

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN
First Session — 16th Legislature
15th Day

Wednesday, March 6, 1968.

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

WELCOME TO STUDENTS

Mr. D.A. McPherson (Regina South West): — Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to introduce to you and to the Members of this Assembly the students from St. Pius school. We have two classes here, Mr. Speaker, one from grade seven and one from grade eight. They are up in the west gallery here and they are here with their three teachers, Mr. D. Oer, Mr. Kraft, and Mr. Thompson. I would like to welcome them here, Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Assembly and hope this day is both educational and enjoyable.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. W.S. Lloyd (Leader of the Opposition): — It is with pleasure I recognize the presence of visitors today in a group of 18 students from the Delisle school. They are in the Speaker's gallery accompanied by their teacher, Mr. Chalad. I am sure that all Members of the Assembly join with me and through you, Mr. Speaker, to not only welcome them but express the hope that their stay in the Chamber and their visit to our capital city have lived up to all expectations.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. R. Heggie (Hanley): — I would like to take this opportunity to introduce to you and to the House, the members of two grade seven classes from the Clavet composite school, 17 miles southeast of Saskatoon. The Clavet composite school was built in 1962. It has grades one to 12 and an enrolment of 600 pupils. Now this is a large enrolment and a wide variety of grades considering that this institution is actually out in the country, situated on Highway No. 14, 17 miles southeast of the city of Saskatoon. It is the largest building in the surrounding area for many miles and a bus system brings the students to the school from a radius of 20 miles in each direction. The teachers accompanying the pupils are Mr. Derald and Mr. Bernholen. There are 27 teachers in all in the Clavet composite school. It is considered the best equipped school in the Saskatoon East school unit. It can boast of a home economics lab, a gymnasium and a shop mechanic lab in addition. I want to take this opportunity, Mr. Speaker, to welcome the teachers with their classes of grade

seven students. I hope that they will stay and see the House in session this afternoon as time permits, and that their stay in the capital city of Regina is a pleasant one. I hope that they will all go away with nice memories of their visit to Saskatchewan's capital city.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. E. Whelan (Regina North West): — Mr. Speaker, I would like to introduce to all Members of the House 32 grade seven and eight students from northwest Regina. They are located in the east gallery and are from St. Philip school. Their principal, Mr. Ernest Nadan and some of their parents are with them. Their visit I understand is part of their social studies course. Members join me, I am sure, in welcoming these young people and in expressing the wish that their stay will be pleasant, informative and educational.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. P. Schmeiser (Watrous): — Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to introduce to you and through you a group of grade 11 students from Viscount high school. They are seated in the west gallery with their teacher, Mr. Foster, also one of their drivers, Mr. Reiber. We hope that their visit to Regina this afternoon is both informative and educational and we wish them all a safe journey back to Viscount.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. C.L.B. Estey (Saskatoon Nutana Centre): — Mr. Speaker, I would like to introduce to you and to Members of this House, a group of students from Haultain public school in the city of Saskatoon who are here today with their teacher, Mrs. Morris, and are sitting in the Speaker's gallery. I am sure that all Members join with me in thanking Mrs. Morris for giving these students an opportunity to be with us today, and we hope that their stay with us is educational.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

QUESTIONS

RETURN CHARGES APPLICABLE TO CANCER PATIENTS DETERRENT CHARGE APPLICABLE TO BOTH MOTHER AND INFANT DETERRENT FEES FOR TREATY INDIANS

Mr. G.T. Snyder (Moose Jaw North): — Before the Orders of the Day are proceeded with I would like to direct a question or perhaps three questions to the Minister of Health (Mr. Grant), which I think is a matter of some urgency and some great interest. I would like to ask the Minister if return charges will be applicable to cancer patients;

March 6, 1968

secondly, in maternity cases will deterrent charges apply to both mother and newborn infant; thirdly, what arrangements have been made with the Department of Indian Affairs so that deterrent charges will be paid for Treaty Indians.

Hon. G.B. Grant (Minister of Health): — Mr. Speaker, these questions all involve Government policy and they will be disclosed in due course.

TAX ON PETROLEUM PRODUCTS

Mr. F. Meakes (Touchwood): — Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask a question of the Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Steuart). Will the 2 cents a gallon tax on petroleum products that was announced in the Budget be only on petroleum products or will it also be on motor oil, on oil as well as fuel?

Mr. Steuart: — It will be on all petroleum products except those used in heating. This will all come out when we bring the Bill in, when the Bill is introduced. I will explain all this when we get into Committee and the regulations and so on.

Mr. Lloyd: — This will apply then to oils and to grease as well?

Mr. Steuart: — No, fuel products. This will all come out when the Bill comes in.

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).

Mr. H.H.P. Baker (Regina South East): — Mr. Speaker, I rise to take part in the Budget Debate. First of all I express my congratulations to you as Speaker on attaining your position once again. My best wishes go to my colleagues elected on this side and to all others, but my particular congratulations go to all Members here for the first time.

Before I get on the air in two or three minutes, I, too, would like to welcome the students who have come to this session today and particularly the students that have come from other parts of the province and from our good city of Saskatoon. We look forward to them visiting the many sights in our community. The capital centre has many to show to our tourists, as well to

our people living in this province. The Museum of Natural History is one of the finest of its kind on this continent, which has on display some 500 exhibits. We hope that they will also visit the RCMP Barracks, being the actual home of the Mounties. For their information Regina has been known as Pile of Bones. This became part of our history because we were known as the centre where the buffalo were slaughtered. They were slaughtered here in the thousands by the native and white population, thus the name Pile of Bones, which was known as Wascana by the Indian population and to us today as Wascana. It is aptly named and in line with this past history, we celebrate Buffalo Days. We have a few buffalo hunters in the clan in this city and as Chief Buffalo Hunter No. 1, I haven't as yet made the Premier, Chief Buffalo Hunter No. 2.

Mr. I.H. MacDougall (Souris-Estevan): — That's typical.

Mr. Baker: — I'll put the Member from Estevan at the bottom of the heap. He would be hard to take around and hunt so we'll put him at the bottom of the heap. Yes, we have a unique history, we were named after Queen Victoria, the famous queen who reigned for many years, and during her period no wars were encountered. Princess Louise named this city after Queen Victoria, Regina being the Latin word for Queen. We have a unique history, some like to call it a Victorian history, but we appreciate the fact that we re part of this great heritage. We are the capital of Saskatchewan and we were the first capital of the North West Territories. Last spring we had the privilege of greeting representatives from the second and new capital of the Territories here. We gave them a tremendous reception in our Centennial Year. They will be inviting us, and perhaps this Legislature, to one of their main events in 1970. I have been told that some of us would be taking part in officially inaugurating their city as the new capital of the North West Territories.

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate you allowing me to cover a bit of our history. I did it chiefly for the benefit of the students and for the edification of some of the Member across the way. Seeing I am to go on the air shortly, I will be able to expound some of the things that I have in mind with regard to this Budget. I want to wish the Minister of Natural Resources (Mr. Barrie) who is in the hospital a speedy recovery and to express to Mr. Barrie my personal best wishes for good health. I had been with him a week before this happened at a meeting, and I didn't expect that he would be taken to hospital with this condition. However, I hope that he will be well very shortly.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Baker: — At this time, Mr. Speaker, as I rise to take part in this Budget debate, I want to express my congratulations as I have already done to you on attaining your position, and also in welcoming new members. I want to express a warm welcome to our radio audience who take time out, and take an interest in

March 6, 1968

following these proceedings. Before commenting on the Budget, may I as Mayor of Regina bid you all welcome and invite you to enjoy the many pleasures that our fine city has to offer. I express appreciation to the people living in Regina South East, who did so much in my re-election to this Legislature for the second time. I say thank you for your strong support and dedication to the principles expounded by our democratic party. I hope that I can once again serve you and the people of Saskatchewan well.

Having listened to the Budget address, I am moved not only to criticize, but to censure the Government of this Province. Since Premier Thatcher and his followers took office in 1964, my ears have been assailed with ceaseless and blatant propaganda about the dramatic improvement in the economy of our province. We have heard that more and more money is being invested in the province and vast numbers of jobs are being created to diversify the economy and increase the prosperity of our people. The Premier — I'm sorry he is not in — with the aid of his inexpensive aeroplane, has continually stated he was bringing scores of new industries into the province. Nothing is said of the financial incentives, resource give-aways, and tax abatements which were offered to those interested, many of whom had already decided to locate in the province due to the efforts of the CCF, which, I might add, did not include incentives of this nature. I am wondering now whether my ears have been deceiving me these past few years, particularly these past few days. During the past fall and winter, after the election, we heard nothing but austerity, tight money, high interest rate, restraint on spending. In other words, we were told the Province was broke. And looking at this Budget, it appears to be true. Obviously the facts are now appearing and while the Premier's horn is as brassy as ever, we are at last able to hear the other instruments in the band. It is quite apparent they are not even playing the same tune. Of course, it is quite difficult for the band to sing at all without their leader present to wave the baton, and perhaps an admonishing finger at those who dare give the odd solo performance. Certainly his Ministers have had to be careful in their choice of music lately. Good honest music is hardly their forte. Anyway, anyone with a basic knowledge of music can readily detect the swing from the lilting melodies which accompanied the solo promises of unceasing progress to the discordant strains of the austerity dirge we heard so much about. It pains my ears, I imagine that the Premier must find it necessary to wear ear plugs all the time now, or perhaps more vigorous baton-waving provides the emotional release he needs. However, his baton-waving provides the emotional release he needs. However, his baton-waving has now come suddenly to an end since the purse strings have been passed on to this heir-apparent. I am told that the Premier planned to retain the Treasurer's portfolio, but after a crisis that took place between him and the Minister of Health (Mr. Grant) while discussing preliminary estimates, his career as Provincial Treasurer came to an abrupt end. He has played his last post.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Baker: — How strong the words were between the Premier and Minister of Health which caused the Premier to leave remains a military secret. But the occasion did cause the Cabinet to take immediate action, relieving the Premier of this portfolio. However, I am pleased he kept Industry because I hope he will get more done than the former Minister did. Now that the Deputy Premier has the purse strings, and with the addition of two or three new supporters in the ranks, Davey now has the tools to finish the job to remove the Premier, and with this Budget the Government will finish off the people of Saskatchewan as well. Mr. Steuart now has such control over the Premier that he has become the captain of his heart, and the master of his soul. It is now obvious that the Premier will not lead his party again in another election.

Yes, it is a Budget to get Thatcher. Already the accusations are being made that had proper budgeting been carried out these past 3 1/2 years, we would not be in our present predicament. The 1 per cent increase in the sales tax to 5 per cent again, was actually the source from which any government could have resolved most of the budgeting problems, had it been left alone four years ago. The loss in revenue over that period meant well over \$50 million. Had this plan been followed, as I suggest, it would not be necessary to tax the people of this Province to death. But we could and should be talking prosperity in view of the tremendous wealth this Province is able to produce.

Entering this debate, I must say I was as astounded and bewildered as anyone in this city and province, on Friday last. In budgets where increased services are required, modest increases can then be the order of the day. But to tap practically every major source of revenue possibilities under the jurisdiction of the Province, certainly is the beginning of the end. And more than ever this Government should realize it has now manufactured the beginning of a recession and finally a depression. I understand there was a tremendous sale of dark-colored glasses on Saturday to the Government Members, to cover up their identity. This is certainly a switch from the rose-colored glasses the Government Members wore last year during the election.

