

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN
Fourth Session — Fifteenth Legislature
19th Day

Wednesday, March 1, 1967.

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

WELCOME TO STUDENTS

Mr. E. Whelan (Regina North): — Mr. Speaker, through you and on behalf of all Members, I would like to welcome to the Legislature approximately 70 grade 11 and 12 students who are in the speaker's gallery. They are from O'Neill High School in North Regina. With them are their teachers, Mr. Echel — mathematics and science; Mr. Berezny — history, and Mr. Peter Fieger, vice-principal. Among the group is my eldest daughter, Gaile. I am sure all Members join me in expressing the wish that their stay with us will be educational, pleasant and informative.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. W. E. Smishek (Regina East): — Mr. Speaker, on your behalf and on behalf of the Members of this Assembly, I would like to welcome a group of grade eight students, some 60 of them, who are seated in the west gallery from Imperial School. They are accompanied by their teacher, Mrs. Oberg and I'm sure that the Members of the House would like to extend to them a warm welcome and express the hope that they will have an enjoyable day with us and that their stay here will be both educational and informative.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mrs. Sally Merchant (Saskatoon City): — Mr. Speaker, I see the Member for Hanley (Mr. Walker) is taking his seat at the moment, but I thought again today he might not be with us and I didn't want the group from Sutherland School to go un-welcomed in this Legislature. So I, coming from Saskatoon, and Sutherland of course being a part of the city of Saskatoon, take pleasure in introducing to you, Mr. Speaker, and to the Members through you, a group from Sutherland School whom I welcome to the Legislature and hope they will enjoy their day in Regina.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. R. A. Walker (Hanley): — Sir, I'd just like to join with what the Lady Member for Saskatoon (Mrs. Merchant) has said. Since she is well reminded that Sutherland is still part of Hanley constituency, I won't mention that this time. I want to say that I am very proud and pleased to see the Sutherland School here. This is the school where my two oldest children got their public education and

and indeed one of them now teaches there. I have a very fond recollection of Sutherland School because our family was very closely connected with Sutherland School through the years and Sutherland of course being my hometown, I'm pleased to have them here. I hope they will enjoy themselves and on your behalf, Mr. Speaker, I want to express the hope that every Member of the House who is taking part in the proceedings today, will try to maintain an unaccustomed dignity so that these students will go home with a favourable impression of the Legislature.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. H. H. P. Baker (Regina East): — Mr. Speaker, I would also like to welcome a group of students from the St. Thomas School, some 30 in number under the direction of Mr. Yano, their principal. I certainly want to extend a warm welcome to them. They are in the east gallery behind me here. I also want to say hello to the students from Wascana School, the Imperial School and O'Neill High and also to the Sutherland students who are here from the good city of Saskatoon. I'm sure that this is one way that we can promote good citizenship through our schools by coming to the Legislature and learning the ways of their democratic institutions in which the laws are made. We welcome them most sincerely and particularly St. Thomas which is my area, and wish them a very fruitful and pleasant stay this afternoon.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. D. T. McFarlane (Minister of Agriculture): — Not to be outdone, Mr. Speaker, by the urban centres, I want to welcome a group from Francis High School in the west gallery this afternoon. I'm sure that they will enjoy themselves for the balance of the day. We wish them a safe journey home after they watch the marvellous behaviour of themes on this side of the House during the balance of the day.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

ANNOUNCE RE: SASKATCHEWAN SAVINGS BONDS

Hon. W. Ross Thatcher (Premier): — Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, I would like to tell the House of the progress that has been made with the sale of

Saskatchewan Savings Bonds to date. As of last night \$5,300,000 had been sold as compared to \$4,700,000 in the same period a year ago.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Thatcher: — We are still hopeful that the total will exceed the \$12,000,000 figure of last year.

ANNOUNCEMENT RE: ST. DAVID'S DAY

Mr. A. E. Blakeney (Regina West): — Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, I would like to call attention of Members of the House to the fact that this day is March 1, Saint David's Day. If any of them missed the significance of these outsize daffodils, that is indeed it. Saint David as you know is the patron Saint of Wales. He was known as a scholar, a man of learning and peace and preached peace and brotherhood and practised what he preached. He might even have a message for this Legislature from time to time. Legend tells us that he slew no dragons or uprooted no snakes from Ireland. But then legend also tells us that Saint David was a temperate man and of course that sort of cuts down on the available supply of dragons and snakes.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Blakeney: — Wales is really a land which honours its singers and its poets, its men of the mind and spirit. I suggest that these are trades which mankind needs to encourage and I'm sure therefore that the House will join with me, not in any sense of nationalistic pride, but rather in a spirit of doing honour to our citizens of Welsh ancestry and of doing honour to the ideas and ideals for which Saint David is famous. I invite you and through you, Mr. Speaker, all Members of the House to join in paying a tribute to Saint David, to our citizens of Welsh ancestry and to Wales.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. A. R. Guy (Athabasca): — Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, it was brought to my attention that a Member should be prepared to table any documents that he reads from in his speech. Therefore, I would like at this time to table the pamphlet "How to Make Silkscreens", from William Deverall, special assistant to the Leader of the Opposition. I truly believe this is one document that all Members of the should have access to.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

ADJOURNED DEBATES

BUDGET DEBATE:

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion

the Hon. W. Ross Thatcher (Provincial Treasurer) that the Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair, and the amendment thereto by Mr. Blakeney (Regina West).

Mr. W. A. Robbins (Saskatoon City): — Mr. Speaker, perhaps I should preface my remarks with a word or two concerning the performances we witnessed yesterday in the House in Budget Debate. First, we were favoured with a rendition by the roustabout, the artful Athabaskan, who gave us a lecture on social aid. Mr. Speaker, the \$18,000 per year social aid recipient from the Athabasca constituency should be the last person to deliver a lecture on the administration of social aid to anyone. Eventually he got all mixed up, with ghosts and goblins and Hallowe'en. His nom de plume will have to be changed, Mr. Speaker, from Gigolo Guy to Gobbledegook Guy.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Robbins: — Then we were favoured with...the Member from Athabasca should close his mouth, I can see his fallen arches.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Robbins: — Then we were favoured...

Mr. Speaker: — I consider that the reference to any Member of this House as a Gigolo is absolutely out of order. I would ask the Member to withdraw that. That's absolutely un-parliamentary.

Mr. Robbins: — I shall withdraw, Mr. Speaker. Then we were favoured with a rather picayune performance from the pixie from Prince Albert...

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Robbins: — ...who lectured us on power profits and failed, however, to mention the Liberal leadership in the prostitution of power potentialities in this province. This Lilliputian leprechaun, this noisy little nuisance from the northern woods, did not reduce the credibility gap by one iota.

Perhaps, Mr. Speaker, the most pitiful performance came from the Hon. Attorney General (Mr. Heald). This is really too bad. Most of us hold him in reasonable esteem. Can't you just see him, Mr. Speaker, out in Lumsden in the Qu'Appelle Valley with his head poked into a three-foot snow drift, posterior precariously pointed to the sky, listening to the whispering and the rustling of the grass roots.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Robbins: — He said he heard them and they told him some things about the next election. Well, what he really heard, Mr. Speaker,

was the whisperings of Wilbert in Los Angeles or the rustling may have been Rustler Ross slamming out slogans in sunny San Francisco about Socialist stagnation in Saskatchewan.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Robbins: — Mr. Speaker, in participating in the Budget Debate of the fourth session of the fifteenth Legislature, I too would like to commend the Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Thatcher) on his presentation. He is a forceful individual, Mr. Speaker. He forces one to realize very vividly how unfortunate are the people of this province to have him and his Government in charge of the Treasury benches. The Member from Maple Creek (Mr. Cameron) ridiculed Opposition charges that the Government was bent on its own destruction. The proper term would be hell bent. This same Member ridiculed the Opposition when we criticized the Government for not reducing power rates but using instead \$3,000,000 of power profits as current revenue. He said the rates were set by the previous Government. They were, but he has conveniently forgotten the previous Government made many reductions in power rates during its term of office.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Robbins: — Mr. Speaker, I would like to make a few remarks with respect to the city of Saskatoon which I along with four other Members of this Assembly have the honour to represent. The city of Saskatoon like other municipal governments throughout Saskatchewan has many severe financial problems. In many respects the financial problems which confront my home city are much greater than those confronting other municipal governments. These are dependent to considerable degree on the potash developments on the periphery of my home city. The Alwinal Plant at Lanigan, Allan Potash at Allan, Potash of America at Patience Lake, were all initiated or announced long before the election of the present Government. Duval, Cominco and Noranda are additional mines in the process of construction and development. These developments put heavy pressure on the finances of the city of Saskatoon. Most of the services related to traffic control, schools, fire and police protection and other municipal services to meet the needs of the construction workers and their families must be met by the city of Saskatoon. Compensating revenues to meet the heavy expenditure required are not available. This is due to the fact the mine sites, Mr. Speaker, are located in the periphery area. The Government of Saskatchewan in typical Liberal fashion provides no answer to these problems. It says, and I quote from the Budget Debate, the Provincial Treasurer's Budget address:

During the year because of the tight money situation municipalities experienced some difficulty in obtaining funds. The Government for some time has been giving consideration to the setting up of a Municipal Loan and Development loan Fund, but in view of tight money and

high interest rates, the Government does not feel that the time is yet opportune for such a fund.

This is the regular Liberal logic and solution, Mr. Speaker, do nothing, the time is not ripe, it's a good idea, sometime in the future we may get around to doing something about it.

Well, Mr. Speaker, the Government should know a great deal about high interest rates. It floated a \$15,000,000 debenture issue dated October 1, 1966, at a cost of 6.45 per cent. The Treasury officials of this province had largely completed negotiations for the flotation of this security at the end of June in 1966. Investment houses contacted possible purchasers with respect to the flotation. Less than an hour after this release we were notified that the Toronto Metro, a municipal corporation, was on the market with a debenture issue at a cost to that corporation of 6.09 per cent. It is a well-known fact, throughout the investment community, Mr. Speaker, that this Saskatchewan issues was withdrawn because Big No. One willed it so. He wasn't going to pay an interest rate of 6.09 per cent, he wasn't going to pay as much as the municipal corporation and he didn't Mr. Speaker. He waited three months and then paid 6.45 per cent – an increase of .36 per cent. I would like to point out to the Members of this House, Mr. Speaker, that .36 per cent increase meant an increase in the cost of interest on that debenture issue of \$54,000 a year, a total of \$1,080,000 to the taxpayers of this province in terms of additional cost to Saskatchewan Power Corporation where the money was utilized. And then the Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Thatcher) has the audacity to get up in this House and boast about efficient administration. If he had floated the issue last June, he would have had some reason to boast about it. Some business efficiency!

An Hon. Member: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Robbins: — Well, for example, Government Insurance had \$601,795 of earnings in 1966, bringing total returns since 19445 to \$6,144,564. More efficient – nonsense! No sense from Athabasca that's a cinch. They have simply disregarded the basic rights of the insurance consumer. They have removed effective competition by raising rates to equal those charged by private insurers. They have invoked deductible clauses which eliminate potential claims and they have capably distorted the facts. The Provincial Treasurer boasts about the Saskatchewan Sodium Sulphate Corporation. He says it is one of the bright spots in Crown corporations. I believe a year ago, Mr. Speaker, he referred to it as "sodium Socialist" and said this was one that he favoured. This organization returned \$879,508 to the people of this province in 1966 and today has returned \$5,492,562 since it was started back in 1948. And Mr. Speaker, the people across the way condemned it from the beginning and maliciously told stories

about it being closed from time to time in its initial stages of development.

An Hon. Member: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Robbins: — He mentions the Saskatchewan Transportation Company with profits of \$236,038 in 1966 and a total return of \$1,727,171 to Saskatchewan residents since it was incorporated by the CCF in 1946. He also referred to the Saskatchewan Timber Board and its 1966 return of \$332,586, with total earnings since its inception of \$7,059,008. Total returns, Mr. Speaker, on these very successful Crown corporations since their inception have come to \$22,647,609.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Robbins: — In his Budget speech, he points out that Saskatchewan Government Insurance, Saskatchewan Transportation, Saskatchewan Sodium, and Saskatchewan Timber Board, in total, employ 1,840 persons. Not one of those jobs, Mr. Speaker, would be there had there not been a CCF Government in the province from 1944 to 1964. These are the facts that these people to your right cannot logically deny. If they deny them, they make a mockery of their whole concept of publicly owned, Socialist corporations which they so repetitiously and religiously condemn.

