

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN
Fourth Session — Fifteenth Legislature
17th Day

Monday, February 27, 1967.

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

WELCOME TO STUDENTS

Mr. W. A. Robbins (Saskatoon City): — Mr. Speaker, I would like to draw your attention and the attention of the Members of the Assembly to a fine group of students in the speaker's gallery from Albert School in Saskatoon. They are accompanied by their teacher, Mrs. MacMillan and their principal, Mr. Kyle. I do not know whether Mr. Kyle can be classified as the best principal in the province, but I'm sure he can be classified as one of the biggest in the province. I'm sure, Mr. Speaker, that all the Members of the Assembly would join with me in wishing this group a fine educational afternoon in this Assembly and in their visit to Regina.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. W. E. Smishek (Regina East): — Mr. Speaker, I'd like to draw your attention and the attention of this House to a group of students from Central Collegiate Regina, seated in the west gallery. On behalf of yourself and on behalf of the Members of this House, I'd like to extend to them a welcome and hope that their stay today with us will be pleasant and informative.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. D. G. MacLennan (Last Mountain): — Mr. Speaker, I would like to welcome through you a group of students from the Carl Frederickson School in Govan. They are seated in the Speaker's gallery and I know we all wish them a most interesting and informative visit to the Assembly.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. A. E. Blakeney (Regina West): — Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to call to your attention and to the attention of other Members of the House, two groups of students, one in the west gallery from the Herchmer School in Regina — some 50 students from two grade eight classes guided by their teachers, Mr. Meyer and Mr. Hatlelit — they have had a tour of the buildings and they are now here to observe our proceedings and in the east gallery, a group of students — an even larger group — I dare not say a better looking group, about the same I believe, from the David School, about 90 in number. As you can see they are largely filling the east gallery. I'm sure that all Members through you, Mr. Speaker, would want to wish them an enjoyable afternoon and one which hopefully will add to their understanding of British parliamentary procedures.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

ANSWER TO QUESTION: RE: DR. HOFFMAN OF ILE-A-LA-CROSSE

Hon. G. B. Grant (Minister of Public Health): — Before the Orders of the Day,

I would like to reply to a question raised by the Hon. Member for Regina West (A. E. Blakeney) last Thursday when he inquired as to whether the medical doctor at Ile-A-La-Crosse had been dismissed or was going to be dismissed. I can advise that the medical doctor at Ile-A-La-Crosse, Doctor Hoffman is under contract to the Department of Health. There has been no suggestion by either side that the contract would be terminated. The department is perfectly satisfied with Doctor Hoffman's services. I know Doctor Hoffman personally and have had some communications with him recently and there is no indication whatsoever that he was anything but satisfied so I'd say the answer is no.

QUESTION RE: ORDER FOR RETURN NO. 6

Mr. J. H. Brockelbank (Kelsey): — Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day are proceeded with, I want to again ask the Government about the Order for Return which was issued by this House almost three weeks ago now — on the 10th of February, asking for the amount collected in taxes in the current fiscal year. I asked before and this is still not here. I'd like to ask what is the cause of the delay.

Hon. D. V. Heald (Attorney General): — I tabled some Returns on Friday but I thought that Return was in it. Which one is that — No. 6?

Mr. Brockelbank (Kelsey): — Yes.

Hon. Heald: — I'll look into that.

TYPOGRAPHICAL ERROR IN LEADER POST RE: EMPLOYMENT FIGURE

Mr. L. P. Coderre (Gravelbourg): — Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day are proceeded with, I would like to draw the attention of the House to a typographical error in the Leader Post published February 25 where in regard to the statement I made in this House last Friday, the Leader post states:

Additional information published monthly by DBS shows that between January and December, 1966, employment in Saskatchewan rose by 21,000.

Whereas, I said:

It may be seen that from additional information published monthly by the Dominion Bureau of Statistics that between January and December, 1966, employment in Saskatchewan has risen by 12,000.

I then quoted my DBS special table, catalogue No. 9603525. I believe it is a typographical error in the Leader Post and I'd like to have it corrected in this House. It still indicates, Mr. Speaker, that the total increase in the last two years and eight months is 49,000 extra jobs in the province.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

ADJOURNED DEBATES

BUDGET DEBATE

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of the hon. W. Ross Thatcher (Provincial Treasurer) that Mr.

Speaker, do now leave the Chair, and the amendment thereto by Mr. Blakeney (Regina West).

Hon. D. Boldt (Minister of Highways): — First, Mr. Speaker, I would like to make a few remarks about the Budget. May I say at the outset that I was very proud to be associated with the Provincial Government and the Premier of this province.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Boldt: — The Budget that was brought down by the Premier is realistic in every sense of the word. It represents the financial and the factual position of the Province under his leadership. On Friday last, the Hon. Member for Melfort-Tisdale and the former Minister of Highways under the Socialist regime (Mr. Willis) told the House that the Liberal Highway Crash Program cost the Saskatchewan taxpayer an extra \$12,000,000 last year in wasted funds. He mentioned that we had invited the contractors to come to this province, name the price and we would pay the bill. He would like to have the people of Saskatchewan believe that the contractors are a bunch of crooks, that the Liberal Government had made a deal with them and that it's costing the taxpayers plenty.

Mr. C. G. Willis (Melfort-Tisdale): — I at no time referred to contractors as crooks and it is not my intention to do so. I want the Hon. Member to watch his language in the future. I think he should withdraw that statement.

An Hon. Member: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Boldt: — He made his speech last Friday and I'll make mine today.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Boldt: — The fact is, Mr. Speaker, the Liberal party was elected to office on the platform that we would build highways at a minimum of \$175,000,000 in the first term of office. The people want, the people need these roads and we will build them and we are building them. We told the contractors of our program and invited them to participate. I would say that they have done a tremendous job at the lowest price possible as all jobs were tendered. Would the Hon. Member for Melfort-Tisdale (Mr. Willis) suggest that contractors such as Ramsey Bird or South Construction of Regina are robbing the taxpayers of Saskatchewan when they tender for a job? Would he also suggest that the city of Saskatoon who did all the contracting for the Idylwlyd Freeway in which the Department of Highways shared up to almost \$8,000,000 robbed the taxpayers of a few millions of dollars? Would he also suggest that the Mayor of Regina robbed the taxpayers of hundred of thousand of dollars...

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Boldt: — ...when they did all the contracting on the Albert Street subway which we shared with the city at the cost to the Highway Department of almost \$400,000.

Let's look at the finances and see how they compared under their regime. Almost \$4,000,000 was taken from the taxpayers, mostly through schools and hospitals to finance a bankrupt Crown Insurance Company with offices in Montana. I need not repeat the details. Hundreds and thousands of dollars of the taxpayers' money went into other Socialistic events that only saw red. If you want to examine waste, let's look at what the Regina Mayor, a Member of this Legislature, is doing with the taxpayers' money. I need only refer to the auditorium most commonly known across Canada by now as "The Great Monkey Bars." I drive past them every day and I think of Henry, that poor old soul. I think of Henry...

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

An Hon. Member: — They are the monkeys.

Mr. Boldt: — I'm sure the mayor has received enough punishment. I'm afraid he lives in the first century. His way of financing could have existed in those days, but surely we need not expect this to happen in the 20th Century. But it has and for his benefit, I would like to give him a little bit of Biblical advice. Permit me, Mr. Speaker, to just quote a few verses from Luke, Chapter 14, and this happened I'd say almost 2,000 years ago. In Luke, Chapter 14, Verse 28, we read:

For which of you, intending to build a tower, sitteth not down first, and counteth the cost, whether he have sufficient to finish it?

Lest haply, after he hath laid the foundation, and is not able to finish it, all that behold it being to mock him,

Saying, This man began to build and was not able to finish.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Boldt: — That applies to the auditorium, and I hope your pastor will read that scripture for you some day.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Boldt: — I learned that when I was in Sunday school.

Mr. H. H. P. Baker (Regina East): — Thank you, Reverend Boldt.

Mr. Boldt: — I'm proud, Mr. Speaker, to outline the 1967 program for modernization of the Provincial highway system. It is a little tiresome but worth repeating that Saskatchewan has a rather special road problem. Our people are scattered uniformly over more than 100,000 square miles so we need a lot of roads. We have a lot of roads. We have quite a few, we have a few more than we really need or can really afford. It is easy to establish some kind of trail on the prairies and so it is hard to be selective. This is one of the reasons there exists such a great backlog of road improvement today. We have to be selective about what roads we improve and to what degree we improve them. This does not mean that the road system should remain static. Far from it. It must grow as our economy grows,

it must grow as our industrial development increases. We certainly have increases here as we extend the frontier into the North, but it does mean that we have to be a little careful and particularly clear-eyed about what we do. There are roads that we must have to serve our economy. There are roads that we must have to expand our economy. There are roads that we would like to have and that we cannot; but there are also roads we would like to have and which we cannot afford. The key to the problem is the proper selection.

Sub-division of the road system into sub-systems is an effective way to clarify the question, so we have the designated Provincial highway system and the designated grid system; and these systems are further sub-divided for administrative purposes. Last year we published a Road Needs Study which provided a useful thumbnail sketch of the three major road systems; namely Provincial highways, other rural roads, and the urban street network. It tells something of the developing pressures on the road systems, outlines and illustrates some of the deficiencies and provides an estimate of the magnitude of these deficiencies or backlog and of the sums required to meet the developing needs. As with all studies, we must be ever mindful of the limits and limitations of this one. Although the document was published in 1966, it is well to remember that the fact-gathering and interpretation occupied some years prior to the publication. So the report is not quite as up-to-the-minute as it might appear. Referring to the Provincial highway section and its requirements, there are some notable adjustments for up-dating purposes, and some important things that are covered. Assistance to urban governments has been markedly increased to the order of \$5,000,000 annually. There is an increased emphasis on northern development. Roads to serve industrial developments are not covered in the report. The system has been expanded to about 9,750 miles and will be expanded further.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Boldt: — Because we have emphasized highway development, we seem to have stimulated expensive public tastes and this costs more money. The increasing traffic load requires higher quality of construction and so, higher costs. Further, we have an uncomfortable degree of price inflation. Superficial reading of the Need Study Report would suggest that at the current investment level of \$56,000,000 we will catch up on the highway problem in about 10 years. Because of the just mentioned factors, this unfortunately is not true, and the catch-up period seems to be more in the order of 15 years. The tremendous backlog is a troublesome thing, and it is attractive to think in terms of cleaning it up first and immediately. However, we must provide for our northern development, for our industrial development, and for our increasing traffic load and carry on concurrently with progressive removal of the backlog, with the progressive extension of the frontier into the North, with the progressive improvement in the services of our industrial entities, and the construction of sections of road designed to handle the increasing traffic load. It is a fact of highway development that improvements or additions must be added in sizable increments or chunks, that is, one piece of the highway may be a little bigger and little better than it needs to be currently, while an adjustment section is a little smaller and a little inferior for the demands placed upon it. But it does not make sense to carry out piecemeal and gradual improvements. The program that I will outline to you is intended to reflect these

pressures and the necessities and to be the best possible blend of the various kinds and ways of improvement within the sums of money which the Provincial economy will afford. As I mentioned a few moments ago, I would like to point out some of the needs that become apparent from the Study.

It was borne out that the volume of traffic on Saskatchewan roads and streets is 4.4 times as heavy as it was 20 years ago. There is every indication that the rapid increase will continue. This post-war trend has placed severe demands on the province's streets and highways. As traffic volume continues to rise, new problems will develop. Improvement programs must be carried out on our roads as the need grows. In summary, the main findings of our Needs Study are these: Within the next 20 years, \$1,580,000,000 will have to be spent on Saskatchewan roads and streets if we are to have a modern system. The Provincial highway network will need \$774,700,000, urban streets (in centres of more than 1,000 population) will need \$283,300,000 and the rural municipal roads will need \$526,800,000. The raising of these sums will require examination of the tax structure. In a general way, levies now devoted to road and street construction can be expected to meet the requirements over the next 20 years.

The population trends in Saskatchewan also play an important role in highway needs and planning. The distribution of the province's population has changed greatly in the last 15 years and this trend will continue for some time in the future. With industry moving into the province at such an accelerated rate since the Liberals took office in 1964, it is expected that our urban centres will absorb a greater proportion of the population. By 1984 it is anticipated 67 per cent of the Saskatchewan population will be living in urban areas over 1,000 population. Now, what are the reasons for rebuilding and relocating highways?

Firstly, a road begins to deteriorate the day after it is built. Studies conducted by the Department of Highways have shown that the average life of bituminous pavement is 16 years while that of an oiled surface is six years. Secondly, obsolescent roads caused by increasing traffic volumes, require reconstruction. In the last few years, motor vehicle travel in Saskatchewan has increased approximately six per cent. Thirdly, comfort and convenience to the travelling public must not be overlooked. With the paving of road surfaces, the irritating effects of dust, mud and flying gravel are eliminated. For passenger cars, it costs about three cents more per vehicle mile on gravel roads than on paved roads. Fourthly, in locating the highway system, the most economical system is one in which minimum road-user costs are obtained. Highway locations should be chosen to achieve this desired result.

The number of motor vehicles has grown steadily in Saskatchewan and in recent years the growth has been quite spectacular. Motor vehicle registration has increased from 70,000 vehicles in 1933 to over 400,000 in 1965. By 1984 there will be about 485,000 cars and 190,000 trucks and buses in the province. From studies involving traffic counts it is estimated that 52 per cent of the travel in 1965 was on the Provincial highway system, 24 per cent on urban streets, and 24 per cent on rural municipal roads including towns less than 1,000 population.

Mr. Speaker, I would also like to say a few words about grid roads. A large problem is the determination of what should be a Provincial highway. The primary or arterial highways are relatively easy to select as are the more important secondary

or collector highways. However, there is a broad area where determination is not so precise. Subjected warrants and criteria have been set up to determine which roads warrant highway designation. Some of the warrants are more important than others. In addition, partial credit should be given if a warrant is partially met. Since these are to be weighed, a point system will be used. For example, 100 points means a very high justification for inclusion, while no points means no justification. Fifty points should be the minimum for inclusion into the system. The warrant and criteria rating will be sent to the RMs upon request. I would urge those RMs who are considering application for designation of a grid road to write in for this information before making the application to make sure that the road in question qualifies.

Before I go into the details of the capital program for 1967-68, I want to make reference to two bridges. First, I want to confirm the announcement made by my predecessor that a bridge will be constructed at Deer Creek on the North Saskatchewan River.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Boldt: — The planning and design will be completed shortly. It is expected the bridge will be tendered for construction towards the latter part of March. Considerable representation has been made to have the bridge site changed to Maidstone. Two basic reasons for choosing Deer Creek over Maidstone are: (a) The cost of constructing a bridge at Deer Creek is 50 per cent less than the cost of constructing one at Maidstone. (b) The ferry crossings on Deer Creek in 1966 totalled 41,080 vehicles as compared to Maidstone with 16,210.

These two figures purely and simply indicate the justification for the Deer Creek site. The other bridge I want to make special mention of is one on the South Saskatchewan River. Mr. Speaker, when the Conservative Government at Ottawa and the Socialists in Saskatchewan negotiated and signed an agreement to build the Gardiner Dam at Outlook, no consideration was given as to what would happen to ferry crossings between the Dam and the Squaw Rapids. Today we find that no ice crossings are permitted except at the owner's risk, and ferry crossings during the summer were on a hit and miss basis all summer. This has caused severe hardships and handicaps to the farmers, businessmen and to the tourist trade on both sides of the South Saskatchewan River. Had the Socialists held out to the Federal Government for assistance for bridge construction along the South Saskatchewan River, this might have been considered. Now it is too late and a real crisis exists. Another Socialist planning.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Boldt: — I therefore recommended to my officials some time ago that they design and plan a bridge to be constructed at Gabriel. It is hoped that the designing and planning will be completed some time in August or September and the tenders will be called immediately. Justification for choosing Gabriel as the site is: 1. Gabriel ferry crossings, next to Deer Creek, are the highest in the province. 2. This is a very scenic area with a rich historical background. Names such as Batoche, duck Lake, Gabriel, and St. Laurent are part of our Saskatchewan history and will continue as land-marks for years to come, - and this is

what the Socialists want me to say – 3. Gabriel is in my constituency.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Boldt: — These two bridges, coupled with the recently completed Saskatchewan Landing and Battleford bridges, will mean a substantial improvement in river crossings on the North and South Saskatchewan Rivers. A number of major projects for 1967 will be associated with provisions of roadways to serve pulp-hauling to the new pulp mill east of Prince Albert. In 1966, the grading on Highway No. 2 north of Prince Albert was started, and with a good construction season the grading will be completed on the new location to intersect existing Highway No. 2 northeast of Waskesiu. The paving will start on this project and will continue through 1968. The new connection from Prince Albert to the pulp mill is scheduled for paving this year. The additional road plans subject to agreement with the Pulp Company include grading from the pulp mill to Meath Park, and the start of a road from Candle Lake to Cub Lake. Expenditures on these roads will be \$3,000,000 in 1967-68.

The urban assistance program will continue at a high level. The actual expenditure will drop to \$3,900,000 reflecting the decreased expenditures on the Idylwyld Freeway in Saskatoon. This Freeway is planned for completion in 1967, and will be the first major urban Freeway constructed in the prairie provinces.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Boldt: — It will provide for 60 mile per hour travel from south of Saskatoon into downtown Saskatoon, with no traffic signals or stop signs enroute. The accelerated program of four-lane construction will continue. The planned projects are; Moose Jaw to Boharm on Highway No. 1, Highway No. 11 from Dundurn to Saskatoon, Highway No. 11 from 40th Street in Saskatoon to the new junction of Highway No. 5 and Highway No. 1 both east and west of Swift current. The grade separated interchanges will be provided at important intersections on a number of these highways to reduce stopping delays and to reduce accidents. The other major projects include; The completion of the 4-lane highway from Regina to Moose Jaw; the continuation of the reconstruction of the Delisle to Rosetown section of Highway No. 7. The construction of this section of roadway is expected to continue to 1968, and includes major urban work in Rosetown; the completion of the Balgonie to Fort Qu'Appelle cut-off. This road will result in a large mileage saving for 1,200 vehicles per day; the reconstruction of Highway No. 11 from Lumsden to Bethune. This along with the improvements from Saskatoon to Dundurn, represents the beginning of a number of future projects to complete the reconstruction of the entire Saskatoon to Regina route; the major grading and paving projects north and south of Yorkton on Highways No. 9 and 10; the continuation of a number of projects in the Battlefords area; a new project for this year will be the reconstruction of Highway No. 4 from...

Hon. W. Ross Thatcher (Premier): — There goes Kramer!

Mr. Boldt: — ...North Battleford to the junction of Highway No. 26. and the grading and paving of the Weyburn Bypass, and highway No. 39 from Weyburn to Yellow Grass.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I have a long list here. I'm sure that the Hon. Members would like to hear it, I hope I don't bore them too much, but I would like to go over in detail the list of the construction for the 67-68 program.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Boldt: — First, on Highway No. 1, the completion of the resurfacing on various sections between Manitoba border and west of Oakshella; the resurfacing from McLean to junction Highway No. 6; the completion of the paving between Regina and Moose Jaw; the completion of interchanges and railway overpasses between Regina and Moose Jaw; the grading and paving of the moose Jaw Bypass; the grading and paving from Moose Jaw to eight miles west; the grading and paving from east of Swift Current to junction Highway No. 32; the interchange and creek crossing structures from Swift current to Highway No. 32.

On Highway No. 2, the completion of the grading paving from the airport corner to south of Moose Jaw; the grading and paving from Moose Jaw to junction Highway No. 1; bridge over the Moose Jaw Creek south of Moose Jaw; spot resurfacing from Cudworth to Wakaw; the paving north of Prince Albert to junction Highway No. 55; the paving of the pulp mill access road; the completion of the grading from Christopher Lake to McPhee Lake; the grading from the junction of Highway No. 55 to Christopher Lake; and grading from McPhee Lake to junction with existing Highway No. 2 near Montreal Lake.

On Highway No. 3, the completion of the grading from Hudson Bay west; oiling from Veillardville to Prairie River; the paving and resurfacing from Melfort to Birch Hills; the bridge at the Deer Creek Ferry site.

On Highway No. 4, the completion of the paving from junction 43 to Swift current; the grading and paving at Rosetown; paving between Battleford and North Battleford; underpass at the Canadian National Railway in North Battleford; the grading and paving from North Battleford to the junction Highway No. 26; and the completion of the grading from Highway No. 55 to the Waterhen River.

On Highway No. 5, the completion of the grading from Kamsack to Mikado; the grading from Wadena to Watson; - after I heard the Hon. Member from Wadena (Mr. Dewhurst) speak the other day, I should really take this out – the completion of the grading and paving from highway No. 11 to the Borden Bridge.

Mr. F. A. Dewhurst (Wadena): — Mr. Speaker, I never spoke in this debate.

Mr. Boldt: — The previous time then!

Mr. Dewhurst: — You can't refer to me in any other debate.

Mr. Boldt: — Do you want me to take it out? Don't tempt me! – paving of the North Battleford Bypass; and the completion of the grading and paving from Lashburn to Lloydminster.

On Highway No. 7 – the Socialists built roads in the CCF seats – paving from Delisle to Harris and grading and paving

from Harris to Rosetown.

On Highway No. 8, the completion of the grading from Highway No. 22 to south of Langenburg; grading from junction No. 10 to Kamsack; and a bridge over the Assiniboine River.

On Highway No. 9, the completion of the paving from north of Yorkton to Canora; the grading from Canora to Stenen; oiling at Reserve.

On Highway No. 10, completion of the grading from Yorkton to Melville; paving from Yorkton to Melville; the grading and paving of the Melville Bypass; the construction of a railway overpass at Melville; resurfacing of old No. 10 Melville to 10 miles north; and the completion of the paving from Fort Qu'Appelle to Balgonie.

On No. 11, the grading and paving from Lumsden to Bethune; grading from 1`5 miles north of Dundurn to junction of Highway No. 14; paving from Dundurn to junction 14; grading and paving from the underpass north of Saskatoon to junction No. 5; railway underpasses north and south of Saskatoon; the interchange at 42nd Street in Saskatoon. Tenders are expected to be called late in summer or early fall to start on the construction on the Saskatoon-Rosthern-Prince Albert cut-off.

On Highway No. 13, resurfacing from Griffin to Hume; grading from Horizon to Verwood; oiling from Eastend to Robsart.

On Highway No. 14, oiling from Langenburg to Churchbridge; completion of the grading from Elfros to Dafoe; grading and paving around Lanigan; grading from Clavet to junction of Highway 11; paving from existing Highway 14 to the south boundary of Saskatoon; completion of the paving from Hawoods Corner to Perdue.

On Highway No. 16, oiling from Manitoba to junction No. 8.

On Highway No. 17, completion of the grading from Lloydminster to No. 3 Highway.

On Highway No. 18, oiling from Torquay to Oungre.

On Highway No. 19, oiling from Hodgeville to junction No. 1.

On Highway No. 20, oiling from junction Highway No. 14 to Humboldt.

On Highway No. 22, grading from junction No. 8 to junction No. 9.

On Highway No. 23, completion of the grading from two miles east of junction No. 38 to junction No. 3; oiling from Crooked River to Arborfield.

On Highway No. 26, oiling from Dulwich to St. Walburg.

On Highway No. 31, oiling from Kerrobert to Salvador; oiling from Herschel to Stranraer.

On Highway No. 35, oiling from Weyburn to junction Highway No. 33.

On Highway No. 39, completion of the grading from Rouleau

to Pasqua; grading from south of Corinne to Rouleau; grading from East of Weyburn to yellow Grass; twin bridges over the Souris River at Weyburn.

On Highway No. 42, grading from Central Butte to Riverhurst; resurfacing south of Delisle.

On Highway No. 43, oiling from Vanguard junction to junction No. 4; oiling from Gravelbourg to junction No. 19.

On Highway No. 44, oiling from south junction No. 4 to Snipe Lake.

