

**LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN**  
**First Session – Sixteenth Legislature**  
**14th Day**

**Tuesday, March 5, 1968.**

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

**WELCOME TO STUDENTS**

**Mr. J.J. Charlebois (Saskatoon City Park-University):** — Mr. Speaker, it's a pleasure for me at this time, to introduce two student groups from Saskatoon City Park-University constituency. The first group is from the College Park school and this school serves one of the newer residential districts in Saskatoon, a district that has been built up outside the circle drive of that city and indicates the rapid growth that is taking place in Saskatoon. The second group of students is here from Saint Patrick school, a school that serves the Greystone area, one of the very fine residential areas of Nutana in Saskatoon. This group is here with Mr. Kaliger and Mr. Fogel; and it is a pleasure for me to introduce them at this time.

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

**Mr. W.E. Smishek (Regina North East):** — Mr. Speaker, through you I would like to introduce and welcome a fine group of students who are seated in the east gallery. They are 60 in number; they are grade 7 and 8 students from Saint Anne's school, located in the north part of the constituency I represent. They are accompanied by their principal, Mr. Zurowski and their teacher, Mr. Juryzniec. I'm sure that the Members of this Legislature would like to extend a warm welcome to them and hope that their stay here today will be both pleasant and educational and a memorable one.

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

**Mr. J.E. Brockelbank (Saskatoon Mayfair):** — Mr. Speaker, I would like to introduce to you and to all the Members of this Assembly, a group of students from Casswell school in the constituency of Saskatoon Mayfair. These students are in junior high, grade 7 and they are accompanied by their teacher, Mr. Deacon, I understand. I believe that they are situated in the east gallery, and the west gallery as well. It is my hope and I'm sure the hope of all the Members here that the students have an interesting day at the Legislature and a safe journey home afterwards.

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

**QUESTIONS**

**MOORE COMMITTEE REPORT**

**Mr. F.A. Dewhurst (Wadena):** — Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day are proceeded with, I would like to ask the Minister of Education (Mr. McIsaac) when we may expect a copy of the Moore Committee Report?

**Hon. J.C. McIsaac (Minister of Education):** — Mr. Speaker, I will be able to comply with the Hon. Member's wish later this afternoon. I've got them in my office.

#### TABLING OF ANNUAL REPORT OF MEDICAL CARE INSURANCE COMMISSION

**Mr. Smishek:** — Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, I'd like to direct a question to the Hon. Minister of Health (Mr. Grant) as to when this Legislature can expect the annual report of the Medical Care Insurance Commission to be tabled in the House? I think it is an important report in view of the proposals in the Budget and we would like to have those as soon as possible, Mr. Speaker.

**Hon. G.B. Grant (Minister of Public Health):** — Mr. Speaker, I can't give the exact date, but I'll check on it and report to the Hon. Member.

#### ADJOURNED DEBATES

##### BUDGET DEBATE

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of the Hon. Mr. Steuart (Provincial Treasurer) that Mr. Speaker do now leave the chair and the proposed amendment thereto by Mr. Blakeney (Regina Centre).

**Hon. A.C. Cameron (Minister of Mineral Resources):** — Mr. Speaker, before I commence my remarks on the Budget, I presume that some of the Hon. Members at least may have seen the program Contact last night in which the Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Steuart) was interviewed. You would notice that, shall we say, the telephones didn't perform to top performance. I just wanted to inform the Assembly that Sask Tel was not the culprit in this instance.

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

**Mr. Cameron:** — You'll recall, Mr. Speaker, that yesterday I took some time, 20 minutes in fact, I guess, to reply to some of the remarks of the financial critic (Mr. Blakeney). Today I would like to confine my remarks to some vital aspects of the Budget which likewise the financial critic either touched on lightly or didn't touch on at all. I regret that the financial critic is not in his seat — I don't like to refer to statements made by Members unless they have an opportunity to hear them. However, the debate must go on whether the financial critic is here or not. I will attempt to be a little more generous in my castigating, shall we say, of the financial critic than I was perhaps yesterday. I would like, however, to recall to the House that yesterday I think the House was subjected to over a two-hour diatribe by the Opposition financial critic. We have heard devious ways, Mr. Speaker, to test one's endurance, even such things as walkathons. Yesterday the financial critic staged a one-man talkathon. The radio carried it from 2:45 to 4:00 p.m. and it closed down. There is none of this 4 o'clock stuff for the financial critic. He proceeded on with his talkathon. He talked and talked until he talked the galleries empty. If it weren't for the exceptional endurance of the Members, he would

**March 5, 1968**

have talked the House empty too.

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

**Mr. Cameron:** — Talkathons, I presume, like walkathons, however, must eventually end. This one did too, Mr. Speaker, at 5:10 o'clock.

The Budget, as Hon. Members know, is one of the major items to be laid before the Legislature. It has perhaps a greater effect on the economic position of Saskatchewan people than any other matter brought before this House. And the Budget, once submitted, is in the hands of the Legislature. The Legislature may reduce or delete certain proposed expenditures. It may analyse the priorities and suggest changes in these. When the Estimates are before the House, motions can be moved to change or even delete certain expenditures. In essence, the Budget is subject to close scrutiny and it may be changed, accepted or rejected. Mr. Speaker, the financial critic is no stranger to this Chamber. As a former Provincial Treasurer, he knows how Estimates in this House are handled. The Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Steuart) in presenting this Budget, asked the Opposition to indicate what items they would delete, what expenditures they would cut, what priorities they would assess.

Now the financial critic in reply to this request, said, "I am going to offer some suggestions as to how the Provincial Treasurer could reduce this massive Budget." What were they? First, fire the Deputy Minister of Co-operatives; secondly, fire the Chairman of the Workmen's Compensation Board; thirdly, fire one person in the Power Corporation.

In his words, these are the most vicious taxes ever levied on the people of Saskatchewan, yet he proceeded to outline additional expenditures which the Government should undertake. He included in these expenditures chiropractic services in the Medical Care Plan, and urged Government to institute a drug plan, grant free university tuition, increase municipal grants, increase municipal road assistance, and if this was not sufficient, he wound up by adding an 11-point program for the city of Regina. In this regard, Mr. Speaker, he even moved into the private preserve of the Mayor of the city, who each year has taken the opportunity to present his own 10-point program. If these requests for increased program were acceded to, it would levy on the people of Saskatchewan an additional amount of tens of millions of dollars. He termed the Budget the most vicious taxation ever levied on the people, yet these were his suggestions upon which he would reduce the Budget.

In his speech, he bled for the farmers. He opposed the levy of 2 cents a gallon tax on farm fuels and farm tractors. I want to say, Mr. Speaker, when we moved to grant the right to use purple gas in their trucks, it netted a saving to the farmer of 15 cents per gallon on every gallon of gas he uses in his farm truck.

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

**Mr. Cameron:** — When we moved in this direction, every Member opposite rose up and condemned this as a hoax, as a political fraud. They said we are granting privileges to the farmers and putting them in a preferred position over other people who must use trucks likewise in their livelihood. They said, you have given

the farmers preferential treatment as against the bricklayers, and the carpenters, and the mechanics and the welders. Some even stood up in their seats and said, if they were re-elected to office, they would repeal this section which gives the farmer the right to use purple gas in his farm trucks. I suppose farmers, like everyone else, do not welcome increased taxes. Perhaps here in the Budget we could have withdrawn the use of purple gas in farm trucks and exempted the farm tractor. We could have removed this differential in price enjoyed by farm truck operators – the differential of 15 cents per gallon. We could have, I suppose, put the farmer back into the identical position he was in under the NDP where he had to pay \$1.50 more on every 10 gallons of gas which he put in his truck. They were very critical of this 15 cent differential. Well, Mr. Speaker, I would ask how they would act if we were to increase this differential a further 2 cents. You can visualize the howl that would go up on special treatment to the farmer. We chose in presenting the Budget to retain this 15 cent differential, and when the gas to other motorists were raised 2 cents, we taxed the farm truck gas 2 cents, retaining a 15 cent advantage. I would ask the farmers of this province if they would prefer to go back to the NDP program and pay 17 cents per gallon on every gallon of gas they burn in their truck in exchange for an exemption of 2 cents per gallon on the fuel they burn in their tractor.

We have, Mr. Speaker, as Hon. Members know, launched a major program of extending dust-free highways to rural areas. We undertook a program which will bring all-weather roads to every occupied farm home. We are absorbing an ever-increasing number of miles of grid roads into the highway system. Since this is of major benefit to rural areas, we have asked the rural people to contribute something toward the costs. I am sure that farmers in the main realize that these services like any others cost money. I am sure that farmers like other citizens are prepared to pay their fair contribution toward these costs.

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

**Mr. Cameron:** — The financial critic spent some considerable time downgrading the resource development in the province. I was amazed at the attack he launched against the mining industry, against the potash industry, against any and all and every corporation in the Province of Saskatchewan. Returning to the subject of mining areas of the north, he says that the Saskatchewan people have been fed on a fanfare of publicity and that northern Saskatchewan was not a beehive of activity, but rather that northern Saskatchewan was existing in a state of depressed stagnation.

To support his argument, he then proceeded to quote some figures from the Annual Report that would discredit these claims of activities in northern Saskatchewan. What did he refer to, Mr. Speaker, in support of his claims? He said that from 1962 to 1967 gold production in northern Saskatchewan had dropped. He said silver production in northern Saskatchewan had dropped. This is true. But he forgot to mention that gold and silver are just a by-product of the production of copper and zinc and the quantities of gold and silver produced in Saskatchewan are not measured in tons; they are not measured in pounds; they are measured in ounces. He referred to a metal that is reclaimed from production of others and in the main amounts to only ounces and he says, “The whole north is stagnating.” He conveniently neglected in the same report, which was available to

**March 5, 1968**

him, the value of metal production in northern Saskatchewan. Since he carefully avoided to mention this to the Legislature, Mr. Speaker, I would like to give it to you now. He carefully avoided this because it shows conclusively in the same report from which he was reading that metal production consistently declined from a high of \$91 million in 1958 to a low of \$40 million in 1964. This same report, Mr. Speaker, reveals that this decade of dropping mineral production in northern Saskatchewan has been halted, that mineral production for the first time in a decade is now on the ascendancy in northern Saskatchewan.

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

**Mr. Cameron:** — He conveniently neglected the fact that since 1964 Saskatchewan has three new mines in production, that now Saskatchewan is producing lead for the first time in our history.

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

**Mr. Cameron:** — There are some vital statistics of mineral resources which he thought he might well stay away from and since he stayed away from them, I think I should tell the House about them. They are these: Today Saskatchewan oil wells are producing 20 millions barrels a year more oil than was ever produced before, 20 million barrels a year today than what was produced in the last year of the NDP in 1964. Revenue to the Government today in 1968 from mineral resource development in Saskatchewan, Mr. Speaker, is in excess of \$40 million.

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

**Mr. Cameron:** — \$40 million today compared to \$29 million in 1964.

Take it on a 4-year period. From 1961 to 1964, the last four years of the period of the NDP, the total mineral revenues contributed to the Province in the period was \$92 million. Compare the last 4-year period. In the 4-year period from 1964 to 1968, total resource revenue to the people of Saskatchewan was not \$92 million, it was \$153 million. During these four years mineral resources have netted the people of Saskatchewan, Mr. Speaker, \$1 million per month more than was ever received in the history of the province. One might ask why the financial critic set out to purposely discredit the facts and discredit the mineral industry. I think the most charitable thing we can say about an attack of this nature is that little minds deal only with little things, such as, ounces of gold and ounces of silver.

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

**Mr. Cameron:** — In spite of all the criticism, levelled against the mining industry and the oil industry and against indeed the whole policy of resource development in general, these resources today, Mr. Speaker, are being opened up, opened up at an accelerating pace, opened up in order that they may contribute their share of wealth to the benefit of the people of Saskatchewan. As for attempts to downgrade the resource industry of this province, I want to read to the House an article from the Oil and Gas Journal published in Calgary. Now this certainly is not a

Saskatchewan publication nor is it influenced by political propaganda. I think the House will be interested in this part. He is speaking about the prospects for development in 1968. He says the biggest surge of wildcatting in Saskatchewan's history is shaping up this year. Two plays are rapidly nearing the all-out drilling stage and prospects never have appeared better. As the new year opened, 12 geophysical crews were probing the Winnipegosis Devonian, another 8 crews were working the Upper Devonian and the Ordovician formation. Oil shows in the Winnipegosis and the two strikes in the Williston area last year had kicked up a new interest in Saskatchewan.

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

**Mr. Cameron:** — In a 39-million acre spread, the Winnipegosis prior to 1967, only 100 wells had been drilled. Last year, the article goes on to point out, 30 test wells were drilled through the formation and some observers expect 1968 to hit the total of 60 with a momentum increasing in 1969.

