

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN
First Session – Sixteenth Legislature
5th Day

Wednesday, February 21, 1968

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

WELCOME TO STUDENTS

Mr. J.B. Hooker (Notukeu-Willowbunch): — Mr. Speaker, I would like to introduce to you and through you to the Members of this Assembly the grade 12 high school room from Glentworth, Saskatchewan. These students are accompanied here today by one of their teachers, Mr. Adams, and by Mr. Nelson, a unit board member. We hope that their visit to this Assembly this afternoon will not only be informative but also educational, and I know that the Members of this Assembly wish them a very pleasant afternoon and a safe journey home.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. L.P. Coderre (Gravelbourg): — Mr. Speaker, I wish to draw to the attention of this House a group of 25 students from the College Mathieu school in Gravelbourg. They are accompanied by their teacher, Mr. Guy Pariseau and Brother Vereyken. They are in grade 12 and I would like to draw the attention to this House that many of these students are from Quebec, Ontario, Manitoba and Saskatchewan and they are availing themselves of the bilingual attitude or atmosphere of Gravelbourg. I am sure that the Members of this Assembly will join with us in welcoming them here this afternoon. I am sure they will find it most enjoyable hearing the Premier of this Province. On behalf of the Assembly I would like to welcome them here.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. E.G. Gardner (Moosomin): — Mr. Speaker, I would like to welcome to this Legislature today a group of students from the Peebles school. They are accompanied by Mrs. Hawken, and they are in the east gallery behind me. Peebles is in the extreme southwest corner of my constituency, so this group includes students from Qu'Appelle-Wolseley and Cannington, and I would like to extend them a welcome on behalf of these Members also.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. G.T. Snyder (Moose Jaw North): — Mr. Speaker, I want to take this opportunity on your behalf and on behalf of all the Members of this Assembly to welcome here a group of nurses-in-training at the Providence Hospital in Moose Jaw. They are located in the Speaker's gallery. The Providence Hospital is one of two hospitals in

Moose Jaw, a fine hospital. We have not been given to understand that their SHSP grants are to be cut off, so we assume, Mr. Speaker, that they will continue to provide a valuable service to our community. I want to take this opportunity on behalf of the Member for Moose Jaw South (Mr. Davies) to welcome them here. Mr. Davies would have liked to be here but he has been detained because of sickness. I want to take this opportunity to wish them a pleasant and rewarding day with us today.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. W.A. Forsyth (Saskatoon Nutana South): — Mr. Speaker, yesterday it was my pleasure to introduce to this House a very fine group of students from Queen Elizabeth school in Saskatoon. Today there is a grade 7 class from that same school here, another very fine group of young people and again they have been brought to Regina by Mr. Flury. We are very, very happy to have these people with us. I am sure that they will enjoy not only their visit to the House but the educational visit which will take them to other points of interest in the city of Regina. Mr. Husulak, the principal of Queen Elizabeth school is a very old friend of mine and I am particularly pleased to welcome you people here today.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. G.G. Leith (Elrose): — Mr. Speaker, I wish to take this opportunity to introduce to you, and through you to Members of the Legislature, a group of students in the wet gallery of the Legislature, about 47, from the Dinsmore school which is in the Eston-Elrose school unit. They are accompanied by Mr. Bruce McLean and Mrs. Fay Beattie, teachers, and driven in the school bus by Mr. Mann. I think that this is the first time that students from Dinsmore school have come this far to visit the Legislature. I think it is going to be an interesting and instructive afternoon. They arrived just a little too late to have a full tour of the building itself, and they are going to be a little short of time to visit the Museum of Natural History. But I think when they go back they are going to be able to tell their friends and their parents that they had a good tour of Regina and of the Legislature. Dinsmore is one of the large education centres in west central Saskatchewan. Some of these students are from the neighboring constituency of Rosetown, but most of them are from the Elrose constituency. Some come up from the King George school district, Queen Elizabeth school district, some of them go to Dinsmore from Wiseton. I take great pleasure in welcoming them today because I can look out my kitchen window and see the town of Wiseton. I walk out in my yard and I can see the town of Dinsmore, 20 miles away. These people come from one of the best farming areas of the country. They are I think indicative of the high standard of the youth of Saskatchewan today. Mr. Speaker, I want to welcome them.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

February 21, 1968

Hon. D.T. McFarlane (Qu'Appelle-Wolseley): — Mr. Speaker, I join with the Members for Cannington (Mr. Weatherald) and Moosomin (Mr. Gardner) in welcoming the students from my own home school district. For many reasons, Mr. Speaker, this is one of the best areas of Saskatchewan. I am sure that the stay here this afternoon by these young people will be enjoyed, will be educational, and we will look forward to seeing them back here on many more occasions.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

QUESTIONS

PHASING OUT OF THE QUAKER OATS FEED MILL IN SASKATOON

Mr. R. Romanow (Saskatoon Riversdale): — Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, I wonder if I might be able to direct a question to the Hon. Premier (Mr. Thatcher). Yesterday, Mr. Speaker, you will recall a question directed by my colleague from Saskatoon Mayfair (Mr. Brockelbank) about the proposed phasing out of the Quaker Oats Feed Mill in Saskatoon. Would the Hon. Premier be good enough to inform Members of the House if he has taken any steps to inform himself about this position today?

Hon. W.R. Thatcher (Premier): — We are in the process of making inquiries but I still have no report to make to the House.

ADJOURNED DEBATES

ADDRESS-IN-REPLY

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Mr. McPherson (Regina South West) and the proposed amendment thereto by Mr. Lloyd (Leader of the Opposition).

Mr. Thatcher: — Mr. Speaker, this afternoon I should like to initially join with other Hon. Members who have welcomed students to this Chamber. I should particularly like to welcome a group which have come from the constituency of Morse, the town of Eyebrow. They are here, I understand, with their teacher, Mr. Dayday. I think it is interesting that each year more and more of our young people are interested in the workings of the Legislature. I suppose it won't be many years before some of them will be sitting as Members of this Legislature. I hope of course that many will decide to sit on the Government side when that time comes, and that we are still the Government.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Thatcher: — Mr. Speaker, a few days ago, we commenced the first session

of this 16th Legislature. I should like again to congratulate those Members who have taken their seat for the first time in this House, and several who have returned after an absence. I am sure that it will be the united purpose of Members on both sides of the House to work in the best interests of the people of Saskatchewan.

We are here in this Legislature today after a general election in our province. I am pleased, of course, that the people of Saskatchewan chose to return the Liberal party to office for another term, with a substantially increased majority.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Thatcher: — I hope you noticed, Mr. Speaker, and I'm sure you did, that the Liberal popular vote sharply increased from 1964, it went from 40½ per cent to 46½ per cent. I am going to suggest to you this afternoon that this fact is significant. I wonder how many Hon. Members realize that Mr. Manning and the Alberta Government, with his very substantial majority, only received 44 per cent of the popular vote. I wonder how many Hon. Members realize that Premier Robarts of Ontario only received 42 per cent of the popular vote. Mr. Johnson, in Quebec, a year ago, only had 42 per cent of the popular vote. The Government of British Columbia had 46 per cent of the popular vote. For that reason, Mr. Speaker, I am sure that we might be excused in this debate for expressing pleasure at the great wisdom of the Saskatchewan people for giving us, as I said, 46½ per cent of the popular vote.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Thatcher: — Very frankly, I had rather hoped for a larger majority than the 11 seats which we hold at the moment. However, 11 are much better than the four, which we had in the last Legislature, so we are not complaining. I am sure you will permit me to say, however, Mr. Speaker, that a few hundred votes in the right constituencies could very easily have given us a majority of 20 on this side of the Legislature.

Perhaps you wouldn't mind me saying, Mr. Speaker, that the Liberals have steadily improved their position in every single election since 1952. In the next campaign we hope and expect to finish the job permanently, ridding Saskatchewan of the Socialists, whether NDPs or CCFers.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Thatcher: — Mr. Speaker, the Liberals were elected last October 11th on the basis of a 15 point program. We would like to think it was a businesslike program which contained no extravagant promises that we can't carry out. We did not make promises that

February 21, 1968

we felt the people could not afford. We intend, without reservation, to fulfil every one of those 15 promises over the next four years.

Why did the people of Saskatchewan give the Liberal party another mandate? I believe the Liberals were re-elected for three major reasons: (1) first of all, because the people approved our programs designed to expand both agriculture and industry; (2) because they endorsed our realistic fiscal policies. Year after year they noticed that Saskatchewan Liberals balanced their budgets, and also reduced taxes at the same time; (3) because in the election campaign, we put forward a platform which was both responsible and progressive. Today I propose in this debate to deal at some length with our plans for the next four years.

Mr. Speaker, let me make it very clear at the outset that the Liberal party will continue trying to build a better Saskatchewan by using private enterprise methods.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Thatcher: — We know that this system has given Canadians one of the highest living standards in all the world. We are convinced that the private enterprise system can provide a maximum of good jobs in the Province of Saskatchewan. We know that the new industries which are coming here – almost all private enterprise companies – will widen the overall tax base, and permit us to ease the tax burden on the average citizen. Now our Socialist friends may disagree with that philosophy. They claim that Socialism, state ownership of resources and industries could do more for Saskatchewan. I remind the House, Mr. Speaker, that the CCF were 20 years in office. Yes, they certainly failed to produce any results which would justify such a claim.

Yesterday afternoon, Mr. Speaker, I pointed out to you that a year ago the Socialists were defeated in Norway. A month ago the Socialists were defeated in Denmark. All reports say that, when there is an election in Sweden in October, they will be defeated again. People all over the world are finding out that there is nothing wrong with Socialism except that it won't work.

If any additional proof should be needed, I would invite the people of Saskatchewan today, who may be listening on the radio, to look at the fiasco which has taken place recently in Great Britain under a Socialist Government. Recently the British have watched their country going from one crisis to another, always growing weaker economically. Among other measures, the Socialist Government of Britain has frozen all wages. What would happen in Saskatchewan if we followed that Socialist example? They have taken over the steel industry; they boycotted the export of capital; they set up planners to direct investment – some planning. They savagely raised taxes. At least partly as a result of this Socialist tinkering, today Britain

faces economic chaos. Last year the British gross national product under the Socialists went up only 2.6 per cent, the lowest of any major industrial country in the whole world.

Britain has fallen further and further behind Western Europe in almost every economic field. Partly as a result unemployment has increased sharply. A few weeks ago we watched the Socialist Government of Britain bring in devaluation of the pound – the second time since the war. Yet even after that devaluation, the pound is still shaky and under attack. Already you hear talk of another balance-of-payment crisis within 18 months. The whole economy, my friends in Saskatchewan, under Socialism reeks of decay, incompetence and failure.

There is a growing revolt among the young people of Britain. It shows up in the form of large-scale emigration of doctors, engineers, teachers and other professional people. Not long ago, they held an opinion poll among young people. It was learned that 43 per cent of the young Britishers would like to leave their country. In this respect, I suggest that anyone who still thinks that Socialism may be the answer – and there are fewer everyday – should take a look at the mess in Great Britain since the Socialists took office. Yet this is the kind of system that the NDP still advocate for the Province of Saskatchewan. Small wonder they lost another election!