On Highway No. 47, grading near Melville. On Highway No. 49, grading from Preeceville to Okla.

On Highway No. 55, grading from Meath Park to the Prince Albert Pulp Mill; oiling from Debden to Big River.

On Highway No. 80, paving from Esterhazy to Yarbo.

On Highway No. 102, completion of the grading from Otter Rapids to McLennan Lake.

On Highway No. 104, completion of the grading from Canoe Lake to Cummins Lake.

On Highway No. 120, grading from Candle Lake north.

On Highway No. 135, completion of grading from junction 106 to Pelican narrows.

On Highway No. 162, oiling from Eldorado to Uranium City.

On Highway No. 202, grading of the Waskesiu Access Road.

On Highway No. 240, completion of the grading from Highway No. 55 to Prince Albert National Park.

On Highway No. 308, completion of the grading from Welwyn to Highway No. 8.

On Highway No. 311, paving of Pasqua Street North.

On Highway No. 312, South Saskatchewan River Bridge at Gabriel Ferry.

On Highway No. 34, oiling from Cutbank to junction Highway No. 19.

On Highway No. 330, completion of the grading from Kerrobert North.

Now we have some additional projects that are expected to be tendered in the fall of 1967 for late construction:

On Highway No. 1, grading, paving and interchanges on the Regina Bypass.

On Highway No. 5, paving Kamsack to Canora.

On Highway No. 9, grading from South junction No. 13 to four miles north of North junction No. 13.

On Highway No. 11, grading from north junction No. 5 to Rosthern.

On Highway No. 13, grading Carlyle to Arcola; grading Cadillac to Admiral.

On Highway No. 14, grading Yorkton to Springside; paving Elfros to Dafoe; paving junction No. 2 to east of junction No. 11.

On Highway No. 22, grading Lemberg to junction No. 10.

On Highway No. 29, grading from Battleford south.

On Highway No. 37, grading from Climax west.

On Highway No. 46, grading Climax to Claydon.

On Highway No. 49, grading Kelvington to Okla.

On Highway No. 135, clearing and muskeg filling from Pelican Narrows north.

On Highway No. 367, grading Eyebrow to Bridge ford.

On Highway No. 350, oiling Torquay to U.S. border.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that the contractors and the public are entitled to know what the future planning is for the Highway department. I would just like to make a few announcements here of the long-range program for the next three to five years: (a) The South Saskatchewan River Bridge and highway from Birch Hills to Prince Albert; (b) the reconstruction of Highway No. 2 from Prince Albert to LaRonge; (c) reconstruction and paving of Highway No. 55 from Nipawin to Prince Albert; (d) total reconstruction and paving of Highway No. 11 from Saskatoon to Prince Albert; (e) completion of the reconstruction of Highway No. 11 from Regina to Saskatoon; (f) the paving of Highway No. 14 from Saskatoon to the Manitoba border; (g) construction of a Highway from Saskatoon to Wakaw; (h) reconstruction and paving of Highways No. 37 and 13 from Gull Lake to Eastend; (i) continuation of four-lane construction on No. 1 Highway from Balgonie easterly and from Moose Jaw to Swift Current.

Mr. Speaker, I shall support the main motion and not the amendment.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. T. M. Breker (Humboldt): — In view of the fact that great and magnificent orators from both sides of this House have both defended and attacked the Budget Speech, and because all areas have been so abundantly and thoroughly dealt with, and because I don't have any great personal desire to attack the Members opposite, it is my intention to deviate from the norm in this debate and discuss the Budget as it affects me and the constituents I represent.

Mr. Speaker, about three years ago the Saskatchewan Legislature recognized the urgent need to take action to conserve and properly utilize our water resources. As a result, a multi-purpose project called the Saskatoon Southeast Water Supply was launched to provide water to the various potash mines, to

expanding urban centres, and to areas being developed for irrigation and recreation purposes. We in the Humboldt area will derive a great deal of benefit as a result of this system. First of all it will solve our water problem by bringing not only abundant water but it will bring us water that is reasonably fresh and soft. Secondly, because this pipeline will run along Stoney Lake, which is just four miles south of Humboldt, I see no reason why this lake cannot receive the badly needed water to raise and maintain the lake level and thus create a much needed recreation facility for my area.

Now, the total cost of this project will be in excess of \$25,000,000. During 1966 a start was made and about \$1,700,000 was spent. In the coming year, the Government will advance \$9,800,000 to finance the 1967 capital program. The main canal reservoir should be basically completed by the end of 1967, and water will be provided to the potash mines near Guernsey, Colonsay, and Allan and the towns of Allan and Lanigan in 1968. It is to be hoped by 199 the much dreamed-of-river water will finally hit Humboldt.

I turn now, Mr. Speaker, to municipal affairs and how the Budget will affect the rural municipalities. I see that unconditional equalization grants last year were increased to the rural municipalities from \$1,400,000 to a total of \$2,000,000. This assistance received widespread acceptance from the RMs. In the coming year the Government proposes to further increase equalization by another \$400,000 to a total of \$2,400,000. 1. Equalization Grants, an increase. 2. Snow Removal assistance, in 1966 we inaugurated a program to bring Provincial assistance to some of our major rural routes. We made grants in the past year for this purpose up to a ceiling of \$250,000. Again the program has met with widespread acceptance. In this Budget, the Government proposes to likewise increase snow removal grants by \$50,000 to a total of \$300,000. 3. The Grid Road program year by year has added new mileage in rural areas. In the initial program, all municipalities had a given mileage to construct over a ten-year period. Next year 38 municipalities will have completed this program. Another ten municipalities will only have one mile left to construct.

An Hon. Member: — A good program.

Mr. Breker: — It certainly is. the Government wishes to see the program completed in all municipalities, but where a municipality has completed its grid road program, the Department of Municipal Affairs will consider financial assistance on the same basis for feeder collector roads.

This program is an excellent one, Mr. Speaker, but I wish to point out that we have only scratched the surface. Mr. Speaker, we have at present 17,000 miles of grid in our grid system, 4,000 more miles to finish, which will take another four years. We have 15,000 heavy volume farm access roads which serve anywhere from 15 to 20 farms. We have 22,000 to 25,000 of low volume farm access roads each of which serve only one to five farmers. At the present rate of expenditure, it will take 15 years before every farmer has an all-weather road. Grid roads are excellent, if you live on them. Feeder roads are fine, again if you live on them, but many farmers are still virtually mudded-in in the summer and snowed-in in the winter. I ask this Government, my Government, if and when more money is to be had, we proceed more rapidly than at present to ensure each and every farmer a reasonable all-weather road.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Breker: — What do the rural municipalities think of the way this Government is treating the RMs. “Budget Pleases the RMs.” Evert Murphy of Estevan, President of the Saskatchewan Association of RMs said his association was pleased with the 1967-68 Provincial Budget presented in the Legislature last Friday. Mr. Murphy said:

Generally association officials feel the Government dealt fairly with the request we had made to them. I think rural municipal officials and rural residents can be quite happy with what was included in the Budget for them. The announcement that the Government is planning on financial help on the feeder road system is welcome as is the additional \$500,000 the Government is putting into the grid road construction program.

And he ends up by saying:

We had hoped for \$1,000,000 out of this Budget and it gave us \$950,000 which is not too bad. We feel we got what we asked for.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Breker: — Now, the Member for Wadena (Mr. Dewhurst) used some figures to show that several municipalities received less money under the Liberals than when they were in power. The Member, using some sort of fuzzy brain formula, showed that the municipalities he cited did receive less, even with the increased equalization grant, even with the grid road maintenance grant and even with the snow removal grant. He says in the “Watson Witness,” “Municipal grants and grid road assistance have suffered under the Liberal Administration.” He quoted from the financial statement of one municipality which showed grants in 1962 of \$25,000; in 1963, \$22,000; in 1964, \$44,000; and from the new Liberal Government, \$3,766. Well, I too can cite a very classic example of a municipality getting less money for grid expenditure and the sole reason for this is the fact that the municipality has practically finished the grid road program for that municipality. I have here St. Peter’s Municipality. In 1956-57 they got \$5,000 and it goes all the way up to 1963-64, when they got \$47,000, in 1964-65, \$25,000, 1965-66, \$2,876. This municipality has only half a mile to complete in the original grid program. Now if Mr. Dewhurst would look on the other side of the ledger he would see that this same municipality, St. Peter’s 369, got an equalization grant, not \$500 like they did the year he was in power, but an equalization grant of \$9,075.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Breker: — They got a grid maintenance grant of \$5,476 and they got a snow removal grant of \$666 to a total of \$15,000. This is one...

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Breker: — ...municipality. Now we have the Lake Lenore Municipality and the grass-roots Member from Kinistino (Mr. Thibault)

is very well acquainted with that municipality. He tells me, now that the Government has changed hands, yes, that the Government has changed, his hands are empty, and our special grants for that municipality are as follows: They start out in 1956 with grid expenditures of \$4,900 and have worked the way up to \$61,000 in 1960-61, and then it starts to increase, \$33,000 to \$41,000 in 1965. In 1965-66, \$88,000 was received in grid expenditures. I think, Mr. Dewhurst must own this paper because his speech was on the front page. He has another one. He says this Government is making double the expenditure on highway maintenance that the CCF made. There is a bit of truth that only half the work is being done, he charged. The Great Right Charger.

Mr. Speaker, I represent an agricultural constituency. Seeing that agriculture is still our largest industry in Saskatchewan and that there are approximately 135,000 workers employed in agriculture and about 50 per cent of the gross and net value of commodity production in the province is produced by agriculture, and because of the fact that many of our service trade, and manufacturing industries are based on the needs of farmers, a large part of our economy is dependent upon a healthy agriculture. I am concerned that Saskatchewan is so highly dependent on agriculture and within agriculture, so highly dependent on wheat. In the year 1966, 80 per cent of our production is from field crops and of this 80 per cent is in the form of wheat. Therefore, the province and its farmers are highly vulnerable to crop losses. A normal yield of wheat would mean at least 200,000,000 bushels of wheat less than in 1966. This would mean that farmers would receive \$350,000,000 less for their years' toil than they will from this year's bumper crop. \$350,000,000 less would be twice as much as the Canadian Wheat Board paid out to the farmers this year. The huge abnormal crop has overshadowed the effect of stable produce and rising costs. A series of good crops since 1962 has helped conceal the effect of the cost-price squeeze. Should we now have a normal crop or (Heaven forbid) a below normal crop, the farmers would realize suddenly the serious situation that we are in and the impact on our whole economy would be a severe cutback in activity of this province.

We have two problems, Mr. Speaker, one is the cost price squeeze which has been pushed in the background by the recent good crops, the other is not enough diversification. I note with concern, despite persistent efforts by this Government over the past year, that marketings of hogs and sheep declined. As I said before, we have enjoyed good crops in the recent years, nevertheless history has shown us the danger of depending on a one-crop agricultural economy. We are, Mr. Speaker, cruelly vulnerable to drought or a major drop in overseas wheat sales. Some time ago the Government announced a new policy under which loans would be made available from SEDCO for farmers wishing to go into intensive hog production. This action has helped, but I am disappointed in the lack of response to this program to get farmers into the hog business. I urge farmers in their own interest to raise more hogs and I urge the people in my constituency, especially, to seriously consider the possibility of raising more of these so-called mortgage lifters.

Mr. Speaker, I would be remiss in my duties as an MLA if I didn't mention the mobile counselling unit called the Opportunity Caravan. This project, the first of its kind, in Canada is designed to bring job opportunities and people together. It

will provide rural Saskatchewan with professional counselling to all who need or want it. This Caravan is now making its debut in Humboldt and later it will offer its assistance and its information to the areas served by Watson and by Naicam. I urge the people in those areas to make use of the facilities and information that this unit has to offer. Mr. Speaker, I will support the motion, I will not support the amendment.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. W. J. Berezowsky (Cumberland): — Mr. Speaker, the Provincial Treasurer in his Budget Speech said every dollar the Government spends must first be taken from the pockets of the taxpayers. And I of course agree with this point of view. There is this year an increase of \$35,000,000 and this means that \$35,000,000 more taxes have been picked from the pockets of the taxpayers of this province. So the Provincial Treasurer need not mislead the public that taxes are not up. Mr. Speaker, this Government could be deserving of support if, first of all, tax dollars were used to purchase farms from retiring farmers to be leased or sold to young farmers as Crown lands are not being disposed of; second, if the 1964 provisions of the CCF ADA legislation were put into effect to rehabilitate small farmers, trappers and other industries; third, if a comprehensive program of housing were started to do away with the disgraceful slum conditions in both urban and rural communities; fourth, if all or part of the \$10,000,000 surplus of the Power Corporation were used to extend capital and power services; fifth, alternately, if power rates had been reduced or farmers refunded part, if not all, of their original capital investment, as had once upon a time been promised.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Berezowsky: — Mr. Speaker, this \$35,000,000 in taxes will raise the Budget by \$35,000,000. And how come, people may ask? The Premier of course told us how come. Provincial taxes and revenues will be up as a result of good and improved retail sales and expanding business enterprises. Thus tax dollars are and will be in the future rolling into the Treasury. Good crops and the industrial growth which the CCF started some years ago, are bringing in the results today. Liberals can take credit only for higher interest rates which they have imposed on our people or other charges, for example the Ottawa tight money policy. So the Provincial Treasurer has very little to crow about free enterprises governments. As a matter of fact, this Government, according to returns that were made recently spent \$49,00 on some trailers down in Squaw Rapids; they spent another \$122,000 on equipment. The camp was to produce 12,000 cords of pulpwood to be shipped out, but today I find the camp is closed, men are out of jobs, the operations are suspended. This is the kind of success that you have under your free enterprise Liberal Government in Saskatchewan. Here is another Liberal failure and an insult.

A Liberal appointed Manpower Committee insulted the intelligence of our rural population, referring to them as having a lower IQ than other citizens. One cannot understand how such an insulting statement could have been allowed and be circulated when it is so completely biased. Indeed, this Government must have encouraged this kind of report, otherwise it would not have been printed.

Now, I want to compare the CCF philosophy and accomplishments with the Liberal philosophy and accomplishments, Mr. Speaker.

CCF philosophy recognizes that in our complex society a government must have a definite purpose, and these are my own definitions: It must be a good servant of the people. Secondly, it must be an instrument of human welfare in our modern society. Thirdly, it must undertake policies and programs and work, which individuals or even groups or communities cannot do for themselves. Now, recognizing such a purpose and responsibility, the CCF Government of the past expanded the fields of opportunity in education. That is why the CCF Government initiated hospitalisation and medical care insurance benefits. We legislated new programs for social assistance. We passed the Farm Security Act. That is why the CCF undertook a universal electrification program throughout the province. We legislated for low rental housing for the urban communities and brought in geriatric centres for the elderly people. The CCF raised living standards in depressed regions. Fish, fur and other marketing services were established as everyone knows, and cooperatives were encouraged and helped. Enterprises such as filleting plants, forest and game conservation programs, equalization policies for power, gas and for municipal roads, as well as grants for educational purposes were legislated. We built schools and we built hospitals where none existed before, one in my own community of Meath Park. We assisted with school grants in many other areas of the province. There is not a Saskatchewan community which failed to benefit from our former progressive CCF policies, Mr. Speaker. But the Minister of Natural Resources (Mr. Steuart) has called this stagnation and I'll have something to say about that. As a matter of fact, had we not come to the aid of the city of Prince Albert with public buildings and roads, the Diefenbaker Bridge, and the library as well as all kinds of other projects, the Minister and other business men would probably have been bankrupt before now.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Berezowsky: — We set up a Saskatchewan Timber Board to produce and utilize our forest products and provide work for people.

Need I remind the farmers of my community and of the community of Saskatchewan of the different things that we did for them. Community pastures were set up, help was given to farmers when crops were under the snow. Crop insurance was brought in to benefit farmers. What about the assistance that we brought in to help with sewer and water projects to better the homes for our farm people. This was all started by the CCF yet the Hon. Members call this stagnation, Mr. Speaker,.

But prior to 1944, I want to remind Members of this Legislature that the Liberal Governments of that day leased out a 1,000,000 acres of oil potential land for only \$1 to the Imperial Oil Company. They never got a well, while later under the CCF, hundreds of companies came to Saskatchewan and started to produce oil and potash. Other minerals are being produced as well. We are now getting taxes and revenues for the people of Saskatchewan. Wealth has been produced to the value of hundreds of millions of dollars. Yet the Liberals call this stagnation compared to their own progress in 1944.

Now this Thatcher Government has no thunder and is riding piggyback on the record of the CCF progress, not having anything of their own to ride on, not even an Assembly. This is a disgraceful and shameful stand for a floundering, incompetent, bewildered Liberal party which must mislead the public. It would be much

more honourable, Mr. Speaker, for them to admit the paucity of their own accomplishments or to prove to us that their CCF inheritance left to them in trust is being administered efficiently and honestly, which it is not. Let us not forget, Mr. Speaker, too, that the Liberals in Opposition tried to destroy the steel mill in Regina. They were unhappy with the cement plant. Later they sold the Wizewood plant and now they have sabotaged the plywood plant at Prince Albert, and all the Provincial Treasurer can think of is: What is there to sell next? It may be the Power Corporation, telephone system or maybe the Estevan plan, I don't know.

An Hon. Member: — It's his business.

Mr. Berezowsky: — Mr. Speaker, the CCF were the Government which built up the power, the telephone system, the gas utilities to benefit Saskatchewan people and profit has been a secondary consideration. That's right. Under the Liberal policy, power has not been available to many communities who need power, such as Candle Lake, Cumberland House and all over the Province of Saskatchewan. Their theory, Liberal theory, is profit must come before people. Profit must be put into the Treasury to be used for the aggrandizement of the floors of the Legislature or to pay legislative secretaries rather than to provide services the people of Saskatchewan in capital or other programs of value. This Liberal Government provided tax concessions as they said. Of course they did give tax concessions, but to whom, Mr. Speaker? To corporations, not to you and me. The cement plant at Cory received unjustified tax concessions, and I know a little about the story. Hundreds of thousands of dollars are not now required to be paid in taxes. The Prince Albert pulp mill is another big deal that received an unwarranted tax concession after the interference of the Government of many years' duration and all that you did was to raise the mill rate for the people of Prince Albert. Smaller establishments throughout the province have not received concessions of any kind and neither have you nor I, Mr. Speaker, as I have said. Today I read something in the Carter Commission Report which says that there should be no concessions, three-year tax concessions to corporations and I agree with what the Carter Commission has said. I hope the Government will also take a good look at some of their programs and act so that it does not give away the prerogative of the people of this province.

Mr. Speaker, I must point out to this House that this Liberal Government is mean and parsimonious.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Berezowsky: — Under the former CCF Government we recognized that trappers and fishermen and people of the North had economic difficulties and we granted them a free licence, for example to get a moose or an elk or a caribou. But this Government is so hungry for money and so inconsiderate of people's needs, that it has imposed upon these poor and needy trappers in the North, a licence before they can get their meat for the winter. Note, Sir, too, that conservation of resources has little meaning to the Government opposite. The former CCF Government assisted trappers of Cumberland House and Birch River, as you know, in granting thousands of dollars for the improvement of the Saskatchewan Delta for wildlife and trapping. What do we hear now? That the Cumberland House Delta is one of the best wildlife and

waterfowl areas in Canada. Agreed, and we spent thousands of dollars and Ducks Unlimited spent thousands of dollars and the Government of Canada spent thousands of dollars to improve that area. But I would say to this Government that the destruction of this habitat for which it is most admirably suited will be an historical sin for future generations to lay down at the feet of the present Government. Of course there are some lands suitable for the plough but there is just as much if not more in the present settled agricultural areas that you could improve, not by draining and dyking expense such as you have up at the Delta, but by levelling soil improvement programs and so forth with the goal of higher production, the ultimate production potential of our province. And I would say to this Government to consider the Delta potential from our people's point of view and not from a dollar point of view.

Now, we made millions of profits in our corporations in spite of what the Government may say. I would say let us now plough back some of these profits and invest in industrial development of our province. I suggest we create more public industry to develop our resources such as the resources of clay or silica or any other resources such as the resources of clay or silica or any other resources which may beckon to us. I think it's stupid and costly to miss an opportunity. What if there are some losses sometimes. So what! As long as the final goal is reached for the good of the people of our province. I haven't got time to talk about NorCanAir, I wish I had. I only have two or three minutes so I have to rush, but I will say this.

Here is my opinion of this Government. It has been in here for three years. I consider it not only to be incompetent but disregarding and insulting and threatening to the livelihood of our people. Wizewood, NorCanAir and lately the Power Corporation situation. Men who try to make a living ask for a modest increase to cover the higher cost of living. This Government knew that the cost of living had gone up more than eight per cent. It has said in the Budget Speech that the personal income of other sectors of society has gone up by 12 per cent so surely eight per cent is modest. Yet this Government used every device to deny these workers a decent increase and finally enacted an inglorious precedent, a vicious Bill No. 2, full of compulsion and threats, not only against the Power corporation workers but against all other labouring people, and is now threatening negotiations for professionals such as teachers and the like. And it is strange that the Minister who got elected from Prince Albert (Mr. Steuart) for example, got elected on the slogans, "Compulsion, stagnation, high taxes," should have become the spokesman for that same slogan which he directed against the CCF. The Government uses compulsion. Let me illustrate. I have before me a memo from Paddockwood and I hope the House will listen:

Moved by William Czychowski, seconded by A. Jones and carried unanimously that George Newell be removed from Paddockwood office as it is felt his done does not warrant the pay he is receiving, secondly because it is felt he does not have qualification for the pay he is receiving, and thirdly a person at less salary could be hired to do his job. The saving of about \$1,200 a year could be used for roadwork or placed in the machinery account. And it is further moved that the secretary should mail a copy of today's minutes direct to the Deputy Minister.

What happened? Did the Government remove this man, this former Liberal candidate? No, Mr. Newell is still on social aid at the expense of the taxpayers in LID 959. And I must urge that the

Minister be fair and either act on the recommendations of the representatives or explain to this Legislature his failure.

Mr. Speaker, I have much more to say, but I want to wind up with just a few suggestions to the Government and I say this: If this Government doesn't call an election and stays in office for another year then I recommend the following. The Government should be doing more in water conservation and the building of small dams to raise water levels in many northern lakes. Northern highways such as No. 102 and No. 106 and others should be dust-proofed for the sake of safety and the encouragement of tourists and hunters to travel into the primeval areas. There should be a program of habitat improvement for the increasing wildlife in the North. It should give grants to improve present agricultural lands, as I have mentioned, by levelling, spreading of peat, soil and so forth. I think it should adopt the ARDA projects for the reforestation, berry culture, processing, encourage manufacture of fish boxes, development of peat bog industry, fur ranching, fish smoking and processing plants of all kinds for the economic improvement of northern people establish large public enterprises to utilize clays and glass (silica) sands as a joint public-private industry. Service stations should be allowed to dispense purple gas to farmers, and homeowner grants should be extended to all homeowners and not just those who have a Torrens title. In conclusion then, I want to assure the people of my constituency that when the Thatcher Government is defeated and the CCF return, they will once again be able to go forward with progress and development. You can see, Mr. Speaker, that I shall vote against the motion and for the amendment.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. D. W. Michayluk (Redberry): — Mr. Speaker, on rising, I feel it most appropriate at this stage to congratulate the Provincial Treasurer for his forthright manner and his energetic effort in presenting his Budget. Permit me, Sir, to hasten to add that it only took a left verbal hook and a sound financial uppercut from the Hon. Member for Regina West, (Mr. Blakeney) the financial critic for the Opposition to expose to this Legislature and to the Saskatchewan taxpayers that this plump, presumably juicy, spiced-up health financial bird was not the real specimen, but an adulterated species contrived to deceive until its real identify is recognized one year hence when it comes home to roost.

