

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN
Fourth Session — Fifteenth Legislature
18th Day

Tuesday, February 28, 1967.

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

WELCOME TO STUDENTS

Mr. E. I. Wood (Swift Current): — Mr. Speaker, I would like to draw the attention of the House to a very fine group of young men and women in the front seats of the east gallery. These young people are from W. A. Beatty Collegiate, the grade 12 students in Swift current. As you will notice, Mr. Speaker, they have brought some Swift Current weather right along with them. I hope that they will enjoy their visit with us here today and trust that they will find their visit with us both profitable and informational. Through you, Mr. Speaker, I welcome them to the House this afternoon.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. D. W. Michayluk (Redberry): — Mr. Speaker, I rise with a great deal of pleasure to welcome and to introduce through you to the Hon. Members of this Legislature a fine group of grade 12 students seated in the east gallery from the three high schools in the Blaine Lake School Unit. There are 20 students from the Blaine Lake Composite High School accompanied by one of the high school teachers, Mrs. Doris Popoff; a group of 15 high school students from the Marcelin High School accompanied by Mr. Gordon Rutten, the vice-principal. Marcelin School, Sir, is of some significance to me as I am a member on the staff of this school. The last grade 12 group from Leask High School, numbering some 19 are accompanied by Mr. Mehta, one of the high school teachers. I sincerely trust, as I am sure that all Hon. Members do, that their trip to this Legislature and to the capital city will be most informative and educational. I personally want to wish you all a safe journey home.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. D. T. McFarlane (Minister of Agriculture): — Mr. Speaker, I would like to welcome an outstanding group of young people in the speaker's gallery from the town of Indian Head the Beautiful. Each year they avail themselves of the opportunity to be in the Legislature and view the proceedings of the day. I know they are in a hurry to get home because they have about 200 young boys engaged in minor hockey in Indian Head so we wish them an enjoyable afternoon and a safe journey home.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. G. B. Grant (Minister of Public Health): — It is gratifying to see the interest shown by the students of this province in the proceedings of this House. Not to be outdone by the rural areas, I am very happy this afternoon to introduce through you, Mr. Speaker, a group in the west gallery from St. Mathew School. We know their presence here this afternoon is appreciated and we trust that they will receive some worthwhile education and information.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Speaker: — I crave the indulgence of Hon. Members to introduce to you in the speaker's gallery, a group of senior students from the Froid Public School at Froid, Montana. They have come to this Legislature to see the procedure that takes place herein and compare it with the procedure that takes place in the elected Legislature and the Senate in the State of Montana. I'm sure all Members will wish to join with me in extending to our neighbours from the South a very warm and sincere welcome.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Speaker: — I would further crave the privilege of the Legislature to also introduce to you a very fine group of students from the Esterhazy elementary school, the potash capital of Canada, that's where that is.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Speaker: — They are accompanied by their teachers and their bus driver and I'm sure all Members of the Legislature would also wish to join with me in extending to them a very warm welcome and that they will enjoy themselves, that they will have a safe trip home and that they will come back again in the future.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

QUESTION RE: ITEM IN WAKAW RECORDER

Mr. A. Thibault (Kinistino): — Before the Orders of the Day, I would like to direct a question to the Premier and the Minister-in-Charge of Youth (Mr. MacDonald) if he is aware of the article that appeared in the Wakaw Recorder of February 23, under the item Calling Card G13. It has to do with...

Hon. W. Ross Thatcher (Premier): — No, I'm not aware of it although I know the editor is a well known Socialist, so I wouldn't be surprised at anything he carried.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

CONGRATULATIONS TO MR. ELI LINDSAY ON HIS 108TH BIRTHDAY

Mr. J. H. Brockelbank (Kelsey): — Before the Orders of the Day are proceeded with, I have a matter I would like to bring up in this Legislature. I have in my constituency a man who is celebrating his birthday today. It isn't just an ordinary birthday because it marks the fact that he is now 108 years old.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Brockelbank: — He is Mr. Eli Lindsay of Arborfield. There was an article in the local paper about him and it says:

Mr. Lindsay enjoys good health – a physician recently examined him and pronounced him in sound health. He joins members of the family at the table for each of his meals and walks to his second-floor bedroom on the finish of each night. He does not require glasses and his hearing is better than that of some of his children.

I do have here a picture of Mr. Lindsay which was published in the Tisdale Recorder two years ago. I'm not going to give it up but if anybody wants to see it, I'll be very happy to let them see it.

By consent of the Legislature, Mr. Speaker, I would like to move, seconded by Mr. Radloff, the Member for Nipawin:

That this Assembly records its pleasure in congratulating Mr. Eli Lindsay of Arborfield, Saskatchewan, who is this day celebrating his birthday, marking 108 years. This Assembly also wishes for Mr. Lindsay good health and happiness.

It is with a great deal of pleasure that I move this motion, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. F. K. Radloff (Nipawin): — Mr. Speaker, it is with a great deal of pleasure that I join with Mr. Brockelbank from Kelsey in wishing Mr. Eli Lindsay of Arborfield good health and happiness. I have known Mr. Lindsay and his family for a good many years and I know, like Mr. Brockelbank, that the Lindsay family have made a tremendous contribution to the development of the Arborfield District and in assisting in the development of northeastern Saskatchewan. The people of the Nipawin constituency also know of the Lindsay family and on their behalf and on behalf of all the Members here I would like to extend to Mr. Lindsay continued good health and happiness.

ANNOUNCEMENT RE: SCROLLS FOR PERSONS OVER THE AGE OF 100

Hon. J. W. Gardiner (Minister of Public Works): — Mr. Speaker, before closing

this discussion, I would just like to say that one of the programs of the Centennial Corporation this year is honouring each person over the age of 100 with a scroll which is made out indicating the appreciation of the Province to the individual along with a small gift that will be symbolic of Centennial Year. These gifts may not be fully prepared yet, but this gentleman along with others who have reached the age of 100 will be receiving this recognition from the Centennial Corporation.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. Brockelbank (Kelsey): — Mr. Speaker, also by consent of the House, I would like to move, seconded by Mr. Radloff:

That the Resolution just passed together with the transcripts of the oral congratulates and best wishes be communicated to Mr. Eli Lindsay of Arborfield on behalf of this Assembly by Mr. Speaker.

Motion agreed to.

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. W. S. Lloyd (Leader of the Opposition): — Mr. Speaker, at the outset may I join with the words of congratulations which have been sent to Mr. Lindsay. I had at one time though we had in my constituency almost a record for an aged person in that Mr. Sam Prichard of Cando was just a little while ago, 105 years of age. We have to yield in this matter of records and I'm very happy to yield to the constituency of my seatmate, the Member for Kelsey (Mr. Brockelbank). I join also in the good wishes and the welcome to the students who are in the gallery. As you have suggested, Sir, we particularly welcome those who have come to visit us from the State of Montana and our wishes to them are indeed particularly warm. As the Member for Regina South (Mr. Grant) said, the number of students visiting us seems to grow each year and I might add that the choice of adjectives used by the Members in welcoming them seems to extend itself also. One can only hope that we don't become so popular that in addition to a matinee showing we will also have to put on an evening showing, a repeat showing of the same act.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Lloyd: — When I made some remarks, Mr. Speaker, about the Budget last evening, I was referring to my opinion that the

Budget had inadequately analysed the needs of Saskatchewan people and Saskatchewan economy and that as a result the measures which it was proposing and providing were likewise inadequate. I want now to turn to some more specific reasons as to why I think those opinions are accurate.

May I say to begin with that this is a deficit Budget. It's a deficit Budget not only in dollars as was so very well explained by my colleague, the Member for Regina West (Mr. Blakeney). Even more important is that it is deficit not only in dollars but it is deficit in ideas and that's far worse. It is deficit in ideas in that it proposes little or nothing to provide this year's promised quota of 20,000 new jobs. It is deficit in ideas in that it proposes nothing to stabilize agricultural income. It is deficit in ideas in that it proposes nothing which is going to reduce the property mill rate. It is deficit in ideas insofar as it proposes nothing to reduce the loss of population. It is not only deficit in dollars and deficit in ideas, Mr. Speaker, it is deficit also in terms of facts.

At the same time, the Budget succeeds in being a surplus Budget. It is surplus, first of all insofar as misleading statements are concerned. Many have been quoted. I remind you again of the statement of the Provincial Treasurer that the requests of the doctors for adjustment in their fee schedule could mean a cost of another \$6,000,000 to \$8,000,000. This was corrected a day or two later by the Minister of Health (Mr. Grant) who put the cost not at \$6,000,000 to \$8,000,000 but at \$3,800,000. It is a surplus Budget also with respect to political propaganda. I submit that no other Provincial Treasurer in all of Canada would use a Budget Speech so completely as a political document as this one has. It even goes to the extent of stating promises for the next election. I submit no other Provincial Treasurer in Canada would so make use of the Budget document for this purpose.

Certainly it is a surplus Budget in so far as conceit and arrogance are concerned. Again no other Provincial Treasurer in Canada would use a Budget Speech to describe in derogatory fashion what other Provincial Governments have done. No other Provincial Treasurer in Canada would say in effect how lucky Saskatchewan people are that I am not as the Provincial Treasurer of other provinces are. In addition to being a deficit Budget and a surplus Budget in those ways, it is also, Mr. Speaker, a deceitful Budget. To begin with it claims, and Members on the Government side have repeated the claim, that it doesn't provide for any new or added taxes. It does of course.

An Hon. Member: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Lloyd: — It does of course. It takes \$3,000,000 out of the earnings of the Power Corporation.

An Hon. Member: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Lloyd: — The first time that earnings of the Power Corporation have been used for this purpose.

Mr. Thatcher: — First time in the province.

Mr. Lloyd: — Mr. Speaker, this means \$3,000,000 of added taxes which the users of power and gas are being asked to pay this year.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Lloyd: — This is another first for the Liberal Government, one of which surely no one in this province is going to be proud or nobody is going to boast of. This means many other things. It means that the Power Corporation which could otherwise have used this to finance capital is going to have to borrow an additional \$3,000,000. This use of \$3,000,000 out of the Power Corporation is the 1967 trick employed by the Provincial Treasurer for balancing the Budget. Each year that the Government across the way has brought in a Budget, we have seen a new trick to balance it when introduced. In 1965 it pillaged the Medical Care Insurance Fund to the extent of many millions of dollars to balance the Budget. In 1966 it robbed the Student Aid Fund of \$2,000,000 in order to balance the Budget. In 1967 it is plundering the Power corporation earnings to the extent of \$3,000,000 to balance the Budget.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Lloyd: — It's deceitful also as I pointed out last evening in that it repeats the statement about the reason for a change in the amount of money we get out of the Federal-Provincial tax sharing agreements. It says and I quote:

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

Mr. Speaker, this statement I submit is not accurate. I submit that the Government was never notified in that way. I submit that almost everybody in Saskatchewan now knows that the reason for change is not because Saskatchewan's position differs from the rest of Canada, but that the formula which distributes the money differs from the one last year. One gets proof of this in the Budget in part. The money which we get in this current year under equalization grants is greater than the amount of money we got last year under the equalization grant under the same formula. In other words we were not being affected by our economic circumstances. Had the same formula continued into next year, then we would have received some \$4,000,000 to \$5,000,000 more out of the same formula next year as we would receive this year.

Certainly it is a deceitful Budget in respect to the claim it makes regarding the decrease in the net spending for social

welfare. Let me read the words:

The increased opportunities for training and employment in the province, together with increased Federal financing have permitted us to reduce the net cost of welfare by \$1,800,000.

Mr. Speaker, this is a statement which is only half true at best. It's true increased Federal contributions help us to reduce the spending. A million dollars for sharing costs of a child welfare program – that's new. Another \$200,000 because Federal takeover of some pensions in the 65 to 69 group saves the province some more money. There is \$1,200,000 because of more Federal contributions. The municipalities are going to be asked to decrease the Provincial net Welfare Budget. It saves, the Government does, some \$500,000 by transferring certain programs out of social Welfare to other departments and this helps to decrease the net Welfare Budget. Mr. Speaker, I say again that statement that the increased opportunities for training and employment in the province have permitted the cost to be reduced for net Welfare programs is just not proven by any of the facts. In addition to this, in looking at that Welfare Budget, we must note that the amount for the Saskatchewan Social Assistance Plan has been reduced by \$1,000,000. And again I ask the question: how much of this is because the Province is preparing to take advantage of the fact that the Federal Government is going to make additional payments to old age security pensioners and as a result the Province can save some money by reducing its contribution to it? Again I ask the question: why has the Government waited two months and more to reassure pensioners that this is not going to be the case? It's bad enough, Mr. Speaker, to balance the Budget by using \$3,000,000 of Power revenue. It's infinitely worse to balance the Budget on the hopes of people to get a little additional income to meet the rising cost of living. And again I hope that the Minister when he speaks or the Premier when he speaks later in this Debate will make clear what the Government policy is. All we need from them is a clear and unhedged and unequivocal work Yes; yes, that the old age pensioners are going to get every cent of money that the Federal Government is willing to make available to them and that the Province is not going to take advantage of this added payment to save some money for themselves. All we need is a clear statement of Yes without any kind of equivocation whatsoever.

The Budget is deceitful in that it suggests the students are making use of Provincial loans. I'd say this is of doubtful truth. Last year in February, we asked the question and we were told that seven students in the entire Dominion of Canada were getting loans from the Government of Saskatchewan.

I say this is a deceitful Budget. It is a deficit Budget. It is a surplus Budget in so far as misleading statements and political propaganda are concerned.

It is revealing in one sense, in one sense only, and that is when one looks at the amount of money to be spent for information

services. This reveals the priority of the Province Government – more for propaganda - \$100,000 and more – more than twice as much to be spent for these kinds of services as last year. Mr. Speaker, one has to ask along with this the question: not only how much more of this information, but how accurate is this information?

I want to take a minute or two to talk about the case of the missing telegram. This, Mr. Speaker, is even more unbelievable than the case of the missing car which we had a few years ago.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Lloyd: — It will be known that on Friday, Members of our party had a rather large reception for our Federal leader, Mr. T. C. Douglas. Some 2,000 and perhaps more people attended. If anybody isn't familiar with how big a group 2,000 is, let me say it is approximately the amount of the increased size of the population in Saskatchewan under a Liberal Government.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Lloyd: — I watched that evening the last television news. Now there was nothing on the late television news with regard to the size of the meeting or its enthusiasm, but there was a note about an alleged congratulatory telegram which went from the Premier to Mr. Douglas. Now the irony of this is simply this. The meeting which was held wasn't mentioned, but the telegram which was never received was mentioned.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Lloyd: — The press, Mr. Speaker, were told about this missing telegram, which was not received and I submit was not sent, sometime in the middle of Friday afternoon. I submit that in doing this the Government or its agencies or the Premier himself who is in charge of this agency has tricked the press and has deceived the public.

In the Throne speech Debate, I made three predictions with respect to education. They are substantially borne out by the Budget. I said first there would be large increases for technical facilities and so there are. I remind the House again that \$3 out of every \$4 of this is Federal money. I predicted also that most of this money will remain unspent at the end of the year and I see no reason to change that prediction. Certainly the Minister of Education (Mr. Trapp) speaking yesterday said nothing to reveal plans which would enable them to spend the amount of money that is voted or to be voted this year. Certainly history, if it means anything, tells us that this money voted will not be spent. I recall the words of the Provincial Treasurer and the Premier (Mr. Thatcher) in the Budget Speech last year: "We are extending," he said, "the facilities

at the Technical Institute at Moose Jaw to handle another 125 technology students.” How much was spent? I asked a question about it in the Legislature the other day and the answer to that question has been delayed. I submit the answer has been delayed, not because the Government doesn’t know the answer, but I submit the answer has been delayed because the Government does know the answer and it knows the answer is so small that it would embarrass it to put it on the answer paper in this province.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Lloyd: — This year he says, “We must provide for a substantial increase at Moose Jaw,” but no increase in staff to provide more courses for more people.

In 1966 it voted over \$2,500,000 for the institute at Saskatoon. Spent to date? Less than \$700,000 of that. In the 1967 Budget except to provide training for nurses, they provide only three more staff people for the institute at Saskatoon. It seems almost certain then that the usable space made available in 1967 is going to be for nurses’ training.

Secondly, I said in the Throne Speech Debate that the school grants for operating purposes would be up some \$3,000,000 to \$4,000,000 – the Budget claims it is up to \$3,900,000. Let’s be mindful of the fact that we measure school grants not just in terms of the amount of money the Government provides. We measure them in terms of what is left over to be provided out of property taxes as well. This \$3,900,000 is inadequate to meet the increasing costs of a school programs in 1967. There’s only one good feature that I can see in the school grant proposals this year and that is that incentive grants aren’t mentioned. this, to quote, Mr. Speaker, “horrendous monstrosity” invented by the Members across the way seems to be forgotten about and good riddance too in 1967.

But reading the school grants is a tricky business. It includes such items as some \$200,000 for driver training. Most of this was spent last year, almost this amount spent last year by Government Insurance by way of a grant to the Safety Council in Saskatchewan. So it is in large part a transfer from one expenditure to another, supposedly added to school grants. For grade ten text books there is a substantial sum and this is good, but it has no real meaning insofar as added contribution to school board costs are concerned. It provides over \$500,000 for private colleges and this again has no real meaning insofar as the operation of public schools throughout the province is concerned. This increased operating grant falls then short of \$3,900,000. In fact the \$3,900,000 in itself fell short of what was needed in the beginning.

And then as a result my third prediction that local taxes for education will again go up is most certainly going to come true. What we need in this province is the program recommended by CCF Members last year – this is the program we urge again this year – that there be vast increases in the amounts and a

speeding up in time of providing technical educational facilities in the Province of Saskatchewan.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Lloyd: — Two, that there be increases in school grants. Enough to meet the added costs and to reduce the local tax levels at the rate of two mills a year. I know we are talking about a lot of money but nothing less than this is going to be fair to the people of Saskatchewan, meaningful to local governments, or adequate for meeting the needs of the Saskatchewan economy.

The third item to which we must turn some attention is the matter of financing the University. I said last night and I repeat that the Government is deficit in it doesn't give us any way of judging how well the University is being treated. let me analyse it as best I can. I hope somebody will be able to correct me if I am wrong. The Estimates shown an increase of some \$7,600,000 to be paid by the Provincial Government to the University this year. but this amount must include three items. It must include the amount of over \$4,500,000 paid to the University last year by the Federal Government directly, this year paid to the Provincial Government. It must include the Provincial Government's grant of last year plus any addition for this current year. The Budget tells us that the Federal Government is going to make available to the Provincial Government \$14,200,000 for purposes of post-secondary education. Now, some of this has to go to activities other than the University. It has to cover technical institutes, apprenticeship programs, grants to post-secondary colleges. Let's take half of the cost of these which is \$2,600,000. That would be the share, roughly, which the Province was paying last year. That taken from the Federal Government payment of \$14,200,000, leaves still \$11,600,00 for the Province to meet the needs of the University. It is providing instead of that total amount some \$7,600,000. In other words there is about \$4,000,000 of the money from the Federal Government to be used for post-secondary institutions which is not explained in this particular Budget. Even if one adds the total amount of capital for the University of \$2,000,000 it still leaves \$2,000,000 unexplained. It looks again as if the Provincial Government is going to take advantage of this to spend on other programs and not for the purpose intended.

Mr. A. E. Blakeney (Regina West): — That figures!

Mr. Lloyd: — I want to say just a word or two about this whole matter of Crown corporations. You will recall, Mr. Speaker, that there has been some discussion of what the Government is doing to Power corporations and to Government Insurance. And it's by looking at what it's doing to these corporations, which it doesn't dare to sell, that I think we can get the best picture of the Government's designs on public ownership in this province. What we do know is this — that they have substituted as the objective for these Crown corporations, instead of service, profits. This

has become the main measuring stick of success which it is applying to these public enterprises of Saskatchewan. We've already commented on the Saskatchewan Power Corporation to show that this is being used. It is being pushed to make more and more profits, to provide taxes for the Provincial Government to carry on day-to-day operations.

Let me look just for a moment at the Saskatchewan Government Insurance. We've already had in this House information to show that the insurance costs on homes have gone up by 40 per cent with a greater deductible. The personal property floater policies have gone up by 50 per cent with a higher deductible and less coverage. Let me look at two other items, Mr. Speaker, one has to do with cattle. The farmers in my constituency tell me that their cost of insuring cattle has gone up and the coverage has gone down. You know out there they're bothered to some extent with rustlers and the rustlers are locked up. They are being robbed I submit within another way, by the increase in the charges of the Government for insurance and decrease in coverage at the same time. I learned a little ditty in my history books a long while ago which said something like this:

The law locks up the villain who steals the goose from off the common, but leaves the greater villain loose who steals the common off from under the goose.

I submit that the Minister (Mr. Boldt) in charge of the Insurance corporation fits in that picture.

Let me refer to the costs of insurance with respect to licence and permit bonds. most of these are required by either provincial or municipal law. Here I have examples of some two pages typewritten, typed on both sides of these. It shows 19 classes. It shows four of them the same. It shows 15 of them increased, some of them increased by one-third, some increased by a half, some doubled, indeed and some more than doubled. These are bonds required by law. These are the sort of costs which people pass on to the consumer. It seems very plain, Mr. Speaker, that what is going on is a constant, and I think studied, destruction of the main purpose of vital publicly owned enterprises in this province. No longer are they designed to give the best service possible at the lowest price possible. the objective has become that they make as many profits as possible. The objective now is, under this Government, that they operate as much like private concerns as possible. This is not the purpose for which they were set up. This is not the way in which the public should use its enterprises.

Mr. Speaker, in summary, let me say this. this Budget fails by too much and it fails too many people. It fails to give enough information regarding university financing. We don't know whether the Provincial operating grant per student is up or down this year. We do know that the Budget fails to make even a start on reducing student fees. It fails secondly to provide enough school grants to prevent further increase in local property mill rate. It fails thirdly to assure pensioners they'll get the full benefit of the Federal Government's potential

increase of \$30 a month. And again, I hope the Minister or the Premier will assure these old folk that they will get this full measure of help, that the Provincial Government is not going to use it to decrease their own costs as seems to be the case.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Lloyd: — It fails to protect small farmers and small communities with respect to rail line abandonment. These people are worried. These people in my constituency, for example, some of them, if the rail line is abandoned, are going to have to haul their goods 30 miles further to market than they now do. The Government itself needs to be making more studies. This Budget doesn't say it will. These communities deserve some help in preparing their case when they have to face the CPR and CNR about rail line abandonment dispute. This Government has rejected this idea. The Government should say more clearly than it does, in fact it doesn't say it at all, that it is prepared to help municipalities with alternative means of transportation if rail lines are abandoned. This Budget fails to provide enough extension of crop insurance. Two groups of farmers in my constituency who wanted crop insurance this year have been told they can't get it. As a matter of fact one of them can't even get answers to letters. The Federal change of two years ago makes possible a great acceleration in crop insurance. The roadblock is in the Provincial Government opposite. Nothing but an election happening will dynamite them from that. This Budget fails to make any provision for drugs as a Medicare method. This Budget fails to make any provision for new job opportunities. We don't even know that the opportunities are going to be as good as they were in the past. You know we have the manpower survey to guide us. The Liberal main plank in the last election had to do with 80,000 new jobs. If ever there was a plank that turned into a sliver it's that one. And that sliver is pointed into the middle of the Liberal anatomy at this point.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Lloyd: — This Budget fails to take advantage of opportunities to reduce or even hold the line of living costs. It fails to stimulate development. As the Hon. Member for Hanley (Mr. Walker) said last night, we need a meaningful Saskatchewan development Corporation to help Saskatchewan grow.