With regard to mineral resources, Mr. Speaker, let me say this. We said, when we were asking the people for a mandate in 1964, that we believed that if Saskatchewan was to reach her full potential, we must turn every effort to the development of the resources. The potential resource wealth, no matter how great it may be, is of little value to the people until it has been tapped and extracted and utilized for the benefit of the people. We said further that, if we believe Saskatchewan is to reach the full potential of her growth, we must push back our northern frontiers. We believe that the mining industry must be in the vanguard of that challenge. In order to induce the mining industry to accept this challenge we established an incentive program tailored to the mining needs of northern Saskatchewan. In 1964, there were less than a dozen mining companies operating in northern Saskatchewan with a budget of \$250,000. I am pleased to say that today, Mr. Speaker, there are 92 companies operating in northern Saskatchewan with a budget of \$5 - \$6 million. If the Opposition objects to this incentive program for northern Saskatchewan they have it in their hands to show it. Let them stand up and vote for this northern incentive program to be deleted.

We said too that Saskatchewan is in a fortunate position in that she was able to market every barrel of oil she produced. But we said that the oil reserves were dwindling and that we felt that, if we were to guarantee Saskatchewan's production in the future, we would have to look for increased reserves. We said we believe the area in which we should look would be down deeper into the bowels of the earth. We said we didn't know whether we would find oil or not, but we said we owed it to the people of Saskatchewan to go down and find out. So we offered the oil industry an incentive program, if they would undertake to spend millions of dollars in search for oil in the deeper horizons. We told them, "You may spend millions and not find any oil, but if you do, we are prepared to give you a period of time in which you may recapture part of your capital investment before we subject you to tax." They accepted this proposal and last year, Mr. Speaker, Saskatchewan struck commercial oil in the Devonian, she struck commercial oil in the Ordovician and today Saskatchewan has joined Alberta as a producer of oil from the deeper bowels of the earth.

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

**March 5, 1968**

**Mr. Cameron:** — I want to turn, Mr. Speaker, if I may for a moment to education. Education is not only uppermost in the minds of Saskatchewan people, it is uppermost in the mind of the Government also. This year, one-third of the total revenues of the Government, is allocated to education. I notice Alberta's budget brought down the other day, allocated 31 per cent, slightly less than we do in Saskatchewan. Education receives the larger slice of the Budget than has ever been allocated to education in the Province's history.

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

**Mr. Cameron:** — People ask everywhere why education requires such massive sums of money. They ask why we undertake such huge construction expenditures in a period when construction costs are at the highest in history. Those are good questions but the answer is crystal clear. We must undertake these massive expenditures now because of the lack of foresight to plan and prepare for the post-war baby boom. These children are now reaching high school and university levels. The facilities which these students require today should have been planned and constructed over a period of years. This lack of foresight, this ineptitude of the NDP Government compels us now to launch a crash program to build in a few years structures which should have been built over a period of 15 years. As a result of this ineptitude the people of Saskatchewan are being called upon this year to provide \$200 million for education. This sum, Mr. Speaker, the Member should be interested to know, being spent on education this year, this \$200 million is more than the total Provincial Budget under the last year of the NDP.

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

**Mr. Cameron:** — This Budget provides for operating grants to the University of \$20 million as against \$6.6 million in 1964 under the NDP. The then Provincial Treasurer when he delivered his Budget, displayed a great elation over the fact that this \$6.6 million grant to the University would equal \$644.00 per student. Compare this, he asked, to the grant of \$516.00 per student 10 years ago. Mr. Speaker, this Budget provides grants not of \$644.00 per student but of \$1,350 per student for every student enrolled in the University of Saskatchewan. In addition to the operating grant of \$20 million, the Budget provides an additional \$10½ million for additional classrooms that are desperately needed at the University campuses. It does so because, Mr. Speaker, the Liberal Government has pledged that no Saskatchewan boy or girl will be denied access to the halls of learning, because of either lack of accommodation or lack of finance. The Board of Governors announced recently that the proposed level of assistance will enable the University to accommodate any student who meets the required academic qualifications. This announcement, Mr. Speaker, by the Board of Governors, confirms that we have honored this pledge.

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

**Mr. Cameron:** — There is another pledge that this Government made and I want to make reference to it. The Premier stated that when a government is launching such a massive expenditure for universities, the people who foot the bill should have an opportunity to see how their money is being spent. If Members will

turn to page 56 of the Estimates, you will find a breakdown of the University budget. The Estimates are no longer hidden away in a dark corner under the heading of 'Education'. I would ask the Opposition to scrutinize very, very closely, the breakdown of the University budget. I would ask them to do so because they were in the forefront of the cry that breaking down University expenditures was an invasion of the academic freedom of the University. The financial critic in this regard was most vocal. He and his cohorts declared that they would not permit their power-hungry Premier to stick his fingers into the affairs of the University. "Why," the financial critic said, "I will carry this battle to the floor of the House." In all his condemnation of the Government yesterday, he did not see fit to even mention the university efforts.

**An Hon. Member:** — Shame!

**Mr. Cameron:** — As I said yesterday, I must repeat today on this university issue, he was a lion in the hustings and a mouse in the House.

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

**Mr. Cameron:** — The Premier stated to the people of Saskatchewan categorically that this Government would not interfere with the academic freedom of the University. Mr. Speaker, this Budget shows that this gentleman has honored this pledge.

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

**Mr. Cameron:** — I would like, Mr. Speaker, to turn if I may to another part of the Budget which I have some connection with. I would like to speak for a moment on Saskatchewan Government Telephones, which I refer to today as Sask Tel. I would like to lay before the House some of the activities of Sask Tel. I would recall to you that in 1964 a program was launched which we hoped would bring direct distance dialling, to every one of the telephone users of Saskatchewan. During the interim period since then we have extended direct distance dialling to all the major urban centres and the rural areas connected to these centres. This program has been vigorously pursued, and today, the Members, I am sure, will be interested to know that 92.5 per cent of all Sask Tel customers have direct distance dialling telephones. When we consider the rural telephones, in relation to direct distance dialling, 88.5 per cent of all telephones within Saskatchewan, both urban and rural, today have access to direct distance dialling. This program providing direct distance dialling service will continue at the level it has. It will continue until every telephone subscriber in Saskatchewan, whether he is urban or whether he is rural, will have access to this method of phoning.

By mid-June we will have completed our portion of the second Trans-Canada micro-wave system. This has permitted us to bring vastly improved telephone services to Saskatchewan subscribers. You will notice, as you travel across Saskatchewan, that Sask Tel telephone poles and open wires are fast disappearing from the Saskatchewan scene. Within a period of two years, less than 3 per cent of the long-distance messages will be



**March 5, 1968**

carried on pole or open wire. Within a few years Sask Tel telephone poles will have completely disappeared from the Saskatchewan landscape. Now this updating of Sask Tel's services has meant large capital expenditures, investments in the neighborhood of \$20 to \$25 million per year. These improved facilities have not only brought vastly improved telephone services to Saskatchewan people, they have led to the placing of an ever-growing number of long-distance calls. Saskatchewan subscribers in 1967 placed 16½ million long-distance calls, over 1¼ million telephone calls per month. I must report that 1967 has been a successful year for Sask Tel. Revenues increased by 11 per cent, resulting in a net profit of \$8.3 million. 50 per cent of this amount, namely \$4,150,000, will be turned over to the Provincial Treasurer as a dividend to the Saskatchewan people.

The balance of the earnings will be retained for expansion of our facilities. The Opposition, I am sure, should be pleased to note that these retained earnings are placing more of the ownership of Sask Tel in the hands of Saskatchewan people and less in the hands of foreign control.

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

**Mr. Cameron:** — I should like to turn for a moment to another aspect of Sask Tel's operations, the unserved area program which we initiated two years ago. You will recall that, when I announced it, I said that, when we formed the Government and I became the Minister of Telephones, we found that a survey had been done by the former Government some years back which showed that there are in the Province of Saskatchewan 7,000 farm homes that didn't know what it is to have a telephone — an instrument on the wall that we take for granted. Yet 7,000 farm homes had never experienced the comfort of a phone call when their children were caught in a blizzard that they were safe. They had never experienced the warm feeling when tragedy strikes of a phone ringing to tell them that help is on its way. We believe that these 7,000 farm homes were as much entitled to this amenity of life as any other citizen of Saskatchewan. We asked Sask Tel to undertake the responsibility of bringing telephone service to these unserved areas. The House will be pleased to know, I am sure, that 13 of these farm areas now have telephone service.

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

**Mr. Cameron:** — It has cost Sask Tel to date, \$1 million, but \$1 million in exchange for 700 farm homes which have telephones for the first time. By the end of 1968, 1,200 farm homes that never had a telephone before will have this amenity for the first time. Thus, Mr. Speaker, I was somewhat amazed to hear the Opposition attack this program too. They said that the costs were too high, the restrictions were too great, the minimum number of farmers required in an area is too high. Why they said, this whole program should be revised. Why should the farmer pay more for his telephone than does the resident in the city of Regina? These are the criticism that they launched on this program. Mr. Speaker, Members will be interested to know that this is an expensive area of constructing telephones. Every farm phone, which we put in these areas, costs Sask Tel almost \$1,300 for each phone. We have asked the farmers to pick up a nominal portion of this amount, namely, \$400. I would ask those people who would criticize and discredit this program to

go into the Mankota area, into the Ormiston area, into Fox Valley, Leader and Mossbank, and ask these farmers who have telephones for the first time if this service is acceptable to them. I would ask them, too, to take it upon themselves to go into these points which will receive this service in 1968: Shellbrook, Eastend, Empress, and go to all the other points we propose to serve this year and ask the farmers there if they want this program delayed or discontinued. Mr. Speaker, we propose to push on with this program. We propose to push on at an increase of pace, because we believe that these farm homes are entitled to telephones as the rest and we want them to know that they are no longer the forgotten people of Saskatchewan. Mr. Speaker, I understand that there are others who wish to participate in the debate today, and for that reason I would indicate that I will support the motion and oppose the amendment.

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

**Mr. G.G. Leith (Elrose):** — Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to rise to congratulate you on your election as Speaker of this Assembly for another four years. I think I have learned a great deal about parliamentary procedure and about good temper and good manners by watching your conduct in the Chair and I want to congratulate you. I think that all of us can learn from your behavior that cool heads and cool temper win the day in almost every case.

I also want to congratulate the new Members of the House. I arrived first in this Legislature in 1964, and I think that I have learned a little bit about parliamentary procedure and about the work of the Government, and I commend the work of the House to you, as new Members. I am sure that every one of us has something to offer to the people of Saskatchewan in our work in this House and in Committee, and I think that you will enjoy it. I also want to congratulate the new Cabinet Ministers on their appointments. I am sorry that the Hon. Member for Pelly, the Minister of Natural Resources (Mr. Barrie) has not been able to be with us. We wish him a speedy recovery and return to this House. I also want to congratulate some of the Members opposite on their apparent elevation. We have seen some moves from third rank to second rank, and some of them have even come down to the first rank. And without mentioning any names, I want to congratulate these Members too. The Member for Prince Albert East-Cumberland (Mr. Berezowsky) I think especially deserves election to front rank status. We have all listened to him for these many years. We don't always believe all that he says, but we always believe that he thinks that he is sincere in what he is saying, so I want to say congratulations to that Member.

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

**Mr. Leith:** — Yesterday we heard quite a long speech. It was supposed to be a criticism of the Budget, which was delivered here in this House on Friday. It sounded more to me like a leadership speech, and I think that we are going to see a spectacle in Saskatchewan of the NDP choosing a new leader. I hope that the Hon. Member for Biggar (Mr. Lloyd) finds solace in the Federal House. He may do so and he may not, if he is nominated to run as a Federal Member out in the western part of Saskatchewan. I think people might have some reservations about voting for him as a Federal Member, if they had seen television on the week-end.

**March 5, 1968**

I think we were all treated to the sight of the conference in Winnipeg of the party opposite. They call them the 'Top Strategy Planners' for the next election. 10 or 20 or more of their top people from all over Canada were spending their time in Winnipeg plotting the overthrow of the present Government.

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

**Mr. Leith:** — I say again, to the Hon. Member for Biggar, that I wish him luck, but I don't think that he will be very successful. It is unfortunate perhaps that there is no senatorship available to him, because he has done a good job here these past four years and he ought to be rewarded.

The two and a quarter hours of criticism we heard yesterday, I think was based mainly on that Member's aspirations for leadership in the provincial party of the NDP here. I wonder if he feels or hears the top voices that are panting along behind him in the snow, the Hon. Member for Saskatoon Riversdale (Mr. Romanow) perhaps has some ambition in this respect. The Hon. Whip, the Hon. Member for Moose Jaw, north or south, I can't remember which, perhaps has some inclination. Again I wish them all well. I am sure that there will be some changes made and it will be very interesting to see which of these Hon. Members opposite, or indeed if any of them, heads the new NDP party in Saskatchewan.