Before proceeding, Mr. Speaker, may I take a few moments to extend a sincere and cordial welcome to the people of that area of The Battlefords constituency who will be added to the Redberry constituency for purposes of the next Provincial election. This area, Mr. Speaker, comprises the rural municipalities of Great Ben, the villages of Radisson and Borden. Hon. Members of the Legislature may we aware that this area for the last 15 years has been ably represented by the Hon. Member for The Battlefords, Mr. Eiling Kramer. My only wish is that, if I am represented-elected, I may continue to give this area the same dedicated service. This area for many years was part of the Redberry constituency. Prior to my active participation in the realms of politics, public figures had already left their imprint within the confines of this Legislature. The names of the last Mr. George Cockburn and Mr. Dick Lazarko are only too well known by the people of this particular area.

Mr. Speaker, as you know, the Provincial Government has announced its plan to restore the homestead of the former Prime

Minister, the Rt. Hon. John Diefenbaker and to move it to Wascana Centre in Regina. I will have the pleasure, if elected, to represent the area in which Mr. Diefenbaker's former home is now located, and I want to say that I greet the Government's plan both with pleasure and dismay. The pleasure comes in the decision to restore the Diefenbaker homestead and to turn it into a historic site. Although we in this party may quarrel with the political view of Mr. Diefenbaker's party, we have no hesitation in recognizing the only Saskatchewan citizen and the only pioneer of this province to become Prime Minister of Canada, which Mr. Diefenbaker was. The dismay comes in the decision to move the homestead from its location, some 13 miles northeast of Borden in the southern part of my new constituency.

Mr. Speaker, I think I speak on behalf of all of the people of the area and generally on behalf of the people of north-western Saskatchewan when I say that it is a mistake to move a historic site from the place where the site made history. What has the Diefenbaker homestead go to do with Regina? History should be honoured where history was made. Mr. Speaker, it is the policy of most governments to build their historic shrines in areas where history was made. But this Government is following a policy with respect to industry, with respect to development, with respect to historic sites, of ignoring and many regions of this province. I say I have some reservations for the removal from the area, of the Diefenbaker, homestead home, and I suggest that to rebuild the homestead in Wascana Park is a decision, not motivated out of respect for Mr. Diefenbaker but one motivated politically as an attempt by a government to cash in on some of the personal popularity of the former Prime Minister in Saskatchewan.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Michayluk: — Well, we know the Government and the party which formed this Government are suffering a serious decline in popular support and are desperately working to get support from new quarters. This moving of the homestead shows what the Party opposite is prepared to do to buy new support. Would it not, Mr. Speaker, be more just to select the city of Saskatoon for this farmstead, a city which Mr. Diefenbaker's family and the Rt. hon. John Diefenbaker had been associated with because of the proximity of the homestead to Saskatoon? But the present Government, Mr. Speaker, has not always been so eager to render tribute to great people of Saskatchewan who have made history.

You will recall that an official film was made by the CCF Government before 1964 with respect to the signing of the Agreement to proceed with the development of the South Saskatchewan River Dam. In part the film showed the former Premier of this province, the Hon. T. C. Douglas and the former Agricultural Minister, Mr. Alvin Hamilton, signing the Agreement to build this Dam. The film was taken in the library of this Legislative Building. The film, since 1964, Mr. Speaker, has had some scenes cut out from it by this Government. the Government has very carefully censored the film so that Mr. Douglas and Mr. Hamilton no longer appear. The signing of the Agreement was one of the greatest moments in the history of this province but the Government is prepared to censor history. The Government would like to represented-write the history of Saskatchewan and give itself credit for having something to do with the Dam. But of course the only think that the Liberals, Federally and Provincially, Mr. Speaker, recently have given it its official name.

It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that irrespective of what this loaded Budget promises or contains, irrespective of what glowing future the Liberal propaganda machine is promising with full support of the daily press, the Saskatchewan people know that this reactionary Liberal Government has broken many of its pre-election promises and ordinary people are being and will be short-changed.

May I remind, the Premier and his Government of some of the promises that it made to the people in Saskatchewan in 1964. On April 10, 1964, as was reported in the Saskatchewan Liberal, the Liberal party's propaganda sheet, a paper which may be on the drawing board, being made ready for publication and general distribution, contained among other things, the following promise: Promise No. 1. The Liberal party promises to reduce power and natural gas rates. This is pure fiction, Mr. Speaker. This is mockery. A \$3,000,000 tax was imposed on power users by the Treasurer in his Budget just brought down, a \$3,000,000 additional tax burden at the time when the profits of this corporation are in excess of \$10,000,000. When the CCF were the Government and as profits grew...

An Hon. Member: — You won't be back.

Mr. Michayluk: — Don't worry, we will be back,...lower rates were passed on to the users. Mr. Speaker, power rates were lowered several times under the CCF Government. Liberals promised to reduce power rates; now a \$3,000,000 tax imposition on the users of gas and the users of power. Liberal promise No. 2. Mr. Speaker. The Liberal party promises to institute a drug care program to take care of major drugs. Not only did it renege on this pledge, Mr. Speaker, but it has denied many senior citizens the privilege of drugs who formerly received them at shared costs under supplementary allowances by cutting many of our senior citizens off supplementary allowances. I have them in my community, Mr. Speaker. Liberal promise No. 3, Mr. Speaker. Children's clothing and shoes will be exempt from the sales tax. Fiction again, fiction, real and simple, Promise No. 4: Find ways of reducing land and property taxes. This is the greatest of them all!

Mr. E. Kramer (The Battlefords): — Big deal!

Mr. Michayluk: — Mr. Speaker, this promise was intentionally conceived to confuse and to catch the unsuspecting voter and at the same time to leave the impression that the power-hungry Liberals meant business and would alleviate the tax burden for the Saskatchewan taxpayers.

Mr. Speaker, in the two years that this Government has been in office, property taxes have gone up by an estimated \$6,000,000 each year. The Budget just brought down by the Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Thatcher) will extract an additional \$34,000,000 in the next fiscal year from the Saskatchewan taxpayers by our money-hungry Premier. Not only were the Saskatchewan property owners let down, Mr. Speaker, this Government since its election has imposed a systematic series of taxes and tax increases that affect our residents of all age levels of all occupations. May I, Sir, remind the Provincial Treasurer of the tax increases, and I will let the people of Saskatchewan judge this Government for its honesty and its integrity. To begin with, Sir, the 1965 medical care insurance premiums went up by \$20 per family and \$10 per single employed persons.

Mr. B. D. Gallagher (Yorkton): — ...it was '62 Dick.

Mr. Michayluk: — I'll come to that, don't worry. The Liberals are trying, Mr. Speaker, to leave an impression that premiums would have gone up had we formed the Government. This Government could have, in place of the flashy homeowner grants, decreased the premiums for medical care and hospital services. This would have been a just and a fair way for the distribution of tax money to all our Saskatchewan people. This rebate, Mr. Speaker, would have recognized that all Saskatchewan residents contribute to the coffers of this Government.

Next, a five per cent increase to make our cigarette and tobacco tax the highest in Canada; a flat 10 per cent on all tobacco and cigarette purchases. It promised to remove the four per cent on children's clothing and shoes and it has not been fulfilled. Housewives who, because of high living costs, are struggling to meet the household needs by tight budgeting, had this Provincial Treasurer and Premier foist on them a four per cent tax on soaps, detergents and other laundry commodities. This additional household tax could be called by many unparliamentary names, but I think the name of dirty tax could well serve the purpose, Mr. Speaker.

From the unfortunate and the seriously ill requiring immediate help, Mr. Speaker, the Provincial Treasurer used the Air Ambulance to extract an additional \$15 per flight. Is this possible, Mr. Speaker? Could Hon. Members of the Legislature in all fairness conscientiously and honestly agree with the Provincial Liberal Premier and Treasurer who sits in an office newly renovated, with wall drapes and plush floor rugs costing the Saskatchewan taxpayers \$13,700 – a fridge close at hand to keep his contents cool, drawing an annual salary of \$18,000, with a \$13,000 expense allowance, flying an \$86,000 executive plane and a pilot paid for by the taxpayers of Saskatchewan – and is now determined, Mr. Speaker, to extract from the unfortunate sick residents, an additional \$15 more for the use of an air-ambulance? This could only be done by a true Liberal who has money mania.

Mr. Speaker, the 16-24 age group, regardless of their driving record had their driving licence doubled in price; as were the blue and red licence holders. A one cent tax on a gallon of gasoline; a one cent tax on each gallon of diesel fuel used for cars and automobiles. Community pasture fees went up; lease fees have generally increased. Sale price of agricultural Crown lands has increased and contractual agreements for Crown leases have gone up too. Legal and vital statistic documents such as birth and marriage certificates have gone up 100 per cent.

Next, Sir, came the turn for the long-distance users.

Mr. T. M. Weatherald (Cannington): — Why don't you tell us everything?

Mr. Michayluk: — Largest increases are for person-to-person calls. In most instances they have gone up by 30 per cent and in some cases even higher. Mr. Speaker, I have them here and I'll show them to you. Mr. Speaker, the amount that is now charged for a person-to-person call between two small communities would be better compensated if one travelled to see a person by automobile.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Michayluk: — On March 1st, the day after tomorrow, Mr. Speaker, telephone rentals for government telephones will be increased anywhere from \$3 to \$12 per annum. This too, Mr. Speaker, in the year when the revenue income from this Crown corporation was the highest in its history.

And of course university students could not be overlooked. Their fees were increased by some \$35 per student.

Auto licences went up, including insurance, and according to a recent announcement will go up again in 1967. Rates for natural gas users will be surcharged and in some instances 30 per cent for a number of years to pay part of the capital cost.

Today, Mr. Speaker, the users of natural gas in the Minister of Highway's constituency in Rosthern, Hague and Duck Lake are paying a higher rate for natural gas than do the people of Wakaw and other centres.

Mr. Kramer: — Liberal leaders.

Mr. Michayluk: — The gas users of the now proposed extension lines for Waldheim, laird, Blaine Lake, Marcelin, Leask, Shellbrook, when completed will be surcharged for the capital cost of building the gas line into their community. However, Mr. Speaker, may I assure the people of my constituency and of other areas that gas rates will be represented-adjusted when we form the next Government of this province.

Mr. Coderre: — That will be a long time.

Mr. Michayluk: — Mr. Speaker, a second, recently announced and now-in-effect five per cent increase in the price of liquor, this too at the time when the profits from the sale of liquor increased from \$16,500,00 in 1965 to an estimated \$21,500,000 in 1967.

Mr. Speaker, it is sometimes necessary to be repetitious. The Hon. Member for Regina West, (Mr. Blakeney) has covered the subject of Saskatchewan Government Insurance. To the Premier and to this Government, Mr. Speaker, this Crown corporation has been like a thorn in the side, as no doubt it was to the private insurance companies since its inception when the CCF Government came into power in 1944. During the 19 years of its operation under the CCF, during the period of inflationary costs, this Crown corporation has reduced the insurance premiums to Saskatchewan residents by an estimated 60 per cent. Hon. Members will recall that one year ago — a year in which the profits of this Crown corporation were the highest for any one single year — the rates were increased up to some 40 per cent in most of the urban centres of this province. My community, Mr. Speaker, had a 40 per cent increase in the insurance rates. it did not end, Mr. Speaker, with the increase in urban insurance rates. Saskatchewan farm dwellings coverage was increased from a flat 50 cents per hundred up to \$1.45 under the Liberals by the same Saskatchewan Government Insurance Office. This has happened in a little more than two years under the Liberals. No more have the Saskatchewan farmers a flat 50 cent farm dwelling rate. Dwellings are now classified according to construction and the

rates have gone up anywhere from 65 cents per hundred for Class A up to \$1.45 per hundred for Class E. A farmer who not too long ago, Mr. Speaker, paid \$25 for a premium for a three-year coverage for his dwelling, will now have to pay two and a half times that amount or \$87 – a \$57 penalty for electing a Liberal Government.

An Hon. Member: — Pretty expensive!

Mr. Michayluk: — During debates in this Legislature, Mr. Speaker, I have pointed out the savings made by the people who had carried insurance with private companies when the Saskatchewan Government Insurance Office operated under the CCF. These savings were possible because the Saskatchewan Government Insurance Office was providing cheap coverage and competition to private insurance companies. I know of business men in my own community, Sir, who have saved as much as \$170 or more per year on similar coverage from 1945 to 1964, although prices have gone up, and we have had a period of inflation since the removal of price control.

Liberals, Mr. Speaker, so far, were just afraid to sell the Crown corporation, much as they would like to. They are mutilating its effectiveness of increasing the rates, thus giving the private insurance companies millions of dollars in the form of higher premiums from the Saskatchewan people.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Michayluk: — Mr. Speaker, I want to remind you and the Members of this House, that these free enterprise insurance companies will do everything in their power financially and otherwise, to make sure that the Liberals are re-elected because they are their friends. The pledge made to the insurance companies by the Premier before his party was elected to government is now slowly being fulfilled.

Mr. Kramer: — Not so slowly.

Mr. Michayluk: — That the Premier made a deal is indicated in Monetary Times of May, 1965, and I have it here on my desk, Mr. Speaker. May I quote in part:

Some private companies feel the new Government is dragging its feet. The Thatcher Government has not indicated how it may keep its pre-election promise. All that it is saying is that the situation is being reviewed.

And it has been reviewed, Mr. Speaker, by increasing the rates to feed these private insurance companies with Saskatchewan insurance money.

Not only is the money greed of private companies satisfied, but many of the 600 agents selling insurance for the Saskatchewan Government Insurance Office have since the election of the Liberal Government lost their agencies without any compensation for building up premiums and policies from local Liberal politicians who were waiting for their reward and political plums. In my constituency, Mr. Speaker, three agents have lost their agency, and there are many more all over the province, without any compensation. One of the three agents paid \$2,400 for the

agency only two years prior to his losing it. His agency was taken over by a good local Liberal without any return for the investment. This, Mr. Speaker, has created a feeling of resentment among the Saskatchewan Government Insurance office policy holders, who will forego their coverage and represented-insure else where with other companies.

Mr. Kramer: — This is what they want.

Mr. Michayluk: — One other agency was sold to a Liberal with full knowledge that the meat axe would fall. Several other agents are still working under constant pressures and fear of reprisals. This, Mr. Speaker, is rank discrimination, this is bludgeoned injustice, this is out-modern crudeness of the jungle era that should have no place in a 20th century society. But to the Liberals, Mr. Speaker, irrespective of how it affects the livelihood of others, graft reigns unabated.

Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Member for The Battlefords (Mr. Kramer) discussed certain matters that affect both of our constituencies. The Battlefords Provincial Park expansion has come almost to a complete halt. More trailer, camping, and tenting areas and a golf course are my main concern. Many of the people had to be turned away due to lack of accommodation. I would urge upon the Minister and the Government to proceed with the plan as laid down in 1964 by the CCF Government.

Mr. Coderre: — You got hopes.

Mr. Michayluk: — Had the proposed expansion, Mr. Speaker, been proceeded with, it would not have been necessary for the Hon. Member for The Battlefords and me to raise this matter in this House at this time. I do, Mr. Speaker, wish to commend the local governments of the Rabbit Lake area for their willingness to share costs in the establishment of the Meeting Lake Regional Park. This park is located on the west shore of Meeting Lake and is a credit to the area. I want to thank the Minister for the financial assistance given for its establishment. This park is located over two miles on a gravel grid road; the access is very difficult after the usual summer rains. I would suggest to the Minister of Natural Resources (Mr. Steuart) that the full cost of an all-weather road be borne by the Department under the Road to Resorts Programs, in conjunction with the rural municipalities concerned. I want to congratulate the Meeting Lake Regional Parks Board for their efforts. The untiring work of Mr. Norman Haryung as Chairman of the Board and the generous and able assistance, almost free, from his father Mr. Anton Haryung, together with a large number of people from this area are to be heartily commended for this effort and this, Sir, I do at this time. Martin's Lake Regional Park established several years ago is progressing well. It is hoped that ownership of the cabin area is established so that power is brought in to speed up cabin expansion.

Petrofka road-side picnic camp – as I had envisioned it under the CCF has been dismally proceeded with. The cairn commemorating the first Russian settlers and the establishment of a village on the west banks of North Saskatchewan River, the Petrofka village, after which the ferry and the bridge have been named, will be moved from its present location to this park site at government expense shortly after the next election has been gone through with. And not by the Liberals but by a CCF

Government/

Mr. Speaker, my constituency has three hospitals. Two were represented-built by the CCF Government. The third, the Lady Minto Hospital at Edam, was under serious consideration by the former Minister of Public Health (Mr. Blakeney). This hospital for many years now has had a very competent doctor to serve the people in this hospital area. It is also noteworthy, Mr. Speaker, that the people in the hospital area have given approval to proceed with the construction of a new eight-bed hospital. May I, Mr. Speaker, suggest to the Government and to the Minister that every possible assistance be given. Any intervention by the Local Government Board to disallow proceeding with the sale debentures to delay construction would only be construed as unwillingness of this Government to recognize the basic needs of health services in this area and new facilities.

Mr. Grant (Minister of Health): — Mines Branch – it's open on Thursday.

Mr. Michayluk: — An impression is being created...

An Hon. Member: — Late again.

Mr. Michayluk: — ...and Liberal politicians are very good at creating impressions, that the CCF would have never built it and that they were going to close it down. Oh yes, this is some type of Liberal propaganda, Mr. Minister, that is being peddled in the Edam Union Hospital area. Now I suppose some of you gentlemen; will be up there to do the same. An impression is being created that the Lady Minto Hospital was slated for closure or conversion to alternate use. It is true that a recommendation was made by the hospital survey committee. But a recommendation to the Minister or the Government is not government policy. Delegations from the Edam area in respect to the Edam hospital were given every assurance by the CCF Government that the Edam hospital will not be closed or converted to alternate use.

There is immediate concern in the large section of my constituency as applications for rail abandonment have been made by the CPR for the Iffley, Scent Grass, Hatherleigh and Sandwith area and the CPR has made application to abandon the Whitow, and the Redfield line. If these abandonments are approved it will make it necessary for some 274 permit holders who produce over 250,000 bushels of grain to haul their produce long distances, and in some instances up to 25 miles or more. This will add to production costs. Additional road building and road maintenance costs will have to be borne by the rural municipalities. Many of the business establishments with large investments will be virtually wiped out. It may be that planned and rational abandonment of rail lines may be justified, but communities and municipal local government and private businesses established in these communities should be assisted and compensated.

Mr. Speaker, I will make reference to the agricultural machinery testing program, scrapped by the Liberal Government.

The machinery testing program costs, Mr. Speaker, were shared not only by the Department of Agriculture of this province but also by the Social Credit Government of the Province of Alberta. Some 16,000 Saskatchewan farmers availed themselves of the information this program provided. Before its

abandonment the Saskatchewan Farmers' Union Convention and the Annual Convention of the Saskatchewan Wheat Pool made representations to the Government. Farm organizations sent requests to Members on this side of the House and to the Members of the Government and the Minister of Agriculture (Hon. H. A. McDonald) in the present Government. Our Members spoke in defence of this program in this House. What happened, Mr. Speaker, is a betrayal by the Liberals of the Saskatchewan farmer and the basic agricultural industry. These honourable men in government to quote Anthony from Julius Caesar – and we had Caesar from Wascana the other day – considered the interest of machinery companies over the interest of the Saskatchewan agricultural industry. Yet they dare to rise in this House and under pretence of conceit and deception pretend to represent the interests of the Saskatchewan farmers. The Hon. Member for Cutknife (Mr. Nollet) in debate assured the farmers a few days ago, and the agricultural industry that the program will be reinstated in the near future, Sir, and I will give him my full support.

My village, Mr. Speaker, last year engaged a firm of engineers to carry out a survey to give the village council an estimated cost of modernizing this community by providing sewer and water. Upon receipt of the report members of the council met with the Local Government Board. We were given to understand at that time that a 10-year debenture issue would be permitted. We encountered difficulty in obtaining a figure from the Department of the amount of grant that would be made available to our village. I had approached the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. McIsaac) on several occasions for a definite commitment. It is true that the Department did send a representative from the Local Government Board to inform the village that a 10-year debenture period is too long and will have to be shortened to eight, and that a total grant of \$3,000 will be made available to assist the village to install sewer and water. Mr. Speaker, this is exactly \$500 less than the CCF Government gave to the RM of Redberry for a two-mile stretch of municipal road for a bus route. The village of Krydor has some 160 people, and only \$3,000. I want to assure the people of Krydor that in a CCF Government I will do everything in my power to facilitate the installation of sewer and water, giving full regard to assistance on long-term financing.

Mr. Kramer: — You'll have to send a note to Treasury, if you want to do that.

Mr. Michayluk: — At this time, Mr. Speaker, permit me to commend the Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Thatcher) and the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. McIsaac) for their effort to continue the CCF program of building on a cost-sharing basis inter-grid feeder roads. Hon. Members will recall that the grid road program was the Hon. Lachie McIntosh's contribution to rural Saskatchewan. Next to power, grid roads. Although bitterly opposed and misrepresented by the Liberal party in 1956, the Saskatchewan electors entrusted the CCF to carry out its 1956 pledge with respect to grid roads, which are now a reality and of which the Liberals boast.

What was the pledge, Mr. Speaker? Short and simple – that the CCF Government if represented-elected, would in conjunction with the municipalities, over a 10-year period build inter-municipal grid roads connecting the Provincial highways on a cost-sharing basis. From 1956 to 1966, almost 12,000 miles were completed. This has

now set the stage for the new Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. McIsaac) for the inter-grid connections now being proposed by the Government.

The Provincial Treasurer in his Budget Address stated and may I quote:

These roads link main grid roads – may be built to slightly reduced standards for less money.

I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, to the Minister and to the Provincial Treasurer, that with increased and budgetary revenues the Department of Municipal Affairs should assume a larger share of the cost of building feeder roads and that a good and a decent standard be maintained. These roads, Mr. Speaker, will be used by our rural Saskatchewan people for many years to come...

Mr. Steuart (Minister of Natural Resources): — To come!

Mr. Michayluk: — ...therefore skimping now and reducing the standards of these roads, will in the long run cost the Saskatchewan taxpayers more. Money, Mr. Speaker, seems to be the root of all evil if it's doled out by the Liberals for services to people. Some of our Members will recall, Mr. Speaker, the condemnation that was heaped upon the CCF Government when the grid roads were proposed. Liberals stated that this proposal was too costly and unworkable. Some went as far as to say that in its experimental stage, when the Liberals were the Government, the idea of grid roads and larger school units had to be abandoned.

May I, Sir, with your permission, satisfy the curiosity of the younger Members on the Government side and probably the uninformed by turning your attention to a political meeting addressed by the late Hon. J. G. Gardiner, the then Federal Minister of Agriculture, speaking at a public meeting at Dysart, which was reported in the Prince Albert Herald, on June 8, 1956, and I quote:

The Liberal Administration has laid the ground for the highways, power and telephone systems and had tried the larger school units and the municipal grid road system, Mr. Gardiner said. The latter two had to be abandoned, because they proved to be too costly and unworkable.

Here, Mr. Speaker, is the Federal Minister of Agriculture trying to convince the Saskatchewan rural people to vote Liberal because grid roads and school units proved to be costly and were abandoned as unworkable. Remarkable, Mr. Speaker! The philosophy of the Liberals has not changed today. Any investment that will bring benefits and returns to our people have been bludgeoned and institutions that were on the drawing board under the CCF have all been unmercifully abandoned.

In a period of slightly over two years, Mr. Speaker, some of the basic freedoms enjoyed by people in Saskatchewan over the last 20 years have been curtailed, particularly of civil servants and Crown corporation employees and hospital workers under this Government. Yes, Mr. Speaker, the privileges that were enjoyed for the 20 years have been restricted. Some of the most sincere and honest citizens who were in public service were threatened with loss of employment if they did not become

politically subservient to this Government. Supremacy has reigned supreme. Both the Premier and his number two right-hand man in almost Gestapo-like fashion have threatened Crown corporation employees with outright dismissal, although pledges were made prior to his election. Similar assurances were made by the Premier to the Civil Service of this Province when he assumed office.