Now, Mr. Speaker, as this Legislature commences another session, our country and our province do face a number of thorny issues. I want to deal with some of those today. Probably none is more critical than the problem of national unity. In recent years, the people of Quebec have shown increasing dissatisfaction with their rights, with the Constitution, and with their position in Confederation generally. Indeed, as Hon. Members know, a very vocal minority in Quebec has advocated secession from Canada. To most of us, I think, Canada without Quebec is unthinkable. Yet it has become increasingly obvious that, unless some action is taken soon, the country could break up. Thus the Prime Minister on last February 5th called a Federal-Provincial Conference to see if compromises could be found. I think that all Provinces attended the Conference in a spirit of co-operation and good-will. Time and again people say in essence: what are Quebec's demands? Well, Premier Johnson was certainly very explicit at the February 5th Conference.

The first complaint of Quebec had to do with linguistic rights. The Quebec delegation pointed out time and again that in Quebec the English-speaking minority had full language rights. Yet in the English-speaking provinces French-Canadians did not enjoy the same privileges. In all honesty and in all fairness, most of the Provincial Governments felt that there was justice to this demand. Thus eight Provinces out of the ten promised at an early date to take remedial action.

Where Saskatchewan is concerned, there are certain difficulties. Hon. Members in this House know that according to the last census only about four per cent of our people are

February 21, 1968

French-Canadian. We have people of other ethnic origins that have substantially larger numbers. For example nine per cent of our citizens were originally German-speaking; seven per cent are of Ukrainian origin. I know that there are some people in the Province of Saskatchewan who are opposed to the extension of the French language. But I am certain that most of our people would wish the Government to take all feasible steps to see that Confederation does not founder on the matter of language rights. As a contribution to national unity, the Saskatchewan Government announced in the Throne Speech that it would bring forward legislation at this session that would permit the use of French as a language of instruction in certain schools.

At an appropriate time, the Minister of Education (Mr. McIsaac) during this session will go into detail. Let me only say at this time that no compulsion will be involved. No English-speaking person in Saskatchewan will be obliged to learn French. French schools will be set up, only where the number of French students makes such a project economically feasible. Probably this year sometime we shall start with two or three schools in an experiment, probably in Gravelbourg, possibly in Prince Albert, maybe in Regina, perhaps in Saskatoon. However, we are not in any way envisaging a third school system because the costs would be prohibitive. However, the new legislation will permit French-Canadian children to be educated in their mother tongue in Saskatchewan, if their parents so desire.

Now there were other demands at the Conference which were made by the Province of Quebec which we didn't think were quite so reasonable. Quebec Premier Johnson says he does not believe in separatism, and I think he is sincere in that belief. However some of the demands, which he presented to the Conference on behalf of his Province, in my opinion, would just as surely lead to secession. Among the powers he sought for Quebec and still seeks, as far as I know, are the ability to enter into treaties with foreign governments; control over immigration; and over all, a transfer of major fiscal powers from Ottawa to Quebec. Now, Mr. Speaker, I believe that, if the rest of the nation gave in to those demands, our Confederation would end.

May I say without equivocation, that Members on this side of the Legislature and I think probably on the other side, favor a strong central government.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Thatcher: — In our opinion, the Federal Administration must have adequate financial and monetary resources to cope with unemployment and economic recessions to ensure stable economic growth, to combat either inflation or deflation. Parliament must be able to equalize living standards in the various areas of this nation. Quebec's demands, as they were made on February 5th, would emasculate the Federal Government's power and authority. Therefore, the Government of Saskatchewan

will not willingly agree to changes in our Constitution, which would deprive the Federal Government of vital powers essential for it to provide a strong National Government. Now, Mr. Speaker, some people have asked me whether Mr. Johnson really meant what he said. I don't know. I sincerely hope that he didn't. I am told he may have an election coming up. But Mr. Johnson certainly is a realist, and I think he will realize that no part of the country would be hurt more seriously than the Province of Quebec, if separation did come. Today there are many people in Saskatchewan, I think there are many people in Western Canada, who find it difficult to understand the strains and stresses, the pressures, which are weakening our Confederation. However, I think it is becoming ever more clear that the people of all ten provinces must pay a price for the privilege of continuing as a united nation. No Province in Canada is more determined than Saskatchewan to work with everything at our command to preserve Confederation.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Thatcher: — I think, the English-speaking Provinces must make every reasonable concession, but I say, Mr. Speaker, that Quebec must also come part way. National unity then as I see it, is problem No. 1 for this Legislature and for Canada at the present time.

A second major problem, I think, has to do with inflation, the rising cost of living. There is an old cliché — I suppose one shouldn't use clichés but I will — that inflation is like a thief in the night. It robs everyone. Inflation particularly hurts the average citizen, those in the lower income bracket, the farmer with fixed grain prices, pensioners, those with insurance policies and so on. During 1967, Canadians watched the cost of living going up month by month. Economic authorities have repeatedly warned that, unless the spiral is halted, or at least slowed down, Canadians face an economic recession or dollar devaluation or both.

Now there are, Mr. Speaker, many, many causes of inflation. I only want to mention two. The first has to do with wage demands which have been repeatedly made in the past year by many Canadian trade unions. Wage increases tied to improved productivity are desirable and beneficial to all concerned. But wage demands which are not related to increased productivity are harmful to the whole country. Canada is an exporting nation. We depend for three-eighths of all our jobs on the export market, and unless Canadian workers, and I include Saskatchewan workers, exercise restraint in their wage demands, we shall soon price ourselves out of many international markets. This can only result in unemployment. Surely the example of England today should be heeded. During 1967, real Canadian productivity increased by about 4 per cent. I don't need to remind you that many wage settlements were far above that 4 per cent.

February 21, 1968

A second contributing factor to inflation can be Government policies. I certainly believe and I have no hesitation in saying this, that many of the policies followed by the Federal Governments over the past decade have fed the fires of inflation. Deficit after deficit has been financed by borrowing. New program after new program has been announced with little regard to the overall budgetary position. Provincial Governments and municipal governments have also contributed to inflation.

Today, most local governments in Saskatchewan must pay 8 per cent or 8½ or 9 per cent for borrowed money. That is why time and again in the past year, the Local Government Board has asked municipalities and cities to temporarily postpone projects until interest rates come down.

What about the Saskatchewan Government record? We don't claim perfection. However, since taking office in 1964, we have tried to follow policies which were fiscally responsible; we have balanced our Budgets. We are determined in the future to follow sensible fiscal policies, because we know that good management is still important in Government affairs. If an individual or a business spends more money than it takes in, sooner or later it's in trouble. So it is with Governments. No Government has money of its own. It can only spend what it takes from the taxpayer, either individual or corporate. The pressures for spending this year, Mr. Speaker, far exceed the problems of any previous period. The three principal areas for sharply rising costs are: 1) primary and secondary education; 2) our University and technical schools; and 3) the field of health, though highways also are a contributing factor.

I would like to tell the people of Saskatchewan some of the new requests that have been made in recent months for the tax dollar. First of all, the Civil Service. Our civil servants asked for increases this year which, as far as I could find, were the highest in history. Now they didn't get everything they asked for. But nevertheless the Government will have to find at least \$2 million for increases in "in-scope" and "out-of-scope" Civil Service raises. The House will note that in British Columbia, Premier Bennett didn't give any increase or at least he hasn't so far, to his civil servants. May I indicate that I have a very high regard for the ability and efficiency of the Saskatchewan Civil Service. Moreover it is getting better by the year. May I also say that we are well aware that, if we don't pay competitive salaries, we may lose some of our key civil servants. And thus we have tried to be as generous as the Province's financial position would permit.

Once again we have had very substantial wage demands from the Saskatchewan Power Corporation. I want to remind the people of Saskatchewan that under the Socialists this corporation really made no actual profits, if fair accounting methods had been used. When we took office, we found that 92½ per cent of SPC was owned by the bond holders, and only 7½ cent was owned by the people of Saskatchewan. The equity position has now been

improved from 7½ to 13 per cent. But we still think 13 per cent is a ridiculously low equity figure. Through better management, through more efficiency, the SPC this year will make about \$11 million. And we are pretty pleased about this figure. But it's still far from satisfactory when you realize that we have an investment now of almost \$640 million in SPC. Power workers demanded wage increases in the neighborhood of \$2,300,000. When one remembers that gas and electricity rates are pretty well frozen, one realizes that these are fairly substantial wage demands. Until SPC is on a sound and lucrative financial basis, we shall expect the employees to use some restraint in their wage demands. However, regardless of what the final settlement may be, the people of Saskatchewan must realize that a lot more tax dollars will be required.

Most of the other Crown corporations have also made some pretty heavy wage demands this year. Usually the unions have attempted to be reasonable. One notable exception was the Estevan Brick Plant. Under the Socialists, this company had huge losses. The taxpayers had been called upon time and again to subsidize it. Despite the rather sorry balance-sheet picture, last summer the union made demands which were out of line with realities. In essence, management offered them a 6 per cent increase. The union refused this offer and went out on strike. The strike lasted four months. When the settlement was finally made, Mr. Speaker, they received less than they could have had before the strike commenced. The strike cost the taxpayers about \$50,000, it cost the workers more than that sum. My only hope is that this episode has made it crystal clear that just as a Government can't push unions around, neither can trade unions push this Government around.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Thatcher: — In all future wage settlements, we shall consistently insist that the capacity of the taxpayer must be given paramount consideration.

The new demands for education this year are almost unbelievable. Year after year these costs have been going up inexorably. I want to say, Mr. Speaker, that no field has been given greater priority, priority as I said yesterday in hard cash than has the Department of Education. Certainly we have been far, far more generous than the Socialists ever were.

During their last year in office, the Socialists spent \$57 million on all forms of education. This year the Liberal Government is spending \$91 million, and next year it will be substantially more. Why? We are spending at this level because we know that our future as a province is determined to a major extent by the quality of education that we provide. Additional education means a more highly skilled work force. It means more highly trained professional people. Education properly directed is the chief means whereby people can find new kinds of jobs when the old kinds disappear. Therefore no Government,

February 21, 1968

this one or any other, can shirk the awesome responsibility of providing the best possible educational facilities for every Saskatchewan child or youth. Yet even our educational priority must be related to the financial capacity of the taxpayer. People everywhere, regardless of their politics, are more and more concerned at the staggering annual increases in costs of education.

This year new demands for elementary and secondary education will approach another increase of about \$20 million. Our teachers are again looking for major salary increases. We want our teachers to have the highest possible salaries and the best possible working conditions. Indeed, we are well aware, as I said a moment ago, that if we lag behind other provinces, we may lose some of our teachers. Yet, Mr. Speaker, there must be reasonable limits. And we are concerned that, despite huge increases in Provincial grants to the various school units year after year, local mill rates have continued to sky-rocket. During the 1950s, our Hon. friends opposite paid school grants that were in the neighborhood of 30 per cent. By 1963, those grants had increased to 44 per cent. Last year our Government raised the average percentage to 51½ per cent.

Yet in all of these years, the position of the local taxpayer has steadily worsened. Today we have a situation in Saskatchewan where local units set teachers' salaries, school operating costs, they decide upon construction. This Government has little or nothing to say about those decisions. However, after the decisions are made, we are required to pick up the Provincial share of costs, which now is the major share. Our Government is not prepared to continue indefinitely making grants on such a basis. And we believe that in the long term, inevitably, the percentage of educational costs paid by the Province will continue to increase. But we are determined that a substantial portion of the increased Provincial assistance must given local taxpayers more benefit for their tax dollars. The property owner cannot be expected to assume a much larger tax burden for any purpose.