Mr. Speaker, the real gem in the Budget comes when the Hon. Provincial Treasurer gets around to discussing the two major utilities, Government Telephones and Saskatchewan Power. As usual he makes far-out, unsubstantiated statements such as this: "Unfortunately under the Socialists, all profits from Saskatchewan Telephones were drained from the Company and put into the Consolidated Revenue Fund." Not true, Mr. Speaker. He knows that that portion paid as a dividend into the Consolidated Revenue Fund was because of an agreement with telephone companies across Canada, some privately owned, some publicly owned, whereby the arrangement with respect to long distance rate tolls involved costs including bond interest and payment of specified dividend payments to the respective owners. In Saskatchewan, the Telephone Company is publicly owned and the dividend was naturally enough payable to the owner, the Government, and thus payable to the Consolidated Revenue Fund. The Treasurer pretends, Mr. Speaker, this was some Socialist plot. A pretence, Mr. Speaker, and a false one at that. His own Budget Speech proves it. After condemning the Socialists for alleged mismanagement, as he calls it, of telephones he asserts 82 per cent of the company has been financed by bondholders and the shareholders (the people of Saskatchewan through their Government) only own 18 per cent. He says this is bad. The Socialists were responsible he says. They drained the revenues away to the Consolidated Revenue Fund. Then he turns his intelligent observations to Saskatchewan Power. The equity debt ratio is at 11 ½ per cent and 88 ½ per cent. The equity debt ratio in telephones is at 18 per cent and 82 per cent and he says that is bad. They are going to borrow less. They are going to retain 45 per cent of the profits of telephones for expansion to improve that 82

per cent ratio. The power corporation has an investment four times as great as telephones and its equity ratio, according to him is 11 ½ per cent to 88 ½ per cent. And yet he, Mr. Speaker, takes \$3,000,000 out of the estimated 1967-68 profits of Saskatchewan Power into the Consolidated Revenue Fund. Why? Is it logical in terms of equity debt ratios in relation to these two utilities? Obviously it is not. He had to find revenue to balance budgetary expenditures. He used a device, a device condemned in his own Budget Address when he talks about Saskatchewan Telephones. Mr. Speaker, simply an additional example of the utilization of false pretences by this Government.

Mr. Speaker, the Saskatchewan Power Corporation has improved profits by reason of the generation of hydro power from the Squaw Rapids plant and the inclusion of the profits from the Regina City utility recently incorporated into Saskatchewan Power operations. The present Liberal Government has deferred extension of hydro power in favour of extension of thermal power generating capacity. This is evident in the Budget. The Budget Speech says work will continue on the following projects:

1. 2 – 15 megawatt units at Success costing \$2,000,000.
2. 2 – 150 megawatt units at Boundary Dam costing \$11,900,000.
3. 3. 62 ½ megawatt units at Coteau Creek costing \$11,300,000.

The first two mentioned are thermal plants. The total cost is \$13,900,000. The last one is a hydro plant – total cost \$11,300,000. Hydro capital costs are much higher, but hydro operating costs are much lower, Mr. Speaker. Thermal capital costs are relatively low, but operating costs much higher. Short term advantages at the sacrifice of long-term gains. Electrical engineers realize the implications of Liberal actions since 1964 for the long-term power needs of this province. They realize the policies are short-sighted and they realize the implications in the potential power shortages to come as a result of Liberal prostitution of provincial power potentialities. They, the Liberals, pretend to be efficient operators of the basic power utility. They again utilize, Mr. Speaker, false pretences to proclaim how efficient they are.

The Provincial Treasurer had a fair bit to say in his Budget Address about capital financing. He had a windfall in 1966 from a public program which he always, of course, condemns. It borrowed \$19,380,000 from the Canada Pension Plan. For example, it got \$2,028,000 on the fourth day of July at a 5.4 per cent rate. it got \$2,255,000 on August 3 at 5.44 per cent rate and it got \$2,022,000 on the first day of September at a 5.48 per cent rate, rates which are very favourable in terms of market conditions, because, Mr. Speaker, such monies were made available under the terms of the Canada Pension Plan to the Provincial jurisdiction in which the contributions were made at the long-term Canada rate – the top credit in the country. Mr. Speaker, this is a public program, a Socialist one, Mr. Speaker,

advocated by the CCF in 1957 and adopted almost completely in 1966 by a Liberal Government, which incidentally had condemned it ten years earlier as a program which would financially wreck the country. False pretences again, Mr. Speaker. I caution the Provincial Treasurer again as I did a year ago with respect to Saskatchewan Savings Bond issues. Here's another good CCF program copied from the previous Government. In response to Question No. 58 I asked in the current session, the Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Thatcher) informed me and Members of this House that the first six series of Saskatchewan Savings Bonds resulted in sales of \$79,393,300. The return also indicated \$20,196,000 of these had been redeemed leaving \$59,202,300 still outstanding. The Provincial Treasurer usually gives us periodical reports on Savings Bonds sales each year. Today we heard the first one. This yearly ritual has been suspended for some reason. Perhaps he was overwhelmed by the tremendous amount of sales in this particular issue and therefore could not report on it. Nevertheless, I think it should be apparent to any responsible Treasurer that there are dangers in Saskatchewan Savings Bonds sales issues if the proportion of total sales becomes too large a proportion of the total outstanding debt.

The Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Thatcher) had a bit to say about dead-weight debt. It is declining. It has been declining for years, Mr. Speaker, both before and since the advent of the Liberal Government. Mr. Speaker, had the Provincial Treasurer used his treasury functions more judiciously it would be much lower still. Strangely enough he says nothing about the funded debt, the self-liquidating debt or the Treasury bills outstanding. A few comparisons are revealing. Again in response to questions put by myself in the current session, the Provincial Treasurer revealed that the funded debt, and it's incidentally also on the White Paper report that we get from the Government, as of March 31, 1964 when we had a CCF Government, was \$559,120,000. Two years later, Mr. Speaker, it had grown to \$606,936,000 under a Liberal Government, an increase of \$47,816,000. Treasury bills outstanding on March 31, 1964, when we had a CCF Government \$36,153,000. Two years later, March 31, 1966, under a Liberal Government, \$53,143,000, in increase, Mr. Speaker, of \$16,990,000. In terms of the gross debt, Mr. Speaker, as of March 31, 1964, \$595,273,000. We had a CCF Government in power at that time. Two years later, March 31, 1966, with a Liberal Government in power, \$660,079,000 in gross debt, an increase, Mr. Speaker, of 464,806,000. Now, Mr. Speaker, I agree that the debt is manageable in terms of the assets off-setting them. However, Saskatchewan people should remember the condemnation heaped on the previous CCF Government by the Liberals when they were in opposition. The debt was piling up they said and it would ruin the province. No distinction was made between the self-liquidating and dead-weight debt. The Provincial Treasurer could not previously distinguish between them. Well, Mr. Speaker, on March 31, 1964, the self-liquidating debt of Government Telephones was \$99,697,000. Two years later, March 31, 1966, under a Liberal Government \$120,858,000, an increase of \$21,161,000. As of March 31, 1964 the debt of Saskatchewan Power – and we had a CCF Government – was \$440,782,000 and as of March 31, 1966, it had grown to \$481,675,000, that's an increase,

Mr. Chairman, of \$40,893,000. I do not contend these are bad in themselves, but they illustrate the paucity of the Liberal assertions and the fact that the Liberal government was elected under false pretences when they made wild, unsubstantiated statements concerning the Saskatchewan Provincial debt when the previous Government occupied the Treasury benches.

I have in my hand a clipping from the Saskatoon Star Phoenix, May 26, 1964, and what does it say? It says \$20,000,000 Cut in Expenses New Liberal Government Aim. Some aim! May 26, 1964, they were going to cut expenses \$20,000,000 in their first Budget. Well, Mr. Speaker, the last Budget introduced by the CCF Government had total expenditures of \$197,737,000. The first Liberal Budget which came down on March 31, 1965 was \$221,090,000, an increase of \$23,393,000. Some aim! Wrong way Corrigan – wrong way Thatcher. The next Liberal Budget ending March 31, 1966, called for expenditures of \$243,860,000, up by another \$22,770,000. The third one ending next March 31, this year 67, calls for expenditures of \$268,500,000 up \$24,640,000 over the preceding year; the latest edition, Mr. Speaker, for the fiscal year ending next March 31, 1968, calls for expenditures of \$302,746,000, an increase of \$34,264,000 over the previous year. Since this Liberal Government was elected increases in expenditures total \$105,027,000 and they aimed, they said, to reduce their expenditures in the first year by \$20,000,000. Mr. Speaker, they're just out \$125,000,000 to date. No one said expenditures would not rise, except the Members of the present Liberal Government. False pretences again, Mr. Speaker,.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Robbins: — The Liberals before being elected in 1964 campaigned on a program that Government tax revenues were too high. Recently the Hon. Member for Kelsey (Mr. Brockelbank) asked a question with respect to the tax revenues to January 31, 1967 for the current fiscal year. The answer came showing total revenues of \$153,173,239 in ten months of the current fiscal year. On this basis they may well exceed \$180,000,000 by the fiscal year end namely March 31, 1967. Well, Mr. Speaker, the financial statement of the Province under the signature of the auditor of this Province indicates that the year ending March 31, 1964, the last year the CCF was in power, received from the same revenue sources a total of \$126,575,426. Tax revenues were too high they said. If they were too high then, they are much too high now. Elections again, Mr. Speaker, by false pretences.

The Federal-Provincial agreement comes in for some discussion in the Budget. The Treasurer intimates we were once a have not province and now hints that as a have province, which somehow he created, we will suffer loss of equalization grants. He says in his Budget Address:

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

False pretences again, Mr. Speaker. We are still a have not province under the Federal-Provincial formula on finances. However, the formula has been changed. When we were youngsters we used to play mathematical games. One was how do you make four nines equal 100? It's really very simple - — 9/9 equals 100. The reason Saskatchewan's federal payments are declining is 99 9/9 per cent due to the formula change and it has not changed one iota by reason of changed economic conditions in the province. False pretences again, Mr. Speaker.

the head of this Government, Mr. Speaker, consistently maligns his own province, particularly when he's outside of it. I have in my hand a pamphlet, "Where Socialist Failed Close to Home." This pamphlet is being distributed to workers in a drug plan where they're producing drugs in Rochester, New York. When you open the pamphlet you are first encountered with the handsome visage of the Provincial Treasurer and Premier of this province. The second page and here again is a further example of false pretences. This page says:

New industry, such as this refinery being constructed by Alwinsal Potash, has been attracted by the change in investment outlook.

Now, I don't know whether this is a posed picture or not. One of the construction fellows with a hard hat looks like Mac the Knife. But if you look at the chronological record of mining events in Saskatchewan produced by the Department of Mineral Resources and its responsible Minister, Hon. A. C. Cameron, it says on page 9, and I quote, "Alwinsal Potash of Canada Limited announced intention of mining potash in 1962." Mr. Speaker, if you turn a few pages in this piece of yellow journalism, you will find a sign showing a hardware store. It's marked on the front, "Out of business, closed." I presume that's the Thatcher Hardware Chain that has gone by the Board. It has a lot to say about Crown corporations and it concludes with the remark on the Saskatchewan Transportation Company. It says it was organized to provide bus service within the province taking a number of routes from private operators. "Despite this monopolistic position, it has not returned a large profit." Well, Mr. Speaker, it has returned a profit of \$1,727,171 which is \$51,951 more than the total losses of \$1,675,220 from a tannery, a shoe factory, a woollen mill, a box factory, a fish filleting plant, which the Premier of this province classifies as "colossal losses." False pretences again, Mr. Speaker. The difficulty with this Government, Mr. Speaker, is that it is a have-not Government. What we have not got is efficient Government. A group of individuals in recent conversation were discussing the cold weather of Saskatchewan. I remarked, "Well we do not have hurricanes, floods, earthquakes, tornadoes, Saskatchewan isn't all that bad. All we have to put up with is the cold weather and the Liberal Government. Back came a prompt reply, "The cold weather I can stand."

Mr. Speaker, the Treasury job is not an easy one. The Treasurer wants to save money, and he has been unable to do this. There is a reason for this. He has a Legislative Secretary who

is a spendthrift. That's the difficulty. A bit of verse will illustrate:

The treasury account's afflicted
By one persistent flaw
Ross is fast on the deposit
But Mac is quicker on the draw.

This government, Mr. Speaker, has an obsession with highway spending. The results are somewhat less than spectacular. I believe it was the Hon. Member from Melfort-Tisdale (Mr. Willis) who perhaps somewhat inadvertently referred to the Provincial Treasurer as a highwayman. Possibly Members are familiar with Alfred Moyes' poem, "the Highwayman". It goes something like this:

The Highwayman came riding
Over the purple moor
The highwayman came riding
Up to the Old Inn Door.