One has, Mr. Speaker, but to turn to the Dome Civil Service Publication of May, 1964, the day on which this Government took over the reins of this province and I quote in part. Here is what the Premier said, Mr. Speaker.

I have said so many times in the past that civil servants have nothing to fear from a new Liberal Government. Their jobs will be secure and their political independence respected.

The Deputy Premier, the Hon. Member for Prince Albert, (Mr. Steuart), now the Minister of Natural Resources, during the by-election of 1962 made pledges on behalf of himself and the Liberal party as reported in the Prince Albert Herald, November 10, 1962, and may I quote in part:

The NDP-CCF Socialist Government have thrown a scare into the people as to the safety of their jobs if there is a change in Government.

The truth is the Liberal Government guarantees the civil servants and Crown corporation employees first, the safety and security of their jobs; second, the right of collective bargaining.

Bill No. 2 I suppose gave them that.

the right of freedom of collective bargaining. A Liberal Government will take political pressure off all Government employees and treat them as free, independent individuals.

Bold, headline statements, Mr. Speaker. Aesop couldn't have done better in his fables. Very bold, noteworthy pledges that could be incorporated in any Provincial or Federal Bill of Rights. However, were they sincere and were they in accordance with the fact? The people in Saskatchewan know, as do civil servants, that with the implementation of Bill No. 2, a large segment of Saskatchewan employees have lost their basic freedoms and the right to collective bargaining.

Mr. Steuart: — Nonsense.

Mr. Michayluk: — What has happened to the conscientious, devoted and sincere employees of the public service?

Mr. G. G. Leith (Elrose): — Slow down, we can't hear you.

Mr. Michayluk: — Some were summarily dismissed, and in many instances hints and suggestions were given to look around. Under such circumstances when other governments are clamouring to obtain services of capable and qualified people, some of our most able servants pulled up stake and left and sought employment elsewhere. They were welcomed with open arms by Federal and Provincial

Government. Saskatchewan, Mr. Speaker, was the loser.

I want the Government to tell me where did those civil servants go that were fired when the CCF became the Government. Did they go to Ottawa or other governments? They were political organizers for the Liberal party up to 1944. Saskatchewan Crown corporation employees were threatened by one, Mr. Herb Pinder. Saskatoon Star Phoenix of October 29, 1964, in an editorial said, and I quote in part:

Minister Herb Pinder said that Saskatchewan civil servants have been asked to refrain from political activity both on and off the job.

The Hanley by-election, Mr. Speaker, gave Mr. Pinder an opportunity to refrain from making such statements on behalf of the Saskatchewan people. Irrespective of all this, the Liberals don't seem to learn, Mr. Speaker.

The Hon. Member for Prince Albert on January 21, 1966, as reported in the Saskatoon Star Phoenix too, gave blunt warnings of reprisals to Crown corporation employees and I quote:

Last week, Hon. D. G. Steuart, the Minister in charge of the Saskatchewan Power Corporation issued a warning that the Corporation would not accept, allow or condone political activity in the Provincial field by its employees. Such activity, the Minister said, would result in dismissal.

What a change!

An Hon. Member: — Big stink, little man.

Mr. Michayluk: — Big stink, that's right. Stack this, Mr. Speaker, with his pledge to his constituents and to the people of Saskatchewan when he said that he guaranteed civil servants and Crown corporation employees the right of freedom of political choice.

Mr. Leith: — It's still there.

Mr. Kramer: — Provided they make the right choice.

Mr. Michayluk: — The Hon. Member for Regina West (Mr. Blakeney) and the Hon. Member for Regina East (Mr. Smishek) have covered the inadequacy in respect to education and I need not cover the same subject. May I add just a word or two. Educational facilities and the provisions for technical school expansion planned by the CCF Government had all been abandoned. On assuming office, the Government cancelled the \$2,000,000 appropriated for technical schools. This move, Mr. Speaker, lost \$6,000,000 of Federal money for the Province of Saskatchewan. Not only did we suffer loss of Federal money but many of our young students have been and are being denied access to technical skills and training. The Minister of Labour (Hon. L. P. Coderre), Mr. Speaker, just the other day had the audacity to rise in this Legislature and so blatantly without regard for facts state that no one has been denied access to technical training. May I remind the Minister, in an answer to a question put by the Hon. Member for Regina East (Mr. Smishek) that 880 applicants were not admitted due to lack of space a year ago. There is nothing to make me change

my view that this did not occur last year, Mr. Speaker. Regional technical schools planned by the CCF have been abandoned. This Government had announced vocational schools for Lloydminster, Melfort, Swift current, for two successive years, 1965 and 1966, and I suppose in several weeks they'll be trudging up and down the province announcing them for 1967. Mr. Speaker, announcement, headlines, no performance, no construction.

Mr. Speaker, whatever the incentive grants proposed by the Department of Education by the Minister were, I don't know what they are and I'm sure that the Minister doesn't know. They were but a gimmick to force the school boards to hold the tax line. My school unit because of these grants had to budget for a deficit. In no other field did this Government show more complete disregard than it did to our young. Members remember that when the CCF were the Government and proposed to give the 18-year olds of Saskatchewan the right to vote, the Liberal Opposition of the day called it a chocolate bar vote.

Mr. J. H. Brockelbank (Kelsey): — So they did.

Mr. Michayluk: — What is the Minister in charge of Youth Agency doing today? He is peddling a huge caravan, driving an Opportunity Caravan to becloud the inadequacy of this Government by pretending that they are really trying to do something for our youth. A caravan at this time, Mr. Speaker, is nothing else but a propaganda agency. Give them schools, give them universities, give them accessibility at no cost, counselling, in schools. What I want to suggest to this Government is to expand and provide facilities, provide the opportunities for our young girls and boys and make education readily accessible to all our youth without financial burdens.

I want to make just one reference to an item that is not on my printed sheet and this is to a bold headline in the Saskatoon Star Phoenix, June 8, 1966, under the title – and may I quote, Mr. Speaker,; “Estevan Brick Plan Reorganizes Private Corporation.”

Private corporation – it was mentioned by some Members on this side that shareholders have been named and the Government wants to show that reorganization of a Crown corporation into a private corporation would show a little better balance sheet than it did than when it was owned publicly or rub publicly. I think it hasn't changed at all. The only thing that has changed, Mr. Speaker, is what this Government is doing to the Saskatoon Star Phoenix of June 14, 1966, under the heading: “Saskatchewan Brick Must Be used” and may I quote – just listen to this –

Notice has been served that the Province will provide no financial assistance for Centennial auditorium projects in Saskatoon or Regina unless bricks used are produced in Saskatchewan.

However, a notice carried in the current issue of the Saskatchewan Gazette also says that the limitation will not apply, if it is shown the price of Saskatchewan manufactured brick is not competitive with prices for other bricks. There is a threat to the two major auditoriums, one of course couldn't even get assistance to get it off the ground. They must buy bricks from a reorganized publicly-owned Estevan brick plan, reorganized as a private corporation, so it must show profit. Mr. Speaker, I

presume that it should be evident to you, Sir, and to the Members of the Government and all Hon. Members of this House, that I will not support the motion, but I will endorse the amendment.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. G. J. Trapp (Minister of Education): — Mr. Speaker, the Premier's Budget Debate was a triumph. It increased spending and services to the people of Saskatchewan and yet brought no tax increases. This utterly deflated the Opposition. The Member for Regina West (Mr. Blakeney) when he found he had no case in fact turned to the theatrical. He put on quite a performance, especially if one heard him and didn't know the facts. I would like to bring some of the facts to the attention of this House. I was amused at the Hon. Member's give-away program for Regina. Now His Worship the Mayor and Hon. Member for Regina East (Mr. Baker) indulges in certain forms of fantasy at times and most of us enjoy hearing him. He disregards CCF platforms and this is all to the good. He put forth his own program for local consumption. Most of us enjoyed it and everybody has had a good time. We must remember that the Member for Regina East was not a Member of the CCF Government when it was in office. If he had been, he would have been sadly disillusioned with them. But there is no excuse for such fantasy on the part of the Member for Regina West. Let me show what I mean:

He talked about Provincial grants to ring roads for Regina. He talked about Provincial grants for Regina streets. He reminded me of a little boy reading a Christmas letter to Santa Claus. Why didn't the Hon. Member see that some of these things were done when he was in the Government? Mr. Speaker, I would like to remind the Hon. Member for Regina West (Mr. Blakeney) that if these things are done for Regina, they would need to be done for all centres in the province. Towns and villages also have streets and road problems. Now let me mention one example of how the CCF treated Regina when they were the Government. I'll turn to libraries for a moment.

The CCF gave Regina a grant of \$2,700 a year; we will this year offer Regina Library \$19,000 as a Provincial grant, seven times as much. Regional libraries established by the CCF — they established one in 20 years. Within a week we will have another announcement of another regional library. We will have established two in less than three years. More than this, Mr. Speaker, we will increase the library grant to regional libraries by 33 1/3 per cent. The increase this year to libraries in the province will be more than \$246,000 over what it was last year. For far too long our opponents short changed both the people in the cities and in the country regarding libraries. But the cities on their own and at a high cost to the people, provided their people with libraries. For 20 years the people in the province were shamefully treated by the CCF with respect to library facilities in this province. The Hon. Member for Regina West made a statement in the House on Monday concerning technical and vocational schools, particularly the new one in Regina. I want to inform him that his statements in this House regarding these schools were absolutely false. I quote his remarks:

As for technical high schools, the program has been abandoned. There has been a return to composite schools and Members opposite are acting as if composite schools are something new and different. I say, again, with

regret, that the composite schools while useful cannot do the full job required. For example, how many students who failed grade eight are at a composite or comprehensive school? How many students over 20 years old? What is to happen to the very group whom technical high schools were meant to serve, those who cannot meet the academic requirements of the composite school and those who have left the school system but need technical training? These are the forgotten people under the Liberals. These are the people that the Government is condemning to a precarious life on the unskilled labour market. They are being denied technical training.

I checked with the particular school to which the Hon. Member referred and this is what I found out. They have an adult class at the Miller High School of 25 adults. One lady in the class is 36 years old and has four children. They are in the process of organizing four other adult classes at this school. They have 86 students taking vocational courses leading to employment and two other courses are being organized at the present time. Why try to downgrade a good school program and the school just being opened. He was there at the opening he knows the school is not in full swing. Why did he make these remarks? It is within the boundaries of the city, so why didn't he go out and find out the facts before he made these statements in this House? You would think that if the Hon. Member were interested in Regina, he would have found out what was going on in this school before he made disparaging remarks about this program. I want to assure him that under the leadership of the Superintendent, Mr. L. A. Riederer and his staff, this school will be a leader in education in Canada. It will take care of the needs of the total school population and of adults in this area. The Hon. Member from Regina West (Mr. Blakeney) said:

The Government has completely abandoned the program for technical high schools.

This is somewhat misleading. We have abandoned the unfeasible technical school program which we inherited from the Socialists. Yes, this was never a program though. It was only election talk at the last election and you know it. There was not a work written about the program. There was not a plan for any school. Why come up with this nonsense from time to time of talking about a technical program. I never heard about it. I was in education until the furore started about the last elections, then I heard about ten technical regional schools. Incidentally it was recommended to the previous Government while it was in office that this program be abandoned. Experience in both British Columbia and Alberta showed the wisdom of such a movement. Your program for ten regional technical high schools fell flat on its face, and you know it. It was not acceptable to anyone in education, neither teachers or trustees. On the other hand, our program is being received with great enthusiasm, and we can hardly keep up with the demand. Don't forget we had to start from scratch. We had to develop the program and plan with Boards. We had to get Federal approval of these various projects. I want to pay tribute to the staff in the Department of Education on how they have worked on this program, to the Deputy Minister, Assistant Deputy, and the total staff. I must say they have done yeoman' school service in less than three years to get this program underway and a successful program too. They must take a great part of the credit and I want to give it to them.

In developing this program for the comprehensive high schools, these basic principles were guidelines. First, a complete secondary school education should be within the reach of the majority of the students of secondary school age. Secondly students should be encouraged to remain in high schools as long as they can profit from school attendance, which means that appropriate programs must be available. Thirdly, the course offered, course organization and graduation requirements should facilitate attainment of these first two basic principles. The comprehensive high school program provides the opportunity but we also strengthened the matriculation program leading to professional training at the university. Furthermore it provides a greater emphasis on the fine arts. In addition it offers a sound institute preparatory program for students who are interested in semi-professional training. This program offers technology education in the following broad fields: mechanical, electrical, electronics, construction. For students more interested in trades training courses, there are opportunities in auto body, auto mechanics, electricity, metal work and carpentry. A greatly expanded commercial program has been developed. In addition to secretarial training, in the traditional sense, courses will include training in business administration, computer technology and data processing, merchandising and sales. The agricultural program has been revised to include farm shop, farm-record keeping, farm management, economics and the application of science to farming operations, fertilizers, weed control, irrigation and so on. The new program reflects a concern for increased educational opportunity for both groups not previously well served by our high schools.

First, adults – academic upgrading programs will be provided for all who come. Secondly, young people who could profit from some kind of cooperative school work training program. Appropriate programs have been developed to assist these young people to acquire some marketable skills which will enable them to make a useful contribution to society. In summary, the comprehensive high school program provides for a wide range of interest, aptitudes and abilities for those in Division IV. It stresses general education throughout, but at the same time it provides a far greater range of vocational offerings and by so doing opens the door to many more employment opportunities. Our technical vocational high schools will do all that your ten regional high schools intended to do and more. Our schools will provide a total school program for young people.

Our friends across the way like to mention the postponement of the technical project at Saskatoon. What they fail to realize is that, because their planning was so completely unacceptable to us and to the people of Saskatchewan, we had to develop new plans for new programs for the extension at Saskatoon. I heard about three or four times during the session, mention of the fact that new extension would be used mainly for nursing education. This is false. Less than one-quarter of the space and the facilities at the new extension will be used for nursing education.

I'm going to say a word about school grants, Mr. Speaker. Members opposite will not deny that the total sum of school grants which we are paying is much larger than they ever paid. In 1963-64 they paid \$37,600,00. In 1967-68 in this Budget, we are proposing \$58,000,000 – an increase of \$20,000,000. The most important aspect is that we are not paying the highest percentage of school grants ever paid. It is now in the neighbourhood of 50 per cent or more. The CCF in the last year paid

only 44.8 per cent. Our Socialist friends avoid these figures like the plague because they can't juggle them. What do they do? Well, they say taxes for education are going up. Suppose the cost per teacher goes up \$400 in a school system. Certainly, if we pay half, the Board will have to raise the other half. This has always been worse than this. Only if we pay the total sum of education could you avoid this happening. Probably our friends across the way don't like it on a percentage basis or in actual totals. Let me give it on a per-pupil. This year it will amount to \$230 per pupil, an increase of \$64 per pupil.

Let us now turn to the university. The Hon. Member from Regina West (Mr. Blakeney) said, and I quote:

In the early 1960's, when it was decided to build the new Regina Campus, it was recognized that building would have to continue at a brisk pace if critical shortages of classrooms and other space are to be avoided.

Well, the work 'brisk' was the understatement of the year. The students who are filling the University today were born before 1960. They were in the school system in 1960. Why the briskness? I thought they were the super planners.

Hon. L. P. Coderre (Gravelbourg): — Great planners.

Mr. Trapp: — Let me turn for a moment now to adult training.

Hon. W. S. Lloyd (Leader of the Opposition): — With regard to the assistance to the University, does it include the money which is this year coming from the Federal Government for the University?

Mr. Trapp: — The same as it always was.

Mr. Lloyd: — No, no, partly.

Mr. Trapp: — Exactly the same.

Mr. Lloyd: — I beg your pardon, Mr. Speaker, I'm referring to money which last year the Federal Government paid directly to the University but this year it pays to the Provincial Government to be passed on to the University.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Trapp: — Adult training at this time

I would like to make some reference to this. In 1965 the present Government initiated in-plant training, and by March 31, 1967 we will have trained under this program, 1,907 students or persons through this program. In more than 20 different fields. The length of the course has varied according to the specific training requirements by the nature of the course. For example, while the structural steel drafting course required nine months in-plant training and six months on-the-job training. The latest report from the Weyburn Vocational Centre shows that more than 330 adults are now taking either vocational training or upgrading classes, we have more than 3,000 adults who have received training since the summer of 1965. This is the Liberal answer to unemployment and social aid.

I want to turn briefly to northern education. In 1963 the capital grants to northern schools were \$249,090. In 1966-67 capital grants were \$520,170, an increase of \$271,080 or an increase of 108.8 per cent. Operational grants for northern schools, in 1963-64, \$575,550 and in 1966-67, \$894,500 an increase of \$318,950 or an increase of 55.4 per cent.

Mr. Coderre: — How do you like that for action?

Mr. H. H. P. Baker (Regina West): — ...decimal in the wrong place.

Mr. Trapp: — In the summer of 1963, 16 new classrooms were added in the North. In the summer 1966, 25 new classrooms were added in the North, an increase of 56 per cent. For the same period there was an increase in teacherages of 42 per cent. This year more than \$1,600,000 has been provided in the Budget for northern schools compared with \$800,000 by the CCF, double for northern education. I am proud of our changeover to a Northern School Board of eight members. The people of the North feel they now have a voice in the education of their children. I am very pleased with advice of the four native members from the North who sit on this Board.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to report on other significant aspects of the work of the Department of Education during the past year. More specifically, I wish to speak on the following topics; first, the reorganization of instruction; 2. teacher supply; 3. provision of free text books for high school students; 4. introduction of Driver Training in the high school curriculum; 5. school bands; 6. Centennial projects in Saskatchewan schools.

Reorganization of instruction – under the new pattern of instruction four broad divisions have replaced the traditional eight grade elementary and four grade high school arrangement. This new organization provides for continuous pupil progress throughout the first two divisions, an extension of elementary education to include grade 9 in division three and a far greater range of offerings in the secondary schools, division four. I want to give you a brief progress report with respect to this reorganization of instruction.

Divisions one and two, formerly grades one to six. In divisions one and two the curriculum has been revised to fit the non-graded, continuous progress approach, in which children progress at varying rates of speed, with no failing in the sense of repeating an entire year's work. Instead, children start in

September where they left off the previous June. We are convinced that this plan is sound. You may be interested to know that other Canadian provinces are following Saskatchewan's lead in adopting this approach to instruction in the elementary school.

Division three – I am able to report that the new curricular offerings for division three, which was grade seven, eight and nine, will be ready for use in the fall of 1967. I want to make it clear, however, that we are not encouraging a wholesale implementation of these new division three courses next year. Rather, we see a more gradual implementation as teachers become prepared for the new curriculum, and as school boards are able to provide the new facilities which will be needed for certain parts of the program.

Division four – several districts have been able to meet the requirements for financial assistance for building and equipping comprehensive high schools under the terms of the existing Federal-Provincial Agreement. The Yorkton and Miller Comprehensive High School in Regina are now operating. Six other projects have been approved in Lloydminster, Melfort, Swift Current, Saskatoon-Two projects, and North Battleford. Construction has commenced at Melfort and at one of the Saskatoon schools. A number of additional projects are in varying stages of planning-Prince Albert, Regina-three schools, Weyburn, Melville, Nipawin and Estevan.

I want to say a word about teacher supply. I think it is a known fact that across Canada, United States and western civilization, there is a shortage of qualified teachers. Positive steps have been taken to alleviate the shortage of qualified teachers in Saskatchewan. I am pleased to report that we have recruited 556 teachers from outside Saskatchewan last year. Through our overseas recruiting campaign in Britain last spring, 231 qualified teachers are now in Saskatchewan schools. We have received very favourable reports from school boards and parents with respect to the work of the majority of these teachers from overseas. You will be interested to know that since mid-December we have had one of our Superintendents of Schools recruiting teachers in England, Scotland and Ireland. We are aiming to bring 250 qualified teachers to Saskatchewan for service next fall. I must say that we are having wonderful cooperation from our Superintendents and from school boards throughout. I'm happy to announce this year that there will be free texts for all grade 10, a long delayed promise of the previous Government, more than 20 years late. I'm very pleased to have a part in the fulfilment of this promise. Provision of free textbooks for grade nine last fall, at an estimated cost of \$600,000, have been enthusiastically received by parents throughout the province. It is our intention to extend free textbooks to include grade 10 in the fall of 1967. An additional \$650,000 is budgeted for this purpose. This program will mean \$1,250,000 in savings to parents with students in grades nine and ten.

I would like to turn for a moment to Driver Training. The decision to include Driver Training as an integral part of the high school curriculum, commencing in the fall of 1967, is a Canadian first, which I know will have the whole-hearted support of parents and the public generally. When the plan becomes fully operational, every Saskatchewan high school student will have the opportunity of 20 hours of in-class instruction and eight hours behind-the-wheel instruction. During the next school year we plan to train approximately 6,000 students at an estimated cost of \$150,000 in grants and more than \$37,000 in

administration costs. The number of students receiving training in each succeeding year will be increased. By 1970 training will be provided for approximately 18,000 students each year at an estimated cost of a half million dollars per year. I have here a suggested number that we hope to train each year, 1967-68, 6,000 students at a cost of approximately \$150,000; 1968-69, 9,500 students at a cost of \$237,500; 1969-70, 13,500 students at approximate of \$337,500; 1970-71, 18,000 students at a cost of over \$450,000. Mr. Speaker, I feel very proud to announce this policy. For too long our school systems have spent many years training and educating the young people, and yet we fail to train them and educate them to stay alive on our highways. I think last summer a number of cases brought it home to us. This is a great tragedy that we should teach our young children so much in our schools and not give them a chance to learn how to survive on our highways.

I want to say a word about school bands. Last summer we set up a school bank program whereby the Government gives to new school bands a grant of 50 per cent on instruments and music to a maximum of \$2,000 per bank. Over 30 new bands with over 1,200 students have been formed since this program went into effect last summer. We have budgeted \$50,000 for the total program in 1967-68. We are delighted with the response we have had to date from school systems. I would like to say also that there's a bursary program for the training of band masters and four such people are now being trained.

I would like to close my remarks by saying something in connection with our Centennial projects for the year, because I think Centennial should mean more probably to young people than to any other group in society. The schools of Saskatchewan will be participating in many activities designed to help our young people catch the significance of Canada's 100th birthday. Most school children will have the opportunity to visit the Confederation Train or one of the Confederation Caravans during their Saskatchewan tour. These visits should be memorable experiences for school children. Through it, they will come to know what it was like in Canada after the ice age left its indelible mark upon the land. They will come face to face with the realities experienced by the first explorers and settlers, their parents and in some places their great grandparents. They will be able to reflect upon the meaning of Confederation itself, as they stand before the exhibit devoted to this historical event. During July and August some 5,000 high school students from all parts of Canada will participate in the Youth Travel Program. There will be 480 Saskatchewan students travelling eastward and westward; 20 Saskatchewan communities will be extending hospitality to students from across Canada. The objective of this program is to provide young Canadians with an opportunity to meet and to develop a closer understanding of Canadians living and working in regions other than their own. Every school child in our province will be encouraged to participate in the Centennial Athletic Program. Pupils equalling or bettering the given standards for that event will receive a gold, silver or bronze crest; all other participants will receive a red shield crest. On June 1, all other school children in Canada, will receive the Centennial medallion as a reminder of the Centennial Year and its significance to Canada. A special program has been prepared to mark the presentation of the Centennial medallions.

Of all the activities that have been planned for Saskatchewan schools, none are more important than those that have been planned

as an integral part of the day-to-day school program. To assist teachers in planning suitable activities, a Teachers' Centennial Guide Book has been distributed to all Saskatchewan schools. It is my sincere hope that Saskatchewan teachers will seize the opportunities which Canada's Centennial Year provides, to help students achieve a greater awareness of our past achievements, to foster closer ties among Canadians, to count our many blessings and to unite us to make Canada an even greater country in which to live. Mr. Speaker, I take great pleasure in supporting the motion but not the amendment.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. E. I. Wood (Swift Current): — Mr. Speaker, in entering this Debate, I also would like to compliment the Provincial Treasurer upon the speech which he delivered in bringing down the Budget we have before us. It was a well-prepared document and delivered with considerable less noise than usual which made it, I think, quite a bit more effective and much easier to listen to.