I think I have congratulate them enough, Mr. Speaker, and I want to now congratulate the Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Steuart) on the responsibility that he exhibited in bringing in this Budget and his honesty inputting the question directly to the people of Saskatchewan.

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

**Mr. Leith:** — The question, Mr. Speaker, is; do you want the continuation of services and programs? If so, do you want to pay for them? That is the question that he asked this House and that is the question that we are going to have to answer in the next several weeks here in Regina. The Budget has major tax increases in it. I am going to support the Budget. I am not happy about it, but I will support it as a matter of public necessity. And I think that Hon. Members opposite will support parts of the Budget too, when it comes to the point of voting for them. I say to them that, if these increase had not been put on this year, they would have been doubly necessary and doubly difficult next year. I want to give them a very short lesson in economics, Mr. Speaker. I just want to say to them that they must realize by now that there is a safe level of public and private spending . . .

**Mr. C.G. Willis (Melfort-Tisdale):** — Just tell the Treasurer.

**Mr. Leith:** — . . . in any economy. Now it is possible to exceed the total level of spending and we can do that by overspending. But if we do overspend, the consequence is a major cause of inflation and following that inflation, if we carry this overspending to an extreme, it is going to lead to national bankruptcy. Economic history has many examples of run-away inflation. Even today we are witness to the sad spectacle of the once proud and once rich nation of Great Britain struggling in the coils of

economic strangulation. The Canadian economy is perhaps another example of mismanagement over the last number of years. I think that it is evident that governments on all levels have misjudged the economy. They have somewhat misjudged the safe level of spending or their collective decisions have resulted in overspending.

**An Hon. Member:** — Liberals again!

**Mr. Leith:** — Perhaps some of the financial difficulties that we are experiencing in Canada have been accentuated by the massive celebration of our national birthday last year. It reminds me, Mr. Speaker, of a family who have a daughter that is going to be married. They have a large guest list. She has a beautiful wedding gown and there is going to be a big reception. All the time the father knows that he can't really afford this kind of wedding, but do they curtail their plans? Nine times out of ten they go ahead and hope to pay the bills afterwards. This is what I think has been happening in Canada and to the western world. Whether the Socialists like it or not, whether we like it or not, we are in a situation where finally the bills have to be paid and it is a national emergency. Members opposite can laugh if they wish, but in my opinion it is the direct result of social over-spending in Great Britain that has brought her to her knees now. If they want that kind of situation here, then they can go on sitting on the ice, on the backsides, howling about higher taxes when they are not in power. I think that it is time for them to exhibit some responsibility in this respect.

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

**Mr. Leith:** — It's really curious to see politicians and especially Members opposite complaining about these high taxes. And I am curious to know what kind of logic could prompt the financial critic of their party, yesterday, to chastise us severely for raising taxes, when just one year ago, he gave us a bad time because we were, he said, slowing down on some of the programs that were so essential. He can't have it both ways, and Members opposite can't have it both ways. And we are going to find out what is the problem, right now. I say again, Mr. Speaker, that there is a safe level of total spending and that we exceed this level at our peril. It follows that, as we increase the level of public spending by governments on all levels, we surely decrease the level of spending that the private sector can indulge in. This is an economic matter that none of us likes to believe, but we must believe it.

This Government faces choices like every other government and like every other person in the economy. These choices are not pleasant. They are three-fold. We could have continued every program and raised taxes to cover each of them. The inevitable consequences are that public spending will rise and that private spending will be of necessity curtailed. As second choice, we could continue every program and borrow heavily to cover the costs. The consequence of this situation is a high interest rate and inflation. And this is in fact what has happened in Canada and in the western world. The third choice is to curtail or eliminate present programs, to hold public spending at the present proportion of the total spending. I think our Treasurer has exercised his option on the choice of two of these. We have attempted to curtail in some way the programs and we have had to raise the taxes.

**March 5, 1968**

Now some of these newer programs have come as a result of strong demands from the public and perhaps they should get higher priority than some of the older programs. Government spending is not very different than private spending in the matter of choices. A farmer must choose whether he needs a new tractor more than he needs a new house. He makes a decision and then allocates his resources accordingly. A government, especially at a senior level, makes the same kind of choices. More money spent on highways and bridges, means less money to increase the number of public servants. Governments, like the farmer or small businessman, are plagued with increasing built-in cost which limits the freedom of choice in allocating resources. I want to quote something from the Monetary Times, February, 1968. They are talking about some of the studies made on the three Federal farm assistance programs prepared for the Economic Council of Canada. One was on PFRA, another was on MMRA and yet another on ARDA. This article said:

The study's condemnation of the many aspects of the Government's rural development policies leads directly to an even more basic question. How many other high-priced, highly promoted government programs are really nothing but bottomless barrels down which vast sums of money are being systematically poured?

"Under rapidly changing economic conditions, many expenditures which were once considered to have high priority will no longer be so important or will become obsolete and should be reduced or eliminated," the council said. "It is especially important, in our view, to give a high priority to the abandonment of obsolete programs and activities. Failure to have an adequate and effective system for reviewing priorities and for eliminating marginal and obsolete programs could eventually lead to restriction and curtailment of all programs, including many of which yield a high rate of return to the whole economy in terms of the higher growth and human welfare."

I want to say to you, Mr. Speaker, that a policy that may have served Saskatchewan well in 1915 may not necessarily be the one that serves us well in 1968. This is an exaggeration but I don't really think it is exaggeration to say that this Government like every other government is spending money on policies that could be evaluated and should be evaluated. And here again, I have to question the responsibility of the Members opposite. Last year when no tax increase were brought in, they chastised us severely for, as they said, starving worthwhile programs. This year when there are tax increases, they chastise us for daring to find the money to continue them. Yesterday, the Opposition critic called Friday's Budget Black Friday. Mr. Speaker, I want to remind you that for 20 years the people of Saskatchewan had a black Friday. They only relief they had from it was to elect a Liberal government in 1964.

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

**Mr. Leith:** — Mr. Speaker, the responsibility of the Members of this House is not only to promote government spending on their pet projects, it is also our responsibility to examine all programs of the Government and discard the ones that may be outdated or that cost more in physical and human resources than the benefits that they bring to the public. In this connection, I want to give you one more small quote from the same article and

it has to do with the choice that the Government has to make:

It's no easy task. Governments don't operate on a profit or loss basis; there is no simple balance sheet to show the effectiveness of a given program. Furthermore almost half of the government's budget involves expenditures which are beyond the reach of the financial managers — expenditures governed by statutes for long-term commitments to international organizations or public debt charges. This greatly diminishes the degree of flexibility available to those who seek to manipulate resource allocations.

Mr. Speaker, in my opinion it makes more sense to eliminate whole low-priority programs than to pinch pennies and jeopardize the effectiveness of all programs.

I want to tell the Members opposite that in the next several weeks they are going to have full opportunity to examine the spending estimates and the proposals of the Treasurer. I ask them to be responsible when they are asking for more money for their pet projects. I ask them to be responsible when we are examining other programs which may need changing or deletion. Mr. Speaker, until the Members to your left are prepared to consider this question honestly, I am not able to take any of their criticism of the Budget very seriously. I am going to vote against the amendment and vote for the motion.

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

**Mr. E. Kramer (The Battlefords):** — Mr. Speaker, I want at the outset on entering the Budget debate to congratulate all those who deserve congratulations but my main congratulations must go to our Leader, the Hon. Member for Biggar who fought through in the face of one of the most unfair boundary redistributions and in face of one of the most highly paid publicity campaigns that any party was ever able to enter into; a campaign from a Government that campaigned with public funds for months before the election through so-called information bulletins, paid for at the taxpayers' expense, unblushingly, illegally. I think that it was a major feat, Mr. Speaker, in spite of all these abuses of privilege and all the hidden truths such as the Economic Review, which the Hon. Premier kept out of sight for ten months, until he was forced to table it in this House. The truths were covered up and still the people of Saskatchewan gave our Leader of this Opposition the added support. And if it hadn't been, Mr. Speaker, for the scissors and the paste pot there would have been 30 to 31 Members or thereabout sitting in this House today on your right. Right now across there, there are two Members sitting there because of judicial decisions, and two more, who, if it were not for the tremendous cost of court action, would not be sitting there either; but we just haven't got the money to fight the legal battle.

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

**Hon. D.G. Steuart (Provincial Treasurer):** — We've got some good lawyers!

**Mr. Kramer:** — Yes, and you've got some good judges too. Mr. Speaker, looking at this fourth Budget of the Thatcherite Government one cannot help but recoil at the complete hypocrisy of this Government.

**March 5, 1968**

We just heard a Member, the Hon. Member for Elrose (Mr. Leith), whom I have watched with some respect until now apologizing for this Budget. We have watched the action of other Members in the House since this Budget was brought down. It seems to me they must be something like the voiceless African hound when they are in caucus, the basenjjs. I am surprised that a group of men, elected by the people, would sit in caucus and allow this particular Budget to be put forward by the Provincial Treasurer, Mr. Speaker. It baffles me that a group of honorable men could sit there and not revolt against the cruelty that is evidenced in this Budget.

During their first three years in office this Government contrived to spend all the savings, many of the resources left to it through the provident planning and careful management of the former CCF Government. In order to maintain the façade of prosperity that it was attempting to sell the public it borrowed, and borrowed heavily, to pay for the programs. We have witnessed activities that have never been countenanced by any democratic government in Canada even at their extreme worst. It has brazenly used public funds for political propaganda through every Department of this Thatcher Government. It has used threats and fear to line up civil servants and businessmen, either to activate them politically or to silence them. My colleague, Mr. Blakeney, has already said in this debate and proven his points that Saskatchewan after four years is behind, and falling further behind any way you wish to check the score. I shall not repeat those valid points that were raised yesterday.

I want to suggest, Mr. Speaker, that this cruel, unnecessary Budget reveals the true character of this Government. It reveals that it has no consideration for the average taxpayer and that it is only concerned with making the rich richer. It appears that with this Budget it can indulge in over taxation for the next three years to build up this sagging Provincial purse, and after that it can blossom forth once again with propaganda and handouts, hoping that the public will forget that they have paid dearly in unnecessary taxes over the past three years in order to provide a climate for the re-election of another profligate Thatcher Government. Millions of unnecessary dollars will be taken from the wrong people during the next three years through the process and the taxing structure indicated by this Budget.

The Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Steuart) challenges us to indicate where we would not spend and what programs that we would cut. Mr. Speaker, I suggest that there is plenty of evidence throughout southwestern Saskatchewan, and that there has been unnecessary spending, waste and patronage in the highway program. I suggest that there has been the same inefficiency in public works construction. Hundreds of people have been hired by the various Departments of Government for propaganda and political purposes, while the necessary civil servant positions have not been filled and many have been abolished. The costly propaganda mill, run through MacLaren Advertising and paid for by every Department of Government, is a disgrace and a completely unnecessary expense.

The emphasis on health costs, the imposition of deterrent fees on the sick are also the wrong emphasis. The medical profession in Saskatchewan is the highest paid anywhere in Canada. This Government indicates that it is going to pay them even more in the coming years. At the same time this same Government put a tax on the unfortunate people who must go to hospitals, must

have doctor's services, and in another department cannot even forego to collect that extra \$1.50 given by the Federal Government to help meet the cost of living for the old age pensioners.

One does not have to look far for instances to prove these statements regarding government inefficiency. First of all, in the field of highways, we have right at North Battleford a \$4 million bridge and road complex built around the town and city at far greater expense than was necessary. Even after spending these millions, the Department of Highways could not put in the necessary safety features to prevent death and destruction – an overpass. You have been asked for it, Mr. Minister of Highways (Mr. Boldt), in between the two towns on the old road. It's too dangerous at this crossing. Why don't you spend some of this money that you are wasting other places to protect the public? We are told that they are now busy constructing slide defences, slide defences to protect the new bridge.

Well, we have seen a good many slippery deals conducted by this Government since it took office; and there is no doubt that we ought to have slide defences in many other areas of Government activity in this province. I want this House and the public to know, as the people of The Battlefords know, that thousands and thousands of unnecessary dollars are being spent now. They have practically dammed the North Saskatchewan River in an effort to hold an ill-conceived and hastily constructed bridge at a point where, I am sure, that the engineers never gave assurances to the Government that the ground was sound and that it would be safe to proceed with a \$2 million structure and \$2 million worth of approaches and circle roads. This is what the public can expect from a Minister that thinks he does not need engineers' advice and a Government that believes intelligent civil servants are a danger to their well-being. Highways construction has not only suffered in this particular instance, but it has suffered throughout all the area under my purview in northwestern Saskatchewan. This Government has blundered and stumbled along, thinking more about politics, the politics of flagmen and other minor workers, than they have about the efficiency and the economy and the safety of the construction work that they have undertaken.