Under these circumstances, the Provincial Government proposes to introduce changes in several of our Education Acts over the next several years. It will achieve such an object during the coming session as was indicated during the Throne Speech debate. We shall provide for area bargaining between teachers and school units. To us it simply doesn't make sense to have 169 different units, or whatever the number may be, carrying out bargaining procedures. The number will be reduced to a handful.

Now at a time when school boards are being obliged to pay 8 or 8½ or 9 per cent to borrow money, we have felt it necessary to curtail all but emergency school building. We have no hesitation in saying that we are concerned by the staggering costs involved in the division 3 and 4 programs. We have, therefore, temporarily frozen all new building projects in this

category. The special committee of two, Mr. Nicks and Dr. Gathercole of Saskatoon, has been named by the Minister of Education (Mr. McIsaac) to thoroughly investigate their program and make recommendations to the Government. It seems likely that the building freeze will probably remain, except in emergencies until tight money has eased.

Our University provides the Government with major financial problems. The need to increase our University goes on every year more and more. This year the original demand of the University, when they came down to see us in December, called for a 41 per cent increase in the operating budget. Throughout the years, this Government has tried to give our University a top priority. Moreover, that priority has been, as I say, in the form of hard cash, not merely lip service. Again, I must remind the people of Saskatchewan that in all the 20 years the Socialists were in power, the average grants they gave the University for both operating and capital were a little better than \$3 million. The most they ever gave in a single year just before the '64 election was \$11 million. This year our Government is finding \$28 million for the University of Saskatchewan. And the coming year, it will be substantially more.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Thatcher: — The Socialists talk about education, the Liberals act with money. Now the campus is growing at the rate of more than 1,200 students per year. Our Government has been concerned by the fact that the elected representatives of the people have had too little knowledge or control of University spending. Now, once a year, under the former Government and under this Government, the budget has been presented to Cabinet by University officials. A superficial examination usually amounting to an hour or so, resulted. I have been told by your officials, this was precisely the procedure used by the previous Government.

An Hon. Member: — Nonsense!

Mr. Thatcher: — Now, for the rest of the year, there has been little scrutiny of accounts either in the Legislature or out of the Legislature. Certainly when the Estimates came up last year I doubt if my Hon. friends took ten minutes on the University. Now this was not serious, perhaps, when the University was only getting about \$3 million as it did under the Socialists. But it is very serious now that it is getting almost \$30 million from this Government.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Thatcher: — Under the circumstances, the Government is asking for a certain change in the format. The new format will be introduced when the Budget is brought down by the Minister, who is now in charge of the University. And it is hoped that closer scrutiny

by this Legislature will result.

We have also decided to change the way that new construction is approved. From now on, all new buildings will have to be finally approved by the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Guy). This is the way the Socialists did it during most of their years in office. Now the Deputy Minister is being placed on the building committee. It will be the duty of the Minister and his Deputy to see that all buildings are functional and modern. But it will also be their responsibility to see that the taxpayer is getting value for his dollar. I want to emphasize that our Government is not dissatisfied with the Board of Governors, or the University officials – quite the contrary. I have said many times that we have no intention of interfering with the autonomy or independence of the University. I must say though this year that when we went over the University budget, there were some aspects which concerned us. For example, the student faculty ration has been dropping rather sharply recently. In the current year, that ratio is down to one professor for 18.1 students. However, in numerous cases the ratio was much lower. For example, in Home Economics, the student ratio was one professor to 7.5 students; in Medicine, the student faculty ratio was still one professor to 8.5 students; in Nursing, one to 7.4; Pharmacy one to 13. And we were informed by the President that if the professor faculty ratio could be increased by one student per class, the taxpayer could be saved \$1½ million. And we have thus strongly urged University officials to improve this ratio in the coming year rather than to give any consideration at all about reducing the number of students.

We found that tuition fees in the University of Saskatchewan for the most part were the lowest in all Canada. Last year, even after the five increases the Socialists made when they were in office, those fees covered only 17 per cent of the total cost of student training. The state paid the balance, 83 per cent. Therefore, we concurred with the decision of the Board of Governors to raise tuition fees. They will still be, Mr. Speaker, the third lowest in all Canada. Now our Government intends to provide very large sums for capital programs in the year ahead. Work will be finished this year on the Education building in Regina. A start will be made on the Dental building in Saskatoon. As a party, we are committed to spending \$50 million for new buildings over the next four years at our campus.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Thatcher: — And I want to tell my friends opposite, I want to tell the people of Saskatchewan, that Dr. Spinks, the President of the University, has given our Government full and firm assurance that all students with the necessary academic qualifications can be accommodated during 1968.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Thatcher: — Our taxpayers, however, must realize that the financial demands of the University will be very, very heavy in the years ahead.

There is another financial problem of increasing concern to our Government and to the people of Saskatchewan — the field of public health. The Liberal Government gives a very high priority to the whole public health program. The total gross spending this year on our medicare, hospitalization, and other health programs will be a gross of about \$120 million. Our Government would be less than honest if we failed to point out that rising costs are endangering some of our health programs. Spending demands are rising far more rapidly than revenues. When hospitalization was introduced in this province back in 1947, the costs were \$7 million roughly. This year they will be \$70 million, an increase of 1,000 per cent. When the plan was introduced, average hospital costs in Saskatchewan were \$7 per day; this year average costs will be \$31 per day and they are still going up. Medicare was commenced in 1963. The total costs that year were \$22 million. This year those costs will exceed \$30 million and they also are going up very rapidly. In short, the people of Saskatchewan must realize that we have a proverbial tiger by the tail where health costs are concerned. Anyone who ignores that fact is like an ostrich who puts his head in the sand. Economically, our people cannot afford the huge annual increases, without endangering funds which would be available otherwise for such fields as education, social welfare, or highways and so on. There are a number of reasons for our financial difficulties in the field of health. Times will only permit me to mention a few today.

First of all I would mention nurses' salaries. Some time ago the nurses made very substantial wage demands here in Saskatchewan. Our Government recognizes that we must be competitive with other Provinces if we are to keep our nurses. And that is why the Minister of Health and his officials finally decided to give our nurses increases which averaged \$30 per month. That decision alone will increase our hospital costs this year more than \$1 million. Yet the nurses were far from satisfied.

We have had, as the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Lloyd) said yesterday, very substantial demands for increase in the fee schedules from the doctors. Our negotiations with the College of Physicians and Surgeons have gone on for some time. The original demands which they made, I believe, would have come to more than \$6 million. We felt that we couldn't justify that kind of an increase, but we did make an adjustment for general practitioners which in the coming year will cost about \$1 million. The Government isn't going to be able to give all the doctors all they want, of course. However, the hard facts of life are that, if we are to hold and attract good doctors in Saskatchewan, there is little alternative but to make some kind

February 21, 1968

of adjustments. Such action will cost our taxpayers a good deal of money.

Mr. Speaker, there is every indication that our spending on mental health will have to be sharply increased. I wonder how many taxpayers realize that in this past year the Government spent \$13 million of their money on mental health. However, in order to be sure that this money was being effectively spent, sometime ago the Government engaged the services of Dr. Frazier of Houston, Texas, one of North America's most outstanding experts in the field of mental health. Yesterday the Minister of Health (Mr. Grant) tabled his report. Dr. Frazier's report openly and frankly assesses the strengths and weaknesses of our community psychiatric plan, and we do not intend to drop the matter with the tabling of the Report. We have already allocated substantial additional funds to implement some of his recommendations. The people of Saskatchewan must realize that huge additional sums will probably be required. The people of Saskatchewan over the next few years must find huge new sums of money for hospital construction. For the Regina base hospital alone initially, we must find about \$16 million. It might interest the people of Regina and Hon. Members to know that the land for the hospital has now been acquired, the architects' plans are now being processed, and it is hoped that construction may start not later than June of 1969. Mr. Speaker, if the Socialists had ever thought of making some plans, instead of just talking, this construction could well have been underway by this time.

We also face an expenditure of about \$12 million over the next few years on the Saskatoon University hospital. In total, we need about \$75 million for new hospitals up until 1973. The taxpayers of Saskatchewan, provincially, will have to find about \$35 million of that sum. So these are new costs that are facing the taxpayers.

We are also pleased, of course, unless the events of the last two or three days make it otherwise, that we will be receiving about \$10 million from Federal Medicare. However, before the Socialists spend that money too quickly, let me remind our people that we lose substantially more than such an amount in the form of equalization payments.

And in addition, under the new agreement, there are other programs which must be financed.

An Hon. Member: — . . . Weasel . . .

Mr. Thatcher: — You're the only easel in this House that I know of. For example, our Government will be obliged to provide coverage for eye examinations which presently are not an insured service. The cost of the Medicare program for introducing eye services in one year will be \$1.2 million. In the second place, coverage for war veterans and Indian citizens becomes Saskatchewan's responsibilities. This will add another \$2 million to our

program. In sort, Mr. Speaker, the introduction of the Federal Medicare Plan will add about \$3.2 million to the costs of our Provincial scheme. So this Federal money is not going to be all gravy.

Mr. Speaker, I think everyone in Saskatchewan supports our various health programs. Nevertheless I must warn the Legislature and our citizens that, unless something is done to control costs, the very future of these schemes could be jeopardized. All over North America, even more in England and Europe, costs are increasing in a staggering manner. We like our health programs and we are proud of them, but to protect those schemes we must keep them on a sound fiscal basis. And I will tell this House and the people of Saskatchewan that the Government will not shirk its duty in this regard. Even though some of the measures that are urgently required may be unpopular, we intend to take appropriate action this session.

The Government must continue to find huge sums of money for our highway system. When we took over the highway system from the Socialists, I guess it was the worst in Canada or close to being the worst.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Thatcher: — Now since that time we have been improving it. During the last election campaign, we promised the people of Saskatchewan that we would spend \$300 million over the next four-year period. And we are going to do just that. We are convinced that our people want modern, dust-free, and safe highways. Last year or in the current year, our expenditures were about \$60 million. Because of tight money, that sum may be modestly decreased for one year. But if we want Saskatchewan to be developed industrially, if we want our rural areas to be better serviced, if we want to promote the tourist trade, we have no choice but to increase our spending on highways. And that as I say is precisely what we are going to do.

I could go on talking about other financial problems. There is some indication today in Saskatchewan and in Canada that many groups are asking for more government services than we can pay for. Surely it is a truism that government at all levels, just like a family, cannot spend beyond its means for long, without weakening its credit and undermining its strength. If our citizens keep increasing their spending demands, taxation may reach levels that could seriously affect economic growth and jeopardize job opportunities. The Government must strike a balance between what is desirable, and what is financially possible. I must say that nothing of value is free. If the people truly want and need additional services, there must be taxes to pay for them. And I say again, no matter how unpopular, this Government is determined to take steps which are required to keep Saskatchewan on a sound economic basis.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

February 21, 1968

Mr. Thatcher: — We shall urge restraint in new spending programs. We shall concentrate on widening our economic basis.

The Socialists, of course, are already piously objecting to some of the measures that we feel are necessary. I wish that all the people of Saskatchewan could read this little program, which they had in the last election. Because if the Socialists had been re-elected and had implemented their program, Saskatchewan would really have higher taxes.