I looked in vain throughout this Budget for some tax relief to municipalities for cities, towns, village and rural areas. I looked for some re-alignment of tax revenues that could have been passed on to local governments. I first hoped that the Government would give Regina and other centres and municipalities an unconditional grant of \$7 per person. Then I expected at least \$5 per capita, which would have given Regina \$700,000. A city like Moose Jaw would have received \$175,000, Saskatoon \$600,000, and a city the size of Melville some \$25,000. The total cost to the Province would have been less than \$5 million and would apply to every town, city, village and rural municipality. But this didn't happen. I looked for a share of the gasoline tax for Regina of which we contribute millions of

March 6, 1968

dollars to the Province each year. But no results. The municipalities, whether urban or rural, have been practically and completely forgotten.

Mr. Speaker, we have reached a saturation point on property taxes because of high education costs. For the past nine years Regina's municipal mill rate has only gone up four and one-half mills, for which I am very proud, but the education board mill rate has gone up 19½ mills and will probably go up three and a half mills more this year, over which those of us in council have no control. The Government claims it is paying 50 per cent of the education costs in Saskatchewan. In Regina, it only pays around 28 per cent. If the Government paid Regina its rightful share of 50 per cent of education costs, our mill rate could be cut by more than 15 mills. When you have tax increases, it is not only expected that present services be continued, but that they would be extended. In this Budget services are being reduced, and cities, towns and rural municipalities are asked to carry the load.

If we believe in the principle of costs being divided two ways, that is, such as services to people and services to property, the following divisions could be made. Services to people should be covered by the Provincial and Federal Governments, then it would be their responsibility to take care of all the health, welfare and education needs of our people. Services to property should cover costs for water, sewers, sidewalks, fire protection, refuse pick-up and other related services, and should be handled by the cities on property tax. This is the premise upon which senior governments must plan budgets in order to give a proper re-alignment on tax revenues.

Ever since October 11th, election day, we have heard nothing but austerity. According to the many tax increases in this Budget, you would almost think we had peak prosperity. This Budget will gradually erode the basic fabric of our economy, creating a higher cost of living, a continuation of inflationary trends, less take-home pay and the eventual destruction of the CCF's progressive, humane and people's programs, programs of security, health and welfare. It will also create a real hardship on our publicly owned utilities, such as the Power Corporation, Government Insurance and Telephones. And no doubt in future years we can look forward to the sale of these enterprises.

When the CCF came into power in 1944 and were in office until 1964, this Province was known as a leader in Canada in many fields of legislation. Had it not been for Saskatchewan, hospitalization and medicare would have never been realized. Now it has become a reality for all of our Canadian people. This Government in its plan to place deterrent fees and utilization fees on patients is paving the way for the destruction of medicare in Saskatchewan. I honestly looked for increased services in our health program, not cut-backs and added costs to each person. I looked forward to the implementation of a free

drug plan for our people, particularly for all our senior citizens and our children. I looked for a dental care plan covering dental costs for our youths under 16 years of age. Where is the money in the Budget to cover the costs of chiropractic services without charge to the patients? A resolution for this was passed unanimously by the Legislative Assembly four years ago, and yet no monies have been allotted for the thousands who take treatments from chiropractors, a medical requirement so important to our people. I am so strong in my support of chiropractic services being provided under medicare, because I know personally what these people did for me 20 years ago. This Government is receiving over \$10 million from Ottawa from medicare. Surely this could have been included in the Budget for extending health services to our Saskatchewan people . . .

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Baker: — . . . without deterrent fees and fees for doctors' visits.

In the last session I prodded this Government to press Ottawa to see that the old age pension of \$105 per month be paid to all our pensioners without a means test. This should have been given top priority in dealings with Ottawa. It is quite conceivable and workable to have this right included under our Canada Pension Plan. Your colleagues control affairs in Ottawa. Why isn't the influence of this Government used at these Federal-Provincial Conferences to see that all pensioners get the \$105 per month without a means test? If this wasn't possible, then we should have gone for it alone, on a cost-sharing basis and have it included in this Budget. Last year I also called for an increase of \$30 per month under the Public Assistance Plan for Mothers' Allowances and for those on social aid. Does this Budget provide this? The answer is no. With these tremendous increases in taxes, one would have expected that you might have thought of the needs of others. Let's hope we are not heading back to the dark days of repossession of our homes in cities, towns and our farms as well, when people were unable to meet payments on their properties through excessive costs.

How is the Health Department going to collect deterrent fees for long-stay hospital patients? Are caveats and liens going to be put against people's homes and farms if they are unable to pay? Is this vicious spectre of fear, insecurity and economic chaos in this country facing us again as it did in the 30s? I can agree in part with the Provincial Treasurer when he blames the Federal Government for some of the conditions existing today. But should we in Saskatchewan compound their errors?

What is the Government of the day doing for our primary industry, agriculture, in Saskatchewan, in this Budget? The future of our Province basically will always lie in agriculture, covering wheat-growing, cattle-raising, sheep-raising, hog-raising, poultry and dairying. What is the Budget doing to preserve the family farm? With cost skyrocketing on farm machinery, with farmers being paid lower prices for wheat and for many of

March 6, 1968

the other products our farmers produce, there must be some semblance of parity. The family farm must be preserved at all costs. The 13 per cent of our people engaged in agriculture across Canada get only 8 to 9 per cent of the national income. To those engaged in agriculture in Canada, the income should be at least 13 to 14 per cent of the income across this country. Think what it would mean for this Budget and our Provincial economy if that were the case. The policy I have advocated for the past three sessions of a two-price system for wheat would have brought in more money for the farmers in Saskatchewan during 1967 as well as to our Provincial Treasury. This would certainly have been true because of our lower wheat quotas. As you know, I advocated that for the first 2,000 bushels sold, \$2.75 be paid to farmers for No. 1 Northern wheat, over and above the freight charges. This should now probably be raised to \$2.95 per bushel in view of the increased cost over the past three years of the things the farmer has to buy in order to produce this grain. Grain over the 2,000 bushels could be sold at the prevailing market price. I noticed where the Canadian Federation of Agriculture advocated a two-price system for wheat to the Federal Government, giving to the farmers \$2.12 per bushel for wheat exported and \$3.12 per bushel for domestic consumption. Members of the Legislature, agriculture must at all costs be kept strong, even if we have to subsidize the farmers. Fear is expressed in many quarters that rising costs throughout the economy will soon price many Canadian goods out of export markets. But while the cost spiral twists upward, the price of wheat drops. The grain producer becomes the victim of the squeeze, generated by forces over which he has no control. The International Wheat Agreement which has helped to stimulate world trade, and has given price stability to wheat, a major food commodity, has temporarily lapsed after 18 years. Reduced world demand, lower prices and higher costs put the present wheat situation at the top of the list demanding immediate attention. Already lower wheat prices have contributed to the loss of revenues in this Province. I would urge this Legislature, Mr. Speaker, in the strongest terms to be resolute and firm in our deliberations to support the farmers in Saskatchewan to the hilt, if we want the economies in our cities and towns to survive.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Baker: — I would again urge this Government to set up an agricultural loan fund to purchase farm lands for resale to young men wanting to take up farming, loans to be given free of interest for a five-year period to enable young farmers to acquire the land and the machinery they need to cultivate it. This could be one method of preserving the family farm. Adlai Stevenson once said, "Farming is more than an essential industry, it is a way of life that must be preserved and encouraged in much of the free world." In much of the free world land reform and tenure by the many instead of the few is the major goal. Let us not go into the opposite direction and plough under the family farm. This Government should enact legislation so that a 2 per cent royalty be paid to all farmers who own the surface

rights of their farms wherever oil or minerals are discovered and produced. This is to apply to those who do not own their mineral rights. Where is the \$400 rebate to the farmers, in this Budget, who installed electricity on their farms and were promised this rebate by the present Government four years ago? Yes, industry is also a major part of our wealth and strength, but wheat, cattle, hogs, sheep, poultry and dairy products are the bread of life, no matter how you look at it. It is necessary that proper floor prices be set for all farm products so that the farmer will get his proper share of the national income. Many of the necessities of life for education, health, welfare, and other services, could be taken care of without these excessive taxes we are faced with in the 1968 Budget, if proper prices were sought for the farmer and for the things they produce.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Baker: — I am pleased to see that the Budget still permits the continuation of the eight smaller hospitals slated to be closed, or at least I hope so. The effects of that original policy would have had drastic results on the fiscal problems of those communities. Payrolls now in existence would have disappeared. The climate would have been ruined. It would mean the ultimate decay of those communities. Men and women who worked and served in these institutions dedicated themselves to the human needs of their patients. They gave the best years of their lives in public service and have a right to be retained in some form of employment because of the services rendered. The only result that could have come out of these inhuman policies for them was the relief roll. In this day and age of bed shortages, surely it would be an insane policy to close up these facilities. I hope that this Government would shelve all thoughts of hospital closures. Even if further bed facilities are provided through a third base hospital, there will still be a dire need for these hospitals, if only to provide convalescent care.

The meagre grants allotted for schools explains the reason why the Government wants the Teachers' Salary Act passed. It explains why it wants to freeze salaries. It shows why it is seeking restricting legislation between teachers and trustees for basic minimum and maximum salaries. But I say in the long run it will result in added costs to our Provincial economy. It will mean a mass movement of our teachers to other provinces. Problems of staffing our schools are difficult enough at the present time. It costs thousands of dollars to educate our teachers in training. We must be competitive in salaries with other provinces if we are to keep our teachers here. The best interests of our children will surely be hindered with any legislation that infringes upon the actual negotiations of bargaining agreements. Collective bargaining is a right by statute in this province. Let's not destroy the image of the important teaching profession. It took years to bring it back from the teaching days during the depression. Let's not discourage it again.

March 6, 1968

Where in the Budget are funds for the extension of higher education in nine of our cities who haven't university opportunities. Last year I called for a second year arts program for all cities outside of Regina and Saskatoon. In the long run, this would cut overall university costs, not only to the Province, but to the parents and their sons and daughters living in and around these communities. May of our towns should be looked at so that they could take one year beyond grade 12 too.

In regard to university autonomy and looking at the university estimates and having to put up with weeks and weeks of crossfire as to the infringement of academic freedom and costs of our universities, I find it appropriate to make some comment, too. It was most obvious that the Government fully intended to take over complete control through the Department of Education. But thanks to our democratic form of government, where those of us in the Opposition can speak out, this has no doubt helped to stop the Government from its dictatorial stand to control the minds of our students. All this haranguing over the months did do irreparable damage, and impaired the progress of our institutions for higher learning. Listening to all this, Mr. Speaker, I have come to the conclusion that the only way a proper budget accounting of all actions can take place is by granting autonomy, full autonomy to the campuses in Regina and Saskatoon, by setting up two separate entities with two separate Boards of Governors. This is the answer to the ills that exist and the root of many of the problems particularly on the Regina campus. This would keep academic and financial control in the hands of the two boards, where comparison costs could be made more effectively in current operations. By doing this, the integrity of each University is maintained. The status of our faculty members could be recognized in proper perspective. I don't intend to let this recommendation stand until full autonomy is recognized for the Regina campus as well as for Saskatoon.

Looking through the Budget, I draw your attention to a promise made by my good friend, the Premier, in 1966 for a housing complex at the University. Has the Government conveniently forgotten this promise? The students at the University and the citizens of Regina just don't forget that easily. On December 4, 1966, the Premier announced with great fanfare that it would provide \$700,000 in the 1967-68 fiscal year to begin a \$2 million housing complex at the Regina campus. I suppose we can expect it as an announcement for the next election.