While we are talking about bridges, Mr. Speaker, maybe the Minister (Mr. Boldt), later on in this session will tell us why a bridge, built on Cutknife Creek, No. 40 west, less than two years ago, was torn out again this year and another one put in its place. Maybe he will tell us why it takes four years of construction on the 21 miles of highway between Lashburn and Lloydminster and again at tremendous inconvenience to the travelling public. The only advantage, Mr. Speaker, I can see to this, is that possibly people might not be able to get to Lloydminster to save the four per cent sales tax. Maybe there's some method in the Treasurer's madness. Not only has this Government caused inconvenience, it has caused several accidents. It has caused tourists to avoid Saskatchewan and destroyed Saskatchewan's image as a province of good roads. Waste and inefficiency, there have never been so many roads started and unfinished in this province in history.

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

**Mr. Kramer:** — Never before, and you stand accused of making a mess of the whole situation. Every one of you that sits across there is guilty. I would like to take the Premier, right back to the



**March 5, 1968**

Primrose path bit. Maybe I should tell you a bit about that fiasco – that dream from the never-never land.

**Hon. J.C. McIsaac (Minister of Education):** — The old Kramer trail . . .

**Mr. Kramer:** — You fellows had your time yesterday. In an effort to make the Premier's story stick, his April Fools' Day announcement three years ago that an industrial complex would be built to process timber from the Primrose Lake area. We would have expected that at least by the past year, our Centennial Year, that there would have been an official opening, more than \$1 million, thousands more than a million, were spent on a highway from Canoe Lake to a point near Cummins Lake in northwestern Saskatchewan in an effort to make the Premier's story stick, to indicate to the public that something was actually happening up in the northwest. Well, the road is there, more than a million dollars worth, used by no one except possibly a few moose and timber wolves for a race track, and even they have to be careful that they don't break their neck on it and fall in one of the holes where it has sunken into the muskeg. No, we didn't have an official opening on the Premier's Primrose path. That is still to come, if they ever get around to it! Nor was there an official opening of the Primrose Forest Products mill and plant at Meadow Lake. There wasn't even an official sod-turning, not a brick or a board has been set up to start this pipe dream of the Premier's, who is so careful with the money for the sick and the old, and yet has millions to spend on a pipe dream to try to please and persuade a wealthy operator from the Province of Alberta. I want to say here and now, Mr. Speaker, that there isn't enough timber in the Primrose-Vermette area to warrant anything but a bush trail and a winter road. If every stick of timber was harvested in that area, at present royalty rates, it would net the Government no more than \$385,000, and their estimate of what is there is exaggerated at that. This is a businessman. I see the Premier has gone back to the refrigerator; he's not here, I wish he was in his seat. This is the business man. This is the Premier who fancies himself as the salesman for Saskatchewan. He's selling alright, but with the wrong priorities and to the wrong people. A \$2 million road, Mr. Speaker, to gain royalties of less than \$500,000. Is this good business?

Mr. Speaker, this Budget is going to provide that the sick and the old and the poor are going to pay millions of dollars for foolish, ill-conceived, expensive works devised by the Premier to create a façade and an image for himself as the doer of great things. He has wasted the bank account he inherited in 1964. He has wasted many of the resources, and now he is going to bail himself out by over-taxing all of the people of this province and especially those least able to pay, once more to try to shore up the coffers of the Treasury, so that when another election rolls around it can once more attempt to bribe the people with its own money. Oh, there will be plenty of money going out of the taxpayers' pockets during the next three years to provide for that Christmas tree that will be put up before the next election, in an attempt once more to fool the public of this province with the huckster propaganda created by an imported firm of image-makers. I don't think, Mr. Speaker, that the public will be fooled again.

Another example of waste and inefficiency, Mr. Speaker, in the highway program is indicated all along Highway No. 4 from

Battleford to Meadow Lake. Several miles of this highway constructed by the CCF Government have been allowed to go to rack and ruin, remaining unfinished without blacktop, while the Department of Highways has attempted to build 13 miles of super-highway immediately north of the city. This road not only cost too much in the first place, but, in order to show off a little more and provide a little more convenience to the farmers along that road, it has begun to construct costly service roads on either side that no one wants and no one needs. Already \$75,000 has been spent on these service roads. This money, Mr. Speaker, could better have been spent, if those roads, those thousands of dollars, had been given to municipalities in that area which would have been very pleased to have had those many miles of roads at even half the standard of those service roads. If this is going on throughout the province, Mr. Speaker, I suggest that hundreds of miles of country roads could be constructed out of the money that is being spent for frills and waste by the Department of Highways. I could cite many more instances of waste and inefficiency, but I believe I have said enough about this to convince the Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Steuart) that there are places that he can save money, without taxing the sick, the young, the old and the average citizen.

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

**Mr. Kramer:** — The Department of Public Works has been in the process of attempting to build a new highway depot for the last three years. It will be interesting to know what all this will cost when the bills are all in because of the manner in which the contract was let and the construction undertaken. Another example of inefficiency and patronage and waste. I would like to suggest at this time to the Minister in charge that our liquor outlet in North Battleford is causing a great deal of traffic congestion on Main Street, which is also Highway No. 4. Something should be done about off-street parking.

**Hon. A.R. Guy (Minister of Public Works):** — Close her down!

**Mr. Kramer:** — Well, I don't think they will. You know the Minister asks: do we want to close the liquor outlet in North Battleford? Not at all, I don't think he will regardless of whether I ask him or not. This Government is making \$5 million more out of liquor than it did three years ago, and I don't think it will be shutting down its little gold mines. No, I simply want safety on the main street of North Battleford, Mr. Speaker, I simply want safety. It is congested there, this is no place to have that much traffic congestion on any day. If you take the time to go out there you will see what the problem really is. But here again, once more, you see evidence of scoffing across the way when someone raises an item that is in the interest of public safety. This Government doesn't give a damn about the public, Mr. Speaker, it is only concerned with a few wealthy friends.

Mr. Speaker, there are many other critical areas. There is not a department that has not indulged in playing politics with civil servants and patronage wherever possible, but the most callous and damning thing that can be laid at this Government's door has been its complete disregard of the situation created through its own folly and mismanagement during the period

**March 5, 1968**

since it took office in 1964. My city used to be a happy city, a friendly city, a city without fear. Battleford and North Battleford historically have the welcome mat out for visitors as one of the early pioneer centres and historical centres of this province. Mr. Speaker, my city is now a city of locked doors and frightened people. Since this Premier took over and appointed the Member for Prince Albert West (Mr. Steuart) as his Minister of Health, we have had incidents of rape, murder and child molesting all involving former mental patients. No reasonable person would attach direct blame for all these incidents on the Premier and the former Minister of Health, but for my part, as the Member for The Battlefords, I do attach blame on the Premier and his Ministers for not doing something about it, when they were warned by knowledgeable people of what was happening and what might happen.

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

**Mr. Kramer:** — The former Minister of Health (Mr. Steuart) chose not only to ignore the warnings but, even worse, chose to answer the people who were voicing concern with vituperation and abuse. Even after one of the worst tragedies that this province and the Dominion of Canada has ever known, the present Minister of Health and the Premier chose to accuse me of playing politics with the situation and refused to take immediate action to see that violent former patients were recalled and placed under maximum security. Now, Mr. Minister for Prince Albert West penitentiary, just remember this, you have a place in Prince Albert where these people can be kept under proper surveillance. I mean, Mr. Speaker, the people who have a known history of violent tendencies. This is all we ask. We don't ask you to stop the plan. We ask you to take care of these people who are dangerous.

**Mr. Steuart:** — How about the people . . .

**Hon. W.S. Lloyd (Leader of the Opposition):** — . . . Frazier report.

**Mr. Kramer:** — No, Mr. Speaker, they were too busy last August playing politics and laying the groundwork for a snap election to consider the safety and well-being of the people of my constituency and the people of Saskatchewan. I believe the record will show that throughout last summer this one-man Government did not even hold half a dozen full-dress Cabinet meetings. They were so busy running around to official openings and dispensing liquor at the taxpayers' expense, desperately trying to garner popularity . . .

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order, order! When a person wishes to make a charge of that nature, he must have it on a substantive motion, so that it can be properly debated. Therefore you will have to withdraw it now. You will have to do it in the proper way, because that is a charge of an illegal act.

**Mr. Kramer:** — The Minister of Natural Resources . . .

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order, order!

**Mr. Kramer:** — . . . at an official opening served liquor at Sask Tel. Now, do I have to withdraw the truth, Sir?

**Mr. Speaker:** — You are going to have to sit down before we discuss it any further.

**Mr. Kramer:** — Very well, very well.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Now, order! When a person wishes to lay a charge of criminality against anybody else in debate, he has to produce the evidence and lay the charge in the proper, formal manner by making a substantive motion. Then everybody has a chance to defend themselves, because everybody has a chance to enter the debate. Those who wish to act for the prosecution may do so and those who wish to act for the defence also have the privilege of doing so. But the charge if I understand it correctly, as the Member said it, was a charge of criminality, that is a criminal offence in this province. Now I may have misunderstood the Member, but that is the understanding that I have. You will have to withdraw this charge of a criminal offence and lay it in the proper way, if you wish to.

**Mr. Kramer:** — Mr. Speaker, I simply said that at official openings at North Battleford liquor was served by the Minister of Natural Resources at that time, paid for by the Department of Natural Resources. Liquor was served at North Battleford by the Minister of Telephones at a Sask Tel opening. Now is it wrong for me . . .

**Mr. Steuart:** — Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, if you are referring to an opening we had there, we had refreshments and everything was quite legal and above board. You should withdraw what you said. You said it was illegal. It was not illegal.

**Mr. Kramer:** — I did not say it was illegal, I simply said . . .

**Mr. Steuart:** — You certainly did say it was illegal.

**Mr. Kramer:** — Mr. Speaker, I have my notes before me, there is nothing about illegal, I simply told . . .

**Mr. Steuart:** — You're having trouble with your words.

**Mr. Kramer:** — . . . You know what they were doing; I told this House what they were doing. If they choose to deny it, did you or did you not serve liquor at two official openings at North Battleford.

**Mr. Speaker:** — My understanding was that the Member was making a charge of an illegal action, and I am telling the House what the Member will have to do if he wishes to make the charge.

**Mr. Kramer:** — Mr. Speaker, I did not intimate an illegality. I am sorry if you misunderstood me, I did not intimate — could I read

**March 5, 1968**

my notes again, Sir. I have the printed word in front of me. May I proceed?

**Mr. Cameron:** — As I recall he had more than his share the time I saw him.

**Mr. Kramer:** — Mr. Speaker, they may be a bit touchy about some of these matters. I aid they were desperately trying to garner publicity, and these are my words, publicity by any means at their disposal. They were so busy that they did not have time to be concerned with the safety of the people of Saskatchewan. They did not have time to be concerned with what might happen to women, children and young girls who might venture out after dark. It was only after tremendous public pressure that the Premier and the Minister of Health announced that they were going to conduct a review and invited Dr. Frazier to come to the Province to do the job. Well the report has been tabled, much read and dog-eared. The Government is attempting now to have the public forget as soon as possible by making statements that everything is gong to be done to implement the Report. Pardon me if I have some serious doubts, Mr. Speaker. Pardon me if I question the intentions of this Government. First of all the \$500,000 that it has voted in this Budget is not enough. It is only enough to do a patch job, not to do the reconstruction job that is necessary. Secondly, it is not the first time that this Government has announced programs, allocated budgets and spent scarcely anything on the announced project. We will not be satisfied on this side of the House, Mr. Speaker, until everything is being done that has been recommended in the Frazier Report and even more has been done.

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

**Mr. Kramer:** — It was totally unnecessary to go through the expense of bringing Dr. Frazier to this province in the first place. Everything he said was said by us in Opposition over the past three years and everything he has said was known to the Psychiatric Services Branch, which would have been able to do the job, if the money had been provided for it by the Scrooge and Shylock team, the two first Ministers of this Government.

The Thatcherites opposite have chosen to drag a red herring across the path in an effort to discredit Members on this side of the House for their efforts in trying to bring about better administration of the Saskatchewan plan. I have here with me today, Mr. Speaker, letters, quotes, statements by spokesmen of the Government, from Thatcherite candidates from the last election, and, of course, from the Premier, himself accusing us of trying to make political capital out of the tragic situation. I want to suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that the expense that this Government has gone through in securing Dr. Frazier and bringing down this Report would have been totally unnecessary, and I repeat this, if it had listened to our Leader, The Hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Lloyd), and to the former Minister of Health, the present Member for Regina Centre (Mr. Blakeney). In public statements and in the records of this House one will find statement after statement and warning after warning from these two gentlemen, and also from other Members, including myself.

