

**LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN**  
**First Session – Sixteenth Legislature**  
**13th Day**

**Monday, March 4, 1968**

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

**WELCOME TO STUDENTS**

**Mr. W.G. Davies (Moose Jaw South):** — Mr. Speaker, I would like through you to introduce a group of students from the William Grayson school in Moose Jaw. Now there are originally 56, but I don't think they all got in to either the east or west galleries. But as many as are here, I know, will be welcomed by the House this afternoon, as well as their two teachers, Mrs. D. May and Mrs. S. Bowler. I hope that everyone in the group will have a most stimulating afternoon and a safe journey home.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. H.E. Coupland (Meadow Lake):** — Mr. Speaker, I would like to introduce to you and to this House, a group of 55 high school students seated in the Speaker's gallery. They are accompanied by their instructor, Sister Mechtildis, and the Principal of the Goodsoil high school, Sister Veronica, along with the bus driver and his wife, Mr. and Mrs. Carl Hoffer. Mr. Speaker, this group left home at 5 o'clock Saturday morning and arrived in Regina at approximately 6 o'clock Saturday night. And I think that they have been singing ever since. I would say, Mr. Speaker, that I attended a performance that they put on at the St. Cecelia Parish Hall last night, and, I can assure you, to a capacity crowd. They got two standing ovations, which is indicative of what good singers they are. Mr. Speaker, these are all high school students from Goodsoil and they belong to a sing-out group.

I would just like to take a few minutes of the time of the House to say what a sing-out is. It is a part of the moral rearmament movement of Canada, or of the world. Sing-out is the action, the energy, the principle, of young people all over the world, of high school and university students who are launching a revolution to rebuild the world. It is a harmonious way of saying, "Every man is my brother." It is a moving proof that there is much more to today's younger generation than a minority of young irresponsibles, such as the hippies, drug addicts, or what have you. Sing-out members are out to destroy the misleading images of youth, to banish hatred and fear, and to replace these by an international brotherhood. There are only 252 of these groups in the world, 10 in Canada, and three in Saskatchewan, one of which is in Moose Jaw, one in Wilcox and this wonderful group from Goodsoil, under the instruction of Sister Mechtildis. They have travelled over 400 miles to be with us today. They put on a performance out in the rotunda,

**March 4, 1968**

just a little while ago, and I think that anybody who heard them will join with me in saying that they are a real good bunch of singers. I am justly proud that this group has come all the way from Goodsoil to be with us today in the Chamber. I am sure, Mr. Speaker, that this House would wish them a very informative stay while in the city and a safe return to Goodsoil.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. W.E. Smishek (Regina North East):** — Mr. Speaker, I would like to introduce at this time, a group of 64 grade seven and grade eight students from the Glen Elm School, who are seated in the west gallery behind me. They are accompanied by their vice-principal, Mr. Calder and the assistant to the principal, Mr. Securr. I want to extend to this group a warm welcome. I am sure that they will find their stay in this Legislature today an exciting day as this is the day for the debate on the Budget. They are going to hear, in my opinion, one of the most exciting and best debaters in the Legislature and for that matter in Canada. To them, I extend a warm welcome and I hope that their stay is going to be both pleasant and memorable as well as educational.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

#### **TELEGRAM OF CONGRATULATIONS TO GOODSOIL SING-OUT GROUP**

**Hon. J.C. McIsaac (Minister of Education):** — Mr. Speaker, I would like to take just a moment to read to the Members of the House and to yourself, Sir, a telegram I received this morning. It is from Meadow Lake and it reads as follows:

Would you kindly convey the enclosed telegram to the Goodsoil sing-out group today. Congratulations to Sister Mechtildis, Sister Veronica and the students of the Goodsoil sing-out group. We are very proud of you and we wish to extend to you our sincere wishes for a pleasant tour.

It is signed by the Meadow Lake Saskatchewan Teachers Federation, the Unit Board, the Superintendent and staff. If I may just take another moment, Mr. Speaker, this week, as I am sure that all Hon. Members realize, is Education Week. I am sure that it wasn't pre-arranged, but I can certainly think of no better way to have begun Education Week for the Members of the House than with the performance put on by the Goodsoil students just a short while ago. I would commend the Members, while I am on my feet, to partake if they can, in many of the observations that are being held throughout the province to mark Education Week.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. R.H. Wooff (Turtleford):** — Mr. Speaker, I would very

much like to add my words of welcome to the sing-out group from Goodsoil and the Sisters and those who are training them and have come with them to pay us a visit at the Legislature. Amongst these students are names of families that have been pioneers in the area for many, many years. It was my privilege, Mr. Speaker, to represent this area and work with these people, and I do want to thank them for their entertainment out in the rotunda. We wish them well, both in their school endeavors and in their singing. I hope that their visit to this city has been both enjoyable and educational, and above all that they have a safe journey home.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Hon. G.B. Grant (Regina South):** — Mr. Speaker, through you and to the Members of this Assembly, I would like to extend a welcome to 64 grade six students, in the first two rows of the west gallery, from McNiven school in Regina South. This is the first time these students have attended the Legislature, and I know that the other Members of the House join with me in wishing them an enjoyable visit today and trust that they learn something from this session this afternoon.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. A.E. Blakeney (Regina Centre):** — Mr. Speaker, I would like to introduce to you and through you to the House, a group of students from Regina Centre. They are a group of senior students from Herchmer school and my information is that they are distributed in both the east and west galleries. They are a group of students pursuing a Social Studies course and they are here with their teacher, Mr. Meyer. I, too, hope that they will find this afternoon educational and instructive. I will do what little I can to add to their education, during Education Week. I know that all Members of the House, while they will not necessarily agree with my brand of education, will join with me in welcoming the students and expressing the view that their stay with us be enjoyable and informative.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Hon. C.L.B. Estey (Saskatoon Nutana Centre):** — Mr. Speaker, through you I would like to introduce to this House students from Bishop Murray school in Saskatoon, who are in the Speaker's gallery and are here with their teachers, Mr. McGuire and Mr. Kob. Bishop Murray school was named after the first Roman Catholic Bishop in Saskatoon. I am sure that I speak for all the Members in the House, when I say that it is our hope that you will find your visit here instructional and educational and that you will, at the same time, enjoy yourselves. We congratulate Mr. McGuire and Mr. Kob for showing the interest in bringing these students to the Assembly this afternoon.

**March 4, 1968**

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

## **QUESTION**

### **BATTEN REPORT**

**Mr. W.G. Davies (Moose Jaw South):** — Before the Orders of the Day, I wonder if the Premier could now advise us whether copies of the Batten Commission Report will now be circulated among the Members in view of the fact, as I understand it, that the news sources have been provided with copies.

**Hon. D.V. Heald (Attorney General):** — Mr. Speaker, I was just about to rise to my feet before the Hon. Member, to lay on the table the Report of the Royal Commission on Consumer Problems and Inflation, the Prairie Provinces Cost-study Commission. I might just indicate to the Hon. Members an aid to reading the Report. It might save you a little time. You will find that the recommendations in respect of each subject matter are at the end of each chapter. You will find also, for quick reference, the recommendations are indented. For example: I am looking at page 364 and there are two indented paragraphs, each of which contains recommendations. So this is the lazy man's approach, but if you want to get the recommendations quickly, you can look at each page and see what the recommendations are, because they are indented. I should say, Mr. Speaker, before I lay the Report on the table, there are many recommendations to the three Prairie Provinces. As all Hon. Members know, this is a Report for the three Prairie Provinces. There are a number of recommendations in the Report as you will see to the three Provinces, and of course, before this Government can take any action with respect to those recommendations, it will probably be necessary for the Prairie Economic Council, which consists of the three Premiers of the Prairie Provinces, to consider the various matters which are the subject of recommendation to the three Governments. Then there are a number of other recommendations made specifically to each individual Province and to the Government of each individual Province. I can give the Hon. Members of this Legislature assurance that this Government will be giving active and early consideration to each and every one of those recommendations that are made so far as it is within the powers of our Government to implement these recommendations. So with that short introduction, Mr. Speaker, I would lay this Report on the table.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

## **ADJOURNED DEBATES**

### **BUDGET DEBATE**

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Mr. Steuart (Provincial Treasurer) that Mr. Speaker do now leave the chair.

**Mr. A.E. Blakeney (Regina Centre):** Mr. Speaker, when last Friday, the Provincial Treasurer delivered his Budget, he indicated that he had dispensed with the practice of wearing a special kind of tie and that he was going to wear a simple Scottish tie. It seems to me that if I were to do justice to this occasion, I ought to have picked up the practice and worn a black tie. I would have, had I thought that the blow struck by the Budget to the Province of Saskatchewan was a mortal blow. But may I assure the Government that the patient will recover. It may take four or five years, but recover it will.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Blakeney:** — It will recover when the people of Saskatchewan have an opportunity to voice their opinion on the Budget brought down last Friday by the Provincial Treasurer.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Blakeney:** — First, Mr. Speaker, I want to take the opportunity of congratulating you on your re-election to the office of Speaker. I want, too, to congratulate those new Members who have taken on the heavy burden of being a Cabinet Minister. Just how heavy a burden it is was made rather clear last Friday. I fancy that those who took on the burden didn't realize it was that heavy, but they, like the rest of the people of Saskatchewan, now know what they are in for. I want to congratulate colleagues of mine who were re-elected — in the cases of the Members for Touchwood (Mr. Meakes) and Pelly (Mr. Barrie) — and I am sorry that the Member for Pelly is not here with us — after an absence of one term. I particularly want to welcome new Members to the House. I know that the procedures of the Legislature sometimes appear tedious and time wasting. And I've no doubt sometimes they are. We need to have our procedures under review. They can stand some revision. But having said that, the parliamentary form of government has much to commend it. One is reminded of the thought expressed by Winston Churchill. "The parliamentary system is a terrible form of government — it's just that nobody has yet invented a better one." I welcome the new Members on both sides of the House to participate fully in the work of the House. It is an honorable calling and a fruitful field for service.

Mr. Speaker, when I spoke last Friday, I was suffering from a sense of shock at the savage tax increases announced in the Budget. Over the weekend, I'm sure, that same sense of shock has settled on every person in Saskatchewan.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Blakeney:** — Mr. Speaker, to quote Mr. Churchill once again: "This is one of those cases where the imagination is baffled by the

**March 4, 1968**

facts.” Many of us suspected that all was not well. Many of us knew that the picture of a prosperous Saskatchewan held out by the Liberal leaders during the last election a few months ago, was transparently false. We knew that the facts were being misrepresented. But we didn’t know how gross were the falsehoods. I don’t believe that even the most uncharitable in the ranks of the party that I represent – and some of us are inclined to be pretty uncharitable towards the Premier – but I doubt that the most uncharitable among us would have accused him of the degree of distortion which this Budget revealed.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Blakeney:** — We were not prepared to think that the Liberal party would deceive the voters to that extent, but we were wrong. Mr. Speaker, I say to you, and to all the people of Saskatchewan, ‘Welcome to the New Saskatchewan.’

We have seen in the last five months a complete about-face on the part of the Government. On Friday I referred to this Government as the Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde Government. You remember the story of Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde. Dr. Jekyll was the urbane and kindly man who went about pleasing all the people, smiling, and charming the people. He was everybody’s friend. But he could by drinking a potion convert himself into a savage beast of a man who went about attacking and slashing his unsuspecting victims.

Well in Saskatchewan, Mr. Speaker, that potion was power. While the election campaign was on, the Premier and his Ministers, who must have known the facts, continued to pretend that all was well, continued indeed to promise larger homeowner grants, higher school grants, and yes, the abolition of the estates tax. The Premier did not promise, indeed, he gave no inkling, of what he knew was to come, and come much faster – savage tax increases.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Blakeney:** — But once the ballots were counted and he had squeaked back in with a one per cent plurality in the popular vote, the potion acted. The transformation took place. This Government set out to find its victims. We saw the results last Friday. Mr. Speaker, the Provincial Treasurer called it a ‘responsible Budget.’ This from a Member of a party which campaigned on representations of prosperity that they knew were false, on promises that they knew were hollow. Any party that deceives the people like the Liberal party of Saskatchewan did last October doesn’t know the meaning of the word responsible.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Blakeney:** — Mr. Speaker, to use the vernacular, the people of Saskatchewan have been had, and they have been had by the

Liberal party. They won't soon forgive the party that so shamelessly deceived them. This is called the New Saskatchewan. Well there is nothing new about it. It's the same old Liberal party which we have known provincially way back in the 1930s and 1940s and we knew federally in the 1960s. This is the same party that still believes that there is a sucker born every minute. It still believes that it can offer people goodies at election time and sock it to them right after the election and they will forget by the next election.

**Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Blakeney:** — This is the party which federally in 1963 promised \$2 wheat and welched on that promise. But the people of Saskatchewan remembered. And when in 1965 these same people faced the electors the Liberal party was wiped on the prairies. And if the Federal-Liberals continue to collapse under the weight of their own incompetence and have to face the electors again, they will be wiped out again.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Blakeney:** — Now, provincially the Thatcher Government was elected in 1964 on a promise to lower taxes. This was the number one promise, both from big number one and all his little cohorts. "We are going to lower taxes." And some people believed this in 1964. And some believed it even in 1967 because between 1964 and 1967 some taxes were increased and some were lowered. The picture was blurred and blurred, I think, consciously so. But this was only possible by the use of bookkeeping methods which just didn't tell the true story and which couldn't last for long. The Government can pretend that it's not going into debt. It can pretend this for a little while but it can't go on for long. Very soon that has to stop. To delay a tax increase is only to make it worse when it comes. But the Government kept the true facts hidden. When the Liberal party campaigned last October, the facts were still hidden. That party practised wholesale deceit on the voters. They worked a fraud on the people. They pretended things were rosy when they knew they weren't rosy, when they knew that the financial situation was desperate. There can be no doubt about that. They are counting on the people of Saskatchewan to forget this deceit, but I think, like the Federal-Liberals, they underestimate the Saskatchewan people.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Blakeney:** — Mr. Speaker, the voters will remember. Doubtless the Liberal party hopes that with the vicious tax increases announced by this Budget, that with the amount of money so raised they can go along without raising any other taxes, and that then in three or four years they can spread around some goodies again, and the people will forget. Well, Mr. Speaker, it won't work.

**March 4, 1968**

The voters will remember. They will remember this Budget for one year, two years, three years, four years, five years. And when the Government Members opposite have to go to the electorate they will still have to answer for this Budget.

In England they talk about the great train robbery. Well, in Saskatchewan they are going to talk about the great tax robbery.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Blakeney:** — One of the great train robbers is still at large, and I think people will be forgiven if they think that he may be hiding in the inner sanctum of the Saskatchewan Liberal party.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Blakeney:** — Let's detail this great tax robbery once again. Every major tax was increased. Let's list them. Sales tax increased 25 per cent.

**Hon. W.R. Thatcher (Premier):** — We put it back where you had it!

**Mr. Blakeney:** — Not a bit of it and you put it on things which have never been taxed before in the history of Saskatchewan. Gasoline tax up 13 per cent; operators' licences up 100 per cent; vehicle licence fees up 33 per cent; tobacco tax up 60 per cent; some up 100 per cent – cigars 100 per cent; Yes! Pari-mutuel tax up 100 per cent. And that is not all. They have levied taxes on things that have never been taxed before. Automobile insurance premiums under the Automobile Plan – 2 per cent; sales tax on meals, hotel and motel rooms, telephone, telegrams, and the rest – 5 per cent; tax on purple gas, not only for farm trucks but for combines and tractors, as well as on diesel fuel for combines and tractors – up 2 cents.

**An Hon. Member:** — The farmer's friends.

**Mr. Blakeney:** — The farmer's friends over there, the people who want to lower the cost of agricultural production, but we will come to that. Deterrent fees on medical care – office calls \$1.50 per call, home calls \$2; deterrent fees on hospital care - \$2.50 per day. They have heaped these on top of a series of recent increases: higher liquor prices; higher university tuition fees; higher liquor outlet fees; higher park fees; they have even lowered the BTU content of the gas they sell.

I said, Mr. Speaker, that every major tax was increased. This is not quite true. Although the need for funds was obviously desperate, they major taxes were not increased. Individual



income tax, although this is perhaps the fairest tax of all and although it is lower than it was when this Government took office, and although there is leeway there because the Government of Canada is not proceeding with its intended increase, the Government has decided not to impose a tax on high incomes. Instead they will tax the sick.

Corporation taxes – in looking for people who could pay more, the Provincial Treasurer overlooked completely his corporation friends. We have been assured that things are booming in the New Saskatchewan. Well surely if things are booming, the corporations must be the recipients of this boom. They must have shared the bounty. Yet the Government has decided not to impose a tax on corporations, instead it will tax the sick. Resource royalties – we have been assured time and time again that our resource industries are booming. Yet in the midst of this boom in the New Saskatchewan, it apparently did not occur to the Provincial Treasurer to try to get more money out of our natural resources. Resource revenues are about the same as they were last year. The Government did not ask those who exploit our resources to pay more. Instead they will tax the sick.

Just why the people who are exploiting our resources, why people with large incomes, just why corporations should get off scot-free was not explained. Just why these people should be exempt while every housewife pays more for clothing for her children, every university student pays more in fees, every wage earner who uses his car to go to work pays more to license that car, more to buy gas for it, more for his own driver's licence, more to insure his care, that wasn't explained. While every farmer pays a tax for the fuel he burns in his combine and his tractor for the first time in history; while every senior citizen who goes to the doctor pays more – it wasn't explained why these people are the right people to pay the taxes, and the corporations and the people with high incomes are not. Yes, every housewife, every student, every wage earner, every farmer, every senior citizens, oh they can pay and pay, but not those who exploit our resources, not the corporations, not the people with high incomes, not these people. Not in the New Saskatchewan. In the New Saskatchewan these are the people who were exempt from tax increases. No Government in the history of this province has ever increased taxes to the same extent in four months. No Government has ever increased taxes so ruthlessly, so deceitfully and so unfairly.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Blakeney:** — This was done by a party which on October 11, election day itself campaigned on the slogan, "If you want less taxes vote for your liberal candidates. If you want less taxes vote for your Liberal candidates, signed Gordon Grant and signed Don McPherson" in the Leader Post of October 11. That was false and at least some of them knew it was false. Mr. Speaker, the voters will remember.

**March 4, 1968**

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Blakeney:** — Mr. Speaker, the Provincial Treasurer has invited those who criticize the tax increase to say how they would make savings, and what taxes they would cut. Well I'm going to offer a few suggestions. I'm going to offer a few suggestions to the Provincial Treasurer. He wants to revise his Budget, or so he seems to indicate, and it certainly merits revision. Now this Government is in such a calamitous state that our Premier, the Caesar of the Wascana, has to go into every hospital to pick off taxes from people who are lying flat on their backs. Yes, if this is the state of the Province, I have a few suggestions.

First let's look over the Government payroll, see whether there are any people whose services the Province could perhaps do without, in this time of extremity. Well, I think of J. Walter Erb, I wonder if the Province could survive without his services. And then there is Edward Odishaw, that sometime Liberal candidate and currently manager of Mitchell Sharp's Saskatchewan campaign; perhaps his services could be dispensed with. There's Bernard Biershenk; maybe the Attorney General could manage to do without his services. Then there's Mr. J.C. Harrington, the Chief Electoral Officer; certainly this Government would never face the electors for five years, so his services can be dispensed with.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Blakeney:** — There's Mr. George Trapp, I suggest that his valuable services could be foregone in this time of extremity. Then there is J.W. Gardiner; perhaps some person in the Department of Co-operation, Mr. Minister, could take over his duties. In a time of financial crisis it's pretty unreasonable to ask the voters to pay for his apprenticeship in this area where he has no previous experience.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Blakeney:** — Second, I suggest the Government might look at MacLaren's Advertising. The public would welcome a change there. Perhaps the Liberal party could start paying for its own election propaganda and save tens of thousands of dollars.

Third, Legislative Secretaries, I for one have failed to perceive the great public benefits which flowed from the appointment of assorted Liberal backbenchers as Legislative Secretaries from time to time. Here is a saving I would commend to the Minister.

Fourth, aircraft, I suggest the Premier and his Cabinet could use a chartered aircraft, and save the taxpayer the expense of maintaining a plane and a crew on a standby basis.

I also suggest incidentally that you could par the aircraft farther from the Premier's car or vice versa.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Blakeney:** — Fifth, highway equipment, Mr. Minister. You could stop the practice of renting construction equipment to friends of the Government at less than cost, as the Provincial Auditor has reported now two years running. If goodies are to be handed out, try handing out a few to some senior citizens, and not to your favorite contractor.

Sixth, you could re-instate the practice of constructing some highways with department crews, so that you could have some measure of what your bid prices ought to be. Perhaps you could stop paying some of the ridiculously high prices that you have for highway construction.

Seventh, you could cut down on some of the more extravagant publicity programs of this Government. In a year of rigorous austerity isn't it just a little bit ironic that one of the votes that is up is Photographic Services. Well, I'm sure that the people of Saskatchewan are very grateful for the many pictures of the Premier and his Cabinet that appear in every newspaper and every television screen. But I think that in this time of austerity we could forego the pleasure of looking at the Premier's beaming countenance and look at something else for a while. Furthermore maybe people who have televisions in public places wouldn't want these pictures to be shown; it's going to be hard on the televisions.

**Mr. Thatcher:** — You're going to hurt my feelings.

**Mr. Blakeney:** — But I think we can do with a little less of this type of publicity and a little more on some solid programs.

Eighth, as I have already mentioned you could raise an equitable share of the additional taxes required by taxes on those who develop our resources, by increased taxes on corporations, by increased taxes on large incomes.

Ninth, if necessary and I emphasize that, you could delay the construction of a four-lane highway between Moose Jaw and Swift Current. I admit that four-lane highways are desirable, I do not admit that that stretch of four-lane highway should have top priority over all other spending in Saskatchewan.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Blakeney:** — Neither on the basis of the traffic count nor on the basis of the condition of the existing highway should that be top priority. Now I know that the Premier would like to take

**March 4, 1968**

out-of-province visitors from Regina all the way down to the ranch, a la LBJ, on a four-lane highway. But I don't think that's quite enough to justify the savage tax increases that this Budget contains. There are a number of other suggestions I could make, but the ones I have made would produce tens of millions of dollars.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Ah . . .

**Mr. Blakeney:** — That's right! Tens of millions of dollars. Well I admit that Liberals can't add, but I don't expect you to show it so obviously.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Blakeney:** — The Provincial Treasurer asks what taxes I would cut. Well there would be many, many cuts. First I'd abolish the tax on the sick, and I'll say more about that. Second, I'd abolish the tax on fuel used in farm tractors and combines. The Provincial Treasurer may feel that Saskatchewan farmers can withstand more taxes on production, but the New Democratic party does not feel that. We would wipe out this indefensible tax. Third, we would wipe out the tax on the automobile insurance premium, under the Automobile Accident Insurance Plan. We see this as just another step to undermine the Automobile Insurance Plan. We think this is a prelude to another sell-out, a sell-out which would cost the people of Saskatchewan millions of dollars every year.

Fourth, we would provide some additional funds to school boards, so that mill rates wouldn't soar. This Budget will cause mill rates to continue their upward spiral. This Budget is calculated, whether intentionally or not, to discredit education in the public mind. We would correct that.

Fifth, we would use further funds, and this would amount to millions, to cancel out some other tax increases and to do more in some other field; technical education, the University, grants to urban communities and others.

But I don't propose to re-write the Provincial Treasurer's Budget for him, however much we would like to criticize someone else's Budget rather than try to defend his own. It's his Budget, his tax priorities, his spending priorities that are under review. He must defend them and they are indefensible.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Blakeney:** — The Liberal party deceived the people by promising lower taxes. But it has done more than deceive the people, it has betrayed the people, by taxing the wrong people, by starving the wrong programs. It has shown itself to be not only unprincipled but incompetent. It has no mandate to govern, because

it got its mandate by fraud. It doesn't deserve to govern; it should resign and fight an election on the basis of the truth.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Blakeney:** — The Government wouldn't dare do that, but it can't last forever and, Mr. Speaker, the voters will remember. You people can chuckle now but the voters will remember.