Mr. Speaker, it was a purposeful speech. Undoubtedly, its purpose was to lead the people of this province to think that under his regime Provincial taxes have been reduced, property taxes have been slashed and that now, in spite of a great loss in Federal grants, he is able to bring in a balanced Budget.

Now, this Budget speech is an admirable production. I'm sure that the Hon. Member from Arm River (Mr. Pederson) is right in that it is one that has been in preparation for quite some months. It undoubtedly has much good and weighty matter for consideration. But insofar as proving what its authors would like it to prove, this production is plainly what the theatre people would call a farce.

In the first place there was that bit about Saskatchewan having taken a cut in Federal grants because we are no longer a have-not province. I must compliment the Provincial Treasurer on keeping a comparatively straight face when he rendered these lines. I think he did grin just a little bit, Mr. Speaker. I had something to say about this in an earlier debate and the Hon. Member from Regina West (Mr. Blakeney) exploded that fable completely in this debate, so I will not go into it again here.

That part about the Liberals having kept their promises of the last election is also worthy of some mirth. They as you will remember were elected largely on the basis of their promise to reduce both Provincial and property taxes. In regard to this question, the people on the other side of the House have quoted administration nauseam the tax reductions which they have made and total them up. We on this side, just about as often, refer to the tax increases they brought in. I wouldn't wonder if the general public were not becoming a little confused on this subject.

I think possibly that some arithmetic on the question might be worthwhile. I'm a little sorry for the Hon. Member from Regina South (Mr. Grant). I must say that he is one of my favourite Ministers over on the other side. He did indicate the other day that he had his mind made up regarding this Debate and didn't want to be bothered by the facts. He didn't want to be bothered by figures. He thought that we were very foolish to worry about figures on this side, but there are some figures that are worth consideration on this. I think that it is worthwhile to take a look at them. There is no doubt that taxes have

increased under the Liberal Administration, absolutely no doubt about this, Mr. Speaker. Just take a look at the public accounts which show what we are now paying under the Liberals as compared to what we were paying under the CCF. You simply take your Estimates for 1964-65. You find there that it is estimated we would collect \$108,980,000 in taxes that ensuing year. Look at the estimates which we have before us in this Budget debate, Mr. Speaker, and you will find that there have increased from \$108,000,000 to practically \$160,000,00. The Motor Vehicle Licences have increased from over \$9,000,000 to over \$11,000,000. Liquor profits have increased from slightly over \$16,000,000 to \$21,500,000, Mr. Speaker. compare the two Budgets and you will find that we had in 1964-65, \$135,445,000 in estimated taxes. In this one if you take into consideration the increase in the amount that is being taxed from the Saskatchewan Power Corporation as compared with the amount which was taken previously under the CCF Government from the Saskatchewan Government Telephones of that day, you will find that there is \$3,000,000 in this budget taken from the SPC and there is just \$50,000 less being taken from the Saskatchewan Telephones than what there was in the CCF Budget. This adds up, taking those two on balance, to some \$2,950,000 of an increase. You take this increase and add it to other increases and you have a total in this Budget before us now of estimated taxes of \$195,478,000, an increase of just about exactly \$58,000,000 in taxes that are being extracted from the people of this province under the Liberal Government as compared to what was proposed in the last Budget of the CCF.

And besides this, a perusal of the annual report of the Department of Municipal Affairs for 1965, which has just been laid on our desk, and is the last report available to us, shows in that year alone local government taxes increased by some \$8,900,000, very near \$9,000,000.

The Members opposite undoubtedly will say that this is not a fair comparison, that, if it were not for the tax reductions that were made by the present Government, the people of Saskatchewan would be paying even more than this. And it's possible that they have a point there. So I would like to take a different look at the comparison between the increases of taxes which have been brought in by this Government and the decreases which it talks so much about. Speaking in the Budget Debate last year I also spoke somewhat along this line and I made a summation of the tax cuts and the tax increases since the Liberals came into office. I have a little more to say about that today. In regard to the 1965 instalment of tax reductions claimed by the Liberal Government there is an item in the 1965 Budget which claimed that there would be a reduction of \$9,600,000. Now, this is the figure that I used last year. In looking at the public accounts which we have laid before us, the 1965-66 public accounts, we are able to see that this reduction in taxes was not \$9,600,000 as was indicated earlier but was actually some \$11,000,000. This is an increased saving in taxes for the people of Saskatchewan credit for at this time, if you're going to make a fair summation of the tax reductions as compared with tax increases. The education and health tax reduction from five per cent to four per cent amounted to \$11,000,000.

And then there is the education and health tax increased exemptions. It was at that time estimated as \$90,000, that there would be increased exemptions and I must still keep that figure. It was estimated by the Provincial Treasurer that the exemptions for married couples would amount to some \$300,000 and this is the

figure I used a year ago. But there have been some press releases on this. I notice a year ago that the Premier said that, in regard to this exemption for married couples, it was not \$300,000 that was the amount that had been saved for them but \$10,000. The other day in a paper dated around the middle of January, he said that in the last year, 1966, the saving was some \$62,000. So I think I'd be fair with him there. Instead of putting in \$300,000 I'd put in the \$60,000 which was the part currently used last year. But it is a long way from the \$300,000 which was used in the estimate figures in the first place.

Mineral tax reduction of \$250,000. I am using again the part of the Provincial Treasurer's figures in regard to the savings of the people of Saskatchewan, and purple gas of \$3,900,000. There are also other reductions which were claimed in that Budget statement of that time of \$160,000 and I will still retain that figure. If you add these things together, Mr. Speaker, you come up with a reduction of taxes claimed by the Liberals, and I think which is fairly well supported, of some \$15,460,000 in that 1965-66 Budget.

Then let me turn to the 1965 tax increases. It was estimated in that Budget that the tobacco tax would bring in an increased revenue of \$2,250,000. This as it turns out actually amounted to \$2,350,000. They also have the Medicare hospitalisation premium increase which we estimated amounted to \$5,500,000. And then there is the property tax increase. Last year, Mr. Speaker, when I was speaking in this Debate along these lines, we estimated the school costs would go up by \$10,000,000 and that the grants that were being given to the schools of this province in the 1965-66 Budget, amounted to some \$3,300,000, leaving a net increase of taxation for school purposes of some \$6,700,000 plus a general municipal tax increase of some \$2,000,000. Taking the two together, we estimated that the general property tax would go up by some \$8,700,000.

Well, since we came to this session, Mr. Speaker, the annual report of the Department of Municipal Affairs has been brought down and in that report it shows that this increase was actually \$8,900,000. I think that something was said across the House in this Debate concerning one Mr. John Burton. I believe his name was brought into the Debate in regard to the help that he has been giving some of our people on this side. But I would just like to commend to you a look at those figures. The figures that he was able to provide to me last year said that the estimate that he was able to provide was \$8,700,000. And in the actual figures brought down by the Department of Municipal Affairs they are \$8,900,000. Now I would think that this economist has a better grasp of figures and a better grasp of what the prospects are in regard to many things than what the Provincial Treasurer showed when he estimated that the amount for the young married couples was \$300,000 which turned out to be \$10,000. When Mr. Burton made an estimate of \$8,700,000 for an increase in property taxes and it came out to be \$8,900,000, I think, he's a man that I would kind of string along with on estimates.

Now, there is something else that I'd like to say about this, this figure of \$8,900,000. You will recall, Mr. Speaker, in the 1965 session that there was some discussion as to what was actually being provided by way of assistance to the schools. Members on the other side of the House said, "We're doing more for the schools of this province that has been done under the CCF." They harped on the fact that they were bringing in such huge increases in aid to the schools of this province. Members

on this side, particularly the Hon. Member from Regina West (Mr. Blakeney) said that, when you strip all the verbiage away and get down to the facts of the matter, they're not making nearly as large a contribution to the schools as they would like us to think they are. Now, Mr. Speaker, the figures that Mr. Blakeney used in regard to his estimate were not those that were advanced by the Members on the other side but they were those which were advanced by the Members on this side. He was absolutely vindicated by what has been said on this side of the House and by the figures that are brought out in the Department of Municipal Affairs annual report that was laid on our desk just the other day. It plainly shows that the people on this side of the House are the ones who have had a true conception of what the tax policies of this Government are going to do for the property owners and the school boards of this province. And I'd like to say something a little further about this figure of \$8,900,000, Mr. Speaker, but if you will allow me to at this time to call it 5:30, I would much appreciate it.

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

Mr. Wood: — I'd like to point out, Mr. Speaker, how our Liberal friends like to talk about how property taxes increased under the CCF. Well, if property taxes had increased at this rate during the 20 years that the CCF were in office, the increase would have been \$178,000,000, rather than the \$80,500,000 by which they increased while the CCF were in office. More than twice as much, Mr. Speaker. Now on a per capita basis if we had had an increase like this every year since 1944, the per capita property tax would now be \$211 instead of the \$120 which it is at this time.

Mr. Speaker, in making these comparisons I do realize that I am falling into the Liberal habit of comparing 1967 dollars with those of the average since 1944. Personally, I think that comparisons on a mill rate basis would be fairer. In 1966 the property tax mill rate increased by two mills. If taxes had advanced at this rate since 1944, property taxes would, at the end of the CCF regime, have been 10 mills higher than what they actually were at that time. Look at it another way. In recent years from 1957 until 1963, the last full year under CCF Administration, property taxes rose in that six-year period by a total of only two mills. Under the Liberals in 1964 and 1965, the only two years of Liberal Administration in which we have definite information, property tax mill rate rose by four mills. One thing I can promise you, Mr. Speaker, is that a new CCF Government will do its utmost to see that we do not allow any such increase in property taxes to happen again in this province under CCF Administration. Our commitment has already been made that we will roll back property taxes as they concern school costs by at least two mills a year.

But now let me return, Mr. Speaker, to my comparison of tax increases with the reductions that were made under the Liberals. I was talking before I went for supper about the 1965 tax increases, in the 1965-66 budget year. Auto licences were also up by \$300,000 and fire insurance rates were up by \$800,000, a total of \$1,100,000. Grazing leases were up by \$35,000, vital statistic fees were up by \$30,000 making a total increase in taxes in that year of \$18,230,000, Mr. Speaker.

Before supper I pointed out to you that in that fiscal year we had tax decreases brought in by the Government opposite of

\$15,460,000. On balance in the year 1965-66 this does not give you any tax decrease but it gives you a tax increase of \$2,770,000, after giving the Liberals full credit for all the tax cuts and the tax increases that were brought in that year.

Then look at the 1966 instalment. That year the Provincial Treasurer didn't consider that the education and health tax exemptions were worth putting a figure on, so we don't have any figure on that in regard to any of the small exemptions that were brought in. I think that was the year he brought in the turkey saddles and a few of those things. But we did have an income tax reduction of one per cent that year of \$1,100,000 and the homeowner grants were brought in, which have turned out to have been worth \$8,200,000. This makes total tax decreases of \$9,300,000. In 1966 we also had some more tax increases. An increase in the education and health tax in regard to soap, etc. after you took away the exemptions, has turned out to be approximately \$500,000. Gasoline tax increases has been shown to be \$2,300,000. We have estimated the increase in property tax of some \$6,000,000 and let the Members opposite not fool themselves, our estimates, as I've said before supper, are shown to be very correct. The increase in compulsory arbitration compulsory insurance is \$1,800,000, the increase in grazing lease fees, \$100,000; increase in the Saskatchewan Government Insurance Office rates, another \$1,800,000; hospital revenue tax, an increase of \$400,000; which makes for increases in taxes in 1966-67 of \$12,900,000.

Compare this, Mr. Speaker, to the decreases which I have just referred to of \$9,300,000 which gives us a net tax increase of \$3,600,000 of taxes imposed in 1966-67. To this you must add the net increase of the year before, because once these taxes are put on they are not taken off. For the year 1966-67, you have the people of this province paying a total of \$6,370,000 more than they would have if the Liberal policies had not been implemented.

And then we have the 1967 instalments before us at the present time, Mr. Speaker. We don't hear much about tax cuts this year. Well, the homeowner grant is up by \$300,000. We have the surcharge on auto insurance premiums, \$200,000. We have estimated school operating costs will be increased by \$10,000,000 and as the Hon. Member from Regina West (Mr. Blakeney) has shown us, the actual school operating increase will be \$3,900,000. This gives us an estimated increase in property tax to cover this deficit of some \$6,100,000. And again, Mr. Speaker, let me tell the Members opposite to not underestimate the accuracy of these statements. The power rate tax has been put on to the extend of some \$3,000,000 from which I think in all fairness we must subtract, Mr. Speaker, the \$50,000 which is that amount by which the Saskatchewan Telephone contribution is less in this year than what it was in the last year of CCF Administration. So this makes a power rate tax increase of \$2,950,000. We have individual income tax up from 29 per cent to 33 per cent, \$6,000,000. Corporation tax increase up by \$1,500,000 and you add to these things the telephone rate increase, the liquor price increase, and the anticipated increase in auto insurance premiums, and you have a net 1967 tax increase of approximately \$17,000,000, Mr. Speaker. The Members opposite say there are no increases in this year's Budget. I say there is \$17,000,000. I said that there were no decreases, these are practically no decreases, but there is \$17,000,000 worth of increases. You add to these things the 1965 increase which is still in effect - \$2,770,000 - the 1966 increase which is still in effect - \$3,600,000 and you have a total amount of taxes which the people of the province will be expected to pay this year of some \$23,370,000, more than what

they would have if the 1964 tax rates were still in effect.

Let me say, Mr. Speaker, further that these tax rates are cumulative, I mean I'd like to show you the accumulative total of these net tax increases over the years. In 1965 we have an increase of \$2,770,000, in 1966 you have this 1965 increase plus the 1966 increase, and it came to a total of \$6,370,000. In this year 1967, the people of this province will have to pay in increased taxes due to the Liberal policies, the 1967 increase of \$17,000,000, the 1966 increase of \$3,600,000, the 1965 increase of \$2,770,000; a total of over \$23,000,000, Mr. Speaker. You add these together and you come up with a total of \$32,510,000, that the people of this province by the end of this year will have had to pay over the last three years over and above the ordinary taxes which they would have had to pay if the rates had remained as they were under the CCF.

Mr. Speaker, I have endeavoured to show you, and I think I've shown you quite plainly and clearly, that not only have we had an absolute increase of \$58,000,000 in the taxes that have to be paid by the people of this province but as well as that, even when you consider the increases in the tax rates as compared with the decreases in the tax rates, you come up with some \$32,000,000, which the people of this province have had to pay since the Liberals have come into office simply because of the changes in the tax rates imposed by the Liberal Government opposite. And besides this I must point out that the Liberal Government has also received the returns of the sale of some \$8,000,000 in Crown land.

And what is the comparative financial position of the province? The Public Accounts of March 31st, 1964, show net assets of \$33,000,000; of March 31st, 1966, they show net assets of some \$52,000,000, an increase of net assets of some \$19,000,000. You add to this what the Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Thatcher) spoke of the other day, the \$300,000 which would be the surplus for the past year, and you'll have a total of some \$19,500,000 which has accumulated during those three years. But there have been other transactions that do not show up, which have taken place in the last year, such as the \$2,000,000 which has been taken from the Student Aid Fund and \$1,000,000 which has been taken from the Public Administration Fund. Also we have what is not shown in this statement but are shown as contingent assets, namely the money which was borrowed for the University of Saskatchewan back in 1965, \$4,000,000; in 1966, \$8,300,000; in 1967, \$9,300,000 and this year we also have the borrowing for highways of \$6,500,000. Public Accounts will show on December 31, 1965 that, as of that time, some \$4,200,000 has been taken out of the Medicare insurance fund. These deficits on the deficit side of the ledger add up to some \$35,500,000.

Now the Hon. Member from Yorkton (Mr. Gallagher) the other day pointed out the CCF had also borrowed money for highways. Of course we did, because we felt it was good business to do so when funds were not available otherwise, but not under the guise of cutting taxes in a time of buoyant finances. We didn't do this under the guise of cutting taxes at the time; we said that we were borrowing money and we did.

You take this \$35,000,000 which has been taken from reserves and from borrowing and which does not show up in the 1965-66 total net assets figure. We must subtract from this the \$19,500,000 which is shown as an increase of assets and you come up with a net reduction of assets of approximately

\$15,000,000. This means, Mr. Speaker, that by the end of 1967, the people of Saskatchewan will not only have paid over \$32,000,000 more in taxes than they would have been the case if tax rates had remained as they were under the CCF, but besides this, the Liberal Government has used up reserves and mortgaged the future of this province to the extent of approximately another \$15,000,000. Even if we deduct the current raise of \$7,500,000 to income and corporation taxes, which now increase the Saskatchewan share of these taxes, even if you don't take these into consideration, we still have \$25,000,000 of increase in taxes under the Liberals, due to their change of tax policies, plus another \$15,000,000 deterioration in our over-all financial position.

Mr. Speaker, the gentlemen opposite want us to believe that they are good business men who have cut taxes and balanced the Budget in spite of a cut in funds from Ottawa, due to Saskatchewan having become a have province. Mr. Speaker, such an assumption has no basis on fact but is only an attempt to hoodwink the people of this province. Those beautifully decorated homeowner grant cheques that proclaimed that they were being paid out of the benefits of industrial growth could more truthfully have said that they were being paid out of increased taxation and borrowed money.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Wood: — Now, Mr. Speaker, if the Hon. Member from Melville, (Mr. Gardiner), and I am sorry he is not in his place, I was going to say if he would pardon me, I have some words of commendation for some of the things that he has said in the House . When he spoke the other day about the increases in municipal grants he at least recognized that there had been some assistance to municipalities before this Government came along. On the other hand I am somewhat disappointed in the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. McIsaac). I have always felt, Mr. Speaker, that the Ministers of Municipal Affairs of this province both past and present were pretty fair fellows. I still think the Hon. Member opposite is a pretty fair fellow but in making comparisons the other day between grants given last year to municipalities and those of previous years he was grossly inaccurate. He apparently missed out all mention of grid road assistance either past or present.

I believe he referred to the RM of Biggar No. 347, which he said obtained over \$13,000 in grants last year but had only received \$3,792 previously. I looked up the Public Accounts and found that in 1963, the last full year under the CCF, this municipality had received nearly \$20,000 in grants from the Provincial Government. The Hon. Minister indicated that the RM of Shellbrook, 493, had last year received \$11,500 but had previously received only \$1,849. The Public Accounts show that in 1963 this RM received \$23,279 from the Government. He said that the RM 367 had received some \$15,000 but had only received \$880. I will admit that apparently this municipality in 1963 did receive only \$1,637 but the year before that it had received over \$49,000 in Provincial grants.

Up to this point the Liberal Government of this province has been riding the crest of a wave of prosperity that has been in evidence throughout Canada and which came about in Saskatchewan with the good handling of public affairs under the CCF.

It is certain, Mr. Speaker, that if Provincial affairs had not been handled properly by the CF the present Liberal Government could not have had this affluence ever since it came to office. Good times don't arrive instantaneously.

While I think the Government could be more generous with the urban governments and school boards, I certainly am not belittling the aid that has been given rural municipalities and I am sure they also are appreciative, but the people of this province have had a high regard for the grid road program of ten years' standing and ignoring it now only adds to this Liberal Government's credibility gap which will undoubtedly result in their undoing.

Something in the same vein could be said of the Hon. Minister of Agriculture (Mr. McFarlane). He had indicated that in the three years since it came to power, the Government has given grants of some \$2,000,000 under the Municipal Water Assistance Act. Again let me say that this is a good program and I am glad to see the Liberals carrying it on, but all good things did not begin with them. While the Hon. Minister is bragging about spending \$2,000,000 in three years, he's not saying anything to the public that out of a much smaller budget the CCF spent this much on the program not in three, but in two years. We spent over \$2,000,000 in two years, not three.

Members opposite have been saying that the CCF Government did nothing for smaller urban centres. Without even bothering to go further into the records, this one program, in which the CCF Government took a leading role in bringing water and sewer to the smaller urban centres, is one of the greatest things that have ever been done to establish their permanence and to give their residents a good standard of living. No amount of belittling by the Members opposite can destroy this fact.

Another point I would like to make concerning the consideration being given to smaller communities in Saskatchewan is in regard to rail abandonment. While it is agreed that lines should be abandoned, if it is proven that they are uneconomical, when the cost of operation is compared to both the profits of the company and the services rendered to the community, there is a wide variation of ideas as to what constitutes a proper examination of the facts to be considered. The position taken by the Hon. Members opposite gives one the impression that they are not too interested in the situation. The new Federal legislation on the subject gives an additional lease on life for some of the lines for which application was originally made for abandonment. The attitude of the Saskatchewan Government would indicate that they are not unduly worried about what happens to those railway subdivisions that have the threat of early abandonment still hanging over their heads.

Mr. Speaker, when there was a CCF Administration in the province there was no doubt as to where our sympathies lay. We spent a good deal of time and money helping to set up local committees to fight abandonment of branch lines and gave the best assistance we could to help prepare their cases. We called a conference of the Government and interested local organizations in the prairie provinces. I firmly believe that it was this definite stand and decisive action on the part of the CCF Government of this province that stopped massive rail abandonment in its tracks and gave a new lease on life for scores of small communities in this province. It actually did something for the

communities of the province that this Government opposite has not duplicated.

Mr. Speaker, for a few minutes I would like to look at another kind of income for the province, that of the revenue derived from the mining of potash. We are pleased to see this developing. While the CCF were in office in Saskatchewan, ways were found to mine this valuable substance after a good deal of hardship and expense. If the mining companies had not had every confidence in the Government of the day it would never have been accomplished. Nearly all the companies that are now in the province came here and started operations under the CCF. Let me repeat that I am glad to see this development to make people think that it was responsible for this progress is so silly that it can only be believed far outside the borders of the province.

Members opposite have made a great deal of how the introduction of industry was going to lighten the tax burden of the province. I note that in his Budget Speech the Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Thatcher) is expecting over \$2,000,000 from this source for the Provincial Treasury. Undoubtedly in this respect, the potash industry is very valuable to the people of this province and something whose development is much to be desired. However, I have here a copy of an article from the Rural Councillor of February 1st, "Potash – boon or detriment to RMs" which I would commend for the reading to Members of this House. I cannot go through it in detail, but it sets out some of the difficulties that beset the rural municipalities wherein potash mines are located. Apparently, while potash spells money for Provincial coffers, it does not mean a bed of roses for the rural municipalities.

Apparently one of the big expenses is in regard to roads. Not only must much better roads be provided but the upkeep of these roads in represented-gravelling and stabilization and snow removal is a real burden. This does not apply only to the main access roads, but in some municipalities where there is no main residential centre, miners travel in all directions and almost every road has to receive special attention. Policing costs have risen rapidly in some municipalities. Power lines crisscrossing fields "with insufficient damages being paid are a factor which created a great deal of hard feelings among farmers affected", says one municipality. It is pointed out that while assessment of farms is from 15 to 18 per cent of total investment, mines are assessed at only five per cent. Possibly this is a situation that should be reviewed.

Loss of local control is feared due to large donations toward the welfare of its workers by these large corporations. Some RMs do not have any tax revenue from mines but are subject to many of the difficulties common to those which actually have the mines within their borders. These municipalities receive some grants from the mining corporations. The increasing or withholding of these grants places the companies in a position of holding a great deal of control over the elected municipal councils.

Nor are the difficulties accompanying the development of potash felt only in rural municipalities. I have here a clipping, Mr. Speaker, from an Esterhazy publication of July 7, 1966, and I will read the first two paragraphs. The heading is High Taxes Prompt Special Meetings of Ratepayers.

Well over one hundred irate ratepayers attended a special citizens committee meeting held at the theatre in Esterhazy Tuesday afternoon to voice their protests at what they claimed were drastic increases in taxes this year over last. Chairman Mike Sich explained to the gathering of 123 people that the combination of a sharp increase in assessment coupled with no reduction in the mill rate created great hardship to many older people on pension and fixed income in the town, and was a matter of concern to all taxpayers.