Hon. J.C. McIsaac (Wilkie): — People didn't want it.

Mr. Thatcher: — Everything was going to be free under the Socialists. Their promises would have cost hundreds of millions of dollars. For instance some of their pledges were: free dental care for children - \$2 million; free drugs, even with a deterrent - \$5 or \$6 million. Their highway program was really a dandy. Not only were they going to build highways, they aid this: An all-weather road was to be built to every occupied farm in the province – every one of them.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Thatcher: — I asked Dave Boldt how much that kind of a program would cost. He said, “Well perhaps a half a billion – perhaps more.” then they promised to set up an Economic Development Corporation to develop Saskatchewan resources. They earmarked a \$100 million for that purpose. Then a Municipal Finance Corporation - \$100 million. In addition they promised a Saskatchewan Housing Corporation, which would promote construction of 8,000 new units each year.

Mr. D.W. Michayluk (Redberry): — You know what you promised.

Mr. Thatcher: — Last year Central Mortgage put up 2,000 houses so I suppose the Socialists would have to put up the other 6,000. If the average cost of a house was \$20,000, they would need a \$120 million for such a program. The Socialists promised new street paving, tree planting, park development, town renewal, better equalization grants, and so on, for municipalities. Such a promise would have cost \$15 million. Then free university tuition fees.

An Hon. Member: — Better than Henry!

Mr. Thatcher: — They increased them five times when they were in office, but suddenly they were going to be free. That would have been about another \$7 million. Add it all up, Mr. Speaker, if the Socialists had been on this side of the House and carried out the promises they made in the election, they would have needed anywhere from a half billion to a billion dollars this

year, and they would have had to have new taxes in order to pay for them.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Thatcher: — And yet this is the big spending group, that has the audacity to ask the people of Saskatchewan to believe that the Liberals were overtaxing them.

Now I would like to say a few words about agriculture because agriculture is still the great foundation of our society. Looking back on the Centennial Year, it would be recalled that for many months it looked like a crop disaster was imminent. When everything ended up, because farmers have learned better methods, used more fertilizer, and so on, we ended up with the sixth best crop in our history — 17.2 bushels. It wasn't as good as the year before, but it was still encouraging.

Mr. A.E. Blakeney (Regina Centre): — Fertilizer!

Mr. Thatcher: — However, the sales record for our wheat has been rather disappointing. Low quotas at many points mean shortage of cash on some farms. The recent sale which the Liberals made to China of 78 million bushels should help in a major way. The situation has been improved by the Federal guarantee of \$1.95½.

Mr. Blakeney: — \$2.00.

Mr. Thatcher: — In order to combat the drought problem, our Government has a number of suggestions to make. One has to do with crop insurance. In 1964, about 2,400 farmers were insured. In 1967, 8,200 farmers were insured. This year we propose to insure 12,000 farmers, involving a total coverage of \$24 million. Next year we will do better.

The Soil Testing Laboratory that this Liberal Government built has proved very successful. We are going to extend its use in the coming year.

Our Government continues to believe that Saskatchewan can have a tremendous expansion in the whole field of agriculture, if our farmers are willing to diversify further.

Thus, most of our Provincial programs will give every possible encouragement to the expansion of specialized livestock and poultry enterprises. For example, our program working with ARDA, to provide farmers who wish to go into hogs, with better farms, better equipment, etc. has been most successful. One hundred and eighty notifications of "intent to build" have been received by the Minister. SEDCO has made 23 loans to large hog producers, which has meant 50,000 more market hogs this year. I am informed that the overall hog population will go up to about 600,000 this year, which is about a 28 per cent increase from a

February 21, 1968

year ago.

Over the last five years, Saskatchewan's cattle population has gone up about 250,000 head. To support the cattle industry, we are continuing with the Community Pasture program. The Minister of Agriculture (Mr. McFarlane) tells me that he is going to buy more bulls for those pastures than ever before, this year. In 1964 the Lands Branch operated 34 community pastures – 42,000 cattle. Next year they will operate 51 pastures with a total carrying capacity of 78,000 head. P.F.R.A. in addition will operate another 67 in Saskatchewan. Our Department of Agriculture proposes to build two major feed banks in Saskatchewan, one on the South Saskatchewan River area and the other in the Cumberland Lake area. We are hoping to be able to build up feed reserves that will be available in a dry year. Now with the problem of quotas, make no mistake that the wheat farmer will have serious difficulties for some time to come. We are hoping that more and more farmers will decide to market grain through livestock.

The sheep industry has had many difficulties in recent years. The Minister of Agriculture has tried to help it by setting up community sheep pastures. Four were operated last year, and one additional one will be opened this year. Together those pastures have meant that 9,000 ewes could be carried through the summer months, together with their lambs. We know that the industry is in trouble. We are not sure that these community pastures are the answer, but it is at least an effort. Our departmental officials still tell us that sheep are one of the profitable ends of the livestock industry.

On the whole, I think that this Province is making some progress in agricultural diversification. In 1967 as far as cattle were concerned, the income for the second time in history went over \$200 million. Income from hogs was about \$27 million. I remain absolutely convinced that Saskatchewan could double these figures within several years, if our farmers became genuinely interested. I cannot recommend diversification too strongly.

I would like to say a word about Crown leases. When we took office in this Province, 9 million acres of land were owned by the Crown. Our Government does not believe that it should be in the land business under normal circumstances. We have been endeavoring to persuade farmers to buy some of this Crown land, not without success. The House might be interested to know that 257,000 acres of grazing land have now been sold and I believe somewhat more acreage of cultivated land. We are going to add to this program somewhat in the coming year. If the farmer wants to buy cultivated land, he has to work it for five years satisfactorily. In the case of grazing land, we have recently expanded the policy so that any farmer with a lease in good standing can buy up to two sections. Time payments are permitted. Up to January 1st of this year, 257,000 acres had been sold. This year the Department is going to experiment with

the sale of a very limited quantity of grazing land by tender. And I commend this sales program to the consideration of all Saskatchewan farmers.

Mr. Speaker, the Department of Agriculture tells me moisture conditions in Saskatchewan at this time, after the fall rains we had last year, are somewhat above normal in most parts. That fact and an exploding world population should make the 1968 future for our farmers reasonably satisfactory.

I want to touch upon industrial development for a few moments because there are very few programs that this Government has shown greater interest in. We have done this, we have promoted industry because we are convinced that such promotion is the best way to get jobs for our people at better wages.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Thatcher: — A good deal of progress has been made in the fields of oil, potash, timber, mining, and manufacturing. In the coming year we will see a number of developments in Saskatchewan. For example, the first pulp mill will go into operation sometime before the 1st of July. McMillan and Bloedel has just announced another \$4 million expansion at Hudson Bay.

Our oil production today is about 30 per cent of Canada's total. It will give us, this year, about 92 million barrels, a total value of \$210 million. We believe that these figures will improve during 1968.

Most Hon. Members know that three new additional potash mines will come into production this year, Allan, Alwinal and Duval, and they will increase the province's annual potash production from 4.9 million tons to 8.4 million. Total investment in that industry now exceeds \$650 million. Mineral production went up \$21 million in the last year to \$387 million. It is most exciting to go into the Uranium City area, as I did last fall. A second mine is coming into production, and Eldorado says three more should be feasible within two years. Gunnar Mining Limited is back into the area. There is a great exploration boom going on in the whole Uranium City area. At latest count, and I am sure the House and the people of Saskatchewan would be interested to know that 92 mine companies are active in the Province of Saskatchewan doing exploration work. Several promising nickel finds have been made, which we hope may prove to be of real commercial value. It is only fair to wonder, Mr. Speaker, just how much of this activity, if any, would have taken place if the Minister of Mineral Resources (Mr. Cameron) had not come up with his incentive program.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Thatcher: — The same, of course, applies to the deep oil fields. Would the oil companies have been there if those programs of the

February 21, 1968

Minister of Minerals Resources had not been introduced?

Last year we had two new sodium sulphate plants. We will have another one starting this year. The Government has continued to work diligently to obtain a pelletizing plant for iron ore. Now if obtained, and I am certainly not announcing that it has been obtained . . .

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Thatcher: — . . . such a mill could be one of the largest employers of labor in Saskatchewan. The final decision, according to the officials that I spoke with a few days ago, one way or the other will probably be arrived at during 1968.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Thatcher: — Hon. Members might be interested to know that the Government is trying to interest Canadian, American and Czechoslovakian interests in our Choiceland iron deposits. We had a number of interested parties in our office in the past month. So far the industrialists involved have not put together a viable operation. And so I say, Mr. Speaker, that all in all, the industrial prospects are excellent in Saskatchewan.

There are some clouds in the horizon. Tight money and high interest rates have persuaded a number of these very large companies to temporarily postpone their plans for expansion. However, such hesitancy is apparent all over Canada, all over the United States, all over the world. And we as a Province must be concerned by a temporary surplus of potash capacity. While world demand is going up about 7 per cent a year, our huge increase in Saskatchewan production has produced a weak market. This has resulted in rather savage competition, together with a sharp reduction in prices. There are many who feel that before too long some kind of prorationing will have to take place. It is too early to say whether prorationing is the answer. However, the Government is investigating the facts. If we find, after the most careful consultation with the potash companies and with other interested parties, that we can contribute to the overall health of this vital industry, we shall co-operate. We would, of course, be much happier if the potash companies could solve their own problems without Government intervention.

I might tell the House and the people of Saskatchewan that intensive investigation is proceeding as to the feasibility of constructing a potash pipe line from the Saskatchewan fields to Duluth. Such a pipe line would cost, we are told, in the neighborhood of \$175 million. The purpose of the line, of course, would be to reduce the freight per ton from \$5 to \$7 in the great American market. A Saskatchewan company has now been set up for organizational purposes only, Western Resource Pipeline Company Limited. The problems at the moment are not financial. Several large American banks and pipe line companies are taking

the lead, financial and otherwise. The Government of Saskatchewan contemplates no financial participation of a major nature. The problems appear mainly to be technical – how do they take the potash at one end of the line, transport it through water, and then get it back to powder form at the other end of the line? The interested parties are also looking into the feasibility of moving pulp from the Prince Albert mill through the line also. It is of course too early to know when, where, or if ever, this pipe line will materialize. However, if or when it does materialize, it could have very beneficial effects on the Saskatchewan economy. Even if the pipe line doesn't materialize, but persuades the railroads to reduce their freight rates, it could be a great asset to the Province of Saskatchewan. That is why, Mr. Speaker, I said yesterday that because of all this industrial development which has been taking place under a Liberal private-enterprise Government, Saskatchewan has had the lowest rate of unemployment of any province in the Dominion of Canada these winter months.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Thatcher: — Not only have we low unemployment, but we have major labor shortages. We are short of teachers. We are short of nurses. We are short of university professors. We are short of carpenters, waitresses. Saskatchewan today without the Socialists is a land of opportunity, indeed.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Thatcher: — And I can say in the coming decade, Mr. Speaker, I am absolutely convinced that this province will become one of the best, the most prosperous areas in the whole Dominion of Canada.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Thatcher: — Now I would like to say a few words about housing. While this problem is not as serious in Saskatchewan as in certain other parts of Canada, nevertheless the demand for houses in some communities has been rising sharply. We found that, when we took office, the Socialists in their 20 years in office had done virtually nothing about housing. Virtually nothing. Until several years ago, we believed that the financing of new housing should be left (a) to the Federal Government; (b) to the private sector of our economy. However, in 1966 a Housing and Urban Renewal Branch was established in the Department of Municipal Affairs. Its main purpose was to co-ordinate all housing activity. It was given the responsibility of persuading both CMHC and the private sector to invest increased amounts of money in Saskatchewan. In a modest way, the Branch was also authorized to invest Saskatchewan funds.