What the Budget does is to increase taxation by taking \$3,000,000 out of the earnings of power and gas to pay the day-to-day grocery bills of the Government. It takes additional and unnecessary money from insurance on homes and in other ways. It erodes the basis of public ownership, making profits more and more the sole measurement of success, and service to the people less and less — the real measurement of the success of those corporations. For those reasons, Mr. Speaker, I shall not support the Budget, I will obviously support the amendment.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. I. H. MacDougall (Souris-Estevan): — Mr. Speaker, after listening to the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Lloyd) for the last half hour as he brought in all the failures which this Budget failed to bring out, I want to remind the people of the Province of Saskatchewan we failed to increase taxes and that's what the people of the province wanted most of all. They wanted to have a Government in this country of ours that was going to reduce or leave taxes the way they were. They are sick and tired of paying more and more taxes every year, and I think that the Premier, when brought down this Budget, brought down a Budget which did not increase the taxes and this is what the people of this province were looking for.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. MacDougall: — Mr. Speaker, I am most pleased to associate myself with other speakers on this side of the House in the wholehearted approval of the Budget as brought down by our very able Provincial Treasurer. By bringing down this Budget he has demonstrated his sense of responsibility toward the people of Saskatchewan and the taxpayers by keeping taxes down and by balancing this Budget. I cannot help but think how the people of other provinces will envy Saskatchewan this year. We will get our homeowner grants of 450 once again and yet experience no tax increases. If there is an election, Mr. Speaker, I want to remind the people of this province that an NDP victory would soon abolish this very much-welcomed \$50 homeowner grant. We will benefit from the reduction of the sales tax which was done last year. Meanwhile the residents of Manitoba are faced with a new 5 per cent sales tax and still no balanced Budget. We will now be able to get some of the business back from Manitoba which we lost over the past 20 years by the increase in the sales tax every so often by the NDP. We will be spending more money on education and public health than ever before and yet no tax increases. Residents of Ontario must shudder, Mr. Speaker, to think of their tax increases amounting to some \$200,000,000. Our ability to hold down taxes is mainly due to the policies of this Liberal Government. We have encouraged business and industry to locate here. This will in turn broaden the tax base and in so doing help to ease the individual tax burden. Continued good crops, I acknowledge, are the largest single source of prosperity in our province, indeed, but the second reason is undoubtedly good, responsible, free enterprise Liberal Government which we have here today. I would suggest to the people of Alberta, who are soon going to the polls, that with a deficit Budget in that wealthy province, with a population of under a million and a third people, and with a similar economy to our own, they seriously consider a Liberal Government as an alternative, in order to inject a little bit of economy responsibility towards their citizens.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. MacDougall: — The Alberta Budget is substantially higher than ours,

approximately \$800,000,000. They have accumulated a surplus of over \$600,000,000 gathered over the last 20 years or more. I can only conclude that the people of that province have been grossly over-taxed over the years. I for one do not believe Governments should acquire huge surpluses of such magnitude. I know that when the people of Saskatchewan stop to compare the attitude of our Government toward the collection and spending of Government funds with that of any other province, they will realize just how fortunate we are to have had a truly responsible group of people in power over the past three years.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. MacDougall: — Let me repeat the words of the Premier in his Budget Address of Friday, February 17th, when he said:

We have increased spending in vital fields. However, that spending has been related to the economic capacity of the taxpayer.

Mr. Speaker, in the time at my disposal, I want to deal briefly with our program to improve the dental health services in the province of Saskatchewan. Last year, discussions were held between the then Minister of Health (Mr. Steuart) and the Saskatchewan Council of the College of Dental Surgeons regarding provisions for present and future dental services in Saskatchewan. Both the Council and the Minister agreed that the setting up of a School of Dentistry was of the greatest importance. And it is hoped to have the Dental College opened by the fall of 1968. This means that the first graduates would become available by 1972, about a year earlier than planned. Out of all these discussions between the ten Minister of Health and the Council of the College of Dental Surgeons evolved a five-point crash program which was given approval in principle by the Government. It called for an increase of two-thirds in the number of dental bursaries to be made available by the Province, involving an additional expenditure of \$60,000 in the current fiscal year. Now, bear in mind, this was over and above the original \$154,000 budgeted for the same purpose. Four points in the program are related to dental education while the fifth recommended substantial financial grants to dentists settling in specially designated areas. Now, the number of dental bursaries was increased from 90 to 150 and I might add by November of 1966, Mr. Grant, the Minister of Health, announced that all 150 undergraduate dental bursaries were given out. In addition, five postgraduate bursaries were awarded to dentists specializing in various fields. These bursaries will help fill the acute need for teachers and specialists when the dental school opens. Students were recruited from all across Canada with recipients of bursaries required to enter into a contract to set up practice in Saskatchewan upon graduation. Under the proposed crash program, plans are being considered to train special auxiliaries to relieve the shortage of dental personnel. A committee composed of Department of Health officials, educational personnel and some members from the dental profession are currently studying such a program. This committee is headed by Mr. Wm. Patton

of Regina. As well, the committee is studying the practical advisability of the training of dental auxiliaries in Saskatchewan. Now, this would be the first program of its kind in Canada. This is also one of the recommendations of the Hall Commission Report. In 1962, a study of dental nursing services in New Zealand was made by two officials of the Department of Health and one private practitioner from Saskatchewan. The Department feels that if we were to institute a program of dental auxiliaries in Saskatchewan, it would make more care available for our Saskatchewan children. Dental nurses are trained in special schools in New Zealand with emphasis on mechanical skills rather than on academic background. It is estimated, Mr. Speaker, that 94 per cent of the children of New Zealand receive care from dental nurses and the Government attempts to maintain a ratio of one nurse for every 500 children. Provisions are made for referrals to licensed dentists if children need special treatment. This mission to New Zealand included Dr. J. J. Schachter, an orthodontist practising in Saskatoon, Dr. A. E. Chegwin, the then director of Dental Health Division, Department of Public Health, and Mr. Cyril McKay of The Hospital Administration and Standards Division. While the group investigating the new Zealand and set-up felt there were some drawbacks to the program, they also felt that the general oral health amongst the children was not surpassed anywhere. In New Zealand, dental nurses on the other hand, have gained complete acceptance from the professional dentists and they have shown to be a solution to the treatment of routine problems in children.

Undoubtedly, there are many aspects of the New Zealand program which could be very useful here in Saskatchewan. Mr. Speaker, the Department of Health in their discussions concerning dental auxiliaries have suggested that these persons should work under the supervision of dentists here in Saskatchewan. Dentists could then handle far more persons per day than they can find time for under present conditions. I notice that some dentists now train their nurses to do routine teeth cleaning and other related work.

One further proposal, Mr. Speaker, of this crash program is a \$5,000 grant to be made available as an inducement to have graduate dentists settle in areas of the province which have been designated as having an acute shortage of dentists. Selection of candidates and designation of such areas are to be made by the same advisory committee which is handling the bursaries. Besides the inducement of \$5,000 grant, the Government will provide transportation for the dentist and his family moving to the areas where he is to be located. The inducement debt will be then written off at the rate of \$1,000 per year. Dental graduates who have already received undergraduate bursaries are also eligible for the inducement bonus. Letters have gone out to all Canadian graduates in dentistry this year and have been sent out to make such students aware of Saskatchewan's program. At the present time, Saskatchewan has a ratio of about one dentist for every 5,000 of population, but this is one of the lowest in Canada. I believe that only New Brunswick and Newfoundland have a lower number of dentists per 1,000 population. As at November 30, 1966, there were 219 dentists registered here in

Saskatchewan with about 200 dentists in active service. This is the highest number in many years. In past year, bursaries and loans have been offered to dentists setting up practice in some areas of Saskatchewan and recruiting has been carried out in Britain and the United States.

Some success was found with recruiting in Britain but aside from having our own dental school, our next best approach at the moment would seem to be to approach young people studying dentistry in Canada. In 1961, a bursary program was set up when two students obtained bursaries. Now, as I mentioned earlier, 150 students are using Saskatchewan bursaries. This year there is a potential of about 16 graduates entering the practice of dentistry in this province. Early in 1966 our ads in English Dental Journals attracted some 80 inquiries but only eight of these persons wrote the qualifying exams. Of the eight applicants, I'm informed only five were successful.

Soon after the 1966 session, I attended a meeting at Weyburn in the Regional Health office at which there were at least three MLAs present. The Health Department officials together with several others from the general southeast area who were interested in improving rural dental health services and conditions were also represented. It was felt by the group that the major cities of Regina, Saskatoon, and Moose Jaw probably had a sufficient number of dentists. The smaller cities and towns on the other hand are in desperate shape for dental services. For example in my own constituency alone, we have three dentists in the city of Estevan and one in the town of Carnduff. Unless one more dentist, of which I am unaware at the moment, has been located in that constituency over the past two months, these four men serve a population of over 30,000 people, of one dentist for every 7,500 of population. This situation is desperate, and we do sincerely hope more dentists will be available in the rural areas within the next year or two.

May I turn firefly to some services, Mr. Speaker, which this Government has placed in Souris-Estevan over the past two years. Firstly, we have substantially improved our highways by rebuilding and oiling within Souris-Estevan boundaries. We took back into the highway system Highway No. 50 which the NDP threw back into the lap of the municipality of Torquay. No amount of discussion with the Member from Melfort (Mr. Willis), who was the former Minister of Highways under the NDP, would change his mind. And this was most unwelcome to the people of that district, because they simply didn't have the equipment to look after the highway which was tossed back in their laps. We have now taken that back into the highway system. I understand from yesterday's Budget Address by the Minister of Highways (Mr. Boldt) that this is scheduled for oiling later in the year.

We established for the convenience of the citizens of the towns of Oxbow and Gainsborough, Liquor outlets, which, I might add for my friends across the way, were voted in at a referendum by at least three to one majority in each case. A change in Government policy has made it possible to get a private bus company, in cooperation with Saskatchewan Transportation Company,

to establish a much needed and much used run into Manitoba and all the way to Winnipeg.

A group of local citizens in Estevan, after two years of work, established an area along the boundary dam reservoir for a summer resort. This involved many hours of planning and legwork by local residents. We had hoped to have had lots along the reservoir in a mile-long strip parcelled out before the end of 1966, but technical snags and other details had to be worked out. Now, however, we are all set for the spring of 1967 and I want to publicly thank the Department of Natural Resources and the Saskatchewan Power Corporation officials for their excellent cooperation in launching this great project. It will be a tremendous asset, though a by-product of the power development. I want, however, to point out that we had asked the old NDP Government to make it possible for the people of Estevan to develop this reservoir area for summer cottages, but after four years we still got No for an answer. The Liberal Government saw the benefits of such a project when we took office in 1964. We cooperated fully with the local people interested in the boundary dam resort and helped develop a plan to allow this development to take lace. The local Estevan committee is to be congratulated for the work they did and we will continue until the development is completed. Once again, it only goes to show what can be done by free enterprisers operating without governments becoming too involved. I approve wholeheartedly of this type of venture.

Finally, with the minute or so that I have left at my disposal, I want to make one other recommendations to my colleagues and this is for the establishment of a holiday – a statutory holiday to be celebrated say the first Monday in August each year. A long weekend in August would be most welcome, I am sure, particularly by the urban dwellers. It will enable them to enjoy an extra holiday during the warm summer months of the year. I might suggest that we do this first for a Centennial Project and we label this holiday National Flag Day. Now, if this holiday, the statutory holiday has to be proclaimed by Ottawa, then I would urge my fellow MLAs to support this type of project. I think that an extra statutory holiday in the summer months would be most welcome. Mr. Speaker, at this time I want to say that I will support the Budget and I will vote against the amendment.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. C. P. MacDonald (Minister of Welfare): — Mr. Speaker, first or all my first words in the Budget Debate must be a compliment to the Premier and Provincial Treasurer for the Budget that he has passed down. Certainly all the Members on this side of the House have been most enthused with the treatment that has been given to the programs which we feel will benefit the Province of Saskatchewan. Now, Mr. Speaker, let me turn for a moment to some of the remarks made by the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Lloyd) last night. First of all he stood on his feet and unleashed a tirade of abuse and charges

of deceit. Most of it nonsense against the Government. He stood up at his desk, pointed that long finger and like the bull-frog poking in the mud, accused us of refusing to announce our policy on guaranteed income because of a deep, dark, sinister motive. He accused us of attempting to refuse to pass on the financial benefits...the financial benefits of the new Federal guaranteed income supplement to the people of Saskatchewan. Well, Mr. Speaker, we have seen him panic before. Last week he panicked and announced the next Provincial election. Last night he panicked again and convicted the Government before he knew what he was talking about.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. C. P. MacDonald: — I want to tell the Members of this House that the only Government in this province that ever tried to save money at the expense of the needy, in Saskatchewan, were the socialists. In 1951 the Minister John Sturdy proposed to establish a floor level of income. This meant that some of the needy people in Saskatchewan would receive less than they had been receiving. The human cry that followed made little Tommy and his Cabinet reverse their decision.

Today, Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to announce the Government policy on the guaranteed income supplement and how it will affect senior citizens in Canada, and in particular, in the Province of Saskatchewan. Because of the widespread interest by everyone in this policy, I propose to take the next few moments to outline in detail its ramifications on Provincial programs administered by the Department of Welfare. I have several comments I want to make on the Budget and on several other matters brought up in this debate. However, Mr. Speaker, I will reserve these comments until I have completed my remarks on the guaranteed income.

First, Mr. Speaker, let me say that the Government of Saskatchewan welcomes the Federal Government's program of guaranteed income supplements to old age security pensioners.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. C. P. MacDonald: — We believe that our senior citizens should be able to live out their lives in dignity and comfort. We are pleased to see that the Federal Government has seen fit to provide an interim measure, until the Canada Pension Plan assures retirement income for most Canadians. This program will guarantee a minimum income for all senior citizens without having to apply for needs-tested assistance.

By using this approach, the Federal Government has been able to put an additional \$30,000,000 a year or more into the hands of 500,000 to 600,000 older Canadians whose only income is the \$75 per month old age security benefit or slightly in excess of that amount.

Sir, I am pleased to tell the Members of this House and the people of Saskatchewan that the financial benefits of the new Federal program will be passed on to the recipients of the Saskatchewan Assistance Plan. These increased benefits will be passed on to all those in need; the blind, the disabled, the widows, the aged, without any cost to the Saskatchewan taxpayer. In total, approximately 35,000 needy people in Saskatchewan will benefit from the new guaranteed income supplement.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. MacDonald: — This is possible because of the savings that will be realized as a result of the maximum \$30 a month supplement that is to be paid to old age security pensioners by the Federal Government.

Under the Canada Assistance Plan, we and all other provinces are required to calculate the increased Federal payments to these pensioners as income. This means that we have been given no alternative. We must adjust the rate of needs-test assistance to these people.

Mr. Kramer (The Battlefords): — Weasel words.

Mr. MacDonald: — Just a minute. You'll get an opportunity. If we fail to calculate the guaranteed income supplement as income, the Federal Government will not share in this program. In other words, Mr. Speaker, if we fail to include the guaranteed supplement as income, we will lose the Federal-shared portion of the Provincial supplemental allowance program.

As an example, if a pensioner receives a \$20 a month supplement from the Province, \$10 comes from the Provincial and \$10 from the Federal treasury. If we fail to include the \$30 a month supplement as income, we will lose the Federal portion - \$10 of the \$20 Provincial allowance. It would cost the Saskatchewan taxpayers slightly over half a million dollars. In addition, it could jeopardize the entire Canada Assistance Act agreement of which it is a part.

Let me quote a portion of the letter from the Deputy Minister of National Health and Welfare at Ottawa, Mr. Joseph Willard:

My Minister's view on this question is that we are bound to reaffirm the position that was put forward in the draft agreement; that is, that any major income maintenance payments provided by Canada, such as old age security (which includes the guaranteed income supplement) and unemployment insurance, should be recognized in total as available income in deciding upon the amount of supplementary or additional assistance to be provided to a person in need. This, of course, does not rule out Federal sharing in additional assistance to be provided to a person in need. This, of course, does not rule out Federal sharing in additional assistance payments in cases where the budgetary requirements of the recipient

are not met by the income received from these sources.

This, Mr. Speaker, is what we have done. The only exceptions the Federal authorities will permit are family allowances and youth allowances. This applies to all provinces and all Provincial programs. I want to repeat, this does not only affect Saskatchewan, but every province in Canada and they are exactly in the very same position.

If the Leader of the Opposition was interested, or you, the Member from Hanley (Mr. Walker) were interested, you would check our sister provinces of Alberta and Manitoba. They too, have been forced like all other provinces, to come up with a new policy in regard to their Provincial allowances.

The task that faced our Government and my Department was to find a way of distributing the Provincial savings in the most equitable manner throughout our program. It was also a question of ascertaining in what area of our programs the greatest need existed. Many factors were taken into consideration. I would like to outline briefly our thinking in the decision that was made.

The first thing we did, Mr. Speaker, was to consult with the Provincial Municipal Advisory Board to obtain their recommendations and advice for any proposal put forth. One year ago, the Government introduced legislation to provide for the Saskatchewan Assistance Plan. One of the objectives of this Plan is the development of a single program for all persons in need in the province, a program that would be uniform and treat all persons in need equally.

This goal has been partially achieved because the level of benefit for persons receiving a supplemental allowance is substantially higher than the benefits provided by the Saskatchewan Assistance Plan. This is true despite the increases for Social aid schedules introduced in April of 1966.

For example, the supplemental allowance program provides about \$16 a month for a single person and \$36 more for a married couple than for persons in exactly similar circumstances under the Saskatchewan Assistance Plan. Many of these people could only be a few months younger.

We are particularly concerned because of the evidence that the needs of younger people, particularly those with growing children are in fact as great as those of our older people. Any of you who have children, particularly adolescents, know that they are always hungry and that they wear out their clothing much more quickly than adults.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to explain briefly how this discrepancy came about. It came as a result of the decision of the former Government in 1962 and 1963 to amend the supplemental allowance regulations without adjusting other programs. The result is a difference, a difference not related to the needs, but in the assistance available in the province to different groups of needy persons.

The reason, Mr. Speaker, in 1961 they changed all schedules of allowances was in order to integrate all public assistance programs. A good policy if they had had the courage to carry it out. But in 1962 and 1963, they lost their courage, they lost their foresight, and they lost their principles. For a Government that was supposed to be welfare-conscious they left a legacy of inequality, of discrimination, between various groups of needy people in Saskatchewan.

Mr. Speaker, it is our intention to use the Provincial savings in the province to increase benefits to all needy persons.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. MacDonald: — I want to emphasize that the Government has no desire to save money as a result of the Federal increase in benefits to senior citizens. Our only desire is to use this money where it is needed most.

What are the changes that will result from this new program? Approximately 9,000 of our senior recipients will receive an increase of up to \$30 per month from the Federal Government. Any pensioner whose needs exceed his income will continue to receive assistance from the Province and will benefit from the increased allowances under the Saskatchewan Assistance Plan.

I want to emphasize that all these senior citizens will be better off financially than ever before.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. MacDonald: — Most important, the Provincial Government will continue to provide health services to all pensioners presently receiving assistance from the Province. We realize how important it is to see our senior citizens do not lack medical treatment. I want to point out, Mr. Speaker, that it was this year in April that once again we expanded the medical benefits under the Saskatchewan Assistance Plan. The 2,500 pensioners who are presently receiving an allowance solely at the expense of the Province since 1961 will continue without any change. All those whose needs are not fully met by the increased pension of \$105 per month will continue to receive an allowance from the Saskatchewan Assistance Plan.

In determining the increases in allowances under the Saskatchewan Assistance Plan, several factors were taken into consideration. First, we have been most concerned about the way in which rising costs of living have been eroding the value of the benefits we paid to needy people. For example, the index for food in Saskatchewan has increased by 7.4 points in the past year. Our increases in the allowance of over one million dollars last April almost disappeared with the rising cost of living. I would remind our Socialist friends that this was the first increase in food allowances since 1959.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. MacDonald: — Isn't it amazing, Mr. Speaker, that with all the platitudes and high-sounding praises, with all those great ideals expressed by the Socialists across the way, particularly concerning the cost of consumer goods, when you examine their record in this regard, it was completely pathetic.

Not even for the needy, the aged, the handicapped, did they once raise the food allowance to compensate for increased costs from 1959 to 1964.

When we became the Government, we made two promises regarding social aid: 1. We would put these people who could work back to work. 2. We would expand the benefits to those who were in need such as the blind, the disabled, the widows and the aged, so that they could have a decent standard of living.

Well, Mr. Speaker, we have done just that.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. MacDonald: — Over 14,000 people are now off the welfare rolls. They are back to work in the community contributing in a productive way to the betterment of their community and of the Province of Saskatchewan. And then, Mr. Speaker, we have assured those in need that we would provide a decent living. We have also done that by raising the allowances by over \$1,000,000 last April.

However, the problem is still before us. Costs of living continue to rise and new adjustments are required. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, we will use the savings provided to the Province to adjust the following allowances in the Saskatchewan Assistance Plan.

First, an increase in the food schedules by approximately ten per cent. An increase in the personal allowances for every adult doing their own housekeeping, from \$1.75 to \$3.25. The ceilings on assistance payments for care and nursing and other special care homes are being raised from \$165 to \$180 per month for limited care, and \$235 to \$260 for extensive care in order to benefit most those senior citizens who require this kind of care.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. MacDonald: — Another group whose situation will be improved are single persons, mostly elderly men who live in rooms and eat their meals in restaurants. Until now, these people could only be allowed the board and room rate of \$60 per month to cover their meals. These elderly men will now receive a rental allowance for the room in which they live and \$2.70 a day for meals.

One problem that has given us difficulty is the method of

handling retroactive payments. the guaranteed income supplement is effective from January 1st, 1967. Needy recipients will be receiving retroactive payments with their March or April old age security payments. This poses the question of how to handle Provincial allowances paid during the months of January and February. in order to eliminate the necessity of collecting overpayments for those months preceding the retroactive payments, the following method will be used.

Retroactive payments from the guaranteed income supplement will be calculated by the Department of Welfare as income for the month in which they are received. As a result, there will be no overpayments of Province assistance for the preceding months. Recipients who continue to be eligible for a Province allowance, but in an amount less than the retroactive Federal adjustment, will receive no cheque from the Province for one month, but will commence receiving a Province cheque again the following month. Health services will be continued during this interval. For those whose entitlement is more than the retroactive adjustment, they will receive a reduced amount for one month, but will have their allowances increased the following month.

The Department of Welfare, Mr. Speaker, will begin at once to put this into effect. Every effort will be made to inform and explain to all people, who will be affected by the guaranteed income supplement, the personal implications of the new program. These changes will be effective April 1st to coincide with the Federal payments of the guaranteed income supplement.

Now, Mr. Speaker, let me turn for a few moments to be Debate at hand. A few days ago, the senior Member for Saskatoon (Mr. Nicholson) the former Minister of Welfare for this Province, stood on his feet and he challenged the Liberal Government in Ottawa and in Saskatchewan for introducing the income tax test. Let me quote his remarks:

The income tax test which is going to be quite as obnoxious as the means and needs test which have been so offensive to so many elderly people in the past.

Mr. Speaker, of all the Members, of all the parties, of all the provinces, he should be the last to make that statement. He is like the conductor who blew the whistle after the train has passed the station. I have in my hand a copy of the means test income report used by the NDP up until 1961. It is the most vicious, the most obnoxious, most disgusting means test ever used or ever applied in Canada.

Mr. Kramer: — Nonsense.

Mr. MacDonald: — They wanted to know everything from the false teeth to shoe laces.

Mr. Whelan (Regina North): — Federal Liberals.

Mr. MacDonald: — And what did it do for our senior citizens? Well, Sir, that's a Provincial NDP means test not a Federal Liberal means test.

Mr. A. M. Nicholson (Saskatoon): — Mr. Speaker, I'm sure that the Hon. Member wishes to be fair. This was the rule that the Federal Liberal Government required of the Provinces to share at that time.