Perhaps the Assembly Members will be interested in a modern version of this verse:

The Highway came riding
Over the broad four lane,
For he was quite enamoured
With the dark-haired Treasury Jane.
The highway came riding,
up to the treasury door,
He came in his speedy Chrysler,
He'd been there twice before,
He was quite content, on pleasure bent
His work would soon be done
He could contemplate a clear escape
Under the alias – Big No. One.

He had heard of the buoyant revenues,
Pouring into the treasury bin.
He was filled with expectation
From his toes to his double chin.
But treasury was empty
Not even a bale of hay,
To tempt the unwary voter
On the next election day.
His joy is turned to anger
Oh! what a wretched fate,
Nothing to carry the false pretence
To the next election date.
There is only one solution,
Vacate the Treasury bench.
He should never have been so enamoured
With his two bit treasury wench.
He'll turn her over to Steuart
The shrimp from the SPC,

And return to the ranch at Caron
 To live in serenity.
 Better still he'll ride into the western sunset;
 To the roll of drum and fife,
 And leave the wench of the Treasury bench
 To the mercy of Mac, The Knife.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Robbins: — Mr. Speaker, I shall support the amendment and vote against the motion.

Mr. H. E. Coupland (Meadow Lake): — His third balanced Budget is further proof of growth and expansion in our province, advances and progress made possible by positive Liberal action. Mr. Speaker, I would just like to mention the fine group of students that travelled in to sit in this Legislature for the opening. I was sorry that I did not have the opportunity to introduce them to this Legislature, as I believe that they were the first and only group that has come in from the Meadow Lake constituency. These children travelled a distance of some 400 miles to attend this session. And I'd like to thank Mr. Norman Mapes, a school teacher from Green lake for the efforts he put into that trip.

Mr. Speaker, I have listened in vain for some kind of constructive criticism from the Hon. Members Opposite. Mr. Speaker, for the last seven or eight days of this Debate, I have listened to the Members opposite talk and talk and talk, but I have yet to hear anything constructive, anything suggested for the good of the province. I have heard them talk about the 30s. I have heard them talk about 1944. I have heard them even get right up to date and talk about 1964. but, Mr. Speaker, they do not seem to realize that this is 1967, that this is a new Saskatchewan that is going places and doing things they never dreamed of.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Coupland: — I have the honour, Mr. Speaker, of representing the Meadow Lake constituency in this Assembly, the true North, now strong and free. Last year, Mr. Speaker, we had a problem in my area, a drought which affected farmers in my riding. Together with the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. MacFarlane) we made plans for action when needed. We added another \$40,000 to the \$20,000 already planned for the winter works program. And I can assure you, Mr. Speaker, that there are a lot of farmers taking advantage of this and are very happy.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Coupland: — There are also 244 licences issued to fish in the Primrose Lake this winter which will bring the landed value of fish in the area of some \$175,000 plus an estimated revenue on the Easter weekend of some \$80,000. Both of these plans return maximum cash benefits to the men in the area who needed this work, not Socialist handouts, Mr. Speaker, but honest work for proud men who had a bad break. The Opposition Members, Mr. Speaker, tried hard to make political capital out of the misfortunes of these Meadow Lake farmers, tried to use them. The House will remember, as the people of the Meadow Lake constituency remember, how the Members opposite tried in 1963 to use the tragic death of an infant child for the same sad purpose. The people of the Meadow Lake constituency know about CCF policies and tactics, Mr. Speaker. So do the people in the Dorintosh area. They fought poor roads and a dangerous, narrow bridge, over the Beaver River for 20 years of CCF-NDP promises. Today they have a modern bridge, and a new highway which will be completed this summer after only three years of Liberal action.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Coupland: — The people of Loon Lake know about the CCF talk, Mr. Speaker, the road they had to use until last fall was built 25 years ago, but they now drive on a new highway built by Liberal action.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Coupland: — Socialists talk and talk, Mr. Speaker, but Liberals act, and the people of Meadow Lake know it. A few days ago in this House, the Member from The Battlefords (Mr. Kramer) who sits opposite, said that he had to abandon his compulsory arbitration 20 miles south of Meadow Lake. Well, Mr. Speaker, I do not know why he brought that up. It is a CCF road we have not got around to fixing yet, but we will. Everybody drives over that road and I've never heard of any others who had to abandon their compulsory arbitration. Maybe some of the expenditure-CCF voters on that road met him and he had to hit the ditch or maybe, Mr. Speaker, he just couldn't see the road. I am glad though, Mr. Speaker, that he mentioned Highway No. 4, Mr. Speaker, because this is one that I have been talking to the Minister of Highways (Mr. Boldt) about and we will do something about it and very soon.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Coupland: — But, Mr. Speaker, I would like to remind the Members opposite that we cannot fix up 20 years of mistakes all at once, not even in three years. There has been more done in the last two years, Mr. Speaker, than was done in the previous 20. more grid roads, more access roads, more gravel in two years than

they saw in 20, grants for snow removal for the first time, grants for flood damage to roads in the LIDs, grants to LIDs the like of which they never saw before.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Coupland: — Tax reduction, Mr. Speaker, not increases like the Members opposite would like the people to believe. Mr. Speaker, I would like to quote some figures sent to me yesterday by a farmer in my constituency. He has just completed his financial statement for 1966, and was very interested and pleased with the savings he made by the policies of the Liberal Government. The savings he made on the use of purple gas was \$341.63; the homeowner grant, \$50; his savings on the one per cent reduction of education and hospital tax, \$36. Mr. Speaker, a total saving to this farmer alone of \$427.63.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Coupland: — In my book, Mr. Speaker, that is a tremendous tax reduction, and these figures are authentic and you can check them any time you want to.

An Hon. Member: — What about the tax increase?

Mr. Coupland: — These are all programs, Mr. Speaker, that the CCF-NDP would do away with, were they ever lucky enough to be elected again.

Mr. J. H. Brockelbank (Kelsey): — We won't allow that!

Hon. D. V. Heald (Attorney General): — It's true, Brock!

Mr. Coupland: — Yes, Mr. Speaker, the Northwest knows Socialist talk compared to Liberal action, especially those in the northern part. For years, and years, Mr. Speaker, the men and women in the northern part of the Meadow Lake constituency had no voice in their own affairs but they did as they were told by the man the CCF-NDP sent up there. The Liberal Government has already started to change that, to set up local councils to give the people a voice in their own affairs. Local councils are already set up at Buffalo Narrows and Ile-a-labour-Crosse, and there will be more. Liberals act where Socialists only talk and talk and talk.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Coupland: — Nobody knows better than the people themselves what they need, and what they can do, and what they want to do. These councils will produce worthwhile ideas, and these ideas will be acted upon. It is my personal hope, Mr. Speaker, that there will be developed a method of marketing some of the wonderful

handicrafts from the area, beaded jackets, moccasins and mukluks of the finest craftsmanship found anywhere in Canada that can provide a steady source of income when properly merchandised. This and other developments will come out of these new local councils.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to say a few words on housing and special care homes. Mr. Speaker, Saskatchewan's housing projects and special care homes for the aged are a monumental tribute to the men and women who literally and figuratively pioneered our province and laid the foundations of the economic and cultural heritage that is ours to enjoy and pass on to our children. Each of the many projects is, indeed, a place where the elderly can be accommodated with the dignity, comfort and security they so rightly deserve. Housing and special care homes, Mr. Speaker, are made possible through The Saskatchewan Housing and Special Care Homes Act, 1965, and its predecessor, The Saskatchewan Housing and Nursing Homes Act, 1953. The Act provides for the construction of low-rental housing and other accommodation for aged, needy, infirm and blind persons. It makes it possible for municipal, church and charitable organizations to sponsor and incorporate non-profit housing companies and qualify for loans from Central Mortgage and Housing Corporations under the National Housing Act. Mr. Speaker, a non-repayable Provincial grant amounting to 20 per cent of the capital cost is available towards the construction of approved projects. Technical and advisory assistance through the planning and construction stages, and annual maintenance grants are also given. The fundamental reason why we need to provide accommodation for the aged in our population is that people are living longer. Not so long ago, Mr. Speaker, three score years and ten was considered a ripe old age. Since world War 1, the number of persons living beyond the age of 85 years has increased by nearly, 1,000 per cent. I understand that a national health survey in the United States, taken not too long ago, reveals that four out of five persons over 65 years of age have one or more chronic conditions. While these people need some care, they do not need the expert and costly services of a hospital. Their needs can be adequately met by the services provided in special care homes. Mr. Speaker, another factor underlying special care home development has been the changes in family structure. The two or three-generation family group on the old homestead no longer exists. Families are scattered, immediate relatives are usually not available to offer care. The visiting family doctor of times past is not as readily available for help and guidance. Faced with a crisis of long-term illness, many families must seek help outside their home. but again, it may not be intensive hospital care that is needed. It is the special care home that fills the gap between the hospital and a person's own home. Mr. Speaker, in Meadow Lake there was a 30-bed nursing home wing added to the Pioneer Lodge last year. It is full to capacity and there is a waiting list.

This, Mr. Speaker, was the Centennial Project for Meadow Lake area with Goodsoil, Loon Lake and four Local Improvement Districts participating. Mr. Speaker, I hope my Government will look into the feasibility of a senior citizens home and nursing

wing in the northern part of the Meadow Lake constituency. Mr. Speaker, this Government has supplied additional accommodations for some 795 persons in self-contained units and 2,175 persons in special care homes in the province. Mr. Speaker, this has been done by my Government paying grants in excess of \$5,000,000 to municipal, church and charitable organizations who sponsor and incorporate non-profit housing companies. Mr. Speaker, I am very happy to support the Budget and I will not support the amendment.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. G. G. Leith (Elrose): — My first words in this speech must be to congratulate the Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Thatcher) on bringing in a Budget that is balanced, especially in this year when most Provincial Governments and the Federal Government itself are operating on a deficit basis. It is very pleasant, I think, to the people of the Elrose constituency to see that taxes are not going up this year. They got used to it, Mr. Speaker, during 20 years of Socialist, they could expect a new levy every year, sometimes two or three.

I want to say something about the speech that was made by the Hon. C. P. MacDonald, Member from Milestone and Minister of Welfare, in this Assembly yesterday. I want to congratulate him on the news that he brought us on the disposition of assets from the new Federal guaranteed income plan. I am very pleased and I think that people in my constituency are going to be pleased that the guaranteed income supplement will be passed on to the recipients of the Saskatchewan Assistance Plan. I was rather amused to see the expression on the face of the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Lloyd) and the former Minister of Welfare (Mr. Nicholson) when this news came out. I think it was bad news to them. They had been predicting that this increase would not be passed on, and it is interesting to see how they react to Liberal policy, good Liberal policy. I want to congratulate the Minister, and I want to thank him on behalf of the people of the Elrose constituency who are going to be better off financially because of the action of the Federal Liberal Government and the action of the Provincial Liberal Government.

Mr. Speaker, while I am on the subject of welfare, I want to say a word about some of the tactics of the junior Member from Moose Jaw (Mr. Snyder). I am very disappointed that he is not in his seat, I hope he comes back before I am finished. He has drawn the attention of this Assembly and indeed the spotlight of publicity on a group of unfortunate citizens in what I consider to be a relatively cheap attempt at personal publicity. The complaints that he has raised in this Assembly are not so much complaints about a particular institution as they are complaints against the aged and about the problems that they have. That Member can go into any nursing home or special care home, or geriatric centre in this province, he can go wherever older people are being cared for and see exactly the same problems that he talked about yesterday. Every day, incidents such as he described occur. These incidents are the very reason that our nursing and special care homes and geriatric centres are being built

and being maintained by the people of Saskatchewan. When older people come to the age when their memories and their mental and physical capabilities no longer make it possible for them to be looked after in a private home or in a family situation, then a nursing or special care situation must be found for them so that the necessary care can be provided. I am not trying to defend the private nursing homes, I merely try to point out that the incidents which the junior Member for Moose Jaw described are the problems of the aged. Of course it is the responsibility of the nursing home and it is the responsibility of the licensing agency to make adequate provisions for their care and to see that these are observed. But the nursing home that he referred to has a physical plant and a trained staff that is comparable to any other in the Province of Saskatchewan that provides similar care.

Mr. Kramer: — It improved last week.

Mr. Leith: — Mr. Speaker, if the Member from Biggar (Mr. Lloyd) chooses to complain about a little bump or a hole in the highway in his constituency. I think this is his right and privilege. But when the junior Member from Moose Jaw focuses the spotlight of publicity on the intimately personal problems of the aged without first taking those problems to the Minister, then I say that he has violated the bounds of good taste.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Leith: — And he hasn't acted with the tact and understanding that is required by a Member of this Legislature in many of his duties. I don't want to say any more about it, Mr. Speaker.