February 21, 1968

Now in the past year a number of factors beyond the control of our Government prevented us from doing all that we would like to do in housing. Interest rates have gone up very sharply. CMHC loans I think now have a ceiling of 8 5/8 per cent. In addition, the Federal Winter Works program grant was discontinued, the grant of \$500 to each new house being built in the winter.

Despite those drawbacks, however, we found that in 1967 starts on housing construction in Saskatchewan increased by about 1,500 over 1966. Our Provincial Department was responsible for the commencement or completion of almost 300 units. The majority of these were for subsidized rental, although some will be available for sale. There were in addition to that total about 18 which were constructed for people of Indian ancestry at Green Lake and Uranium City. We are now trying to assemble lots which can be used for housing.

The Federal Government has told us that there will be cutbacks this year. It has also been announced that the major emphasis on housing will be for low-cost and subsidized housing. This isn't going to help. However, for 1968, we have already scheduled 178 units for construction to begin almost immediately. These will be located at: Carrot Rive – 10; Esterhazy – 18; Hudson Bay – 10; Humboldt – 28; Prince Albert – 34; Saskatoon – 78. And our Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Estey) is presently negotiating with a number of growth communities throughout the province for another 385 units.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Thatcher: — You might be interested to know that 645 serviced lots are now being prepared under an additional program. In short, during 1968, the Government will: (1) co-operate with CMHC to obtain every possible dollar of Federal funds for housing; (2) urge private lending institutions to step up loans for housing in Saskatchewan; (3) make Provincial funds available under certain emergency conditions.

Mr. Speaker, the Throne Speech indicated that the Government will continue to take every feasible step to provide employment for members of our Indian and Metis population. During the last campaign, the Socialists made many promises in this regard. It is very interesting to note that in their 20 years of office they did virtually nothing for these people. It was this Government which involved the Province in tangible programs. I think the seriousness can be realized, Mr. Speaker, when we understand that we have 35,000 people of Indian origin on reserves. We have another 35,000 people of Indian origin off reserves. They have one of the most explosive birth rates in the whole world. Despite the endeavors of our new Branch, it is no secret and it is no source of pride that the major proportion of our native population continues to live in social and economic conditions that are often little short of appalling. It has been a key objective of this Government to take whatever

steps are effective to improve their living standards.

We have maintained from the outset that further handouts of social welfare are absolutely no solution to the problem. For years this has been the remedy applied, and it is obvious today that it is no remedy at all. We believe, instead, that education and particularly employment opportunities are the keys to a new improvement in the lot of these people. Now we have been somewhat successful. Our Branch last year employed about 1,600 of these people, which was 500 more than a year ago. About 300 were provided jobs in Government service. But there are many difficulties and frustrations involved. Often a job will be found by the Branch for an Indian in Regina, Saskatoon, or Prince Albert, or somewhere like that, and then no housing can be found. Time and again their educational qualifications are inadequate. Frequently an Indian will take a job but only remain on it for a few weeks. But despite these obstacles, our Department will continue to press forward with this vital task during 1968.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Thatcher: — We recognize that job opportunities alone do not at this time completely answer the problem. In fact, the majority of our Indians, even those who want to take gainful employment, are, as I said a moment ago, handicapped by a lack of education. We, therefore, have embarked on a program to upgrade their basic academic knowledge and to train them in special skills and trades. The House might be interested to know that 900 have already been taking upgrading courses and 600 more have taken trades training to fit them for employment. The response of the Indian people themselves to these educational programs has been gratifying. A good many of them have moved off the reserves to such centres as Prince Albert, Moose Jaw, Weyburn, and Saskatoon, in order to take these upgrading courses. During the past year, the Indian and Metis Branch has been virtually inundated with requests from the Indian people for more and more of these courses. We intend to do all that we can this year to step up the numbers that can take the courses. The Government is doing everything in its power to integrate Indian children with whites, throughout our school system. Grants are being made in many parts of the province to bus the children from reserves into schools and villages. I am convinced that, if there is any final solution to be found to this very thorny issue, it must come through education.

We brought electricity to 16 additional reserves during 1967; there are now 39 in all which have electric power. We built, in co-operation with the Federal Government, 81 miles of roads at a cost of \$335,000 on reserves. These are all important measures. And, Mr. Speaker, once again we are repeatedly running into the hard fact that no program will succeed without the co-operation of the Indians themselves. Any program must be two-way. Some method must be found to persuade the Indian, once he has taken a job, to remain with it. As long as Ottawa is

February 21, 1968

willing to pay out social aid, indiscriminately, whether a man is able-bodied or not, it may be difficult to persuade any of these individuals that they should leave the reserves to take employment.

Now we are negotiating at the present time, as are other Provinces, with Ottawa. Ottawa would like to see the Provinces take over Indian affairs. We are willing to do this, if the Indians want us to, as long as Ottawa absorbs most of the cost involved. At the present time there is a bit of an impasse.

Mr. Speaker, I only want to mention one other matter and I will sit down. This is a matter mentioned in the Throne Debate having to do with child adoption. In this session, the Government is proposing legislation to permit the adoption of children by parents whose religion may differ from that of the child's natural parent. In the past, the question of the religion, in which an adoptive child is raised, has been the source of many difficulties. There are only a limited number of homes available for those children awaiting adoption. And finding a suitable home has repeatedly been made more difficult by the requirement that these children must be placed with families of similar religion. Over the years, there has been growing recognition that this requirement on occasion is causing genuine hardship. IN the past the Catholic Church has opposed any change in the legislation. However, recently, the Catholic Charities Council of Canada approved a resolution which, in effect, said that such children had a right to: first, a wholesome family life; secondly, a religious upbringing in a home where the religion is the same as the natural parent. However, the resolution went on to say that, should any conflict arise between these two rights, then the need for a solid family life should take precedence. Our Government took an initial step in this field two years ago, when we made it permissible for the natural parent to designate the religion in which the child was to be raised. Since that time, Archbishop O'Neill of Regina has established a committee to investigate the extension of this policy. And under the proposed legislation, which has been approved in principle by Archbishop O'Neill's committee, the Department of Welfare must first make all reasonable efforts to place the child in a home of the parent's religion. However, if this cannot be done, then the Department is permitted to proceed to place the child for adoption in a home where the religion differs. We believe, Mr. Speaker, that this is a breakthrough. We believe that this is progressive legislation which will help us to relieve a problem of long standing. And I think the Minister of Social Welfare (Mr. MacDonald) should be commended for finding what appears to be a workable solution to this very urgent and important problem.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Thatcher: Mr. Speaker, at this session, the Liberal party is settling down to another four years of office; it might be five. What will we try to accomplish in the years ahead? First of all,

we shall try to build an opportunity Province where everyone has a job at the best possible wages. We are also going to work for a just society, Mr. Speaker, where Government is courageous, where learning is abundant, where law is honored, where compassion is practised, where power is benign, and where prosperity is generous. We shall endeavor to make decisions not on the basis of political expediency, but rather on the basis of what is right for Saskatchewan. Sometimes those decisions will not be popular. But we believe we were elected to make decisions in a responsible manner, using the Liberal philosophy and the middle-of-the-road approach, the private-enterprise approach. This Government is determined to lead Saskatchewan to a new era of economic prosperity.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. G.T. Snyder (Moose Jaw North): — Mr. Speaker, I welcome this opportunity to contribute to the 1968 Throne Speech debate. I do so with even a greater degree of pride and satisfaction than on previous occasions. I believe my remarks in this connection will be best understood by those who sit opposite and who conspired in the drawing of the new boundaries for the constituencies of Moose Jaw North and Moose Jaw South prior to the last general election.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Snyder: — I think Members will be aware, Mr. Speaker, that the city of Moose Jaw has consistently elected MLAs of the political faith of those who have sat to your left for almost 25 years. The Thatcher Administration recognized that their hopes and aspirations were sterile as long as Moose Jaw remained a single two-member constituency. So, Mr. Speaker, the Liberal statisticians were put to work and their terms of reference included a directive to gerrymander one of the two Moose Jaw seats into the Liberal orbit.

Consider the problem for just a moment, Mr. Speaker, If Moose Jaw's approximately 20,000 voters were divided evenly into two seats, even the most optimistic Liberal wasn't able to see a ray of hope. A division, Mr. Speaker, by a vertical, a horizontal or a diagonal boundary failed to produce the desired results. The final result, Mr. Speaker, by the Liberal brain thrust saw the creation of Moose Jaw North by drawing new boundaries around what was considered to be the best of the Liberal polls in Moose Jaw, with the disparity of about 5,000 voters between the Moose Jaw North and Moose Jaw South constituencies. No attempt was made to divide the two constituencies into an equal representation situation, Mr. Speaker, and no logical explanation other than political expediency could be offered. Liberals were so confident, Mr. Speaker, that this was a job well done that the Premier, when he spoke in Moose Jaw at a meeting prior to the election, expressed the feeling that there was something wrong with the Liberals if they couldn't win in Moose Jaw North.

February 21, 1968

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Snyder: — Mr. Speaker, the Premier on election night probably expressed his disappointment with results of Moose Jaw North and suggested that his Government would have to see to it that this didn't happen again.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Snyder: — From this, I expect, Mr. Speaker, that we'll see a further adjustment in constituency boundaries before the next general election. I just want to point out to you, Mr. Speaker, and Mr. Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Steuart) that the Liberal Government of this province misjudged, offended and underestimated the people of Moose Jaw with the last bare-faced gerrymander.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Snyder: — If the experience has taught them nothing, Mr. Speaker, then I extend to them the invitation to try once more. I claim a minimum credit, Mr. Speaker, for our win in Moose Jaw North. Most of the accolades must go to the fine and dedicated group of people who refused to accept the fact that they had been gerrymandered out of existence. No candidate ever had a finer or harder working group of supporters in his camp, and I wish once again to express my appreciation to them for my land-slide majority of 135 votes which permits me to take my seat in this House.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Snyder: — To begin my remarks today, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to extend to you my sincere congratulations for your election as Speaker and your position in presiding over Saskatchewan's 16th Legislature. For my part, Mr. Speaker, I intend, if at all possible, to abide by your judgment at all times and provide for you a minimum of problems.