Mr. MacDonald: — Mr. Speaker, this is the non-shareable means test. What did it do for the senior citizens? Well, sir, it is giving about 2,500 of our senior citizens in Saskatchewan an average of \$5.70 a month. I repeat, \$5.70 a month, not even enough to buy the shirt on their backs. I know of no program in Canada that had the same disastrous effect. These senior citizens still drawing this allowance are now all over 75 years of age.

What about after 1961? Did they remove this vicious, cheap, stingy, niggardly principle that he referred to? Did they provide an across-the-board allowance for all senior citizens the way they cry in Ottawa? No, Mr. Speaker, they changed its form a little. Let me quote the Senior Member for Saskatoon (Mr. Nicholson) in this House in 1963, just a year before they, lost the Government. Let me quote:

In August 1962, we approved a new means test that is more liberal than that under which supplemental allowance was originally granted.

Imagine, the NDP with a liberal means test. let me compare the Liberal and NDP programs and their effects on our senior citizens. We now have three programs under which our senior citizens receive help. Here is the average payment under each of these programs:

1. The NDP means test - \$5.70 per month. Then the supplementary allowance program originated under the NDP, slightly in excess of \$29.00 per month. The Liberal Saskatchewan Assistance Plan, all senior citizens in Saskatchewan receiving assistance under this plan are averaging \$65 per month. From \$5.70 NDP means test to \$65 a month by Liberal Saskatchewan Assistance Plan.

The second generalization, Mr. Speaker, was a comparison of two Scots, one the Hon. Allan MacEachen in Ottawa and myself. First, Mr. Speaker, let me say that I was rather proud to be compared in the same breath with a man who has provided such outstanding leadership in the social reform of this country. The man who initiated guaranteed income, the Canada Assistance Act, Canada Pension Plan. He has just put through National Medicare and the minimum income of \$105 a month for senior citizens.

Mr. Whelan: — It's still coming.

Mr. MacDonald: — It's still coming in 1967.

Yes, the legislation is passed. He suggested that what one gave, the other would take away. He also stated that in its term of office, his Government passed on the \$10 increase in old age security to provincial recipients. but he forgot to mention a few pertinent facts. One, not only does Ottawa provide the guaranteed income supplement, but they also share in the Provincial supplemental program. One is based on need, the other on income and Ottawa refuses to duplicate these payments. Second, he further asked that any benefits be passed on to a small group who already receive substantially more than any other needy people who might be a few months younger and with even greater responsibilities. He asked us to widen the discrepancy from \$16 to \$46 per month for a single person, from \$36 to \$96 for a married couple. With a few months' difference between two older citizens, a difference of \$96 a month.

Mr. Speaker, if there is one principle in welfare that we must abide by, it is a uniform program with equality treatment for everyone, whether it be in Milestone or Regina, Yorkton or Saskatoon. Whether they be the blind, the aged, the disabled, for all needy people whether they be in these conditions, it must be based according to their needs.

Mr. D. W. Michayluk (Redberry): — That's Ross.

Mr. MacDonald: — He also forgot to mention that the Saskatchewan Assistance Plan was tailored to look after the needs of all our senior citizens no matter how high or how serious they might be. In Saskatchewan today, our senior citizens receiving assistance from this plan receive an average of \$65 per month.

Then the last statement, Mr. Speaker, was the one that really had me buffaloed. I don't know where he pulled it out of or what hat the rabbit came from. The last statement he made was typical of the arguments of my Socialist friends from the beginning of this Debate to the end. He said he had a blind friend 76 years of age that was receiving \$85 per month in allowances and that I would reduce it to \$55. How typical, how like the fictional arguments that we have heard all week.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. MacDonald: — First Mr. Speaker, of all the people on that side of the House he should know that if his friend received \$85 a month, he did not receive it all from this Province. First he would receive \$75 a month from the old age security program and \$10 a month from Provincial allowance.

Mr. Michayluk: — \$85 for...

Mr. MacDonald: — Oh hospital! Would this... You said he was 75 years of age.

Mr. Michayluk: — Yes, but his wife wasn't in...

Mr. MacDonald: — Oh gee, too bad you can't make this clear. You've had your chance to make your speech. Sit down.

Mr. Michayluk: — His wife was quite eligible for the assistance that I mentioned.

Mr. MacDonald: — You should have said that. Here is Hansard. Read over your remarks and see if you said anything about a wife.

Mr. A. E. Blakeney (Regina West): — ...credit of intelligence on the other side.

Mr. MacDonald: — First, Mr. Speaker, of all people, he should know his friend. When this new program comes in he will receive his \$75 a month old age security and up to \$30 a month supplement and if he has any additional needs, the province will pay for it. Let me sum up by saying in this policy we have taken as our principle — “The greatest good for the greatest number of people.”

Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to make a few comments on another rather unfortunate subject that has been raised in this House. During the Throne Speech Debate several very unfortunate accusations were made. Mr. Speaker, I have no intentions of referring to the Throne Speech, I am going to speak about three press releases that have been released subsequent to the Throne speech.

I think that the Throne speech adequately handled it. However, Mr. Speaker, unfortunately the MLA for the city of Moose Jaw (Mr. Snyder) did not feel that this was adequately handled in the past. He turned to the press and began to issue some press releases and press statements. Mr. Speaker, this apparently has become a disease in the city of Moose Jaw. Every NDP Member in Moose Jaw is trying to scope one another.

Mr. Speaker, let me refer to one of the first press releases that he released. “Snyder Says Government Investigation Farce.” And then he went on to say several other things in that press release. A few days later he involved me and my Department. It disturbed both me and angered my officials. “Snyder Proposal Rejected,” and I want to read to you what it said:

Gordon Snyder, MLA for this city, said Wednesday that the Provincial Department of Social Welfare has rejected his suggestion of interviewing persons who may have information regarding the controversy surrounding Central Park Lodge.

Mr. Speaker, there is a small particle of truth, only a half-truth. I would like to explain exactly what was said between

the Member from Moose Jaw (Mr. Snyder) and myself.

First of all he asked me if I would take a member of my Department, a civil servant, to go with him to interview these people who had placed complaints. Mr. Speaker, I said to him on one condition, that he would give me his personal word that he would not involve that civil servant in a political hassle in the House. He said No. then I said, and to his credit, Mr. Speaker, he agreed that we should not compromise a civil servant's position, his job, his wife, or his family.

Mr. G. T. Snyder (Moose Jaw): — Mr. Speaker, on a point of personal privilege the Member is not saying the truth. He said he would sleep on it, come back with a ruling tomorrow. He said his civil servants decided they wanted to have no part in it, and I accepted that. Exactly and the Minister knows that.

Mr. MacDonald: — I would hope, Mr. Speaker, that that is the impression I gave, because he is correct on that! He came back the next day and said that he agreed with me, at the time I asked him for his personal word not to compromise a civil servant. He said that he would have to think about it.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the first thing is, I then turned to the man and I said that members of my Department would interview every individual complaint that he made, to give me the names and I would provide a complete and full enquiry and make that report available to him. Instead of that he turned to the newspapers. Well, Mr. Speaker, there are two or three comments in the newspapers that kind of puzzle me. First of all he said that the only reason that the ambulance driver in Moose Jaw had changed his stand was because of legal counselling. I don't know where he pulled that one out. Mr. Yates has told the investigators from the Department of Health that he hadn't talked to a lawyer. Then, Mr. Speaker, I want to read the reply from Mr. Yates. First of all, Mrs. Yates told the Leader Post that when Mr. Snyder phoned her husband long-distance, Thursday evening...

Mr. Snyder: — On a point of personal privilege, can you get any more remote. This is a conversation that was transmitted fourth-handedly, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: — Order, order! These allegations were made in the House. Everybody heard them. Surely a Member has the right to reply without being interrupted, and I would ask the Member to refrain from these interruptions.

Mr. J. H. Brockelbank (Kelsey): — Mr. Speaker, on a point of order.

Mr. Speaker: — The Member from Kelsey, on a point of order.

Mr. J. H. Brockelbank (Kelsey): — I think this situation is that one Member is quoting what he says is a conversation between himself and another Member. And this is a situation where the question of privilege can very easily arise because we all know how easy it is for any Member quoting a conversation that he has had, or any person quoting a conversation that they have had with someone else, to get just a little different or some change that gives quite a different meaning. And so I think in a situation like this, first of all, Members quoting conversations should be very careful and second, Members who considered that they have been misquoted in that conversation, I think, must have a proper point of privilege in that they can say: “That isn’t what I said or that isn’t what I meant”, and the other Member must accept it. I agree that the interruptions are bad but...

Mr. MacDonald: — On the point of privilege, Mr. Speaker, I agree with the Member for Kelsey (Mr. Brockelbank), and the only reason that I bring the subject forth is not to deny the Member from Moose Jaw’s (Mr. Snyder) statement that we did agree in our conversation. My objection was that after a personal agreement between the two of us, he resorted to the press and gave a wrong implication. As far as the last quotation, I am not quoting a conversation between the two of us, I am referring to an article that has been quoted from the press that was made by Mr. Yates, the ambulance driver in Moose Jaw. He told the Leader Post that...

Mr. F. A. Dewhurst (Wadena): — Mr. Speaker, Mr. Speaker...

Some Hon. Member: — Oh nonsense, we’ve all read it.

Mr. Speaker: — Kindly let’s follow the rules of the House. I’ve been trying to listen to the Member from Wadena, while he’s been howling his head off. Now would you be kind enough to be quiet while I listen.

Mr. Dewhurst: — Mr. Speaker, the point of order I wish to make is on page 133 of Beauchesne’s Parliamentary Rules and Proceedings, in sub-clause 5. It says:

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

That’s page 133, sub-section 5 of Beauchesne, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: — Yes, well I’m quite well aware of that citation and I am listening to what the Member has to say in his quotation

from the newspaper. It is absolutely impossible to tell whether the citation applies to the newspaper article or not until you have heard what the article is. That is the first thing that I draw to your attention, or at least a part of what the article is. Now I don't know whether I read that article thoroughly or not. You may read articles from newspapers, provided you say which newspaper it is and the date thereof. This concerns a newspaper article emanating from people outside the House – well any newspaper article emanates from people outside the House – referring to, or commenting on, or denying anything said by a Member expressing an opinion or reflecting on proceedings within the House. Now, whether this comes under that heading, whether this particular newspaper clipping comes under that heading or not I couldn't say. I would have to study the clipping first to find out, but certainly it has to do...

Mr. MacDonald: — Mr. Speaker, to facilitate, I will not read the clipping; I think everybody is familiar with it.

Mr. Speaker: — ...certainly it has to do with what previously occurred and I don't think that it does transgress this rule; it might but I doubt if it does. I will have to study the newspaper clipping first to find out. Now who is next up? The Member from Regina West (Mr. Blakeney).

Mr. Blakeney: — Precisely the same, I think we had this...My point that I had noted here is that it is not in order to quote a newspaper or to contradict what is said by a Member in this House. I think this article was read in the House before and I think that – quite apart from the fact that it's about third-hand evidence – it's not what Mr. Yates said. It's not what Mr. Yates told the reporter but it's an allegation of what the reporter says Mrs. Yates said Mr. Yates told her that Snyder told. Now this is real good evidence but never mind.

Mr. MacDonald: — Mr. Speaker, on a point of order.

Mr. Steuart: — Maybe if the Hon. Member for Moose Jaw (Mr. Snyder) would apologize it would clear the whole thing up.

An Hon. Member: — Could we hear from the Hon. Member from Moose Jaw.

Mr. Speaker: — This argument has gone back and forth across the House for some considerable time. One Member made charges about a certain thing. Everybody has a right to comment on it; that's freedom of speech. If he cares to deny or answer the charges that were made that is his privilege. I draw to the attention of the Member from Moose Jaw who has been making the interjections that I don't think he has spoken in this Debate so far. If he wishes to answer the charges that were made by others

this is what a Debate is for; in the right time and in the proper place, each in his own turn and at the proper time.

Mr. MacDonald: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, now has the press clipping. However I do want to say this, that any Member of this House who makes an accusation has the responsibility to check its authenticity. He may not have done it deliberately but he definitely made statements in this House that were not true, and outside this House and he has the responsibility to check their authenticity. Mr. Speaker, my Department and the Department of Health have checked every single allegation. There is not one single factor which substantiates one item as true.

I'll give another example, He brought up the case of an elderly woman formerly from the Mental Home that was transported from a private home to the hospital by the ambulance. He said that after the patient had been removed they had to fumigate the bus. Mr. Speaker, we check that name. Do you know what we found? We found that here was a woman who had been out of the Mental Home for many years who is doing a good job of rehabilitation and adjustment, who has absolutely no mental problem whatsoever but she was taken to the hospital on a physical disorder, the same type of disorder that happens to many old people, the same type of disorder that could happen to you and me. Mr. Speaker, I think this is enough...

Mr. Snyder: — I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that he check with Mr. Yates because that's where the information came from, from your friend, Mr. Yates.

Mr. MacDonald: — Mr. Speaker, if the Member would check with the medical profession, the hospital and the doctor in charge, you have a responsibility to investigate the authenticity of your charges. Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to say one other thing; there was a comment made about a report. My Department went over and checked the report as to how the Central Park Nursing Lodge stood up to the regulations for the Housing and Special Care Act. I have here listed all the members of the staff, the qualifications, the number of hours that they are on duty, the regulations themselves. I would like to table this in the House for anybody who would like to see it.

Mr. Walker (Hanley): — ...garbage.

Mr. MacDonald: — Yes, that too. Mr. Speaker, with that I think you will certainly see that I will support the Budget and will not support the amendment.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. W. G. Davies (Moose Jaw City): — Mr. Speaker, in beginning this afternoon I think I should say just a few words about the allegations that have

been made by the Minister of Welfare (Mr. MacDonald), with respect to my colleague from Moose Jaw (Mr. Snyder). I would like to say this, Mr. Speaker, that my colleague came into this House and made a number of statements and made them in good faith. He made them on the basis of information that had come to him from a number of citizens in Moose Jaw and he brought them quite properly in this Debate, to the attention of the Government. Subsequently, as we all recall, the Deputy Premier (Mr. Steuart) made what I consider to be a rather violent attack on my Moose Jaw fellow Member. Now the Minister of Welfare stands in his place and resents the fact that my Moose Jaw colleague has attempted to make some answer in the press, because he well knows, Mr. Speaker, that the press report dealt at some length with the allegations and the statements of the deputy Premier (Mr. Steuart).

I would like to say this. The Minister of Welfare (Mr. MacDonald) would have been far better if before making the statement that he made this afternoon in this House, had he tabled the text of his findings or the findings of his officials, and allowed some time for the reading of that report and then made whatever subsequent remarks he wanted to make about it. He talks about responsibility, Mr. Speaker. I say that his Department has a continuing responsibility to see that the kind of things that the Member, my colleague from Moose Jaw, was complaining about do not take place. I say that he would have been better this afternoon if he had made the investigation and reported it to the Members of this House. I regret very much that he did not do so and that he chose to make this a further occasion for attack on my fellow Member from Moose Jaw (Mr. Snyder) who as I say, said everything in this House on the basis of complete good faith, bringing to the attention of the Government certain matters that he wanted investigated. And the Members on that side of the House know perfectly well that these kind of things come to the attention of every Member in this House. We like to bring these when we hear about them to the attention of the proper Ministers and I think we should. But let us not take the attitude that these matter cannot be brought to the attention of the House in a Debate as my colleague from Moose Jaw did on the occasion of the last Debate. I say that after a perusal of the investigation of the Department we'll be in a better position to know what did take place.

I would like to say this further, that in my opinion, Mr. Speaker, we should have in the major urban communities at least, a type of hospital or institution visiting committee that would be composed of prominent citizens – and I would hope that the selection would be made if this suggestion was followed – on the basis of a non-partisan approach, that would from time to time visit the homes where unfortunate people are located, by or through the Government so that we would be assured at all times, Mr. Speaker, that these people received proper treatment. This would follow the procedure of the former Government and its Hospital Visiting Committee that went on for a period of many years. I believe it is still the practice with this Government. I would think that in the instance of Moose Jaw that the Minister of Welfare might have asked the Judge of the Magistrate

Court in Moose Jaw, perhaps have asked Alderman J. S. Roberg and Alderman V. Cole to act so as to balance the Committee a little bit. He could ask some of the respected citizens among the clergy to make an investigation on their own account. However, he has chosen to follow the method of having his own officials pursue the matter; I'm not at this time criticising him for that. But I do think that in every area of the province where these matters can become a bone of contention, the Government would be well advised to appoint public committees that would make routine visits to the institutions and report on their inspections.

Mr. Speaker, I listened also to the remarks of the Minister of Welfare (Mr. MacDonald) with respect to the matter of the Saskatchewan Aid Plan and social Assistance in the broad scale and sphere. I was almost provoked in rising this afternoon, into transgressing upon the rules of the House and charging him with a clever attempt to deliberately mislead the House. I think many of the statements that he has made here this afternoon are statements that might well have not been made at all. I make reference for example, to something along the following vein, "that the CCF was the only Government that ever tried to save money at the expense of the needy." Now, I say that this is a most unfortunate and a most untrue comment, Mr. Speaker. When I think of the Liberal Governments of the past, particularly the Liberal Governments of the 30's; when I think of the politically motivated social aid scheme of the 1930's under a Liberal Government and hear a comment like that from the Minister of Welfare, I stand in my place this afternoon absolutely appalled. And when it comes down to the question of need, when it comes down, for example, to the question of old age pensions, who was the main in this country who caused a Liberal Government, under great pressure, to institute an old age pension plan if it wasn't the late J. S. Woodsworth?

Mr. Coderre (Minister of Labour): — Get off your high horse.

Mr. Davies: — I know my hon. friends don't like this reference and they are all the more indignant because they know it is absolutely true. And when my friend talks about lack of foresight and the loss of principles and a legacy of discrimination, I recall just a few years ago when this Government was in opposition and its Leader rose to talk about the drunks and dead beats and all the rest of it. Do you remember that? And these are the speakers that are rising today and asserting they are the persons to look after social aid recipients in this province and taking great credit for increasing the social aid schedules.

And, Mr. Speaker, well they might, well they might. Because it is under this Administration and under a Liberal Government at Ottawa that we have seen the most rapid increase in the cost of living over the past decade. As a matter of fact the cost of living index on food prices increased three and a half times more rapidly in 1966 than the ten-year average before that time. That they take credit for something that had to be done because of their own ineptitude in allowing the cost of living to

skyrocket as both Liberal Governments have done, is to my mind, simply pursuing the policy of the best defensive being the offensive. I think my friend, the Minister of Welfare, has pursued this policy this afternoon.

Now, Mr. Speaker, may I say, before I go on to the text of my talk this afternoon, that I am sure that my fellow Member from Moose Jaw will be rising in this Debate and will have a good deal more to say than I have had to say on this matter, and I am content to leave this matter in his hands. I am sure that he will give an excellent account of himself when the time comes to do so.

Now there have been a number of speakers on both sides in this House who commented on the speech delivered by the Provincial Treasurer as well as the speech of the Member from Regina West (Mr. Blakeney), my seatmate; and I shall do the same. I think the Premier must be complimented on a change of pace in delivery. There were fewer clichés and his talk was given in a less bugling tone than customary and I appreciated this. I must also compliment him for his adeptness at handling areas that were clearly embarrassing for his party. So all in all I thought he did the best job that he could for the Government in advancing a financial posture which leaves much to be desired. Many of these points have been commented upon of course and I am not going to repeat them here this afternoon.

I think my seatmate, the Member for Regina West (Mr. Blakeney), deserves the commendation of all Members, not only for the deft surgery with which he uncovered the sore and festering aspects of the Budget, but for the style and the wit which not only enlivened, but raised the standard of the Debate. Mr. Speaker, the nature and the composition of the Budget have, as I have said, been indicated by Members of my own party in this House. In many ways it seems to me that, probably unknowingly, the speeches of some of our friends in the Government have shown better than anything else the basic weaknesses in their party positions.

Mr. Speaker, it would be very, very strange indeed if riding the crest of the North American boom, this Government had not been able to produce a Budget that spent more money. I suggest that every Government across this country this year will be spending a lot more money on many things. But as has been so well underlined by CCF Members, the Budget falls far, far short of meeting very many real needs of the citizens of this province. The Premier and his fellow Members keep talking about tax reductions, and well they need to. It will take a powerful lot of talk and rhetoric to explain how the Government claims to have put money in one pocket of the citizens when it has picked the pocket on the other side. All the speech-making and all the tub-thumping aren't going to explain the new Liberal burdens that are imposed on Saskatchewan people, whether it is a health tax, a gas tax, a tobacco tax, increases in insurance rates, in telephone rates, in SPC profits or the other higher charges we have come to know by reason of both the Liberal policies and the Liberal ineptness in administration.

Now what's the single underlying fact of our difficulties today, Mr. Speaker? I say that it's plainly not only in the existence of a Liberal Government in the province but a Liberal Government at Ottawa. The greatest single cause for concern is the rise in living costs. Now I don't of course say that this can all be attributed to a Liberal Government that runs the nation. but is undeniable that the rate of increase in cost of living has been two or three times as rapid with the Liberal Administration at the Federal level and at the Provincial level as was the case prior to that time. Several hikes in the income tax and the sales tax are other examples and I say neither one of these Liberal Administration has really grappled with true consumer legislation. It is really only now, after the damage has been done, that we are getting even a faint-hearted response in the direction of consumer legislation; and this Liberal response has been largely inadequate. Whatever the debate is on these matters, it is clear that, both by heavier taxes and the erosion of living costs, the Liberals have fallen far short of even modest performance either here or at Ottawa. There is no doubt in my mind that if there were another election in Saskatchewan, we would see far more onerous tax burdens should another Liberal Government squeeze in. But I have also no doubt that the people of this province are very, very unlikely to permit that to happen.

Now, last Friday, Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Labour (Mr. Coderre) gave an almost pitiable performance in this House when he strove to repeat the statistical nonsense which has now been so badly exposed in the Government's own report on manpower, and yet it's also the report of the Federal Government since it of course paid half of the cost. So it's really useless for the Government to claim that these Federal-Provincial figures used in a joint report can be contradicted by some juggling on the part of the Minister.

However, last Friday, the Minister did cast some doubt on these figures and it is my purpose today to refer a little more deeply to some of the areas that he only touched upon. As I recall it he said that the increase in the number of employed persons in the province over recent years was something in the order of 59,000 or somewhat less, depending on which set of figures he used. One of the figures that he used had reference to the last year. He told us that from January, 1966 to December of 1966, there had been a 12,000 increase in the number of employees. Mr. Speaker, what the Minister did on this occasion – and I'm not accusing him of having done it deliberately but he certainly did use these figures and they are very misleading – was to take a period when there was a high level of unemployment and contrast it with a period when there was a relatively high degree of employment. in the middle of December, for example, the Christmas lay-offs had not yet taken place, the lay-offs which take place in the building industry around the end of the year had not taken place. The levels of employment are increased by the number of students who work during the Christmas season and all those who have not yet been laid off. The January figure, however, Mr. Speaker, naturally does not include a large number of workers who have lost their jobs

because of the seasonal decline. And this is what of course happened in the figures that the Minister gave us, so that the 12,000 increase that he told us about can be discounted because of that. However, I thought that it might be useful if we got in touch with the Dominion Bureau of Statistics and got further information on the Special Surveys Division to which the Minister made reference and this we did. What I am now able to report completely discounts the information that the Minister gave us last Friday and further confirms the kind of information that is present in the Government's manpower report. Now, Mr. Speaker, ...

Mr. Coderre: — Will the Member permit a question?

Mr. Davies: — Yes, I will.

Mr. Coderre: — The figures that you are discounting, my figures, you say that you have another authority. Would the hon. Member be prepared when he quotes his figures to lay on the table his authority, from where he has it and the authority of DBS. This is what I want to have.