**An Hon. Member:** — Will poppies grow in Flanders Field?

**Mr. Blakeney:** — I have here a little banner, "I like the New Saskatchewan". Is that going to be the Liberal slogan next time?

Well, Mr. Speaker, I want to look more fully into some of the implications of this Budget — why was it necessary and what will be some of its consequences?

First, why were these savage tax increases necessary? Well I gave one reason last Friday, and it was because the Government had cooked the books for three years.

But the basic reason is that the economy of Saskatchewan is faltering. The Government has refused to admit this, and this is not surprising. It goes again all the mythology of the Liberal party. Mr. Thatcher's most oft-repeated phrase in his many speeches, at every whistle stop in the United States, has been this. "Twenty years of Socialism has resulted in oppressive taxation, industrial stagnation and major depopulation."

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Blakeney:** — . . . "And I Caesar, I myself have changed all that." Well the 20 years of Socialism is history . . . and I'll let them speak for themselves. But let's see what four years of Liberalism has brought us, under Caesar himself. Oppressive taxation? Need I say more? I merely refer the public to the Provincial Treasurer's Budget. No Budget ever imposed more savage taxes at one time in the history of Saskatchewan. Economic stagnation? Well let's look at this economy of Saskatchewan over the last three or four years.

Yes, we have enjoyed some prosperity, but our prosperity has been on a very shaky footing. Just how shaky it's been is indicated by the results in 1967. The United States is experiencing a war boom. Canada is prosperous. Under these circumstances Saskatchewan can't help but be prosperous. Added to that we have had six successive better than average crops. But the chief beneficiary of this prosperity have been those Saskatchewan people who have decided that they're going to go to Ontario and British Columbia to find ready employment. Now

**March 4, 1968**

with this national prosperity, with the United States having a war boom, with these six better than average crops, you could expect all the economic indicators in Saskatchewan to be pointing up. How could they be otherwise? But what are the facts? Let's look at these indicators. And once again they show two things. Our rate of growth has slowed drastically since those dark days of stagnation. In some cases it's stopped. And secondly, we're losing ground compared with the rest of Canada. Let's look at a few of them.

Oil production. Our increase in oil production has been this: 1963 – 7 million barrels; 1964 – 10 million barrels; 1965 – 7 million barrels; 1966 – 5 million barrels; 1967 – no increase at all – a drop of one million barrels, the first drop since 1949. Definitely disquieting.

Now let's look at hard rock mining. We've heard a lot about hard rock mining in this House. The Premier is such a persistent peddler of the myth of the burgeoning north that it is easy to fall victim to his story, if for no other reason than its tedious repetition. How many times has he suggested that northern mineral development was blossoming, after a period of stagnation? How many times has he suggested with a sort of careful vagueness that the north was just sprouting mines like daffodils in the spring?

Well it's really a shame to see this balloon pricked, carefully nurtured as it has been by these repeated blasts of hot air, and it's particularly difficult to see it pricked by a government publication, the report of the Department of Mineral Resources. Now this report contains a comparison of mineral production, two year – 1962 and 1967. Now 1962, as listeners to tedious repetition will know, was in the depths of stagnation, while 1967 was well into the New Saskatchewan. Let's turn to this report of the Department of Mineral Resources. It shows, and I will concede this, that there were small quantities of some new minerals produced, nickel, platinum and palladium. But it also shows that of all the minerals mined in the north, gold, silver, copper, zinc, cadmium, selenium, tellurium and uranium and the rest, including these new minerals, overall production was lower in 1967 than in 1962. Even more startling the production of every single one of the major metals was lower in 1967 than in 1962. Now for uranium there may be a reason, for gold there may be a reason. But for copper and silver, prices have been at all-time highs, and yet the production drop has been sharp. Let's listen to a few of these. Between 1962 and 1967 what happened to production? Gold down 36 per cent; silver down 29 per cent; copper down 39 per cent; zinc down 4 per cent; uranium down 61 per cent. Every one down. If 1962 was stagnation, 1967 was super-stagnation. Now there may be a reason (and I see the Minister of Mineral Resources, Mr. Cameron, making a few notes), there may be a reason for this decline in hard rock production, and I'm glad to know that the Minister of Mineral Resources is going to follow me and he will doubtless enlighten the House on these points. But I'll tell you this. He cannot deny the facts, the hard facts, that

hard rock mining has declined and declined badly in the last five years.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Blakeney:** — In this field as in so many others we could use some good old-fashioned stagnation.

And we're not the only ones. The Provincial Treasurer could use a little bit of stagnation in these hard rock royalties. In 1963-64 the CCF Government collected in royalties on metallic minerals \$2.4 million. In 1968-69 the Provincial Treasurer has budgeted for revenues of \$1.1 million. What happened to the money? Down 50 per cent. If we've got burgeoning production in the north how come metal royalties are down over 50 per cent? These, Mr. Speaker, are some of the reasons why the Province Treasurer has had to send his tax gatherers, not into the hard rock mines, but into the hospitals of Saskatchewan, into the doctors' waiting rooms. Ah, things might not be so tough there. These patients might not put up a very hard fight when they're flat on their backs. The development program for metallic minerals has failed to produce the promised increases in revenue. It failed even to hold revenues where they were in 1962. It has failed to hold them at even half the level of 1962. Who has to pay for this failure? The taxpayer of Saskatchewan. In case someone will say, "Oh you're just picking out the hard rock minerals, there have been other developments," I will look at the whole resource picture. I'm prepared to concede that there has been resource development, there has been development in potash. NO thanks to the Government, but I don't suppose it did much to impede it. But let's look at this whole resource picture. What does the Budget show about where the Provincial Treasurer proposes to get his revenue? We have heard the Liberal story time and time again that once Saskatchewan developed, once a free enterprise Government got into office, there would be floods of revenue from resource developments and the proportion of Government services supported by this revenue would go up and up, and the amount of Government services supported by the taxpayer would go down and down. That was the story peddled at every whistle stop and on every platform in Saskatchewan. The facts have proved the precise reverse.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Blakeney:** — In 1968-69, and the Treasurer can do his own calculations, resource revenue will cover about 13.4 per cent of his Budget. How does this compare with the stagnation years? Well in 1963-64 it wasn't 13.4 per cent but 15.9 per cent. This year, 13.4 per cent compared with the last CCF year, 15.9 per cent. And then these people opposite still talk as if they were providing the services to the people of this province out of resource revenues when they know the facts are otherwise.

So, notwithstanding the Government's propaganda to the

**March 4, 1968**

contrary, the proportion of Government spending paid from resource revenues has been declining, not rising, and is very much less than it was during the CCF years. Is there any wonder then that in the New Saskatchewan the taxpayer gets hit harder and harder?

Now let's take manufacturing. Our manufacturing performance has been poor. The value of manufacturing shipments in 1967 shows this, Canada up 2.1 per cent; Saskatchewan down .7 per cent. Not very impressive. Or retail trade. This was up much less in Saskatchewan than in Canada as a whole, in 1967 in Canada up 6 per cent; in Saskatchewan up 3.6 per cent. That was the lowest increase of any province in Canada, the poorest performance in the nation. The next lowest was Liberal Prince Edward Island with 4.3 per cent. Not very encouraging, certainly not for our small merchants. With no more pie to cut up, how are these merchants going to get along as new outlets open up in our cities? A very bleak future for the small merchant in the New Saskatchewan.

Now let's look at agriculture. How is agriculture getting along in the New Saskatchewan? Take cattle numbers on farms, December, 1964 – 2,050,000; December, 1967 – 1,950,000; down a hundred thousand head, 5 per cent. Hogs, well hog numbers while dropping in 1965 and 1966 rose a bit in 1967, but prices are uncertain and that's certainly not a rosy picture. Sheep numbers, 1964 – 165,000; 1967 – 120,000; down 27 per cent. Poultry numbers, 1964 – 6.8 million; 1967 – 6.4 million, down 5 per cent. Egg production, 1963 – 29 million dozen; 1967 – 22 million dozen, down 25 per cent. Milk production, 1963 – 1,100 million pounds; 1967 – 800 million pounds, down 26 per cent. The Government set out to diversify agriculture, to reduce our reliance on field crops, and it has totally failed. In virtually every category of agriculture, except field crops, production is down. Hardly a success story.

How about employment? Jobs, that's a word we hear quite a bit about. Now let's consider this matter of employment or jobs. Liberals used to talk a lot about jobs. You'll remember that old chestnut that they got in on in 1964, to create 80,000 jobs.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Blakeney:** — Well, we know that that was a hollow promise. The total population of Saskatchewan since 1964 has gone up by less than 20,000 and there are certainly not 80,000 more people working. In fact there aren't 80,000 more people working, there are not 20,000 more people working, there are not 1,000 more people working than there were in 1964. So lately the Premier has changed his pitch. He's still trying to get the beat, but he's not quite making it. He stopped talking about 80,000 jobs; that's a sort of a worn out fairy tale. He's invented another fairy tale about a labor shortage. Why, he says there's a shortage of 15,000 skilled workers. Now is it true? He usually saves the story for Chicago or Los Angeles or somewhere like



that. He sure wouldn't want to try it in Regina Centre where there are scores of people looking for work. Let him go back to his old home in Moose Jaw and tell everyone about the shortage of labor. Let him try that!

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Blakeney:** — And he wouldn't want to say it to anyone who has read the Economic Review — that's the one that was published in 1967 in April and was suppressed until February, 1968. That's the one that took ten months to get from the Provincial Treasury to the Legislative Library.

**An Hon. Member:** — And one election.

**Mr. Blakeney:** — And one election, right! Because this review published by the Government itself clearly shows that the total number of unfilled job vacancies registered with Canada Manpower Centres in Saskatchewan are as follows: male — 1,600; female — 980, total 2,580. These the Premier adds up to 15,000. In fact they add up not to 15,000 but to 2,580. He's just another Liberal who can't count. While there are 2,500 unfilled jobs, there were in 1966, the comparable period, 11,000 people looking for jobs. This acute labor shortage of 15,000 people is another figment of the Premier's imagination.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Blakeney:** — Mr. Speaker, the Premier may like figures, but he certainly can't count. Except for skilled workers and we are short of a few skilled workers I admit, but except for a very small number of these, this labor shortage does not exist except in the Premier's imagination.

Let us check these again. Oppressive taxation? Yes — emphatically. Industrial stagnation? It would certainly look like it.

Major depopulation? Well let's look at this story. This is a story the Premier would like to forget. When he was in Opposition he talked about little else. And outside Saskatchewan he's still using the 1960 speech. That's the one about all these people leaving Saskatchewan. "The greatest exodus since Moses", that was his favorite phrase. All this was going to end when the Liberals were elected. We remember his first Budget Speech.

In the near future, the Government will endeavor to take action which will retain the natural increase of this province and attract other citizens from Canada and other parts of the world.

Well, he hasn't had much luck. But he's still trying. He thinks

**March 4, 1968**

that there may be still some person in some remote part of the world who hasn't heard about our Premier and still might be enticed to come to Saskatchewan. Just last week he told us he was going to try Kenya. I commend him for his perseverance and his offer to assist in taking people from Kenya. I'm afraid, however, that like so many of the Premier's efforts at population increase, this one too will amount to very little. Let's consider a few figures. During the whole of the 1950s, those years of dark stagnation, the population of Saskatchewan increased by about 10,000 people a year. In the year ended May 31, 1965 – 9,000; May 31, 1966 – 4,000; May 31, 1967 – 3,000. From 1964 to 1967 our natural increase – and as you know that's the difference between the births and the deaths – was 38,000. And a few people did come to the province; some people who might have been transferred in by the Army or the RCMP and couldn't get out of it. How is it then, Mr. Speaker, that with a natural increase of 38,000 and with some people coming into the province, our population went up by only 16,000 in three years? The answer is that over 22,000 people left Saskatchewan in those three years, 22,000 people under the new Caesar. This makes Moses look like a piker. If this keeps up the Premier is going to have real trouble giving this speech anywhere. Pretty soon he won't be able to find an audience where there aren't so many people who have left Saskatchewan that he'll be laughed off the stage.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Blakeney:** — Certainly they are leaving in record numbers, leaving because Saskatchewan has failed to keep pace with a booming Canada.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Blakeney:** — There may be many reasons for this and quite a few not the fault of the Government, and I want to concede that. But it was certainly true in the 1940s that many people left Saskatchewan for reasons not the fault of the Government. But the Premier has never hesitated to blame Socialism for the population shifts of the 1940s. It would be foolish to blame private enterprise alone for the present flight of people from Saskatchewan, but it's true that private enterprise has been no more successful than democratic Socialism in keeping people in Saskatchewan. This private-enterprise Government is dismantling our health schemes, is breaking apart our education schemes in the vain hope of making this province more attractive to the rightest of the right wing industrialists and thus keeping our people in Saskatchewan. The pity is, Mr. Speaker, that in a few years we will have a poorer system of health services, a poorer educational system and no more people. What the Premier has not learned is that it takes more than an offer of jobs to keep young people in Saskatchewan. There are jobs for psychiatrists, but they're leaving in great numbers. There are jobs for teachers, but they are leaving in great numbers.