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

**Mr. Kramer:** — These warnings met with nothing but vituperation and abuse from the Government, and especially from the Premier and the Member for Prince Albert West, who is now the Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Steuart), this Minister who must share the blame for this tragic situation equally with the Premier, who was the Provincial Treasurer for the past three and a half years, and whose Scrooge policies caused havoc to the Saskatchewan Plan motioned in page after page of the Frazier Report.

I said earlier, Mr. Speaker, that I did not blame the present Minister of Health (Mr. Grant) too much. He inherited the mess from the present Provincial Treasurer, the former Minister of Health. Small wonder that this Saskatchewan Plan and the total Psychiatric Services Program have deteriorated beyond the danger point with these two individuals in charge of the situation, a Premier with a Scrooge personality, the tight-fisted, small town hardware merchant, and a Minister of Health with a Shylock personality of a second-hand furniture dealer.

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

**Mr. Kramer:** — Mr. Speaker, the Members on this side of the House have begged and pleaded with the Government. They have warned the Government headed by the Premier and the former Minister of Health, as Premier and Deputy Premier. They have warned them that this good program was being scuttled with too much haste and lack of supervision, lack of supervision not only because the personnel were not doing their jobs, but simply because they were not provided with the money and the people to do the job properly. All the time the former Minister of Health was saying, “Get these people out of the hospitals, get them out of the road, get them out on the farms, get them into the basements, get them anywhere as long as we don’t have them in our hospitals, especially those areas that had the indecency to vote against this Government. Let them shut down.” How can you expect anything else, Mr. Speaker, with a Scrooge and a Shylock at the helm? Mr. Speaker, I know that the present Minister of Health (Mr. Grant) is sensitive about this and I don’t blame him. I’ll admit I was a bit angry with him last August, when once more he refused to take action in this area and chose once again to be abusive and make what were at that time completely false accusations against me. I know that he was busy at that time getting ready for an election and really didn’t have time to worry about the needs and fears of the people of Saskatchewan, especially those people of northwestern Saskatchewan, who at that time were upset and living under a cloud because of one of the worst tragedies that has ever been known in Canada. I know that when I asked for his resignation at that time, I meant it at that time, Mr. Speaker. I have to say today . . .

**Mr. I.H. MacDougall (Souris-Estevan):** — Who are you?

**Mr. Kramer:** — I’m the MLA for The Battlefords in case you want to know.

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

**Mr. Kramer:** — I know that I am and I was re-elected too. They said the Premier and the Minister of Health and a few others made

**March 5, 1968**

this situation an issue, not I. I know that I asked for his resignation but I want to take that back, not that I'm too happy with him, but Heaven only knows that if he stepped out we might get the former Minister back and that would be even more of a tragedy than some of the others across the way who might be in line.

**Mr. Lloyd:** — All that and taxes too.

**Mr. Kramer:** — You know, Mr. Speaker, after the election of October 11th, the Premier made a public statement about the possibility of additions to his Cabinet. He said he was in a quandary; he said his quandary was too many good men. On looking across the way I think it's a pity he hadn't exploited that quandary more diligently, at least as far as the new Minister of Public Works (Mr. Guy) is concerned. Further I suggest it might have been in the public interest for him to have retired some of his earlier appointments. Mr. Speaker, in order to run some of the Government departments and certainly the field of Health and Welfare, you certainly must have sensitive men. The Minister of Health has my sympathy. I believe that he is probably one of the most sensitive men, if not the most, on that side of the House, and I believe that he sincerely hopes to be able to right the wrongs done to the unfortunate people in the mental health area, the wrongs done through the disregard and mismanagement of the former Minister of Health and the Premier, whose philosophy is big business first with the most, and may the devil take the poor and the sick and the taxpayer, I might add. Who on the Treasury benches over there are going to side with the Minister of Health when he argues for more money and better programs to repair the damages done through the folly and mismanagement of the past four years? He is going to need sensitive men, Mr. Speaker. Will he get assistance from the Minister of Education? I doubt it, after the attempted emasculation of the teaching profession and the University. I believe most people will have serious doubts about this box-stall physician. I must say at this time, Mr. Speaker, that actions speak louder than words and certainly the Premier's sense of priority in selecting Ministers for departments is well indicated here. And I'm sure that, when he chose this veterinarian from Prince Edward Island to do the job on the University and the teaching profession, his intentions in the field of education were made very clear. The question is; what is he going to use, a knife or a burdizz? While I am talking about the sensitive, sympathetic Ministers that the Minister of Health (Mr. Grant) may rally to his assistance, I wonder how he would fare with the Minister of Social Welfare (Mr. MacDonald), that silver-haired daddy from Milestone, who apparently is able to squeeze an extra \$1.50 per month from the neediest of the old age pensioners, while his Premier and fellow Ministers wallow in expensive frills for private offices, private planes and the unnecessary renovations. There is a couple of other things, Mr. Speaker  
...

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

**Mr. Kramer:** — . . . There was something else I was going to mention that you objected to earlier, but I wonder, in view of some of the other expenses they've indulged in, how they can have the conscience to withdraw these funds from the needy. Why they seem to have absolutely no qualms whatever about where they spend when it comes to their own comfort. I certainly do not envy the Minister of Health his position in attempting to secure

more money for these sensitive programs, when I think of him trying to rally that tower of intellect, who is not in his seat anymore either, the Minister of Highways (Mr. Boldt), and that super-sensitive Member for Athabasca (Mr. Guy). No, Mr. Speaker, the man that was so sensitive, while the money was being refused students in need, was still able to use his influence of whatever he did use in order to get a loan, a student loan, a \$20 - \$22,000 a year former MLA now Minister of Public Works (Mr. Guy). No, Mr. Speaker, I do not envy the Minister of Health his task nor do I hold out much hope that he will be able to wring the necessary concessions from the Treasury when I look at some of the other Members headed by the Scrooge and Shylock duet, the Premier and the Deputy Premier.

**Mr. Thatcher:** — It's the new generation.

**Mr. Kramer:** — The public can hardly expect the team that wrecked the best mental health program on the North American continent in their first four years in office to be sensitive and helpful. Let us take a look, Mr. Speaker, at the evidence provided by Dr. Frazier in his report. They don't like listening to what I have to say. Maybe they would like to have me quote some of the things that Dr. Frazier has to say.

**Mr. Steuart:** — If you can pronounce the words, go ahead.

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

**Mr. Kramer:** — Dr. Frazier himself, and it is expected that Dr. Frazier would be as kind to this Government, in writing his report as he possibly could be. On page 3, paragraph 3, Dr. Frazier states:

The major changes in Saskatchewan's psychiatric care program began in 1946. Many factors appeared to contribute to this, but one major one was an influx of talented and dedicated people.

Further in the same paragraph, Dr. Frazier goes on to say:

From then on there was developed and accumulated a large number of talented workers in psychiatry and related fields in the Province; many acquired international reputations; unfortunately, many have left the Province in recent years.

Dr. Frazier states here that there were many factors contributing to this sudden change and advance in Saskatchewan's mental health program in 1946, and he suggests that there was an influx of talented and dedicated people. This is true, Mr. Speaker, but it also follows before you can have an influx of talented and dedicated people in the public and civil service you must have talented and dedicated people in government. The major fact contributing to the change in 1946 was the election of a Government of talented and dedicated people in 1944, the "humanity first" Government headed by Tommy Douglas, with our present Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Lloyd) as one of his right-hand men.

**Mr. Coderre:** — You weren't around then, Eiling.



**March 5, 1968**

**Mr. Kramer:** — Oh, yes I was! Oh yes, I'm not one of the swingers of the new generation, I'm a little older than that. I wish I was younger. Dr. Frazier goes on to say that many of these talented and dedicated people have left the province recently and I suggest that the reason for that is this Government with the Scrooge and Shylock complex that was elected in 1964 and unfortunately re-elected last October with a program of false pretences. They are sitting here now like the old maid that got herself all primped up with her wooden leg and her glass eye and she finally got this fellow to marry her. But boy! It was a rough story when the falsies, and the glass eye and the wooden leg cam off after the wedding.

**Mr. Thatcher:** — Dirty, dirty!

**Mr. Kramer:** — Oh yes, that was another thing you accused me of, wasn't it, Mr. Premier, I'm sorry about that. This Thatcher Government with its dollars-before-people attitude can neither attract nor keep talented and dedicated people. This kind of Government, Mr. Speaker, can only attract the kind of civil servants that may be interested in the middle and end of the month. There is no doubt that it requires super-dedication to the public, for any talented and sensitive person to remain in the employ of the Government that sits on the Treasury benches across the way. I can to congratulate those good people who have had the intestinal fortitude and dedication to remain with us during these last unhappy years. Allow me to turn to page 14 of the Frazier Report, paragraph 3, Dr. Frazier says:

Many of the questions and criticisms of Weyburn discharges are directed to the period of 1965 and later; this is seen as the time when the "big push" started. Prior to this the releases appeared to be well received.

The big push, Mr. Speaker. And who was responsible for that big push? None other than that little squirt that left his seat. I guess he is gone to the refrigerator too.

**Hon. C.P. MacDonald (Minister of Welfare):** — Cheap!

**Mr. Kramer:** — None other than that little squirt, former Minister of Health (Mr. Stuart) in charge of the big push, the second-hand furniture salesman with the Shylock complex, the tool of Sawdust Caesar of Wascana who bragged about reducing the in-patient population at an accelerated rate and promised even great acceleration in the future. Allow me at this point, Mr. Speaker, to quote from the Debates and Proceedings of 1965, when the Member for Prince Albert, now the Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Stuart) was criticizing the fact that the patient population had not been reduced as swiftly at North Battleford as it had in Weyburn. On page 509 of the Debates and Proceedings, 1965, he complained that the patient population had only been reduced by 13 per cent in North Battleford. At that time he rose up in this House, he shook his chubby little fist and he said we are going to change all that, "We intend to take immediate steps to rectify this situation" and promised further on in that same speech to develop a more dynamic program. Mr. Speaker, it's all very well to be dynamic, but let us always remember that ill-placed charges and short fuses may be dangerous. It appears to me that the ill-placed charges and short fuses of that would-be

dynamic former Minister of Health have resulted in some serious casualties, not only among individuals, but in the long run the greatest casualty will be the lose of public confidence in the Saskatchewan Plan, a plan that could have continued to enjoy public confidence, if a Liberal Government had not been elected in 1964 and if a Minister of Health such as the present Provincial Treasurer hadn't been placed in charge of the administration of the Department of Health, the short-sighted, short-fuse dynamic would-be dynamic Minister from Prince Albert West.

Mr. Speaker, I suggest that Ministers and Members opposite take note, careful note, of what the consequences are and have been due to the pushing around by the present Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Steuart) and the Premier (Mr. Thatcher). You don't continue to enjoy the confidence of the public or the staff by being pushy, ruthless and completely oblivious to the needs and safety of people. This side of the House were subjected, I repeat again, to floods of abuse when they suggested that all was not well in the Mental Health Program.

Let us see what the Frazier Report says, let us see what this, and I must say, hand-picked investigator, has to say about the Government's failures.

Recommendation 1 – “We recommend that . . . there be an easing off in the pressure for discharges from the Weyburn Main Building, no matter what the effect on hospital census. The discharge rate, along with the type of patients being placed in the community, is exceeding the capacity of the community care staffs.”

Recommendation 2 talks about confusing, fragmented and inefficient organization. Further down on page 15, Recommendation 4, section (b), Dr. Frazier talks about complaints arising out of patients having been released from North Battleford “while still assaultive, unruly, and unco-operative.” It seems to me some of us said this, didn't we, Mr. Speaker? We said it many times in the last three years and what was said over there, everyone of the Treasury benches, or nearly everyone of the Treasury benches rose up and stopped and said we were playing politics. Quoting again from the second paragraph, section (b) of Recommendation 4 on page 15, Dr. Frazier says:

Some of the families perceived this hospital as being over eager to get rid of patients. Physicians complained that admission to North Battleford was too difficult, taking as much as three or four days of negotiations whereas discharge was much too easy.

These are physicians and many of them have told me the same thing. I am sure that when the Hon. Member for Kinistino (Mr. Thibault) gets up in his place and speaks in this debate, he will have something to say about how a doctor could not get admission to a hospital, but when a Member of the Legislature phoned the hospital the patient was admitted immediately. What kind of criterion is this, Mr. Speaker? I'll admit that the Member for Kinistino has many, many attributes, but I don't think that he is knowledgeable enough in psychiatry to know whether or not the patient should be admitted to hospital. Further on in Recommendation 4, page 15 and 16, it states that “the North Battleford hospital also received its share of comments concerning precipitate, seemingly unplanned and uncoordinated discharges.” More of Shylock's dynamite, Mr. Speaker, more of Shylock's dynamite,

**March 5, 1968**

These are Dr. Frazier's words. This is what was politics when we were protesting; this was politics making politics out of an unfortunate situation. What do you call them now? What do the Members opposite call them now when they read them in Dr. Frazier's Report? I'd like to hear a word or two on it later on in this debate. Further on, Recommendation 5, page 16:

Better communications, arrangements and understandings should be developed between North Battleford Hospital and the other Mental Health Regions from which it received in-patients and overflow in-patients. This should include a clearly defined admission policy.