I'd like also to congratulate the mover and seconder of the Address-in-Reply, Mr. Speaker. I thought the mover, the Member for Regina South West (Mr. McPherson) lacked the customary enthusiasm that Members generally show for the job, when he began by announcing that the total value of production output fell slightly in 1967, that oil production declined during the year, that there was a drop in personal income and that manufacturing shipments declined also. I thought, Mr. Speaker, that this was something of a dismal beginning for a triumphant Throne Speech. However, Mr. Speaker, the junior Member for Regina took a deep breath; and he announced that potash, uranium and helium were all doing very nicely, industries, Mr. Speaker, developed under the CCF and continued by the Liberals. Then, Mr. Speaker, the Member for Regina South West travelled abruptly to Southeast Asia to the land of Tom Dooley and to the Mother Country, Great

Britain, to conjure up some kind of an obscure argument to prove the everlasting value of what he referred to as the “independent sector of our economy”, at the same time to conjure up reasons to convince himself that public enterprise and welfare measures are the damnation and the ruination of mankind. The Member for Regina South West, Mr. Speaker, presented, I thought, what was an interesting but a very antiquated point of view. Herbert Hoover back in 1932 expressed a similar kind of a sentiment. I think some Members of this House will recall Herbert Hoover at that time, stating that the typical American way to care for unemployment is not to raid the nation’s treasury, but to have these unfortunate people cared for by friends, relatives and charitable organizations. Such, Mr. Speaker, is the thinking of another political dinosaur that has joined the ranks of those who sit opposite.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Snyder: — Well, Mr. Speaker, the seconder of the Address-in-Reply, I thought, addressed himself to the Throne Speech in a very capable manner. While we on this side of the House might not agree with a good deal of what he had to say, it was evident that a good deal of thought in preparation went into a well-delivered speech and we look forward to hearing from him again.

I want also at this time, while I’m congratulating Members, to say a particular word of welcome to all Members who are assuming a seat in this House for the first time, and I want to say a special word of welcome to the Member from Pelly (Mr. Barrie) and the Member for Touchwood (Mr. Meakes), who returned to this House after a brief absence. Both Members were deeply missed, I’m sure, by their respective parties and I think I speak for all Members on both sides of the House when I say, “Welcome back.”

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Snyder: — Other Members who are assuming new responsibilities are also deserving of recognition. The Member for Athabasca (Mr. Guy) is to be congratulated, not only for his appointment to the Public Works portfolio, but also for his recent venture into matrimony. IN recent years, Mr. Speaker, many of us on this side of the House have come to regard the Member from Athabasca as a person that only a mother could love. However, his recent marriage would perhaps indicate that we may have to revise our thinking on this matter.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Snyder: — I believe, Mr. Speaker, that both sympathy and congratulations are due to the new Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Steuart). The Premier sheds his cloak at a most appropriate moment. The 1968 Throne Speech forecasts beyond all doubt that we are in

February 21, 1968

receipt in the near future of major tax increases and reduced services. I believe it explains beyond all doubt the logic which prompted the calling of a general election before the Liberals' four-year term was complete. So I think the Member for Prince Albert is to be congratulated, Mr. Speaker, if he indeed accepted the job voluntarily.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Snyder: — The general consensus might seem to indicate, Mr. Speaker, that he was conscripted by the Premier in order that . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order, order!

Mr. W.J. Berezowsky (Prince Albert East-Cumberland): — Mr. Speaker, I'm just wondering, so we could clear up things on a point of privilege; who is the Hon. Member referring to when he says the Member for Prince Albert? I happen to be the Member for Prince Albert and . . .

Mr. Steuart: — . . . tragedies that happened last year.

Mr. Berezowsky: — Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Member is to blame for it.

Mr. Snyder: — Mr. Speaker, I'll attempt to orient myself in this connection in the future and I'll just refer to him in the future as the Provincial Treasurer to prevent any confusion on my part. But, as I said, the general consensus seems to indicate that he was conscripted by the Premier in order that he, the Premier, might avoid the sordid task of heaping new taxes upon Saskatchewan people. And I'm sure the Provincial Treasurer recognizes the significance of that familiar quotation, "He who builds and lacks wherewith to pay, provides a home from which to run away."

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Snyder: — Well, Mr. Speaker, the 16th session of Saskatchewan's Legislature represents the second session during which the Members of my political party have had the opportunity to serve as Members of Her Majesty's Loyal Opposition. Since this Legislature last met, a convention of our party, representing all 59 constituencies, voted by a large majority that our group assume the name of the Federal party. The Premier had something to say about this yesterday, and I thought perhaps that this decision might meet with his approval because he's had some difficulty in the last number of years deciding what our name

was, Mr. Speaker. If he has any desire to test his popularity, Mr. Speaker, I suggest to him that, under the new circumstances mentioned, it might be timely for him to call a by-election in Kelvington, Nipawin or any other appropriate constituency and we'll be willing to try our wings under our new party label, Mr. Speaker. The resolution, Mr. Speaker, from our convention last November, with respect to the change of name, was welcomed by the great majority of us who sit to your left, Mr. Speaker. It was generally recognized that Co-operative Commonwealth Federation, Saskatchewan's section of the New Democratic Party represented a somewhat clumsy title. I think it's quite understandable, Mr. Speaker, that some Members might show a preference for retaining the old name, which to them was synonymous with such things as hospitalization, medical care, grid roads, rural electrification, low-cost government insurance, fair and equitable labor laws, economic diversity and so on.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Snyder: — The transition, Mr. Speaker, is one which I personally welcome and I am moved to remind all those concerned that the guiding principles and the general political philosophy of our party remain unchanged. The political philosophy which I speak of, Mr. Speaker, was described I believe, in better words than I command when this was said: "Among other things, our party is shaped in the belief that people are capable of responding to higher motives than selfishness; that people are capable of facing their problems, understanding them and devising solutions for them; that people as individuals have rights in our society, particularly the right to share effectively in directing the course of society and in sharing of the benefits." Now these, Mr. Speaker, are not my words, but the words of our Political Leader, Mr. Lloyd, and with terms of reference such as these, I am willing to serve in whatever capacity I may with equal pride and satisfaction regardless of party label.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Snyder: — It may be, Mr. Speaker, that the words of the Premier yesterday and today provided an inspiration for some new Members, but for those of us who entered this Assembly at the same time as the Premier for the 1961 session, it was the same tiresome and repetitious harangue that we've suffered through for the last six or seven years, the same gestures, Mr. Speaker, the same mannerisms, the same shop-worn platitudes. The Premier this afternoon attempted to indicate that the problems of Great Britain, Mr. Speaker, relate to the election of a Labour Government. These were problems, Mr. Speaker, that were inherited by a Labour Government from a free enterprise Government.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Snyder: — Need we remind you, Mr. Speaker, need we remind

February 21, 1968

anyone that Great Britain was ravaged by two World Wars and saw her empire crumble about her. It's widely recognized, Mr. Speaker, by authorities everywhere that one of Great Britain's major problems relates to the failure of British industry to modernize their industrial plant and to compete in a modern technological age. For the Premier to suggest that Great Britain's problems began with the election of a Labour Government is naïve and shallow, and it will not be accepted by any number of thoughtful people.

The Premier once again today, Mr. Speaker, had something to say about the large amount of money being provided to Saskatchewan Universities and he mentioned again the figure of \$28 million. I rather thought that he would shy away from that figure today because the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Lloyd) broke this down in an able fashion and showed beyond all doubt, Mr. Speaker, that \$9.3 million of that figure is a loan and can be considered as nothing else, that \$12 million of this total figure is Federal money and this leaves a total only of \$6.7 million, Mr. Speaker, not that \$28 million that the Premier points to, when there is no one around to correct him on this matter.

The other matter that the Premier drew attention to today that I'd like to comment on very briefly, Mr. Speaker, is in connection with the results of the 1967 general election. Once again the Premier played rather loosely with numbers and percentage points. He suggested that the Liberals had received some 46.5 per cent of the popular vote, which is not true, Mr. Speaker. They received 45.7 and after eliminating the plural voting in 1964, Mr. Speaker, and going to single member constituencies in 1967, it should be a matter of interest to the Premier to note that the vote which the CCF drew in the 1967 general election went up by 4 per cent and the Liberal vote went up by 2.3 per cent, Mr. Speaker. The CCF vote in terms of actual voting numbers, Mr. Speaker, increased by 10,000, the Liberal vote went up by 2,200. 343 more votes for the CCF in the right seats would have given the CCF 30 seats in this House. Alternatively, Mr. Speaker, the switch of 174 votes from the Liberals to the CCF in the right seats would have given the CCF 30 seats in this House; 632 more votes for the CCF in the right seats would have given the CCF 32 seats. Alternatively a switch of 323 Liberal votes to the CCF in the right seats would have given the CCF 32 seats in this House. This is just how close the 1967 general election was. I suggest to you that you prolong your term the full five years, Mr. Speaker, if you want to do some fence-building and mend your image before that time.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Snyder: — I thought, Mr. Speaker, that the Premier on one occasion departed from the line that he has used in previous years. He tried a new approach which I hadn't heard him use before to explain how well Saskatchewan was doing. He said, "Why, unemployment figures are almost the lowest in Canada, only Alberta

has a smaller percentage of unemployment.” Now, Mr. Speaker, one could ask the Premier, “What else is new?” This has been the case for 20 years, Mr. Speaker, in the Province of Saskatchewan . . .

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Snyder: — . . . and if the Premier will check his figures he will find that Saskatchewan has had the distinction of having the lowest unemployment figure across Canada until recently, until the Liberals assumed office in this province. We have now lost that envied position and Alberta has now taken over, Mr. Speaker.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I leave the remarks of the Hon. Premier. I want to say something now concerning what I believe is one of my most profound obligations, and I want to take this opportunity to say something concerning the unique and the specific problems which the constituency I represent faces at this time. I know my colleague who represents Moose Jaw South (Mr. Davies) shares this concern with me. Being located in the shadow of the capital city has been an initial geographic disadvantage which has had the effect of retarding our growth in Moose Jaw. Prior to the general election of 1967, I was disturbed and disappointed, Mr. Speaker, with some of the persistent threats that Moose Jaw would be neglected and ignored and would not share in Saskatchewan’s growth, if that city did not elect a Liberal to the Saskatchewan Legislature. Those people who made those threats, Mr. Speaker, will remain nameless, because I feel sure that these were words that were uttered in the heat of an election campaign. I’m hopeful that Ministers of the Crown who sit opposite take their obligations seriously and recognize the solemn obligation that they have to all corners of this province and all the people of this province, regardless of the political complexion of the Member in any given constituency.

I think Members will be aware that for many years the city of Moose Jaw has assumed the position of a principal railway terminal and that the new technology in railroading has affected us in a more drastic way than any other centre of population with respect to job losses. Since the end of World War II, Mr. Speaker, job losses of approximately 2,000 have come about in Moose Jaw during post-war years. The Canada Department of Labour in its publication, “Manpower Trends”, shows that for the ten-year period from 1951 to 1961 the sharpest decline in employment across Canada was in railroad industry. The decline was detailed in this way: The number of firemen decreased by almost 50 per cent; mechanics and repairmen in railway shops decreased by 23 per cent; telegraph operators were down by 35 per cent while baggagemen and expressmen declined by 22 per cent. Bigger and faster trains also cut into the ranks of engineers and conductors with conductors showing a 10 per cent loss and engineers a 19 per cent decrease. Brakemen and switchmen lost 26 per cent of their numbers, while sectionmen lost 23 per cent. I think it’s interesting to note at the same time, Mr. Speaker, that during this same period of time the combined revenues of the Canadian

February 21, 1968

National and the Canadian Pacific railways were almost 20 per cent higher in 1961 than they were in 1951. I think that most Members of the Assembly are aware of further drastic reductions in staff across the entire system, numbering in the thousands of jobs since this last publication was printed. The job loss, Mr. Speaker, to our community represents a severe problem, a severe economic problem, not just for those who with their families have been affected, but the impact has been felt by the business community which is dependent upon these industrial pay cheques for their livelihood. The closing of the Robin Hood Flour Mills and the subsequent shutdown of the oat mill after 50 years of continuous operation in Moose Jaw resulted in the loss of another 160 odd jobs, Mr. Speaker, which in turn resulted in the closing of the Prairie Bag Factory.