Many hundreds of young people are looking for an opportunity to build a good life. And this means something more than a job. It means a challenge. It means a climate of opinion where ideas are welcome, yes even where odd-balls, Mr. Minister of Public Works, are welcome, where they are encouraged, where new ideas and new methods are tried. Young people are no longer willing to agree that General Motors has all the answers in industry, and Ronald Reagan has all the answers in politics. These people are looking for a new approach, a fresh approach to life and its challenges. And they are not finding it in Saskatchewan. And they are leaving. The so-called New Saskatchewan is built on ideas which are tired, old and shop-worn. Aside from the odd spark from the Attorney General (Mr. Heald) and occasionally from the Minister of Welfare (Mr. MacDonald), we've heard not a new idea in four years.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Blakeney:** — Perhaps it was good to have a pause. Perhaps Saskatchewan had had enough of innovation and change in 1964. Perhaps we had and I'm not here to dispute that, the people spoke. But the time has come for Saskatchewan to face forward again. And I fear that this will not happen under the Government opposite which is backward-looking and fearful in its approach to public issues. This approach is not satisfying our young people and they are voting against it. They are voting with their feet. They're leaving Saskatchewan in record numbers. I don't know how our young people will fare. They are pretty vigorous and they'll get by. But I do know that Saskatchewan will be infinitely poorer because these vital young people have left to seek their challenge on more fertile ground.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Blakeney:** — This Budget, Mr. Speaker, not only by the measures it contains, but also by the philosophy which it exhibits makes certain that still more hundreds of vital young people will leave. The population haemorrhage continues and will continue until this province is rid of the Government, its ideas, its methods, its style. Until this happens we will continue to have, not only oppressive taxation, not only economic stagnation, but major depopulation. What is needed is to usher out the so-called New Saskatchewan and usher in a New Democratic Saskatchewan.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Blakeney:** — Mr. Speaker, the reasons for the oppressive taxation are, as I have tried to say, principally the economic stagnation and the major depopulation from which we have suffered. There are in fact fewer of us, doing less, to support the services which we must have.

**March 4, 1968**

I want to look at some of the effects of this Budget on those services. But before I do that I want to look at one other matter and that is the question of the utilization fees so-called. Let me first say that these fees, called by the Provincial Treasurer utilization fees, would be much more accurately called deterrent fees and even more accurately called a tax on the sick. The Provincial Treasurer says that with respect to medical and hospital services the amount people pay for such services should be related to the use they make of those services. We on this side of the House do not share that view.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Blakeney:** — We believe that to put a flat rate tax on hospital use and on the use of doctors is to fly in the face of the very reasons these insurance schemes were introduced. We believe that medical and hospital services are services which any society owes to its sick and diseased. We believe that people suffering from mental illness, from TB, from cancer, from other physical illnesses should be treated without cost at the time of treatment, without any deterrent, and that the cost of providing this treatment should be distributed over the public on the basis of ability to pay.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Blakeney:** — In short, Mr. Speaker, we believe that it is fairer and more just to collect hospital costs from the man who is well and well-to-do rather than from the man who is sick and earning nothing.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Blakeney:** — If it can be avoided, we don't think it is fair or just to face a man or woman of limited means with the dilemma of whether or not he used his limited funds to get medical treatment for his sick child or his aging parent. Surely in the New Saskatchewan we don't have to introduce these sorts of decisions and dilemmas for our people which hark back to a dark time which I had thought he had put behind us.

The Provincial Treasurer speaks of correcting abuses. Mr. Speaker, we reject the whole idea of deterrents. If this sickness tax does deter, who does it deter? Only someone for whom \$1.50 or \$2 is significant; only a person with a low income.

Mr. Speaker, there is no evidence whatever that people in this group are abusing the medicare or hospital scheme more than anyone else. All the evidence is the other way. The doctors will tell you, and if anyone on the other side wants to deny this I would like to hear it, the doctors will tell that even with full insurance it is still the people which higher than average incomes who consult the doctor most. And that's not surprising. Well-to-do people have been accustomed to such medical care. They find it easier to get away from work. Frequently the housewife doesn't work, frequently she has a car at her disposal. It is easy for her to take children to the doctor. People with lower incomes frequently have to take time off from work and lose pay to go to the doctor. They're already paying a deterrent and they are now going to be asked to pay proportionately a much higher one. Now who are these people that are going to pay this new tax on the sick? Well, let's look at medicare first, the deterrent fees to be paid to doctors. Who uses doctors' services? The first large group are children or parents of young children. Children under one year of age require much more medical treatment than people in the prime of life. Children under one year of age go to the doctor twice as much as people between the ages of 25 and 64. So, the parents of these young children are the first group to be gouged. But for older people, it is much tougher. People over 70 require and use much more medical care. In Saskatchewan, in 1966, and these are the last figures I had available, every man between 25 and 44 used an average of 3.5 medical services a year. Every man over 70 used an average of not 3.5 but 13.5 services a year. An older man, then, requires three times as many medical services as a man in the prime of life. And these are the people selected to pay this sickness tax. First, the old. Secondly, the children. No there will be some deterrence in each case. But are we proud of this? I say again: are the finances of this Province in such a state that we have to levy this sickness tax, aimed as it is, especially at the old and the children? It has been wisely said that you can judge the quality of a nation by the way it looks after its old, its young, its mentally ill, those who cannot speak for themselves. So too I suggest you can judge the quality of a government by whom it selects to bear the burden of its new taxes and its budget cuts. There are always choices. An increase in income tax would make the sickness tax unnecessary. Two points on the income tax would about cover it. We could even have picked up the slack left by the inability of the Liberals at Ottawa to count to 84, but instead we have chosen to tax the young and the sick. Every single side effect of that tax is bad. If it deters, who does it deter? The poor, the old, the very young, the very groups that the Medicare Plan was designed to protect.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Blakeney:** — And if it doesn't deter, who will pay extra? The poor, the old, the very young, the people in society least able to pay. This tax is fundamentally bad and it cannot in conscience be voted for.

**March 4, 1968**

Now let's look at the tax on hospital patients. First, the patient has no control over when he is admitted to hospital. A doctor decides that. Second, the patient has little or no control over when he is discharged from hospital. A doctor decides that. The only possible way a patient can be deterred is for him to refuse to go to hospital when the doctor tells him to go. Surely this type of saving is just a little bit strong even for the strong stomachs of Members opposite. This tax is simply that – a tax on every patient who has the misfortune to be confined in the hospital.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Blakeney:** — It is bad business for Saskatchewan. For every \$2.50 paid by the patient he saves the Hospital Plan \$1.25 and the Government of Canada \$1.25. Yes, that's right. The Government of Canada. Under the Federal legislation, Saskatchewan recovers from Ottawa approximately \$1 for every \$2 paid to hospitals by the Department of Public Health. But we recover nothing for any money paid to the hospital by the patient. Suppose a patient is in the hospital for 12 days. Suppose he pays \$2.50 per day for his hospital bill - \$30 and the Department of Health pays the rest. The situation is this – and I'll leave aside all the extra administrative costs that the hospitals will have and the Hospital Plan will have. Let's pretend those administrative costs don't exist although they very much exist. The patient pays \$30, the hospital receives the same amount. The patient is \$30 poorer, the Saskatchewan Government is \$15 richer and the Government in Ottawa is \$15 richer. And this is supposed to be good business for the people of Saskatchewan. People in no province east of us pay a deterrent fee and we are paying taxes to see that they don't pay a deterrent fee. And this Treasurer wants us to be taxed to put money into the Federal coffers and then not get our full refund from Ottawa. We know that the Ottawa Liberals aren't very good at putting on taxes. They seem to get fouled up when they try, the awkward squad as they have been called. But this is no reason why the Thatcher Liberals should take over the job. It is no reason why they should collect both for themselves and for Ottawa.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Blakeney:** — Now who will this sickness tax on hospital days affect? Will it be the vigorous and the healthy wage earner? What do the figures show? People who are between the ages of say 30 and 34 spend little time in hospital. In 1966, on the average, 1,000 people in this age group spent 1,400 days in hospital, 1.4 days each. But if you are not between 30 and 34, but rather between 80 and 84, the situation is very different. On the average, 1,000 people in this age group spend not 1,400 days in hospital but 11,600 days, eight times as much. And I want to ask the Government: are our older citizens eight times

as able to pay this sickness tax as those of us who are young? If not, why has the Provincial Treasurer picked out our senior citizens as his particular victims? The situation is only somewhat better if you happen to have small children. They too need much more hospital care than healthy adults. See what has been done. Extra tax has been levied to finance health services, not on the basis of ability to pay, not even on the basis of so much per person or per family. But what people have been particularly picked out for special treatment, especially heavy taxes? The chronically ill, those with large families, and our senior citizens. This is the group on whom the special burden will fall. These are the people who are called upon to pay that special and that extra tribute to the Caesar of the Wascana. He should hang his head in shame.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Blakeney:** — Mr. Speaker, I now turn to the implications of the Budget for mental health. Consider the budget for mental health. It provides \$500,000, clearly added as an afterthought, to implement the recommendations contained in the Frazier Report on Psychiatric Services. And it is not enough. We are not dealing with the situation requiring a normal increase to cover higher costs and the proper expectation of an improvement in services. We are facing a crisis, a crisis brought about by three years of Liberal neglect, three years when the doctrine of the former Minister, now the Provincial Treasurer, held sway, the doctrine which said that you don't have to spend any money so long as you can vilify by personal abuse anyone who criticizes the program. Let's compare the performance of the former Minister and his unfortunate successor during the past three years; let's compare this with the performance during the previous three years. First let us look at the budget increase as quoted by Dr. Frazier himself: in 1962-63 budget, up 5 per cent; 1963-64 budget, up 8 per cent; 1964-65, the last CCF budget, up 8 per cent; 3-year average increase, 7 per cent. In 1965-66, the first Thatcher budget, down 1 per cent; 1966-67 budget, up 4 per cent; 1967-68 budget, up 3 per cent; 3-year average increase, 2 per cent. CCF average increase, 7 per cent, Liberal average increase, 2 per cent. This, Mr. Speaker, at a time when the new methods pioneered in this province in the so-called days of stagnation were being accepted by other provinces and states, when our staff was being sought after, when everything pointed to the fact that we had to fight and fight hard to keep our program. The result was what could have been anticipated by any reasonable person but was apparently not anticipated by the Premier and the former Minister. The staff left. The remaining staff became demoralized; more left — until we have a crisis, the most serious crisis in mental health since the days of the last Liberal Government. This crisis can no longer be denied. For well over two years the Government has been denying that anything was wrong. In fact anyone who dared to criticize was charged with having no other motives than partisan political advantage. The Government opposite brushed off every criticism. I regret, Mr. Speaker, that there is some evidence that the

**March 4, 1968**

Government is still prepared to spend its time imputing bad motives to its critics rather than considering the substance of the criticisms. In 1965 and 1966 my former colleague, Mrs. Cooper, brought her complaints to the attention of the Government. These were brushed off. In 1966 in this House, I outlined at length the complaints about the discharge policy which we had our complaints about, the lack of proper care in the community, about the other defects in the program. The Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Lloyd) did the same. These were brushed off. The Mayor of Weyburn set out some detailed and trenchant criticisms. From the Government there was no reaction except a torrent of abuse from the Minister. Any Member can look at the Hansards of this House to see what Members opposite said about anyone who dared to criticize their mental health program. During the 1967 session we again renewed our pleas for the Government to act. By this time, the Ad Hoc Committee had confirmed the soundness of much of our criticism. The Government still refused to admit their folly although they were visibly less cocky and know-it-all than they were the year before. With the change of Minister, there has been some show of humility, an attribute which, unfortunately, is not uppermost in the make-up of the former Minister. By 1967, the public was fully aroused. In May, 1967, the Star Phoenix said:

Resolutions of the Co-ordinating Council on Rehabilitation, meeting on the University campus Wednesday and today, showed grave concern of the council for care of patients after discharge.