Well, Mr. Speaker, in conclusion, may I refer back to the days before the CCF got into power. How we were accused of being a Godless party! Yet, during our term of 20 years in office, in every community, churches expanded. Greater numbers came back to the church, came back to the faith of their choice. During those years our Christian people and other church bodies proclaimed their belief in God and His great universe. The CCF during its 20 years in office practised Christian precepts in its legislation for the betterment of the health and welfare of all the people in Saskatchewan. Under the present Government and with this new Budget, all humane legislation is being eroded.

Mr. Speaker, I will vote against the main motion.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. A. Mitchell (Bengough): — Mr. Speaker, as I rise to speak in this debate, may I also add my congratulations to you on your re-election to your responsible office. I also at this time congratulate and welcome the new Members of the Legislature on both sides of the House as well as our three new Cabinet appointments. I am sure they will all make a conscientious contribution to the Legislature of our Province.

I also join the previous speakers in wishing the Hon. Minister of Natural Resources (Mr. Barrie) a speedy recovery and an early return to this Assembly.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to take a moment to thank our supporters in Bengough constituency for the confidence which they have placed in me on my re-election to this Legislature. I will put forth every effort to justify this trust and will work for all constituents regardless of political affiliations.

Mr. Speaker, we had attention drawn to our constituency of Bengough last fall, when Mr. and Mrs. Orin Travland and family of Coronach were honored by being chosen the Southern Saskatchewan Mast Farm Family Award Winners.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Mitchell: — This presentation, Mr. Speaker, was made by the Minister of Agriculture, the Hon. Doug McFarlane at a suitably arranged program by the Coronach community. Mr. and Mrs. Travland and family are known throughout Saskatchewan as registered seed growers. In order to enable their children to accompany them on the trip associated with this award, Mr. and Mrs. Travland left at Christmas and flew to Tokyo, Hong Kong, Australia, New Zealand, Fiji Islands and Hawaii. In Tokyo while visiting the Imperial Palace the Travland family met the Prime Minister of Japan and his wife and were honored by being photographed with them. Mr. Travland tells me this is the highlight of his trip. The Travlands took advantage of the opportunity to visit agricultural areas in Australia, New Zealand and the Fiji Islands and brought home some 600 snapshots to show the residents of their community some of the agricultural practices of the countries visited. We appreciate the honor which Mr. and Mrs. Travland and family have brought to our constituency.

I would like now, Mr. Speaker, to speak for a few minutes on some of the Government's programs as they relate to the individual. At the very heart of Liberalism lies the belief in the dignity of the individual as the ultimate in our society. The legitimate role of government must therefore be to ensure that

March 6, 1968

the individual is protected in the market place as well as from injustice. For example, Mr. Speaker, this Government has one of the finest records in the nation, in fact, in all of North America, in the field of consumer protection. This was recently pointed out by the Saskatchewan Conference of the United Church of Canada in their brief to the Government of January 25, 1968. They state and I quote:

We have been well impressed by the enactment of a number of measures under the general designation of a Citizen's Protection Code.

We are aware that legislation has been passed providing for legal aid in criminal matters, in co-operation with the Law Society of Saskatchewan. We also believe that this measure will contribute to the fair and impartial administration of justice and that it should help to allay the common feeling that there is one law for the rich and another for the poor. In this connection we note that the United Church Board of Evangelism and Social Service at its 1967 annual meeting commended those Provincial Governments that have enacted Legal Aid Programs and urged other Provincial Governments to do the same.

The report goes on, Mr. Speaker, and refers to compensation for victims of crimes and violence.

We approve recent legislation to provide compensation for those suffering hardship as a result of criminal acts of violence. We believe that it is right that society should alleviate hardship for those who suffer misfortune of this kind and that government should take responsibility in this way. We hope that other Provincial Governments will follow the lead given by the Saskatchewan Government.

We approve a number measures that might be classed generally under the heading "Protection in Business Transactions." We refer to the following: The Cemeteries Act, The Motor Dealers Act, the Direct Sellers Act, The Mortgage Brokers Act, The Unconscionable Transactions Relief Act, The Cost of Credit Disclosure Act, and The Securities Act. In our opinion this type of protection against fraud, dishonesty, misrepresentation and also against high pressure salesmanship is desirable, especially in view of the complexity of modern business and the development of promotional and sales techniques.

Mr. Speaker, this is a glowing report of just one of the achievements of this Government in its efforts on behalf of the individual. We hear a great deal about what the Socialists would do for the little man from our friends opposite. They try to portray themselves as the defenders of the rights of the little man. The Socialists are very good at talking about what they would do for the little man, when they are not in a position to

do anything for him. Why didn't they do more for him during their 20 years in office?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Mitchell: — In just four years, Mr. Speaker, the Liberal Government of Saskatchewan has done more for the common ordinary citizen than the Socialists did in 20.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Mitchell: — I would like now to direct my comments to another area where the Government of Saskatchewan is giving assistance to the little man. I can think of no better way to help all the young people in our province than to provide them with the opportunity of a first class education. I was delighted to hear of the Provincial Treasurer's remarks regarding the Government of Saskatchewan continuing to give education number one priority. Although I realize that much of the financing of education at the elementary and high school levels is the responsibility of the local governments, nevertheless, I believe this Provincial Government can take a great deal of pride for the large measure of assistance it has extended through the program of grants to school boards. I note that the \$2.7 million increase in operating grants will cover almost 50 per cent of the total projected operating cost of our schools for the forthcoming year. Since taking office, this Government has also done a great deal to bring about facilities for technical and vocational training, to equip our young people to enter the work-force. The establishment of special trade and vocational training courses during the winter months by this Government deserves special attention. I believe that this is the kind of program which is well accepted by the participants and of great value to all people of Saskatchewan. The fact that enrolment in our technical and vocational training institutes has increased from 2,700 students to over 4,800 students is an indication of the public acceptance of this program. When I see figures like this, I wonder why the NDP even try to pass themselves off as protectors of the little man. When we compare the \$6.8 million we are spending for technical and trade training this year to the pittance they spent in this vital field, one begins to wonder what they really did do during their 20 years in office.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Mitchell: — The Government program to provide free text books to the high school students and the provision of student loans to about one-half of the students enrolled at our University is another way in which the Government of Saskatchewan has helped many of our young people to further their education. I think it is fair to say that today anyone who wants to acquire a University education is free to do so through Government grants

March 6, 1968

of one form or another. The NDP believes in free university education. Mr. Speaker, I don't think generally speaking our young people want free university education. I believe those that enter a university feel they have a responsibility to provide for part of the costs of their education. Furthermore, I believe that 90 per cent of our young people, who never see the inside of university, would feel slighted if we did have free university education in our province. For we would be treating them as second class citizens by not giving them the same special help that university students received. I don't see why Government policy should make university graduates first class citizens, and farmers, mechanics, plumbers, and small businessmen, second class citizens. I am against any Government policy which tends to discriminate one group against another.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Mitchell: — In this case, I'd say it is a very large group because as I say, 90 per cent of our young people never go to university. Perhaps the greatest way that this Government has helped the little people of Saskatchewan is by creating jobs in the hundreds of new industries and mines that are opening up in Saskatchewan today. There is virtually full employment in Saskatchewan today and, as I indicated a minute ago, Mr. Speaker, these people who are unemployed are generally those who are partially disabled or those who lack the required training. It is a fact that a shortage of skilled manpower persists in this province. The program to which I referred to a minute ago is one method by which the Government is providing basic training, skill development to upgrade the labor force. This program also helps to retrain employed workers who become displaced as a result of the technological change. I understand that the first two years of the program were very successful with more than 1,000 people taking part during 1967. Furthermore, what better way could the Government of Saskatchewan help the little man than by an increase in the minimum wage? Since taking office, the minimum wage in Saskatchewan was increased by this Liberal Government in 1965 and again in 1966, for a general increase of almost 10 per cent in the past three years. These measures and many others have been introduced to help Saskatchewan's workers share in the growing prosperity of our Province. Mr. Speaker, in these and a hundred of other ways the Saskatchewan Liberal Government is working to assist the little man of Saskatchewan.

Mr. Speaker, I would now like to turn to some of the other programs of this Government to help the little man. I was pleased to hear the Provincial Treasurer say that the number of people on welfare rolls had declined. I was also delighted to hear that the people who really needed help would be getting more help from the Government through increased allowance for the blind, more assistance for widows, orphans and others in need, as well as an expansion of the adoption programs and a provision of more nursing and special care homes. These steps to help the little man are most worthy and I want to commend the Government for them. Another program for the little man which deserves

mention is the provision of housing for the aged. I know that in my constituency we have received nursing homes in the towns of Bengough and Assiniboia. Also the community of Coronach has recently completed the construction of a Senior Citizens' Home. And, Mr. Speaker, this last mentioned construction of the Senior Citizens' Home in the town of Coronach was carried out by a little town of 440 people and the surrounding communities with a 20 per cent grant from the Provincial Government.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Mitchell: — These programs have both proved very popular and they exhibit just once more that this Government tries to help those people who cannot help themselves.

Closely related to this program is the Provincial Government's program to provide housing for our citizens. This, Mr. Speaker, is still another way this Government has helped the little man. I'm informed that during 20 years of Socialist Government not one piece of housing legislation was passed. Oh yes, Mr. Speaker, the Socialists had their planner studying the housing problem, but that's all they did — study it. Now the Members opposite are saying that the Government should do more for housing. Well, Mr. Speaker, had they done anything during their 20 years of office, the housing shortage with which we are now confronted would not have happened. You just don't create housing overnight and I think this Government has done a great deal to alleviate the housing crisis. Mr. Speaker, these and many other items of legislation introduced by the present Liberal Government are for the benefit and welfare of the citizens of our province.

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

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. H.E. Coupland (Meadow Lake): — Mr. Speaker, on rising to take part in this Budget debate, I would first like to compliment you on your re-election to your high office. I want to congratulate the Members on both sides of the Chamber. I would also wish to add my comments to some of the other Members in regard to our Minister of Natural Resources (Mr. Barrie). We hope he has a speedy recovery and will soon be back in the House.

Mr. Speaker, I would also like to thank the people of the Meadow Lake constituency for placing their confidence in me for another term of office. Mr. Speaker, I am the first one to represent that constituency in two consecutive terms since 1938. I think it is quite a feat and I thank the people for the honor. I can assure them, Mr. Speaker, that I will do my best to deserve that honor. Mr. Speaker, in representing the Meadow Lake constituency, one cannot help but do a little bragging.

March 6, 1968

We hear a lot about the need for farmers to diversify. Well, Mr. Speaker, I can say that the farmers in my area are setting the example. The Meadow Lake constituency produces more farm produce of all kinds than any other area in Saskatchewan or in Western Canada for that matter, and it's expanding every year. There are approximately 16,000 acres brought into cultivation every year and the future looks bright for the continuation of this expansion. More people are going into cattle, hogs and even sheep. Agriculture is the mainstay of the area and I compliment the Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Steuart) in bringing in one of the largest agriculture budgets in the Province's history. It shows, Mr. Speaker, that this Government is most anxious to do all it can for agriculture.

Mr. Speaker, we have a tremendous potential for expanding in agriculture in our area. When one drives up north to Ile a la Crosse, Buffalo Narrows and even to La Loche, a distance of some 240 miles, one goes through miles and miles of potential ranch area. I can see where in the future there could be thousands of heads of cattle raised in the area without it interfering with the land that could or would grow merchantable timber. The same holds true right across the north from the Alberta border. But in order to develop these areas there would have to be considerable help from both the Federal and Provincial Governments. Mr. Speaker, in view of the number of people that live in these northern areas, people who have been dependent on fishing and trapping, which sources of income are rapidly being depleted, I feel that this would be one way of encouraging these people to go into ranching and getting on a paying basis for themselves.