I wish to again return to the Budget that we heard a week ago. Members of the Assembly, I think even the ones on your left, Mr. Speaker, realize that the costs of services, all kinds of services, are going up in Saskatchewan. They have been going up for 20 years. Education costs have been rising as well. This Government of Saskatchewan since the election of 1964 has attempted to keep pace with these rising costs. Provincial grants to elementary and secondary education have been increased substantially each year since we have been in office. In 1963-64, the last year in which the CCF was in power, the total of grants to schools was \$37,634,000, the estimate for 1967-68, Mr. Speaker, was \$58,008,000. I want to point out to you that in 1963-64, the Provincial Government paid 44.8 per cent of the cost of running the elementary and secondary schools. In 1967-68 it is estimated that this Government will be paying 49.2 per cent of these costs. In grants per pupil, 1963-64 the grants per pupil was \$166. In 1967-68, the estimate is \$230 per pupil. This is a tremendous increase.

Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Member for Biggar (Mr. Lloyd) suggests that we are being niggardly with school grants. I ant you to compare his statement with the facts. The grants that were received by the three units of Eston, Elrose and Rosetown are of

interest. In 1963-64 these three units received a total of \$1,102,000, in 1966-67 these same three units received a total of \$1,529,000, which is an increase of 38 per cent. These figures demonstrate our concern with the rising costs of education. These millions of dollars that we have allocated to school grants are a direct measure of our concern about the heavy tax load placed on property. We have accepted our responsibility in this regard. What concerns me, Mr. Speaker, is the irresponsible and sometimes hypocritical attacks made by Members sitting opposite on our educational policy. Nothing demonstrates more clearly the callous indifference to the facts or perhaps even their ignorance of the facts than their attitudes to education spending in this province. This Government has allocated 30 per cent of its Budget for education. Yet the Members opposite says we are not doing enough. For instance the hon. Member for Biggar (Mr. Lloyd) runs up and down the province saying that the tuition fees at the University should be abolished. But this same Member when his party was in power and when he was Minister of Education didn't lower the tuition fees, they didn't abolish the tuition fees. In fact they raised them on five separate occasions. The students at our two campuses at the University of Saskatchewan are paying in fees a smaller percentage of the total cost of their education than on many campuses in Canada. The fees are not outrageous; they are reasonable for the education that these people are receiving. I want to say one more thing about this, Mr. Speaker. It is my opinion that not one single person in Saskatchewan is denied access to university because of the cost of going there. If the student has demonstrated that he has reasonable ability then he may get a Government student scholarship of up to \$500. If he does not qualify for a scholarship he may then qualify for a loan. The people who borrow money from Canada Student Loan Fund to go to university have demonstrated that they're good risks. A loan of up to \$1,000 is a very great help in providing the money necessary to put them through one year of university. They have almost five months to earn the balance of the money that is required and as far as I'm concerned this is the way they ought to be paying for their education. They are presently paying 17.5 per cent of the total cost of university education in fees. Mr. Speaker, under the former Administration they were paying 23 ½ per cent. Surely this speaks well for the program of university education that we have adopted.

I would wish to say more about many other parts of the education program. We have been criticized by Members opposite on our technical training plan. We have been criticized for our apprenticeship training plan, I don't have the time today but I do want to say that in my opinion the criticism that the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Lloyd) and in fact all the Members of the Opposition put up is just a gigantic smoke screen, because they won't and they can't allow the people of Saskatchewan to take a good look at the policies in education spending that they made when they were in power. Those people opposite, Mr. Speaker, when they are talking about education remind me of a train going down the track, a train of empty box cars being pulled by one big puffing smoking locomotive that hasn't got very much steam. I think that the track they're on is going to lead

nowhere and if they go far enough the spikes are loose and they are going to find themselves in the gravel.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is obvious from what I have said that I am going to support the motion and vote against the amendment.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. K. G. Romuld (Canora): — Mr. Speaker, I am sorry in the brief time that's at my disposal this afternoon I won't get time to go through what I had wanted to. I'm sorry to see so many absent Members opposite, seeing that they are forecasting an election, I imagine they are out campaigning. Again, I would remind them that it is the Premier of this Province that'll call the election and not the Socialists.

Mr. R. A. Walker (Hanley): — He's the only one.

Mr. Romuld: — Now like other Members on this side of the House I would like to congratulate the Treasurer, Premier Thatcher, for bringing down a balanced Budget and, Sir, the significant feature is that he accomplished this without increasing taxes.

During the Budget Debate, Opposition Members without exception stood up and generally appeared uncomfortable in their attempt to discredit a document that they actually believe in. In some cases, there are Members in the Opposition who can be very dramatic. However, the taxpayers of this province look upon them as ham actors who have presented a very poor act in their criticism of the province's largest Budget and at the same time holding the line on increased taxes.

The Members to your left, sir, in their futile effort to register their disappointment with the Budget have failed to be honest and revealed their real reason for the resentment they have — one only had to look at their faces the day the Treasurer brought down his Budget — and they were shocked beyond words. As we expected, they had anticipated major increases in taxes, and, Sir, when the Budget was revealed and increased taxes did not appear, the Opposition could not conceal their disappointment.

The financial critic, the Member for Regina West (Mr. Blakeney) who is not in his seat, shuffled and waffled around until he adjourned the Debate. He was playing for time in order that he may run out and rewrite his speech criticizing this Budget. All through this session, the Opposition have predicted that the Treasurer would increase taxes. They had patiently been waiting to lower the boom on the Premier for increased taxes. To the NDP increased taxes were inevitable and their predictions and attitude indicate one thing, Sir, if they were still in power higher taxes would have been forthcoming.

There is one thing I am sure we all agree on and that is

Socialism and high taxes go hand in hand. The Socialists feel they have a priority on taxes. If they impose them they are good, and the people should rejoice at the privilege of paying high taxes to a Socialist Government. I believe they call it togetherness. The NDP have the warped idea that they can spend the money more efficiently than the people of this province can. I want to remind you, Sir, that during the 20 years the Opposition was in power, we saw hundreds and hundreds of increased taxes and new taxes brought in. In fact, they averaged over 60 a year for the 20 years they were in power. Now this might not be a record, but I'll tell you it's far above the average of any free enterprise government in this country. Now I am fully aware that taxes are essential for the operations of the government. But when taxes become too high they become a deterrent to our economy. Crippling taxes not only destroyed the golden egg, but will destroy the goose that laid it. How many times, Mr. Speaker, have we heard the Members of the Opposition expounding the perfection of Socialist Sweden. But the fallacy of their philosophy is finally being unfolded along with the true picture of the economic situation that exists there. It indicates that the merits of Socialism are surpassed by the principles adhered to by the governments operating under the free enterprise system. It is interesting to note the news item appearing in the Leader Post and the headline read as follows: "Swedish Taxes Prove Deterrent." Time does not permit me to read the full report. However, it does explain how a married woman earning \$2,800 a year ends up with a net of \$14 a month in her pocket due to high taxes. This type of taxation destroys individual initiative thereby hindering the development of a country.

We on this side of the House believe that the people of this province are fed up being bribed with their own money and will not submit to the promises of glib-tongued politicians offering free programs which must be paid by the taxpayers. This type of campaigning is the pattern used by the Opposition in the past. I can recall when the CCF offered free hospitalisation. True, we have hospitalisation but it is not free. No Government program is free and the people of this province recognize the fact that sound administration carried out by the Premier and his colleagues is more acceptable to our citizens than the political gimmicks and state planning of the former Administration.

Mr. Speaker, of great importance to the people of Canora constituency is the advanced step taken by the Government of Saskatchewan to provide telephone service to the rural areas at reduced prices. Telephone service is an essential for the day-to-day operation of farm units. There is a district in my constituency situated west of the village of Endeavour which has been waiting for phone service for several years. During the term of office of the previous Administration a survey was taken of the district and it was determined that the cost would be in the neighbourhood of \$1,700 for each farm connection. Under the new policy formulated by this Government telephone service for this same area has been reduced from \$1,700 to \$400. I would say that this is a substantial saving, a real saving to the rural residents of Saskatchewan. This type of legislation, Sir, is

another example of Liberalism in action.

And now, Mr. Speaker, I would like to turn to the estate tax rebate. I have long advocated this and I am happy to see that we have taken a step in this direction. As everyone in this House knows, Saskatchewan is still a farming province with a vast majority of its citizens deriving their living either directly or indirectly from agriculture. There are 85,000 farms or farming units in the Province of Saskatchewan employing one or more members of a family. In recent years with the great increase in price of land and equipment, most of these farming units are valued much in excess of the exemptions provided under the Estate Tax Act. There are few farming units in this province that aren't taxable under the Estate Tax Act if the farmer suddenly dies without adequate estate planning. and if a farmer dies tomorrow and has an economic unit, his estate will immediately owe a substantial amount of money to the estate tax department and the assets of his estate cannot be dealt with or transferred to his children. In fact his will cannot be probated until his estate tax is paid. This, Mr. Speaker, is going to create a real hardship on many farmers in this area and we believe that bringing in legislation of this type will stabilize our farm economy by enabling the children to stay on the farm without paying high estate tax to the Government. I was pleased to hear the Treasurer say that we will abolish our share of the estate tax in Saskatchewan.

Mr. Walker: — Why didn't he do it?

Mr. Romuld: — And now, Sir,...

Mr. Walker: — Why didn't he do it?

Mr. Romuld: — Look, I haven't got time to get to you today and I'm not going to say anything. You remind me of an old girl friend I had and that isn't saying much for her either. But I will tell you this, Sir, that I take pride in support this Budget.

Mr. F. Larochelle (Shaunavon): — Mr. Speaker, I would like to congratulate the Premier for the fine Budget Speech he delivered to the people of Saskatchewan the other day. What I was very happy to see was that there were no tax increases. This is in spite of what the Members opposite would like to say. This large amount of increased revenue, without tax increases, was due to the buoyant economy of this province, due to our large wheat crop and also to the fast development of our mineral and natural resources and our accelerated industrial development.

I think I should congratulate the Member for Regina West, (Mr. Blakeney) who is not in his seat again at this time, for the effort he made to criticize this Budget. I think that this was a fine Budget. I think that this fine Budget did not provide him with very much material for his speech. To me he was just grasping at straws to find an issue.

Mr. Speaker, I was very pleased with this Budget because I think it is spending the money in the area where it is most needed. I was especially pleased to note that the Government continues to give education top priority. When one realizes that the Liberal Government has to spend almost twice what the former Socialist Government did on education, it becomes clear that for many years our Socialist friends grossly neglected the young people of this province.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to turn to the achievements which the Liberal Government has made in my own constituency. For years the Shaunavon constituency was neglected in many areas under the Socialist Administration. Now whether this was due to the fact that we are very far from the central administration I don't know, but in the three short years that this Liberal Government has been in power it has vastly increased its services to the people of the Shaunavon constituency. For example at the present in the town of Shaunavon, we have a fine new school under construction. Also, one of the most modern and up-to-date hospitals under construction which will be opened in a very few months. Also, in my own home town of Ponteix they have just completed another fine new eight-classroom school, and at present under construction is also a new hospital.

The grants to the school unit are the highest in the history of the Shaunavon constituency. This grant in 1966, Mr. Speaker, amounted to \$355,550.

Now I would like to go to highways. Last year almost \$500,000 were spent in building, improving and oil surfacing highways in the Shaunavon constituency. No. 4 was oiled from Val Marie to the US Border; Highway No. 13 relocated and built from Consul to Robsart; and No. 13 was oiled from Highway No. 4 at Cadillac to Lafleche, which now gives it an oil-surfaced road all the way to Moose Jaw.

I would also like to discuss the new highway program announced last Monday by the Minister of Highways (Mr. Boldt). The people of Shaunavon constituency will be pleased to note that over \$600,000 will again be spent in that part of the southwest. Some of this money will be spent on No. 46 Highway between Claydon and Climax. work on this Highway No. 46 to No. 4 has been needed for a long time and this Liberal Government has decided to do something to serve the people of that area.

Mr. Walker: — Very good.

Mr. Larochelle: — Some work will be done on Highway No. 13 west of Eastend and also on Highway No. 13 west of Cadillac to Shaunavon. There is one stretch of road in the vicinity of Creighton to Admiral where several people have been killed in the past few years due to alignment.

Well, I am glad to be able to say today that a new road will be built in that vicinity with better alignment which will certainly take many of the hazards out of the driving in that

area. I can assure the Hon. Dave Boldt, Minister of Highways, that the people of Shaunavon constituency appreciate your consideration and efforts, sir, and we welcome these new improvements with the highest regard.

Turning now to the field of municipal affairs. I would like to say how much the RMs and LIDs in my constituency welcome the Premier's announcement of an additional \$500,000 being placed in the Budget for municipal grants. Last year in the Shaunavon constituency the RMs and LIDs received \$68,425 in grants. In 1965 they received \$16,000 and in the previous year, 1964 they had only received \$500. This year grants for equalization, grid road maintenance and snow removal will be the highest ever, and I am sure that this is the way it should be, in order that our municipalities can continue improving their road and service system without increasing the mill rate which is already high. Almost without exception the rural municipalities and LIDs in my constituency last year received the highest grants they had ever received in the history of the province. In many cases it was as much as three and four times as much as the former Government had given us.