August, 1967 – Leader-Post; Regina medical health office, Dr. Chiao:

Chiao calls for policy review on psychiatric patient discharge.

Finally the tragedy at Shell Lake and the need to face the electors made it impossible for the Government to evade its responsibility any longer. It appointed Dr. Frazier to do what we had been pleading for for two years. The Government finally acted, but too late. But I do want to commend the Government for appointing Dr. Frazier. The Frazier Report shows beyond question that the mental health program is falling apart at the seams. The Report is a thorough one, a thorough review of the program and it is not easy to summarize. But if I were to pull from the Report its three chief recommendations to the Government it would be these: He says to the Government: 1. You have a staff crisis. Act, and act now, and act decisively to prevent the flight from Saskatchewan of many more of your best staff. Staff must be retained and new staff recruited now. 2. You must stop the wholesale discharge of mental patients until you have built up your mental health services in the community. These services are near collapse. In the delicate words of Dr. Frazier, they are operating on a “sustained emergency basis.” 3. When you have rebuilt you staff and your follow-up services in the community, then, but only then, resume the program which has been evolved in this Province in over 15 years. Mr. Speaker,



the Frazier Report makes two things clear: 1. The Government has starved the mental health program of funds. 2. The Government has ignored both the public interest and the patient interest in pursuing its discharge policy.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Blakeney:** — Consider these recommendations. Recommendation 36:

The general level of appropriations for psychiatric care programs should be raised to a level which will at least enable the quality of treatment to be maintained.

Just consider that. We have had a program which has improved every year for 20 years. It wasn't perfect, far from it. But each year there was progress. And then came the Thatcher meat-axe. We had the first actual cut in a mental health budget since — what year do you this, Mr. Speaker — 1943-44, during the last Liberal regime. You remember, Mr. Speaker, that \$6 million that the Premier had claimed to have saved during his first year of office. You remember that we said those were going to be some of the most expensive savings in the history of Saskatchewan.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Blakeney:** — Well, we are paying that price now, double and triple, in hardship, in heartache, and in hard cash. The program was re-directed with money saving as a prime objective. The situation is now so bad that an international expert has to come to Saskatchewan to say that funds must be voted. What for? For progress? No. He pleads that more money is needed just to keep the program from going backward. After 20 years we have stopped progressing. We are going back. And in order to stop going back we have to extract some more money from that parsimonious party sitting opposite.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Blakeney:** — And that's what four years of the Liberal approach has done. Or consider this recommendation No. 11:

We suggest that the practice of early discharge be brought in line with the principles, so that discharge is not determined by bed counts, "statistics", or attempts to satisfy institutional goals, but by the needs of the patient, his family, and his community. Early discharge is indicated only if it appears that this will preserve family ties, prevent institutionalization, etc., after individual case study.

In other words, Mr. Speaker, it is time to stop preening ourselves about how many people have been discharged and start

**March 4, 1968**

thinking about the patients and their families. It doesn't sound too revolutionary that a health department ought to start thinking about patients. I suggest that it is time to stop regarding our mental hospitals as factories that can be operated on targets and quotas and begin thinking of them as places where human beings are being treated, human beings with feelings, and with families, human beings who deserve the dignity of individual treatment. We on this side of the House are thankful that this report has been received. We have called for such an investigation for years and we are glad that it came about. I know I have, on several occasions. I have a clipping here from the press in October, 1966. In this clipping I was quoted as saying, that the patient discharge problem was a scandal and that a thorough investigation was necessary. The report says, "Blakeney criticizes patient release. Now a sweeping investigation is imperative." The Leader of the Opposition, the Member for Moose Jaw North (Mr. Snyder) as he now is, the Member for The Battlefords (Mr. Kramer) voiced similar criticism. We are satisfied that there has been a thorough investigation. A few phases have not been covered, but they were outside the reasonable scope of Dr. Frazier's study. On this whole matter, our position is this. We believe that our past criticisms have been vindicated. We believe that the attitude of the former Minister has been shown up for what it is, hollow, callous, and arrogant. We are prepared to believe that the present Minister will do what he can to repair the damage, if he is given the funds to do the job. We are prepared to withhold our full censure to see whether or not the job that must be done will be done. We call upon the Minister to waste no time in acting so that, when this House meets next year, he can report to this House minimum progress as follows: 1. All or substantially all vacancies for psychiatrists filled. We recognize that these cannot all have specialists' qualifications. 2. Major progress in filling other vacancies. 3. An increase in the number of community supervisory workers so that there will be at least one qualified staff person for each 60 patients in community placement. A one to sixty ratio. Dr. Frazier recommended a one to fifty and we would like to see that one possible, but we want to see one to sixty in the next year. 4. The Prince Albert Centre staffed and in operation. 5. A general tightening up in administration in the many, many places recommended by Dr. Frazier. 6. Enforcement of licensing standards for approved homes by the Minister of Health and nursing homes by the Minister of Welfare.

This is a minimum program. We recognize that the Minister is facing a crisis and he must first do a salvage job. We ask him to act at least to meet the minimum program as set out. If he can do more, fine. But we say this, as strongly as it is possible for us to say, to the Minister and to the Government, act on this program in the interests of the patients and the public alike. Act on this program.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Blakeney:** — We say that the Government

should do no less, and must do no less.

Now let's look at the budget for the Hospital Plan. The first thing to note is that in 1968-69 the Province will actually spend less Provincial money on the Hospital Plan than in 1967-68. The second thing to note that this will probably bode ill for many small hospitals in Saskatchewan. And I want to say something about this problem of small hospitals.

In 1951 a Hospital Survey Committee recommended the gradual phasing out of a few of our small hospitals and some did close their doors. In 1961 another Hospital Survey Committee recommended that other hospitals be closed or converted to alternate use. The previous Government recognized that there are instances where over the years hospitals should be phased out. In proper cases this will happen and should happen. But we recognized and the Hospital Survey Committee recognized and freely admitted that the Committee had conducted its study before the Medicare Plan was introduced and without considering the impact of the Medicare Plan. Now one of the great benefits of the Medicare Plan was that it did keep doctors in the country and it has changed the pattern of hospital use. The previous Government made public the report of the Hospital Survey Committee. We made clear that it did not necessarily represent Government policy, but we did publish the report so that everyone could read it. The subject became a matter of public concern and public misunderstanding. The concern was natural and proper. The misunderstanding was mostly generated by the Liberal party. In August of 1963, as Minister of Health, I sent out a letter to every hospital board and every municipal council in Saskatchewan, explaining the Government's position and I want to quote a little from that letter:

There is every reason to believe that in most cases considerable study will be necessary before the Committee's recommendations could be accepted or rejected. In any case no hasty action is contemplated. I think I can assure you that there will be no sudden discontinuance of Saskatchewan Hospital Services' Plan benefits to any hospital, that no major changes will be made without careful study, and that no hospital will be closed or converted to alternate use without full consideration with the hospital authorities concerned.

Mr. Speaker, we, on this side of the House, do not say that in no cases should a small hospital be closed. There may well be hospitals that are no longer serving their communities in the best way possible. We do say that no small hospital should be closed until the community has had ample warning and until all consequences have been considered. Here are a few things to be considered. Does the nearby hospital have the space to accommodate the people? Will the doctor leave? Are there senior citizens' homes or nursing homes to be accommodated and so on?

**March 4, 1968**

No hospital should be closed until these and like questions have been considered. Mr. Speaker, that was our policy and is our policy and we lived up to it to the letter. Mr. Speaker, what is Liberal policy? Their policy is one of hasty action. Their policy is one of sudden discontinuance of Saskatchewan Hospital Services Plan benefits. Their policy is one of major changes without careful study. It is one of closing hospitals without full consultation with hospital authorities. The Liberals can't deny this. They have already acted in a completely high-handed way in a move to close eight small hospitals. They advised these hospital boards that their Hospital Plan payments would be cut off. They did this without consultation, and without even advance warning. Only when the heat from an aroused public became intense did the Government back off a little. They just backed off until this Legislative session is over. But I believe that all they have done is back off temporarily. I believe that when this session is over, and when the people in those communities get tied up with seeding and other activities, the Government will renew its attack. Before this Legislature meets again in 1969, one or more of these hospitals could have passed out of existence. This is Liberal policy. If it wasn't they would have told us. This is a pressing problem of concern to thousands of people in this province. And certainly if the Government was not going to continue its policy of closure without consultation, it would have said so and said so before now.

But then it might be that the Government can say what it likes and no one would believe what the Government says. Because in the past this Government has said a great deal about small hospitals. And I think that the public will believe what the Government does shouts so loud, they can't hear what it says.

Let's consider what the Liberals have said in the past on this issue. In 1964 one Liberal Member said:

Here's a list of the hospitals the Socialists are proposing to close. It's a crime the Government should even consider closing them.

Well if it is a crime who's the criminal? Again here is what Mr. Thatcher said in 1964 at Rosetown, Leader-Post, April 13.

Despite the large number of hospital beds in major centres there are still long waiting lists of people seeking treatment.

It would not make sense to close the small hospitals under those conditions.

Well, the waiting lists are longer than ever, it's just the Premier's memory that is short.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Blakeney:** — Now here is what the Provincial Treasurer, Mr.

Steuart, said in the Star Phoenix, February 23, 1965:

Health Minister Dave Steuart rejected recommendations for closing . . . small hospitals.

‘I don’t think the Government has the moral right to use the power of the Saskatchewan Hospital Services Plan to force these hospitals to close.’

Well it seems that the Treasurer’s morals are a little bit flexible. Before the election, the Government does not have the moral right, but after the election – close the hospitals; close them without consultation – close them by the use of the very power of the Saskatchewan Hospital Services Plan. So much for the Treasurer’s morals.

Again in June, 1965, the same moralistic Treasurer: “Mr. Steuart reiterated his Government’s policy of not closing small hospitals.” In 1966, the Minister of Labour entered the debate – Hansard, page 722:

I believe that the Government should be commended for having established a good hospital policy where the hospitals are not being closed by the administration. The Government would not arbitrarily close any hospitals in this province.

Now recently in February, 1967, and this one is the Minister of Agriculture (Hansard in this House):

We have preserved the hospitals in our rural areas that the NDP were going to close down. Some of those that come to mind in my own area of the province such as Qu’Appelle, Montmartre, Maryfield and Lampman.

Yet this same Minister was unwilling to go out and meet the people of Qu’Appelle and tell them why their hospital was going to be closed.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Blakeney:** — And, Mr. Speaker, Cabinet Ministers continued these bland assurances right up to the eve of the election. They must have been planning these very closures before October 11, while this election was in progress. And yet in October, 1967, Leader-Post, October 7, 1967, and this is the Premier speaking at Yorkton:

Hospitals in about 40 small communities were earmarked to be closed by the former Government but we tossed this plan into the wastepaper basket.

The communities are being allowed to keep their hospitals and are receiving financial help in improving their facilities.

**March 4, 1968**

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Blakeney:** — This is what the Premier said in October when he was seeking re-election. But since then he's been digging around in that wastebasket . . .