I don't think that the former Minister of Health (Mr. Steuart) with due respect to the present Minister of Health (Mr. Grant) is qualified to say who should go and who should come. But it seems when you are withdrawing money and telling the boys to speed up the plan that you are in trouble. Recommendation 5 goes on to say this should be done:

so as to prevent delays, as well as a reasonable discharge policy with prompt notification and communication with local centres, physician and family.

Lack of communication. You would wonder how in the world these poor people that are trying to keep these hospitals going have ever survived and kept the thing together. Let the public and the Government note Recommendation 6 which says very simply:

That no heroic efforts be made at this time to reduce the in-patient population at Saskatchewan Hospital, North Battleford.

I wonder how many times that was said by the people on this side of the House and by the people who warned you from this side of the House.

The Government has scoffed at our criticisms about lack of budget and loss of staff. Let us look for a moment at page 17, Recommendation 9 of the Frazier Report:

There should be instituted prompt, urgent measures to retain present staff and fill existing staff vacancies so as to preserve this outstanding program.

Mr. Speaker, Members of the New Democratic party warned and pleaded with this Government continuously over the past four years in an effort to prevent the development of this tragic situation. They received slander, abuse and vituperation from the former Minister of Health (Mr. Steuart) and others across the way. Even last year when the present Member for Moose Jaw North complained about the situation and treatment of certain discharged mental patients, he was taken to task and called a liar by that so honorable Member for Prince Albert West (Mr. Steuart). What does the Frazier Report say on page 19, second paragraph?

One brief made the point that early discharge was simply the means to an end, the preservation of the person as a social being; if a patient is discharged to a situation which does not provide for the meaningful contact and social interaction, then one is simply kidding oneself about the merits of early discharge. Patients discharged into noxious situations may be worse off than in the hospital.

There were also criticism about early discharges of psychopaths and potential criminals.

Not my words, the words of Dr. Frazier, the man, Mr. Speaker, who was selected. I want to say at this time that I take a pretty dim view of a government, when it is on the spot, when it is being accused of wrong doings, being able to appoint its own judge and jury. Thank God, Mr. Speaker, we had a man that they did by accident possibly select a man of the calibre of Dr. Frazier. One brief made the point that early discharge was simply a means to an end; that's one paragraph. Another paragraph, the last paragraph of Recommendation 10 says very clearly and very clearly bears out and substantiates all the criticism and the warnings from the New Democrats during the past three years. I will quote that last paragraph of Recommendation 19:

We consider, however, that the early discharge procedure at North Battleford and especially at Weyburn is based on unrealistic criteria and not based on improvement from psychotic symptoms . . . and acting out a socially acceptable behavior.

This is what happens, Mr. Speaker, when a government undertakes to put the pressure and the squeeze on the Psychiatric Services Branch that has been doing a cardinal job. A respectable job and they think, somehow in their parsimonious thinking they believe that there must be some waste in there so they say "We'll just cut it down, we'll drop it back by 20 per cent, we won't increase the budget," and they wonder why things went wrong. When we try to tell them from this side of the House that there is something wrong, they scream like a bunch of angry children. Allow me to quote Recommendation 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.

My only criticism of Recommendation 11, Mr. Speaker, is the reference to institutional goals. I suggest that they were not the institutional goals, not the institution's goals, they were the Provincial Treasurer's goals, former Minister of Health's (Mr. Steuart) goals, their goal and the goal of this Government to save a dollar. Just dump these patients out without regard to safety and to hell with the public, Scrooge and Shylock philosophy again. I wonder, Mr. Speaker, if the Minister of Health (Mr. Grant) is going to really be able to prevail upon the sympathy of the Premier and his Deputy. I don't wonder that they have left the House, Mr. Speaker. I don't wonder that they have left is soft soles. I wonder if he is going to be able to prevail on the Premier and his Deputy. I have serious doubts. Possibly he may be able to conjure up Marley's ghost or possibly the ghost of others to have the proper impact on these Scrooge personalities. Let us turn to page 20 of this sad and sordid story, Recommendation 12:

We urge that sufficient facilities be developed to accept all appropriate candidates for in-patient care. We also recommend that appropriate provisions be made for children, adolescents, alcoholics, addicts, psychopaths, and seniles.

March 5, 1968

Mr. Speaker, I want to tell this House a sad story of a little boy at North Battleford, getting on to three years ago, who was out with his grandfather at a post-treating plant north of North Battleford. A certain individual took this little lad, cut around his genitals, ran a knife into his rectum and, if it hasn't been for the grandfather driving this particular character off with a club, no doubt this little boy would have been dead. Now, this little lad is still in a state of nervous upset. The man who did this thing to him was taken to the Saskatchewan Hospital for examination. He was treated for three weeks and released with a pocketful of pills and to the best of my knowledge is still at large somewhere else. I'm not blaming any particular one about this. I don't know if this particular individual had a history of former mental illness but I am saying that when this kind of a situation occurs, three weeks' treatment is not enough, and that this man is certainly a candidate and would certainly have been a candidate for a maximum security area. The little boy, I am more concerned with. The mother has gone to psychiatrists on more than one occasion because she is worried about the child, because the child is in a very nervous condition and she has not been able to get the necessary help to try and assist this boy.

I want to tell the public and the Government that the social workers I know are doing a good job, trying to cope with the tremendous workload that they have with out-patients and home care programs. They need more help. Let us take a look at what the Frazier Report says on page 25, second paragraph, Recommendation 23:

It is possible that fewer of the professional staff would leave the province if the out-patient and home care programs were more truly therapeutic.

These people do not have the time to cover the ground that is necessary and naturally, when they can't do the job that is necessary, they are not going to be happy in their jobs. If there is any doubt left in the minds of the public or the Government about the situation that we are in, due to four years of careless, parsimonious mismanagement, let me quote from Recommendation 24, section 5, subsection (1):

#### Manpower and Personnel

The quality of psychiatric treatment is directly dependent on the staff who conduct the treatment programs, their numbers, their training, their experience, and their human qualities.

It was in this area that we found the most serious problem. In our opinion, the Psychiatric Services Branch is in the midst of a personnel crisis. Many staff people have already left the program and others are considering leaving. This problem is the most severe with psychiatrists, psychologists, and social workers, but it also involves psychiatric nurses and other categories. It should be stressed that Saskatchewan's current, hard-won psychiatric care program, with emphasis on home placement, depends on a certain irreducible number of field personnel to carry out, direct, and supervise the program. If the available staff drops before this number, the whole system will break down.

I wish that the Treasury bench has guts enough to sit there and

take it and listen because I don't think that half of them have even read the Frazier Report.

patients will have to be returned to large institutions.

I want the House to take particular note of what Dr. Frazier says here.

Unfortunately it is possible to operate a large institution with substandard staffing; the resulting conditions may be terrible but the entire operation is out of sight and may therefore be tolerated.

Does that sound like something someone read in "The Canadian" about Alberta, not so long ago?

When patients are living in the community and widely dispersed, the system will not function without sufficient staff, and the resulting deterioration in patient condition will be so visible to the community that it will no doubt be intolerable.

Mr. Speaker, I want to draw the attention of this House to what Dr. Frazier has said here about the less expensive way of keeping people, keeping them in large institutions out of sight. Mr. Speaker, we were there in 1944, before things were changed. This was done before by a dollar-conscious Government in this Province, before the tremendous program and progress in psychiatric help. I can only hope that those of you who sit in the Government caucus will see to it that we do not return to those dark days of the past. I quote again:

In the face of these inherent drawbacks, Saskatchewan is in a non-competitive position at the present time with regard to salaries, fringe benefits, retirement benefits, permission to do outside work for remuneration, and conditions of work including duty hours. Furthermore, the earlier excitement and stimulation which came from a sense of participation in an innovative, pioneering program is now waning, due partly to a slowdown in the program but due mainly to the fact that other provinces and states are setting up equivalent or better programs.

You know those programs that he is talking about here were set up during those 20 years of stagnation that you people like to talk about, by a humanity-first Government. I take pride in this even if you don't as Saskatchewanians. You cannot run a program like this, Mr. Speaker, with programs of freeze and cut and dollar-conscious treasurers. Quoting again from Dr. Frazier:

It is not surprising, therefore, that during the period January 1, 1967, to September 31, 1967, the Branch lost 13 of its senior psychiatrists (in addition to some junior psychiatrists). By the end of our December visit, four more senior psychiatrists had departed, including some more in key positions. During the same period the social worker establishment dropped from 26 MSWs to 13. There was a net loss of several registered psychologists. These trends are continuing. We found that many of the professional staff were considering other opportunities.

I will make reference to the Frazier Report again with the

**March 5, 1968**

Recommendation 43, headed long-range planning:

We failed to find evidence of long-range plans or projections. Despite lip service to the Saskatchewan Plan, it was clear that this plan has never been fully implemented. Furthermore, there was much uncertainty about which unit would be developed next, why the Prince Albert Centre was not in operation, what the priorities were among the many critical needs (such as additional bed space in the two large cities).

Obviously from what is only sparse quotations from this Report, Mr. Speaker, it is evident that this Government has failed in its public duty to meet the needs on all fronts. It has failed the patients, the staff and the public. Certainly the people of my constituency are living under a cloud of fear, especially so after the most recent tragic incident, allegedly – and I want the Minister of Health (Mr. Grant) to take special note of the word allegedly – involving a mental patient. This man, too, Mr. Speaker, has not been brought to trial and we have no way of knowing that this is actually the case. However, I would tell this House that a very wonderful, old pioneer lady was found in her home with 31 stab wounds in her abdomen. This does not make for a feeling of security among the rest of us. The hardware merchants of North Battleford have done a roaring business in locks and chains and, when you have a situation like this, Mr. Speaker, in a community, there is also another danger area. There are people in North Battleford and throughout northwestern Saskatchewan, perhaps in all of Saskatchewan, who have loaded guns in their homes at night. I shudder to think of what may happen if some one of the family comes home unexpectedly some night and fails to identify themselves on time. There is panic abroad. This is something that has to be righted. I don't think you are going to right a situation that has been going down, and down, and down for four years with a measly \$500,000.

**An Hon. Member:** — Highways are more important.

**Mr. Kramer:** — Oh, Primrose paths are more important. Planes, renovations, many of these things are more important. I don't think this Government has chosen the right priorities and the reason that it has failed in the Mental Health Program is because it has chosen to waste the resources of this Government, the financial resources, on give-away, waste, patronage and inefficiency. One of the tragic results of that waste is said more eloquently than I could say it, by quoting once more, from the Frazier Report, page 38, last paragraph:

One of the most important recent influences has been a gradual financial squeeze on the Branch. Salaries had fallen behind, and the leaders of the program began to leave. Furthermore, community psychiatry began to catch on in other provinces and the United States, so that veterans of the Saskatchewan program were in increasing demand. The Province has drifted into a situation in which it is trying to run a first-rate program on a second-rate budget, and this simply will not work.

This is Dr. Frazier saying this, Mr. Speaker, Mr. Provincial Treasurer, Mr. Minister of Health, not I. Do you call that playing politics? I wonder.

As a result, quality of care is slipping, duties are being reassigned to less qualified personnel, caseloads are increasing, and work days are becoming longer, all contributing to demoralization.

How are you going to meet that with a \$500,000 budget?

At the present time the personnel situation is of crisis proportions and must be given first priority.

Mr. Speaker, the Provincial Treasurer and the Minister of Health think they have given first priority in what they have put forward in this Budget. I hope they don't, and I hope that the Minister of Health is able to persuade the Provincial Treasurer, the Hon. Member from Prince Albert West (Mr. Steuart), to open up that purse and forget some of the wealthy people that he is trying to please and get on with the job of making this Province once more safe for women and children to live in.

Our financial critic was too kind yesterday when he suggested that the Premier and his Government had not foreseen this situation developing. I suggest in all probability that they could see this situation develop, and I refer to the earlier passage that I drew to your attention and quoted earlier, which says that it is cheaper to keep large groups of patients penned up in large institutions out of the public eye. That, Mr. Speaker, is where a former Liberal Government had them in 1944. That is where they are being kept by other dollar-conscious, Shylock-type Governments throughout this continent today, and that, Mr. Speaker, is probably where these two aging, dead-end kids – the two first Ministers that don't even have the nerve to stay in their seats – probably want this program to go, in 1944 where people were locked up and in many cases in these conditions that were unfit for animals, where their estate was grabbed by the Government and exploited regardless of family need, where in fact, every dollar was extracted from them that possibly could be extracted and very little attention was given to the rehabilitation of the patient. That is the record of this Government and the history of another Liberal Government, Mr. Speaker. Because of this, not only this, but many other things that are not in this Budget, because this Budget fails to recognize the aspirations of the Saskatchewan people, this Government has failed – and how it failed – to keep its promise to reduce taxes.