Mr. Davies: — This is exactly what I propose to do here this afternoon, Mr. Speaker. What I have here is information obtained by telephone from the Labour Statistics Division of the Dominion Bureau of Statistics on February 28 and which goes into the table made reference to by the Minister and I must correct him. He gave us the number of the supplementary table last Friday as 9603-5250. As a matter of fact this is not the number of the table at all; it's the irrelevant number that simply appears on the information in question and that actual number is 9603-525. In any case these are supplementary tables to the catalogue number 71-00. I think if we had had this a little earlier it might have been easier to check the Minister's figures. but in any event from what is shown, I shall try to sum up from the figures that appear from the investigation that we were able to make, Mr. Speaker. It shows that the labour force figures of 1963 from the Economic Review give us 328,000 in the labour force. Now, the equivalent 1966 DBS figure is only 1,000 up from 1963. Now on the employment figures which the Minister made more specific reference to...

Mr. Coderre: — You're pushing it, Bill.

Mr. Davies: — Well, I hope you can take comfort from the smile, Sir, because I assure you that these figures do you no credit whatsoever. Now the Minister told us as I indicated that employment was up 12,000 on the basis of January 1966 to December, 1966. I said that he took the figures in unbalanced months. The fact is, Mr. Speaker, that the December, 1965 figures show 311,000 in the labour force. The December 1966 figure was 310,000 so that actually between December of 1965 and December 1967, there is a decline shown by these tables of 1,000, a

decline of 1,000 people.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Davies: — Now, Mr. Speaker, the Minister has made his speech and I suggest that if he wants to bring information into this House, he should bring information into this House in a reliable and consistent form and he has not done this. I'm correcting his error and I would like to ask him to remain silent so that I can let him know where some of his errors have been. I want to point this out too, Mr. Speaker, that in 1965, the labour force figure for this province was 318,000. The labour force figure for January, 1967 was 308,000 — a decline of 10,000, (referring now at this point to the whole labour force). Now how in the world we can have increases in employment of 59,000 or 60,000 in terms of the Minister's description and have accurate figures of this kind, I don't know.

I say that what has occurred is that the tables that the Minister has referred to have simply disproved his whole position on the question of employment in Saskatchewan over recent years. It is shown that rather than the 80,000 jobs that have been promised to us, we have perhaps an increase of only a few thousand if not a decline in employment itself.

I hope that the press and the news media will take cognisance of these tables. They certainly can be verified by reference to the Dominion Bureau of Statistics and I would be glad to make available to the Minister all the information on which I relied this afternoon.

Now further, Mr. Speaker, I say it is almost ludicrous to hear the Minister and the Premier say that there is no unemployment in Saskatchewan, when the Minister of Labour (Mr. Coderre) last Friday immediately thereafter tells us that there was 2.6 per cent of the labour force in Saskatchewan, unemployed. I think that could be contrasted with something like 2.2 per cent shown in the Department of Labour Report just given to us a week ago. The Department of Labour Report for the period ending March 31, 1966 — this is on page 3 — tells us that at December, 1965, the unemployed figure was 2.2 per cent. I think that it should be made known to the House that the percentage of unemployed he used is not taken on the employee section of the population — not at all. The labour force figure used by the Minister takes in everybody. It includes farmers, all professional, or anyone who is self employed. And the fact is that if only — the Minister shakes his head, but if he will check this with his statistical staff, I think he will find that this is accurate — the wage and salary section of the population is taken into account in making this assessment, it would run from 4 ½ to 5 per cent of the population. There is simply no doubt about this and it can be easily verified by the figures.

However, the Minister did finally concede that there was at least a substantial element of unemployment in Saskatchewan in this period of North American boom and he says that the

Government is doing a good job in training programs. then he went on, and he had what I thought was the barefaced temerity, to charge the previous Government with lack of planning in this regard. Well, Mr. Speaker, I don't state that the present Government has done nothing on training. It would have been very, very hard indeed for the present Government to have done nothing in view of the facilities and the programs that were created by the previous Government. but the Liberal Government stands condemned in this House as one slowing and halting programs which would have resulted in many of the unemployed today being in jobs today. In Moose Jaw, as one example, the program for expanding the technical institute was, as everyone knows, cut off completely by this Liberal Government in 1964. The \$2,000,000 program of building was rudely and summarily shoved aside. Now after three years, the Government tells my constituents that there is going to be a spending of a rather small \$140,000 to increase facilities in what was the first technical institute in this province and is still the institute that embraces the widest training. Mr. Speaker, in view of the need I say the expenditure that is projected is grossly inadequate. There is no other way of looking at it.

The Thatcher Administration and many of its leaders are spending quite a lot of time in Moose Jaw telling people how much the Liberals would do for the city. I say that the Liberal Government has absolutely failed the people of the city of Moose Jaw as well as the people of South Saskatchewan who look to more building at the Technical Institute location in my city. I say, if the Government had shown even a scrap of organizing ability, it would have anticipated the increase in Federal living allowances for certain trades and technical people, by rushing the CCF program to completion that would have enabled students to have taken advantage of the increases, so that we could have had a larger number of students from the unemployed, the present 12,000 unemployed in this province, Mr. Minister, so that they could have good facilities, and be taking training and not the unfortunate delays that have resulted today. What is the position at this moment? The position is one of confusion and congestion. The number of students who could be trained to their own and the community's advantage can't be accommodated.

Mr. Coderre: — Go take a walk around the block.

Mr. Davies: — Now I have already referred in meetings elsewhere – may I remind the Minister of Labour, Mr. Speaker, that he made his speech last Friday and had he given the House a little more information I wouldn't have to be talking about some of these things at the present time.

I want to remind the Minister again of the remarks of the former principal of the Saskatchewan Technical Institute at Moose Jaw when he gave an interview to the Times Herald and when in a very straightforward way and without any partisan

intent, he indicated the fruits of Liberal delay in proceeding with the CCF technical educational program.

You may recall what he said. He said that half of the recruiting teams from industry had appeared at his school and had been unable to find the workers that they needed.

When he spoke in the House the other day, Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Labour said that the time lost due to labour disputes is relatively low in Saskatchewan. I thought when I heard it, "What an admission from a Government that has just recently tried to justify the most dangerous labour legislation in Canada!" Well, Mr. Speaker, Saskatchewan strike-time losses were relatively low last year. But I want to tell the Minister of Labour in very direct terms this: that the strike-time losses in Saskatchewan in 1966 were the highest in the past 20 years in this province. Last year, there were almost 80,000 man-days lost, 79,199 man-days lost to be precise. True, only some 24,474 of these applied to employees under Provincial jurisdiction. The Minister knows these figures. I got them from him by question the other day and I'm certainly not twisting them. But even the Provincial figure alone is far higher than all lost-time figures of any of the years in the past two decades. And these do include both the losses of Federal-type employees and Provincial-type employees.

An Hon. Member: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Davies: — Saskatchewan's strike-time losses, Mr. Speaker, averaged only 5,731 days per year from 1956 to 1964. The 1965 strike-time figure at 19,770 was three and a half times higher, just taking the 1965 figure, and leaving out the Federal employees, strike-time losses in Saskatchewan in 1966 were over four times higher than in that period that I have just made reference to.

Mr. Speaker, this Government inherited labour relations and Provincial labour legislation that had established the finest record of labour peace in Canada. There is just no doubt about this. The strike-time rate for the 20 years previous to the advent of this Government was unexcelled in Canada.

But there is very good evidence pointing to the fact that the government's labour policies are inflaming rather than improving relations. Naturally, I'm not going to put all blame on the Government. The fact remains — this is an undeniable fact — that the policies of both Federal and Provincial Liberal Governments have not served to improve management-labour relations. The Liberal failure to cope with the cost of living and high profits has been an important contributing factor.

There's been an almost complete lack of understanding by Liberals that the system of collective bargaining in Canada needs reinforcement by updating. The Liberal party, Mr. Speaker, persists in the completely false statements that current labour opinion is just the work of labour agitators. They are entirely ignorant of what is going on and they seem

satisfied to distort, abuse and confuse rather than to get the facts so that changes can be made for the better. I hear, for example, the Premier talking about the solution being a labour court "like Sweden's." I think that is an almost direct quotation from what he said in the debate last fall when Bill No. 2 was up for consideration.

Now surely, even the briefest examination would have told him that compulsory arbitration in that country is very rare indeed. Collective bargaining is universally used in Sweden to get agreement. The core of the Swedish procedures relies on consultation, conciliation and mediation. And the so-called labour court in Sweden is not so to speak at the end of all negotiations, it is very much to one side. Disputes are only referred to the so-called labour courts in Sweden where the parties voluntarily agree to so submit disputes. The Premier or anyone else has no precedent in talking about Sweden as an area where compulsory arbitration reigns supreme.

One of the significant reasons why Sweden has had such good success in labour-management relationships is because labour has a great deal more status at official or national levels and at local levels and is recognized to a far greater extent than is the case either in Canada or the United States.

I want to repeat what I have said to the Government in this House and outside of it, that it's disreputable and dishonest to use complex labour issues as a means to excite prejudice, misunderstanding and division among urban and rural voters. It's almost akin to the use of arguments aimed at creating racial or religious antagonisms, which this province, I am thankful to say, has decisively and soundly rejected in the past.

Repressive legislation, Mr. Speaker, has had everywhere the effect, not of settling disputes but of inflaming them. In Australia, as a further example, compulsory arbitration has resulted in not fewer strikes but more strikes, not a lower rate of strike-time lost, but a higher rate.

I think we must all come to see that lasting solutions will be through the parties with governments assisting them to improve their methods and by remedying the causes of disputes by giving to the parties the means by which disputes can be avoided. I'm sure investigations on these lines will get good results. and I would like to see, in addition to measures of this kind, machinery created where farm and labour bodies could get together at provincial and national levels to consider matters of joint interest. Among these should be questions of fair farm prices for agricultural products.

One of the aspects, that I'm increasingly concerned about and I want to comment about it this afternoon, is the abuse of a right that many take for granted, exercised without discrimination and restraint in Saskatchewan and which I say is constantly abused. it is one of the biggest reasons in my opinion for disharmony between labour and management. I refer here to the right to organize. I say that far too often certain

corporate management pressures are ingeniously applied to intimidate, interfere and to coerce employees during their use of these rights. This is taking place, Mr. Speaker, 100 years after the repeal of the infamous combination laws that led to the jailing of 21 Toronto printers for the mere fact of joining a union. I regret to say that Bill No. 79 is making it more difficult for employees to form unions and exercise those rights and easier for some management elements to apply the methods that prevent that formation.

The Minister of Labour (Mr. Coderre) sometimes says that the proof of the pudding is in the eating. I have often thought that he must like pudding. But apart from this, the record of the first part-year, the first eight months of the application of Bill 79, may offer some of the proof that the Minister may be looking for. Bill 79 amendments, as I say, have been effective for only three-quarters of a year. Yet of 1,050 employees concerned in applications for union recognition in Saskatchewan, only 418 were successful in getting certification, a little less, Mr. Speaker, than 40 per cent. Does the Minister of Labour in this House say that the remaining 60 per cent or is he prepared to concede that there must have been some strong elements of interference on the part of the agents of some of these firms? Again I notice, Mr. Speaker, that in 1966 there were 16 applications to the Labour Relations Board for reinstatement of employees who were discharged for union activity. Not one of these applications was successful. The Minister again may counter by saying that 12 of the applications were withdrawn. But can he assure us here this afternoon that this was not because those concerned felt that they would get nowhere with these applications? I want to repeat that the right of organization is still being actively challenged in this province. I believe that it is regrettable that it has been assisted by the policies of this Government.

Mr. Speaker, I want to deal just for a minute or two with some matters affecting Moose Jaw. The first subject I want to mention is once more the Provincial office building that the previous Government had budgeted \$400,000 for, which was wiped out by the present Government. I want to say this that the Government of today is the same Government that so frequently professes good intentions for the people of Moose Jaw. Now I know the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Gardiner) may tell us that his space investigations haven't justified any action. But the people of the third largest city in Saskatchewan will see this as just another act of neglect by the present Liberal Government. They are going to understand what they've got to do to get a Provincial office building and that is to vote out the Liberals and return the CCF!

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Davies: — When the Liberal Governments at Ottawa and Regina permitted the Robin Hood Mills at Moose Jaw to close, I don't think

that many Moose Jaw employees were surprised. The inertia of Liberals about positive policies to help the railway workers who were displaced by dieselisation over some 15 years is a matter for their constant comment. Local Moose Jaw Liberals, as a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, recently apparently even approved a resolution declaring Moose Jaw a depressed area. I believe this was at a meeting attended by the Deputy Premier (Mr. Steuart).

Now, Mr. Speaker, Moose Jaw doesn't want to be considered a disaster area. In 1965 it had a market rating, according to the Financial Post, of 124 per cent above the national level; and its income is slightly higher than the national average. It does, however, need much more help and its citizens are glad when the Liberal Government even makes some tentative gestures in that direction. Moose Jaw would be grateful if the large expansion previously planned for its prime educational facility, the Saskatchewan Technical Institute, could now be undertaken. What has occurred, of course, is that this has been rejected for just another year except for the expenditure of the very small sum that I mentioned previously.

I would like to make another recommendation to this Government. That is to undertake at Buffalo Pound Lake a program for the aeration of water. Everyone knows that some 170,000 people use the water supplies of Buffalo Pound Lake – mostly the people of Regina and Moose Jaw – and the taste and the quality of the water during the winter months are particularly bad. The chief cause of this I am told is the deposit of algae on the bottom of the lake which absorbs the oxygen in the water and gives us the bad-tasting water. I ask the Department of Natural Resources if they couldn't study a scheme for the introduction of oxygen underneath the ice into the water during the winter months. I think a great many citizens of this province would benefit because of this. I also want to suggest to the Department of Natural Resources and the Minister (Mr. Steuart) that it is not only a question of the water supplies for this large number of citizens, but reports have it that large numbers of fish are dying in the lake because of the lack of oxygen.

I must confess that I don't know the precise method by which my recommendation can be followed. But I should think that an air compressor with a hose running into the water at different points might achieve to some extent the kind of thing I'm looking for.

I'd like also to recommend to the Government that we need improved black-topped roads from Moose Jaw into all recreational points adjacent to Lake Saskatchewan and the lake formed by the Qu'Appelle Dam. Undoubtedly many citizens, including American citizens, will want to travel to the Dam via Moose Jaw, a natural route, and there is going to be some very heavy traffic on these roads. I would like to think that the Minister of Highways (Mr. Boldt) and the Minister of Natural Resources (Mr. Steuart) would pay early attention to this. I'm not satisfied from the report given to us by the Minister of Highways yesterday that a good job is now being done in this direction.

Mr. Speaker, I now make reference to what has been going on during the last several years in particular with the cooperation of the Premier. Here, I am talking about the distorted version of Saskatchewan, its institutions and programs which are so often found in speeches by the Provincial Treasurer when he visits points outside of Saskatchewan.

Lately I came into possession of a reprint of a most biased and, to my mind, false article appearing in a booklet entitled "Where Socialism Failed Close to Home." It is printed by an outfit in Chicago, Illinois, under the doubtful name of the National Research Bureau Incorporated. The first page has a large picture, Mr. Speaker, (and this is a copy of the publication) and it has the caption "W. Ross Thatcher Tells Why..." and "How a Canadian Province tested, then rejected broad, welfare-state planning." It is mostly a collection of quotations of Liberal Government leaders and of the opinion of the reporter, one Theodore Drury, which add up, at the best I say, to a tissue of half-truths to conjure up a wholly unfair and malicious picture about Saskatchewan. I think it will be resented by all Saskatchewan citizens when they know about this publication.

Now, I am not complaining because this spiteful little tract attacks the CCF in the way it does. I complain because it conveys to outsiders, for the narrowest political and corporate reasons and motives, a completely untruthful impression of our province and its people. I note that the former Minister of Health, the Deputy Premier (Mr. Steuart) has at least enlightened us in an unusual outburst of frankness about one thing. We now know why we are not going to get the promised drug program that the Liberal party bought votes with in 1964.

Well, on page 15 of the booklet, the Member for Prince Albert (Mr. Steuart) tells how the Liberals must face the task of slowing the cost of the hospitalisation program. The next paragraph says, "Our great problem," (quoting the Deputy Minister) "is to see that the welfare state doesn't spread. It's a creeping sort of thing, welfare programs are like gaining weight. It's easy to put on, but awfully hard to take off." And I thought when I read this that at least the Minister was at last frank in telling us his real attitude towards the addition of drug benefits in the medical care program.

Mr. Speaker, this Government fired Mr. C. Basken for exercising his political rights. They threatened Government employees with the same kind of treatment in the Bengough by-election. Mr. Speaker, ironically, the head of the Saskatchewan Power Corporation, the man who fired Basken on the orders of the Premier, takes political action with impunity and apparently with the approval of the Premier and the Deputy Premier. Because in this offensive little booklet, Mr. D. B. Furlong makes not only questionable, but partisan statements in which he directly mentions the CCF and significantly mentions his opposition to the CCF ideas that the Power Corporation was a service, rather than a profit-making organization. In other words he engaged in political argument. Mr. Speaker, if an ordinary Power Corporation employee made similar statements about this Liberal

Government, he would be fired just as Mr. Basken was fired. The fact that the general manager in the company made the statement without reprimand of any kind let alone his discharge, is evidence of the hypocritical double-standard of this Liberal Administration.

Mr. Steuart: — Mr. Speaker, would the Hon. Member read the statement Mr. Furlong is supposed to have made and what the publication is? I never heard of either.

Mr. Davies: — Well, the Deputy Premier is certainly quoted here and I'll be glad to read at length what he said.

Mr. Steuart: — I don't care what I said. I'm interested in what Mr. D. B. Furlong said because he can't defend himself. I can.

Mr. Davies: — If you won't interrupt me, Sir, I'll read it to you.

Now here it is:

An insight into the business-management philosophy of the CCF is offered by David B. Furlong, a former businessman brought in early this year by the Liberals, as general manager of the Power Company. He was president of an oil-producer-owned pipeline company before agreeing to take over management of the SPC. Mr. Furlong explains:

'I found that in the SPC was management by committee and by policy and procedure which tended to stifle initiative. It operated solidly and safely in the bread-and-butter job of producing normal service to its customers, but it didn't operate as a private company would in offering new services to new types of industry.'

then he goes on:

'A new potash company may be a million dollar customer, something you love and cherish.'

On the side, I think these are rather extravagant words, but to continue:

'The CCF regarded the big company as something you fight with. They couldn't see how a big customer benefits the small ones by forcing construction of larger transmission lines and better standards of supply.'

And, Mr. Furlong, the article says, continues:

'The biggest change for me was the prevalent idea that the SPC isn't in business to make a profit. When there's no profit motive, the intangibles of outside pressures take on more importance in decision making.'

An Hon. Member: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Davies: — How well this was realized, Mr. Speaker, this year, in the Budget with respect to the SPC brought down by the Provincial Treasurer!

Mr. Steuart: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Davies: — Never mind, Mr. Speaker, the Deputy Premier. There is the statement of the general manager of the Power Corporation.

An Hon. Member: — I'd like to give Mr. furlong a chance to check that. I don't...

Mr. Davies: — I'd say this that this Government must be aware...

An Hon. Member: — Table that document he read...

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Speaker: — Is the Member prepared to table it?

Mr. Davies: — I'm quite prepared to table it, Mr. Speaker. I'm sure that there must be copies in the possession of some of the Members opposite but I'd be glad to table it. The name again is "Where Socialism Failed Close to Home." On the front page is the picture of the Premier and his quotation and numerous other statements are all throughout the book.

An Hon. Member: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Davies: — It's put out by an outfit called the national Research Bureau Incorporated – Employee Relations Bureau Corporation, "How a Canadian Province tested and rejected broad welfare-state planning." below the Premier's picture.

An Hon. Member: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Davies: — I want to say again before I leave this that there's a responsibility on the Government to do with the general manager of the Power corporation what they did with Mr. C. Basken, if at least, they adhere to the standards that they said they had adhered to before.

May I say, Mr. Speaker, something about the so-called Opportunity Caravan of the Youth Agency. I want to say fairly, that I don't entirely reject the idea. It seems to me though that one trailer can be very little more than experimental, it

can touch only the fringes of a very great problem. I am very glad to see incidentally that the Government is taking some advantage of the grants that are available through Canada Manpower and I think probably that the Canada Manpower Department is essentially the body that is running this program.

But it seems to me that we must not let this idea become a substitute for a framework of guidance and counselling which is required and necessary for the public today. Mr. Speaker, we've got to begin to build into our school system, starting with the public schools, a complete and efficient program of guidance counselling. The fragmentary and fleeting contacts by caravan can be useful, but they should be supplements rather than the backbone of the program. The criticism of this program really is that the supplement has come first without the backbone or the principles of the program coming first.

Mr. Speaker, I say that thousands of young people today, including many that are entering and sometimes those leaving university, have no fundamental opinion at all about what they want to do in life. I think a great many are frustrated and very troubled because of it.

This state of things is highly unsatisfactory, I think that the authorities in education are beginning to recognize that we need an integrated system. I believe that advisers above all need to be well qualified and well acquainted with all parts of industry and all aspects of job problems because I feel that guidance and counselling can't be effective unless there is this thorough understanding of the whole fabric of employment today. Plainly also we are short of counsellors. I believe that a degree course has or is shortly to be established. This looks like a good idea because evidently we need to provide monetary assistance to train dozens of such people. It is in this direction that we should be looking because I think without the competent counsellor that we can't build a good system of guidance counselling. It seems to me that a program that would get best results would be one that gave more assistance to desirable people who wanted to take courses or degree courses in this direction. The Caravan proposed can serve to arouse interest and it may be helpful in some areas. But I would urge that the required full and basic program of guidance and counselling shouldn't be shelved just because of this. I have suggested that what we do here is really an auxiliary program starting before the main program. Somehow this doesn't seem to be the best thing in principle.

Mr. Speaker, this afternoon I have ranged over a number of items in the Budget to indicate my misgivings as to its direction and character. I have spoken in overall terms and also about certain specific activities and programs of the Government that are affected by this Budget. The prime reason in a broad way that I can't voice approval in the Government and in this Budget is because I don't think they have confidence in programs that the public want and the public need. Whether it is in the field of drugs, in the medical care program, whether it involves social welfare, labour industry, agriculture or roads, there is, it

seems to me in this Government, either reluctance or opposition to the kind of genuine, inclusive public action that I think these times demand. For that reason, Mr. Speaker, I shall support the amendment and reject the motion.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. A. R. Guy (Athabasca): — Before going into the main substance of the Debate, I would like to make a few comments about the remarks made by the Member from Moose Jaw, who just took his seat. I think all Members in this House appreciate the fact that there was a need for the senior Member from Moose Jaw (Mr. Davies) to come to the defence of the junior Member (Mr. Snyder) since he is not capable of defending himself, but I wish in so doing that he had tried at least to stick to the truth. He mentioned the responsibility of a MLA to bring to the attention of the department concerned any problems which may be relevant to that particular department before bringing it to the House. This is what did not happen in the particular case that he referred to. The junior Member from Moose Jaw didn't take it to the Minister (Mr. Grant) first because he knew that the Minister would look into it and he would have no chance to make any political gain.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Guy: — Rather, he brought it to this House first in the hope of cheap, political publicity. Then after he got his neck in the noose, he went begging to the Minister asking him to get him out of it, get him off the hook. This was just another example of Members opposite for cheap, political gain using the unfortunate circumstances of people who are much less fortunate than ourselves.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Guy: — We have been listening to this ever since Members opposite took up their position on that side of the House.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Guy: — I was surprised that the senior Member from Moose Jaw suggested that the Liberals were the only Government who saved money at the expense of the needy. One needs to be appalled and surprised that the Member opposite would even mention social aid in this Debate and I intend later this evening to refer to some of the remarks made by the loud Member from The Battlefords (Mr. Kramer) who raised the question earlier in this Debate. I was disappointed in the senior Member from Moose Jaw. I have never expected too much from the junior Member because he is young, ambitious and a tool of his labour boss.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Guy: — And I don't doubt that he will be rising in this Debate but whether he gives as good an account of himself as the senior Member is hoping will in itself be debatable. I must admit that I have always had some degree of respect for the senior Member for Moose Jaw, even though at times he gets confused and goes off in a tangent, particularly when discussing matters concerning labour. But I always took into account that he who pays the piper, calls the tune, and since he is being employed by the labour union he really doesn't have much alternative but to speak out in their support. I suspect that in his defence of the junior Member from Moose Jaw his conscience is perhaps pricking him to some degree, because the senior Member got what might be considered the possible safe seat in that city. Of course whether even that proves to be true will be known in a relatively short time. Therefore, when the Member from Moose Jaw who supposedly will rise in this debate as suggested by his partner, it could possibly be his wan song and I'm sure that no one will wish to miss it.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Guy: — I was also amazed at the statement from the senior Member that the strike-time lost in the province since the Liberals took office was three and a half times greater than under the CCF. But I would submit, Mr. Speaker, that this only points out what we have been saying, that this is a deliberate attempt by labour to sabotage the present Government. When the Saskatchewan Federation of Labour passes a resolution at two annual conventions in a row that they will do everything in their power to defeat a Liberal Government, what can you expect in cooperation from the labour unions towards this Province? Labour Members opposite in order to earn their pay and keep their jobs are continuously publishing inflammatory statements to maintain dissension between Government and labour. I would say that, if the Members opposite had any sense of responsibility as MLAs, they would put the welfare of the people of this province who suffer from strikes and labour, ahead of the political gain which they hope to achieve.