Mr. Speaker, I would now like to turn to the main industry in the province and in the constituency of Shaunavon. I am referring, of course, Sir, to agriculture. Since taking office this Liberal Government has worked constantly to assist the farmers of our province. I agree fully with the Government's program to diversify our farms and I would hope that our livestock numbers would continue to rise over the next few years. The Liberal Government of Saskatchewan has acted and will continue to act to safeguard our farmers' income. For example, shortly after taking office we embarked on the long-overdue agricultural diversification program designed to bring stability to agriculture. Everyone knew that such a plan was needed. The NDP talked about it, and now the Liberal Government has acted in a positive manner to bring about diversification in agriculture.

An Hon. Member: — Who are you trying to kid?

Mr. Laroche: — For example, the dangers of drought are being countered by the assistance for constituency of fodder storage facilities. Numerous irrigation projects have been taken with the view to expanding and stabilizing fodder production. The South Saskatchewan River project is being proceeded with and is now in its final stages. In addition, over 20,000 farmers have been able to improve their overall yield per acre by sending soil and feed samples for analysis to the newly established test lab at the University of Saskatchewan. Large numbers of farmers can now get cash assistance to clear land for regrassing. Crop insurance has been broadened so more farmers can get coverage. I understand that more than 8,000 farmers will participate in the program this year. More and more Saskatchewan livestock products are being processed in Saskatchewan. Recognizing the growing consumer demand the Liberal Government made it possible for Saskatchewan farmers to join and profit with this market, while keeping valuable enterprises within the province.

I would just like to point out, Mr. Speaker, some of the policies the Liberal Government has undertaken to stimulate livestock production. Since taking office, a dozen new community pastures have been built, several more are planned. Farmers who want to start or expand on hog operations may secure a low-cost Government loan for the purpose. In many centres community sheep pastures have been established. In addition, a new veterinarian college is being built in Saskatoon to facilitate an increase in the number of veterinarians in our province. This Veterinary College will enable many of our young people to provide professional services to the farmers of this province.

Mr. Speaker, the outstanding example of Liberals helping farmers comes in the field of taxes. Over the past couple of years, the people of Saskatchewan have realized a natural lowering in their taxes by means of grants. After years of bearing an impressive tax burden under the NDP the farmers of this province finally got some action from the Liberal Government. For years the NDP refused to give the farmers of this province the right to use purple gas in their farm trucks. Immediately upon taking office your Liberal Government acted to end this injustice and to allow the use of purple gas in farm trucks. By this one measure alone the farmers of our province have each saved themselves hundreds of dollars. In addition, the Government also instituted a program to give rural home owners \$50 homeowner grants. Another program, Mr. Speaker, which is of special importance to the people in my constituency, is the Government's policy to sell cultivating and grazing land. Many of the farmers and ranchers who lived in my constituency during the former Government's reign lived in constant fear that the NDP would cancel leased contracts. Before this Government took office the administration of Crown land was run on the basis of political patronage.

Since 1964, Mr. Speaker, farmers have been able to purchase these lands and use them to expand and establish themselves on good economic units. I sincerely hope that in the future this policy will be opened up so that even larger blocks of land will be made available for sale to the present lessees.

I would also like to point out, Mr. Speaker, that when leases do come up for new allocation, they are placed under a firm impartial system of allocation. Your Liberal Government has taken the necessary steps to eliminate political involvement in the granting of these leases. We have appointed an independent appeal board made up of representatives from the various farm organizations, and although I do not always agree with the allocations that this Appeal Board makes, I must admit that it is done in a fair and impartial manner, and I think the Government should be commended for their action. I urge them to continue the process whereby a person who needs land gets it rather than the person who is a political heeler.

Mr. Speaker, I will support the motion but I will not support the amendment.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. W. E. Smishek (Regina East): — Mr. Speaker, one of the most interesting parts of this Debate has been the lack of defence on the part of the Members of the Government for this particular Budget. I noticed in the last few days that men who are considered to be the strong men within this Government, like the Minister of Natural Resources (Mr. Steuart), the Minister of Mineral Resources (Mr. Cameron), the Attorney General (Mr. Heald), presented a pathetic presentation in defence of this Budget. Their arguments were weak, they are disheartened, they are disillusioned.

Mr. Speaker, I listened with patience to the Premier's noisy presentation of this Budget on Friday, February 17th. I listened for almost two hours in hopes to hear the Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Thatcher) document in some detail how he intends to implement the election promises he and his party made to the people of Saskatchewan in 1964. I say this, because this is election year in Saskatchewan according to the Premier's previous announcements. It is rumoured that writs will be issued before the spring thaw. I say, Mr. Speaker, if this is the case, then the time is up for the creation of the 80,000 new and additional jobs, or at least 60,000 of them. The time is up for the pre-paid drug program. The time is up to keep the promises the Liberal Government made in paying a larger share of education through some meaningful tax reduction program or introduce some programs which will be of value to our citizens.

The Government opposite got elected, Mr. Speaker, on the promise to reduce taxes. Let us examine their record, let us first look at the consumption taxes.

The education and health tax in the last CCF Budget of 1964-65 was estimated at \$44,700,000. In this Budget the Education and Health sales tax is \$50,000,000, up by \$5,000,000, Mr. Speaker. Oh, but the Premier will say — and I notice him starting to react — that we reduced the sales tax by one cent.

Hon. W. Ross Thatcher (Premier): — 20 per cent.

Mr. Smishek: — True, but only partly true. While on the one hand there was this tax reduction on the other hand there was a tax imposition on a series of new items, soaps, detergents and many other things. And the other important thing for us to consider, Mr. Speaker, is that during this period the cost of consumer goods has gone up, caused by excessive corporate profits, the per capita sales tax since 1964 has been increased by approximately \$6.00 per person per year. The gasoline tax is up by \$5,000,000. Liquor tax is up by \$5,300,000. A new \$4,000,000 tobacco tax has been imposed.

These four consumption taxes alone have increased taxes to the people of Saskatchewan by \$20,000,000 since this Administration took office. But these are not all the tax increases, Mr. Speaker. There was the 40 per cent increase in the medical and health premiums. Motor vehicle licences increase has taken

place, there was an increase in insurance, up from \$10,200,000 to \$12,400,000, an increase of 20 per cent. Insurance premiums have increased, telephone rates are up, this year a one per cent tax on automobile insurance is being imposed. Users of gas and power have been told that this year they will be assessed \$3,000,000 to finance Government expenditures. Also further increases are expected in motor licences and automobile insurance rates.

Mr. Speaker, one tax increase, that will be taking place if this Government is returned to office, but that up till now has not been announced and that the Members opposite have not talked about, is the increase in the hospital and medical premiums. This will be announced next September. Mr. Speaker, remember the reference in one of the speeches to the effect that ways and means have to be found to finance the rising costs of hospital services.

Mr. Speaker, what was meant by this remark? The Budget does not explain, but I suspect, and I'm always suspicious of Liberal Governments, that come next September, if by some quirk or accident and I doubt it very much, if the Liberals are allowed to continue in office after the coming election, the hospital and medical premiums will go up perhaps to \$100 per family and \$50 for a single persons, or more.

The Liberals have always said that the hospital and medical premiums should bear a larger share of the hospital and medical costs. Liberal tax policies have always favoured taxing the poor and relieving the rich from their responsibilities. These are not all the tax increases. They increased the grazing lease tax by three cents per acre, vital statistics went up. The major tax increase, ranging from \$18,000,000 to \$20,000,000 took place at the municipal level, because this Government has failed to provide adequate funds for education and other municipal programs. Add these up, Mr. Speaker, and you will find that over the last three years Saskatchewan residents, in total, have paid hundreds of millions of dollars more in taxes since the Liberals took office.

Mr. Speaker, I am not opposed to taxes. Certainly if we want public programs, and we do, then we must pay for them. What concerns me is that the burden of taxation falls most heavily on the people who can least afford them. Taxes are not related to ability to pay and this Government is refusing to do anything about it. It is my belief that where all pay, all should benefit. Everybody is forced to pay the dirty tax, the soap tax, almost all have to pay the increase in gasoline tax. Mr. Speaker, I was interested in hearing the Member from Meadow Lake (Mr. Coupland) talk about the value and the importance of the elimination of the purple gas tax and what it has meant to this particular farmer. It would seem to me, Mr. Speaker, that man must have been operating an extremely old truck. By the sound of it, it must have been using one gallon of gasoline for every mile he travelled. I suppose it's really because since the Liberals took office he couldn't afford to buy a new truck.

Mr. L. P. Coderre (Minister of Labour): — You don't know much about farming.

Mr. Smishek: — Mr. Speaker, I said what concerns me is that the Government has not introduced a single program which is applicable to all the people even though all people pay taxes. They have not introduced a single program like a Hospital Care Plan, a Medical Care Plan, or the larger school unit system where everybody benefits.

Their programs are confined to such things as opening up a few additional liquor stores, building a few miles of highway and ignoring the maintenance of others, resulting in many of our highways going to pot. Oh yes, the Premier will no doubt say that homeowner grants were introduced, but I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that they are not universally applicable. One third of our citizens do not benefit because they do not own homes. They rent. Their property taxes are included in the cost of the rent that they pay. Over 90 per cent of our Indian and Métis population do not receive a penny from the homeowner grants. These are the people who are most in need.

Now what will the benefits of this new Budget be to the residents and people of Regina that I represent? Really nothing, Mr. Speaker. Outside of the 15 cents per capita grant for libraries, the people in Regina are going to get nothing from this Budget in terms of any new programs.

Let us, Mr. Speaker, take a closer look at some aspects of this Budget before us, and those introduced by the Liberals in the two previous years. Let us look at some of the over-taxation. In the 1965-66 Budget, the first one presented by the Premier, revenues were estimated to be \$221,000,000 and expenditures approved by this Legislature were \$220,700,000 providing for \$250,000 surplus. Now look at the 1966 Public Accounts, the take by the Provincial Treasurer was \$254,400,000 and this is not all. The Provincial Treasurer held back \$3,300,000 of liquor profits and \$1,000,000 of estimated Crown corporation profits. Had these been included, then the surplus, in the words of the Liberals, over-taxation in that one year alone would have been \$38,000,000. In this Budget the Premier tells us and let me quote, "It now appears the total revenues in the current year will exceed estimates by almost \$12,000,000." In two years, revenues exceeded budgetary estimates by \$50,000,000.

The Liberals when in opposition used to call a surplus over-taxation. Let me remind you of the remarks, Mr. Speaker, of Senator A. H. McDonald when he spoke on February 21, 1964, when he was the critic for the Liberal Opposition at that time. He had this to say and let me quote:

I was pleased to see that the surplus from last year was going to be somewhere in the neighbourhood of \$10,000,000. This is roughly the same surplus this Province enjoyed last year. I could not help but feel that at

least one former Provincial Treasurer would probably turn over in his deck chair some place in the Caribbean when he realized that his successor couldn't estimate the revenues of this Province to within \$20,000,000 in two years.

He went on:

I doubt if this Government is accepting some of the good advice that has been made available to them in the past by some civil servants in the Province of Saskatchewan. Because never in the history of this Province of Saskatchewan has a Provincial Treasurer been out \$20,000,000 in 24 months on the revenues available to the Government of Saskatchewan.

And then he said:

We have complained about high taxes, they have taken \$20,000,000 away from the taxpayers of the people of the Province of Saskatchewan, more than they even estimated they would. Taxes in the Province of Saskatchewan have hit an all-time high. They are becoming unbearable for many of our citizens.

The Liberal Government's surplus in two years was not \$10,000,000, it was not \$20,000,000, it was \$50,000,000, Mr. Speaker.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Smishek: — I suggest that taxes in the Province of Saskatchewan have hit a new all-time high, they have become unbearable for many of our citizens. This Government is refusing to accept the advice of the civil servants. Now, Mr. Speaker, if the Liberal financial critic of 1964, Senator A. H. McDonald, was aware of this \$50,000,000 surplus in two years, Mr. Speaker, I could not help but feel that he would probably turn over in his Senate chair, cut up the red rug or even worse mess it up.

Mr. W. J. Berezowsky (Cumberland): — Too bad!

Mr. Smishek: — The words and behaviour of the Liberal past are now coming to haunt them in the present.