I would commend these articles, Mr. Speaker, to consideration of the Government. Potash undoubtedly is good for Saskatchewan, but apparently there are difficulties on the local government level for the municipalities concerned that are not being shown sufficient consideration.

I'd also like to draw to your attention, Mr. Speaker, for a few minutes another item, community planning. This Government opposite is remiss in its regard for community planning. Hon. Members on both sides of the House have been aware that this is a problem that has become of increasing importance to municipalities of the province. They have pointed out the costly errors, that is, the representatives of municipalities have pointed out costly errors that can arise because of faulty planning. Yet the hundreds of smaller municipalities do not have the resources to do this for themselves, it must be a Provincial responsibility. In 1964 the CCF Government budgeted for an exp of \$145,000 and a staff of 20. Here the Hon. Premier was able to wield his axe and save some money. Of the \$145,000 only a \$124,000 was spent. The next year the new Liberal Government cut the budget estimates to \$137,000 and only 19 persons. Again they only spent \$109,000. Last year they brought the budget back up again to \$147,000, but we as yet don't know how much was spent. This year the budget is up to \$159,000 but the staff is still only to be held at 19 people.

This is a program that calls for more initiative and support than that which is being displayed by the present Government. It is something that is vital to the developing province. If Saskatchewan is going forward a tenth as fast as the Liberals would like to have us believe, it deserves more by way of community planning than an increase of \$14,000 in the budget over a four-year period and a cut of one in the staff during that period. Trained personnel may be hard to find. But I am sure that more energy could be put into the search and conditions of service improved. Scholarships and bursaries could be made available to bring forward the planners we need.

Ideal community planning is something that should not be a centralized service, whereas cities and communities may not feel that they can afford to hire planners of their own, subsequently made available on a regional basis, to give on the spot knowledgeable and continuous service.

Another thing about this Budget, Mr. Speaker, which I do not like is that all it says regarding a Municipal Financing Corporation or Municipal Loan and Development Fund is to indicate that the Government does not intend to do anything about it at this time. Members opposite have indicated that because we did not bring this in when we were the Government there is no necessity they should do anything about it now. This does tend to prove, Mr. Speaker, what many suspect that this Government is

lacking in initiative. A comparison of what was undertaken by the CCF Government in its first three years of office with what the Government opposite has done in the same time will confirm this. That Members opposite feel that they are not obliged to initiate anything that we the CCF did not, is a sincere compliment to the progress achieved by the CCF during its term of office. Because the practice of the Government Treasury of buying up a large share of local government debentures was comparatively successful during the time of the CCF Government in this province, it does not mean that no change should ever be made.

I submit, Mr. Speaker, that it is high time that something further was done to assist local governments in capital financing. At last fall's CCF Convention a resolution was passed asking that a Municipal Financing Corporation be set up to handle and to act as a clearing house for municipal debentures. The following week the Liberal Convention followed suit. But still this Government has not acted. Local governments, especially urban municipalities, have been vocal in their desire for something along this line, but apparently the Government opposite is content to still have valuable and much needed schools, hospitals, water and sewage projects held up for lack of suitable financing arrangements.

Mr. Speaker, because this Budget does not promote a sound approach to local government financing and development and because it sets out a distorted picture of what this Government has done or what it intends to do in the field of public finance, I certainly cannot support the motion, I will support the amendment.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. A. C. Cameron (Minister of Mineral Resources): — Mr. Speaker, we had some time to hear the comments of the official Opposition and the other Opposition, comment on the Budget. Listening to the speakers this afternoon particularly, one would think that this Budget is so bad that it would be suicidal for any Government to go to the people on it. Yet in the other breath they've even set the date for the election — April 26, I read in the press this morning as if this Government is bent on its own destruction.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Cameron: — Let Member analyse this feeling. Mr. Speaker, I think if there is one thing evident about this Budget, it is the effect it's had on the Opposition. It has struck a fear in their hearts,

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Cameron: — because they have been caught by surprise. If I was a farmer speaking to the farmers, I'd tell them how they were caught, but in parliamentary language, I'd say they were caught with their garments in disarray.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Cameron: — Then we have three former Provincial Treasurers pooling their knowledge in an analysis of the Budget. What are some of the things they are saying about the Budget? One person got up

and exclaimed, trying to rationalize their fears as to why there will be an election as they see it. Why he says, "Those sawdust Caesars would call an election, not because they must, but because they are hungry for power." Another, not quite so bold,

You know, the Socialists in 20 years of office always went to the people every four years, and I think it would be wrong for the Government to break that pattern.

Mr. Berezowsky: — Try it.

Mr. Cameron: — Another, the official critic of the Opposition said:

They have robbed all the piggy banks and there are no piggy banks left to rob. Therefore, we can anticipate they will go to the p.

You know, Mr. Speaker, one stepped out from the crowd and said, "I challenge this Government to go to the people." It is interesting to note that the one who threw down the gauntlet and made the challenge is the one who set his armour aside and will not engage in the next battle.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Cameron: — Mr. Speaker, I had the privilege for a number of years of analysing Budgets from the eyes of a financial critic in the opposition. It is my understanding that one of the responsibilities of a financial critic was to look at the Budget from the standpoint of priorities, to look at how the pie was sliced, to see if the emphasis was placed in the proper place or in the wrong place. You'd have thought that a financial critic would have had something to say about the Provincial and the National economy, if the Budget was so designed to encourage and promote the economic development of the Province, or if it had the adverse effect. You would think a financial critic would look to the Budget to see if it met the needs of the various sectors of the economy. You'd think he'd look to see if the Budget was sensitive to human needs. You would think that he'd have some comment on the Government's handling of the financial resources of the Province, because Government is big business, the biggest business in the Province. The financial critic didn't choose to speak about these aspects of the Budget, he didn't analyse the Budget from these priorities, he took other aspects which he commented on. I noticed he made no commend on the treatment of local municipalities and I notice that everyone else has been careful not to make a comment on the treatment of local municipalities. I wonder if it was because of a press report the other day that says, "Budget Pleases SARM Officials."

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Cameron: — The official critic and the unofficial critics as well did admonish the Government for borrowing parts of its capital needs for highways. I thought it was a strange thing that the man who criticized the Government for this was a member of a Government and the Treasurer when he borrowed \$10,000,000 for highways.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Cameron: — Since 1948 the Government of which he was a Member borrowed \$30,000,000 for highways and has mortgaged the credit of this province for the next twenty years. Then after having done this, Mr. Speaker, he moved a vote of non-confidence. What was the vote of non-confidence based on? Was it based on the failure of the Government to allocate proper priorities? Was it based on a host of new taxes? No, because there were no tax increases in the Budget. This is what he based his vote of non-confidence on, that the Government was extracting more money by keeping power rates higher than necessary. I would ask you, Mr. Speaker, who set these power rates? Who put these power rates higher than is necessary?

Mr. Thatcher: — Socialists.

Mr. Cameron: — Who put them there? The former Government. In his non-confidence motion he would ask this Chamber to sentence this Government for an offence which he and his colleagues committed when they were the Government.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Cameron: — Mr. Speaker, this is indeed a strange twist of Canadian law where you condemn the innocent in order that the guilty may go free.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Cameron: — What did the critic talk about? He talked about NorCanAir, unrelated to the Budget. He talked about the manpower survey, unrelated to the Budget. He talked about the Dominion-Provincial Conference which has some connection to the Budget. Since he spoke about those, I want to speak about them too. You know when the financial critic was Provincial Treasurer, he had occasion to go to Ottawa too.

Hon. D. T. McFarlane (Minister of Agriculture): — This is going to be good. Listen to this.

Mr. Cameron: — He had occasion to go down in his capacity as Provincial Treasurer and negotiate a new Dominion-Provincial tax agreement. After coming back from his conference at Ottawa, he presented his Budget. And it is interesting to note his comments in his Budget Speech. Here is what he had to say and I quote:

The Prime Minister and the Minister of Finance were unwilling to listen to our proposals. Instead they persisted in their retrograde steps and because of the arbitrary action of the Government, Saskatchewan stays as we are.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Cameron: — In brief, he came home empty-handed. He and his advisors had failed to make a case for Saskatchewan. He as Provincial Treasurer had fumbled the ball. Now he has the audacity to say that the present Provincial Treasurer was taken to the cleaners

at Ottawa.

He had quite a bit to say about NorCanAir, and I notice that he brought out a speech made by the Leader of the Opposition, I think more than a year ago. You know he didn't even attempt to bring it up-to-date. He charged that NorCanAir was in breach of the sale contract with the Government and he said that the Government was content to turn a blind eye on this serious breach of contract. He charged that the company had stripped the workshop, had laid off the men and in essence, the workshop was today a shambles. Section 18, I would remind those of you who should have a copy of the contract because we gave you all one last year, was specific in listing the obligations the purchaser must carry out. Section 18 stipulates:

They must continue to operate from the Prince Albert base.

They are doing that.

They must continue to operate all routes formerly operated by Saskair including the three flights per week to Uranium City.

This is being carried out.

They must maintain and operate the existing repair and maintenance depot at Prince Albert continuously until the first day of March 1975.

It was on this section that he tried to hinge his case. I want to read it again:

They must maintain and operate the existing repair and maintenance at Prince Albert continuously until the first day of March, 1975.

He charges that they are not maintaining this workshop. How did he say they are not maintaining it? Because they are not doing custom work. He says people are compelled to take their work to Winnipeg or to Edmonton because this company is not doing custom work. Now I ask you, does Section 18 make any reference to custom work? Does it say they must do custom work? Does it say they must not do custom work?

Mr. R. A. Walker (Hanley): — Got your life hanging on my head, boy!

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Cameron: — Section 18 commits them to maintain and operate the workshop and to do so for the efficient servicing of the planes which they operate.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Cameron: — This charge is strange, coming from a spokesman of a former Government Member, condemning the company for not doing custom work in servicing other peoples planes, when this very Government of which he was a Member refused all the pleas of Saskair to send the work of the air ambulance to Saskair.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Cameron: — We couldn't get a sniff of the work of the air ambulance in spite of the fact that we had the equipment and the trained personnel with which to handle it. Then he says it is a horrible thing that this company doesn't do custom work.

Mr. Walker: — What are you going to do about it?

Mr. Cameron: — He charged that the company — the most serious charge of all — had laid off men until they had but a skeleton staff. What is the record? The number of employees of Saskair on March 31, 1965 when NorCanAir took over operations, totalled 70. During the interim period from then on until two days ago when I checked, 29 men were laid off. There were 33 new employees hired and the total number of employees of NorCanAir at this date is 74, four more than when Saskair operated.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

An Hon. Member: — What about the 29 that were laid off?

Mr. Cameron: — They are giving employment to more men at higher pay rates than Saskair ever did. This is a typical tactic all the way through the address of the financial critic...

Mr. Steuart: — Do you want him to go over that again so you can write it out?

Mr. Cameron: — ...to take one sentence out of the context and conveniently forget to read the next. Let me say, Mr. Speaker, that I personally visited NorCanAir not more than ten days ago when I was in Prince Albert. I had the opportunity not only to observe their fleet, but to tour the workshop. In the workshop was a DC3 plane that travels the route from Prince Albert to Uranium City. It was about to leave the workshop. It had been completely overhauled. It had a new paid job; it had the seats upholstered and it had carpeting on the floor. Other ones were in equal condition. Let me say here that we have in NorCanAir today, a flourishing industry.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Cameron: — It is not only maintaining all services rendered by Saskair, but is doing so with increased comfort to its patrons.

Mr. Thatcher: — Private enterprise!

Mr. Cameron: — These unfounded and carping criticisms stem from the fact that the CCF Government was unable to dispose of Saskair at a price and a guaranteed service to the northern areas which this Government was able to accomplish.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. McFarlane: — Sour grapes over there, Bill.

Mr. Cameron: — It would appear that the Member from Regina West (Mr. Blakeney) has joined the Member from Moose Jaw in a competition for membership in a select club having the biggest fantastic story that they can concoct to discredit this Government.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Cameron: — And I will say that the present candidate in Morse has earned his spurs and is about to be admitted to this select club.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Cameron: — Then the financial critic turned to the Manpower Survey and I notice that the Member for Hanley (Mr. Walker) had a lot to say about the Manpower Survey and brother was he critical. Did he go to town and both he and the official financial critic called it a damning indictment of this Government.

Mr. Walker: — I hope that Your Honour won't pay particular attention to the statement that I had spoken in this Debate because I wouldn't want to be foreclosed of my right to speak. I still haven't spoken in this Debate.

Mr. Cameron: — I never made any reference to you speaking in the Debate.

Mr. Walker: — As I heard the Hon. Member, he said that I had made some statement in this Debate and he was going to answer it. I haven't spoken.

An Hon. Member: — It seems that you are always beaten, Bill.

Mr. Cameron: — Now he says he called this a damning indictment of the Government. What aspects of the report do they use to arrive at this conclusion? In essence, the report states that estimates are that 30,000 persons could leave agriculture and not impair production. They proceeded to interpret this as a mass exodus from the farms. They coupled this with a charge that the Opportunity Caravan is a sinister plan to draw young people from the rural areas in a massive rural depopulation program. Now, Mr. Speaker, to assess, after these serious charges, whether or not this loss of farm people could be constituted a damning indictment, I went to other sources to gather their assessment of this so-called exodus of rural people. I found a source of judgement, whose assessment I think this Legislature will accept, particularly my friends in the Opposition. I think they will accept this as unimpeachable source. They call this man a great Canadian. I should like to give you the assessment of this particular gentlemen in regard to this. You know in 1956 there was a Provincial Conference on industrial development. This gentleman was speaking to the Provincial Conference and said:

As a result of technological advancements, we are capable of producing more food, farming more land, and doing it with less people. This means of necessity, a declining agricultural population, not only at the present, but for years ahead. Now that is not something to be deplored.

If we require less people on the land to produce the same amount of food, or even more food, it simply means that we have those people available to apply their labour and their ingenuity to producing more wealth from other sources.

And he concludes by saying:

Therefore, we should not cry about going back, we should simply be adapting ourselves to meet this changing condition. But, if we neglect to meet them, then this is the thing to be deplored.

So said the Hon. T. C. Douglas, Premier of Saskatchewan, speaking at this conference.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Cameron: — A damning indictment of this Government? Not so, says Tommy Douglas. Not so. If we don't adapt ourselves to this changing condition, that is to be deplored says Mr. Douglas. I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that the Opportunity Caravan is designed to meet these changing conditions that Mr. Douglas made reference to. Need I say more about the manpower Report in view of the fact that the National NDP leader and former Premier of Saskatchewan put this squarely on record. I must say in fairness to Mr. Douglas he at least had the courage to put forth his position, something which is lacking in the present leadership of the party which he left behind.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Cameron: — Now to turn, Mr. Speaker, to the contents of the Budget itself. And I would ask the Opposition to stand up and declare what changes they would make in this Budget. If the expenditures are too high, what would you cut out.

Mr. Berezowsky: — Good enough.

Mr. Cameron: — The Member for Cumberland said this is good enough. I would ask him, would he cut out the incentive program for northern mining? Would you reduce that \$750,000? Though they haven't the courage to say so, Mr. Speaker, I am confident that this would be one of the first things they would do if the people were ever foolish enough to return them to power. They would throw out this program in spite of its records of accomplishments. Base metal production has been declining in Saskatchewan for the past decade. Each year base metal production was declining until it reached alarming proportions. It had reached a point where production was dropping at the rate of 29,000,000 pounds per year. Because of the stimulus of this incentive program, I am pleased to announce tonight that this decline in the production has been halted.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Cameron: — This past year's production was sufficient not only to recapture the loss of 29,000,000 pounds, but to add an additional 30,000,000 pounds on top of that. Once again, Mr. Speaker, Saskatchewan mines are producing Saskatchewan base metals for the

benefit of Saskatchewan people.

What other programs would they cut out? Homeowner grants – oh yes. Before an election, Mr. Speaker, this is a lily which they are going to gild and I'm just as sure after an election they will claim that in the process of gilding the plant, it died and thus they'd have to root it out. One of the highlights of the Budget is the manner in which this homeowner grant is built into the financial resources of this province. It is a bank, a savings bank for the people of which the Government is the depositor. It deposits this to the credit of every homeowner in this province and each and every homeowner is free to draw out what is credited to his deposit as soon as he has met his tax obligations to his local government. Apart from this direct benefit to the owner, it has been of tremendous indirect assistance to municipalities. As a result of this program, the percentage of tax collections at the local level has never been higher. The municipalities today do not have to resort to collection agencies and to seizures of the farmer's crops at the elevator in order to secure the taxes. One thing this program has done for the municipalities it has removed these compulsory features of tax collections. They have been removed mainly because when a homeowner pays his local taxes, he gets a thank you note from this Government in the form of a \$50 cheque.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Cameron: — I'm sure that every homeowner knows in Saskatchewan that if this lily is to be gilded, it will only be done by those who brought it to Saskatchewan in the first place.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Cameron: — There are other aspects of the Budget I think I'll take a moment to deal with. Sometimes a Budget has on first interpretation a cold aspect about it, dealing strictly with financial matters, with the way in which revenue is raised and the manner in which it is spent, revealing on one hand the collections and on another the expenditures. I think it is only on a closer examination of these spending priorities that one may see something of the philosophy, something of the motivating force which led to the setting up of these priorities. It is in this aspect that one finds a consciousness of human needs in the drafting of this monetary policy in this Budget. I think we find the warmth of this Budget when we look to the various aspects of assistance to universities, of incentive grants to induce dentists to come into Saskatchewan and settle in the smaller urban communities to serve the dental needs of our people; again in a smaller range but nevertheless essential, in the lighted schoolhouse grants to encourage local communities to participate in projects that are not only worthy in themselves but which have a far-reaching effect in promoting the social relationship within the communities; and the allocation of funds to encourage the formation of school bands; increased sums of money to assist those who devote so much of their time and their talents to the fostering of arts and culture to the establishment of Saskatchewan's first permanent school of fine arts; an increase of the Budget assigned to upgrading courses designed to get many others back in the main stream of society, in order that they may make their contribution and by so doing to enrich their own lives in the process; increased sums allocated for housing and special-care homes in order to provide more low-cost housing for our

older citizens; a program to accelerate the construction of low-rental houses to assist those on limited income, in their housing needs; a program of driver training for younger drivers because good driving is so essential if we are to reduce the mounting rate of accidents on our highways.

The Budget breaks new ground in that for the first time, funds will be allocated to provide legal aid to indigents. This step was taken because this Government believes that all citizens rich and poor should have an equal right to a fair defence before the law. Funds are allocated for assistance to innocent victims injured in the commission of crimes by others. Additional funds are allocated to strengthen the Youth Agency and its work; the establishment of the Opportunity Caravan to provide mobile guidance and counselling service to the youth of the province who will not be attending university, to provide them with professional advice in training opportunities available and job opportunities.

Threaded throughout the whole Budget one will find programs and expenditures which reveal this Government's awareness of the needs of the various segments of society, an awareness in programs designed to assist all our less fortunate citizens, to raise them to a higher plateau in order that they too might enjoy more of the warmth and the sunshine of the buoyant economy which Saskatchewan is experiencing. These are the warm aspects of this Budget.

You know, Mr. Speaker, when the present financial critic was the Provincial Treasurer, in his Budget which he presented, he took the opportunity to assess what the Opposition of the day, who are now the Government, would do, if they were ever so fortunate to receive a mandate from the people. And I think it is interesting to recall and to quote from his remarks. He says in reference to the Opposition of the day, they would not cut expenditures needed to stimulate the economy, they would not reduce expenditures on roads; they would not eliminate any of our health and welfare programs, yet they would reduce taxes.

Now I say, Mr. Speaker, this is a summary, a forecast of what the Opposition of the day would do if they formed the Government. I chose those comments of the financial critic when he was Provincial Treasurer, to reveal to all, precisely how the present Government has fulfilled the commitments which it pledged to the people when it was in Opposition.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Cameron: — If you look through this Budget's various aspects, you will see its warmth and consciousness of the needs of the people as an individual as well. You can judge the philosophy and the motives behind it. I would remind the Leader of the Opposition, that at one time he had the prerogative to call an election. That's no longer his. He thinks that the election will be April 26, but come April 26, or June 30, or a year from June 30, whenever that day comes, we are confident of this: When we ask the people to judge the record of this Government and its aims, and its aspirations in the interest of the people in the Province of Saskatchewan, they will give their answer with a resounding applause of appreciation. Mr. Speaker, I have great pleasure in supporting the motion.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. R. A. Walker (Hanley): — Mr. Speaker, there is no better man to recognize it than the Member who has just spoken.

Mr. A. R. Guy (Athabasca): — Go and get the shovels.

Mr. Walker: — Mr. Speaker, I would like to make a few comments on this Budget Address which the Premier has given in his capacity as Provincial Treasurer. But before I do, I want to say just a word that I missed saying last time I spoke and that is a word of congratulations to the new Minister of Welfare (Mr. MacDonald). He was appointed since the last session. I think the Premier is fortunate to be able to gather around him people of the experience and the training of the Minister, and I want, however, to say a word of encouragement to those Members who didn't make the grade, the two or three who have been waiting expectantly in the wings and are still expecting.

Mr. Coderre (Gravelbourg): — You are mixed up, Bob.

Mr. Walker: — The Premier made the choices which he did and I am happy for the two Members, the Member from Milestone (Mr. MacDonald) and the Member from Wilkie (Mr. McIsaac) that they got under the wire when they did because I understand that recently the Premier has had a change of heart. He doesn't want to have men around who can write. This gives, of course, new impetus to the dreams of the two Members who didn't make the grade. They will qualify now, and I hope they do, because it will make the role of the Opposition that much more easy.

First of all, Mr. Speaker, I want to point out a couple of factual discrepancies that occurred in the Speech from the Throne itself. The Premier apparently was advised by some of his image experts that he should blame the loss of the equalization grants upon the fact that Saskatchewan is more prosperous than it was before and I quote his words. He says:

Recently, we were notified that because of our changed economic position these equalization payments would be discontinued.

Now that is a clear statement of fact and yet the question is whether indeed it is a fact, Mr. Speaker. This I submit is just another one of those reckless assertions which the Premier has so much facility with and which many of us have come to expect and which of course is contrary to the facts. The purpose of the statement was obviously to convince his listeners that this fact — or this alleged fact — somehow bolstered and supports the equally false claim that Saskatchewan has maintained the excellent headway which became evident in the late 50's and early 60's, with respect to industrial development.

The Premier hasn't been able to come up with any objective figure to support these windy assertions that Saskatchewan is booming. Indeed he is not able to produce any facts to bolster his claim that Saskatchewan has prospered under the present Government. And so this spurious notion was put forth that because of our increased industrial development, our increased wealth, we were to lose the equalization grant. And somehow this fact that we were to lose \$150,000,000 over the next five years, as the Premier has told us, was expected by him to lend credence to the notion that the province had somehow transformed itself

from Little Orphan Annie to Daddy Warbucks.

Well the statement must have emanated from the image builders whom the Premier has ensconced in offices in this building, whose task it is to put the most favourable possible interpretation on the things the Premier does. This fiction was exposed in almost the next paragraph of the Premier's speech, the second following paragraph in the Premier's speech, apparently written by one of his officials, by one of the people who are less inclined to gild the lily or deceive the public. It says and I quote:

Over the next five years we shall lose in grants, approximately \$150,000,000 which would have been available under the old formula.

An Hon. Member: — Poor boy.

Mr. Walker: — Now, Mr. Speaker, that is a perfectly obvious admission that it is the new formula that has resulted in the loss of the \$150,000,000 and nothing else, because he says that under the old formula, the province would have got a \$150,000,000 in the next five years that it stands to receive now.

It seems to me that it is clear from this inconsistency that the first statement is an unvarnished untruth, Mr. Speaker, and I submit that it ill lies in the mouth of the Premier to perpetrate this falsehood and to put it in that document, which is a state document, which is a public record, the Budget Speech.