Mr. Speaker, the upgrading program in our area is very good. It is a thing that is good for the area and I hope that it can be expanded. It is a real alternative to welfare and even if only a few carry on, it is progress. But, Mr. Speaker, in order to make the best possible use of upgrading in that area, we are going to eventually have to have some type of residential school in Meadow Lake, which could be sort of a stepping stone to getting these people into the main stream and able to take their place in the industrial expansion of the province. Mr. Speaker, there is no area that needs such a school more than the Meadow Lake area, as we have a large population north of Meadow Lake that could and would benefit from such a school, a school where they could learn anything from hairdressing to heavy equipment operation. It is not so far from home that we could encourage a large percentage of them to make use of it.

Mr. Speaker, just to show that the people in the north are interested in working, I would like to point out that not too long ago, a group of over 50 men in the Ile a la Crosse district had meetings trying to see if they could cut pulpwood for the Prince Albert pulp mill. However, Mr. Speaker, Ile a la Crosse being so far from Prince Albert the freight rate is prohibitive. But, Mr. Speaker, I think that a policy of subsidization might

be implemented for these people from Ile a la Crosse, Beauval, Cole Bay, Canoe Narrows, and a lot of other areas in that part of the north, could benefit from such a project. There is lots of timber in that area and some of these people are some of the best bush operators we have in the province. I am sure that they would far sooner earn their own living cutting pulp than drawing welfare.

Mr. Speaker, getting back to a bit of the upgrading, we have two classes in Green Lake and I understand that 16 out of 17 in the junior upgrading class will be graduating on Friday. This is a wonderful accomplishment. What we do have trouble with, though, Mr. Speaker, is the so-called do-gooders, who come into the area when they don't know anything about the local problem and make statements to the press and the radio, which do more harm to our programs than good. I think in most cases they are just trying to get cheap publicity at the expense of the people in the areas. Mr. Speaker, I was amazed yesterday, when I heard the Member from The Battlefords (Mr. Kramer) complain about all the highway and bridge construction in the Battleford area.

Mr. Kramer: — It's still there. It hasn't fallen into the river yet.

Mr. Coupland: — I can assure you, Mr. Speaker, that the people of my area will not complain to the Minister of Highways (Mr. Boldt) over the work being done in the Meadow Lake area. Our only complaint would be that we wish that we could get more.

Mr. Kramer: — It's like Primrose . . .

Mr. Coupland: — Yes, we will get to Primrose in just a second. The Member from The Battlefords (Mr. Kramer) spoke of the road north to Vermette Lake. This road is being used by lumber operators and oil drillers. The people in that area would take a dim view of what the Member has been saying about the Primrose road, or the Vermette Lake road, as it is properly known. This is a real asset to the people in the north, even to the people in The Battlefords. Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Member from The Battlefords does not remember a day, a few years back, when a lot of good men in the Meadow Lake area took off their time and money and pushed a winter road right through to Lake Athabasca . . .

Mr. Kramer: — Why didn't you follow that road?

Mr. Coupland: — . . . to prove to the Government of the day that this was a feasible thing. They even, for two winters, hauled freight over that road. But, Mr. Speaker, what happened? The Member from The Battlefords was on the Government's side in that day. But what happened? The CCF Government of that day, in conjunction

March 6, 1968

with the Conservative Government at Ottawa, decided to go north from La Ronge. They were building a road that would cost more for one mile of road than it cost for the whole Vermette road altogether and it went nowhere. I say, Mr. Speaker, if we had had a strong voice in The Battlefords in that day, that we would have had a road to Uranium City up through Meadow Lake, which would have benefited the whole of the west side of the province and kept Uranium City business in Saskatchewan instead of forcing it out into Alberta.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Coupland: — Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the Minister of Highways (Mr. Boldt) for the highway construction that is going on in the Meadow Lake constituency. I would ask that we eventually get some oil on the No. 26 from Loon Lake to St. Walburg, on No. 55 from Green Lake to Meadow Lake, on No. 4 north to the Provincial park, and on 55 across to the Alberta border. I realize, Mr. Speaker, that this can't all be done in one year or two years. We have a big back-log to catch up after the 20 years when there was nothing done up there. But I can assure the people of Meadow Lake that I am working with the Minister of Highways to have all this put into his program in the next few years. Oiling is very essential in these northern areas, not only for the local residents but to encourage tourist industry. And I can say, Mr. Speaker, we have a lot to offer the tourist. In regard to roads, this Vermette Lake road, I think with a bit of bulldozing we are going to open or eventually hope to open a road into a settlement that has never had an access road, which is Dillon. I would like to announce that we have a winter road from Pine House to Beauval. These people have sat there for 20 and 30 years and never had an outlet of any kind. And he talks about roads in the north.

When the Provincial Treasurer brought down his Budget on Friday, I watched the Members opposite to see what their reaction would be. I thought that they would be sort of glum, but to my amazement they were bouncing in their seats with glee. I wish their constituents could have seen some of them, especially the Member from Saskatoon Mayfair (Mr. Brockelbank) waving his arms and having quite a bit of glee about it. They weren't concerned that the Treasurer had to raise some taxes. They only figured here was another way they could put politics before people.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Coupland: — Mr. Speaker, if they had been elected in October, they would have had to triple all the taxes, and I say all the taxes, in order to implement one-quarter of the promises they made. I even had a man from Buffalo Narrows tell me that they were promised a flour mill in Buffalo Narrows, if the CCF were elected. Now the closest wheat you can get to Buffalo Narrows

is 200 miles. This is the ridiculous sort of politics they were playing to try and get elected.

Mr. Speaker, I want to complement the Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Steuart) in the forthright manner in which he brought down the Budget. It never is popular to raise taxes, but we do have a responsible Government and I feel a responsible government should balance the Budget. Mr. Speaker, I thought that that group of students that I had in from Goodsoil sang a very appropriate song when they were in here, 'Freedom isn't free'. It points out that we have to accept responsibility and that nothing is free. Someone has to pay for it. Mr. Speaker, I will be very happy to support the motion. I think the amendment shows the irresponsibility on the part of the mover and seconder of the amendment and the Members opposite.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. D.T. McFarlane (Minister of Agriculture): — Mr. Speaker, in rising to take part in this Budget debate, I wish firstly to point out that I am particularly proud of the Liberal record over the past four years. I would like to congratulate our former Provincial Treasurer, the Hon. Mr. Thatcher, for balancing the Budget each of the three years he acted in that capacity. To our new Treasurer, the Hon. Dave Steuart, we give him our full commendation and he is deserving of credit as well. Mr. Steuart has had the difficult job of balancing our Budget at a time when demands for Government services are at an all-time high and costs are rising at an unprecedented rate. Mr. Steuart has acted in a responsible manner and presents a balanced Budget for the consideration of this Assembly. He has recognized the difficulties that must be faced if we are to preserve our existing health and welfare programs. How different I suggest is the attitude, of the irresponsibility of the Socialists opposite.

Let us look at the results of a Socialist Government not having faced those responsibilities in Socialist Great Britain. You know, Mr. Speaker, I just found an editorial in the local press as of July 18, 1967 and here is what it had to say:

The universal plan has been in effect in Britain for many years and the cradle-to-the-grave social security in that country is now costing the country \$21 billion a year and the cost is rising faster than the economy is growing.

The British Welfare Minister has hinted that those who needed help must be identified and another Minister has said that a user's charge for health services and for health service care, is the answer to reduce \$6 billion yearly of the service.

One of the radical Labour Members of the House has said that the universality of the welfare programs sooner or

March 6, 1968

later will have to be abandoned, because it is impossible to raise taxes high enough so that the benefits can be of any value.

And so, Mr. Speaker, this is the experience of a Socialist Labour Government in Great Britain. This is the attitude that they are having to take, which is diametrically opposed by our Socialist Members on the other side of the House.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. McFarlane: — I am further pleased, Mr. Speaker, that this Government has greatly increased the budget for our greatest industry, namely the agriculture industry. At \$13.6 million, this is almost \$4 million more than the last CCF budget, and represents the highest budget for the Department of Agriculture in Saskatchewan's history. In the 1964 election campaign, Mr. Speaker, the Liberals promised sound government on a business-like basis. The Government lived up to that promise and the people of Saskatchewan saw fit to re-elect that Government, with an increased mandate, in October of last year. I would like to thank the people of the Province who saw fit to return us to office, especially those in the Qu'Appelle-Wolseley constituency who have once again given me the honor and privilege of being their representative.

I would add my congratulations to those who have already expressed theirs to the new Members elected to this Assembly and to yourself, Sir, as Speaker of this Assembly by virtue of the overwhelming vote from your own electorate.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. McFarlane: — Mr. Speaker, our Centennial Year proved to be a unique year for agriculture, the basic industry as I said, of our Province, and incidentally the only billion dollar industry in Saskatchewan. Centennial Year was marked by many major and quite different events. Firstly, the Centennial Wheat Symposium, staged at the University of Saskatoon, by the three Wheat Pools and attracting scientists from all over the world. 2. The dedication of the Gardiner Dam — and the first flow of water in irrigation project, water flowing down the SSEWS system and the historical Qu'Appelle Valley chain of lakes. 3. The Regina International Hereford Centennial Show with 429 head of cattle being exhibited. 4. The Centennial Aberdeen Angus Show at Regina with 246 head of cattle entered and exhibited there. 5. The annual convention of the American Society of Agricultural Engineers, held for the first time in Canada on the Saskatoon campus of the University. Centennial Year was distinctive in another field, Mr. Speaker. You will recall that for many months during last spring and summer, it was feared that a crop disaster was imminent. The growing season provided almost a record of low precipitation, but the crop hung on. Finally, in spite of a

record low rainfall — certainly less rain than fell in that infamous year 1937 — the farmers of this Province produced a crop substantially above the long-term average yield of 16.2 bushels per acre.

The final estimate of wheat yield was 17.2 bushels per acre for a total of 339 million bushels. Mr. Speaker, this total has only been exceeded in seven years in our history, five of which were the years 1962-66 inclusive. There were some natural factors which helped the crop, such as cool days and nights in June and early July, but the production of this crop was a magnificent achievement by our progressive farmers of Saskatchewan.

We, in Saskatchewan, still continue to fear drought, but the accomplishment of the 1967 crop by our farmers gives a new base to optimism for our future. Good farming, the wide distribution of an excellent new variety of wheat (Manitou), and a greatly expanded usage of fertilizer, all played a part in producing this crop of which we are so justly proud. It is significant to note that the new Soils Testing Laboratory, established a year ago with a grant from the Liberal Government, serviced over 20,000 samples of soil in 1966 and over 30,000 in 1967, and amply justified our investment in it. By not providing this service, the Socialist Government was blind to the advance in farming techniques through the use of fertilizers in the years past. The Soils Testing Laboratory puts money into the farmers' pockets by helping assure minimum expenditure on fertilizer, and by applying the proper formula for a particular soil type, and has saved our farmers hundreds of thousands of dollars. Fertilizer usage increased by 29 per cent over 1966 and was almost double that of 1965. Our Soils Testing Laboratory enabled this fertilizer to be applied in a better program and at rates suited to conditions more than ever before. We look forward to its continued expansion and increasingly important function.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to dwell for a few moments on remarks made from time to time by the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Lloyd), especially whenever he has the opportunity to speak to a few of his faithful, and believe me, Mr. Speaker, they are becoming fewer. The Leader of the Opposition, in his best, "big brother to the little man voice" says that agriculture faces a triple handicap. He says this is lower production, lower prices, and lower grain sales.