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Blakeney:** — . . . a nasty habit he learned from the Member for Athabasca (Mr. Guy). And two months later the Minister of Public Health (Mr. Grant) was sending out letters to those very communities saying that their hospitals were being closed on April 1st. Yet another callous and cold-blooded repudiation of an election promise. You may say — well this only involves a few communities: Frontier, Prelate, Willowbunch, Qu'Appelle, Hodgeville, Leroy, Neudorf, and Maryfield. We on this side of the House say this, people in these communities have rights just as other citizens do. They should not be victims of unprincipled election tactics of the Government and the arbitrary acts of this Government as it thrashes around to get itself out of a financial hole. We say this too, that these eight communities are not the only ones that were threatened. There are many other communities whose hospitals are on the very same lists as those eight. Let me name a few communities who are on the same lists as those eight. Let me name a few communities who are on the same list and who may receive the same treatment, who may pick up the mail some morning and find that their hospital has three months before it dies under the meat axe. Yes, they may even listen to the radio like some of them have done. Here are just some of the communities: Arborfield, Bienfait, Birch Hills, Borden, Climax-Bracken, Craik, Cutknife, Delisle, Doddsland, Eastend, Eatonia, Elrose, Invermay, Kincaid, Kinistino, Kyle-Whitebear, LaFleche, Lampman, Lashburn, Milden, Montmartre, Mossbank, Norquay, Pangman, Paradise Hill, Quill Lake, Smeaton, Spalding, Theodore, Zenon Park. Those are hospitals on the very same list as the hospitals who received those fateful notices about New Year's Day. Let me say again, the actions of this Government have been shameful. It has acted it admits to save money. It has claimed probable savings of \$500,000. Now that figure is patently and transparently false. There is no possibility of closing these eight hospitals and saving \$500,000. The total amount paid to those eight hospitals was less than \$500,000. If you believe that you could save all the amount saved, it would be less than \$500,000, and to believe that you would have to feel that every patient in each hospital was gold bricking, that no one of them should have been in the hospital, that every doctor who put them there was a charlatan who put patients in the hospital that shouldn't be there. This is the only basis upon which they could get their savings up to even \$400,000. The claim of these savings is patently and transparently false.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Blakeney:** — They have refused to consult the people in the areas or to make proper alternative arrangements. I cannot say and I will not say that New Democrats oppose the closing of all small hospitals. There are instances when it is perfectly proper that a hospital close. And where the facts warrant it and where the consultation has been proper and the preparation has been proper, we will not oppose it. However, I can say, and I do say, that we oppose the Thatcher policy of closing small hospitals without warning, without consultation, without regard to whether alternate facilities are available.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Blakeney:** — We are grateful that an aroused public has forced the Government to pause in its policy of arbitrary closure without consultation. We hope the Government will modify this policy. But if it does not, we promise two things: To these communities I say this: we promise to do all we can to see that you get a square deal. And to the Government, I say, we promise you the fight of your life.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Blakeney:** — Mr. Speaker, I do not have the time this afternoon to give a detailed analysis of the school grants vote. However, this year the school grants vote is something like a rotten egg. It doesn't require any detailed analysis to know what's wrong with it. It's just bad, bad, and woefully inadequate.

Last year the school grants figure increased by some \$11 million over the previous year. That figure was fairly liberally padded as I indicated in last year's Budget reply. The Liberals were already embarking on their task of trying to refute the hard facts of educational costs with figures dreamed up for the purpose. But even when the padding was stripped away there was still about three and three-quarter million dollars for an increase in operating grants, \$3.75 million. This was far, far too little. Large increases in local mill rates for school purposes were the order of the day. Increases generally ranged from two or three mills on the low side to 10, 15, even 17 mills on the high side. Here are a few examples: Radville unit – up 5 mills; Estevan unit – up 8 mills; Meadow Lake unit – up 10 mills; Regina City – up 5½ mills; Swift Current – 9 mills; Yorkton Public – 13 mills; Yorkton Separate – 17½ mills. And you may argue that Yorkton wasn't typical. Strike off Yorkton if you think it was atypical. This was what happened when the increase in operating grants was \$3.75 million.

Now, Mr. Speaker, school costs, like other costs are increasing and certainly this Budget is going to make them increase faster. Every school, every school bus, every gallon of gas, every piece of chalk will cost more. In the fact of this what can be said of the Treasurer's proposal that operating grants

**March 4, 1968**

for schools be increased, not by \$3.75 million, not by something a little more, but by \$2.7 million? That figure will be a disaster. The Liberals promised, and I could quote item number 6 of their 1967 election platform – and I commend this to the Minister – that they would increase school grants. In this Budget they raised all major taxes except taxes on their corporate friends. They provide huge extra increases for some programs and yet they cut back the increase in operating grants to schools by over \$1 million.

And this they represent as a responsible Budget. It is the height of irresponsibility. It will have three inevitable results: Local mill rates will soar again, this year or next; the quality of education will be lower; tension between teachers and trustees will be increased. Every one of those results is bad. Every one will result in education being discredited in the eyes of the public. They are unfair, bitterly unfair to trustees, to teachers and particularly to the students. By this choice of priorities, the Government has shown, perhaps more clearly than it any other way, that it is out of touch with the people of Saskatchewan. It is out of touch with their hopes and their aspirations. It is living in a bygone age.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Blakeney:** — Mr. Speaker, before I close I want to say something about the constituency of Regina Centre. I am very proud to present that constituency. It is one of the oldest parts of the Capital City and has near its centre, Scott Collegiate, named in honor of the first Premier of Saskatchewan, Walter Scott. There are a number of business establishments but it is primarily a residential area. Problems of Regina Centre aren't very different than the problems of people elsewhere in the city. From a campaigning point of view, one of the chief problems is to keep in mind the boundaries of the constituency. They certainly weren't drawn with logic in mind. It might surprise you to know, for example, that a substantial part of Regina North West is actually south of the constituency of Regina Centre. For an explanation of this anomaly I would refer you to the Member for Prince Albert West (Mr. Steuart) and perhaps to Mr. Odishaw. After the performance of drawing the boundary lines between Regina Centre and Regina North West and perhaps between Regina South East and North East, the word ought to be changed from gerrymander and be updated and named after the new master of the craft. We'll call it a "Davie" mander. In spite of the fact that a journey around the boundaries of Regina Centre would give a backache to a snake, the result must have been pretty disappointing for the Member for Prince Albert West and his associates. Both the Member for Regina North West and myself were returned with gratifying majorities. I want to thank all the people in Regina Centre who supported me and I want to say to them and to all the other citizens of Regina Centre, whether they supported me or not, I am proud to represent them and serve them. Now just how mixed up things can get when you have a Davie-mandering process was indicated by the fact that in my



constituency during the election I would see great signs saying "Vote Liberal", "Liberal Candidate in Regina Centre – Pat McKerral." Then I saw on other signs – "Liberal Candidate in Regina Centre – Mr. Kleefeld." They were running a vigorous campaign but I thought it was just a little too much to run two candidates in one riding. Well, in due course they got this sorted out and they told Mr. Kleefeld that, in fact, he wasn't running in Regina Centre and that he was the candidate in Regina North West, but it really didn't matter much where he ran . . .

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Blakeney:** — . . . the results weren't particularly impressive.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I looked at this Budget to see what it had for the people of Regina Centre, and I looked in vain. It has taxes, but it's time this Government started to honor some of the pledges which it made to people living in the urban areas.

I want to set out just as shortly as I can some of the things which require attention in Regina Centre. Now by and large these things require attention also in every riding in Regina and every riding in Saskatoon, so I am sure I am going to get a great deal of support from the Member from Nutana Centre (Mr. Estey), the Member for City Park-University (Mr. Charlebois), the Member for Nutana South (Mr. Forsyth), and the Members for Regina South (Mr. Grant) and Regina South West (Mr. McPherson). (1) Funds for arterial streets and roads. Regina was promised and needs a much larger share of the gasoline tax than it is now receiving. This is necessary in order that it can get on with the job of building arterial streets and ring-rounds that are now badly needed and will soon become urgent. Between 20 and 25 per cent of all of the gasoline that is burned in Saskatchewan is burned on urban streets. I wouldn't think it proper for 20 per cent or anything resembling that figure of the gas tax to go to the urbans. However, we do need and deserve more help than we are getting. Now that the gas tax has been increased to still higher figures there is no excuse for denying this help to the urban centres. (2) Regina needs much more help with the cost of police protection. I invite Members to look at the report of the Department of Municipal Affairs. The cost of police and fire protection in Regina, and these two services are lumped together, is about \$4 million. That's more than the total cost of these services paid by local taxpayers in all of the rural municipalities of Saskatchewan, in all of the villages of Saskatchewan, in all of the towns of Saskatchewan, and in all of the cities of Saskatchewan of 20,000 and under. The people of Regina bear the burden of that which is borne elsewhere by all the people who live in rural municipalities, villages, in towns, and in smaller cities. This is a heavy burden for the taxpayers of Regina. The Province bears a very large part of the cost of police protection and I think particularly of Regina and Saskatoon, should receive comparable treatment. (3) Consideration for the elderly. I

**March 4, 1968**

have a very large number of older people in Regina Centre, and I want to report that they are very dissatisfied with the treatment they are receiving from the Government opposite. They are particularly concerned with the spiralling cost of living which as far as I can see is of no concern at all to the Government opposite. I don't know of anything it has done except appoint a Royal Commission and heap on new taxes. Constituents of mine who receive the Old Age Security Pension and the Guaranteed Income Supplement have found that they have lost their \$1.50; if they also receive public assistance they have found that they have lost their \$1.50 or \$2.10, as the case may be. This was taken away by the Minister of Welfare (Mr. MacDonald). Now this cost of living bonus was given by the Federal Government because the cost of living was increasing. It's impossible to understand why the Department of Welfare takes the position that the cost of living is increasing for everybody else, but not for the person who is on welfare. Surely the person who is on welfare is entitled to the same cost of living bonus as anyone who is not on welfare. Grocery prices are going up for them just the same as anyone else. I think when a Government had to dip into the cost of living bonus for people on public assistance, it's in a pretty sorry state. Now it's not only the people on public assistance who feel that they have been done badly by this Government. With this Budget introduced by the Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Steuart) the domestic budget of every older person in my riding will be hit and hit hard. What are the pleasures of the golden years, as they are sometimes called? What do you do if you are retired? You have a car and you travel a bit if you can afford it. Now it's going to cost that man more to license his car, to insure his car, to buy gas for his car. A fellow might enjoy a smoke; if he has a pipe his tobacco bears a 100 per cent increase in tax. Maybe he wants to put through a long distance call to his children – taxed for the first time in Saskatchewan history. Now these are the pleasures of the old taxed by this Government. Now what are the hazards of being old? Well I think the biggest hazard is illness. And older people are now facing when they go to the doctor a new \$2 tax for house calls, \$2.50 a day when they go to hospital and nothing for their additional drug costs. Not much cheer in that Budget for the senior citizens of Regina Centre. (4). Low rental housing. And I am glad the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Estey) is in his seat. Not all the people of modest incomes in my constituency are older citizens. Regina Centre has a large low-rental housing development, so-called, rent-to-income development. The people living there know that the Federal Government has offered them a cut in rent and they know that the Provincial Government has denied them that relief. Mr. Speaker, the situation is this. I will give an example and use one figure for monthly income. I could use another figure, it's about the same for any one figure. Suppose a family has a fixed income of \$300 a month. The Federal Government recognizes the cost of providing the basic food and other necessities for a family who are growing up and that if income was fixed it was only fair to lower the rent, if rent was really to be related to true income. On the current scale such a family would pay a monthly rental of \$85, the new scale

offered by the Federal Government provides for a monthly rental of \$69, a saving of \$16 a month for the family. Any loss that might result would be borne 75 per cent by the Federal Government. In spite of this the Provincial Government has refused to lower those rents. People on fixed income in this rental-to-income project are caught in the squeeze of rising living costs, costs which will rise still higher as a result of this Budget. They are offered relief by the Federal Government and it is snatched away from them by the Provincial Government, refused to them by the Provincial Government, even though the cost of providing any relief would be paid at least 75 per cent by the Federal Government. Mr. Speaker, I have visited many of these people, I go about that riding, and many of them are living in very difficult circumstances. In many cases there is no male breadwinner because the man of the house has died, or he is sick and unable to work. In most cases there are small children. Surely the Government can find some compassion in its heart to help people like these who very much need help. Surely our Province isn't in such tough financial shape that it has to finance out of the grocery budgets of widows and children. (5) Nursing homes. People in Regina Centre are looking for much, much action on the part of the Government to promote construction of nursing homes by charitable and religious organizations. (6) They are waiting for chiropractic care to be included under medicare as was recommended by this House three years ago. (7) They are waiting for the Government to do something about its drug program, even if it is only for chronic patients who have to spend great sums each month for drugs. (8) They would like to see the Government act to provide day-care centres for the children of mothers who are forced to work to support themselves and their children. (9) Education. The voters of Regina Centre are waiting for the Government to honor the pledge of the Liberal candidates to pay for 50 per cent of the cost of education. Local property taxes for education have been spiralling. Our boards of education have not been able to go ahead with badly needed facilities. Regina needs a vocational institute or a community college where young people who have graduated from high school or who have left during the course of high school can get additional training, additional education. Mr. Speaker, this is Education Week and I hear over the radio, doubtless promoted by the Minister of Education (Mr. McIsaac), messages directed at these young people saying "Don't leave, choose", "Don't leave school, choose to go to another educational institution." Well, where are they going to choose in Regina? If they are not one of the 15 or 20 per cent of the young people who go to university, where are they going to get additional education in Regina? Why haven't we started on community colleges. Ontario already has 18 of them in operation. Our young people can't even go to the Moose Jaw Technical Institute. This was the idea, certain – that Regina students could be bussed to Moose Jaw. But they can't even get into the Institute; little has been done to extend that institute and there isn't enough room to take students when they want to go. (10) The Base Hospital. I don't want to go into a long discussion of the Base Hospital. May I say only that the people of Regina want some action on the Base Hospital. They're getting sick and tired of