The Budget Speech is supposed to be an objective summing up. I deplore the evidence of increased political partisanship that comes into it.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Walker: — I sat here in this Legislature for 16 or 17 sessions before the party opposite came into power and I must say that there is more unabashed, shameless partisanship in the present Budget Speech than in all the Budget Speeches in the 16 years that I sat in this House.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Walker: — The stuff is the stuff from Liberal political pamphlets. That's where it comes from. And it has just about as much reliability, as much truth, and as much substance to it as if it was turned out of the Liberal committee rooms.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Walker: — It is clear, Mr. Speaker, that the loss of \$150,000,000 which this Government has sustained as a result of their bungling of our Dominion-Provincial relations, is the result of the new formula and nothing else. The new formula lowered the standard of average revenues against which any province must be measured in order to determine whether or not it will qualify for an equalization grant. The lower standard or the lower average imposed by the Federal Liberals is what disqualified Saskatchewan from receiving that \$150,000,000, and has nothing whatever to do with industrial development or with the economic conditions of

Saskatchewan.

The Premier's Bay Street advisers, his MacLaren Advertising Agency, I submit, have miscalculated the intelligence of the people of Saskatchewan, if they think that they can ram that myth down their throats and benefit from it politically. This is the kind of thing, this is the kind of shabby thing, which in my opinion is discrediting this Government in the eyes of all kinds of impartial and independent voters in this province.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Walker: — It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that in a Premier we should have someone who would not lend himself to this kind of shallow deception.

It's not every day that the official pronouncements of the Government show up the recklessness of the truth which I have referred to, but there was another one in the Budget Speech which I should draw attention to. It was so flagrant that anybody looking at it must wonder whether the Premier read the Budget Speech over before he read it to this House.

Speaking of the mounting pressures upon the financial resources of the province he said and I quote:

Several months ago the College of Physicians and surgeons officially asked for an across-the-board increase in the fee schedule. If this were granted it could well mean another \$6,000,000 or \$8,000,000 added to our Budget.

In a moment of disarming frankness the Minister of Public Health (Mr. Grant) who I think not only likes to tell the truth, but disapproves of untruth being told in his presence, is reported in the February 22nd Star-Phoenix as follows:

Health Minister Gordon B. Grant said today an across-the-board increase asked by doctors would cost the province about \$3,800,000.

Well, the Premier was just out 100 per cent, which isn't bad for his record. Presumably the Premier and the Health Minister on such important negotiations as this were both present. Presumably the Health Minister would tell the Premier, if the Premier wasn't present, of this demand for an increase in the fee schedule by physicians. Surely the Health Minister would be as frank with the Premier as he was with the press, and would give the Premier the correct answer. The only conclusion that can be drawn from this reckless disregard of the truth contained in the Budget Speech, is that the Premier was trying to mislead the people of Saskatchewan into believing that the pressures of money and finances were in fact greater than they really were.

Mr. Speaker, I don't know how many Members of this House are familiar with the magazine 'Canada Month', but I saw it on the news-stand in Saskatoon airport this morning and I couldn't resist picking it up, because it has a fine picture of the Hon. Mitchell Sharp in a two-column cut and then a postage stamp size picture down below it, of someone who looks vaguely familiar to those of us on this side of the House.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Walker: — As a matter of fact I would say the picture looks better, but the arrangement of the picture, I think, is symbolic. You have the Hon. Mitchell Sharp up above and a tiny little picture of the Premier of Saskatchewan down below. But the article – incidentally this is one of the places where the Premier can get quoted favourably – called ‘Saskatchewan since Socialism’, written by the Hon. W. Ross Thatcher. Now the Premier gets quoted in the official journals of the great power monopolies in the United States and he gets quoted in ‘Canada Month’. ‘Canada Month’, in case you don’t know, Mr. Speaker, is the paper which refused to carry advertising or paid advertising for the Government of Saskatchewan, prior to 1964, because they said they did not approve our philosophy. And so the Premier was with friends when he wrote this article and handed it to them. But this is the kind of journalism which I suggest does more to...

Mr. Steuart: — Are you going to take the Saskatchewan...

Mr. Walker: — ...cast a reflection on this province and the achievements of the people of Saskatchewan, than the document which was referred to by the Hon. Attorney General (Mr. Heald) in this House a few days ago. I don’t intend to read the article, but this is the kind of thing that we have in it. First of all he starts out by boasting about Saskatchewan in 1967 and he said, “We have one of the higher standards of living in the world.” As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, we have and we have had for many years. As a matter of fact in the years 1951, 1952, 1953, 1962, 1963, this province enjoyed a higher standard of living, a higher standard of income, than the average for the whole of Canada. In fact in 1963 our increase, our excess over the average for the whole of Canada was more than it is in 1966 or 1967 or 1965, or 1964, any of the years of Liberal Government. The fact is when the Premier draws attention to this question, we ought to either say nothing about it or else he should tell the truth about it. The truth is, of course, Saskatchewan continues to have a higher income standard than the average for Canada as a whole.

When he was asked to explain how did Socialism take over, how did it last for 20 years, he said:

To answer that question you’ve got to go back to the dark days of depression, back to the days of the cave man.

Well, I’m struck by the fact that if Socialism can only be explained and the growing popularity of Socialism can only be explained on the basis of the dark days of the depression, the Premier hasn’t seen many Gallup polls recently.

Mr. Thatcher: — I’ve seen some in Saskatchewan.

Mr. Walker: — The Liberal party has been steadily declining in power since the last election and the CCF or the New Democratic party, the blankety blank Socialists, have been increasing in the Gallup poll rating.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Walker: — So the explanation can’t be based upon the dark days of

the depression. He says, "In the 1930's a terrible drought struck", and so on. "Men lost their dignity and their self respect, this explains it."

An Hon. Member: — And the Liberals didn't improve matters.

Mr. Walker: — He says that the socialists had a glib set of promises which explains it to some extent, and he says they promised to end unemployment. He says they made four promises. The first one was to end unemployment.

Mr. Steuart: — Name the others.

Mr. Walker: — No Socialist or CCF or New Democratic party spokesman that I know of has ever attempted to promise that a Provincial Government could do very much about unemployment within its boundaries.

An Hon. Member: — You found that out.

Mr. Walker: — They say now, of course, that there is no unemployment in Saskatchewan, or very little. there is very little in Canada, as a matter of fact. And if the flow of population out of this province signifies anything, it suggests that the unemployed would rather live somewhere else if they don't have to live in Saskatchewan.

Secondly, he says that the Socialists promised to provide jobs of building Socialist factories. Well, I recall that these Crown corporations, that were set up by the Socialists from 1944 to 1964, at the end of 1964 employed some 13,000 to 14,000 people. I'd like to see some evidence of some program by this Government that employs anything like that additional number of people, or will in its present term of office.

And so the fact is that this was one of the most valuable aspects of these corporations, that they provided jobs for people in Saskatchewan. To supply the needs of the people of Saskatchewan that were formerly supplied by the big business friends of the Government down east and in the United States.

He says the third of these devastating promises was to provide free medical and health services. Well, you don't have to pay your hospital or doctor bill in Saskatchewan, since the CCF Government introduced their medical and hospital care program. This was another one of those promises which the Premier says attributed to their strength.

I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that no small part of the votes which the party opposite got in 1964 came to them because they promised free drugs for the people of Saskatchewan.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Walker: — As a matter of fact, the present Government now indicates that it has no real intention of doing this. Apparently the Gallup poll the Premier speaks of provides for enough marginal support that he doesn't have to keep that promise. So he'll promise it in the years when he thinks he has to, but if he

thinks he doesn't have to, he'll withdraw the promise.

And then he says the fourth of these horrendous proposals that the CCF put forward to get into office...

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Walker: — ...to give a new deal to farmers. Well, Mr. Speaker, we remember that in 1944 farmers were being evicted from their farms, were being foreclosed, were being thrown off their land. The Farm Security Act to give the farmer title, security of his title and his homestead.

We recall, Mr. Speaker, that it was the CCF Government that replaced the old Liberal pork-barrel roads that used to be promised every election in every municipal division by the Jimmy Gardiner Government, and substituted for that, a systematic grid road program based on scientific cost-sharing and based on independent locating of the road by an independent commission, and so on.

Hon. Members will recall that it was the CCF Government that gave impetus to the program of sewer and water on farms in this province. And I suggest that that was a new deal for Saskatchewan. After 35 or 40 years of government by the old parties, less than 200 farms with rural electrification, practically none with sewer and water systems. That has all been changed by this new deal which the CCF gave to the rural people.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Walker: — Then he says that another reason why this lasted for 20 years was because our people were subject to a leather-lunged propaganda machine paid for by public funds.

Mr. Coderre: — ...the propaganda machine.

Mr. Walker: — Well, Mr. Speaker, I have never seen so many gray flannel boys around this building in my 16 or 18 years here, as I have seen in the last two or three years.

The image builders, the hucksters of free enterprise Liberalism, are infesting this Government today and I submit that there is no way of finding out how much money is going to these people. Work that was legitimately done in the public relations and publicity field by the previous Government was isolated in one area for the most part, in the Department of Industry and Information. We frankly put before the Legislature the particulars and the names and addresses of these people and they were public servants. They were employees of the Government. Now it appears that the Government pays fat fees to MacLaren's Advertising Agency and the names of these gray flannel boys don't even appear in the public accounts, Mr. Speaker.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Walker: — People of this province have no way of knowing who they are or what they are doing, or who they are answerable to, or how many of them there are. No way of knowing, it is all buried

in fat fees to McLaren's Advertising Agency. Talk about leather-lunged propaganda machines. this flannel-mouthed propaganda machine that the Premier has is the one that functions with smooth efficiency.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Walker: — I was amused to read in the paper the other day that the Premier of Saskatchewan sent a fine telegram to Tommy Douglas on his return to our province. And I venture to say, Mr. Speaker, that Tommy Douglas never got it and the Premier never sent it. It was a fine, fine, little publicity stunt.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Walker: — A part of image building. The people of Saskatchewan aren't going to fall for it. You can't make a graceful gentleman out of our Premier, I'm afraid, Mr. Speaker.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Walker: — I won't say anything about the silk purse at all, as it might be unparliamentary.

He says millions and millions of (listen to this), millions and millions of tax dollars have been flooded into these Crown corporations that either went bankrupt or kept alive by Government subsidies.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Walker: — Well, Mr. Speaker, anybody who has examined the public accounts of this province, and has examined the financial statements of the Government Finance Office, can tell exactly how much money was put into Crown corporations of Saskatchewan. The amount was something like \$10,000,000 or slightly less.

Mr. Steuart: — What about that Montana deal?

Mr. Walker: — Out of that \$10,000,000, oh yes, that's included in it. I was astonished to see the Minister of Highways (Mr. Boldt) speaking here this afternoon because somebody told me that they had heard a rumour about the Provincial election on April 26 and that Thatcher had shot his bolt and there he was!

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Walker: — I think he might be better off if he did, mind you. But, Mr. Speaker, the Public Accounts are clear and the reports of the Government Finance Office is clear, that less than \$10,000,000 was invested in this corporations, other than telephones and power.

Mr. Steuart: — How much did you lose in Montana, Bob??

Mr. Walker: — During that time net profits of over \$17,000,000 were

earned on these corporations, other than Power and Telephones, most of which was paid back into the Treasury of Saskatchewan. The Premier gives away or throws away these \$10,000,000 worth of industries.

Mr. Thatcher: — Socialist arithmetic, Bob.

Mr. Walker: — but the fact is that some of these corporations are still owned by the people of Saskatchewan. By the last report most of them are.

He says something about value of production being increased; personal income per capita for 1966 is 27 per cent over 1964. I repeat what I said earlier, that the per capital personal income in this province is not much larger than the national average in 1963.

He says that industry in Saskatchewan is also healthier because we have taken the Government out of a number of fields that are properly the field of private enterprise and these are the fields that he speaks of. He says,

Late in 1964 for example, we sold Saskatchewan Government Airways to a private company. As a result the taxpayers received a fair payment for the Airlines; public funds are no longer subsidizing the operation and air service in northern Saskatchewan has been greatly improved.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Walker: — A point of fact, Mr. Speaker, every one of those statements is untrue. Many people will tell you if you go through the North that air service in northern Saskatchewan has not been improved. indeed it is less frequent in many places; some places have actually been taken off in northern Saskatchewan.

Mr. Steuart: —Name one.

Mr. Walker: — He says that public funds are no longer subsidizing the operation, Mr. Speaker, when the Minister brought this report to us we were told that part and parcel of that report was that the Government undertook to pay at least \$274,000 a year to this private company whether we used any service from them or not.

Mr. Thatcher: — We use it.

Mr. Walker: — Now if that isn't a subsidy I'd like to know what it is. And he says that the taxpayers received a fair payment for the airlines. Well, the Minister of Mineral Resources (Mr. Cameron) who is responsible for this service, was reported in the Saskatoon Star-Phoenix, December 23, 1964:

The Province is prepared to sell SaskAir Corporation, valued at a \$1,000,000. He says that's what it's worth.

Well, he didn't get \$1,000,000, he got at least a third less than \$1,000,000 and he hasn't got that yet. As a matter of fact he doesn't get that except in annual or monthly payments over a period of eight or ten years. As a matter of fact the subsidy

will more than cover it. Now, and I'm sorry the Minister's not here. Oh, he is here. Sorry. The Minister attempted to defend the criticism levied against the Government for its failure to enforce the terms of even this improvident deal. The financial critic complained that this company had violated its agreement and closed its workshops in Prince Albert.

Mr. Steuart: —It didn't close its workshop. Open your big eyes and go up there and take a look at it.

Mr. Walker: — Because it had violated its agreement and closed its workshop in Prince Albert, the Minister got up and said, "The only complaint that we had was that no longer was there service for privately owned aircraft in Saskatchewan." Well, I point out, Mr. Speaker, that when he announced this deal back in December 24, 1964, he said the conditions of sale – and I am reporting from the Leader Post of that date – which Mr. Cameron stressed the Government would insist upon, are continued operation of the repair depot at Prince Albert. This, he said, was an important consideration. And now he says they closed it because it doesn't show a profit. Do you know what he said on December 24, 1964? He said, "which presently shows a good profit." The only conclusion one can come to as a result of that statement is that under public ownership it was capable of showing a good profit. But private enterprise wasn't able to do this, wasn't able to run it as efficiently. And then he went on to say, "It is the only one between Edmonton and Winnipeg."

Well, I submit, Mr. Speaker, that the Minister himself attached importance to the fact that this was providing service for other aircraft in the prairie provinces. Now because of the loss of this service, he says that there was nothing in the contract about this. It may not have been in the contract; it probably wasn't about service to other aircraft. But this was one of the virtues and values which the Minister himself put forward as being one of the benefits of maintaining this shop in Saskatchewan. Now he says that there wasn't really a breach of the contract. I would read to him Section 18, Clause Bill, which says:

That the purchaser hereby agrees with the vendor and as a separate covenant with the Crown in right of Saskatchewan as follows: To maintain and operate the existing Repair and Maintenance Shop at Prince Albert, Saskatchewan, continuously until the 1st day of March 1975.

But, Mr. Speaker, if he thinks that ends the matter I would draw his attention to Section 22 of the Agreement which says:

If and when the purchaser makes default in payment, and so on, or if and when the purchaser removes assets from Saskatchewan in breach of sub-clause A of clause 25 hereof, all money still to be paid hereunder shall, although not otherwise then due and payable at the option of the vendor become forthwith due and payable.

I suggest that if the Minister has the interests of the people of Saskatchewan at heart he will exercise this option. Section 25 says that the purchaser will not remove, I'll read the whole clause.

The purchaser hereby further covenants with the vendor as

follows, that the purchaser will assume all risk of loss or damage to the assets mentioned in sub-clause D of clause 1, hereof, and will not remove them or any of them from Saskatchewan without the consent of the vendor first had and obtained.

I suggest that the Minister by these weasel words, that he gave the House here tonight, has not satisfied the onus on him of establishing that there was not a breach of this contract nor has he established, nor has he satisfied the onus on him, of satisfying the people of Saskatchewan that the Government has exercised its rights under that contract.

Mr. Steuart: — Why don't you talk it over with a good lawyer, Bob?

Mr. Walker: — I'm afraid if I had to take advice from my friend, the Minister of — what is it now — Natural Resources? I'm afraid that I would go much further astray than I do.

An Hon. Member: — That's pretty nearly impossible.

Mr. Walker: — Now, Mr. Speaker, he says and I'll go back to the Premier's little epistle for the moment, he says that new and accelerated resource developments are providing Government revenues which have permitted tax cuts at a time when most other provinces are increasing theirs.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Walker: — Well, he would have you believe that this has something to do with Liberal Government. the only tax revenues to come from mineral development are tax revenues that come from the oil industry, the potash industry, that were firmly established in Saskatchewan prior to 1964.

Mr. Thatcher: — That's a joke!

Mr. Walker: — 1964 indeed, Mr. Speaker. I doubt if he's received a red cent from any potash company that wasn't established in April 1964.

Mr. Thatcher: — How about Noranda?

Mr. Walker: — As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, I don't know. How much did you make at Noranda last year?

Mr. Thatcher: — We are getting quite a bit at four per cent.

Mr. Walker: — I'd like to know how much royalty. He's speaker here, Mr. Speaker, of Government royalty of resource development, and I think the question that he answered in the Legislature the other day said, Nil, in answer to that question. the Premier may not read these answers but I commend them to him. The fact is that the oil developments so far are all in oil pools and

oil fields that were located and well established by this Government prior to 1964. As a matter of fact it is fraudulent and false for him to claim that there have been any new revenues from resource development accruing to this Government as a result of any policies initiated by this Government. And what are their prospects for the future, Mr. Speaker? Do they have any? Well, looking at the Estimates which were tabled by the Hon. Premier himself in this House, he says that: "In 1966-67 the current fiscal year, he took in \$32,500,000 from petroleum and gas." And so next year being a buoyant and optimistic year for our Province, he expects to take in \$33,000,000. Look all down the line. No increase of any significance in resource revenue is forecast by this Government for next year. Have they spent their inheritance already and given up any hope of improving upon what was done for them by the Government which they inherited from in 1964. Apparently they have, Mr. Speaker. Apparently they have no optimism about doing anything themselves to expand these revenues. Now I departed from my text quite a while ago and I wonder where I left off.

An Hon. Member: — You're all washed up.

Mr. Walker: — Oh, I shouldn't stop yet, there's a good one here. Going back to that article, Mr. Speaker, he says that massive grants are now being paid to school units and municipalities to permit them to reduce local taxes. Well, Mr. Speaker, the Member from Swift Current (Mr. Wood) gave us the figures a little while ago. In 1965 the total local revenues were some \$6,000,000 higher than they were in 1964; in 1966 they were some \$14,000,000 higher than they were in 1964; and in 1967 they were nearly \$20,000,000 higher than they were in 1964; and the forecast is that this next year local government taxes will be \$25,000,000 higher than they were in 1964. Surely anybody from Saskatchewan who has any knowledge of the facts cannot help but be reduced to tears by this kind of manipulation of the facts, Mr. Speaker. He says, at the same time aid to education on an unparalleled scale.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Walker: — I say this, Mr. Speaker, that in terms of the needs of today, in terms of the number of pupils that present themselves at the doors of our University...

An Hon. Member: — Comparing it with what the Socialists gave.

Mr. Walker: — ...aid is not being given today on the same scale as it was in 1964. The fact is that in 1964 you didn't hear of people being turned away from our educational institutes for lack of staff and lack of money.

Mr. Thatcher: — There was nobody here to turn away.

Mr. Walker: — But in 1966 and 1967, Mr. Speaker, this is the picture under Liberalism. Because of the failure, the bankruptcy of the Liberal party they have failed to make adequate provision for the needs of the young people of these times.

Mr. Steuart: — Sorry about that, Bob.

Mr. Walker: — He says highway building is progressing at a rate never imagined possible under the socialists. Well, Mr. Speaker, there's about 28 miles of highway construction in my constituency from Saskatoon to Dundurn and it's been there since 1964 and nobody has used it yet.

An Hon. Member: — Four-laning it this year.

Mr. Walker: — It's been there since 1964, Mr. Speaker. the first winter it blew away. Now he says he's going to put surface on it next year.

Mr. Steuart: — And we'll put the cap on you the same year.

Mr. Walker: — Now, Mr. Speaker, I don't think I'll take the time of the House to read any more of this Gulliver's Travels.

Mr. Steuart: — Will you table it because it would make a great, great record.

Mr. Walker: — I think, Mr. Speaker, that we should judge the Budget of this Government on the basis of the estimates that were tabled in this House by the Premier.

Everyone in this House who has an interest in Saskatchewan's major industry will lament the fact that the Department of Agriculture has fared ill at the hands of the Provincial Premier. During the current year, during the year 1966-67, including the supplementary estimates which we are being asked to vote, some \$13,353,950 is to be voted and spent during this current fiscal year by the Department of Agriculture. Next year's estimates laid on the table by the Premier called for only \$11,519,110 for both capital and ordinary accounts. This represents a reduction of some \$2,000,000 below the actual expenditures of the current year. Now, of course, the Premier in his Budget Speech says that this is only \$800,000 below the current year's estimates when it was, in fact, \$2,000,000. He conveniently disregards the supplementary estimate of \$1,000,000 which is to be spent during the current year and his radio listeners probably weren't aware of it. So he fooled them that the agricultural estimates were only being reduced by that smaller amount. He tries to escape blame for this by saying that \$2,250,000 of the year's Budget was for completion of the South Saskatchewan Dam. I submit, Mr. Speaker, that there are other crying needs for regeneration and revival of our agricultural industry in areas other than in the South Saskatchewan Dam irrigation area, and that the Premier, if he had the interests of agriculture at heart would not content himself with merely continuing and implementing a program that was launched by the Federal Conservative Government and the Provincial CCF. He would try to think of something for himself, try to invent some constructive program of his own to assist agriculture and switch this \$2,500,000 which he will not have to spend on that program into some other useful agricultural program.

Oh, he did one thing; he got a Manpower Report. The avowed

purpose of this Report is best outlined by some quotations from the Report itself. I refer to pages 144 and 145 of the Report. On page 144 it says:

In broad terms, that phase of our study indicates that a total of some 62,000 non-agricultural job opportunities are emerging over the 1961-71 decade.

That's 62,000 in 10 years.

Approximately 36,000 of these will have been filled by end of 1966, leaving a balance of 26,000 to the latter half of the decade.

The jobs which have been filled have pulled manpower from various sources, not the least of which has been the rural areas of the province.

Then further down on the page it says:

An opportunity does exist to foster the goals of economic growth and the relief of poverty and the means depend on answers to the second and third questions, the aptitudes and attitudes of the rural labour force.

And over on page 174 it says:

Our effort in this study, therefore, was concentrated upon identifying and appraising those who would be most susceptible to occupational and geographic relocation.

So that the purpose of this Report is clear from the words of the Report; that is, to relocate people who are presently engaged in agriculture to locate in industry, either in Saskatchewan or outside Saskatchewan. And so to this end we have an expenditure for a number of Opportunity Caravans to visit the rural communities and to try to recruit what the Government thinks is surplus farm workers into industries. At page 21 of the Report he says that:

It has been estimated that upwards of 35,000 persons could be released from the agricultural labour force without impairing productivity.

