this day of big budgets and big figures, but in the days of the First World War it was a staggering figure. In the Second World War there were 17,000,000 military deaths and this doesn't count the millions of civilians who died. The Second World War was coming close to being a total war; only a few people in fortunate places in the world escaped the consequences of that war. The dollar cost of The Second World War I don't think has ever been computed; I never heard of it. But then we know it would be very great.

Then Dr. Menzies also said: "The fear of war results in defence costs which cannot amount to much less than \$150,000,000,000 annually." Of course \$150,000,000,000 doesn't mean a thing to us. It's just a bunch of figures unless we translate it into something that we can understand. Ten million doesn't mean much to us either, but this \$150,000,000,000 would actually build ten million \$15,000 houses each year. What a waste this situation is where we have to spend this amount on defence. Defence against whom? Against our fellowmen. This \$150,000,000,000 would build 20,000 auditoriums like we haven't got in Regina and that could be five auditoriums on every mile from Newfoundland to Vancouver island. We could have them all across the country. This is the kind of money and material and effort we are putting into what is actually a senseless program of being ready to slaughter and kill all of mankind. Or it could build 10,000 base hospitals like the Government has promised for Regina and that's a lot of hospitals.

So it is not only the question of human life, it is not only the question of violence being a poor way to settle disputes that seldom lead to justice but is wasteful and harmful as well. And now of course it holds the probability of ultimate and complete disaster for mankind.

Sometime ago I was reading that somebody said that half or more of the population of Canada might survive a nuclear war. Isn't that cheerful? If we did have a nuclear war probably only 10,000,000 of the people of Canada would be killed. It should make us think. But what can we do about it? We can say "Abandon violence." We can't attain this end now but for goodness sake, let's not see any Member get up in this House and say that this is idealism; it's all right to talk about it. It is idealism to do away with violence, but that idealism will never be approached,

let along attained unless good people some place begin to stand up and say, I am for that.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Brockelbank (Kelsey): — I don't want to say very much about the situation in Vietnam. But I just would point out this that I don't think any person, certainly no person I have ever talked to has ever suggested that any good could come out of the war in Vietnam, even if you grant that the United States is going to win that war, and it is very doubtful if that can be done. The United States' winning the war in Vietnam is not going to stop the spread of Communism. Let us not kid ourselves. Let's stop and think, when did Communism have its greatest period of spreading in the world? After the First War, after the Second War? War plays right into the hands of Communism. War destroys and makes the problems so acute that people are willing to sacrifice their freedom in the hopes of attaining something better. So there is no hope. If they are going to have Communism in southeast Asia, they are going to have it.

The fact is of course that either Communism or Fascism is quite likely to be found ultimately in not just one place but in all places where there is gross and long extended social injustice and a lack of political democracy. These two ills come because something else has failed, because we have failed to use the principles of freedom, human brotherhood and democracy to solve our problems. And I don't care what you do, if you don't solve those problems of great social injustice you are going to be in trouble. It is very foolish to think that we can stop the spread of Communism by war.

If there had been a reasonable degree of social justice and democracy in the old Russia, before 1917, there never would have been a Communist Revolution. If there had been a reasonable amount of justice and democracy in China, there would have been no Communist Revolution. These things came because of a cause. The only way you can prevent Communism or Fascism is to remove the cause. Now there are people who go around calling progressive people, progressive democratic people, democratic Socialists, calling them Communists. These people who cry "Communism" at every bit of progress, every bit of change, are the very people, Mr. Speaker, who help to make the conditions ready for the development of Communism.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Brockelbank (Kelsey): — You can blame the reds all you like but do not forget the creators of the reds. They are the reactionaries of today and of no progress. These are the people who created the reds. These are the people who are responsibility for the Communism that is in the world today.

Coming back for a moment to the question of Vietnam, there is another very bad dividend which we will reap, and are reaping from the war in Vietnam. We are getting a worse and worse reputation for the white man. Every day that a war like this goes on there are more and more coloured people in the world who fear, who distrust, who hate the white people of the world. I don't like this, I don't want this to happen. It shouldn't be this way.

You, I really don't think there is much danger of Vietnam attacking the United States. Actually there is no danger at all. So it is very hard for the people of the coloured skins of southeast Asia to accept the idea that a great and powerful nation located on the other side of the world should be present in their country and should be creating destruction of their resources and of their people.