An Hon. Member: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Guy: — I'm not surprised, Mr. Speaker, that the Liberal Association in Moose Jaw passed a resolution that Moose Jaw be a depressed area. What else can you expect when you have two weak NDP Members representing them who do not get the ear of the present Government.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Guy: — Then the Member for Moose Jaw went on to criticize an article that appeared in the United States. It came from — I missed the name — some research corporation. It was how the Liberal Government defeated the Socialists in Saskatchewan and

the poor record of the Socialists. Then the Member from Moose Jaw (Mr. Davies) went on to say that it was only half true. There's only one thing, Mr. Speaker, that is worse than a person from this province going out and spreading half truths and that's a Member of the Legislature that goes throughout the province spreading whole untruths. And I'd like to refer to a little article or several articles, that appeared in the mail boxes throughout the city of Prince Albert and I suppose throughout the cities across the province, filled with distortions and untruths. It mentions that education receives no help from the Liberal Government. Well, if they didn't receive any help from the Liberal Government, God help them when they were receiving help under the CCF Government.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Guy: — They went on to say that students had been turned away from the university. This has been proven untrue by several speakers on this side of the House. It goes on to mention that Saskair had not kept their agreement and it showed a picture of a plane that had been forced down into the bush and people had died. But they chose to use this as an illustration and called it a derelict Saskair plane. I would remind them that they are only referring to their own term of office because it was only a few short months that Saskair did exist under the Liberal Government, after that they were known as NorCanAir. Then they went on to say that over 40 people had lost their jobs. I think the Minister of Mineral Resources (Mr. Cameron) showed last night that this was a lie. They went on and made some reference to the Prince Albert pulp mill. They were afraid to come out and say that they definitely opposed it but they posed some questions. They made references to the air ambulance becoming part of Thatcher's executive fleet. Then they ended up with a few references to health, MSI and so on. What really caught me at the end of this — and as I say there is nothing worse than going around the province spreading complete untruths — was that it is published by the constituencies of Prince Albert West, East Cumberland (I imagine our little friend over there had something to do with it), Kinistino, Shellbrook and the Saskatchewan CCF. Do you know the name of this article, Mr. Speaker? It says "Contributions for 'The Truth' may be sent to W. E. F., Prince Albert." The truth, this is what they call the truth. This is the sort of distortion that goes out through the mails every day in this province under the banner of the CCF-NDP. And this is the reason that, when the election is called, the people opposite will be depleted in number because the people are getting tired of this deliberate attempt to distort the facts and the truth. Everyone in this province knows that there is no Government that can be as bad as what they portray the present Government of this province to be.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Guy: — And this is the reason why, Mr. Member from Regina Southwest, the people know that everything you say is untrue and it

will come back to you on election day.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Guy: — Now, Mr. Speaker, I want first of all to congratulate the Premier for presenting a Budget to the people of this province that provides a balance between new programs and present services, that is a balanced Budget and which provides no tax increases. This is a success, Mr. Speaker, that has not been duplicated this year anywhere in the rest of Canada. I must also congratulate the Member from Regina West (Mr. Blakeney) the NDP financial critic, for a masterful attempt in the face of extreme difficulties to criticize this Budget with any degree of validity. He brought in all the extraneous subjects he could to avoid having to spend any more time than possible in criticizing the Budget itself. In fact, the interruptions from the Member from The Battlefords (Mr. Kramer) with his Yeah! Yeah! Hear! Hear! while clapping his hands like a two-year old was perhaps the most intelligent part of the whole performance.

Mr. Speaker, one gets a little tired of listening to Members opposite one after the other complain that we are not doing enough for education. The term enough, of course, is a relative term. To my mind every Government, municipal, provincial and federal could put double the money into education and it still wouldn't be enough. At the rate the demands for university and secondary school education, technical and vocational training, adult and special education are expanding across this country, there is no such thing as enough money for education. Therefore, it is the Government's responsibility to provide as much aid as possible, keeping in mind the other needs of the province and above all the ability of the people to pay. This the Provincial Treasurer has done and he must be commended for it.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Guy: — In this province it is a question of whether an increase to education is relative to the increasing costs of education and it is a question of where the money will come from. Next year our total Budget for education will be 23 per cent higher than this year, a healthy increase in any man's language and certainly in keeping with the rising costs of education. As other speakers have said, this is an increase that is staggering when compared to the records of the Socialists when they were the Government. What is even more important is that this increase was provided without an increase in taxes. The people of Saskatchewan should realize that, although we have substantially increased the costs to education and to health care in the past three years, we were able to cut the education and health tax from five to four per cent.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Guy: — This tax today, Mr. Speaker,

is lower in Saskatchewan than in any other province of Canada with the exception of Alberta which has no sales tax. Alberta, however, has gone into deficit budgeting to the tune of some tens of millions of dollars to avoid such a tax. I would remind you further, Mr. Speaker, that this was the tax that Mr. Tommy Douglas in 1944 promised to eliminate when it was two per cent, but who when he became Premier blatantly disregarded his promise and raised it subsequently to five per cent, where it was when he left for greener and less troubled pastures. The only reason for the increase was given not by Tommy Douglas but by the Premier that followed him, when he said that the people should be glad to pay taxes to a Socialist Government because we know how to spend the people's money better than they do.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Guy: — I was somewhat surprised to see in Saturday's paper a picture entitled "Tommy at Home." I always thought in view of the fact that he was turned out of his home in Saskatchewan and as an orphan forced to seek solace among his labour friends in British Columbia, that the homey atmosphere of Saskatchewan would be forgotten. I see, however, that his sojourn away from the Saskatchewan scene has not made him any the wiser. I suppose in view of the Leader of the Opposition's announcement of the election date for April 26, that Tommy's speech was a kick-off for the next campaign for our socialist friends opposite. On reading the report of Tommy's speech, I'm sure I am right, because the same old clichés he has been using for 25 years appeared again when he spoke to the gathering the other night.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Guy: — He spoke of Government planning and direction of the economy that were essential to promote the expansion of Canadian production. For 25 years he has been using this cliché. He showed his concern with US economic control in Canada because political control always followed economic control, something he has been saying for 25 years. He suggested that public planning and financing of economic development was necessary. Thus it appears that the anti-American, Socialist-planning and faith in public vs private enterprise lessons of the past have gone unheeded by Members opposite. This it would seem the results of 1964 will be repeated in 1968 only more substantially this time. And it would appear that in view of their greeting to Tommy that they were on the march, that the NDP's time of lying down to bleed has gone by and they will attempt to rise again.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Guy: — Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Member from Melfort-Tisdale (Mr. Willis) has suggested I call it 5:30 and since I have a rather lengthy report to make in regard to some of his activities, I would ask to call it 5:30.

The House recessed at 5:30 p.m.

Mr. Guy: — Before calling it 5:30 I had mentioned that we appreciated the senior Member for Moose Jaw coming to the fence of the junior Member and that probably it was necessary since the junior Member has the record of making statements, which are uncalled for, which usually are far off the track and of then having to have someone bail him out to keep him from getting into serious trouble with his own constituency. I also pointed out that that before the evening was over I would have some comments to say about the Member for Melfort-Tisdale (Mr. Willis). I pointed out also, Mr. Speaker, that I had generally some respect for the senior Member for Moose Jaw, but we realize that in view of his tie-up with labour and the fact that he is paid by that organization that quite often he has to made radical rash statements which I think in all due deference to him he doesn't really mean. I pointed out also that there is only one thing worse then going outside of the province and spreading half truths and that was staying home in the province and spreading no truth at all. I referred to a few statements that were made by Members opposite in a little pamphlet which I think they called the truth which when it came right down to it was absolutely no truth at all. I also had pointed out, Mr. Speaker, that we had a Budget that all Members on this side could be proud of because it was one that had no increase in taxes, it was a balance between new programs and present services and it was a balanced Budget, something which is not know in Canada during this year. Now, Mr. Speaker, I was very disappointed with the Tory Member (Mr. Pederson) on the other side of the House. I am sorry that he is not in his seat, but it appears that he has become so engrossed with the Socialists on that side that he can no longer see any further than his nose. However, I must admit that he gave a far better Socialist speech than any of the Socialists had given to date and as such I would not be too surprised if he took over the leadership of the Socialist part after the next election. Also I am not surprised at the Tory's reference to the farm, and the horse and buggy, because we can all remember that it was the Bennett Government in Ottawa and the Anderson Government in Saskatchewan who failed to meet the problems created by the depression and were mainly responsible for the problems facing the Liberal Government in the late 1930s and early 1940s.

In fact, I think that history will show that Mr. Bennett's sole claim to fame was his Bennett buggy where he forced the farmers to take the motors out of their cars for lack of gas and hook them up behind a team of horses. Thus, the Tory Member should be an authority on this part of our history. Tory Governments in Ottawa, Tory Governments in Saskatchewan have always been the forerunners of depression and despair.

Now, the Member from Melfort-Tisdale (Mr. Willis) had his speech filled with his usual number of distortions. I don't know who did his arithmetic but I suspect that it was done in the Leader of the Opposition's (Mr. Lloyd) office in calculating the per capita tax in Saskatchewan at \$300, but he conveniently left

the impression that this is paid out of the pockets of the taxpayer. Today, Mr. Speaker, under a Liberal Government, a good portion of the per capita tax comes not from the taxpayer but from the development of our natural resources, a tax source almost unknown to the Socialists.

The homeowner grant, the purple gas exemption, reduced sales and income tax plus revenue from resource development place the people of Saskatchewan in the most favourable tax position they have been in for years. I am surprised at certain Members opposite constantly opposing programs which have been overwhelmingly accepted by our people in the province. It isn't hard to tell which Members will not be back after the next election as a result of their lack of political assessment.

An Hon. Member: — You're right, Allan.

Mr. Guy: — I think of the Member from Kinistino (Mr. Thibault) who opposed tax-free purple gas for farmers in his constituency although every farmer in his seat is profiting from it. I think of the Member from Prince Albert, East Cumberland, (Mr. Berezowsky) who has made a perfect fool of himself in his opposition to the Prince Albert pulp mill and Anglo Rouyn Mines which have and will provide so much needed work for his constituents, in spite of delegations from his constituency who have warned him to keep quiet.

And now the other day we reached the extreme, the Member for Melfort-Tisdale (Mr. Willis) opposed the homeowner grant although every home owner in his constituency accepted it. How did he do it? He went to the point of writing a letter to himself to prove he was right. What a letter it was! Mr. Speaker, you will recall that he stood in his place and said, "I have a letter from one of my constituents that I want to read to this House."

An Hon. Member: — You're kidding.

Mr. Guy: — "He is a friend of mine although I don't know what his politics are." Mr. Speaker, let's have a look at this so-called letter...

Mr. C. G. Willis (Melfort-Tisdale): — I did not make that statement, I did know what the person's politics were. It was clearly stated in the letter.

Mr. Guy: — Mr. Speaker, he says that he knew what the person's politics were, yet the letter wasn't signed so I don't even understand how he knew who the person was. Anyway, Mr. Speaker, let's have a look at this so-called letter with which the Hon. Member tried to deliberately mislead the House.

Mr. Whelan: — ...Waste-paper basket.

Mr. Guy: — What was the home address of the sender? There wasn't any home address.

Mr. Nollet: — Where did you find that? In the waste-paper basket?

Mr. Guy: — Who was it written to? Well, Mr. Speaker, I am surprised at the Member from Cutknife (Mr. Nollet). Someone from his own side of the House tables a letter and then he goes and says that it came out of the waste-paper basket. I would suggest that it came out of the waste-paper basket before it was ever tabled in this House.

Mr. Nollet: — If the Hon. Member from Nipawin (Mr. Radloff) would table his letter too.

Mr. Guy: — The Hon. Member from Nipawin (Mr. Radloff) isn't on his feet.

Mr. Brockelbank (Kelsey): — Who is?

Mr. Guy: — Well, Mr. Speaker, what was the home address of the sender? There wasn't any. Who was it written to? Who knows, there's no mention of any name. Did it start out Dear Mr. so and so. No., it says, Sir. And then he says, "Would you bring this up at the meeting in Regina?" What meeting? CCF meeting? Liberal meeting? Social Credit meeting? Who knows? When was this meeting, 1962?, 1948: Who knows, it doesn't say. So then we get down to who wrote it and I looked on both pages and I saw that it had been tabled by Mr. Willis during the Budget Debate, February 23, 1967, but there wasn't any signature. No one wrote it. But the writer does say in his concluding sentence I won't sign my name but I am a CCFer. Mr. Speaker, no wonder he is ashamed to sign his name after that confession! the Member should hang his head in shame trying to deceive the House with such a document.

Now, Mr. Speaker, it is becoming increasingly evident from speakers opposite that at long last they're becoming interested in our people of Indian ancestry, and well they should be. For 20 long years they shamefully neglected our Indian and Métis people remembering them only on election day with a few promises which they never intended to keep. In this House I believe we all recognize that there is no pat solution to our Indian problem. You can't overcome in one generation what it took many generations to create. No one knows better than our Government how much needs to be done and we are the first Government in this province that has tried to do something. However, I listened with interest to the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Lloyd) when he stated that he recognized also that there was an Indian problem and that there were certain recommendations that were made

by his party. For the most part they were proposals that have already been put into effect by the Liberal Government.

At their convention last fall they promised that if elected they would set up a Provincial placement service. One wonders where they have been for two years. While they were talking we have been acting and already have placed large numbers of our Indian people through our Provincial placement service. However, Mr. Speaker, a statement made at the CCF-NDP convention is worthy of remembering. The papers that they presented stressed that provision of equality does not mean forced assimilation. This is true. And because we are following this principle, Mr. Speaker, progress cannot be rapid or immediate. However, within the limits of Provincial jurisdiction and with Federal and local band cooperation and participation, our progress in providing education of all kinds, employment opportunities, services such as housing, roads, telephones, power and so on, social services, leadership in community development has been most impressive and, I know, with the support of everyone concerned that it will continue to be so. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I was astounded the other day when the Member for The Battlefords (Mr. Kramer) took to his feet, because he contributed very little to this Debate, on behalf of the Indian people.

After listening to the Hon. Member from Kelsey (Mr. Brockelbank) the other night pleading for understanding among all races, all creeds, and all colours, one can only wonder if the Member for the Battlefords (Mr. Kramer) belongs to the same party with his hate-filled inflammatory remarks aimed at putting our Indian friends against his white brothers.

His remarks about our efforts in placing Indian people are nothing but a pack of distorted lies. We all recognize that Indians have started jobs which later they found they did not like or for which they were not suited. But I ask you how many white people have done the same, not once but many times. And I would like to put on the records of this House the fact that employers for the most part have been most understanding and helpful in placing our Indian people. And our placement people have assisted with counselling and money to place them elsewhere in a job or a training course or even to return them home if this has been their desire. The Member's remarks, that they were sent home by employers, humiliated and frustrated, is nothing but a deliberate slap in the face to employers, Indian Affairs and Provincial officials and the Indians themselves, by a man who will stoop to any gutter-type politics for his own ends. And I'm not surprised, Mr. Speaker, that tonight he is not sitting in his seat because he is not able to tolerate the remarks which will be aimed at him and he knows he can't.

Mr. Brockelbank (Kelsey): — Mr. Speaker, on a point of order I think it is generally recognized that it is quite unparliamentary for any Member to say of another Member he told a pack of lies, and then the remark that was just made a minute ago by the Hon. Member is quite out of order and it makes no difference. As a matter of fact the Legislative Assembly should be more anxious to protect an absent

Member from abuse in this respect and all Members should refrain from attacking the Members even more than when they are present.

Mr. Guy: — Where's the absent Member?

Mr. Brockelbank (Kelsey): — I hope, Mr. Speaker, that you will ask the Hon. Member to withdraw the remarks and I certainly hope he will withdraw them without qualification, because there is no doubt they were extremely unparliamentary.

Mr. Guy: — Mr. Speaker, I'm not sure at this point to what Member the Member from Kelsey (Mr. Brockelbank) is referring. The Member that I refer to is sitting in his seat...

Mr. Brockelbank (Kelsey): — Mr. Speaker, it doesn't matter what Member I was referring to, the Hon. Member referred to some Member in this House as producing a pack of lies just a few moments ago. It doesn't matter who it was. It was an insult and a disgrace to this House that any Member should use that kind of language about another Member.

Mr. McFarlane: — On the point of order, Mr. Speaker, I think the Member for Athabasca said earlier in his remarks this afternoon and again this evening that a publication turned out by Members, or authorized by Members on that side of the House was in effect a pack of lies.

Mr. Brockelbank (Kelsey): — On the point of order it is different altogether. This is a publication that wasn't published by Members on this side of the House at all. It was published by another organization. If Members in this House want to say that a newspaper of the CCF is a pack of lies, that isn't a very nice kind of language, but I don't think it contravenes the rules of parliament.

Mr. Speaker: — Now, on the point of order if the Member refers specifically to another Member as having produced a pack of lies I think that is disorderly and that point has been well taken. Whether he did specifically or not I didn't catch the quotation.

Mr. Guy: — Well now, Mr. Speaker, certainly I will withdraw the remarks "pack of lies", if it seems to be so objectionable to the Members opposite. We remember from the past their consciences are a little touchy in this regard. I will say instead that certainly it appeared to Member to contain a great number of untruths.

Now, I said, Mr. Speaker, before the Member that I referred to took his seat, that his remarks the other day were certainly uncalled for and untrue. This Member as you will recall, Mr. Speaker, was a dismal failure as a Minister of the Crown in a department which had the opportunity to do so much for our Indian

and Métis people of this province and which did virtually nothing. This can be forgiven when one considers that he knew nothing, did nothing and accomplished nothing during his short term of office as Minister of Natural Resources. When he was in his office, which was seldom, never was there a Minister who knew so little about so much of what his Department was doing. Nor was he embarrassed about it. He bragged openly that he had no intention of learning what went on in his Department, but he was only concerned with politics and getting elected out in his own seat.

The mess his Department was in when we took over was ample proof he carried out his intentions.

An Hon. Member: — I don't know who he's talking about.

Mr. Guy: — Each year he stands up in this House on one of the few days he is in attendance and tries to turn a two-bit speech into ten dollars of political capital.

Mr. Brockelbank (Kelsey): — On a point of order, the Hon. Member is saying a lot of things which if they were directed to any Member who was named in the House would certainly be un-parliamentary, but he has not named a Member. He is talking about some apparently fictitious or unknown or a Member in hallucination or something like that, but this language when it's used without names a Member is an insult to all Members in the House.

Mr. Guy: — Well, I can assure the Hon. Member from Kelsey (Mr. Brockelbank) that I'm not referring to him in this particular case. I think this is really what's bothering him.

Mr. Brockelbank (Kelsey): — Mr. Speaker, this isn't good enough.

Mr. Guy: — I was referring to the Member from The Battlefords (Mr. Kramer) who at one time, for a very short time, was the Minister of Natural Resources and did a very poor job. This is what I'm pointing out that the job that he did was not consistent with the job that had been done by any former Minister of natural Resources or any Minister of Natural Resources since.

Mr. Kramer (The Battlefords): — Mr. Speaker, seeing that the Hon. Member for Athabasca (Mr. Guy) has finally been smoked out and has mentioned who he was talking about, I want to deny unequivocally that what he said I never said at anytime. He's putting words in my mouth. I think he should be stopped.

Mr. Guy: — Mr. Speaker, this is all very well, somebody had to put some words of sense in his mouth.

Mr. Michayluk: — Put some sense in your head.

Mr. Guy: — As I was saying he comes into this House on one of the few days he is in attendance and tries to turn a two-bit speech into ten dollars of political capital.

Mr. Willis: — He got it in the waste-paper basket.

Mr. Guy: — Any similarity between his statements and the truth is purely coincidental. And this is evident in his reference to social aid in northern Saskatchewan. Mr. Kramer said that according to the Department of Natural Resources Annual Report of 1964, there were 4,584 people on social aid in the northern half of Saskatchewan. What I want to know, Mr. Speaker, is why didn't he read all the sentence instead of only the last half.

An Hon. Member: — Couldn't read.

Mr. Guy: — Because if he was to read the whole sentence from which he quoted this is what he would find: "The total number of residents receiving assistance was 4,474 in 1964 as compared to 4,584 in 1963." Now I want to remind you, Mr. Speaker, that this is a difference of 110 and 1963 was the last year of the Socialist government.

Now actually, Mr. Speaker, I only mentioned this in passing because...

Mr. Kramer: — Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, he referred to a speech I made, I referred to the final report of 1966 which showed the social aid cost had gone up by 42 per cent. He is not quoting.

Mr. Speaker: — Order, order! Now the Member has already spoken in this Debate and having made his speech the other side has the right to rebuttal. You know it's rather remarkable it all depends...

Mr. Guy: — Mr. Speaker, I would refer to the Leader Post of February 25, 1967, and I am sure that all Members in this House realize and expect that the Press will report what they hear in this House and these are the exact words that are quoted in the press as having been said by the Member who has just left his seat. Mr. Kramer said that according to the Department of Natural Resources Annual Report of 1964 there were 4,585 people on social aid in the northern half of Saskatchewan. All I pointed out, Mr. Speaker, - and I don't know why he's so excited about it - is that he was right that there were 4,584 reported in the 1964 report because it covered the last year of the Socialist Government, but in the following year there were only 4,474, 110 less under a Liberal Government. However, as I mentioned, if he had given me a chance before jumping to his feet with his guilty

conscience, I only mention these figures in passing because relative numbers have little value in the discussion of social aid. What really determines the amount of social aid is the revenue which has been received from fishing and trapping, the two staple industries in our North. In good years the social aid payments decrease, in poor years they increase. There is nothing sinister or significant in the fact that social aid costs increased 42 per cent in a given year.

The Department of Natural Resources Annual Report shows that in that particular year the total value for furs produced was down \$175,000, while fishing returns were about the same. This added to increased population and more people living longer naturally makes for increased social aid.