Mr. Lloyd: — On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. I really don't mind, but he is now talking about something that I said in the Throne Speech debate, and it is out of order to repeat it at this point.

Mr. McFarlane: — It may have been in the Throne Speech debate, but this is what I hear from your faithful, and I am quoting what I hear from them. Let us look at these, Mr. Speaker. Our production in wheat was lower last year, because of a drought condition, but I

March 6, 1968

have already pointed out that last year's production was only exceeded seven times in the history of our Province. Lower prices? Mr. Speaker, I want to take this opportunity to particularly congratulate the Federal Government which has now pegged the floor price of wheat. The Federal Liberal Government put a basic \$1.95½ floor price on wheat, and I feel the farmers of Western Canada are unanimous in their expression of gratitude to the Federal Government for having taken this action pending the ratification of a new international wheat agreement. The sales of wheat have fallen in the last while, Mr. Speaker, but the early fall situation has been vastly improved by the Federal Government's announcement of the sale of 78 million bushels of wheat to mainland China.

The Leader of the Opposition has been critical on many occasions of the United States for not ratifying an international wheat agreement. I think that we all share in that concern. Surely, Mr. Speaker, if the Leader of the Opposition wishes those of us on this side of the House to persuade our political friends in Canada and the United States to sign an agreement, surely then, he would not consider it too much, if we ask that he persuade his political friends in Communist Russia and other Socialist countries to also ratify that agreement.

I might also ask, Mr. Speaker, that those Members of the NDP opposite, who so recently cemented their relationship with labor bosses in the United States and divorced themselves from the farmers, remember the many strikes on the Great Lakes, at the West Coast, and the East Coast, all of these taking place at a critical period when the farmer wants to get his grain moving. It does the farmer of Saskatchewan no good if he produces a record crop every year, if Canada has sales for every bushel, if the international wheat price were \$2.50 per bushel, if we cannot move our grain to the market. There is no question, Mr. Speaker, that a tie-up of our grain delays the income to our farmers, causes our country to lose some markets, and damages our national image as a reliable supplier of grain. Mr. Speaker, I did not hear the NDP raising their voice calling for an end to these strikes over the past year. Rather, Mr. Speaker, they sat on their hands and, as one prominent eastern NDPer was quoted as saying, "To hell with the farmers, they're a declining force anyhow." I suggest that people of Saskatchewan in 1964 finally caught up with the deceit of the Socialists, and they showed again in October of 1967 that they don't want the puppets of American labor bosses to run the affairs of this Province any longer.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. McFarlane: — Mr. Speaker, since we assumed office in 1964, we have been consistent in our approach to agriculture. We have called for diversification and a lesser dependence on a one-crop economy. The danger of drought and the possible loss of markets point out clearly that we should not depend totally on a wheat-based economy. Our Government, Mr. Speaker, is accordingly making

every effort to encourage significant expansion of specialized livestock enterprises on Saskatchewan farms. We believe this offers a most sensible alternative to buying more land for the medium-sized and smaller farm that needs to expand. We believe it would also expand the total economy of the Province and make us less vulnerable to the vagaries of the world wheat market.

Accordingly, our Department of Agriculture through its Agriculture Representatives and the extension programs through the Family Farm Improvement Branch with their two Mexabitions, and through developing programs, is devoting more attention to this phase of the industry. What are some of the results? Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to report that in 1967 we established our third successive record marketings of cattle and calves. The respective figures are: 955,585 in 1965; increased to 975,226 head in 1966; and increased again to 975,500 head in 1967, an all-time high and a record for our province. We estimate that cash receipts for the sale of cattle and calves in 1967 will amount to a sizeable \$163 million, which is again an all-time high in our province. And this record income follows on the heels of previous record years of \$132 million in 1965, and \$152 million in 1966.

Mr. Speaker, Members in the Opposition talk about a decline in our livestock numbers, and they cry at great lengths about the prices for our livestock products. In his address in the Budget Debate, the Member for Regina Centre (Mr. Blakeney) said, "The number of cattle, hogs, sheep and poultry in Saskatchewan farms and egg and milk production have dropped from the 1963-64 era." Well coming from the Member for Regina Centre, I can appreciate that, because I know that he didn't take the time to look up the facts. I want to show you some interesting figures, Mr. Speaker. These are not figures which I have conjured up, nor are they distorted figures so typical of those used by the Member for Regina Centre, and his colleagues of the NDP opposite.

These are figures readily available, and I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that this House would be better served if the Hon. Members opposite looked up the facts before addressing this Assembly. The figures I have here, Mr. Speaker, are contained in the Annual Report of the Department of Agriculture. They show, Mr. Speaker, that the average price for cattle at the Winnipeg Stock Yards, basis one hundred pounds, over the last four years of Liberal Administration was \$20.06. The prices under the Socialists the last four years they were in office averaged not \$20.06, but \$19.46.

In the field of hogs the average for the last four years the Socialists were in office was a paltry \$24.23 a hundred. Compare that to the average since the Liberal Government took office of \$28.50 for the last four years.

In sheep and lambs, the Socialists' average for the last four years was \$15.97 a hundred; under the Liberals up four cents, \$19.15. I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that the Socialists

March 6, 1968

could probably pick out any four years of their Administration and still come out on the short end of the price comparison.

As far as livestock numbers are concerned, Mr. Speaker, the Members of the Opposition claim numbers are down since we took office. Now let us look at these figures. A casual glance at the Department of Agriculture Annual Report should show milk cows have declined in number every year since 1944, the year the Socialists took office. What did they do to check this decline? Absolutely nothing.

This past year, 1967, Mr. Speaker, we had 2,368,000 head of cattle on our farms in Saskatchewan, a record number, the highest number in the history of our Province, and some 220,000 more than in the last year that the Socialists were in office in 1963, and especially when the Member for Regina Centre (Mr. Blakeney) was Provincial Treasurer. He should have looked up his facts a little bit better than he did.

Mr. A.E. Blakeney (Regina Centre): — It's in the Economic Review.

Mr. McFarlane: — This record number has been established as I said after three consecutive years of record marketing. Sheep and lambs, Mr. Speaker, during the last 30 years, hit an all-time high in 1944, once again the year the Socialists came to power, and have been declining fairly steadily ever since that time. Again, what did they do to help this industry and more important, the producers? They did absolutely nothing. We heard of no policies to check this decline. No steps were taken to assist producers of these classes of livestock. It is just another example of Socialist talk in Opposition, and no action when they were in power.

Hogs, Mr. Speaker, hit a peak in the year before the Socialists took power in 1943, but they too declined fairly steadily from a peak of 1.5 million in 1943 down to 423,000 in 1963. Typical progress, Mr. Speaker, under Socialism, progress in reverse.

The Liberals have taken action to check this decline and I am happy to say that hog numbers on our Saskatchewan farms in 1967 totalled 565,000. Let me remind this House of some of the actions taken by a Liberal Government. Last fall, Mr. Speaker, our new Production and Market Branch organized the first Beef Industry Conference in the history of Saskatchewan. The need for coordination of field crops and livestock programs was highlighted at this Conference. The Conference brought out several important points including the observation that Saskatchewan's resource base will carry a greatly expanded livestock population and that actual expansion of the industry is dependent upon satisfactory producer returns from their livestock. It should be noted there that modern production techniques for these livestock and marketing procedures exert a strong influence on producer returns. It was quite significant, Mr. Speaker, when

I attended the convention and the summing up was done, that one of the things the stock growers requested after experiencing 20 years of Socialism was that the Government leave them alone.

While I stated earlier that our resource base will carry a much larger cattle population, present feed and pasture resources are utilized almost to the limit. This is why my Department is placing emphasis on development of irrigated fodder production, more and better storage facilities, the seeding of marginal cultivated land to perennial forage crops, and the opening up of new lands in our Province for forage production. Nearly 60,000 acres of marginal land have been seeded to grass under one of these new policies during the last two years. Our policies as reflected in our Budget are designed to promote all of these new programs.

As further evidence of our interest in diversification we have expanded our community pasture program from 34 pastures for 42,000 head of cattle in 1964 under the Socialists, to 51 pastures with a capacity for 78,000 head in 1968. These pastures will accommodate about 3,500 patrons during this year. The four new pastures which we will open in 1968 are at Nokomis, Insinger, Paddockwood and Swan Plain. These Provincial pastures along with our grazing associations and PFRA pastures will provide facilities for over 200,000 head of cattle this coming pasturing season.

Four sheep pastures were operated in 1967 providing grazing for 5,000 ewes and their lambs from 93 patrons. In 1968 we expect to have grazing for 9,000 ewes and their lambs. We will have provided community pasture facilities for over 13 per cent of our adult sheep population in a period of two years. Our economists tells us that the sheep business is one of the most profitable in the livestock field, and we think that we should make a serious effort to establish this industry on a sound basis. We introduced a Ewe Lamb Purchase Policy in early September of 1966 to prevent some of the Province's best ewe lambs from going to market for slaughter. These lambs were purchased by livestock specialists and were assembled for resale to producers at cost. To date, 2,300 ewe lambs have been placed with 32 producers under this policy.

So far this year, the Department has assisted 58 sheep producers in the selection and purchase of 63 rams at a total cost of nearly \$1,200 in assistance and premium payments.

We also called a major conference of sheep producers, packers and members of our Department to discuss the problems of the sheep industry. The producers and the packers have agreed to set aside one day a week for the delivery of sheep, and the retail outlets have agreed to feature Saskatchewan lamb periodically in their market price. And so, Mr. Speaker, this is just one example of the harmonious relations which exist throughout our sheep industry today.

I'm going to turn to the case of hogs. We were alarmed at

March 6, 1968

the small size of our hog production units in Saskatchewan, on the average, compared to those in other provinces in Canada. When we took office we asked the Saskatchewan Economic Development Corporation to provide financial help to specialized agricultural operations. Since then, SEDCO has loaned \$1.4 million to 22 separate hog-producing enterprises whose operations produce about 53,000 market hogs annually. This production brings revenue to the producer of some \$2,250,000. And last year we went much further than this, Mr. Speaker; we introduced a policy to assist hog producers in the construction of medium to large scale hog production facilities and to extend existing facilities to a more economic size. This policy comes under the ARDA Agreement, and is therefore limited to that portion of the Province which qualifies under ARDA.

For the benefit of Members this afternoon I could maybe explain how the boundaries were drawn up. It was based on the 1961 census report, and I may point that the census taken in 1961 was in the month of June before the disastrous crop was evident. These figures were based on the incomes of the people in those areas for the past 12 months. Within the rural development area 20 to 40 per cent of the farmers had a capital value of \$25,000 or less. But most significant of all I think, Mr. Speaker, is the fact the gross sales of the farmer in this area of our Province was less than \$2,500. So that is one reason why the ARDA area is set up today. It was set up because it includes most of the farmers in our Province who are on the smaller economic units and whose gross income is much below the Provincial average.

We have approved to date approximately 160 notifications for assistance under this policy. This will involve a producer expenditure on swine facilities of nearly \$1.5 million, and we expect to earn a grant of approximately \$368,000 this year. This represents an average grant of \$2,300 per applicant.

Our hog population is now increasing rapidly, and I am pleased to note that in 1967 we marketed nearly 600,000 hogs as compared to 466,000 in 1966. We expect to market over 700,000 hogs in 1968. It is further interesting to note that Saskatchewan's 1967 total production was 5.7 per cent of the total production for all of Canada. And when we hear alarm expressed by Members on the opposite side of the House that this policy is going to increase the hog numbers substantially, and therefore reflect our market values, I would indicate to them that even with the increased hog numbers we are still only producing 5.7 per cent of that produced in Canada. Canada's total production is about 8.5 million hogs. The state of Iowa, Mr. Speaker, alone produces over 15 million. That's how insignificant ours is to the total North American production of about 74 million.