My colleagues have already pointed out that this is a deficit Budget, \$6,500,000 will be borrowed for highway construction, another \$9,300,000 will be borrowed for university purposes. A deficit of almost \$16,000,000 this year. And in addition to that, \$3,000,000 is being snatched from the Saskatchewan Power Corporation to try and cover up a deficit. Not only is it a deficit Budget, as my leader pointed out, it is deceitful Budget. It is a phoney Budget. It is a wrong Budget. Let me give you a few examples, Mr. Speaker, of how phoney it is. The Minister of Education speaking in this House on February 10th

said, "The present Government in 196-67 gave a total of \$51,010,000 in operating grants." The Provincial Treasurer in his Budget Address said and let me quote:

During 1967 we propose to increase operating grants to School Boards by approximately \$3,900,000. The new figure will exceed \$52,700,000."

Mr. Speaker, somebody here is not telling the truth, it's either the Minister of Education (Mr. Trapp) or the Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Thatcher). I am sorry that neither of them is in their seat at this time.

If the grants for the coming year will be \$52,700,000 and if the grants last year were \$51,000,000, then the increase is only \$1,700,000, not \$3,900,000. Mr. Speaker, I suggest that the Minister of Education and the Provincial Treasurer get back into negotiations and tell this Legislature which is the accurate figure. Somebody does not know how to add. It seems to me that the Provincial Treasurer would have been better advised to invest in a new adding machine for his office, rather than a refrigerator.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Smishek: — Either that or he was dipping into that refrigerator too often when he was preparing his Budget. We are \$2,200,000 short on the operating grants for either this year or last year. The fact is that both figures are phoney, both include Federal money and therefore are not Provincial grants provided by the present Government. This is but one example of how deceptive and inaccurate this Budget is. There are many more examples and let me give you another example of how phoney this Budget is. The total budget for education including Federal payments according to estimates is \$101,200,000 plus \$3,700,000 for technical school construction, for an overall total of \$104,900,000. Federal reimbursement is estimated at \$10,900,000, plus about \$2,000,000 for technical school construction or close to \$13,000,000 reimbursement. The Premier tells us that the proposed expenditures by this Government for education in 1967-68 total \$90,300,000. But keep in mind, Mr. Speaker, that as of last week there was no agreement with the Federal Government. Can we rely on this figure? I submit to you that we cannot. I would recommend the Members of this House to read the address made in the House of Commons on October 31, 1966 by Hon. Mr. Sharp, Minister of Finance, in Hansard page 9291. He said that under the proposed new Federal-Provincial fiscal formula Saskatchewan would be entitled to \$14,500,000 for post-secondary education operating grants and \$7,000,000 for technical and vocational capital expenditures, in the current fiscal year, for a total, Mr. Speaker, of \$21,500,000. Does the Premier not want to pick up the additional \$7,500,000 from Ottawa that apparently will be available to us, or is he hiding within the \$90,300,000 figure, this particular amount. If that is the case then the Provincial overall education expenditure will be less than \$82,000,000, far short, Mr. Speaker, of the \$17,800,000 increase the Premier mentioned to us in his address. In fact it will be short by over \$8,000,000.

the Premier said in his Address, "The Government must make every effort to curtail unnecessary or unessential spending." Let us look at page 21 of the Estimates under the sub-heading "Information Services", and here we find, as my leader has already mentioned, yesterday, an expenditure of \$225,950 for what is called Information Services, up from last year by \$116,000. Such expenditures, Mr. Speaker, go contrary to the recommendation of the Johnson Commission. Why did this Province spend almost \$200,000 to get the report of the Johnson Commission, when this Government after getting it, threw it in the wastepaper basket. This, I submit, is another indication of how the Liberal Government intends to use public funds for their election campaign propaganda purposes. This is a further indication, Mr. Speaker, that an election is in the offing.

I said earlier that this is a wrong Budget because it offers nothing new for the people of Saskatchewan. When I spoke to this House during the Throne Speech, I said that this 1967, this year of Canada's hundredth birthday, is a period in our history demanding of governments a new agenda for action. It is a time to do things for people which will have everlasting value. This Budget like the Throne Speech, offers nothing of the sort, it is a stand-at Budget, it offers no new programs, nor is there anything meaningful to date made in the Bills, in legislation, before us.

Mr. Speaker, to me one of the most disappointing features of this Budget is the refusal of the Government to recognize the problems our urban communities are facing in financing the many urgently needed programs and services such as schools, roads, housing, public health services, adequate supply of water, recreation facilities and so on.

I ask the Government when apportioning the different funds and grants that Regina be not ignored as it has in the two previous Budgets. I make the following specific recommendations for the consideration of the Government:

Construction of a technical and vocation school at Provincial and Federal expense. It is urgently needed and universally supported by the citizens of Regina.

Provide adequate funds and cooperate with the city of develop King's Park known as Boggy Creek, as a regional park.

Initiate in cooperation with the City and CMHC a massive housing construction and renovation program, with special emphasis on low-cost public housing and cooperative housing for university students and help the city acquire land for all types of housing, such property then to be made available at cost, prohibiting by law land speculation and profiteering.

Since the Government has announced its intention to continue the homeowner grants, these should be extended to renters, since their property taxes are included in the price of rent. Our native Canadians, the Indian and Métis, should be paid homeowner grants as a right.

Provide sufficient funds and personnel for an effective air pollution control program. This is a serious problem, Mr. Speaker, in my constituency. I regret that while The Air Pollution Control Act was enacted in 1965, the Government did not proclaim the Act until a few days ago. To date no personnel has been employed and I notice that the Budget does not set out any appropriation of funds for air pollution control.

I make two specific proposals and requests in respect of elementary and high school education. In view of the Provincial Local Government Board prohibiting, on Premier's orders, the sale of debentures for school construction, the Provincial Government should, therefore, build at Provincial expense the badly needed school facilities in the city of Regina.

The Liberal party in 1964 promised to provide 50 per cent of operating costs for both the public and separate school systems. Last year they paid less than 40 per cent. I ask the Government to keep its promise and pay at least 50 per cent of Regina's school operating costs.

The Premier told us that the original grid road program will be completed this year. In view of this, I ask the Government to provide similar assistance to urban centres for construction of urban roads and streets as was the case with the grid roads in rural Saskatchewan. I also ask that the two ring roads planned for Regina be proceeded with this year with the Provincial Government assuming all or the major part of the cost.

I urge the Government to proceed immediately with the construction of the base hospital – to delay construction any further will only aggravate the already acute situation – the base hospital to include the 600-bed geriatric centre they promised, a psychiatric and TB unit and other specialized facilities.

Adequate water supply continues to be a problem and inhibits Regina's growth. I ask the Government to take all steps necessary to insure that Regina has sufficient and guaranteed water supply for industrial and domestic use.

Public health grants for the city of Regina at present are based on 75 cents per capita. The regional public health services operated by the Province last year cost \$2.56 per capita and will apparently go up to about \$2.70 this year. I ask that grants for these services in Regina be raised to the same level as the cost of regional health services. There is no justification whatsoever to continue this discrimination. The Regina citizens pay all the Provincial taxes like other citizens. We are not free riders, Mr. Speaker, it's about time we were treated as first class citizens.

Since the problem of completing construction of the Regina auditorium was caused by the actions of the Government opposite when they took office, I ask the Government to now acknowledge its error and complete the auditorium at Provincial expense.

The Government should take all steps necessary towards expediting construction of facilities at the Regina university campus, ensuring adequate university facilities and operating grants, thus eliminating the policy of controlled student enrolment. Immediate plans should be initiated for the construction of a Community College.

As a token of appreciation, Mr. Speaker, and gratitude to our senior citizens, I suggest, not only for the people of Regina but for the people of the province, that the Government provide every Saskatchewan resident who is 65 years of age and over with a free pass to travel anywhere in the province on our Saskatchewan-owned buses during this Centennial Year. We owe it to the people of Saskatchewan; they built this province. Mr. Speaker, I suggest that this will likely cost the Government nothing since the buses often travel half empty, particularly on the first three or four days of the week. The details of such a plan can be worked out with ease.

Mr. Speaker, I ask the Government also to immediately initiate and provide funds for a nursery school program for pre-kindergarten children and day-care nurseries for youngsters where both parents are required to work. These should be developed in cooperation with local school authorities.

Mr. Speaker, I recognize that all the proposals and recommendations that I have made will cost money. I am also convinced that in all of these areas the senior Government has a responsibility and an obligation and must act now in order to relieve the property owners of Regina from the burden of municipal taxation. The Province has a larger base from which it can secure funds and must therefore assume a larger share of this responsibility.

Mr. Speaker, I want to turn briefly to a subject which is very close to me, to a subject that there is certainly a keen interest and I am glad that the Minister of Labour (Mr. Coderre) is in his seat, it is the subject of labour. The Minister of Labour speaking in this House last Friday, tried to build a case that the Saskatchewan Liberal party is not anti-labour. Now, Mr. Speaker, no matter what he says now, the anti-labour record of the Saskatchewan Liberals is a damning indictment, particularly on the present MLAs and some of those in the past. Not only are they anti-labour, they are anti-consumer, they are anti-cooperative, they are anti-Canadian, and they have now resorted to vilification and degradation of our farmers, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Coderre: — I'm anti-communist.

Mr. Smishek: — The Minister of Labour last Friday got wrapped up...

Mr. G. G. Leith (Elrose): — Mr. Speaker, on a question of privilege, I will not be included in the group that the Hon. Member opposite calls any of those things, especially anti-Canadian, and I ask that you ask him to withdraw that remark.

Mr. Speaker: — Order, order!

Mr. Smishek: — Mr. Speaker, I will withdraw the words anti-Canadian. The Minister of Labour (Mr. Coderre) last Friday got wrapped up in a series of figures, which proved nothing and were totally inaccurate as the Member for Moose Jaw (Mr. Davies) yesterday proved. Let him examine, I suggest, let the Minister of Labour examine the speeches of the Hon. Member for Notukeu-Willowbunch (Mr. Hooker), Bengough (Mr. Mitchell), Nipawin (Mr. Radloff) and Prince Albert (Mr. Steuart) made in this House since this session opened. Mr. Speaker, I was indeed disappointed last night to hear the Attorney General, the Member for Lumsden (Mr. Heald) align himself with some of the kind of abusive attacks on labour as some of the Members opposite have resorted over the years. I regret this very much because I've always had a high regard for the Attorney General (Mr. Heald) but apparently the anti-labour policy with which has been associated with over the years is now beginning to rub off on him. Mr. Speaker, I would suggest to the Minister of Labour (Mr. Coderre) that he read the remarks made by the Liberal MLA during the debates on Bills No. 79 and No. 2. Let him examine his own speeches of previous years and those of the Member for Athabasca (Mr. Guy). Mr. Speaker, they are a shameful distortion of facts, a heap of garbage that flowed from the lips of what are supposed to be honourable gentlemen. Mr. Speaker, what proves the point more than anything else is their action, Bills No. 2 and No. 29 enacted by this Government are anti-labour, repressive laws acknowledged as such by all those who respect the rights and freedoms of people.

Mr. Coderre: — Anti-political.

Mr. Smishek: — What are the consequences of Bill No. 79, Mr. Speaker,? Well, here is the acid test. The Hon. Member for Moose Jaw (Mr. Davies), the senior Member yesterday made some reference to it. He asked some questions in the House. Question one was this:

How many applications for union certification were considered by the Labour Relations Board during 1966? What was the total number of employees involved in all such applications?

The answer: 155 applications considered, 1,050 employees involved.

Question No. 2:

What was the total number of employees affected in the rejected applications?

Answer, provided by the Minister of Labour (Mr. Coderre) 632. In other words, Mr. Speaker, 60 per cent of the applications were rejected and only 40 per cent were successful.

Question No. 3:

How many applications involving unfair labour practices were made to the Labour Relations Board in 1966?

Answer: 46.

Question No. 4:

How many of the unfair labour practice cases in 1966 concerned applications for reinstatement of employees discharged contrary to the provisions of the Trade Union Act?

Answer: 16.

Question No. 5:

How many of these applications were granted and how many were dismissed?

Answer: None were granted, 12 were withdrawn.

Mr. Speaker, let us compare the union membership gains under the old Trade Union Act, and we will find a very revealing story. In 1964 the net gain of new trade union membership was 1,035. The Liberal Administration was in office for only part of the year. In 1965 the net gain in trade union membership dropped to 653. The figures I am quoting, Mr. Speaker, are taken from the annual report of the Department of Labour, filed by the Minister. In 1966, Mr. Speaker, the net union membership gain is only 418. In 1964 – 1,035, in 1965 – 653, a drop of 40 per cent. In 1966 a further drop of over 30 per cent. This is the consequence, Mr. Speaker, of the Liberal Administration and last year 60 per cent of the union applications that were filed were unsuccessful and were rejected.