**March 4, 1968**

the promise of the Minister of Health (Mr. Grant). They're getting sick of this little charade of putting a vote in the Estimates and voting it for the Base Hospital, but putting a little tag at the end saying, "But of course the Government is not actually going to pay over any money." And this Government has not paid over anything to that hospital board, except for a few pennies. But all the hundreds of thousands of dollars that have been voted to the hospital board, where is this money? Still in the tight little hand of the Treasurer.

**Mr. Steuart:** — So much that I've got two hands . . .

**Mr. Blakeney:** — That's right. It's not working very fast to build a hospital. Last year, the Minister of Health told us the Government had an option on the land. That proved to be false. This year I understood him to say that the hospital board had bought the land. Perhaps I misunderstood him. I see him shaking his head. At any rate that's not correct. The hospital board doesn't own the land and neither does the Government of Saskatchewan. At least The Land Titles Office hasn't been told about it if it does. Wascana Centre owns the land and I think it is still zoned for park. We want the Minister of Health to get going on this project and not to be deterred by the undoubted reluctance of the Provincial Treasurer to part with a dime for a hospital. (11) Health Grants. The people of Regina Centre want to see larger health grants. These grants have not been increased by one cent per capita since the Liberals took office. During the last term of the CCF the grants were increased 75 cents per capita and during this term of the Liberals they have not been increased one cent per capita. Now, Mr. Speaker, I have said enough to indicate that the people of Regina Centre are bitterly disappointed, and they have every right to be. No Budget has ever levied taxes which were so vicious and in this context more squarely aimed at people just like them. Mr. Speaker, they will remember.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Blakeney:** — One never ceases to be amazed at the pronouncements of some Liberals. They have been very quiet this afternoon but ordinarily they are pretty lively.

**Hon. D.V. Heald (Attorney General):** — Courtesy . . .

**Mr. Blakeney:** — Courtesy, very belated courtesy. We've heard pronouncements at this session and also on the hustings about the evils of government action, pronouncements that would have made Gladstone blush. Elsewhere we have heard not only that university tuition fees should not be abolished, but that anyone who suggests the abolition of university fees is somehow corrupting our youth. I like that twist. Now, why is it morally healthy for university students to accept 80 per cent of his

tuition costs from the Government and morally corrupting to accept the other 20 per cent, is never explained. Why for 50 years it has been morally uplifting and the subject of a great public campaign, as a matter of fact, for students to go to high school and pay no tuition fees, and why it is morally corrupting for that same student to go to university and pay no fees? That too is never explained. Why is it morally uplifting for a student to go to university and have his dad pay all the fees, but morally corrupting to have his fellow student who doesn't have a rich dad to pay to university and have the Government pay, that's not explained. In fact, as we all know, in the latter case that poorer student will have personally worked harder and sacrificed more to get his university education. But what amuses me most is some of their remarks that assume that the university students are stupid and naïve. They are neither – far from it. They know that to campaign for open universities freely available will not help them. They know that they themselves will have graduated before the benefits of this needed reform come, particularly with a Liberal Government. But they know better than anyone else that there are still hundreds of young people, potential university graduates, their schoolmates, who do not graduate because of financial barriers.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Blakeney:** — And they know that while this continues Saskatchewan loses, and Canada loses.

They know too that when open universities come, as come they will, the students of today will pay. If taxes are increased they know that they will pay and they don't complain. They don't complain for two reasons: (1) They know that more university graduates mean more high-paying taxpayers; indeed if we had more university students, we would as individuals probably pay less taxes rather than more. (2) They know that their obligation to those who come after them is to offer the greatest possible opportunity for education, to give every young person something closer to equality of opportunity. They know their obligation is to do something to make our society freer and more equal, more morally acceptable. They know that their obligation and ours is not to offer moral lectures to the young people, but to do something to make the society more equal, and more open and more open to all.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Blakeney:** — They are not really concerned about the lectures from Liberal politicians about the corrupting influence of free education, the corrupting influence of something for nothing. They've heard about enough of the dire warnings and evils of something for nothing from Liberal politicians, many of whom were straining every nerve to be appointed to the Senate.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**March 4, 1968**

**Mr. Blakeney:** — They are a little bit skeptical of these lectures and they have every right to be skeptical. I understand that Senator Argue is taking a couple of university classes at Carleton University during the course of his heavy labours as a Senator at \$15,000 a year. Perhaps he could be called upon to lecture to his fellow students on the moral evils of something for nothing. Our party looks forward to the day when every young person in Saskatchewan can go to any educational institution in Saskatchewan without any financial barrier of any kind.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Blakeney:** — We are sorry that the Liberals don't share this goal. To the young people of Saskatchewan we say this: Liberals don't change but governments do.

Well, Mr. Speaker, there are a number of other topics that I would have liked to comment upon: (a) the university picture generally; (b) serious failure in technical education; (c) further problems of Regina Centre; (d) some of the problems that the Budget is going to create for our Indian people; but I have spoken at length. Other speakers will be commenting in these areas. My concluding remarks must refer not to any of the past failures of the Government but to the present failures of which this Budget is a conspicuous example. This Budget will impose an unwarranted burden on the ordinary people of Saskatchewan. Its tax increases are massive. In round figures here are the extra taxes heaped upon the taxpayers: education tax - \$12.3 million; health deterrent - \$7.4 million; gasoline tax - \$7.9 million; motor licences - \$2.3 million; tobacco taxes - \$1.8 million; insurance tax - \$.5 million; pari-mutuel tax - \$.2 million; total - \$32.4 million. This is almost \$34 for every man, woman and child in Saskatchewan.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Blakeney:** — For an average family, a man and his wife and three children, this means that next year you will pay in new Provincial taxes an extra \$170. And that's not all. They are certainly going to pay extra municipal taxes as well. This is the New Saskatchewan. Of this huge load, who were selected to pay more than their fair share? The sick, the elderly, people with large families, the man of modest means who owns a car, the farmer. And who pays less than their fair share? People with large incomes, corporations and resource developers. This is the New Saskatchewan. And the New Saskatchewan has an old, old look. We see the old, old Liberal game of deceiving the electors and hoping that by the time the next election comes around they will have forgotten. Yes, the New Saskatchewan shows the old, old face of private enterprise, of resource give-aways, of privileges for the wealthy, of the old, old law of the jungle: "Let the race be to the swift and the battle to

the strong.” And this is the New Saskatchewan.

The Budget, Mr. Speaker, was brought in by a party which: (1) promised tax cuts even while it was plotting savage tax increases; (2) taxes the people least able to pay and exempts from taxation those best able to pay; (3) puts a special burden on the old, the sick and the very young; (4) fails to provide funds to present further massive increases in school taxes; (5) provides far too little for vital programs. This Budget will do more to erode public faith in politics, do more to undermine the social fabric of Saskatchewan than any Budget in the history of this province. It proves beyond question that the Government opposite has neither the integrity nor the ability to command the confidence of the people of Saskatchewan.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Blakeney:** — Out of its own mouth, out of the mouth of its own Treasurer, it stands condemned and discredited. This Budget is deceitful in its conception, ruthless in its execution and disastrous in its consequences. It should be unacceptable to this Chamber; it will be unacceptable to the people of Saskatchewan.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, by leave of the Assembly, I move seconded by the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Lloyd), that all the words after “That” be deleted and the following substituted therefor:

this Assembly expresses its profound regret that the government has decided to finance its programs by extracting deterrent fees from the sick and imposing a new tax on fuels used in farm machinery.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Speaker:** — The debate continues on the Motion and the amendment concurrently.

**Hon. A.C. Cameron (Minister of Mineral Resources):** — First may I join with others in offering my congratulations to you, Sir, on the re-election to your high office.

This afternoon we were treated to a dissertation from the financial critic. You know it is a lovely day out. He took advantage of this day that he took off into flight, and he became so carried away with his own verbosity that he was in the air for two and a quarter hours before he found a place to land. One of the longest dissertations I think ever witnessed . . .

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**March 4, 1968**

**Mr. Cameron:** — . . . in this Legislature. And while he attempted to generate some heat, he certainly didn't generate any light. After listening, Mr. Speaker, to two and a quarter hours of doom and gloom, I think the House would appreciate a little cheery news about this time.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I want to make an announcement to the House. Members will recall about a year ago I announced a company was interested in exploration programs in uranium in the coal fields in Estevan and westward through Shaunavon, Eastend and the Cypress Hills. You will recall I mentioned that a young geologist had a hunch that the upper thin beds of the coal that was thrown off as waste in reaching the coal beds below could be a source of uranium, that he believed that these upper layers acted as a filter and trapped uranium carried by the streams in the glacial age. This past year considerable work was done in the area in the way of preliminary tests. The results have been sufficiently encouraging to cause an interested group to undertake a large exploration program in the search for uranium in southern Saskatchewan.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Cameron:** — We have entered into an agreement . . .

**Mr. G.T. Snyder (Moose Jaw North):** — This will solve all our problems . . .

**Mr. Cameron:** — . . . with a company to undertake an extensive search for uranium throughout southern Saskatchewan. I think the Members will be interested to know this is an Alberta and Saskatchewan-based company with Alberta and Saskatchewan money.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Cameron:** — This company is prepared to accept some onerous responsibilities, because it has faith in Saskatchewan. It believes that southern Saskatchewan may be sitting on a treasure of uranium. Therefore the agreement which was drawn up the other day provides for exploration on one and a half million acres. The company will deposit with my Department of Mineral Resources \$175,000 in a bond as surety that \$300,000 will be spent in exploration during the next 18 months.

**Mr. C.G. Willis (Melfort-Tisdale):** — Now we can lower taxes.

**Mr. Cameron:** — At the end of this period the company will surrender fifty per cent of the land, and on the fifty per cent that the company retains it must spend \$1 million from November, 1969 to October, 1970 on detailed coring and related works. From



November, 1970 to October, 1971, it is committed to spend an additional \$1 million on work, and thus in a three and one-half year period, this company is obligated to spend \$2,300 in search of uranium in southern Saskatchewan. At the end of this period it is obliged to go to lease. The lease will carry the same rights and obligations as uranium producers in northern Saskatchewan. If uranium is found in commercial quantities, the company proposes to erect a metallurgical plant designed for particular operation in this area. One of the most interesting points of this agreement is the confidence of the company that there is a totally new geological province for uranium development in southern Saskatchewan.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Cameron:** — Now, Mr. Speaker, I should like to turn to observations on the remarks of the financial critic. I listened with a great deal of interest to the financial critic, not only as financial critic, but as former Provincial Treasurer. I had thought that as former Provincial Treasurer he would have had some alternatives to suggest to this Budget. I had thought he would have spelled out some priorities in the Budget. Mr. Speaker, what did he do? Two and one-half hours of carping criticism. He did not propose one alternative to Government policy. It was typical of a speech of a mentally bankrupt and an impotent political party. He talked about eggs. You know, Mr. Speaker, you don't have to eat a whole egg to know whether or not it's bad. I just want to give you a few incidents to prove what I mean. Why he says this Budget burdens the people of Saskatchewan with excessive taxation, and the people will remember it! And he said, "I was asked to suggest what I would do to reduce these taxes and I'm going to give you some alternatives." Let me read them to you.