In Saskatchewan 42 per cent of the hogs we marketed graded "A", and this was the third highest percentage in Canada. Back in 1957, Saskatchewan's percentage of Grade "A" was the third lowest in Canada, so this indicates a tremendous increase in hog quality in our province in the last ten years. One of the

reasons for such a good record was a policy we introduced in 1965, that is, the Elite Swine Herd Policy. Our objective then, and now, was to provide incentive to improve hog quality through improvement in breeding stock. We now have eight purebred producers who have qualified for Elite status. These producers have a total of 201 ROP sows tested, all of which have been proven to be considerably better than the average for all sows tested and also better than our national average. Incentive payments to Elite swine breeders, based on the quality of hogs produced, have amounted to \$4,551 so far this year. Premiums amounting to 25 per cent of the purchase price to a maximum of \$25.00 were paid on 61 boars during 1967. These payments were based on ROP records and amounted to \$1,460. These new Liberal programs have created a much needed incentive to our hog industry in Saskatchewan and are doing a great deal in expanding the economic position of the farmer concerned. Another instance where Liberals took action and where CCF were unconcerned for 20 years.

Now I turn, Mr. Speaker, to land programs. In 1967 the Government acquired 27,230 acres of land primarily for community pastures and for forage projects, of which about some 2,600 acres were for non-ARDA projects. As I said earlier, land acquisition is now completed for the Brightholme, Fielding, Smeaton and Nokomis pasture extensions. Over 16,000 acres have been acquired in the McDonald Creek near Ardath, Crystal Beach and Wingard pasture projects. These three projects have very marginal farm lands, consisting of light sandy soils to nearly dune sands, and all have suffered wind erosion to various degrees in the past years. We expect to make good progress in land acquisition in these projects in 1968 and, when completed, will provide grazing and some forage in the farming areas that have limited summer grazing at present.

Further, Mr. Speaker, the Land Branch of the Department of Agriculture has also acquired in 1967 over 7,500 acres in the Broderick area and 1,730 acres in the Conquest area for irrigation from farmers who do not wish to go into irrigation farming. Through our Lands Branch our Government still administers 8,760,000 acres of land. Over 8 million acres are utilized by an estimated 18,000 farmers for cultivation or grazing through sales contracts, leases and community pastures.

Our Government believes that there is greater security of tenure if the farmer owns his own land. We further believe that our farmers know far better than Socialist planners how best to utilize their land. The Liberal Government therefore introduced a policy for the sale of Crown land. And, at present, Mr. Speaker, sales to the leaseholder of cultivation and grazing leases up to two sections in size are still receiving major attention. In the two years preceding 1967, 1,081 cultivation leases were purchased. This year, 218 cultivation leases containing 49,604 acres were purchased, and we expect that 30 more will be purchased before the end of this fiscal year. In this same period, 515 grazing leases containing 123,815 acres were purchased compared to 397 leases containing 81,500 in 1966-67

March 6, 1968

and 302 leases containing 58,268 acres in that year previous. So, Mr. Speaker, our totals since we took office and evolved this policy: over 650,000 acres have been sold to over 3,000 lessees as I said, since 1964. The Government expects that about 100 more leases will be purchased before the end of the fiscal year. Fifty-four cultivation leases and 268 grazing leases were cash purchases. The total sale price is slightly over \$3,240,000. We expect the number of purchases by lessees to continue at this rate for at least the next two years.

The Government has this year advertised quarter sections of land for sale by tender on a trial basis. We feel the results of the initial sale warrant that more public lands should be sold in this way.

Leasing is still an active and important phase of our program. This year 484 parcels of land were posted and allocated to 566 farmers. Allocations of land are made according to a carefully revised allocation policy based on a point system, taking into consideration such factors as age, farming performance, resources, proximity and, most important of all, the need for land. All new lands available for settlement are leased and the Government has leased 29 farm units in the Cracking River Project to young farmers or to farmers' sons. Ten of the 20 miles of road to be built have been completed to provide access for every farm.

The Government has also opened half a township of land in the Greenbush area west of Hudson Bay. These lands will be leased as additions to about 12 adjoining farms to increase these farms to economic size and to establish about 12 new farm units in that project. Main access roads and necessary drainage will be provided as in other settlement projects of this type. The Government will clear and break the arable land on these leases. Most of the leases in the Cracking River had 200 acres cleared last winter and many lessees broke at least 100 acres on each of these last summer and will be cropping the land in 1968.

The Government's Clearing and Breaking Assistance Program is available to all leaseholders whose leases have arable land requiring clearing and breaking. Last summer, the summer of 1967, 550 leaseholders cleared 17,856 acres and broke 26,393 acres at a total cost to the Government of \$568,000. In addition, I may point out, Mr. Speaker, that these contracts were let and the work done at the lowest average price since 1957. In addition, the Government assisted 1,244 small farmers in the rural development areas in clearing 39,873 of bush on their private lands at a cost of roughly \$120,000. Both of these programs will be continued in 1968. These incentive programs, Mr. Speaker, plus income tax exemption for clearing, breaking and drainage have resulted in an additional 200,000 to 300,000 acres of new land being brought into production in this Province annually. Certainly a tremendous record for our Province.

Some other examples of major Liberal concern, the concern

for diversification and the well-being of our livestock industry and especially that of the dairy industry, should be brought to the attention of this Assembly.

Because of the dry conditions of 1967 we introduced a Fodder Freight Assistance Policy. Fortunately, the feed situation did not become as bad as we thought it might be, and therefore the amount of feed moved under the policy was much less than originally estimated. Under this policy we have paid almost \$180,000 in fodder freight assistance to some 800 producers. This assisted the movement of some 40,000 tons of fodder and amounted to an average assistance payment of \$4.50 a ton on 50 tons of fodder per producer.

Last summer, at the request of such organizations as the SARM, the Saskatchewan Federation of Agriculture and the Saskatchewan Farmers Union, we extended the Brand Inspection Area to include the whole of the province. This of course meant doubling the area of previous coverage. It appears that the extended Brand Inspection Program went into effect smoothly, and I would like to express the appreciation of my Department and my staff for the co-operation received from producers and all those agencies associated with the marketing of cattle. All cattle in the province are now described on a marketing manifest prior to sale, and all these manifests forwarded to our central office at the end of each week for computer processing. In addition to key punching the brand information for the cattle which have been branded, we are also recording marketing statistics. These marketing statistics will be of tremendous assistance in helping our producers and our Department predict future trends in Saskatchewan's cattle business.

Our present Veterinary Diagnostic Laboratory facilities have become seriously inadequate. I am happy to note, therefore, that we are now building a completely new modern and well equipped Diagnostic Laboratory on the site of the Regina Experimental Farm. The new Veterinary Diagnostic Laboratory will cost approximately \$700,000, of which \$350,000 of the \$700,000 will be paid out of the Horned Cattle Trust Fund Account.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. McFarlane: — This new facility will place our Veterinary Division in a position to provide more adequate diagnostic services and thereby contribute significantly to improved livestock health in our Province, certainly to protect the tremendous investment by our farmers in the livestock industry.

While I am on the subject of the health of animals, Mr. Speaker, I would like to make a few observations about our dairy industry. A quick look at this industry reminds us that it has always played an important role in our economy, as well as providing a supply of nature's most perfect food for the people of our province. I want to point out to this Assembly

March 6, 1968

that we raised strong objection to the original Dairy Commission proposal that a producer would have to deliver 1,750 pounds of butterfat per year before he could qualify for a subsidy payment. One of the reasons for this is that we felt that those producers who would suffer most would be the producers in the newest developing areas of our province, the producers who needed this extra money to supplement their meagre income. Because of that and because of the fact that we in Saskatchewan do not produce a surplus of butter we took issue with the qualifications as laid out by the National Dairy Commission.

Last year, Mr. Speaker, I reported an upward trend in fluid milk production and once again I am pleased to announce a further 3.7 per cent increase in fluid milk produced in the 12 milk shed areas under the Milk Control Board in our province. We have increased from 141.3 million pounds last year to nearly 147 million pounds in the year 1967. Probably the most important of all is the price received by the producer. The price of milk to the producer in Saskatchewan will average \$5.90 per hundred weight, the highest ever in the history of Saskatchewan. The price to our producer is now up 20 cents over what it was in 1967.

Mr. Speaker, I want to outline briefly another major step taken by our Liberal Government. Inspection and related administrative services have long exposed many dairy farmers to the questioning of up to four representatives of Provincial and municipal government. Manufacturing plants have been subject to inspection by a similarly large group. Confusion results from conflicting recommendations. Our Government undertook a study and the recommendations have been presented to this Legislature in the form of amendments to The Dairy Act. Mr. Speaker, while Members opposite continue to criticize and complain about the decreasing livestock numbers, I think that they should look at production figures. New production records are being set year after year by our producers in the Dairy Herd Improvement Program. Our rate of production for dairy cows in the program is second to none, in Canada. Over the past 15 years production per cow has increased at the rate of 170 pounds of milk per year. We believe our producers will continue to set new records. It appears that in the future, solids, not fat, will play an important role in milk evaluation. This kind of analysis is now possible through the use of an infra-red milk analyzer. We are ordering this equipment immediately and will place it in the new Veterinary Diagnostic Laboratory which will be completed this fall. Once again, a Liberal Government is taking some positive action to protect our dairy industry, that had been allowed to drift by way of neglect, for so many years.

We are continuing to expand our crop insurance as part of our active program to bring stability to farm income. In 1964, when we took office, only 2,356 farms were insured against loss. Last year, we extended coverage to include 8,200 farms and this year we expect to cover some 12,000 farmers. These we expect will be insured, involving a total coverage of more than \$24 million.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to say a few words about the South Saskatchewan development. As I have already mentioned, one of the historic events of 1967 was the completion and dedication of the Gardiner Dam. In line with our commitments, we have proceeded with developments to make full use of this water. Our Conservation and Development Branch completed construction of the pump plant on the east side, the main canal, and the Broderick Reservoir last year. The huge pumps that we installed were put into operation on July 5th, and, I might point out, just five days behind the target we had set out some two years ago. Water at the rate of almost 300 cubic feet per second flowed into the system built by the Water Supply Board. This flow continued almost without interruption, until November 15th. In order to help resolve some of the difficulties regarding irrigation, we have set up an Irrigation Advisory Board. We have a project manager and we have awarded a contract to prepare the distribution system for the most southerly 13,000 acre block. This will be completed in the coming year. We now have 2,000 acres levelled and ready for irrigation in 1968. Further, a contract for the main supply canal north of the Broderick Reservoir has been let and work is well under way on this project.

In the Cumberland House area, we have an interesting project. We are proceeding with the development of the base farm as a training and employment project. Last year, 1,351 acres were cleared, broken and seeded to forage. This year, up until a month ago, we have cleared an additional 1,400 acres ready for breaking. We now have five native settlers established on their own farms and developing their own beef cattle herds.

In the Saskatchewan Delta area of our Province, we have set up a pilot project of several thousand acres to determine the feasibility of agricultural and drainage requirements. We expect the final report of the Delta Study Committee to be made available to us later this year.