This is the effect of the so-called employer's freedom of speech provision, and the consequences of the required 60 per cent majority rule for certification. Employees now, Mr. Speaker, I submit, are denied the same right and freedom they used to have and used to enjoy to organize unions of their choice without interference from the employers. Amending the recognized majority rule of 50 per cent plus one for automatic certification and raising it to 60 per cent plus one, together with giving employers by law a right to interfere with employees in forming unions, have seriously inhibited union growth and employees rights.

In the matter of unfair labour practice cases, unions are giving up hope of winning cases under the amended Trade union Act and taking cases to the present labour Relations . This is demonstrated by the number of cases filed and withdrawn. After filing application they check the record, consult their counsel and withdraw, rather than go through expensive litigation. Their hope of wining is slim or nil, Mr. Speaker.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Smishek: — Mr. Speaker, Bill No. 2 has unquestionably proved to be a totally bad and wrong way of dealing with labour-management relations. Six months have elapsed since this Bill was enacted. The dispute between the SPC and the OCAW, which was initiated by this Government in order to give them an excuse to pass the anti-labour, viscous and undemocratic Bill No. 2, is still not settled. Months of hearings, litigation and recrimination have gone on with no sign of settlement.

STATEMENT BY MR. SPEAKER RE: SPC AND OCAW DISPUTE

Mr. Speaker: — The chair must determine whether it is proper for Members to make reference, as it appears to me is about to be done, to an arbitration presently being conducted under The Essential Services Emergency Act, 1966, that is, whether the sub judice rule should apply in this case.

The reason for the sub judice rule is to prevent debate which might directly or indirectly prejudice or be injurious to the interests of any of the parties concerned in an action, or which might tend improperly to influence a Court in its efforts to arrive at a just and a fair decision.

That the parties involved in a dispute have the undoubted right to be heard and to state their respective cases, and the judge the unquestioned privilege of arriving at a decision, unhampered and uninfluenced by anything save the facts, is supported by many parliamentary precedents and years of tradition.

That the Arbitration Board is conducting a judicial hearing is beyond dispute, since under Section 6 of The Essential Services Emergency Act, the Board has the power to hear evidence under oath and the Chairman has the powers of a Commissioner under The Public Inquiries Act, that is to say, the same power to enforce the attendance of witnesses and to compel them to give evidence under oath as is vested in any Court of Record in civil cases.

Moreover, the decision of the Arbitration Board is binding on both parties and enforceable in the same way as a judgment of Court of Queen's Bench.

While I agree that the House may discuss labour-management relations generally, for to deny this would, I think, be an improper restriction on the right of free speech. I would draw attention to the fact that the matter before the Board is singular and specific, and I feel certain that Members would want me to be guided by the long-accepted precedents with respect to the rights of citizens whose case is before the courts, that is, to be heard without interference and without prejudice.

I would rule, therefore, that the dispute between the Oil, Chemical and Atomic Workers' Union and the Saskatchewan Power Corporation is presently sub judice and must not be referred to in any motion, debate or question in this House.

I would have been remiss in my duties if I had not given previous and prior consideration to the possibility of this point of order arising. The debate continues.

Hon. W. S. Lloyd (Leader of the Opposition): — May I ask for some clarification with respect to your ruling, Sir. As I understood what the Member from Regina East (Mr. Smishek) was saying, he was talking about the Act, about the principle of the Act, not about the application of the Act. Surely what the Arbitration Board, to which Your Honour refers is doing, is applying the Act in a specific way. Do I understand from your ruling then, Sir, that Bill No. 2 and its implications which are wider than this specific case are not to be referred to in debate whatsoever?

Mr. Speaker: — No., you don't understand any such thing. I never at anytime said that any Member could not refer to Bill No. 2 or its implications. But what you must not refer to is what is specifically before the Board of Arbitration at this time, which is a dispute, as I understand it, between the OCAW union and the Saskatchewan Power Corporation of the Province of Saskatchewan, one on either side. Now I draw this to your attention because in my opinion this is just what the Member (Mr. Smishek) was starting to do.

Mr. Smishek: — Mr. Speaker, I want to...

Mr. A. E. Blakeney: — Mr. Speaker, this concerns the rights of this House and I think we ought to be very clear that what is prohibited are the facts in the dispute, not the fact that the dispute has been referred to arbitration for example because that flows from the Bill and not from the dispute, not the fact for example that the decision may be delayed because that flows from the Bill and not from the dispute. While I agree with Your Honour's ruling clearly that the facts which are before the tribunal cannot be discussed, the fact of the tribunal and of its operations can very well be discussed since they flow from the Bill.

Mr. Speaker: — Personal reference should not be made either singly or collectively to the people who form the tribunal, that is those who were appointed by the Government and those who were appointed by the labour unions or to their assistants. As to the Bill No. 2 itself, I don't consider that it is sub judice and I think the Member brought up a good point in which he was fairly correct, but I would add this that, if anybody is going to say anything along the line of trying to influence the Board to hasten its proceedings, then this impinges on the sub judice rule and I bring this to the attention of the House for the better order of the House in regard thereto.

Mr. Smishek: — Mr. Speaker, if I may continue, I did not refer and did not in fact mention this particular Board of Arbitration

and do not intend to, I can assure you of that.

Mr. Speaker, the amount of money which this Government has spent in lawyer fees or legal fees and litigation and other related costs over the last few months is larger I submit than the amount of money that was originally involved to have settled this dispute. What the union was asking would have been less than what is going to be spent on legal fees and litigation and other related costs. Mr. Speaker, it appears obvious now that the Premier has only one purpose in mind. It is to destroy the union of these employees. The Cliff Baskin case, the failure to bargain in good faith, Bill No. 79 of aiding and abetting raiding, Bill 2, are self-evident indications that this Government is bent on destroying this particular union. Mr. Speaker, if the Government is determined to break the OCAW union through Bill No. 2 and other action, why include thousands of innocent other workers under Bill No. 2, the hospital employees, the civic workers and other who have never gone on strike nor even taken any strike votes. No reason can be found other than their contempt for unions, a proof of Liberal Government anti-labour motivations.

The Premier has been travelling about the country advocating labour courts, Mr. Speaker, as a panacea to deal with labour-management relations. What does he mean by labour courts? He does not say. How will it work? Under what rules? He does not say, Mr. Speaker. Will labour and management be represented? Will there be a right of appeal? He does not say, Mr. Speaker.

Courts, you know, have a ring of justice about them. They are supposed to be fair and impartial. Surely that's not what the Premier wants. Let us look at the kangaroo court he established to deal with the Baskin dispute. Look at the way he stacked things in his favour in Bill 2. Some of the chairmen appointed by the Minister of Labour to act on the Conciliation Boards, for example, Mr. Speaker, the past president of the Saskatchewan Employers Association. I may cite more. Examine the manner the present Labour Relations Board was constituted. Any labour court established by the Liberal Government would not be impartial. It would be partial to the anti-labour policies of the Liberal Government and the Liberal party.

You know, Mr. Speaker, with labour courts are associated such things as police, jails, lawyers and expensive litigation. Is this the way to promote labour-management harmony and industrial peace? The obvious answer is No. Courts imply more. They imply and provide for right of appeal. I am sure the Premier doesn't want that, he wants binding and compulsory arbitration to deal with all labour-management matters. This is really what he is talking about, Mr. Speaker.

Labour-management relations, collective bargaining is a human relations process. It cannot be legislated or forced upon by law anymore than you could legislate love, marriage or honour. It requires mutual respect and understanding. It is well recognized that a good law must command wide respect and support, particularly by those to whom it applies. Compulsory arbitration

does not have this respect and support of labour and many employers and will not work.

Compulsory arbitration has many social implications. It introduces forced labour, it denies the right to withhold labour, it denies the right of appeal, it is unpalatable to a democratic form of government, it is an erosion of democratic rights of people. Mr. Speaker, it inhibits serious bargaining because the eyes are always on the road to arbitration; it assumes, Mr. Speaker, that the third party has and knows the answers. It has been proven many times over that the third party does not have the answers to collective bargaining. At best it may only have a few answers. Labour would welcome the development of collective bargaining where strikes are unnecessary. Labour and management with the cooperation of government must look for those kinds of solutions.

I draw your attention to an article appearing in Business Week Magazine of January 21, 1967, Mr. Speaker, under the caption of "Can You Force Labour Peace." It is a report of labour and management experts gathered for an anniversary meeting of the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Services. The report notes:

There was one unanimous view. Compulsory arbitration is not the best device for handling critical strikes, whether they create or threaten an emergency or lead to substantial inconvenience for the public.

Who were the people that were agreeing on this? Well, Sir, they were such men as Virgil Daly, Vice President of General electric and R. Conrad Cooper, Vice President of US Steel. Cooper went on further and said: "We probably don't need more laws; we need less." Simpkin, a Director of Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service, said: "We must somehow avoid any further movements in the area of compulsion. The number one issue is the party's right to say No."

What is required is maturity in collective bargaining, not compulsion. We need more expert advice and research, facilities-finding studies when differences and disputes arise, strengthening the voluntary conciliation and mediation process, meaningful labour-management studies, expenditure of additional public funds.

I wonder why, Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Labour (Mr. Coderre) did not tell this House the other day that only \$71,000 will be spent by the Government on labour relations, conciliation services and industrial standards, only \$9,000 more than was budgeted for three years ago. This is less than one-third of what the Premier will be spending on propaganda and then the Minister of Labour has the audacity to say he and his party are not anti-labour.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Smishek: — Let us look at a few more

Department of Labour expenditures. Administration, a little more money but one employee less than in 1964. The same is true of labour standards, less people and less money than in 1964. And he says not anti-labour. Let us take a look at apprenticeship and trades training. Here we find that the Government has slashed the apprenticeship and trades training program by \$178,000 compared with last year and two employees less than in 1964. The Minister (Mr. Coderre) says he's not anti-labour and the Premier beats his chest and says: "We sharply increased expenditures for education." Who is kidding who, Mr. Speaker?

What is the Liberal manpower program? Well, Sir, it's seven caravans that will be travelling about the country. You know, Mr. Speaker, when I looked at this seven caravan proposition costing \$70,000 each, staffed by seven counsellors, and seven assistants, you know I was reminded of a nursery rhyme that my little two year old daughter likes me to read to her. It goes like this:

As I was going to St. Ives, I met a man with seven wives. Every wife had seven sacks, every sack had seven cats, every cat had seven kittens. Kits, cats, sacks and wives. How many were going to St. Ives?

Mr. Speaker, this has the tone of that nursery rhyme. Caravans, counsellors, assistants, propagandists. How many are going to be combing Saskatchewan countryside in search of votes for the Liberal party?

Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Labour made some correction the other day of his speech. I asked him to make some further corrections and retractions. He is reported in the weekend press that minimum wages in the Province of Saskatchewan were increased twice from \$36.50 to \$50 per week. Mr. Speaker, this is not true. This is not true and he knows it. Minimum wages for the last three years for full time employees went up by \$3.50 per week; minimum wages went up from \$36.50 to \$40 per week in cities and from \$34.50 to \$38 in the country. There is one \$50 minimum rate for full time janitors and caretakers that too was increased by only \$3.50. Minimum wages were not increased for a great number of employees, the part-time employees, employees who work less than 36 hours per week. In the cities, Mr. Speaker, this is a large group, perhaps a majority of those to whom minimum wages apply. Since 1964 there has been no increase to those employees, Mr. Speaker. I asked the Minister of Labour to withdraw and correct his statement. Telling untruths about labour conditions, Mr. Speaker, is also anti-labour. It is wrong and, Mr. Speaker, it is also a sin.

Mr. Coderre: — Would the Hon. Member permit a question?

Mr. Smishek: — No, I will not permit a question.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Smishek: — The same untruths were told by the Minister in respect to labour growth. The non-agricultural labour force increases have been refuted by the Hon. Member for Moose Jaw (Mr. Davies) and I will not go into detail. Mr. Speaker, I ask the Government to increase the minimum wages immediately to \$1.25 per hour, I ask the Government to reduce the hours of work to 40 hours per week, the same as provided in the Canada Standards Labour Code. Every time we introduce these measures Government Members vote against them. Mr. Speaker, to prove to the people of Saskatchewan that the Liberal party is not anti-labour, I suggest that they first must recognize the labour movement; allow it direct representation on various Government Boards and committees such as the Minimum Wage Board, the Workmen's Compensation Board, the Labour Relations Board. Labour must be free to select its representatives. This you have refused to do. you have told labour who its representatives must be. Mr. Speaker, repeal of Bills Nos. 2 and 70 is a must as proof of not being anti-labour. Raising of labour standards and strengthening the Department of Labour is a must as evidence of good faith. Mr. Speaker, the Members opposite have failed and have refused to do this thing. they have failed to keep their election promises. Mr. Speaker, I submit that they have stabbed labour in the back.