First he says, "I would do away with the position of Chairman of the Workmen's Compensation Board", and he says, "I would do away with the Deputy Minister of Co-operatives", then he says, "I would do away with Executive Assistants to the Premier." Mr. Speaker, you can't do away with the personnel and save any money if you put someone else in his place. So the only place you're going to save any money is to do away with these positions and that's precisely what he was advocating. Then he said, "I would halt all work on the highway between Moose Jaw and Regina." He says this would save the people of Saskatchewan alone tens of millions of dollars. The salaries of these three men plus \$5 million on the highway according to his figures come to tens of millions of dollars!

**Hon. W.R. Thatcher (Premier):** — Socialist . . .

**Mr. Cameron:** — I was astounded, Mr. Speaker, I was astounded that the financial critic, this new Moses of the NDP, did not take the occasion to deal with page 56 in the Estimates. I had thought

**March 4, 1968**

surely this is something he would have dealt with, because page 56 deals with the University of Saskatchewan and it sets out in sub-votes how the money will be voted. This was the NDP cry, "Loss of academic freedom", this Thatcher Government is sticking its nose into the University. I can recall him and his cohorts saying up and down this Province, "We will carry this battle to the floor of the House." He had his opportunity. A lion in the hustings and a mouse in the House . . .

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Cameron:** — . . . because he knows they know, that not one item of this interferes with academic freedom in the University. They know, in spite of all the abuse that this Premier took over the University issue, he gave a commitment that we would not invade the academic freedom of the University and he has honored that commitment.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Cameron:** — You know he talks about a crushing burden of taxation.

**Mr. Willis:** — Speak into the mike.

**Mr. Cameron:** — Then he says, "I condemn the Government likewise for not introducing a drug program. I condemn them for not introducing chiropractic services, for not increasing the grants to urban centres, for not granting free tuition to the University." In the one breath he talks about the crushing taxation which the people of Saskatchewan will not forgive, and in the other he says he would urge hundreds of millions of dollars more on the people of Saskatchewan.

**An Hon. Member:** — He can't read the financial statements.

**Mr. Cameron:** — Yes, this is what he would do. I want to tell him that, if it was not for him as Provincial Treasurer, and his successor before him, we would not have to raise taxes today, because it was their policy then to go to the United States for almost all of the borrowing they needed in the Province of Saskatchewan. I can recall standing up and suggesting at that time they should be borrowing on the Canadian market because the funds were available. The reply was, "We can get it at a lower rate of interest in the United States than we can in Canada."

**Mr. J. Messer (Kelsey):** — Where do you borrow?

**Mr. Cameron:** — I pointed out at that time what would happen if there should be a shift in the exchange rate between the American and the Canadian dollar. I was scoffed at. Today the taxpayers,

Mr. Speaker, are paying a heavy penalty for the huge borrowings of \$212 million in the United States. 31 per cent of our debenture debt is held by what little Tommy used to call, "The coupon clippers of New York." By the time this debt is paid off under the current rate of exchange it will cost the taxpayers of Saskatchewan \$17 million over and above the debt itself. They must pay the regular rate of interest and they must pay an additional eight per cent because the commitment agreed that these funds would be repaid in American money. This year, the taxpayers because of this policy will have to put up \$756,000 to pay the exchange alone on the borrowing in the United States.

When we heard the other day of the American union, one union in the United States, giving to the coffers of the NDP in Saskatchewan \$150,000, Mr. Speaker, when we look at the borrowing, when we look at the actions of these labor unions, I wonder why they stand up and condemn American capital in Saskatchewan. They stand up and condemn it. Mr. Speaker, between the assistance of the labor unions and the assistance that we are now giving to the coupon clippers of New York, I think this has been a shame battle. It reminds me of what was once said about Noah's Ark. "The animals came in two by two by two, one male and one female. They were expected to leave two by two. They all did until out came the tomcat and the female and there they had a group of little kittens. The tomcat looked at her and said, "And all the while you thought we were fighting."

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Cameron:** — Now I want to turn to some other remarks. I would ask the former Provincial Treasurer; if he was not satisfied with the Budget, where would he suggest we cut it? Perhaps, Mr. Speaker, he's suggest we take the \$2 million put aside for the extension of the University Hospital. Perhaps he would suggest the withdrawing of the \$3.2 million we've set aside for the Regina Base Hospital that he had so much to say about. Perhaps, Mr. Speaker, we should withdraw the \$5 million ear-marked for the completion of the Regina Centennial Auditorium. I have on my desk, Mr. Speaker, as many of you no doubt have . . .

**Mr. E. Kramer (The Battlefords):** — Can't hear you.

**Mr. Cameron:** — . . . an invitation from the city of Saskatoon to attend the official opening of their Centennial Auditorium, an auditorium paid for in the main by the citizens of Saskatoon.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Cameron:** — If it wasn't for the fiasco of another government led by an NDP Member we would not today have to call upon the people of Saskatchewan to take over monkey bars and make of it an auditorium for the citizens of Regina.

**March 4, 1968**

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Cameron:** — Perhaps he would suggest that we scrap the homeowner grants, and save \$8 million. I noticed that he skirted around the homeowner grants and I think he was justified in so doing, because you know in desperation in the election his Leader (Mr. Lloyd), after passing out Thatcher bucks, scoffing at the homeowner grants, in desperation in the last week came out and said, “Believe me when I say we will extend the homeowner grants to renters.” When they met in convention, the grass rapped the knuckles of the brass for advocating the extension of the homeowner grants. This is why he didn’t see fit to talk about the homeowner grants, when he talks about this Budget, and the people of Saskatchewan will not forget.

Let me read some comments that I heard on the radio at noon about the Budget. The secretary of the Rural Municipal Association, looked upon as the Farmer’s Parliament speaking on the radio at noon, said it would be wrong to go to the money market when interest rates are so high. And it is correct for the Government to undertake to finance the projects on a current basis. This is what the RMs are doing.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Cameron:** — He said that if we don’t pay as we go when times are good, we will suffer more when times are bad. “While the RMs did not get any additional funds from the Budget” he said, “the Government has assured us that when present conditions level off, we will receive more, and that is good enough for us.” He gave a warning that the Province must live within its means and that the Budget undertakes to do this.

The financial critic had a great deal to say about hospitals and about the sick and the poor and about deterrent fees. You will be interested, Mr. Speaker, to know what the president of the Saskatchewan Hospital Association said at dinner time. He said that utilization fees on hospitals of \$2.50 and \$1.50 are a little high, but it is not as harsh as the critics of this policy will claim. He said that deterrent fees in the Swift Current Health Region worked with some success, and therefore, we are led to believe that they will work with some success here.

The financial critic referred to the Premier of the Province as a Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde. Why, he said, all he has to do is to take the potion and then he turns into a destructive force who will trample over everything in his way. This potent force is power, he said. Since the people re-elected him he is drunk with power and this is the potent force. Then he said that the great Sir Winston Churchill said that this form of government is a bad one, but the world has yet to invent a better one. Now I presume that when the financial critic quoted Sir Winston Churchill, he did so because he believes in what Sir Winston said, and accepted it as his gospel, that while the

democratic form of government may be bad, it is the best that we have been able to devise. Now he talks about a Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde. I want to ask him; was he speaking on behalf of the new party or was he speaking on behalf of the old?

I want to read for the edification of this House, a press report quoting Mr. LaPierre, the vice-president of the NDP. At the Saskatchewan convention, the national president of the NDP said in Saskatoon, "We have re-surveyed our position since the election and it was decided that Quebec offered a fertile field for future activities." Then he said, "The scene of activity is to shift from Saskatchewan to Quebec and the Maritimes." In announcing this policy the president said further that there will still be a fair amount of concentrated effort in Saskatchewan. In a nutshell, what does it say? We are moving our main force from Saskatchewan to Quebec and the Maritimes, but we will leave a task force in the Province of Saskatchewan. Now, the president rounded out further what the vice-president had to say and it is interesting. "This is a man, vice-president of the NDP National party, who came to Saskatchewan not too long ago and speaking to a group of teachers, urged these teachers to rise up and to throw out the trustees of this province whom he termed as parasites." Yes, he would add to the division between teachers and trustees in this province and he would disperse this responsible body, who administer the affairs of education in the Province, who are responsible for the expenditures of millions of dollars. He calls them parasites and something that is no longer needed in modern society. This is the man who announced a year ago that he was seeking little Tommy's job. And he said, "You know, I may not hit it in the coming election, but in the 70s I will be the Prime Minister of Canada." You know his ambitions have grown since then. Then in a press release from Toronto, the other day, do you know what the vice-president of the NDP said? He said, "I want a republic." He announced that he wants a new constitution and an independent republic of Canada. "I want a republic very badly", he exclaimed. "I don't want to leave for my children a constitution which has the name, British North America Act." And he wound up by saying, "Long live Free Canada." This is the direction of the NDP. The clarion call has gone out. The NDP has served notice that it will not rest until they have destroyed the parliamentary procedures of Canada, and put in its place a Republic of Canada, with a clarion call, 'Long live Free Canada.'

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Cameron:** — Now the vice-president says, "I am determined to change the constitution and I will be the first president of the Republic of Canada." I ask: what does this indicate? It indicates that they reject the thought of the Queen as the Queen of Canada. They reject the office of the Governor General. They reject the office of Lieutenant Governor. Every Legislature across the nation will not be known as Her Majesty's Loyal Opposition or Her Majesty's Government. The last vestige of the parliamentary institutions of Canada, as we built up, will be

**March 4, 1968**

destroyed.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order, order! Some Members are complaining that they can't hear. And for a very good reason. They are making such thundering noise, I can't hear anything. Now let's have a little more order in the place and a little less interjection from both sides of the House.

**Mr. Cameron:** — I would say, Mr. Speaker, you know that the Member from The Battlefords (Mr. Kramer) was more prophetic than we give him credit for when he cried out in agony, "I don't want to be an NDP."

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Cameron:** — But protest or not, he and his CCF cohorts have now been rounded up. And as one of my ranchers put it the other day in ranch parlance, he said, "They have been roped. They have been emasculated and branded, and they must now run with the herd." Therefore, I ask the financial critic: is he speaking for the new party or is he speaking for the old? Whether he speaks for the new, or whether he speaks for the old, he, too, has been branded and must run with the herd.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Cameron:** — I think, Mr. Speaker, that this new declaration of the NDP that they would destroy our constitution, that they would create a Republic of Canada, that they would establish the first president of the Republic of Canada. This is serious enough to call upon the Leader of the Opposition before this session is over, to stand up and declare whether or not he subscribes to the clarion call of the new international NDP, whether he subscribes to the Republic of Canada, whether he would destroy the vestige of parliamentary institution as we know them. And I would suggest to him that he likewise consult with his National Leader and see whether he agrees with this new policy of the NDP and that he too supports the creation of the Republic of Canada. These are some of the things, Mr. Speaker, that the people of Saskatchewan are entitled to know. They are entitled to know if it is the intention now of the new NDP to destroy our constitution and to create a Republic of Canada. This the people want to know. And if they have the intestinal fortitude of the convictions of the vice president and their president, they will have the courage to stand up in this House and declare themselves for or against the Leader, the new Leader, the new national NDP party.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Cameron:** — Talk about Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde. If we follow the

NDP, we will turn our back on the Queen of England, on the democratic process, on the Governor General, on the Lieutenant Governor and in return for these great traditions we will elect the new national leader of the NDP as the first president of Canada. Mr. Speaker, I have many more comments to make on the financial critic's remarks and therefore since it is near 5:30 o'clock, I ask, Mr. Speaker, leave to adjourn the debate.

Debate adjourned.

The Assembly adjourned at 5:29 o'clock p.m.