The Hon. Member for Elrose (Mr. Leith) was chiding us for complaining about this tax increase. It was your party, Mr. Member for Elrose, your Government that promised to reduce taxes, that bragged that it would reduce taxes, and you are sitting now like the basenji hound, voiceless. Because it failed to conduct the Psychiatric Services Program in a proper manner, and because it has chosen to tax the sick and the poor in an effort to shore up its sagging Treasury, and because this Province, in spite of the wonderful speeches, has gone hundreds of millions further in the hole under the managership of this businessman, this number one salesman, who goes about and brags and sells Saskatchewan short, who complains about debts that have nearly doubled since he took office, because of all these things, Mr. Speaker, I will support the amendment, which is a want of non-confidence, and vote against the main motion.

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



**March 5, 1968**

**Mr. J.B. Hooker (Notukeu-Willowbunch):** — Mr. Speaker, after listening to that excoriation of vilification of everything and everybody by the Member opposite (Mr. Kramer), I am going to find it very difficult to follow my notes. All I can say is that it is about what I expected. He is running true to form and I can say to the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Lloyd) I would also in my seating arrangements get him as far away from me as possible.

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

**Mr. Hooker:** — Mr. Speaker, in rising to take part in this debate, I can only add my voice to those of others in congratulating you on being re-elected as Speaker of this Assembly. Your conduct in the Chair of your office, now as in the past, has added dignity and decorum to this Assembly. I would like to congratulate the new Members on their election. We know that you will as your predecessors have done in the past serve the public well. Those who failed in their attempts for re-election point out the fact that there is no security of tenure in public life. I would also like to congratulate our new Cabinet Ministers on their appointment, and I know that this Assembly joins with me in wishing the Hon. Member from Pelly (Mr. Barrie) the Minister of Natural Resources, a very quick and a complete recovery from his illness.

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

**Mr. Hooker:** — I would also like to congratulate our Provincial Treasurer on the manner in which he has presented the Budget. I can well imagine that in his first Budget he would have liked to be able to hand out the goodies. We on this side of the House hope that he will have that privilege in the very near future. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to be a Member of a Government who, when confronted with the financial situation that demands immediate action, has the courage to impose the necessary taxes to balance the Budget.

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

**Mr. Hooker:** — I particularly watched the expression on the faces of the Members opposite, when the increases were announced. Instead of expressions of shock which they now all profess to have, they were actually jumping up and down with joy. They didn't show concern for the taxpayer; they welcomed the increases because they felt that this might assist them in being re-elected in some four years hence. However, Mr. Speaker, I have enough faith in the people of the Province of Saskatchewan to say that they are doomed for another disappointment.

I must also congratulate the financial critic on his exuberance and also on his eloquence. He extolled for 2 hours and 15 minutes the evils of this Government. During that time I don't think he convinced anyone, even himself, that the steps taken by this Government were not essential. He referred to the Premier of this Province as Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde. I wonder what he considers himself. He started out criticizing this Government for spending too much and wound up with uncomplimentary remarks because we were not spending enough. Yes, he finally reverted to his true self, one of the last big spenders.

He states that the actions of this Government have been a story of neglect and mismanagement and that we, as a Government, practised deceit and fraud on the people of this province. Mr. Speaker, before I take my seat, I will ask this Assembly to judge for themselves which Government has been guilty of that practice. Had he and his Government been in the same frame of mind during the years he sat as chairman of the Security Commission, many of the aged would not be in the financial position they find themselves in today, and there would have been more money available for them to educate their young.

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

**Mr. Hooker:** — Mr. Speaker, I contend that he and his colleagues sat idly by doing nothing when many people were being bilked out of their life savings. And I will have more to say about that later. Which Government was guilty of neglect and mismanagement, and which Government was guilty of allowing deceit and fraud to be practised on the people?

Mr. Speaker, I would like to take a portion of the time allotted to me to speak on a subject which we heard a lot about during the recent election campaign. The NDP, CCF, or Socialists opposite claimed that the Liberal party put things before people. Of course this is a gross misrepresentation of the facts. I would like, Mr. Speaker, to remind my friends opposite of just a few of the Acts we introduced and were passed by this Legislature, which indicates without a shadow of doubt that we in the Liberal party act and not yak when it comes to putting people before things. Mr. Speaker, the legislation which I would like to refer to in particular is in that field of consumer protection or citizen protection, which after all, affects all people, no matter what station in life they may be. The Acts to which I refer to are: The Direct Sellers Act; The Motor Dealers Act; The Cost of Credit Disclosure Act; The Securities Act; The Legal Aid Act; The Compensation for Victims of Crimes of Violence Act; The Cemeteries Act. Mr. Speaker, all the Acts to which I have referred will indicate without a doubt that we are the Government which has the interest of the people and not things, uppermost in our minds.

Mr. Speaker, to qualify my previous statement, I would like to take the case of some commercial cemeteries which were allowed to be promoted and operated by the Socialists to prove that the Socialists opposite were the Government who allowed things to happen with total disregard for the people of this province. Mr. Speaker, in 1954 and 1955 certain promoters came to the Province of Saskatchewan and engaged in the promotion and operation of cemeteries for gain. At that time there was no legislation which controlled this type of operation. The CCF considered the operation a type of security, and as a result, it was administered under the Securities Commission. Perhaps the Hon. Member from Regina Centre (Mr. Blakeney) who, I understand, was the chairman of the Securities Commission at that time, could explain in more detail what took place between the promoters and the Government, but the end results I can assure you were sad in relation to the people who entered into contracts with some of these companies.

In 1955, Mr. Speaker, the Socialist Government got around to passing a Cemeteries Act which I presume they felt would be sufficient to protect the public. But as a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, it would appear that the Act of 1955 only assured the

**March 5, 1968**

promoters and operators of these ventures that they could operate with little or no interference from the Government of the day. The only basic requirement of the 1955 Act was that these companies were required to place 15 per cent of monies received in respect to the sale of lots in trust for future perpetual care. But, Mr. Speaker, there were no trust requirements in the Act in respect to monies received from the sale of goods and services such as markers, opening and closing of graves, vaults, etc., and of course, Mr. Speaker, the largest portion of the contract was for goods and services. From the records which were available when our Government took office in 1964, we were able to ascertain that these companies were of concern to our Socialist friends after five or six years of operation. As a result they did have an audit made of some of the companies, and this audit revealed that the only assets which were being left in the companies were the land and equipment. It was apparent that, because there was no law requiring trust monies to be set aside for future delivery of goods and services, all the money received for this purpose was being used for either operating expenses or development of other properties by a parent company, which was not even located in the Province of Saskatchewan. Mr. Speaker, even after receiving reports from the auditors, the Government of the day failed to take action to protect the people who had entered into contracts in good faith with these companies, and, therefore, they were allowed to continue their operations. In 1964, when we became the Government we had an investigation which revealed in fact that a number of these companies were in default in respect of trust monies required for perpetual care. Of course there was no money for delivery of goods and services.

As a result of the investigations of our Government, we at the first opportunity passed a new Cemeteries Act which came into effect April 17, 1965, requiring that all commercial cemetery companies place 35 per cent of all monies received in respect of the sale of goods and services in trust in addition to the 15 per cent, which was required to be placed in trust for perpetual care of the graves. Mr. Speaker, this legislation prevented any future operations to be commenced without proper protection for the people. But it did not repair the damage which had already been allowed to happen by lack of legislation and administration on the part of our Socialist friends opposite.

It was hoped that with proper management and administration these cemetery companies which were in difficulties could possibly be salvaged; but, after looking into the affairs of these companies in detail, it was established that the only moral and proper solution was for the Government to take over the operation of some of the cemeteries in question and guarantee the operation and delivery of goods and services which had been paid for in full. In order to facilitate the takeover of these companies, an amendment to The Cemeteries Act was passed at the last session. As a result the Department of the Provincial Secretary appointed an administration who is managing the affairs of Woodlawn Memorial Gardens of North Battleford; Resthaven Memorial Gardens of Moose Jaw; and Sunset Memorial Gardens Limited of Moosomin.

Since taking over the operations of these three cemeteries, Mr. Speaker, the administrator has been able to establish that the shortages in trust monies required for goods and services alone is in the neighborhood of \$150,000. In other words, Mr. Speaker, when loved ones pass on, the next of kin, if we had not taken action, would be advised that they would have to pay all over again for those services, which had been previously paid

for by the deceased. Mr. Speaker, I can assure you that many of the deceased paid for these services out of old age pensions in order to provide, as they thought, for the day which is inevitable for all.

Mr. Speaker, at this time the Department of the Provincial Secretary has taken over three commercial cemeteries in the Province of Saskatchewan and is operating the same in the interest of the public, who were allowed by the previous Government to be bilked out of thousands of dollars. The total number of contract holders which are involved in these three cemeteries is 4,754. Mr. Speaker, the total deficiency in the perpetual care trust fund, which is an irrevocable trust fund set up for the future maintenance of the cemeteries, is \$18,557.97. I should point out, Mr. Speaker, that this perpetual care trust was a requirement in the old Cemeteries Act which was passed in 1955.

Mr. Speaker, our Socialist friends opposite who claim to put people before dollars, failed to protect the public by demanding that the operators of these cemeteries comply with the law. Mr. Speaker, there was no provision in The Cemeteries Act of 1955 requiring monies to be set aside for the future delivery of goods and services. As a result of this lack of legislation, the operators of some of these cemeteries were allowed to receive these pre-need monies and expend the same for whatever purposes they desired. As a result, the deficiency in the three cemeteries namely, Resthaven Memorial Gardens, Moose Jaw; Woodlawn Memorial Gardens Limited, North Battleford; and the Sunset Memorial Gardens Limited, Moosomin, based on present requirements under our new Cemeteries Act of 1965 is \$104,278.55. Mr. Speaker, I should point out to you that this deficiency figure of \$104,278.55 is only one-half of the amount of monies which was received by these companies in respect of the sales of goods and services. The total of the trust deficiencies and outstanding accounts of these three cemeteries amounts to \$148,859.45. Mr. Speaker, these established figures, which the Department has now been able to establish from months of work on the records, indicate to me that this was a flagrant display of irresponsible government. Mr. Speaker, I am sure that the Members from Moose Jaw and North Battleford in particular do not wish that we pursue this matter further, because it only points up the fact that their Government's concern for the people is not displayed by the actions of their party.

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

**Mr. Hooker:** — Now, Mr. Speaker, which Government has been guilty of neglect and mismanagement? Mr. Speaker, without fear of contradiction, I maintain that our Attorney General and the present Government have done more in the field of consumer protection in the first three years of office than the Socialists did in the previous 20.

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

**Mr. Hooker:** — It appears that they were so absorbed in their Socialistic experiments that they forgot the very people that had elected them to their office. Their concern was for things, not people. How often have we heard the Members opposite cry that we are selling this Province down the river, when we encourage foreign capital to develop our natural resources and

**March 5, 1968**

build our industries? We all know that it would be desirable to be able to do the job with Saskatchewan and Canadian capital if it were available. I well recall the former Government appealing to the people of this province to invest in Saskatchewan-owned and operated industries. They published the articles in their industry and information publications telling the people what a great thing this would be for their communities, pictures of the former Premier, Mr. Douglas, turning the sod for the construction of industries that never opened their doors, excerpts of his speeches proclaiming how investments in these companies would help to build a better Saskatchewan. The people of Saskatchewan did invest, Mr. Speaker, in such things as Columbia Metals, Tyronne Hotel, Prairie Fibreboard, National Industries and many others. In fact, Mr. Speaker, during the period that the Hon. Member from Regina Centre (Mr. Blakeney) was chairman of the Securities Commission, he approved the prospectuses of 33 companies that are now defunct, and of some others that are at present in financial difficulties. The people of Saskatchewan did invest in their province and they invested to their sorrow. The number of people who lost their hard-earned cash and the number of elderly people who lost their life savings will never be known. It would be interesting to know, Mr. Speaker, how many millions of dollars went down the drain by people willing to invest in their province. It would also be equally interesting to know how much of the taxpayers' money through loans made by the Government Finance Office or SEDCO went down the drain along with the individuals' money. I maintain, Mr. Speaker, that some of these ventures were nothing but investment swindles, which were allowed to operate because The Securities Act of the day failed to give protection to the people willing to invest in their province. Where, Mr. Speaker, were some of the great defenders of the public in those days? I suggest that the former Government was so busy trying to force things like the county system without a vote down the throats of the public, it forgot about the people. Which Government practised deceit and fraud on the people of this province in those days? Mr. Speaker, we must admit that investment in new companies and new industries will always contain a certain amount of risk. However, under the amended Securities Act of 19657, the risk has been minimized. The investor will have the protection from the Securities Commission.