However, there are several factors concerning public assistance in the North which I think should be made known and recorded in this House. One significant factor that I am proud of that has led to increased social assistance is the greatly increased number of students that are coming out of their local communities to attend high school. During the time they are at school they receive substantial clothing allowances, because we believe that they must be able to hold up their heads with no feeling of embarrassment because their clothing is not equally as nice as that of the white students from the city.

Another factor is that aid is divided into two categories, permanent and emergency. The Member from The Battlefords (Mr. Kramer) of course, wouldn't know that about his Department. It is significant to note that since a Liberal Government has taken office the emergency aid has decreased and will continue to do so as our placement, training and counselling programs, along with increased job opportunities from resource development, relieve the need for temporary aid.

On the other hand those on permanent aid are now receiving payments on basis of need so that they all might have at least a minimum standard of living. for the first time, Mr. Speaker, we have taken politics out of the handling of social aid in the northern part of our province. We pay it to Conservative, CCF, to NDP, Liberals Social Credit, and even a few Communists in my constituency as long as they require it. I am truly amazed, Mr. Speaker, that Members opposite would even raise the subject of social aid in northern Saskatchewan. Never was there such a mess as under the Socialists.

After we became the Government, I was getting letter after letter asking why one person was getting aid and one person wasn't when circumstances were similar. I was getting letters asking why one person got X number of dollars, someone else in exactly the same position got X-20 dollars. On checking, it became evident that one of the main criteria under the Socialists to become a social aid recipient was that you vote CCF. Many times I was told during election campaign, "I'm sorry, Mr. Guy, I can't vote for you because the CCF will take my allowance away and I can't afford that."

An Hon. Member: — Oh, nonsense.

Mr. Thatcher: — Shame, shame!

Mr. Guy: — After I became the Member of a Liberal Government I received letters begging that the Liberal Government not cut off their allowance because they had voted CCF. Needless to say, Mr. Speaker, this dastardly practice of the Socialist has been discontinued. Today those who need assistance, receive assistance, regardless of politics, and they receive enough to live on. By placing it on a needs basis rather than a how-you-vote basis everyone is getting a fair deal. Naturally, we are hoping that the time will come when no able-bodied man in our North will have to accept public assistance because there is no job opportunity available for him, and that greater assistance can then be provided for the aged, and those who through no fault of their own really need help.

Mr. Speaker, while I am still on the subject of northern Saskatchewan, I would like to make a few more comments. In an earlier debate I mentioned that in the North today it is unbelievable the change that is taking place. In three short years, the new Liberal Government has done more to develop our resources and provide services to our people than the previous Government did in 20 years.

Mr. Thatcher: — True, true.

Mr. Guy: — In 1964, Uranium city and LaRonge were in a serious state of decline. Today, both these communities have a bright future ahead of them. A major reason for this new life has been the mining incentive program instituted by our Government. The past summer saw more than 60 mining companies busily engaged in prospecting and development work in northern Saskatchewan. All the giants of the mining industry in Canada were represented. In the Uranium City area we had Eldorado, Motka of Canada, Numac Oils, Western Nuclear and Tobe Mines, to name only a few.

Mr. Thatcher: — Toby Mines?

Mr. Guy: — I don't know whether that name is after the Member from Cutknife (Mr. Nollet) or not. And I was most happy the other day to hear that Gunnar Mines will be back into the area this spring.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Guy: — In the LaRonge area were Falconbridge, Noranda, International Nickel, Kerr-Adison, Surry Rainbow, among others, while on the east side Hudson Bay Mining and Smelting were busy as were Share Mines and Oils, preparing their property for production in the Cumberland constituency. But like the Anglo-Rouyn mine and the Prince Albert pulp mill, I suppose the Member from

Cumberland (Mr. Berezowsky) will oppose this mine at every step of the way. By the way, I know, and I am sorry that he is not in his seat, that the Member from Cumberland would be glad to know his peanut mine is in full production of 900 tons a day and employing over 200 men, 25 per cent of whom are people of Indian ancestry.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Guy: — It was with further gratification that I heard our Minister of Mineral Resources (Mr. Cameron) state that the decline in base metal production which started under the Socialists has stopped and we are on the way to increased production. I am confident that this year will see some exciting announcements in the mining industry in the northern part of the province.

Transportation and communication are essential in providing access to our natural resources, and I am pleased our Liberal Government has recognized this responsibility, something which the former Minister of Highways (Mr. Willis) failed to recognize. They are continuing the rebuilding of No. 2 Highway to LaRonge and further north, the extension of the highway north from Pelican Narrows to Sandy Bay. I want to remind the former Minister of Highways — and I hope he will never be Minister again that this is the highway, Mr. Speaker, which the CCF promised in the election campaign of 1960 but which it took a Liberal Government to start and it will take a Liberal Government to complete.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Guy: — I would also like to remind the Minister of Highways (Mr. Boldt) that the poorly built roads of the CCF from Prince Albert to LaRonge will not last forever and consideration should be given in starting construction of No. 2 from the LaRonge end south.

I can assure our Government that the airstrips we built at Wollaston and Stanley, and the ones that are planned for Fond du Lac and Southend, plus the many needed improvements and construction on docks, access and development roads, are very much appreciated by the communities which they service.

I would like to refer for a few minutes to the field of education. And I am sorry that the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Lloyd) is not in his seat. In 1948, shop and home economics rooms were provided in the school at LaRonge; by 1962 both these rooms had been turned into classrooms with the result that shop and home economics classes were seriously curtailed. In addition to this, classes were being held in an attic and a room in an old building in the town.

Mr. Brockelbank (Kelsey): — Poor principle there.

Mr. Guy: — In 1962-63 the austerity program of the former Government had played havoc with the classroom situation in the North.

In Wollaston Lake and Pinehouse, schools were being used for children that weren't fit for animals, and then our friends opposite tell us what a great concern they had for education.

Fortunately since that time the Liberal Government has alleviated most of the problems and we are catching up on the backlog of school construction left by the Socialist. Ten rooms were built in LaRonge in 1965, three or four more will be built this year. The cattle barns at Wollaston and Pinehouse have been replaced by beautiful two-room schools and teacherages. many more examples could be mentioned such as Sandy Bay, Buffalo Narrows, Ile-a-labour-Crosse, where unsuitable classrooms have been replaced by new modern facilities.

This year we are spending \$640,000 for capital construction of northern schools compared with some \$250,000 in the last year of the Socialist regime and they have the audacity to criticize our education programs.

Mr. Willis: — Shame!

Mr. Guy: — Before leaving education I would like to point out just one more example of Socialist talk and Liberal action. There is a little Indian community at Montreal Lake that was badly in need of a new school. They had been telling their Member, the gentleman from Cumberland, (Mr. Berezowsky) for four years that they desperately needed a new school but all they got were promises. Finally, one day in the fall of 1965, word was passed to me the next time I went by the school the teacher wished to see me. A few weeks later, I stopped in and heard the whole sordid tale of how hard the teacher had worked trying to get her Member and the former Government to listen to her pleas. I promised I would do what I could. Well, Mr. Speaker, the Member from Melfort (Mr. Willis) is laughing, but one year later, thanks to the understanding of the Premier and the Minister of Education (Mr. Trapp), a brand new four-room school was opened in that community.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Guy: — Certainly a symbol of the desire of this Government to provide adequate educational facilities for the students of this province.

During the last campaign, Mr. Speaker, Members opposite went through my constituency telling the people that if a Liberal Government was elected, their cooperatives would all be closed down. Now I'm sorry, Mr. Speaker, I'm going to have to change from my remarks here, because I intended to say, what a pack of lies! I understand that this is un-parliamentary.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Guy: — However, what a pack of untruths! It is interesting

to note that after two and a half years of a Liberal Government, the co-opposition store in LaRonge had to double the size of their store to handle their business and every other cooperative without exception had increased sales and profits, a direct result of Liberal policies which are developing our resources and providing employment for all.

The only sad note, Mr. Speaker, in the past year in northern Saskatchewan was when the fishermen on Reindeer lake saw thousands of pounds of fish rotting on their docks as they waited for the rail strike to end, another group of innocent people that suffered from the power-hungry labour Members opposite, who sat idly by and refused to raise a finger on behalf of the farmers, the fishermen and any other primary producers who were suffering losses that ruined their whole economy.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Guy: — Yet they say they are the friends of the little man. Finally, I would like to congratulate our Government for the concern they have shown for the people of my constituency during the winter low-employment season, through an efficient and imaginative Winter Works Program which not only provided work, but also provided much needed recreation and other facilities in many northern communities.

In the last three years of CCF Administration they averaged \$80,000 on winter works, while in our first three years we have averaged \$200,000 in winter works projects.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Guy: — Mr. Speaker, before taking my seat I would like to pose a question which I know will be of vital interest to the people of Saskatchewan in the next election. What name will the Members opposite adopt on their campaign posters and ballots? Surely they won't try again to run under two names, one for the farmer and one for labour.

Mr. Thatcher: — What about it, Toby?

Mr. Guy: — Yet a press report leads one to be rather suspicious in this regard and I refer to statements made by the former Premier, T. C. Douglas. Either he is becoming confused in his old age or else he is trying to confuse the electorate of this province. This was one that appeared in the Leader Post, February 24, 1967. I hope you listen closely, because if you can make any sense out of it, you'll do far better than I.

Mr. Snyder: — What press report are...

Mr. Guy: — Douglas Said CCF Stronger. Then it says, "T. C. Douglas, Leader of the New Democratic Party, said at a press conference

Friday, in Hotel Saskatchewan, he believes his party..." Now which is his party, the CCF or the New Democratic? "...would be returned as the Government if a Federal election is held in either 1968 or 1969."

Mr. Brockelbank (Kelsey): — It doesn't matter to you.

Mr. Guy: — He was Leader of the New Democratic Party, but he was in Regina to attend a banquet in his honour organized by six CCF clubs.

Mr. Willis: — A good 2,000 people out too.

Mr. Guy: — Now Mr. Douglas said that he felt that the reason for the NDP — he was addressing a CCF club — going in as the Government in these years was that neither of the old line parties can cope with the problems facing Canada, and also because the NDP is attracting young people.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Guy: — Now this is the confusing part. He says the NDP is attracting younger people, and then he says the number of young candidates nominated by the CCF in Saskatchewan was an example of the party's vitality. Now what is the NDP's views got to do with the CCF?

Now I know that the Members opposite are thinking, "You know NDP, CCF, we are all one great big brotherhood." Not according to Tommy Douglas, he said the CCF and the NDP have to keep renewing themselves. We will all agree with that, because if there is anything that needs renewing and rejuvenating it is both of them.

Mr. Willis: — I don't blame you for being worried.

Mr. Guy: — So then he goes on to say he felt the Provincial CCF is stronger today, So, Mr. Speaker, I only raise this question because I know that this is going to be rather confusing for after reading this report one can only wonder: Who are the NDP? Who are the CCF? Why are Saskatchewan's Members calling themselves CCF instead of NDP? And if they are CCF why did they join the NDP a few years ago?

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Guy: — I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that it would appear we will probably have thirteen NDP candidates representing Saskatoon, Regina and Moose Jaw. We'll have four NDP-CCF, representing constituencies with rural and city voters and we'll have 42 CCF representing predominately rural ridings running around the province, not really knowing who they are, in the next election. Mr. Speaker, I am sorry, as I believe I made one mistake,

because on counting these up they add up to 59. But I believe that they are only going to nominate 58 candidates in the next election. I understand that I will be the one lucky candidate that won't have a CCF-NDP nominated against me.

Mr. Brockelbank (Kelsey): — You're too modest.

Mr. Guy: — A week ago I talked to two defeated CCF-NDP candidates in my constituency and asked them if they were ready for an election. This is what they said, "Allan, you must be kidding. We Socialists in your seat are so busy making money under the free enterprise system of your Government, we haven't time for politics."

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Guy: — In fact they said, "Very confidentially we would be most upset if your Government was defeated before we got our investments back, for we know we will lose everything should the Socialists be returned."

Mr. Nollet (Cutknife): — Table that report.

Mr. Guy: — Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I would like to say tonight that I dare the Socialists opposite to nominate a candidate in my constituency. In fact, I would invite the Member from Cumberland (Mr. Berezowsky) or the Member from Redberry (Mr. Michayluk) to come up to Athabasca so that we could have an invigorating and exciting campaign. Regardless of the name of the party, it is obvious they won't lack for promises. They have become known across the province as the party that never kept their promises.

Mr. Nollet: — Why talk so much about it, if you aren't worried?

Mr. Guy: — Until I read an article in the Leader Post of November 18, 1966, I always gave them the benefit of the doubt even including the Member from Cutknife (Mr. Nollet), believing that at the time they made their promises they really meant to try and keep them. But my faith in this regard has now been shattered.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Guy: — I want to refer to an article that appeared in the Leader Post November 18th, from the CCF convention — Policy Makers Critical:

Saskatchewan CCF policy makers were criticized Thursday, for not developing enough plain good old-fashioned

political promises.

Mr. Thatcher: — How about it, Toby?

Mr. Guy: — Delegate Harry Parkins of Nipawin, complained:

We sat here all day studying high blown papers and resolutions. Here we have something in black and white that 80 or 90 per cent of the people could understand and we can't get it through.

Mr. Speaker, he added:

If we had done a few simple things like this, we would have won the last provincial election.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Guy: — We need a few good black and white things like this.

Mr. Nollet: — You need a few like that.

Mr. Guy: — Listen, Toby. Toby, listen. We need a few good black and white things like this even if they might be a little in the realm of impossible to carry out.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Guy: — From this, I would warn the people of this province that as Socialist promises appear it would seem that they have no intention of keeping them.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I think we all agree that it is desirable to have our youth take an interest in politics. but I am somewhat dismayed at the underhanded approach to our young people that is carried out by the Socialist party across the way. They know that the youth of today are not Socialist inclined, so they use any devious means they can think of to bring school children into contact with the Socialist philosophy and to have them work for the Socialist party.

Several weeks ago in Prince Albert, members of the NDY, although not admitting who they were, went throughout the high schools telling students that a course in silk-screening signs was to be held in a local hall and all students were welcome. However, when they arrived at the place at the appointed time many were dismayed and angered to find they had been duped into attendance by the NDP-CCF. For Leader of the Opposition and behold, no sooner were these students inside the door than they were handed a pamphlet by one of the organizers. This, Mr. Speaker, is the pamphlet which they received: Co-operative Commonwealth Federation, The Saskatchewan Section of the New Democratic Party, How to Make Silkscreen Signs. The circular came from William Deverall,

special assistant to the Leader of the Opposition.

Mr. Speaker, this was a cheap political trick to use on 12, 13 and 14-year old students interested in art, to bring them into the fold of the NDP.

Mr. Weatherald (Cannington): — Really disgraceful.

Mr. Guy: — However, there were several passages in this pamphlet which I am sure Members of this House would like to hear. I am sure that the Member from Arm River (Mr. Pederson) and our Members on this side of the House would like to have some advice in political campaigning.

Mr. Willis: — We need it.

Mr. Guy: — Certainly from this document we can see that we can look forward to a bright and colourful campaign by the Socialists. First of all let's look at the introduction. It says here:

An explosive impact can be made at election time through the extensive use of bright easy to read, silk-screened signs. If each constituency can purchase a screen from the provincial office and start immediately running off signs for telephone and power poles, walls and fences, windows, front yards, on the date the election is called, the province will blossom like cherry trees in springtime.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Guy: — Well then we go on and we find that one of the biggest problems facing the NDP was the colours they were going to use in the next campaign. They said, "Remember the washed-out green and while signs of past campaigns, after a week or so that colour began to fade. The signs were forgotten and unseen. Now, day-glow orange and black should not fade quickly under normal weather conditions. The colours hit the eye from a distance. Everywhere in Saskatchewan those who see the CCF signs will identify the vivid black and orange combination with the CCF."

Mr. Speaker, I would remind you also that black and orange are most suitable for the party opposite, since they also represent the colours used for Halloween.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Guy: — No party has more tricks, more ghosts, more witches, haunting them than our Socialist friends opposite.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Guy: — Then they go on to say:

“The big advantage isn’t in making the screen, but it involves people, especially young people in political activities. Many supporters are unwilling to canvass or do other jobs for the NDP, but they can make their contribution at the silkscreen.”

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Guy: — The results of working at a silkscreen are obvious, and spectacular and give a feeling of satisfaction to the workers.

Well now we come to some very important tips on election campaigns and I want you to listen. It says the basic reason for putting up a sign is to tell the voters the name of the CCF candidate. Well I guess they should be known. But not only do the signs announce the name of the candidate, they also demonstrate his popularity. And in quantity they demonstrate his party’s activities and drives. In other words if there are ten signs up there, ten votes. If there are 100 signs up, there will be 100 votes.

Mr. Willis: — Thousands and thousands...

Mr. Guy: — Signs which are put on poles or trees must be placed high to prevent them being destroyed. How are you going to get them up there? It says, use a ladder. Can you imagine the Hon. Member from Hanley (Mr. Walker) or the Member from The Battlefords (Mr. Kramer) on a small ladder?

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Guy: — Well then you know, they spent a lot of time going on telling how to make these screens. Then they had a problem of whether they should put black on orange or orange on black. I don’t know whether they’ve got that decided yet or not.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Guy: — Well then they were concerned with the cost of these signs. It says, “These signs will be expensive, between \$6 and \$7.50. These can be sold by the constituency to farmers for use in patching granaries.”

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Guy: — Finally they conclude, Mr. Speaker, that if there are to be mistakes made in this program, the time to make them is before an election. And then one last reminder. “Silk-screening is exciting and a challenging project, but it has its drawbacks. It can do little more than shout the name of the candidate and the party.” And when they don’t know what they’re going to call their party, I’m afraid the whole process is going to fall to pieces.

Mr. Smishek (Regina East): — Don't hold your breath.

Mr. Guy: — Well, Mr. Speaker, in view of these slight errors from Members opposite, I think it is quite obvious that I will support the motion and oppose the amendment.

Mr. D. G. Steuart (Minister of Natural Resources): — Well, Mr. Speaker, it is pretty difficult to follow such a warm, friendly, non-political speech, delivered in such soothing tones. I was impressed not only by his frankness and his truth, but also by the rapt attention given by the Members opposite.

Mr. Nollet: — He's got a high shrill voice.

Mr. Steuart: — Mr. Speaker, he did ask a question and I'll give the Members opposite a little time if they wish to answer, as we are all interested to find out exactly what they are going to call their party in the next election.

Mr. Willis: — A Government.

Mr. Steuart: — Now, Mr. Speaker, I would first like to pay a tribute to our Treasurer.

Mr. Kramer: — Why?

Mr. Steuart: — I'll tell you why. In 1967 our Treasurer and our Premier, Ross Thatcher, in 1967 brought down the only Budget in this nation that was without a tax increase or without deficit, the only such Budget in this nation.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Steuart: — I'll remind this House that in New Brunswick, \$17,000,000 in tax increases this year; in Manitoba; \$17,000,000 in tax increases last year, \$40,000,000 in tax increases this year; in Quebec \$300,000,000 in tax increases in the last two years; in Ontario, \$200,000,000 last year and a deficit of \$140,00,000 this year. And even oil-rich Alberta will be having a deficit this year of millions of dollars. And Mr. Speaker, that's one more reason why the eyes of Canada are on Saskatchewan.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Steuart: — Industrial development, full employment, lower taxes. And I can tell you, Mr. Speaker, that as word of this spreads around Canada, we are going to have real problems accommodating the thousands of people the Socialists drove out, who will be coming back if the Liberals stay here for the next few years.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Steuart: — Mr. Speaker, I just want to deal with one thing in the Budget and that is the attempt by the Socialists opposite to discredit the fact that the Saskatchewan Power Corporation will this year pay a dividend of some \$3,000,00 to the people of Saskatchewan through the Government. Now the Socialist have tried to mislead the public by calling this legitimate payment a tax. In fact, Mr. Speaker, it is the theme of their amendment to the motion that we are now debating. Mr. Speaker, this has to be the weakest, saddest, the poorest effort, ever put forward by a so-called Opposition, in the history of this province. Mr. Speaker, let's look at this amendment. It says in part that it regrets that the Government has decided to extract taxes from the people by higher than necessary power rates. This statement is not only nonsense, it's the very essence of deceit. Mr. Speaker, I am sure that the Socialist know that their statements calling this SPC dividend a tax is nonsense. The Socialists for example have boasted inside and outside this House about the wonderful profits made by their Crown corporations. They have pointed with pride when some of this money was taken into revenue to help pay for Government programs. It wasn't a tax then. Oh no! It was Socialist planning at its best. But when we finally put the Power Corporation on the profit side of the picture, when we finally got things straightened out and the Power Corporation started making a profit, then we returned some of this money to the people, the Socialists screamed to high heaven. The Socialists are crying about power and gas rates and about the SPC profit.

But let's look at the rates first. the gas rates are the same as they were under the CCF. The power rates have in fact been reduced by 10 per cent to the people of Regina since we became the Government. The rates in the rest of the province are those put in when the CCF were in charge of the SPC. So, Mr. Speaker, if the rates are higher than necessary let the people put the blame where it belongs, on the Socialists.

This leaves the other half of their complaint, the fact the SPC is now making a good profit. How is it done with the same or lower rates? The Corporation now makes a much healthier profit than the Socialists were ever able to achieve. The answer of course is that we are now running the SPC as a business should be run. We keep our costs down, we don't waste the taxpayers' money on unproductive investments. The truth is, Mr. Speaker, that under the Socialists the then manager did exactly as he pleased. The Government never knew what was going on in that public utility from one day to the next. And in spite of the fact...

Mr. Willis: — Speak for yourself.

Mr. Steuart: — Oh, I'll speak for myself and I'll speak for the situation in the Power Corporation. In spite of the fact that the Leader of the Opposition, the present Leader of the Opposition, was once the vice-chairman, on the Board of the SPC, and the financial critic and Member for Regina West (Mr. Blakeney) was once the

secretary of that Board and in spite of the fact that other Cabinet Ministers from time to time were members of the SPC Board, the Saskatchewan Power Corporation was in fact, the kingdom, the plaything of the former manager, Mr. Cass Beggs.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Steuart: — Mr. Speaker, he had the Socialists opposite, absolutely buffaloed because he was the biggest Socialist of them all. The idea of making a profit was not in line with his principles. Mr. Speaker, I'm not talking about raising rates in order to make money, I'm talking about operating the business in the most efficient manner possible so that you can have some money left at the end of the year to give back to the people, if that is what is decided by the Government of the day. Mr. Speaker, we, the present Government, made a decision this year, to give the people back \$3,000,000 of their own money from SPC operations.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Steuart: — Mr. Speaker, we made that decision and the Corporation has been operated in such a manner as to allow us to decide what to do with the legitimate earnings of this public utility. But when the Socialists were in power they could never make this kind of decision because there were no profits left at the end of the year. The Manager, the then Manager of the Saskatchewan Power Corporation, had already decided for them. He had decided that there would be no profits to give back to the people. What had he done with the money? Well, I'll give you two examples. If the Member from Melfort-Tisdale (Mr. Willis) will keep quiet he might learn something, although having listened to him for a few years I think it's impossible. Well, in the first place, Mr. Speaker, they had far too many employees to start with. We're doing more business today with fewer employees on the SPC payroll than when we took over three years ago. In fact, Mr. Speaker, we have less than 2,800 employees on the payroll of the SPC. But had there been no change in the policy that we inherited, there would be today over 3,300 employees on the SPC payroll. Mr. Speaker, this alone is a saving of over \$3,000,000 annually.

Mr. Willis: — What arithmetic!

Mr. Steuart: — Well you figure it out, George, I don't know how far you went in school, you might have been a drop-out or a throw-out. But you sit down and you figure 500 people at about \$6,000 a year over three years and you'll come to several million dollars – if you can multiply that is. Mr. Speaker, I'll mention one other situation to give you an example of wasting the taxpayers' money. We have a computer at the SPC; we inherited that computer and the Government of Saskatchewan also has a computer – in fact has had for several years. They've been in the computer business long before we were the Government.