One of the lessons which we in the white race have to learn is to mind our own business too. Now the people in the other parts of the world, the coloured races, are going to have some rough times, Mr. Speaker, we had them too, in Europe, we had our revolutions, we had our struggles, we didn't come through to a system of democracy such as we have today without paying some price. You can't impose a system on people. These people in other parts of the world will have to struggle through, will have to work, will have to develop those systems to suit themselves, and they may not be just like our system of democracy either.

Now to mind our own business doesn't mean that we should adopt a system of isolation, but it does mean that we shouldn't interfere in the internal affairs of another country. This is just a little bit worse than putting yourself in between a good healthy quarrel between a man and his wife. You are going to have two fighting you and you are not going to create any good will either. And we see in the world today the two greatest powers, Soviet Russia and the United States; they are both prone to interfere in the internal affairs of other countries. The United States has on different occasions interfered with the internal affairs of countries in Central and South America. When governments were coming into power that they thought they didn't like, they took steps to see they didn't come into power. Russia does the same thing among all her satellite countries. They are both the same.

Now I don't want anybody to say that I am anti-USA. None of us are who believe in this kind of a doctrine are anti-USA. I am just as much against the errors and mistakes of the Premier of Saskatchewan and the Prime Minister of Canada, as I am against the errors and mistakes of the President of the United States; if they are wrong it doesn't matter who it is, if they are doing something wrong. I am against these things which I consider to be sins against humanity. I consider social injustice, I consider starvation, I consider war to be crimes against the human race. I am against those things. War never decently solved any problem in our history. It left worse conditions which we had to solve. I say I am not anti-USA. Mistakes that our Premier makes here are less serious than mistakes made by the President of the United

States, but, Mr. Speaker, if I had to choose between these two people, I think I would still have the man from Texas for President.

Now if we give up violence, what are we going to put in its place, because we recognize that just giving it up and leaving a vacuum will not do. We must put in its place what we have done here in our country. We no longer go to war, family against family, tribe against tribe. We get together here in the Legislature. It gets warm sometimes, Mr. Speaker, but we talk. It sometimes takes a lot of talk but this is the way we settle our problems today and this is the way they should be settled all over the world, by negotiations and talk. We have got in the world today, the United Nations. This is the second effort of humanity to establish the Parliament of Man, the Federation of the world. And I admit it's a weak effort so far. It's far, far from perfect. It's got a long way to go, but I still think, Mr. Speaker, that today the United Nations is the organization that holds the best hope for coming through and solving these war problems.

And so, what can we do besides standing up and saying we're against use of violence as a means of solving international problems. Well, we can help to strengthen the United Nations. No democratic institution can survive for very long without people and without the interest of people. Not enough people today are taking interest in the United Nations. We have in Canada a United Nations Association. Again, it's not a perfect organization. I belong to it. Do you belong to it? This is a question we should all ask. You know in the city of Regina, a city with a population of 120,000 or 130,000, there are about 100 members of the United Nations Association. They should be having some meetings, they should be having some discussions, they should be sending their opinions to the headquarters of the association at Ottawa, they should become an influence in the actions of the United Nations in the world. All we need to do to kill the United Nations, to destroy it, is to continue to ignore it, to leave it alone.

This is a great experiment in world democracy. It deserves our support. You see no organizations can make the world better without the support of people and the world cannot be better than the known qualities of individuals and nations. It is the quality of each individual that makes up the quality of the nation. It is the quality of the nations that makes up the quality of an organization like the United Nations. I wish our country, Canada, would stand up and take a more positive stand on the whole question of the use of violence. As I said before we have a choice, but just barely, 10 years, 20 years from now it may be too late on account of the population food ratio. Every bit of food is needed, all the time we've got is needed and there is always the danger of somebody pulling the trigger. Arnold Toynbee said,

February 23, 1967

Our age will be remembered because it is the first generation since the dawn of history to believe it practical to make the benefits of civilization available to the whole of mankind.

And finally, one more quotation from Dr. Menzies!

It will also be remembered as the only age that took into its hands the power to destroy itself, which choice it will make is, to the limit of our influence, the responsibility of us all. The great issue of the age is a moral issue and the choice is a moral choice.

Debate adjourned.

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