How long it will take before the public confidence is restored, one can only guess. Legitimate investment dealers in Saskatchewan have high praise for this legislation. It has helped to banish the evil clouds of uncertainty hanging over the dealings in stocks and the flotation of stock issues, which, because of dubious operations, have rooked many of our investors in the past. Our NDP friends opposite are continually crying about foreign capital taking over the development of our resources, but, Mr. Speaker, did they ever try to do anything constructive in this regard? Did they ever do anything to protect the investor? They had small representation in most Provincial Governments. Did they press for legislation protecting their Provincial investors? Not to my knowledge. The main reason why Canadians have tended to be conservative in their investments with a strong preference for bonds and life insurance, is that questionable dealings like those which we have had in Saskatchewan have placed risk stocks in an unfavorable light. The sooner legislation is passed by all Provincial Governments, such as we have in Saskatchewan, the sooner the confidence of the Canadian investor will be restored. Then and only then will we be on the road to Canadian participation in our own development.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to make reference to another Act of legislation spearheaded by the Attorney General (Mr. Heald) and passed by this Government, which again proves that we are the party who are concerned with the well-being of our citizens. I refer to The Direct Sellers Act of 1965. I am privileged in this Legislature of having the honor of representing the constituency of Notukeu-Willowbunch, a large rural area in the southwestern part of this province. Many areas in the constituency are sparsely settled, and throughout the years, door-to-door selling has been an accepted and useful industry. During the pioneer days when some people lived miles from a town or village, the farm-to-farm salesman carrying his goods was a most welcomed visitor. People in those areas grew to respect and trust these salesmen and also had confidence in the companies supplying the goods and services. Companies were equally careful that their representatives were people of good character.

Following World War II, when the economy became more buoyant and modes of transportation faster, the industry grew rapidly until in 1964 it was estimated to be a \$20 million operation. One segment of this type of selling alone, namely, aluminium siding and house repairs accounted for over \$2½ million of this figure. The industry became a very lucrative field for salesmen and companies alike, and it is only natural that it attracted those in our society who have no conscience where a dollar is involved, the con-man type of salesman and those that are just plain dishonest. During the period to which I refer, thousands of dollars of hard-earned cash was lost by people, purchasing goods that were never delivered, paying exorbitant prices for inferior products and being fast-talked into long-term contracts which they could not afford. It also appears, Mr. Speaker, that those that lost the most could afford the least, and I suppose this applies in all areas of this province.

What did the previous Administration do to protect the people in this regard? Once again, not a thing. Possibly the reason the former Attorney General didn't take any action to protect by legislation the people of this Province was that he was too busy setting up his equipment to monitor a telephone call from the Mafia in the United States. This to him must have been more important than looking after the interest of the people he was appointed to represent. I understand the previous Administration did pass some type of legislation causing salesmen to be licensed, but like most of their legislation, it did little more than add to the revenue of the Province by collecting licence fees from these individuals. Some may say: why should we have to have legislation designed to protect people against making decisions of their own choice? I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, before we condemn those who were taken in by a smooth-talking salesman, as individuals we had better take a look at our own past records. I do not suppose there is one of us in this Legislature who has not been guilty of using poor judgement in similar occasions, that is, all of us with the possible exception of the go-go boys opposite, who according to their own spokesman, are so young that they probably have never been confronted with anything of this nature.

When we became the Government in 1964, the office of the Attorney General received numerous letters, complaining how they had been fleeced by smooth-talking operators, and I suggest that these letters didn't just start with a change of Government. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to say that it didn't take our present Attorney General long to recognize his responsibility

**March 5, 1968**

to the people of this Province. He immediately went to work on an Act which would protect the public against unscrupulous salesmen, selling inferior merchandise. As a result, this Act, called The Direct Sellers Act, was proposed and passed in 1965. It has received such wide acclaim in this Province and elsewhere that it is being used as a model for similar legislation in other provinces. Today in Saskatchewan, if a salesman comes to the door, all that one has to do to be assured of Government protection is to ask to see his licence. Then they know that if he is licensed, he has also placed a penal bond with the Department. They have four days to change their mind regarding a purchase if they so desire, that the bond of the salesman may be attached even if the principals have left the province and a breach of the Act has been committed, that they may also cancel the contract, if the goods have not been received within ninety days. Mr. Speaker, this Act has not only rid this province of the fly-by-night operator, it has restored the public's confidence in the industry. The proof of that is that today over 4,000 salesmen are licensed and bonded in this province.

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

**Mr. Hooker:** — Mr. Speaker, this is only one of the Acts embodied in the Citizen's Protection Code proposed and passed by this Government, proof positive that we legislate for the best interest of all people.

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

**Mr. Hooker:** — Mr. Speaker, it never fails to amaze me how my friends opposite, the self-appointed paragons of virtue, are so eager to claim that we are the Government of the big people, the corporations, etc., when in fact, Mr. Speaker, their record clearly indicates that they failed to control the so-called fast-buck artists in the field of securities, cemeteries, and the door-to-door salesmen.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the Members opposite who represent Moose Jaw North (Mr. Snyder) and Moose Jaw South (Mr. Davies) and I must now leave out the great defender of the people, the Member from The Battlefords (Mr. Kramer), why they did not look into the cemetery problems in their areas and do something about it. Perhaps, Mr. Speaker, it was because they were more interested in things like Columbia Metals than in the protection of the people they were elected to represent. No, Mr. Speaker, I'm afraid the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Lloyd) must have been like a drowning man grasping at straws when he used the phrase in the last election that Liberals put things before people. We in the Liberal party put people before things, and prove it by legislation and not just lip service.

Mr. Speaker, I will take pleasure in voting against the amendment and for the original motion.

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

**Mr. H.H.P. Baker (Regina South East):** — Mr. Speaker, in rising for the first time in this House to speak, I rise, as one of the paragons of virtue referred earlier to participate in this Budget debate for a few moments. It appears as though I won't have much more time than to make a few salutary remarks, however I do say, Mr. Speaker, it is a real pleasure to be back here once again. May I express

congratulations to you on obtaining your position once more. As others do, I appreciate your firmness and fairness. You have been relieved of a somewhat lighter load ever since the former Member from the Hanley constituency (Mr. Walker) has not come back. We miss him too. I want to welcome all the newly elected Members to our city and congratulate them on their election. I congratulate those who have been put into the Cabinet – I don't know how the choices were made. I understand the Premier was in quite a quandary in making selections. How he picked the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Estey), I don't know but I am sure he must have pulled his name out of a hat. I am sure that the Member for Regina South West (Mr. McPherson) could have filled that position quite ably. I compare the Minister of Municipal Affairs to the American woman living in Los Angeles who wanted to visit this country. She walked into a travel bureau there and asked for a map of downtown Canada. This is about as much as he knows about municipal affairs and housing in this community and in this province.

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

**Mr. Baker:** — Best wishes to the Member for the Pelly constituency, Mr. Barrie, who is ill. I too wish him well and a speedy recovery. To those who have regained their seats, this must be recognized as an accomplishment in their career, of course, depending on which side of the House they sit. I thank the people in the Regina South East constituency for their unwavering supporting for me. I hope I can again promote their interests, the interests of our fine city and the interests of the Province of Saskatchewan . . .

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

**Mr. Baker:** — . . . even though they did a tremendous carving job on the boundaries of my home area. The people of that constituency were most determined to see that I was re-elected and to show the Government that they do not accept the principles of gerrymandering as set up by the Government across the way.

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

**Mr. Baker:** — But I think I should at this time, express sincerest thanks to the Premier, who on the night of the election – I see he is not here – extended some fine words of congratulations on my behalf, the unwavering confidence he has in me. He said that had anyone else but me run from this side of the House in the South East constituency, the Government would have won that seat. But in the same breath he had some unkind and sarcastic remarks for our pensioners and farmers, and also for our native people. I am sorry that he isn't here, I had a few more little comments, therefore I will leave them for later.

You know when you look at the Budget, one really does not know where to begin. It is such a confused Budget from a confused group and leaderless party. You would almost think that, as this Budget reads, we were at the peak of prosperity and full employment, by the way the Provincial Treasurer wants to make these painless extractions. When we left office in 1964, there was \$33 million left in the kitty that could have been turned into liquidating capital. When we left, there was a reserve of some \$9 million in the Medicare Hospitalization Fund to take care



**March 5, 1968**

of certain contingencies, covering perhaps some anticipated increased costs, or which should rightfully have been used to extend the health services. What a wonderful, solid, and buoyant economy we left here four years ago!

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

**Mr. Baker:** — It was so well established that all the people really got value for their dollars. This \$338 Budget is so inflated that I doubt whether we will get \$169 million worth of services. When you have an unbridled economy, all that we can expect from here on in is the promotion of poverty and backward welfare programs paying below subsistence levels. In other words, it is a financial program that can only be conducive to promoting a way of life similar to what we had in the 30s. Once again we are going back to the masters and servants concept of living.

I fail to see any real monies for urban or rural municipalities. It is bound to reflect in municipal tax rates across the Province. Yes, there is some for urban road assistance. In Regina most of our arterial streets are pretty well completed. We have tried to keep abreast with our growth. We realize there are some more to do but every time you get into a public program of this type, if it is a million dollars your community must then raise half of it. What municipal governments need more than ever are unconditional grants, unconditional grants that might pay anywhere from \$5 to \$7 per capita. This would amount to anywhere from \$700,000 to \$900,000 for a city like Regina. I expected to see the homeowner grant increased not only just before election, I thought it would be extended to include renters in the communities. As you know this was one of the planks in the platform that I had advocated some three and one-half years ago in my blueprint for progress. I'm glad you picked it up. Perhaps not everyone agrees with it, but I do and I looked for an extension in providing more monies for homeowner grants and also to include those renting living quarters. I looked for an income continuance pay plan to take care of those who may become incapacitated, a province-wide comprehensive plan. I thought the Government would also embark upon a comprehensive group life insurance plan covering anyone 18 years of age and over to the extent of \$5,000.

This Budget, Mr. Speaker, is taking everything and giving nothing in return, and is actually reducing services to the people. Yes, the CCF left a buoyant economy for the people of Saskatchewan in 1964. It gave security of tenure, it gave valuable service and paid for services rendered. I was quite interested in the remarks of the Minister of Mineral Resources (Mr. Cameron) yesterday, whom I think we could probably rename Mr. Bleeding Heart Cameron. I notice too that he has now assumed the new portfolio that was part of the Premier's, as Minister of Announcements. He has now taken over the auditorium problems that the Premier has had over the past three or four years. You know the auditorium story is a cut story to tell. It has a long history and reflects on many across the way as to what took place. The auditorium is now being constructed in the way it should have been done in the first place. We got the go-ahead sign from the Prime Minister of Canada, Mr. Diefenbaker and his Government, as mayors of Canada were informed that every capital city in Canada was to get \$2½ million. What happened to the grant that was to be given to Regina? It was divided. We don't mind subsidizing the city of Saskatoon, but we don't

like to do it at the expense of the Regina taxpayers. This is where the Centennial project should have been built. I'm glad to see my friend the Premier is here. As he knows, discussion on this went on and on. The people of Regina voted down one bylaw not to put any more into it. We had invested \$1 million which was approved by the burgesses and we hoped to collect another half million. Had we received the money that was promised by the Government, of \$2 million three and a half or four years ago, the project would have been built at a cost of \$4½ to \$5 million and we could have saved the taxpayers of Saskatchewan something like \$3 to \$2½ million.

Last January, you will recall, Mr. Speaker, I visited the Premier to discuss the matter of the auditorium. We had a fine chat and I suggested then that he make a loan of \$750,000 to the auditorium foundation to complete the project plus the \$1 million extra that he had got from Ottawa. He thought it was a good plan. It lingered on all during the session until about March. You will then remember the headlines, "The Mayor and the Premier Lock Horns on the Auditorium Once More." Two or three weeks later he made another announcement, an announcement that he was going to build the auditorium, of course, thinking that he would call the election in June. The reason why he made that announcement was for the express purpose to get Baker, and nothing else. Baker is still here and Baker has got the auditorium. I hope it's going to be built anyway. This was the tactic used. If the Government doesn't get it underway pretty soon the Premier will certain be calling for a ribbon-cutting ceremony on the eve of the next election. I see it is getting close to 5:30. I am told that if I went one minute over I wouldn't be able to speak tomorrow and would have to come back tonight. So, Mr. Speaker, I request that you allow me to adjourn the debate.

Debate adjourned.

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