Now the Government under the CCF and under the Liberals rented their computer as do most other business concerns. Oh, but not the SPC, not the Power Corporation under the former manager. They bought theirs outright and do you know what they paid for it? About \$1,000,000, Mr. Speaker. that was one of the first things we found on the doorstep when we took over the SPC, a million dollar computer. it took almost two years of our time to get that computer working properly, and in the meantime we lost thousands and thousands of the taxpayers' dollars. Oh, that's not all about the computer. I might add that the former manager didn't even buy the same kind of computer that had been tried and tested by the Government. Oh no! He bought a special kind of computer and, Mr. Speaker, just as soon as that company had sold the SPC this computer, what did they do? They went out of the computer business. That was the first and last computer, well, it might not have been the first, but it certainly was the last computer they sold, they are not now and have not been for some time in the computer business.

Mr. Speaker, I could go on for hours outlining the waste and extravagance that existed in the Power Corporation and cost the people of Saskatchewan millions of dollars. It was a disgrace, but I'd like to point out that the blame for this must not be laid at the door of the staff of the Saskatchewan Power Corporation. They are and have been good, hard-working and intelligent people. I don't think we can even lay all the blame on the former manager, although it was his policy and his policy alone. No, Mr. Speaker, the blame for losing millions of dollars of our Province's money must go to the CCF Socialists who were the Government, through whose ignorance and carelessness and the shirking of their responsibility in regard to the running of the Saskatchewan Power Corporation, as long as they sat on this side as the Government. You know, Mr. Speaker, they know so little about business that I sometimes believe that we can't blame them too much for the mess they left us to clean up. But please, don't let them stand up now and talk to us about taxing the people, because we have succeeded in making a profit at the SPC without raising rates and are giving some of that profit back to the people.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Steuart: — Mr. Speaker, the people of Saskatchewan should never forget that the CCF Socialists cost them millions of dollars through their bungling of this Crown corporation, through their bungling and mishandling of the affairs of the people of this province. And now they're boasting about their record of no profit in the Power Corporation, actually boasting about the fact that they lost millions of dollars that the farmers and the people of this province worked so hard to earn.

Mr. Kramer: — Ever hear of reducing prices?

Mr. Steuart: — Once again, Mr. Speaker, the Socialists are trying to make a virtue out of their terrible mismanagement of the affairs

of this province. Mr. Speaker, we're proud of the record of the Saskatchewan Power Corporation now and we're proud of the good management, that has produced money that we can use to help pay for education, for roads and for social welfare and even, Mr. Speaker, to help pay the homeowner grant. This is in fact a dividend that with good management we have been able to pay back to the people of Saskatchewan.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Steuart: — Mr. Speaker, this is Liberal action. It's why our province is on the march and why we will be returned with a larger majority than ever whenever the Premier decides to call an election. You know, Mr. Speaker, there's another reason why we'll win the next election and that's the performance of the Socialists in Opposition. The Socialists were tired, they were old and they were dull as a Government. The CCF hadn't had a new idea or a new program for so long that the people finally put them out of office.

An Hon. Member: — They still haven't.

Mr. Steuart: — But they're harping and crying about their past, their destructive criticism about every action of the present Liberal Government, their refusal, for example, to even discuss the best Budget this nation has seen in 1967. All of these have convinced the majority of the people of this province that they are not yet fit to govern.

Mr. Thatcher: — How true!

Mr. Steuart: — In fact, Mr. Speaker, if the Leader of the Conservatives would show a little independence and a little backbone, I believe the people would not even send the Socialists back as the official Opposition in the next election. Mr. Speaker, they were failures as a Government, they are failures as Opposition and I will of course oppose the amendment and vote for the motion.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. G. T. Snyder (Moose Jaw City): — I think probably there's been a record established in this Legislature tonight for the complete waste of time and waste of the taxpayers' money after having listened to the tirade by the Member for Athabasca (Mr. Guy) for some 30 or 40 minutes. I hadn't intended, Mr. Speaker, until this afternoon to take part in this Debate for the purpose that I now join those who have spoken on the Budget. However, the remarks by the Member for Milestone (Mr. MacDonald) and the remarks by the Member for Prince Albert (Mr. Steuart) a week ago Wednesday and a number of others, has convinced me that I should say a few words on one particular topic that I want to deal with tonight.

I want to begin by saying that I deeply resent the statements that have been made by Members opposite who have questioned my motives in drawing attention to a matter of particular interest and concern to residents of the constituency that I represent. I want to say, Mr. Speaker, that this is a problem which is not new. It has been simmering for a good many months and I'm sure that if the present Minister of Welfare (Mr. MacDonald) wasn't aware of it, I'm sure that his predecessor was aware of the discontent and the problems which have been encountered in recent months in particular.

Some Hon. Members: — Who's responsible for it?

Mr. Snyder: — This problem was ignored, it was swept under the rug. I think the Minister is well aware of the fact that some months ago an investigation took place as a result of a number of complaints that were lodged by residents in the immediate area.

Mr. MacDougall: — What was the result?

Mr. Snyder: — The press accompanied the members from city council and looked into the whole matter. The results were somewhat frustrating and somewhat futile and were discouraging to those who took a deep interest in this particular matter. I hope, Mr. Speaker, that this matter is not a closed issue with the tabling of the document by the Minister of Welfare this afternoon. It's a sterile report and I expect, Mr. Speaker, that under the circumstances little more could have been expected in view of the fact that the investigation was conducted in the manner in which it was. The material that is contained in the document, of which I have a Xerox copy, Mr. Speaker, I could have written the bulk myself. In the main, the contents of the report can be found in the regulations which were issued in the Saskatchewan Gazette some time ago. Let me repeat, Mr. Chairman, that my motives in this particular connection are not political. I doubt if this same thing could be said for the Member for Prince Albert (Mr. Steuart).

Mr. I. H. MacDougall (Souris-Estevan): — What other motives have you got.

Mr. Snyder: — Members may recall that I devoted approximately three or four minutes of a 40-minute speech on this particular subject; only three of a total of about 40 minutes were used for discussion of this matter and this was done off the air and it was done off the air deliberately, Mr. Speaker. However, the Minister of Natural Resources (Mr. Steuart) rose in his place the following day and chose that opportunity on air time to make serious charges and a personal attack against me, based on the evidence, Mr. Speaker, gathered by the intellectual giant from Souris-Estevan (Mr. MacDougall) when he made a quick trip to Moose Jaw and by virtue of a telephone call which he made. I expect, Mr. Speaker, that there is very little value at this

time in a recitation of information which was conveyed to me by the operator of the Moose Jaw Ambulance Service and was later denied. However, I want to state categorically at this time, Mr. Speaker, that I am prepared at any time to swear under oath to every word that I uttered in this House, Mr. Speaker. And I wonder if Mr. Yates is prepared to make the same kind of a declaration. I can only state, Mr. Speaker...

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Snyder: — ...at this time that I regret the convenient lapse of memory of that particular person. It's extremely disconcerting to Member and disappointing, considering that he seemed to be sincerely concerned and interested when he spoke to Member less than a month ago on this particular topic. Following the Wednesday tirade by the Minister from Prince Albert (Mr. Steuart), I spoke to the Minister in charge of the Department of Welfare and I offered to him my services, and I offered to visit with a responsible member of his Department, those people who had offered information to me in recent months in the hope that the facts would be made clear to him and to the members of his Department. He gave this matter some consideration and after sleeping on my suggestion he declined the invitation that I had offered. I suggest that it is his prerogative and I have no quarrel with him in this connection. He informed me that he Department would conduct its own investigation in its own way. As far as I am aware, Mr. Speaker, not one of the interested parties that I had in mind was contacted nor did the Minister ask me for any information concerning their complaints or offer to interview them at that time. I am not aware of any attempt to contact any of the area residents.

Mr. MacDonald (Milestone): — I asked the MLA from Moose Jaw (Mr. Snyder) to give me the names of all those people who had personally complained to him. He told me specifically that he could not do so.

Mr. Snyder: — This is not a point of privilege, it's not even a fact. The Minister didn't make an attempt to find out from me those people that had complained and I would have been most willing to allow him to interview these people.

Mr. MacDougall: — Tell the truth.

Mr. Snyder: — Now, Mr. Speaker, no attempt was made when the investigation took place to interview area residents. The Minister, I am sure, is aware of the fact that a petition was gathered among area residents last fall, a petition that was circulated among area residents who had been complaining about a number of things, among them patients or guests wandering at large and lacking supervision. This petition was submitted to the administration hoc committee last fall. These complaints are still rampant, Mr. Speaker, and as recent as two or three days ago I had a call from two

carpenters working in the general area who picked up an old chap in 27 degree below weather. He was attired in slippers without socks and was in shirtsleeves and a light pair of trousers. They delivered him back to the institution. Now what the interest of the Government has in protecting this situation is beyond me. I'm just presenting facts to you and I have some more facts I'll give you in documented form. Now, if you'll just hold on to your seat for a minute I'll appreciate it.

An Hon. Member: — Yes, well, we'd appreciate a little...

Mr. Snyder: — I think there are a great many people, Mr. Speaker, that share my belief that there is a serious shortage of staff existing for the kind of patients that are being cared for in this particular institution. The regulations, Mr. Speaker, which I have on my desk draw attention to the fact that licensing procedures provide for intensive personal or nursing care accommodation. The second classification is limited personal care accommodation and the third is supervisory care accommodation. The report that the Minister tabled this afternoon drew attention to the fact that 22 of these people are intensive or personal care guests and they fit in that category. There are 84 guests who are limited personal care accommodation guests and there are six who fall in the supervisory care accommodation category, which indicates quite clearly that the large proportion of the guests in the institution are those who require a good deal more than supervisory care accommodation. A number of people have placed their friends or their parents in this institution and when they complain about a lack of care, they have quoted to them the document that I have before me, saying sufficient staff, including dietary, laundry and maintenance staff shall be employed to provide not less than 20 minutes direct supervisory care per guest per day. And when they complain they are asked, "Are you getting 20 minutes care a day? If you are what are you complaining about?" This is the way the institution is licensed. This is the story that has been told to numerous people who have complained about the kind of care that their people are getting in this institution. They have complained about it and they have been told, "When you get 20 minutes care a day that's all that you're entitled to."

Mr. Speaker, over a period of many months, there have been complaints that have been filtered to me. Individually I suggest that these complaints aren't conclusive in any way, but I say collectively they spell out a very serious matter in this particular institution. Mr. Speaker, I want to read into the records of the House some affidavits that have been offered to me, signed before me as a Commission for Oaths in the Province of Saskatchewan. With your permission and with an understanding from the Minister, I will provide a Xerox copy of these affidavits if he assures me he will keep the names of these people confidential. I will proceed but I would like this firm commitment from the Minister because these people have...

Mr. MacDonald: — Mr. Speaker, he can be sure of that as long as he tables the affidavits.

Mr. Snyder: — I want the firm understanding that these people's names will not be brandished in the press.

Mr. Speaker: — I must draw to the attention of all Members of this House to the fact that anything this is tabled becomes public property. Now I merely interpret the rules of the House and these are they.

Mr. Snyder: — Mr. Speaker, if it's agreed with the Minister of Welfare I'll take full responsibility for them rather than table them in the House. If he wishes I'll submit these affidavits to him at a moment directly after the adjournment of the House, if this would be with the agreement of the House. I offer them for the purpose of clarifying this situation and making Members aware of because of the controversy that arose as a result of statements that have been made. I would be more than happy to give them to the Minister if he will give me that assurance.

Mr. MacDonald: — Mr. Speaker, when we speak about what has happened in this issue in the past, I think that the inability to name specific charges is the specific problem that is facing us today. Therefore if the Member has specific names, specific complaints, he should be prepared to name those specific complaints and table them so that we might investigate them.

Mr. Snyder: — I have them here, Mr. Speaker, and I'll be more than happy to give them to the Minister directly after the House adjourns. If he's interested in the facts of this case then I challenge him to let me present this information.

Mr. MacDougall: — why didn't you bring it to him privately in the first place?

Mr. Snyder: — Mr. Speaker, I came by these as a result of the statements made by the Minister. I've had numerous people that have been calling me and wanting to volunteer information because of the speech that you made in this House a week ago Wednesday. Mr. Speaker, may I proceed on that understanding?

Hon. J. W. Gardiner (Melville): —Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, I believe that if the Hon. Member is going to read affidavits in this House they should be tabled. If he wants to give those affidavits in private to the Minister, well then he can do that afterwards. But if he's going to read them these documents should be tabled in the House.

Mr. Snyder: — Mr. Speaker, I'll take full responsibility for everything I have here. They are sworn affidavits taken before me.

Mr. Speaker: — To quote specifically from the affidavits, he has to table them, but I draw the attention of the House again that that which is tabled is the property of the House and it's public property for all to see and witness.

Mr. Brockelbank (Kelsey): — Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, I think that an affidavit is much in the same classification as a letter except that it is or has certain conditions that have gone with it as a guarantee of the truth of the matter. It certainly is not either the custom or the rule of the House that a private Member of the House must table a letter from which he quotes. The honour of individual Members is trusted to the extent that the House accepts a quotation when he gives it on his honour that it is from a genuine letter which he is quoting. Affidavits are nothing else but statements of people with the declaration attached to them and I think the rule for affidavits should be the same as for the letters.

Mr. A. C. Cameron (Minister of Natural Resources): — The Member says he's going to quote from affidavits, and then he will submit these affidavits in confidence to the Minister. Surely in this chamber if the man has the audacity to stand up and make a statement, he should be prepared to table the evidence with the Members. Every Member of this Chamber has a responsibility in this effect, not only the Minister. therefore the point of order is this, that anything that is read from must be tabled in the House and I as an individual will insist on that order, because I am interested in what he is quoting from and I have a right as a Member to ask that it be tabled so that I personally may see it.

Mr. Snyder: — On the point of order, Mr. Speaker, my reason for being somewhat reluctant to table these letters is because of the fact that some of these people, who willingly came forth and submitted this, have parents in the institution. Some of them are former employees who have been somewhat reluctant to sign their name to a document which may or may not place them in an awkward position. However, because they were concerned and interested in the matter, they came forth and willingly signed these documents which I think should be of interest to the Minister of Welfare. I'm willing to give the contents on my own responsibility with deletions of the names that are involved. I will give copies of them to the Minister for his own personal edification afterwards. I think I can do little more or less under the circumstances. If you're interested in the truth of this matter I would be more than happy to comply with you in this way.

Mr. MacDonald: — Mr. Speaker, on the point

of order I would like to say that if the Member is willing to give me the affidavits personally, I will check each and every one of them out, report either privately or publicly to this House concerning each and every one. But the whole substance, Mr. Speaker, of an affidavit is the signed document of the individual who submits the affidavit. Without the signature, without the witness of the person that signs the affidavit it is no longer an affidavit. And if this Member is willing to substantiate that affidavit and is willing to read it, then let him substantiate it in the normal form to make it an affidavit or let's not call it an affidavit.

Mr. D. Boldt (Minister of Highways): — The Hon. Member mentioned my name here before that I knew something about this. Now, he's talking about these people who have been in or come from Weyburn. They could be mentally retarded and those affidavits are not worth the paper they are written on.

Hon. D. V. Heald (Attorney General): — If I might for a moment, the Member for Kelsey (Mr. Brockelbank) made the point that so far as the proceedings in this Chamber are concerned, he felt that a letter was in the same category as an affidavit. surely he doesn't advance that proposal to you, Sir, seriously. There is all the difference in the world between an affidavit and a letter, any court will tell you that and any judge will tell you that. Many, many letters are not admissible in court, affidavits are. Affidavits are sworn. The Member for Moose Jaw stated that he took the affidavit as a Commissioner for Oaths. Now surely in all sincerity and in all seriousness he can't say in this House that we treat an affidavit, making allegations; I don't know what the affidavits say but presumably there are certain statements and allegations made under oath. I think it is a little late for the Member for Moose Jaw, the junior Member for Moose Jaw (Mr. Snyder), to now come along and sort of half heartedly tender this affidavit and then pull it back. Either he gives it to the Minister in confidence or he doesn't give it to the Minister in confidence. He has had all week to give it to the Minister in confidence. Now he comes along and says: "I want to read it publicly, I want everybody, I want the press to hear the affidavit but I don't want anybody to know the names. I'll tell you the names." He can't have it both ways. He can't speak out of both sides of his mouth, Mr. Speaker.

An Hon. Member: — Oh yes, he can.

Mr. A. E. Blakeney (Regina West): — Mr. Speaker, on the point of order, I think that the facts are that a private Member of this House can read from a document, can say that he will not divulge the name of a writer, can give it on his own full responsibility, and this is entirely within the rules of this House. If the Member wants to do it I think he's entitled so to do, and I doubt whether any pronouncements from Members opposite, while they make the rules up on their feet, can change the well-established rules of this House.

An Hon. Member: — We'll wait.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

An Hon. Member: — You're in full flight now, you're afraid.

Mr. Speaker: — Where does that unseemly row come from? I suggest that, if there's any coyote that wants to go bay at the moon he do it outside.

STATEMENT BY MR. SPEAKER

He said: Now, I quote from citation 159 of Beauchesne's Parliamentary Rules and forms, sub-section No. 3:

It has been admitted that a document that has been cited ought to be laid upon the table of the House, if it can be done without injury to the public interest. The same rule, however, cannot be held to apply to private letters or memorandum.

Now the question arises: Is this a private letter or memorandum or public document? As I understand it, the Member is referring to a signed sworn affidavit if I understand this correctly. And it is my personal opinion that if he is going to specifically quote verbatim from the signed sworn affidavit that was given to him by a person or persons, then he has to table them. If on the other hand he chooses to say in his speech that he has x number of affidavits which say this or that, he does that on his responsibility as a Member of this House. But if he tables the documents, again I say, regardless of any arrangement that the names be named or any commitment which may be given, those documents are public property the minute they fall into the hands of the Clerk. Now, I hope that I have made the matter clear.

Mr. Snyder: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I think perhaps this can be approached from a different angle, at least I trust it can. Perhaps I can relay to the House the information and the contents contained therein without quoting from the affidavits. I trust it's my privilege to relate to this House some of the statements that are made in the affidavits. With your permission I would like to proceed on this basis. I hope that this is within the rules of this House because I don't want to step out of the bounds of this Legislature.

In recent months, Mr. Speaker, I have had occasion to have a number of people call me and complain to me. One specific complaint relates to the mother of a Moose Jaw resident who was struck on the back and on the shoulders by a gentleman who is a male patient or a male guest at the Park Lodge Nursing Home who invaded her room. She explained also that she had been extremely unhappy with the invasion of her mother's room at all

hours during the day and night and she said that on numerous occasions guests have entered her room and in different stages of undress, thus making the institution somewhat less than a good place to live, resulting in a rather poor situation with respect to privacy. Her own personal effects were taken and disturbed on occasions. And as I said in the beginning, Mr. Speaker, perhaps, individually these mean little. I think collectively they do tell quite a story. Another case which was drawn to my attention and which, I think, has some significance when we talk in terms of the lack of supervision and the lack of care that is offered to some of these guests at the Park Lodge Nursing Home, relates to a guest at the Central Park Lodge who according to his wife suffered untold agony for about ten days with an ulcerated tooth. The management of the staff and the staff indicated that nothing could be done because her husband was a 'bleeder' and suggested that the tooth couldn't be removed for this reason. After suffering for some ten days with this particular problem, one of the lady's friends finally took the initiative and contacted the guest's doctor who said the guest wasn't a bleeder and there was no reason why the tooth couldn't be removed. He ordered that the guest be taken to a dentist and the tooth was removed with no harmful side effects. Another case which was brought to my attention in recent days...

Mr. Cameron: — On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, as I understood your ruling it was to the effect that he could in general talk about complaints and say that he had the affidavits to substantiate what he was saying. I would point out to you, Mr. Speaker, it is my belief that he is referring to each affidavit which he has and is giving the substance of that affidavit which is quite a different thing from talking in general terms about some of the complaints, and then saying that, "I have affidavits that support these complaints."

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Speaker: — If the Member has the affidavits to support the complaints, then I suggest he has to table the affidavits. If the Member is making statements on his own responsibility at the present time as a Member of the House, he can produce as much or as little evidence in support thereof as he sees fit, but if he is going to produce an official document, a sworn affidavit, which I contend is an official document, then he's in support of his allegations, then he is going to have to table it.

Mr. Snyder: — Mr. Speaker, I am reporting on matters that have been relayed to me on my own responsibility. I was drawing attention, Mr. Speaker, to another case respecting an old gentleman who was housed at the Central Park Lodge. Old friends of the family visited him on one occasion and discovered that he had stitches in his head and his arm was broken. He related the story to them as to how he had been struck by his roommate with a cane. The statement indicates that the broken cane was still on hand,

it was still there when the next visit was paid to this old gentleman. Park Lodge people related a story to the guest's son, saying that he had fallen from bed and had injured himself. Now there are a good many more indications that there is a lack of staff which I think is agreed upon by many people, resulting in a lack of care and a lack of attention that these people should have.

Now, I want to draw attention to another particular case that was brought to my attention involving a guest at the Central Park Lodge. This is an old gentleman who suffered a severe heart attack. He is described by his daughter as a wetter. He has lost control of his physical well-being. He's unable to speak because of the stroke that he has suffered. His daughter told me that in recent weeks they have been unhappy and disturbed because of the condition of his body which she says, to an unskilled eye appears to result from the fact that he has not been given the proper care and treatment and his bed hadn't been kept dry. He has become sore and blistered all the way up to his shoulders. I recognize, Mr. Speaker, that these aren't very pleasant or very palatable statements to be made in this House and I do it for one reason and one reason only. There has been a clear-cut effort to give a clean bill of health to this institution and I don't think it was warranted. I am unhappy and dissatisfied with the result of the investigation that the Minister of Welfare (Mr. MacDonald) initiated.

Another statement by another woman, perhaps rather minor, but very disturbing to the individual comes from a woman whose Mother is a guest at the Park Lodge Nursing Home. She complains that after having taken a full suitcase of clothing to the institution, a short time later her Mother was found in garments that weren't her own. They were badly worn, and the staff were unable to tell her where her Mother's clothing had disappeared or what had happened to her dentures which have also disappeared. I recognize that these are small isolated incidents which could possibly happen in any institution, but I say an accumulation of them indicates to me and should indicate to most people that there is something sadly amiss.

Another incident which I would like to relate to the House involves a woman who says that her principal complaint stems from the invasion of the privacy of her Mother both day and night. She told me that between Christmas and the New Year a male guest entered her Mother's room during the night and pulled the bedcovers from her bed, wrapped them around him and went to sleep at the foot of her bed. She was slightly hysterical and in an emotional state by the time someone finally answered her call light and removed this gentleman from her room.

I want to relate, Mr. Speaker, to information which was given to me voluntarily, after the Minister of Natural Resources (Mr. Steuart) made his speech on that Wednesday afternoon. I had calls from a number of former employees of that institution who said, "For heaven's sake don't stop it now, because you are on the right track." They came forth voluntarily – I have five of them here who have made statements...

An Hon. Member: — Mr. Speaker, he's referring to another debate.

Mr. Snyder: — Mr. Speaker, one of the statements which were offered to me comes from a former employee of the Central Park Lodge who says that he was alone with one nurse's aid on duty with some 80 guests at the institution. The other employee who was on duty, the nurse's aid, also was charged with the responsibility of washing soiled linen during the night as well as checking the patients during this time. She, during the course of her rounds, discovered a female guest dead on the floor. Her roommate, that is the deceased's roommate, had covered the lady's body with a blanket and it was discovered in a short time, but the lady had apparently died on the floor. The same night while making her rounds, the nurse's aid discovered the body of another guest who was already cold and blue and the statement suggests that rigor mortis had already set in at that time. She called for assistance and the incident was closed at that stage.