Mr. Speaker, I will support the amendment. I will vote against the motion.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. W. Ross Thatcher (Premier): — Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Member who just took his seat said that the Liberal party has stabbed labour in the back. May I say that for the first time in the history of this province, labour has full employment at good wages.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Thatcher: — This Government does not merely talk about statutes. We act to give labour the things that they need and I absolutely refuse to accept statements made by the Hon. Member (Mr. Smishek) who took his seat. This gentleman is prejudiced. He makes his living off the backs of labour, if anyone does.

It has been my privilege, Mr. Speaker, to have been in politics for about 20 years, in Ottawa and in Regina. In all that period I cannot recall a Budget Debate which has been quite so dull, except for an hour or so last night of course. Nor can I recall a Debate where the Opposition was able to find so little to criticize so far as major policy was concerned. For the most part their criticism has been puerile, picayune and ineffective. And they have failed completely to put any sensible alternatives before this Legislature.

I suppose the greatest compliment to this Budget has been paid to us by the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Lloyd), because, since the day he read it, he has been running up and down this

province saying: "Clear the decks, get ready; after that Budget we're going to have an election."

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Thatcher: — In Moose Jaw the other day he even picked the day! April 26. Mr. Speaker, in past years whenever the Socialists lowered taxes, and that was very seldom, or whenever they increased services, they always called an election. They just can't believe that the Liberals might have introduced this sound and effective Budget, not as election bait, but because it's in the interests of the people of Saskatchewan. It could be, Mr. Speaker, that we'll have an election in April 26. On the other hand, we might wait as long as two years before we have an election. Whenever the date comes I'm absolutely certain of one thing, that a lot of my hon. friends opposite won't be around after the election is over because the people of Saskatchewan know Socialism at first hand. They know that for two decades Socialism gave them oppressive taxation, depopulation, industrial stagnation, and after that 20-year fiasco they're not very likely to try it again.

In passing I want to leave the legitimate Socialists for a moment and turn to the Hon. Member for Arm River (Mr. Pederson) because the Hon. Member has announced that he is voting against this very progressive Budget. So far, Mr. Speaker, he is batting 100 per cent this session, every vote for the Socialists. I'm sure the Hon. Member wouldn't mind me giving him a little kindly advice. Saskatchewan has one Socialist party; I don't think it needs that one. But it certainly doesn't need a second Socialist party, a Conservative Socialist party, because the Conservative party traditionally is a party of private enterprise. I have talked with many Conservatives, and they don't like their Leader talking and voting with the socialists on most occasions. Small wonder that conservatives throughout Saskatchewan refuse to give him campaign funds. Small wonder he can't find any candidates or very few of them. Small wonder that the Federal Conservatives are so nervous about helping him. Small wonder the thousands of Conservatives in this province vote Liberal provincially. Mr. Speaker, the objections, the actions and the votes of the Hon. Member from Arm River, make it crystal clear that in Saskatchewan today the Liberal party is the private enterprise party and the Liberal party is the only real alternative to Socialism.

Now, Mr. Speaker, what has the Opposition criticism of this Budget been in the main? first of all they claimed the Government has indulged in deficit financing. We have made no secret of the fact that \$6,500,000 of our four-lane program has been put into a capital account. It is also true as I indicated, that we are putting sinking funds aside to pay for the highway program over a ten-year period. The Member for Regina West (Mr. Blakeney) criticized the Government in this regard. He said that what is required...

Mr. Kramer: — What about Crown lands?

Mr. Thatcher: — Would you quit braying. Can't you make some contribution to this House? The Hon. Member for Regina West said that: "what is required is not evasion but straight forward candour," and he intimated that in some way we were deceiving the public. Mr. Speaker, I would remind the Hon. Member for Regina West that the Socialist Government used the same revenue and capital account consistently up until 1957. Therefore, according to his reasoning, they deceived the public for 13 years. During the years of Socialist Government a total of \$33,000,000 was borrowed for highways and it still remains dead weight debt - \$33,000,000. Under the Socialists, year after year huge sums for highways were not included in the current accounts. I say flatly today that this is one more case of the Socialists acting one way in office, but advocating something completely different now that they are in the Opposition. I would also point out that every province in the Dominion of Canada uses revenue in capital accounts. The four-lane highways will be used for many years to come, and we see no reason why the people who use these facilities should not help to pay for a portion of the cost. The only other alternative would be higher taxes. I repeat that this Government, after 20 years of Socialist, believes that taxes in this province are already out of line. If revenue should prove to be more buoyant than we expect it to be this year, a portion or all of that \$6,500,000 will be put back into the current account.

A second criticism made by the Opposition has had to do with our highway program. The Hon. Member for Arm River (Mr. Pederson) said:

The Provincial Government's crash program of highway construction has left spending by other departments in a lopsided condition. It seems to me that the Premier's road building mania has starved other Departments."

Mr. Speaker, we have given highways huge sums of money but not at the expense of other key Departments. Actually spending on education, on health and on the University this year, proportionately, will be a good deal more than we're spending on highways as far as the increase is concerned. The Hon. Member for Melfort-Tisdale (Mr. Willis), the former Minister of Highways, was also critical of our program. He said price bids for highway work have rocketed during the three years of Liberal Administration. Of course costs have gone up. during the past three years prices in all fields have risen as labour costs have increased. Now this Government has built highways by calling for tenders from contractors from Saskatchewan, Alberta and in Manitoba. In virtually all cases the lowest tender has been taken. We believe we are getting the most efficient job possible by building highways this way. Naturally the fact that we are building two or three times more highways this year than the Socialist ever built, means that there is some pressure. However, as new contractors return to Saskatchewan, and as they add new equipment, we believe that competition will keep prices under control. We don't deny that Saskatchewan has major problems

insofar as highways are concerned. With five per cent of the nation's population, we have 30 per cent of the country's roads to build, and we are remedying the situation. As I say, this year we shall spend a minimum of \$56,000,000 on highways, and we will give local governments another \$10,400,000 to build roads. Compare those sums with the paltry \$24,200,000, which the Socialist spent in their last year of office. This Government believes that our people want better highways and a Liberal Government is going to build those highways.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Thatcher: — May I remind you that we building this great mileage of roads without tax increases.

The third major criticism of the Socialists is the allegation that the Government is not spending enough money on education. I suppose, Mr. Speaker, that it is impossible to ever spend enough money in this vital field. Even where education is concerned, there must be some relation to money allocated and the economic capacity of the taxpayers.

But I do remind you that this year we will spend overall \$90,300,000 on education, an increase net of \$12,000,000 over a year ago. In our Budget this year, 30 per cent of it will go for education. This is more than 70 per cent above the highest figure that the Socialists ever spent on education. During the Debate they claim we aren't giving enough school grants. Again I say that school grants this year will be over \$70,000,000. That is an increase net of \$6,100,000 and the basis is comparable. this year we will pay 51 ½ per cent of school costs. It is interesting to compare those sums, Mr. Speaker, to Socialist assistance when they were in the Government. In their last full year of office they gave our schools not \$70,000,000 but \$37,600,000 and that was their best year. In short, Mr. Speaker, this Government has given education top priority. We have done so because we believe there is no better investment a Government can make than in its young people. the socialists can cry from now till Doomsday that we haven't given enough, but I say again that Liberal grants to education are far, far more generous than those ever given by the Socialists. The Socialists talk about education; the Liberals provide our institutions with hard cash.

This fourth major criticism which the socialists have made about this Budget, is the proposal to take 25 per cent of the SPC profits into the Consolidated Revenue Fund. Yesterday the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Lloyd) indicated that this proposal was deceitful. Well, Mr. Speaker, if this practice is deceitful may I repeat that the Socialists have been deceitful in the same manner for more than a decade, because year after year they took from the Telephone Company, not 25 per cent of profits but 100 per cent of the profits to help balance their Budget. As I have already indicated, this Budget is permitting the Telephone Company to keep \$3,000,000 and put it into their equity account. We are, it is true, taking \$3,000,000 from the SPC, but one offsets the other. Now I believe that to suggest

as the Leader of the Opposition did, that some way this represents a tax increase, is obviously economic poppycock. It will be the policy of this Government to build up the equity capital both of the Telephone Company and the Power Corporation. How nice it is for a change, Mr. Speaker, to have some profits in the Power Corporation, which can be used to provide the people of this province with service, because there certainly were no profits around when the Socialists and Mr. Cass-Beggs were running the company.

There is one final matter that I would like to raise at this time. At least one of the Opposition Members across the way expressed the belief that my personal expense accounts were too high. And I notice that the Commonwealth, the official organ of the socialists, has also been intimating that in some way I have been joy riding around this province, this country and elsewhere at the taxpayers' expense. Mr. Speaker, since assuming leadership of the Government, I have travelled in many parts of Canada. I have travelled in many parts of the United States. I have travelled to Europe. Initially of course both as Premier and as Provincial Treasurer I have been obliged to attend Provincial-dominion Conferences. With the dual portfolio there are a good many of these conferences. Then in addition I have been obliged to attend meetings of the Prairie Economic Council, something which didn't exist under the Socialists. But even more important, Mr. Speaker, I have travelled extensively in an effort to find new industry.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Thatcher: — After 20 years of Socialist, industry generally had been suspicious of Saskatchewan. Everywhere I have gone I have tried to give business groups one message, that the Socialist war on business is over and that private enterprise is now welcome here. It has been my experience, Mr. Speaker, that you can't get businesses and industry by sitting in an office in Regina like the socialists used to do. I suggest that these trips have had some merit. For example, I recall that negotiations for the Anglo-Rouyn Mine began after a large meeting I had in Toronto. Discussions with the Hon. Bob Winters commenced immediately thereafter. I would point out that MacMillan and Bloedel is in this province after discussions I had following a Vancouver meeting. Canada Cement Company decided to expand following a trip which I had in Montreal. The Prince Albert pulp mill is in this province because of two trips I made to New York and with the Minister of Natural Resources (Mr. Steuart).

An Hon. Member: — Where's your pulp mill?

Mr. Thatcher: — Canadian Controllers Limited, a company established a few weeks ago, is here following a meeting I had in Toronto. If I had 20 minutes I would enumerate more industries that are coming because I had trips which I or the Minister of Industry has taken. Sir, I made no apology for the expenses of my office, and as long as I am here I'm going to take a lot more trips and

I shall get a lot more industry for this province.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, may I say that never since 1944 have the socialists looked quite so futile, quite so hapless, quite so disorganized as they have in the last ten days. One person sitting up in the gallery the other day told me they looked like a group of tired, bewildered old men.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Thatcher: — In this Debate they've been like a ship without a rudder. They've been leaderless, they've been bankrupt of new ideas. As the Member for Athabasca (Mr. Guy) pointed out last night, they can't even decide what their party name is. Mr. Speaker, why have they been so ineffective this last ten days. surely one reason is the fact that this Liberal Budget is a good Budget. This Liberal Budget provides for increased spending on services more than \$34,000,000. This Liberal Budget gives education huge increases. This Liberal Budget provides millions more for health. This Liberal Budget gives local governments so much more money that the President of SARM said: "We are indeed pleased." This Liberal Budget provides funds for the largest, most imaginative program in our history. And while doing all this, Mr. Speaker, this Liberal Government provides no increases in taxes, no increases in taxes, Mr. Speaker, at a time when almost every other administration in Canada is either raising taxes or is indulging in huge deficit financing.

Mr. E. Whalen (Regina North): — Tell us about the Gallup Poll.

Mr. Thatcher: — Mr. Speaker, I do not say that the Liberals will fight an election on this Budget, but I will say that nothing would give me greater personal pleasure than to fight it on such an issue. The days of Socialist in Saskatchewan are rapidly drawing to a close. and I say, again, Mr. Speaker, whenever we do go to the polls I know that a great majority of these weak, ineffective Opposition Members will no longer be here.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Speaker: — Order! For the information of the Member for Hanley (Mr. Walker) who has his eye glued to the clock, let me inform him that the House accorded the Member from Regina who was finishing his speech four minutes and accorded the Premier three minutes.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Speaker: — The question before the House is on the amendment.

The amendment was negatived on the following recorded division:

YEAS — 27

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

NAYS — 29

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

Mr. Speaker: — The question before the House is now on the motion.

Motion agreed to on the following recorded division:

YEAS — 29

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

NAYS — 27

Lloyd	Whelan	Snyder
Hunt (Mrs.)	Nicholson	Broten

March 1, 1967

Wood
Nollet
Walker
Brockelbank (Kelsey)
Blakeney
Michayluk
Smishek

Baker
Wooff
Kramer
Dewhurst
Berezowsky
Pederson
Willis

Larson
Robbins
Pepper
Brockelbank (Sktn. City)
Davies
Thibault
Link

The Assembly adjourned at 5:30 o'clock p.m.