Mr. Speaker, in summing up, I wish to indicate to you that as I said earlier in my remarks, we are proud of our Liberal record during the last four years in this Province.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. McFarlane: — I think that I have indicated to you as the people of this Province have indicated to me, and as the people have certainly indicated in Great Britain on the base of the Gallup Poll, the people of Great Britain indicated that only 20 per cent would support a Socialist Government if an election was called. It has been tried in Britain and it has failed. It has been tried in the Scandinavian countries and it has failed. It was tried in Saskatchewan for 20 years and it failed here, and we are still picking up the pieces of the Socialist experiment. As I have said, Mr. Speaker, this Budget is a responsible Budget. Top priority was given to education. I know that the people of rural Saskatchewan will be pleased that we are

March 6, 1968

continuing our extensive highway and grid road programs. The rural municipalities will again receive large grants in equalization payments for snow removal and municipal road maintenance. Our policy of providing sewer and water facilities for the small town, the village and the hamlets, has been very well received and will be continued and expanded. And, as our Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Steuart) has pointed out, Agriculture's budget is now the fifth highest of all spending departments. We certainly have come a long way from the dull, dark days of Socialists. Mr. Speaker, this is a responsible Budget. Mr. Speaker, in all my history in public life, I have never voted for one measure that would bring a greater degree of Socialism into this province. And so today, I will vote against the amendment and I will vote for the main motion, that will ensure rapid development of our Province and give our people the degree of financial security they are so worthy of.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. G.T. Snyder (Moose Jaw North): — Mr. Speaker, since the Budget debate began a few days ago, on Friday last, Members opposite have demonstrated an absolute reluctance to talk about the document that's in front of us. The Minister of Agriculture (Mr. McFarlane) today provided us with the most tiresome harangue that we have been treated to in this House in many, many years. He talked about milk cows. He talked about swine, he talked about forage crop on sandy soil. He talked about Great Britain and the dreadful state which Britain finds herself in. And somehow he tried to blame this situation in Great Britain on creeping Socialism, ignoring once again, Mr. Speaker, the fact that the present Government of Great Britain inherited that mess from a free enterprise predecessor, ignoring once again, Mr. Speaker, that Britain had suffered the ravages of two World Wars, and had difficulty because their industrial plants failed to meet the requirements of the post-war era.

Mr. Speaker, the Member from Maple Creek (Mr. Cameron) showed similar tendencies. He talked about the possibility of finding uranium in the southwest corner of the province. He spoke about Sask Tel and he talked about Winston Churchill and Mr. L. Lapierre and Regina's auditorium. The Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Steuart) wasn't exempt either. When he was on the Hot Line program, getting razzed by the people who were calling in, he finally had a thoughtful caller who mentioned potash to him and he clung onto that subject, Mr. Speaker, like a pup to a root. Just hung on for dear life . . .

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Snyder: — . . . and attempted to finish out that program by talking about potash, rather than having anything to do in a further discussion of his Budget. The Member for Notukeu-Willowbunch (Mr. Hooker) spent his entire effort in discussing The Direct

Sellers Act, The Cemetery Act. Every Member opposite has avoided this Budget like the plague except the Member from Elrose (Mr. Leith) who had a few words to say about it. He said that he didn't like it, but he would be voting for it.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Snyder: — Mr. Speaker, I can't recall what it was that the Member for Meadow Lake (Mr. Coupland) really had to say today and I hope that I will be forgiven, but I am sure that he had very little to say about the Budget. So we just hope that, at some time during this debate, some Member from the other side of the House, will rise in their place and have a few words to say about this document and the oppressive tax measures that it contains.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Snyder: — Mr. Speaker, there are a great many adjectives that may be used to describe this 1968 Budget. It can be properly described as a Budget which ignores meaningful and accepted priorities. It is a Budget which contradicts in total the Liberal boast of affluence and good business-like Government over the past four years. It is a Budget which strikes once again at the people that Mr. Lloyd described as the leanest of the lean. Since the 1968 Budget speech was delivered on March 1st, many of my constituents, Mr. Speaker, have phoned me with very apt descriptions of this document. I hesitate to pass on some of their views, in this House, because many of these adjectives, I am sure, Mr. Speaker, you might find to be unparliamentary in this Assembly.

Leading Liberals in my constituency have even been more profane in their criticism of their own party and their own leaders who betrayed them, following the 1967 general election.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Snyder: — Only a few weeks ago, Mr. Speaker, the new Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Steuart) inherited this sensitive post from the Premier at a time when it had become clear that many unpopular measures would provide the framework for this 1968 Budget. Many of the tax increases contained in the Budget were predictable. Many warning flags had been flown by Liberals just following the October general election. The present financial crisis, Mr. Speaker, in which we find ourselves, didn't come upon us suddenly nor did it materialize as a result of obscure or uncontrollable factors. This financial quagmire was manmade. While he was the Provincial Treasurer, the Premier presented three Budgets to this House. All were designed with short-term objectives in view. All were designed for the purpose of building the image of the Liberal party during their first term

March 6, 1968

in office.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Snyder: — To accomplish this, Mr. Speaker, the Premier established something of a record as a 20th century Jesse James. The Premier raided the fund set aside for providing assistance to Saskatchewan students — a fund that was set up by the former Administration. This money was taken into general revenue in one of the Premier's first raids. This netted the Government about \$2 million. The Public Administration Foundation was held up for another \$1 million. The Medical Care Commission fund also had an attractive-looking strong box and the Premier couldn't resist his kleptomaniac tendencies, with the result that fund is now depleted. There seems to be very little doubt concerning an increase in the head tax on Medical Care and Hospitalization in the immediate future. The Saskatchewan Power Corporation was also a target for the Premier and his search for new ways and means to balance his last Budget. This public utility was also raided to provide the 1967-1968 Budget with another \$3 million worth of artificial respiration. Having raided every fund within reach and after financing much of an expanded highway program out of borrowings and after having over-extended the capacity of the Government to carry on without major and unpopular tax changes, the Premier went to the people before the Liberals had completed, or dared to complete, their four-year term. It did this, Mr. Speaker, rather than risk facing the people of Saskatchewan after this 1968 financial fiasco.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Snyder: — October 11th, Mr. Speaker, for some reason was a magic day. It marked the end, the abrupt end, of one era and the beginning of another. Liberal pre-election boasts of prosperity and unprecedented growth faded and disappeared. Almost immediately, the Premier became preoccupied with austerity measures and tax increases without even observing a respectable period of mourning. Having inherited the Treasury portfolio from the Premier, the Member for Prince Albert West (Mr. Steuart) also found it necessary to sound a few words of warning to soften the blow of things that were to come. The new Provincial Treasurer speaking in Moose Jaw, as recorded in the Moose Jaw Times Herald of January 18, 1968, claimed that the Government was left with three alternatives: 1. a cut-back in Government programs. 2. increased taxes, or 3. a combination of both. And he went on to explain and I think that this is interesting, and I quote him:

We didn't suddenly discover this after the election; we knew it was coming.

Mr. Steuart continued by saying that the election was held

to provide his Government with a new mandate to continue to give sound and responsible government to Saskatchewan people.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Snyder: — Well, Mr. Speaker, if the Liberals knew that they were going into rough water and that tough times were just around the corner, they certainly failed to inform the Saskatchewan voters prior to October 11th. The entire Liberal program was centred around tax reductions, buoyant and prosperous circumstances and the forecast of better things to come. In my constituency, Mr. Speaker, the Liberals pointed to this 15-point program which was intended to “keep things moving in the New Saskatchewan”. Well, there are many people who will question the Liberal’s mandate to carry on as they have since October 11th, especially since this new Budget was placed before them on March 1st. The mandate that they speak of, Mr. Speaker, represents a scant 1 per cent more of the popular vote than was received by those of us who sit to your left. One a skilful and a partial successful gerrymander allowed the Government, the Members opposite, to squeak by with a very narrow margin of a vote in the last election, Mr. Speaker.

If, indeed, the Liberals have a mandate to govern, it’s a mandate to carry out the promises and the pledges that they made to Saskatchewan people prior to October 11th in this 15-point program of theirs, this Liberal blueprint for happiness and prosperity. This Liberal 15-point program, I know makes no mention of austerity or reduction in services; it makes no promise to take from Saskatchewan Universities the autonomy that they have enjoyed over the years. No mention is made by this Government to place teachers in an economic straightjacket. It says nothing of an earlier proposal to prevent large numbers of the teaching profession from bargaining collectively with their employers. It is silent concerning the closure of a number of small community hospitals. This 15-point program, Mr. Speaker, makes no mention of increased tuition fees for students. This 15-point program failed to tell Saskatchewan people that entrance fees to Provincial Parks would be increased by 100 per cent and that the cost of utilities within these parks would be sharply increased also. Now, Mr. Speaker, these were all made, or introduced, or announced between the October 11th general election and the introduction of the Budget on March 1st. Saskatchewan voters who felt that they had been betrayed by the Saskatchewan Liberals during the post-election period were in for more of the same with the introduction of the 1968-69 Budget. Liberals, Mr. Speaker, both in Ottawa and in Saskatchewan, have been attempting to bolster a sagging, free enterprise economy with tax increases and austerity measures, indicating that our buoyant, free enterprise economy is running out of steam and losing momentum. They now propose to reverse the very process that has sustained it for over 20 years. The cold fact of the matter is, Mr. Speaker, that, while a few were taking their prosperity in cash, the great majority of Canadians were

March 6, 1968

persuaded to get their prosperity from credit and debt. Credit bridged the gap between cost and price. It represented the purchasing power required to keep the wheels of industry turning.

We are now, Mr. Speaker, being treated to the spectacle of the free enterprise medicine men looking for scapegoats, trying to cure the patient without taking time to diagnose the case and ignoring completely excessive profits being drained from the Canadian economy in many, many sectors, which restrict in large measure the financial ability of Canadians to buy back the goods that they produce. In the past, attempts to stimulate a profit — motivated economy, have been either temporary or futile. Leon Kesserling, chairman of the Economic Council of Advisors under President Truman, stated as recently as January 15th, in the January issue of the United States News and Report, that the big tax cut in 1964 did create a boom in the American economy for a year and a half. He says that the cost was \$20 billion and stagnation set in again in 1966, and the real growth in the economy in 1967 was only 2.5 per cent or only about one-half of the real growth rate of recent years. He also states that most of the \$20 billion went to the wrong people, to investors and high-income people and he suggested that this was not the place where the economy needed stimulating.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Snyder: — The Canadian and the Saskatchewan economy, Mr. Speaker, has been sagging under the stewardship of the Liberal Governments, both in Ottawa and Saskatchewan in recent years. Living costs have risen at an unprecedented rate. Municipal taxes in Saskatchewan, particularly for school purposes, have risen to a danger level in recent years. New taxes which were introduced last Friday, can only make the position of Saskatchewan residents more acute. The proposed increase in school grants this year is woefully inadequate, which is undoubtedly going to be a matter of great concern to local school boards in holding their municipal mill rates across the Province of Saskatchewan. The people of Saskatchewan had reason to expect something better, Mr. Speaker, from this Government. Members will recall the Premier speaking in the 1965 Throne Speech Debate when he said this; and I quote:

We have also maintained that Provincial levies are working a major hardship on lower-income groups. We have argued that tax reductions in this province are possible and necessary.

Speaking in this House in 1966, the Premier declared on March 28:

This year we have reduced taxes by \$7 million. Wait until we bring our next Budget down and then my Hon. Friends will really see action.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Snyder: — Well, Mr. Speaker, we really saw action here on Friday last. The Premier then went on to forecast that we on this side of the House would be fortunate if we held on to nine seats following the next election. I just ask the Members opposite to take a look around them and do a little mental calculus as to how many seats they would hold today if there was an election called in Saskatchewan.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Snyder: — Speaking on the Address-in-Reply as late as February 8, 1967, the Premier still maintained this bold front and he claimed and I quote him again:

Mr. Speaker, we believe that in normal times a good Government must balance its Budget and keep taxes from becoming onerous. We contend that in this period the Liberal Government has started Saskatchewan along the road to prosperity and expansion.