All Moose Jaw citizens and especially workers who had recently been displaced looked with hope to a new industry which was announced some months ago. The Times Herald of December 30, 1966, carried a new story in the following terms, "Premier Thatcher announced a new wire plant would achieve full production, employing 150 men by the fall of 1967." Well, Mr. Speaker, Moose Jaw waited patiently until September 14, 1967, just prior to the general election when the Moose Jaw Times Herald reported again and I quote once again, "Premier Thatcher announced construction of steel wire plant would begin within two weeks." Now, Mr. Speaker, we question the authority for the Premier's optimism at that late date. Whatever the explanation, this represented another disappointment to our community. The election came and went as did the TISCO steel plant for our city. However unfortunate and regardless of the reason or reasons, Mr. Speaker, all of this is now history. A Christmas card which I received this past year had this message enclosed:

The present is our opportunity,
The future is our hope,
We cannot change yesterday,
But the results of tomorrow depend upon the efforts of today.

I would hope, Mr. Speaker, that the Premier still retains a warm feeling for the community which he regarded as his home until a few short years ago. I trust he will remember it as the city which did a good deal for him personally in a variety of ways. When speaking in Moose Jaw, the Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Steuart) also draws to the attention of his audience that he too is a native son of our city.

Our city has a good deal to offer, Mr. Speaker, as a residential centre as well as a future site for new industry. It is situated ideally at the junction of two major highway arteries, No. 1 and No. 2 and it has an international rail connection with the United States at North Portal. Contrary to the opinion of some of my Regina friends, Mr. Speaker, Moose Jaw is still the "Gateway to the South Saskatchewan Dam." With all of these amenities to recommend our city, and in the light of persistent difficulties which we face, I remain hopeful that there is more

in the Throne Speech than there would appear to be on the surface. I am willing and anxious, Mr. Speaker, to offer whatever support I may, and to work closely with any department of Government, with the knowledge that measures designed to assist our area will in turn be of benefit to the whole of the province and its people.

Mr. Speaker, the Throne Speech draws attention to some remarks which are of concern to the Government opposite. Rising costs of services provided to our people cannot be regarded as a problem that is new, nor is it peculiar to our Province alone. One can scarcely think of any service that is presently being provided that will not claim an increasing share of our wealth and our resources and our energy. I think especially of education and health services, but many other services provided by our Government to our people, at cost, could very well be mentioned here. The cost of providing these services is, Mr. Speaker, and should be a matter of concern to all those who are involved in government, whether it is on the municipal, provincial or federal level. I believe, however, that the success in providing these services to Canadian people will not be measured strictly in terms of how many dollars we spend. I think the success of any public service provided for our people will be measured in terms of the prudent use of taxpayers' dollars in order that services of a high quality are available to the greatest number of people at the most reasonable cost. I think this must be acknowledged as a cardinal principle, whether we are concerning ourselves with highway construction, Government insurance, mental health, or our much talked about comprehensive Medical Care Plan. To the greatest degree possible, Mr. Speaker, those of us who sit on your left believe that the cost of providing these services must relate to the ability of the individual to pay.

Since the election of October 11th, Mr. Speaker, we have witnessed a great many warning flags being run up by the Premier and his colleagues. Contrary to pre-election boasts of affluence and reduced taxes, the Government is now preoccupied with finding new sources of revenue. In a few short hours, Mr. Speaker, we made this transition from prosperity to austerity. Under these circumstances, Mr. Speaker, the inconsistency of Members opposite concerning the introduction of a national Medical Care Plan I think is deserving of close examination. Members will be aware that Saskatchewan stands to gain some \$14 million annually from Ottawa in the transaction. I understand that Saskatchewan will receive \$10 million in 1968. However, recent happenings in the nation's capital may raise some doubts in this connection at this time. An editorial in the Regina Leader-Post of January 12th carries a news item quoting Provincial Treasurer Davy Stewart in Eastern Canada who said and I quote:

We put the reminder to them as strongly as we could, pointing out that it is the law of the land, and there should be no further delay.

So here you have a conflict between the No. 1 and the No. 2 men

February 21, 1968

in the Provincial Government, Mr. Speaker, one suggesting postponement for a year and the other one saying full speed ahead.

Mr. Speaker, the same evening that Mr. Steuart made this profound statement, a British aircraft manufacturer announced that their firm had developed an experimental aircraft that was capable of rising vertically, flying horizontally, and reversing directions while flying at high speeds. On the face of it this looks like a neat bit of manoeuvring, Mr. Speaker, but it is really no more spectacular than the antics of Liberals opposite and those of their Federal colleagues over the past 49 years.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Snyder: — Liberals, Mr. Speaker, have been in favor of Medical Care ever since 1919. The anxiety of the Thatcher Liberals to see Medical Care introduced in Saskatchewan in 1962 manifested itself in a number of very strange ways, with influential Liberals running about the province organizing K.O.D. demonstrations and contributing in many other ways that are well known to all Members.

For the records, Mr. Speaker, I refer to Volume 17, Page 19 of Debates and Proceedings for the official position of the present Premier on April 14th, 1962. The words he uttered at that time, Mr. Speaker, bear a marked resemblance to the words some by some of the top-drawer Liberals in Ottawa recently concerning medical care. These are the words of Mr. Thatcher in this House on April 14, 1962:

First, we voted against third reading of this Bill because we did not think the Government could get the co-operation of the doctors. Secondly, we voted against the Bill because of the staggering costs involved - \$25 million the first year. Thirdly, we voted against it because of the unprecedented tax burden which the Government proposed to finance the plan, and we were particularly opposed to the vicious 5 per cent sales tax neither the people of Alberta or Manitoba have. Fourthly, we opposed the Bill because of the timing, coming as it did in a year of drought, recession and unemployment. Finally, we opposed the Bill because we feared then and we fear today that if it is passed, many of our best doctors may leave the province.

These remarks, Mr. Speaker, might very well qualify as 'famous last words', except that they have been repeated over and over by prominent Liberals in recent weeks. Some months ago, the Hon. Judy LaMarsh said that Medical Care was in "Never, Never Land." Then along came Allan MacEachen with a National Plan to help us celebrate our Centennial, to be introduced on July 1st, 1967. Then, Mr. Sharp appeared on the scene postponing the plan for a year, not because of drought or recession, or unemployment, as Mr. Thatcher argued in 1962, but because times were too good, money was too plentiful, and inflation was a threat, and there

was a need to cool off the economy of the country.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Snyder: — Well, Mr. Speaker, July 1st, 1968 is drawing near, and the Hon. Mr. MacEachen went on record as favoring the introduction of the plan on that date. Mr. Kierans said “No”, Mr. Greene said, “Yes”, while Prime Minister Pearson indicated that his Cabinet would have to take another look at it. Following a meeting of the Federal Liberals, Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister announced that he and his Government stood four-square behind Medical Care and that the plan would be introduced as planned. I think it was evident to all, Mr. Speaker, that the decision of the Government to proceed came about, not as a result of any firm conviction, or humanitarian instinct, but because of the threatened resignation of several Liberal Cabinet Ministers. Meanwhile, back in Saskatchewan, the Premier reported recently that he supported the postponement for at least another year, while Mr. Steuart expresses his delight at having received that cheque for \$10 million, or the expectation of receiving that \$10 million cheque from Ottawa.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Snyder: — Those who faced Horatius at the bridge, Mr. Speaker, had a similar problem:

Was none who would be foremost
To lead such dire attack:
But those behind cried “Forward”
And those before cried “Back!”

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Snyder: — Surely, Mr. Speaker, that British aircraft manufacturer must have had the Liberal party in mind when they designed a vehicle which rose vertically, flew horizontally and reversed direction while flying at high speed.

For as long as I have been able to remember, Mr. Speaker, the opponents of comprehensive, pre-paid medical care have been vocal and persistent with the perennial argument that costs would be prohibitive. In 1962, Liberals in Saskatchewan expressed the feeling that the annual cost of \$25 million would be an entirely new impost on the Saskatchewan people. Those who oppose medical care today, Mr. Speaker, are using the same tactics when they make reference to the estimate cost of \$1 billion annually. Those who have opposed medical care in the past, and those who oppose it today, deliberately ignore the undeniable and basic fact that a large part of this total figure is presently being spent on medical care. Health Minister MacEachen estimates that it will only require \$80 million of new

February 21, 1968

money to finance a national plan. I suggest to you today, Mr. Speaker, that this represents the bargain of the century, if a national plan can be made to insure every Canadian against the sometimes disastrous and crippling costs of health services.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Snyder: — A National Health Plan, Mr. Speaker, will produce a number of calculated results. First, it will make medical care available to all those who could not afford it previously. Secondly, a large number who have been excluded from private plans because of chronic illness will be covered. Thirdly, Mr. Speaker, all Canadians will be receiving medical care at cost. Costly duplication of services by many private plans with excessive administrative charges will be eliminated. Fourthly, a national plan, under the auspices of an agency of government, can relate costs to the individual to his ability to pay for the service. Finally, the introduction of a plan, hopefully on July 1st, next, Mr. Speaker, will provide \$10 million in cold, hard cash to the Saskatchewan Treasury.

For ten long years, Mr. Speaker, Saskatchewan provided hospital services for her people without assistance from Ottawa. Our example here paved the way for a national hospitalization plan. Saskatchewan's initiative and Saskatchewan's sacrifice here have drawn medical care to the attention of all Canadians. I have no doubt, Mr. Speaker, that all those who sit on the Treasury benches opposite look forward to receiving that \$10 or \$14 million dollars from Ottawa, regardless of their sentiment concerning medical care. Many of us on this side of the House also share your anxiety in receiving that substantial amount of money from the senior Government.

It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that, after receiving assurance that this money is forthcoming, this would be a most appropriate moment for the Government to take a fresh look at their 1964 election promise to provide drug coverage under medical care in order that disastrous drug bills may be lifted from the shoulders of Saskatchewan people.

Let me quote you from the 1964 Hansard of the Legislature of Monday, February 24. The speaker had this to say:

I mentioned prepaid drug insurance in this House on Friday last. I'm going to mention it again today. There are many instances in Saskatchewan, Mr. Speaker, where some of our citizens are called upon to pay as much as \$100 a month for drugs. Now there are few people in Saskatchewan who can afford to pay \$100 a month. There are many instances where drug costs are crippling families.

Certainly, Mr. Speaker, we on this side of the House agree with the words of the speaker, Senator A.H. McDonald, a former Member of this Legislature and later a Minister of the Crown. We on this side of the House are aware also, Mr. Speaker, of the

impressive amount of money necessary to finance such a plan. However, we suggest that Federal participation in medical care and the introduction of a drug plan in Saskatchewan should take place simultaneously with an immediate start by covering the drug costs of terminal cancer patients and other exceptional categories.