Now, I submit, Mr. Speaker, that that's a highly dangerous conclusion. I submit that in the world food situation that is developing we could very well in Saskatchewan, in 10 or 20 years, be in the position where we have to develop our agricultural industry on an intensive basis. I submit that the time could well come within our life-time when we will need, not fewer agricultural workers but as many or even more than we have today. I grew up on a farm and many Members of this House grew up on a farm and I think that it is a matter of common observation that you can't make a farmer out of a city kid. I think you've got to grow up on a farm if you are going to be a farmer. I think that this Government might very well be confronted in the years ahead with the necessity of finding and making a manpower study for the purpose of trying to bolster and increase the agricultural labour force in Canada.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I have already referred to the disparagement of rural people contained on page 156 of this Report and I wouldn't take the time of the House to refer to it again, except that it was made the matter of some rather unfair comments in

an editorial in the Leader Post not long ago. I refer to the passage on page 156 of the Report which I read to the House to the effect that the intelligence of the rural population is significantly lower than the IQ of the general population. Such findings would suggest that it would be more difficult for people in rural areas to learn the many new skills in trying to adjust to urban patterns in employment. The Leader Post took those of us on this side of the House who noted this passage to task by saying that if we had read a few lines further down we would have found a statement which qualified that general conclusion and they quoted this passage:

Rather than being below average, the people who came to our Opportunity Day program for counselling and testing were if anything, above average in basic intelligence.

And the Leader Post tried to get this Government and this Commission off the hook for having made such a low assessment of the people of Saskatchewan by saying that we had taken the earlier passage out of context. If anyone took anything out of context, it was the Leader Post because when they quoted the passage, I submit they misrepresented what the Report said because the very next line was:

Perhaps only those who were intelligent would consent to testing or counselling.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Walker: — And this may in fact be the case, the Report says. So I suggest that it ill behoves the Editor of the Leader Post to give lectures on honesty to Members on this side of the House for their quotations out of the Hillis Report. The Leader Post Editor could hardly have issued that next line unless he did it intentionally.

But my question about this Report is much more fundamental. My view of the Report is that I question its usefulness from several more basic points of view. On page 194, the consultants, when speaking about the mode of interesting rural people in relocation and retraining, say this:

Of equal importance is the timing of the counselling. Our experience in Broadview and Foam Lake indicated a rapid decline in interest in our program after young people had been out of school for several months.

But for several years, but for several months. The point is if the proposed relocation, resettlement and retraining are to be effective at all, it must be at a time when young people are still in school or within a few months, two or three months of graduation. Now when one considers the nature of this problem, one of orienting young people to opportunities and depicting to them the various vocations and occupations that are to be had in Saskatchewan, what better place is there for this than in our educational system. This is the job of our educational system, to adapt and to train young people for their role in life; indeed modern progressive schools engage in a good deal of vocational counselling of young people. If we were going to have a really effective program of acquainting young people with opportunities in other communities it should be tied in with the training of them for job opportunities in other communities.

The two things can't be separated in any practical approach to the problem.

It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that the real explanation for this Report and for the Government's policy as a result of this Report, is that the Government wants to have nine or ten fancy painted trailers running around the province, giving the impression that the Liberal Government is doing something. Well, what are they doing? Look at the Report. The Report says that the approach of these trailers into the communities should be preceded by a newspaper advertisement in blatant format. In blatant format, Mr. Speaker! "Hand bills and signs proved effective media in our pilot projects." And so this is to be accompanied by a fan-fare. It says that the trailer shouldn't be parked on the main street because some people might not want to be seen coming in or going out but it should be close to the main street. This sounds more and more like a Liberal Convention. Then it says, "A strategic service of refreshment might melt the atmosphere of the meeting."

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Walker: — It sounds like what it is, a Liberal stratagem to take in the people of Saskatchewan. It's another elector gimmick, Mr. Speaker, another gimmick with fancy \$9,000 trailers pulled around by \$6,000 trucks bought outside this province, circulating the towns and villages of Saskatchewan and intended to create the impression that this Government is doing something dramatic about this problem of retraining and relocating of young people in industry.

An Hon. Member: — Liberal education.

Mr. Walker: — If this Government was really, concerned about this problem instead of being concerned about the spectacle it is creating it should have done something through our established school systems, something on a continuous basis where they already have skilled and qualified psychological testers and administrators and teachers and other qualified in job counselling. If they don't have teachers fully qualified for this same program, they should give teachers special training in this area so that they could be of more assistance to young people throughout their school career in the choice of a vocation and relocation. Something constructive would have been done about it. I say, Mr. Speaker, that it is just another ostentatious waste and squandering of public money on a Liberal election campaign gimmick. That's all it is.

Mr. Speaker, the Premier speaks of his \$56,000,000 program. Well, this is not a true measure of the success of our highway program. The condition of our highways found by the travelling public is a better measure of the success or failure of this Government in the Highways Department. The question which the public is asking is: How can the Government spend such vastly increased amounts of money with such singular lack of results? The explanation is found in several facts. One sees money expended on incomplete projects which I have already referred to, and I submit that better planning would result in much less delay in putting these expenditures to use. Secondly, the improvident cutback which the Premier made in maintenance, the meat-axe treatment of highway maintenance administered in 1964 is still resulting in the break-up and deterioration of good

highways in Saskatchewan. Thirdly, I submit that the Government has been led down the garden path not so much by the contractors but by their own imprudence in respect to the construction of new highways. The annual report of the Department of Highways shows that, on page 29, an increase in unit yardage prices from 1962-66 are from less than 16 cents per yard to 27.1 cent per yard according to an answer given in this House by the Minister of Highways. Hon. Members will recall the present Government is pledged to get rid of five, to do away with Government construction crews. While there is no reliable comparative information as to the cost of work done by this Government crews as compared to that of private contractors, there is some intimation contained in an answer given by the Government on February 9, 1967, to a question asked by the Member from Melfort-Tisdale (Mr. Willis). The cost of blacktopping by Government crews and private contractors was set out. The Government crews cost \$2,686 per mile, while the private contractors cost \$4,670 per mile, almost twice as much.

Mr. Speaker, the Budget Speech goes on to speak of collector roads in our rural areas. The CCF Government introduced the grid road program which was so beneficial to our agricultural industry. Part and parcel of that program was to branch out into feeder roads as the grid roads were completed. Now the Premier announces on page 40, of this Budget Address, a new policy. He says, "a sharing of costs for approved feeder roads or collectors roads." As a matter of fact the previous Government was doing that in cases where bus routes and so on were needed, and this was just a preliminary to this policy of building feeder roads to the grid system.

Most Members of this House will perhaps not remember the road work, the pork barrel, of the Jimmy Gardiner regime back in the 1920's. Perhaps I wouldn't remember it either, I was only 10 years old, but I can still remember hearing my father talk about it. You remember that during the 1920's and the early 30's, the middle 30's, the Liberal Government used to go out and promise Liberal heelers in the various polls that there would be road repairs in the vicinity of their farms if the vote turned out right. And when people no longer believed these promises, then they would give the local Liberal three days work with a team of horses and a slip, filling a pothole somewhere as a reward for working hard at the polls in the constituency or as an invitation to work hard at the polls in the upcoming election. The promise of this road work and the rare cases where it was actually done was approved and distributed on a purely political basis. In 1944, you'll recall, Mr. Speaker, we ended all that. Our grid road program was laid out by a non-partisan committee. The costs were shared on a scientific and orderly basis...

Mr. Stuart: — You said that, Bob.

Mr. Walker: — One of the very first acts of the Liberal Government on being elected in 1964 was to abolish this impartial, this non-partisan committee of municipal men and to put this matter in the hands of the Government, the Minister. So, to that extent, we have already reverted back, we have already gotten back to the mechanism of Liberal pork-barrelism.

The Premier in his Budget Address said, "approved feeder roads or collector roads." Why did he have to say approved? Is there something about these feeder roads or collector roads that has to be approved by him or by the Minister or by the

local Liberal MLA or candidate? Why approved? Is this just another example of the reckless use of words or does this really mean something? I submit that to those of us who are acquainted with the traditional ways of Liberalism, there's something sinister about this word.

An Hon. Member: — Reverend Murphy.

Mr. Walker: — Now, are we going to have Liberal heelers roaming around visiting rural people, promising them that they will approve of this particular road to John Doe's farm provided the vote in the poll turned out right? Well, Mr. Speaker, I submit that I'm gravely apprehensive that we are returning to the old days of the Jimmy Gardiner pork-barrel roads of the 1920's and 30's.

Well, Mr. Speaker, this party from this side of the House are committed to bringing forward an improved all-weather road system to every farmer in Saskatchewan, whether he's...

Mr. Thatcher: — 20 year, 20 years.

Mr. Walker: — ...approved or not, during our next term of office.

Mr. Thatcher: — Where were you those 20 years, Bob?

Mr. Walker: — With 20 years of rebuilding our grid roads...

Mr. McFarlane: — Digging himself a hole in the valley.

Mr. Walker: — ...of building an rebuilding and relocating our highways all done on a non-partisan, objective, scientific basis. This party on this side of the House can be trusted to carry this feeder road program to completion, to do it without political interference.

But the real failure of this Government, Mr. Speaker, and this Budget, is the Government's failure to revive the lagging economy of Saskatchewan. In his concluding paragraph the Premier says that the Government is making every effort to widen our provincial tax base by bringing in new industries and mines to the province. What has the Government done and what does it propose to do in this Budget? There is not a single proposal in the Budget Address of the Premier, as laid down in this Legislature, to accomplish a revival of our industrial growth. Is the Government content to rely on the give-aways of natural resources, the imposition of higher municipal taxes by providing municipal tax exemptions in the municipalities for favoured industries, for industries that are friends of the Premier?

The Government says it doesn't cost the taxpayers anything to give royalty-free privileges to oil companies and mining companies. Of course, if the royalty-free privilege fails to result in any mining development then there is no loss of royalties. But it does make it more difficult for the Government to maintain realistic royalty rates for industry generally when it is indulging in give-aways of resources and royalty-free

periods. But the Government argues that, even if there is production during the royalty-free period, there is no loss of revenue, because there was no production before. Well, Mr. Speaker, that's a specious, fallacious kind of argument. That argument assumes that the resource is valueless in the ground. Some states, some provinces have largely been depleted of oil and other mineral resources by just such policies as royalty-free incentives. The resources belong to the people of Saskatchewan. It is the duty of the Government to get as much development as possible, to maximize the return to the people of Saskatchewan as much as possible and not to increase the returns to foreign exploiters in preference to the taxpayers who own these resources.

Mr. Steuart: — Running dogs.

Mr. Walker: — The philosophy of the Government seems to be we'll be as generous as necessary to entice investment capital to develop our resources. This ultra-conservative free enterprise type of auction of our resources can only succeed so long as we are willing to give away our resources on less favourable terms than any other captive stooge in the US sphere of influence.

The Premier is in competition with the tin-horn dictators of Central and South America in this field as in other fields as well. This means that we must compete with these captive stooges who are running some of these resource-rich countries in Africa, South America, and South East Asia.

An Hon. Member: — Let's do some Bills, Bob.

Mr. Walker: — Mr. Speaker, it is a fact of life in Canada and particularly in Western Canada that there are great amounts of investment capital which cannot be readily attracted into industry and resource development. If this Government had any imagination and was willing to acknowledge the failure of its development policy, it would give some leadership in attracting Canadian and Saskatchewan capital into a planned program of industrial and resource development.

Our party immediately after the next election, will launch an industrial and resource development program. We will set up a huge...

Mr. Thatcher: — That won't be enough, Bob.

Mr. Walker: — ...development fund subscribed to in partnership between the Saskatchewan Government and Saskatchewan investors. The CCF Government will set up this investment fund to supplement the investment capital that we were so successful in attracting when we were last in Government. The Hon. Members can laugh, but the facts are, Mr. Speaker, that we attracted oil investment capital in Saskatchewan. It hasn't so far. We attracted potash development into Saskatchewan. Let them point to some comparable industry that it has attracted into Saskatchewan. Laughter will echo over the hills without causing any increase of Liberal votes to the candidates in the next election.

An Hon. Member: — We've wasted enough time.

Mr. Walker: — They CCF Government will set

up this fund to supplement the investment which normally comes into Saskatchewan and which we encouraged to come into Saskatchewan when we were the Government. I don't care what the fund is called, it can be called the Saskatchewan A-Go-Go Fund, or anything for all I care. It's that this fund has got to be set up. It should be a participating fund in which the people of Saskatchewan can benefit from the growing use and development of our resources and from the profits coming from them. We will encourage the people of Saskatchewan to put their savings into Saskatchewan development.

Mr. Thatcher: — You tried that in 1944.

Mr. Walker: — I have seen, Mr. Speaker, in my office people who have invested money in shares and companies in eastern Canada and western Canada but not very much in Saskatchewan. Instead of that we have capital coming in from outside the province gobbling up the royalty-free resources of this province. At present there is no choice for the people of this province but to invest in companies having their headquarters in New York or Toronto or Montreal or some place like that. I wouldn't for my part, want to discourage companies from those areas from coming to Saskatchewan. We will continue to encourage them but in addition to that we will encourage the people of Saskatchewan to invest in the expansion of our province. It is the Provincial Government's role and it is their responsibility to act as a catalyst in bringing together the savings of the people of Saskatchewan and the natural resources which the people own.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Walker: — The CCF Government will encourage local participation, participation by Saskatchewan people. We wouldn't go chasing after a New York company every time. I notice there was a law suit here awhile ago reported in the paper between a group of Saskatchewan promoters and a group of New York promoters over who was going to get the contracts for the pulp mill up in Prince Albert, just a couple of years ago. The paper said that the Provincial Government was backing and supporting the New York interests. I thought that was a foregone conclusion which they needn't have reported, but a CCF Government would encourage local participation in the search for oil. The search for oil in this country is largely conducted by foreign companies, by foreign capital. But there are oil producers in this province who are locally owned, owned by the Saskatchewan people, who I submit ought to be given some encouragement and even some advantage which will supplement the vast millions of dollars of exploration funds owned by these gigantic foreign companies. And so I look forward under a CCF Government to seeing a sharing of the profits derived from potash and oil going to the people of Saskatchewan both as investors and as a Government.

The CCF Government would work for the development of a potash industry owned by the people of Saskatchewan, producing profits to stay in Saskatchewan not all to go out of this province.

This Government took over an excellent basis for the development of resources in our province. There was a plentiful supply of power with an excellent power grid to distribute it in this province. Instead of building upon that, instead of expanding their hydro facilities, this Government is taking the short-term advantage of investing money in coal and this kind of electrical

production. The Government is showing no vision toward the expansion of our power utility and for lower and lower power production costs, through expansion of our hydro facilities. They talk about their power profits of course. They come from the farsightedness of the CCF Government which developed the hydro power in this province that is now producing more than half the power used by the people of Saskatchewan.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Walker: — The Liberal Government, what is it doing? It is taking the short-run course, - it is putting taxes and extra imposts on the cost of power, and thereby depriving the province of this very important economic advantage in attracting industry.

We had an excellent highway system. The present Government is, I believe, sincerely interested in extending and developing our highway system. It has gone about it in a rather careless, casual way with the result that tens of millions of dollars of the money of the taxpayers of this province will be wasted with no commensurate advantage to them.

The previous Government maintained, as the previous speaker pointed out, developed and protected our rail network, and the present Government has shown a complete and callous disregard of the question of rail line abandonment. They didn't even both to get off their backsides and go to Ottawa and object to this policy or to say anything about it, which might have had some effect in deterring the wholesale abandonment of our rail lines.

The previous Government made a good start in oil and potash. I wish that I could say that in the last three years the present Government could show any similar, corresponding area of economic or resource development. What has this Government been doing? Well, all I say is, if the Premier is led by his public opinion polls to call a general election in the spring, I don't advise him to do it although I will welcome it when it comes. If he is ill-advised enough to call a general election in April of this year, it will be an unparalleled opportunity for the voters of Saskatchewan to give a boost to our province's development. The voters will have a chance to replace the present Government with sensible, responsible, sober leadership.

Mr. Speaker, I will support the amendment and not the Budget.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. W. S. Lloyd (Leader of the Opposition): — Mr. Speaker, there are in fact two documents before the Legislature at this time. One of them is the Budget, the other is the Budget Speech. There are occasions, I admit, on which they happen to coincide but not always. Regardless of that fact when you put the two together there are still a number of ways when both of them combined, fail to do the job that we have a right to expect the Budget and the Budget Speech to do in this province. They fail I submit, Mr. Speaker, to give a clear picture of the finances of this province. In particular they fail to give a clear picture of how many of the services in this province are going to be financed.

We, in particular, refer to what is going to happen with

respect to the University. It is impossible from studying this Budget to know just what the state of the finances of the University will be in the next current year. The facts and the figures are not there. One reason of course why they are not there is that there is a change this year in the method by which the Federal Government is giving assistance for university education. Last year this assistance was given directly to the universities of Canada on a per capita basis. I believe that last year our University received somewhere in the neighbourhood of \$4,500,000 to \$5,000,000 in this way. This year, however, this money does not go directly to the universities. This money comes to the Government of Saskatchewan for passing on to the universities. Nowhere have we been given the information which will enable us to evaluate the situation of the University this year as compared to last year and one of the reasons is this change in the method of payment by the Federal Government. I submit it is quite plain that the Minister of Education (Mr. Trapp) himself isn't fully aware or isn't willing to reveal the full extent of the situation. Speaking this afternoon I asked him a question which he was good enough to answer. I asked him whether or not his figures included the money previously paid directly to the University by the Federal Government, by this year paid to the Provincial Government. He replied that it was on the same basis as before. I submit, Mr. Speaker, that that answer is not correct. I submit now, as I submitted in the Throne Speech, that sometime before the end of this session somebody on the opposite side, the Premier, Provincial Treasurer, Minister of Education, ought to give this House and this province a statement so that they can see how the University is going to be financed, how adequately it is going to be financed in the coming year. This we haven't got.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Lloyd: — Certainly, it is impossible to get from this Budget any clear picture as to how our school boards are going to operate financially this year. We are told what grants are going to be in total. But there is no real way of sorting out how much of these grants are for comprehensive schools, or composite schools, whichever one may call them, which are as yet not even on the drawing boards, which are as yet not even finally planned in the pre-drawing board stage. There is no way as yet of telling from the figures just what the increase in operating grants is going to be. So the Budget fails to give a clear picture in that sense. And thirdly, it fails also to admit some necessary truths. My friend, the Member from Hanley (Mr. Walker) who has just sat down has emphasized one of those truths which the Budget fails to reflect. That is the truth with respect to the change in the amounts of money we are going to receive through the Federal-Provincial tax-sharing grants. And even at the expense of repetition, Mr. Speaker, I want to draw attention again to some of those statements in the Budget Speech which not only fail to give the truth but which give a false picture of the situation. At one point it says this:

We were notified because of our changed economic position that the amount of money we are going to get will be less.

I submit, Mr. Speaker, that there never was such notification from anybody for that reason given to the Provincial Government. Never was there any such notification that they are going to reduce the grants because of changed economic position. Secondly, I submit, that the statement that immediately follows that is

open to question. It says that:

As a result of vigorous protest the equalization payments would be phased out, not taken away immediately.

In fact, I submit, that this happened, this phasing out, not because of any protest by the Provincial Government. Rather this was a part of the plan from the first and the Provincial Government knew about it from the first. The proof of that lies in the statements made by the gentleman who shares the top page of 'Canada Month' with the Premier in its recent publication. For example, Mr. Sharp said on September 1st in the House of Commons, that he had asked some of our officials to visit the Provincial capitals and discuss with them certain principles. Out of this Mr. Thatcher drew the inference that there would be no payment for Saskatchewan but such was never intended. And again Mr. Sharp, speaking on September 13th at the Federal-Provincial Conference said this:

They – that is the estimates with regard to the new formula – also take into account transitional arrangements which was recognized from the beginning would be required if there were substantial reductions in the payments to any province under the new formula as compared with the old.

In other words, these transitional arrangements were not as a result of vigorous fighting and arguing by the Provincial Government; they were involved all along in the plan of the Federal Government. So the Budget fails to give to the people of Saskatchewan the facts with regard to this and I invite the Premier when he closes this Debate on Wednesday of this week to stand up and say to the Province of Saskatchewan, as he ought to say, this amount of money is not available under this agreement this year, it is not available because of the fact of a changed formula and for no reason other than that. He ought to stand up in his place and say that to the people of Saskatchewan; that is, he ought to if he is interested in the people of Saskatchewan having the facts of the situation.

Mr. Thatcher: — Pretty weak, pretty weak. haven't you got a point to make tonight?

Mr. Lloyd: — Then we have also, Mr. Speaker, the other ways in which this Budget fails. It fails to give any assurance to persons receiving old age security pensions that they are going to get the full benefit of the recent actions of the Federal Government in increasing benefits a possible \$30 a month. It fails to give this assurance. We have been asking the Government to give this assurance since December. We've asked them at least three times in this House since it started, and not once have we had any answer to that question other than that the policy is not yet decided. I submit that if the policy isn't yet decided then the Minister of Welfare (Mr. MacDonald) or somebody had better start telling the officials out in the country that it isn't decided, because people are still being told that the amount that they receive from the Provincial Government is going to be reduced when the Federal payments become a fact next month. Now, Mr. Speaker, it seems to Member that the Budget was an excellent opportunity to say to this people:

Don't worry. Whatever the Federal Government has made

available by this \$30 a month extra, whatever it has made available in that way, you're going to get the full benefit of it; the Provincial Government is not going to save money as a result of this added money problem.

It hasn't said that yet. Again, I invite the Premier when he closes this Debate to give that kind of, that which the Minister of Mineral Resources (Mr. Cameron) referred to as "wealth and sunshine", to these people because there are a lot of them worrying about it.

Mr. Thatcher: — Mr. Speaker, I assure the Hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Lloyd), we won't take it all away from then the way the Socialists did in '49.

Mr. Lloyd: — Mr. Speaker, in other words what the Premier has just said is they're going to take part of it away. I invite him to...

Mr. Thatcher: — We won't do it the way you did.

Mr. Lloyd: —...stand up and say just what it is going to take away. I invite him to clarify this, for dozens and dozens of old people throughout the province who right tonight are worried about the...

Mr. Thatcher: — You'll be shocked when you hear what we are going to do.

Mr. Lloyd: — You're going to have a chance to make a speech, Mr. Premier. I am inviting you to make a clear statement of policy on this. I suggest you don't dare.

Mr. Thatcher: — You had better...I don't dare?

Mr. Lloyd: — I suggest you don't dare make a clear statement.

Mr. Thatcher: — And it will be made tomorrow.

Mr. Lloyd: — Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Member will have a chance...

Mr. Thatcher: — You'll get it tomorrow!

Mr. Lloyd: —If he had any decency and respect for the principles of this House, he'd sit there and keep his mouth shut for a while and give some more things that I want him to give his assurance about when he speaks on Wednesday.

Hon. D. T. McFarlane (Minister of Agriculture): — Temper! Temper!

Mr. Lloyd: — This document fails to give assurance to a whole lot of other people in a whole lot of other ways. It fails to give any assurance that they're going to be any more new jobs next year than there are this year. It fails to give any assurance that

they are going to do anything about their promise to provide drugs under Medicare. As a matter of fact, the opposite, its silence talks.

It fails to give any assurance that highway conditions are going to be any better in 1967 than they were in 1966. And in 1966 they were pretty bad. Wherever one went in this province, the talk immediately began of just how difficult and how bad it was with respect to our highways. Let me give one example. In my own constituency, Highway No. 14 west of Biggar, a hole resulted from the spring break-up. That hole was there in March, it was there in April, it was there in May, it was there in June. One result of this was at least two accidents. One of them resulted in a man with his wife and family going off the road into a ditch full of water. The Hon. Minister of Highways (Mr. Boldt) sometimes speaks as if he is worried about the high cost of insurance. I say if he would do a little bit better job of keeping the highways decent and safe, he'd have less to worry about with respect to the cost of insurance.

There's one thing the Budget does assure us of, Mr. Speaker, and that is that there is going to be lots of Liberal propaganda next year. We're assured of it in two ways. The Minister of Education (Mr. Trapp) applauds. He likes propaganda; he needs it to support his activities. The Budget Speech itself is worthy of one of the Premier's efforts to add to the smog of Los Angeles. Secondly, we're assured of more propaganda when we look at the vote for information of the Government because we find this vote this year is more than doubled. We find that the Government proposes to spend \$100,000 and more in addition to what they spent last year. This for Government propaganda. Mr. Speaker, it is, I think, almost 10 o'clock. I ask leave to adjourn the debate.

Debate adjourned.

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