Another former employee, a nurse's aid, tells the story of being on duty the same night. She tells the same story of being obliged to make her rounds and change the beds and do the laundry during the course of the night and also looking after some 80 patients at the same time. She tells a similar story to the other one that I have just related to you.

Another former employee, who was employed as a nurse's aid says that she was required by management to dispense medication to guests at regular intervals and she said that as a nurse's aid, she felt she was not qualified to perform this function. She said, however, that she and other nurse's aids were required by management to do so. She also says she was of the sincere opinion that more staff were badly required because of the type of patients that they were required to handle in this institution.

Another former staff member draws attention to the fact that during 1965, the latter part of 1965, a former guest expired in the Providence Hospital in Moose Jaw. Early that morning a priest arrived to inform the deceased's wife of the death of her husband. She contacted the matron because they were having some difficulty with this woman. The matron instructed her to give this woman a hypo. She said she protested this and insisted that she was not qualified to perform this service, but the matron refused to come to the institution and she gave the hypo. I think perhaps you can understand my reluctance in letting these names be brandished around publicly because I think there is perhaps some doubt as to the legal responsibility of a person in this connection. This is why I offered these people my sincere word that I would not release their names and place them in a position of jeopardy. She goes on to say that the statement is in no way intended to indicate a reflection on the staff. She indicates that they are doing the best that they can, working under awkward conditions.

I have one last statement that I want to refer to this evening, Mr. Speaker. It involves another former employee who has some critical remarks which I won't relate to you at this moment in connection with the direct management. He said, in addition to this, that during the eight months that he was employed there, he was impressed with the lack of staff, lack of management and lack of supervision. He said he was employed as a caretaker, but was required to get guests up in the morning, dress them and prepare them for breakfast, and on numerous occasions he was called back to work to help to locate guests that had strayed and become lost from the institution.

Once again, I say, Mr. Speaker, that individually these statements probably mean very little because I recognize when you are caring for elderly people in this age category that they cause some real difficulties, I understand the average age is approximately 82 or 84 and I concede some complications will arise. I think this is inevitable. But I say to you when you have a voluminous accumulation of information such as this, it suggests that there is something amiss. It indicates that something deeper, an investigation in depth deserves to be taken into the operation of the institution. Something a good deal more far reaching than the investigation conducted by the Department of Welfare into the operation of this and other nursing homes in the Province of Saskatchewan is needed. I hope, Mr. Speaker, that if the Minister is as sincere as I believe he is, that he won't consider this to be a closed book, merely because the people in his Department have investigated and gone away giving the institution a clean bill of health. I hope he'll take another look and make it his business to see that better care and better attention is given to some of our senior citizens who are living out their declining years in the institutions across Saskatchewan. The standard of care which is provided in this institutions must be looked at again and with an eye to reviewing the regulations with respect to nursing home accommodation. We all know that in recent months in particular some 1,000 new nursing home patients have been placed in the community somewhere, people that were formerly patients of the Weyburn Mental Institution. I'm not suggesting in all cases that this creates the problem. I only say it has a tendency to make the problem that much more acute. I hope that something will be done in order to prevent some of the occurrences I have related tonight from being repeated. I note by the report that was submitted by the Minister that there have been some changes that have come about in recent days at the Central Park Lodge. From 11:00 p.m. until 7:30 a.m. the report notes that there are three aids and one maintenance orderly on duty. My information about a week ago was that there were two nurse's aids and one maintenance orderly on duty during that night shift. Apparently there has been an increase in staff in recent days and I say if this investigation has done nothing else, it has increased the staff to a very limited degree. But I'm only saying that I hope that this change in attitude isn't a temporary one at this institution, and I hope that there will be a follow-up to ensure that good service and good care is given to our senior citizens. I've been told by people who have someone as a guest at the institution that the care and attention that

they are receiving in recent days has improved. It has become somewhat better than has been the case in the past. One of the ladies that I know well whose Mother is in the institution has told me that in recent days when they visited her, the nurse's aid fluffs up her pillow, takes her temperature, washes her hands and face. This is the kind of treatment that hasn't been accorded to her recently until just the last few days, so I think there has been some effect and I just trust that this change won't be temporary in nature.

The senior Member for Moose Jaw (Mr. Davies) made mention of a citizens' committee which could be established to visit the institution. I think this is an excellent idea and I would hope that the Minister might see fit to recommend this to Moose Jaw city council or some other interested body. This could assure that follow-up visits be made and that there would be some place other than management to go in the local area where people are discontented and unhappy. A citizens' committee, I think, is a good idea. I just want to conclude by saying, Mr. Speaker, where there is this much smoke, I have to conclude that there is some fire too. My only interest, Mr. Speaker, is to find a solution in this continuing nagging problem. I think with the cooperation of the Department of Social Welfare, a solution can be found. If I had done any less than what I have done, I would have felt that I hadn't done my duty to the people that have brought these matters to my attention. I offer no apology to Members for having done what I have. Other efforts that have been made in this connection have been sterile in the past, and I hope, Mr. Speaker, that this won't be the case in this particular investigation. I hope the Minister will make it his business to do what he can to see that an objective standard is set. Something more realistic in the care of the aged in institutions such as the one we have been discussing is needed.

I fear, Mr. Speaker, that in view of the fact that this is a Budget Debate, that we have been somewhat off the track but the latitude of the Debate allows this kind of latitude for which I am grateful. I expect it would be conventional for me to say that I will support the amendment but I won't support the Budget.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. D. V. Heald (Attorney General): — Mr. Speaker, in rising to take part in this Debate, I'm not going to spend very much time on this shabby Moose Jaw business we've been listening to for the last few minutes, only to say this that I have been saddened and somewhat ashamed by the kind of Debate that we've had in the last few minutes by the Member for Moose Jaw (Mr. Snyder). He introduced this matter into the Legislature a few days ago without any specific examples. The Minister (Mr. MacDonald) offered to investigate the matter and now he comes in tonight with some affidavits he says — he doesn't table the affidavits, he makes general statements about certain things that were going on in the Home. He bares the most intimate personal details of the inmate's life

before this Legislature and says there must be something wrong, where there is smoke, there's fire. You investigate it. I say to the Member for Moose Jaw, in all sincerity: "Don't you think there would have been a kindlier way, a less cruel way to deal with this matter? Don't you think it would have been better to have gone to the Minister with chapter and verse? You went to him before you didn't have chapter and verse. Now you claim to have chapter and verse tonight, but you stand up here and for cheap, political publicity, you drag these people onto the floor of this Legislature." I'm ashamed that one of the Members of this Legislature would take these means.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Heald: — Now, Mr. Speaker, we were all amused a few days ago when the Member for Regina West (Mr. Blakeney) was speaking as the financial critic on behalf of the Opposition. He had a little skit that was really quite good and since it's getting late, perhaps we would all like to be entertained again for a little bit. We've had some serious moments, we had some lighter moments with the Member for Athabasca and the Minister of Natural Resources (Mr. Steuart). Perhaps we should go back to the little skit which the Opposition financial critic commenced the other day. You remember the routine about George and Ross, and Ross and George with reference to the Premier and the Minister of Education (Mr. Trapp), the Minister of Education trying to get money out of the Premier and so on. I was very entertained by this little skit and it displayed some talents that I didn't know the Member for Regina West had. I'm quite comforted in the knowledge that if and when (and I suppose this happens to all politicians sooner or later) the electors of his constituency retire him and if he gets tired of the law, he will be secure in the knowledge that he won't have much difficulty in obtaining a job on radio or on television. So I thought perhaps that Hon. Members might like me to continue this little skit so I will try to do so. Of course I'm not in his league so far as acting is concerned. But I'd like to change the scene a little bit, Mr. Speaker, and the cost of characters a little bit.

Mr. Kramer: — Here comes the greatest character that radio and TV has ever known.

Mr. Heald: — You're going to applaud in a minute because I'm going to change the scene and I'm going to change the characters, the scene after the next election and wonder of wonders. Now you can applaud in a minute. This isn't going to happen, but since we are in the realm of fantasy and the world of make-believe, let us just suppose that the Socialists are again the Government of this province. Now you can applaud.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Kramer: — So the scene has changed.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Heald: — Now we are going to change the cast a little bit. Woodrow is Premier and the financial critic is the Provincial Treasurer. And it is Budget time plus one, it's election time, plus one.

Woodrow says, "Allen, old boy, what have you got lined up for our first Budget?"

Allen: "Well, Woodrow, you know it's four or five years until the next election and we've spent a lot of money since we got in a few months ago. You know we had to give Henry "(I'm sorry he's not here)" \$10,000,000 or \$12,000,000 to finish his auditorium and of course we had to set up the centre for community studies again, a very important institution, and we had to set up the public administration foundation which cost \$1,000,000. And our friends in the OCAW, the bosses wanted a 30 per cent increase in their wages down at SPC and we can't have them going on strike and we can't antagonize them because they had their organizers in during the last election. They helped us get elected and of course we repealed Bill No. 2 at the emergency session which we had right after the election. So we can't legally prevent them from striking. We certainly can't have a strike in 30 below zero weather, so of course we gave them a 30 per cent increase. And of course, Medicare costs are continuing to rise and accident costs are continuing to rise. So all together, Woodrow, I have real Budget problems."

Woodrow: "Well, Allen, how do you propose to solve it?"

Allen: "First of all, we can put the tax back on purple gas. We'll get \$5,000,00 or \$6,000,000 there. Then we can abolish the homeowner grant, that's another \$9,000,000. I never like it anyway. Then we can stick the three cents per acre tax back on the owners of mineral rights. Maybe we could even increase it to five cents per acre. It isn't very much. And you know, there will always be some farmers who will forget to pay the tax, that worked pretty good before. The Crown will get some more minerals back and then we'll get even more royalties. That worked real good before. Then we could always cut the equalization grants to municipalities. You know those silly Liberals in 1967 raised the equalization tax from \$600,000 to municipalities to \$2,400,000. We could move that back to around \$500,000. Then we could cut out the snow removal grants that the Liberals brought it."

Then Woodrow comes in. Now this next sentence, Mr. Speaker, is not original. I'm indebted to that paragon of journalistic integrity, Mr. Tom Alderman for this next sentence. And the sentence is:

Woodrow: "Allen, my boy, you wouldn't be putting your old

Premier on, would you?"

Mr. Steuart: — ...be putting him off.

Mr. Heald: — "That would be murder in the country. The farmers wouldn't like that. The farmers like purple gas. Look what happened to Arthur Thibault (Member for Kinistino). Everybody likes homeowner grants. You said so yourself, Allen, at our Convention in 1966."

Allen: "Who cares about the farmers" They mostly voted against us anyway. We got to look after our friends, the trade union bosses. Anyway we can take care of the farmers. All we've got to do is bring our friend the Mayor back and he can start talking about the country system. that will keep the farmers busy for awhile, fighting that."

Mr. Speaker, I could go on and I know my hon. friends aren't very amused. I'm disappointed, I thought they might be.

Mr. W. E. Smishek (Regina East): — ...You just haven't got it.

Mr. Heald: — Mr. Speaker, I'm like the hon. gentleman from Prince Albert who has been in this province the last two or three days and he's been, he says, listening to the grass roots grow even in the winter time.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Heald: — And I've been out in the country the last two or three days in different parts of the province and I've been listening to the murmur of the grass roots too. And I'll tell my hon. friends opposite, that the kind of image that you are presenting to the people of Saskatchewan in the rural areas, is the kind of image that I've been talking about for the last five minutes.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Heald: — The farmers of this province know and the people in the rural areas of this province know that if you are the Government after the next election, they can just kiss good-bye to these things that I have been talking about for the last few minutes. The message has not been lost on them, I can assure you. So I'm indebted to all the Hon. Members who have taken part in this Debate over the last ten days because you've certainly got the message across to the farmers of this province loud and clear.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I would like to make a few references to some of the things that the financial critic said about the very bad negotiators that we are when we go to Ottawa. And of course this is typical of the Socialists you know. They always think they can make a better deal or do a better job. They are

just a little bit smarter than anybody else anywhere in the Province. Well, you know we got along in this province for quite awhile...

Mr. J. H. Brockelbank (Kelsey): — I think you could do worse.

Mr. Heald: — ...without some of these people across the way. We struggled along in this province without the Member from Regina West (Mr. Blakeney) for 25 or 30 years and maybe we can do without him again. But I would like to remind Hon. Members the kind of negotiators that the Members opposite were when they were the Government and when they went to Ottawa. I would like to point out that our initial position when we went to Ottawa was identical to that proposed by the Members opposite when they were in power: that is to say, the Province's share of the three standard taxes would be equalized to the top province and all other Provincial revenues to the national average. As a matter of fact, the new equalization formula, Mr. Speaker, is different in one very significant respect from the formula which the Government of Saskatchewan has long advocated; that is to say, the three standard taxes would be equalized to the national average rather than to the yield of these taxes in the highest province. Now we forcefully reminded the Federal Government that departure from this principle of equalization, of the standard taxes to at least the highest Province was a withdrawal from the commitment which it had made to the Provinces and the people of Canada at the time it took office.

I'd like to remind Hon. Members opposite that so far as negotiating these agreements is concerned, you haven't anything particularly to be proud of. You people were at the negotiating table a few years ago when the deductions for natural resource revenues were introduced into the formula. This change, Mr. Speaker, cost the people of Saskatchewan between \$5,500,000 and \$6,000,000 annually due to the loss in equalization grants. Where were you then? You didn't do such a good job when you were down there. It was your Government which negotiated the terms of the same equalization formula which saw revenues from the standard taxes equalized to the national average rather than to the top two Provinces. As a matter of fact, it wasn't until 1964 with a Liberal Government in Ottawa that the basis of equalization reverted to the equalization of the standard taxes to the top two Provinces. It ill-behooves the hon. gentlemen opposite to throw out their chest and say we are the great masters, we are the great negotiators. You didn't do anything particularly to be proud of. You lost money for the people of Saskatchewan, when you were down there.

An Hon. Member: — We didn't do as badly...

Mr. Heald: — Now, Mr. Speaker, the financial critic made a number of statements about the operations of the Local Government Board. And since I report to the Legislature for the Local Government Board, I would like to make some comments in this

regard. At the outset, Mr. Speaker, I would like to say that I was shocked as were many, many, people in this province including the members of the Board, at the criticism directed by the Member for Regina West, (Mr. Blakeney) at the Board. I think it is the first time that anybody that I have spoken to can recall that there has been this type of criticism directed to this Board, either inside or outside of the Legislature. Now you might disagree with some of the decisions of the Board, but nobody before has attacked the independence or the integrity of the Board. And it's a kind of peculiar thing, Mr. Speaker, that they would see fit to attack people whom they appointed to the Board, whose integrity, whose reputation in this province is beyond question. Mr. Eric Mackay, once a CCF Member of Parliament, appointed to the Board by the CCF Government under Premier Douglas, now because he has committed the unpardonable sin of working for the Liberals is all of a sudden biased. He is subject to being told what he has to do and all of a sudden the Board is no longer independent. This is the kind of thing, the innuendoes that the Member made the other day. One statement that the Member from Regina West (Mr. Blakeney) made, and I am quoting from his speech, "The Premier issued a virtual edict to the Local Government Board." Not true, absolutely not true. I have spoken to all members of the Board. Neither Premier Thatcher or any other Member of the Government has issued any orders to the Local Government Board as to the decisions it should make.

Mr. Blakeney: — Tell that to the Financial Board.

Mr. Heald: — The Premier and the Members of the Government have respected the independence of the Board. It should be emphasized that the Board has developed its own policy and assumes full responsibility for its actions. Another statement: "The Local Government Board is the Provincial Government agency which is designed to okay municipal finances." Now the Member knows better than that. The Local Government Board is not a rubber stamp.

Let me read sections of the Act:

Paragraph 1, sub-section 1 of section 17. The board shall have power; 1. to inquire into the merits of any application of a local authority for permission to raise money by way of debenture or upon the security of stock, and to grant or refuse such permission.

Section 16; The board in conducting its inquiry and in arriving at its decision shall consider the nature of the work, undertaking or other object of the proposed loan, the necessity for expediency of the loan, the financial position of the local authority and such other matters as in the opinion of the board may call for consideration.

Is this the duties of a rubber stamp? This Board acts in a

judicial capacity and they make a judicial determination, and they are not a rubber stamp. And I am surprised that the Member opposite who was a Minister of the Crown for many years, would make that statement. These are his exact words. “The agency is designed to okay, that means rubber stamp, municipal finance.” Another statement, “Projects which have been approved by the cities, passed by ratepayers, with the full knowledge of high interest rates, were cut back, refused.” You said that. In the recollection of members of the staff of the Local Government Board, none of the projects refused by the Board had been approved by the burgesses. As a matter of fact it would be irregular for a debenture bylaw to be submitted to a vote of the burgesses prior to Local Government Board authorization. So you are wrong again.

Mr. Stuart: — You should know that.

Mr. Heald: — The statutory provision is that the authorization of the Board must be obtained before the matter is submitted to a vote of the burgesses. So you are wrong. Three up, three down, all wrong.

Mr. Blakeney: — Rough shape Davey.

Mr. Heald: — I am quoting you again. “So far as I can find out, the Local Government Board, never in all the twenty years of CCF Government, formally rejected a single debenture issue.”

An Hon. Member: — Oh, oh.

Mr. Heald: — Now, Mr. Speaker, I looked up in surprise when he made that statement and I suppose he saw me because then he tried to backtrack a little bit and he said, “Well it might have happened and if it did, it might have happened once or twice.” Wrong again. During the 20 years that the Socialists were the Government of this province there were at least 29 applications for permission to borrow money by way of debentures, which were refused, involving a total of \$2,162,000. That’s how close you were. Now, not even that is the whole story. During the same period there were many instances where the officials of local governments did not file applications because it was known that the Board would probably refuse to approve them. These situations usually resulted from conferences with the Board, at which time there would be a general recognition of the fact that perhaps the merits weren’t there. But to make this statement, never in 20 years, and then say maybe once or twice, 29 times over \$2,000,000. How far out can you get?

Now, the next statement that he made – and I can’t really blame him for this, Mr. Speaker, because he did quote a newspaper article, and the newspaper article was wrong – came from the Saskatoon Star Phoenix and was repeated in the Regina Leader Post. The headline, and the Member read the headline, was that 70 per

cent of debenture values were refused by the Local Government Board. Now I asked the Chairman of the Local Government Board about this and apparently this story came as a result of an informal discussion which he had with a reporter of the Star Phoenix. He didn't have the annual report before him and he made it very clear to the reporter that he was guessing. He didn't know the percentage of applications that were being turned down, but anyway this statement came out as 70 per cent. Now what are the facts? In 1966 applications for a total amount of \$46,000,000 have been considered by the Board. Of this total, \$9,500,000, has been refused. This represents about 29 per cent of the total value that has been turned down. Not 70 per cent. So that's wrong. And I want to correct that. I don't blame the Hon. Member for that because he quoted from the press. And then he made another statement, that over the years the previous Government did what was necessary to enable local governments to sell their debentures. The Government bought millions and millions of dollars of these debentures. Well, sure they bought some debentures. But we are doing the same thing. As a matter of fact I looked the figures up. You get the impression from what he said, that they helped out local government and then the big, bad, Liberals quit and didn't help them out anymore. That's the impression that he left. All right, let's look at the figures. From 1957 to 1964 they purchased debentures on an average of \$3,769,000 per year. The total for the years 1965 and 1966 under our Government was an average of \$5,833,000. Nearly double.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Heald: — That's a little different than the impression you created with that statement. Now, Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Member made some reference to the situation in Dieppe Place in the city of Regina. There are problems in the city of Regina and they didn't start with this Government taking office in 1964.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Heald: — First there was a heavy debt burden in the city of Regina. Commencing with the year 1962, the Local Government Board periodically from time to time has issued warnings to the officials of Regina that the debt of the city was reaching dangerously high levels. Concern was expressed on numerous occasions by different investment dealers in regard to this matter. At times, and from time to time, the Board has made various suggestions, most of which have not been followed, and the situation has therefore been worsening. For this reason the Board has been convinced, and is convinced that further borrowing by the city of Regina will have to be viewed with a considerable amount of caution. In the year 1966 the records show that 28.4 per cent of the expenditure in the city of Regina was required for debt retirement, nearly 30 per cent. And secondly, the Local Government Board strongly recommended to the city of Regina that careful use be made of any surplus money, in the

direction of the most urgent capital programs. Now we understand, the Board understands, that the boundaries of Education did have some surplus money which it had planned to use in providing new office space. Now while the Local Government Board doesn't criticize the trustees of the Board of Education, and realizes that they have a problem in respect to office facilities, we feel, and the Board felt that a reasonable case could be made for the use of these surplus monies for at least some of the projects involved in the debenture application, more particularly Dieppe Place. In other words, the position is, Mr. Speaker, that the Board of Education could determine the priority of capital requirements within the bounds of funds available. And if they did so, they did have the resources by establishing their own priorities to take care of the situation in Dieppe Place. So that is the situation in regard to Dieppe Place and the position of the Local Government Board.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Heald: — Now, Mr. Speaker, I don't want to say very much more, but there was a reference by the Member from Regina West (Mr. Blakeney) and here again, this is in character. He attacked the integrity of the Local Government Board. And then he attacked the integrity of the Board of Arbitration set up under the Essential Services Emergency Act. And of course, by inference he attacked Judge Kindred, who is the Chairman of that Board. That's particularly for the course. He attacked the Local Government Board, attacked the judges of the courts, heaped scorn on our established institutions. He called the Board of Arbitration a Kangaroo Court, a Thatcher Court. Judge Andrew M. Kindred of Yorkton, one of the most honourable men in this province, presiding over a Thatcher Court and a kangaroo Court!

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Heald: — He even went further than the OCAW. The OCAW wrote me a letter in which they advised me that there were two District Court Judges in this province, whom they didn't want on the Board. The inference was that all the other District Court Judges in the province were suitable to them. And the Government didn't appoint either one of them, we appointed one that they apparently agreed to. So you have gone further than they have.

Mr. Smishek: — How far can you stretch that?

Mr. Heald: — I haven't stretched it. I've got the letter here, and you know the letter. It's the same old story, Mr. Speaker, heap scorn, discredit the courts, discredit the administrative tribunals, discredit in advance any decision that might come from this court. This is what he did. I am ashamed, once again, I am ashamed. It's not worthy of you.

Mr. Speaker, I think you will observe from the remarks that I have made, that I am prepared to support the motion and not support the amendment. I have listened with a great deal of interest to all of these speeches that have been made. There was a reference by one of the speakers earlier about the Budget not being constructive, about this Government not being progressive. I don't think that the people of Saskatchewan agree with that and I don't think that the people of Canada agree with that. I think some of the legislation which is going to come before this Legislature is going to be the most progressive legislation on this subject in our country. And I have in my hand an editorial from the Vancouver Province in which they are chiding the Government of British Columbia because it is not taking the lead which Saskatchewan is showing in this matter of compensation to victims of crime. And I just want to read the last paragraph: "Once again it has been left to another government to show B.C. the way. Saskatchewan will soon debate in its Legislature a Bill to compensate victims of violent crime. Perhaps B.C.'s Legislature..."

Mr. J. H. Brockelbank (Kelsey): — Point of order. Is the Hon. Member now giving second reading to this Bill?

Mr. Heald: — No, I am just reading a newspaper article which I'll table.

Mr. J. H. Brockelbank (Kelsey): — Well, it seems to me like he has started debating a Bill, which is on the Order Paper. I am sorry that I have to interrupt...

Mr. Heald: — "Perhaps B.C.'s Legislature should sit in the fall instead of the spring, then it would have time to copy from other Legislatures the new ideas it seems to have trouble finding for itself."

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. J. A. Pepper (Weyburn): — Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to adjourn the debate.

Debate adjourned.

The Assembly adjourned at 9:47 o'clock p.m.