I am sure that there are few Members on either side of the House who will argue about the need for a program of this sort. The cost of providing a drug plan will provide of course the traditional argument. In this connection, Mr. Speaker, there are several factors which I think are deserving of comment. As Canadians we have the doubtful distinction of paying a higher cost for the drugs that we consume than any other country on the face of the earth. I could offer many examples, Mr. Speaker, but I'm sure this is unnecessary because I'm sure that all Members will be willing to accept this as a statement of fact.

I find myself unable to think or to talk in terms of the provision of a prepaid drug plan, Mr. Speaker, without relating to another feature which contributes to excessive costs. A news release in the Regina Leader-Post of January 2, 1968, provided some detailed information which I think shed some light on the matter. The news release draws attention to the conviction of three drug companies for conspiring to control the production and distribution of \$1,700,000,000 worth of antibiotics. These firms were found guilty of restraint in trade, conspiracy to monopolize and actual monopoly. The investigation showed that the cost of manufacturing 100 capsules of this particular drug was between \$1.59 and \$3.87, but the cost to the consumer was \$51. I'm not sure whether the Hon. Member for Regina South West (Mr. McPherson) would refer to this as the independent sector of our economy or not.

Many more such examples such as this could be given, Mr. Speaker, many could relate to the high cost of consumer goods to Canadians ranging from food stuffs to farm machinery. However, drug costs are the commodity under discussion at the moment and I suggest to all Members of this House and particularly to Members opposite, that it is incumbent upon the Federal Government to take the necessary steps to initiate a complete study into the excessive costs which Canadian consumers must pay for their drugs. A repaid drug plan is vital to Saskatchewan and the Canadian people. However it's equally important that an appropriate agency of the Government take the necessary steps to see to it that a plan does not merely function for the purpose of fattening the coffers of Canadian and American drug companies, while causing financial burdens for Canada's taxpaying citizens.

I would hope, Mr. Speaker, when funds are received from Ottawa under the terms of the National Medical Care Act, that some of this money or all of it would be used to bridge this, the most impressive gap in Saskatchewan's health program. At the same time I trust that Members opposite will use their

February 21, 1968

influence with their Federal counterparts to ensure that the kind of monopolistic free enterprise being enjoyed on occasion by drug manufacturers would be placed under the most stringent observation and control.

Mr. Speaker, we were pleased to see the report of the Frazier Commission tabled in this House yesterday and before I resume my seat I want to say a very few words in this connection. I haven't had the opportunity to study the Report in any detail, but I believe a number of observations and recommendations which I found in it strike me as being in accord with many of the expressions of concern that Members on this side of the House have registered over the past number of months. We've claimed repeatedly, Mr. Speaker, that patients should not be discharged unless they stand to profit by the experience in a meaningful way. We pointed out the Government's rapid discharge policy of recent years has caused severe hardship to the families in many cases and oftentimes to the patient. We've drawn attention to the fact that if the Saskatchewan Plan is to accomplish the objective expected of it, when it was conceived, then much more needs to be done with respect to follow-up visits, occupational therapy, and continuing attention must be given to the standard of the half-way houses and nursing homes to which these patients are discharged. Recommendation No. 11, Mr. Speaker, of the Frazier Commission Report, I think, is one which is deserving of close attention. Recommendation No. 11 says:

We suggest that the practice of early discharge be brought in line with the principles so that discharge is not determined by dead-count statistics or attempts to satisfy institutional goals but by the needs of the patient, his family and his community.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Snyder: — This recommendation, Mr. Speaker, we suggest has been ignored in a major way by the Government in recent years. Likewise, Mr. Speaker, Recommendation 17 is deserving of consideration and thought. Recommendation 17 says:

We urge that prompt steps be taken to increase the number of community supervisory workers and also increase the level of skill through training, supervision, and consultation. There should be at least one staff person for each fifty patients in community placement.

Recommendations 1 and 6, Mr. Speaker, also warn of the dangers of continuing the over-zealous practice of mass discharge from Saskatchewan mental institutions. Recommendation 1 has this to say:

We recommend that for the present there be an easing-off in the pressure for discharge from Weyburn main building, no matter what the effect on hospital census. The discharge rate along with the type of patient being placed

in the community is exceeding the capacity of the community care staff.

Recommendation 6 goes on to say further that no heroic efforts be made at this time to reduce the in-patient population at Saskatchewan Hospital, North Battleford.

Mr. Speaker, I know that I express the feeling of those who sit to your left when I say that we are extremely hopeful that the Government will heed the advice and the recommendations contained in the Report that is now before us. Too often, Mr. Speaker, Commissions of this nature represent a vehicle to get an irate public off the back of the Government and are largely ignored and gather dust on some remote shelf. We trust that this will not be the fate of the Frazier Report.

Mr. Speaker, there are a number of other matters that I wish to touch upon and accordingly I beg leave to adjourn the debate.

Debate adjourned.

ADJOURNED DEBATE

MOTION

FLAG COMMITTEE

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of the Hon. Mr. Thatcher:

That a Special Committee be constituted to consider the matter of selecting a design for a distinctive flag for the Province of Saskatchewan and to report their recommendations thereon.

Hon. W.S. Lloyd (Leader of the Opposition): — Mr. Speaker, I have no wish to delay the passing of the motion for any length of time and no wish to suggest that those of us on this side of the House have any intention of being anything other than co-operative with respect to the proposal contained in the Resolution. The Resolution asks us to agree that a Special Committee be constituted to consider the matter of selecting a design for a distinctive flag. When I spoke yesterday I pointed out the very difficult position that we were in. It is rather impossible to discuss an idea when we haven't been told what the idea is in the first place. Certainly there is not enough in the Resolution to enable us to say what it is we are being asked to support. I am sorry that the Premier put it to us in that way; it puts the Legislature in a rather awkward situation. I note that he had found time earlier in the day to say something in the press about it, because one of the reporters in a column at least wrote what the Premier intended. I think it was unfortunate that the Legislature couldn't have been given at least the same amount of confidence as was given to the

press with respect to the idea.

Mr. Speaker, with regard to the Resolution there are some questions which perhaps the Premier can clear up when he speaks in closing the debate. He has asked that a Special Committee be constituted. We would like to know, constituted of whom; we would like to know, constituted by whom. Is it to be by way of further resolution in the Legislature? Is there to be discussion as between the two parties with respect to who is going to be on the Committee? Is it going to be by Order in Council? Just who is going to be included? I think we should know when it is planned that the Committee is going to meet. Is it expected to meet during this session? Is it expected to meet during this next session, and between now and the next session as well or just when? I think we ought to know. We ought to have an opportunity to discuss in this House. The Resolution in the form it has been submitted doesn't give us any opportunity to discuss the terms of reference of the Committee. Surely we don't just set up a Committee on the basis of the rather scanty description contained in these particular lines. We have no way of knowing what the Government's intention or the Government's wish is in this regard. There are a number of items which need to be talked about at some point. I don't know where we are supposed to start in looking for a distinctive provincial flag.

It has been suggested in other places and at other times that probably the Centennial Flag is one we could inherit. I don't know whether this is the Government's thinking or not, but it seems to me unfortunate if it starts out with a premeditated decision of this kind. If we are going to have a flag, then let's give some consideration to it. Let's not just accept an inheritance in a sense from a symbol which was adopted for another purpose at another time, and concerning which this legislature had no opportunity to take part in discussion whatsoever. Are there going to be competitions so that people in the province can submit ideas? There are a whole host of matters to be discussed which, knowing not what the Government's idea is puts us in a difficult position. I hope that if the Committee is set up, it would be given both time and opportunity and also encouragement to consult to a considerable extent within the province and perhaps even outside of the province. We are choosing something that's going to be and probably will remain a symbol, insofar as a flag is a symbol, for all time. Therefore it needs to be understood, it needs to be appreciated, it needs to be something that is meaningful to more than just four or five people sitting down in a Legislative Committee. There is the need to consult. There is the need to make certain that a flag which we do adopt is properly symbolic, in that it has the kind of meanings that we associate with our province. There is the need to consider so that it has a design which is aesthetic and is pleasing, which we will be proud of as something to see. There is a lot to be thought of and a lot to be talked about in connection with it. I think Members of the Legislature are competent to come to an amicable agreement about it, but we're in a very difficult position because of the fact that the Resolution was put before us without a single word of explanation

as to how the Government proposes to proceed.

If the Premier can satisfy us with respect to the Government's intentions, give us some idea of it, particularly we should know what the next step is, that is to say we are anxious to co-operate, but we can't co-operate in the dark.

Hon. D.G. Stuart (Prince Albert West): — Mr. Speaker, possibly I can answer some of the questions raised by the Leader of the Opposition. To begin with the Government felt that it is timely that Saskatchewan should have a distinctive flag, that is, officially adopted by the Legislature, so we proposed this Committee. We suggested the Committee be twelve in number, that it be drawn from both sides of the House through consultation. We would hope the Committee would meet, we would want the Committee to meet this session, and bring in recommendations for the consideration of this session of the Legislature. Once the Committee has been agreed upon, that is, its composition, we would bring in another Resolution setting out the terms of reference and I might say that we have no preconceived idea, some Members may have, but as a Government we have no preconceived idea as to what the flag would be like. This is why we're suggesting the Committee and we are hopeful. I am pleased to hear the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Lloyd) say that they are prepared to co-operate because, I think, this should be something that the House could work together on, both sides of the House. In choosing something like the flag, I hope we could avoid some of the debates and some of the feeling that were generated in choosing the national flag. I think a flag should be a unifying symbol and so this is the idea behind the Resolution, that they be 12 in number chosen by consultation. Once the Committee has been chosen we would bring in another Resolution laying out for your consideration the terms of reference. We would hope that the Committee could make its decision and bring back recommendations for this session which the Legislature would accept and endorse the flag that they propose.

Mr. Lloyd: — Before the Treasurer (Mr. Stuart) sits down would he answer a question? Wouldn't it be possible to supply us with at least suggested terms of reference before you ask us to vote on this Resolution.

Mr. Thatcher: — Mr. Speaker, we could do this . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order, order! If the Member speaks in closing the debate, I must draw the attention of the House that the mover of the motion is about to close the debate. If anybody wishes to speak he must do so now.

Mr. Lloyd: — Mr. Speaker, I had asked the Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Stuart) a question. I think it's rather desirable to have

February 21, 1968

an answer.

Mr. Speaker: — A question was asked of the Provincial Treasurer.

Mr. Steuart: — Well, I would think that, when we set the Committee up, we would be guided by any suggestion they might make for the terms of reference. If another Resolution is necessary we would bring that back to the House. What we're suggesting now is that, if we can agree, we will form a Committee which will be 12 in number. There will be consultation about the make-up of the Committee, the numbers from each side of the House and hopefully this Committee would meet. They could then suggest the terms of reference. If these terms of reference needed to be embodied in another Resolution we could bring that back to the House.

Mr. A.E. Blakeney (Regina Centre): — Mr. Speaker, it would appear that there is a problem here, a technical problem of sorting out the issues before we vote on this motion. I think there is a real possibility that we could find ourselves in a position of disputing over this matter and, as the Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Steuart) the Member for Prince Albert West indicates, it's a matter which probably shouldn't be a matter for dispute. It is my view that there might be real merit in some consultation between whips, or whatever channels might seem appropriate, before this Resolution is put to a vote. There are some comments which I might wish to add before the vote is taken. Under those circumstances, Mr. Speaker, I would ask leave to adjourn the debate.

Debate adjourned.

The Assembly adjourned at 5:08 o'clock p.m.