An Hon. Member: — Hurrah, hurrah!

Mr. Snyder: — Then he went on to say and I quote:

Liberals believe that government can be run on a sound business basis with a maximum of efficiency and the minimum of waste . . . Liberals do not believe that oppressive taxation is necessary. The plans and platforms of this Government . . . are designed with these principles and objectives in mind.

Just before the 1967 general election, Mr. Speaker. What a farce and what a sham! This is the Government that postponed the inevitable until it found itself impossible to live out its first four-year term in office. This is the Government, Mr. Speaker, that takes the sales tax off teat dilators and farrowing grates and puts it on restaurant meals.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Snyder: — It takes the tax off turkey saddles, Mr. Speaker, and it imposes a tax upon the users of hospital and medical services. This is the Government, Mr. Speaker, that shifts the tax load onto those least able to pay, while boasting of economic growth and prosperity. It is any wonder that the Premier sat in his place, last Friday, like a giant Buddha contemplating his shoelaces for a full 75 minutes while the new Provincial Treasurer waded through \$30 million of new taxes that were being foisted upon the people of Saskatchewan.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

March 6, 1968

Mr. Snyder: — Never in 63 years, Mr. Speaker, since we became a Province in 1905, have we seen such deceit, such dishonesty, and such a breach of faith.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Snyder: — On the many omissions in this 1968 Budget, I think that at this present time, and under present circumstances, one stands out above all others. Members have had the opportunity to read the Frazier Report since it landed on their desks some days ago. When I spoke on the Address-in-Reply, I'd only had a few hours to glance through some of the major recommendations that it contained. Further studies indicate that many of the observations that Dr. Frazier makes relate directly to that period of time when the present Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Steuart) was Minister of Health in charge of the psychiatric services. Dr. Frazier recommends that about \$2 million be allocated to set this plan right and repaid the damage that has been done to our mental health program, since what he describes as the big push began in 1965. The same Minister, the Minister that now controls the purse strings of this Province, has begun by ignoring one of the principal recommendations in the provision of adequate funds, in order that our mental health plan may be spared from complete and absolute disintegration. It appears, Mr. Speaker, that \$500,000 will be made available. Dr. Frazier recommends \$2 million. The Provincial Treasurer is only 25 per cent ready to make the necessary financial arrangements to set right a plan which he bungled and botched and almost destroyed while he was Minister of Health.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Snyder: — The Provincial Treasurer, when psychiatric care was his responsibility, criticized or offered criticisms and complaints with the absolute contempt that we saw in this House, when Members opposite brought these matters to his attention. Had attention been paid to the words of advice offered to the Minister at that time, and if he had observed in full the recommendations of his own Ad Hoc Committee Report, we suggest to you today that the present emergency would be far less acute.

Consider for a moment the comments contained in the Frazier Report with respect to the history of Saskatchewan's mental health plan. Dr. Frazier says that major changes in Saskatchewan's Psychiatric Care Plan began in 1946, a scant two years following the election of the CCF Government for the first time. He says that from then on there was developed and accumulated a large number of talented workers in psychiatry and related fields. Many acquired international reputations but unfortunately, he continues, many have left the Province in recent years. On page 27, Dr. Frazier says:

the earlier excitement and stimulation which came from

a sense of participation in an innovative, pioneering program is now waning.

He goes on to say:

It is not surprising, therefore, that during the period from January 1, 1967 to September 31, 1967, the Branch lost 13 of its senior psychiatrists (in addition to some of its junior psychiatrists). By the time of our December visit, four more senior psychiatrists had departed including some more in key positions.

In an attempt to cloud this issue, Mr. Speaker, Members opposite have suggested that somehow the former Administration has been partly responsible because of the absence of a so-called long-range plan. Let me say only this, Mr. Speaker, it is an accepted fact that Saskatchewan under the CCF developed an imaginative and excellent mental health plan which was recognized all over the western world. Saskatchewan took mental care from the earlier snake-pit approach in the care of the mentally ill into an era which made every Saskatchewan resident, I believe, deeply proud of the contribution that had been made in our province. To suggest that the former Administration was in any way negligent, Mr. Speaker, is to fly in face of the facts. Our Administration was prepared to meet the needs of the mentally ill by providing sufficient funds and well-trained staff. Saskatchewan, it is worthy of note, spent more on research into the problems of the mentally ill than all the other provinces combined. It is absurd to suggest that this kind of neglect and thoughtless bungling would have taken place if the CCF had remained in office.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Snyder: — Many features of the Frazier Report cause us to be concerned with the care that has been offered, or the lack of care that has been offered, to the many hundreds of mental patients which have been discharged from our institutions in recent years. These patients, according to the report were released to meet institutional goals having regard for statistics rather than the welfare of the patients, the family or the community. Patients, it says, were regularly dismissed without the consent or knowledge of the family. I can qualify this, Mr. Speaker, because many, many such cases were brought to my attention, one not very many months ago. A Moose Jaw woman travelled to Weyburn to visit her mother who had been in that institution for many years. When she arrived she was informed that her mother had been discharged two weeks previously and was living in the Central Park Lodge in Moose Jaw, only about three blocks from her own home. I draw your attention again to the case of the Moose Jaw woman who had been in the Weyburn Institution since the early 1940s. About a year and a half ago her husband was informed by letter that his wife had been discharged to a halfway house in Weyburn and that he would be required to provide

March 6, 1968

\$135 a month for her keep. The husband was a man in his mid-seventies who had retired some time earlier, but he returned to his work as a painter and decorator in the twilight of his life in order to avoid the stigma of being dependent in any way upon the state, a fiercely proud person, Mr. Speaker, who refused to ask or to accept any kind of assistance from the Department at all. These are the kind of good people, Mr. Speaker, that have been hurt and have been destroyed by the thoughtless and the callous action of Members opposite. Dr. Frazier makes an observation that should not have been necessary. He says that discharges should relate to the need of the welfare of the family and the community. Surely, Mr. Speaker, this should be a cardinal principle in any such program. The fact that an observation such as that had to be made at all is a condemnation of all those Members opposite who were in a position to observe this plan falling apart before their very eyes.

While the welfare of the patient is and should be regarded as of primary importance, Mr. Speaker, the welfare of the community and its ability to meet the needs of the discharged patients must be considered also. Dr. Frazier's observation that such has not been the case is a matter of genuine concern also. He points to incidents where recently discharged Weyburn patients were described as, and I quote, "grossly psychotic, physically violent" etc. On page 22 he says in some situations the supervision was very thin so it appeared that the program was barely holding together. The program appeared to be operating on a "sustained emergency basis." Case loads per community care worker appeared to be excessive and as a result visits were too widely spaced. Staffing was especially inadequate for follow-up of "potentially dangerous patients." On page 38, Dr. Frazier concludes:

The Province has gradually drifted into a situation where it is trying to run a first-rate program on a second-rate budget, and this simply will not work. As a result quality of care is slipping, duties are being reassigned to less qualified personnel, case loads are increasing, work days are becoming longer, all contributing to demoralization. At the present time the personnel situation is of crisis proportions and must be given first priority.

Surely, Mr. Speaker, the evidence contained in the Frazier Report should be regarded as of sufficient import to justify devoting more than 25 per cent of the amount of money that Dr. Frazier recommends as being necessary to restore our mental health plan to a point where we may again exhibit some pride in it and not find it necessary to offer excuses for it daily.

If more money must be found for this purpose, then I humbly suggest to you that the four-lane highway that skirts the ranch at Caron might be delayed for an indefinite period, Mr. Speaker, until more pressing problems are met.

This Budget, Mr. Speaker, is physical proof of the lack of

meaningful priorities on behalf of the Members' Treasury bench opposite. The deterrent charges which will be borne in a large measure by our senior citizens will damn this Government until the moment that it is removed from office, Mr. Speaker.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Snyder: — This tax, Mr. Speaker, is an unforgivable example of the Government's lack of the barest shred of sensitivity or regard for people. This new tax, Mr. Speaker, will not deter sickness. It may, however, deter people from seeking medical services, however, and if this is so, it's a sad day for Saskatchewan people. I say again, Mr. Speaker, patients are admitted to hospital on the authority of a doctor; they are discharged by the same process. The patient can exercise no discretion with respect to being admitted nor does he have control over the length of time that he will be confined. The Provincial Treasurer suggested on Friday last that the Government would provide for those who had been declared indigent and that they would be spared from this new impost.

Mr. Speaker, what possible alternative could there be? The Provincial Treasurer in his wisdom concluded that even for him it's difficult to get blood out of a stone. Those who are indigent, Mr. Speaker, are not those who will be most seriously affected. It is the senior citizen who is a borderline case who will be destroyed and humiliated by this new deterrent charge. Thirty days in the hospital, Mr. Speaker, will take the entire monthly pension cheque from this old age pensioner if he receives no supplemental. If he is discharged on the 31st day, he will return home with his rent and with other bills overdue, without the necessary funds to take care of his basic needs.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Snyder: — Mr. Speaker, the Eskimos in some part of the world deal with their elderly people in a more honest and more humane manner. When they become old and they have outlived their usefulness and appear to be reaching the stage where they may be a burden to the community, they are left alone in some remote spot where they will shortly be dispatched by some hungry transient polar bear.

An Hon. Member: — Davey Stuart!

Mr. Snyder: — To many people, Mr. Speaker, this will appear to be a more humane and honest way to treat senior citizens than to degrade and destroy the morale and the dignity of an elderly person, who asks nothing more than the basic right to be cared for during the period of illness after a lifetime of service to the community.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

March 6, 1968

Mr. Snyder: — The proposal to impose deterrent charges, Mr. Speaker, on hospital services is a barren and futile effort. If this new tax is really intended to curtail the use of hospital beds, then it simply will not work. However, the proposal to impose a deterrent charge on a visit to the doctor is a horse of a different color. There will, I suspect, be many people in the lower income levels who will be deterred by a charge on an office call. Many people who visit a doctor for an annual check-up will undoubtedly postpone this visit or perhaps neglect it completely. I believe, Mr. Speaker, that at this point it becomes necessary for us to ask ourselves if the best interests of our people or the best interests of our Hospital and Medical Care Plan are best served by putting up road blocks and discouraging regular check-ups, early diagnosis and treatment. If this Liberal Government has decided that this is a wise judgement, then I suggest to you that its judgement is in total and complete contradiction to the advice of every medical doctor in practice today.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Snyder: — It's generally accepted, Mr. Speaker, that the whole spectrum, the whole spectrum of preventive medicine depends on early and regular diagnosis and early treatment. To ignore this fact, Mr. Speaker, is to promote neglect of ailments that need early care. To ignore this fact is to allow minor complaints to become chronic illnesses, leading to lengthy treatment, hospitalization and needless suffering.

This Government, Mr. Speaker, in less than four years has established a record and a reputation for ignoring the legitimate needs of Saskatchewan people. Short-term objectives have dictated the Government's policy with little thought for long-range philosophy. This proposal to tax the sick is just another example. I suggest to you again, that the principal, and probably the only beneficiary will be the insurance companies, who will shortly be offering extended coverage plans to insure Saskatchewan people against paying this hideous new tax.

The frantic and frustrated effort by this Government, Mr. Speaker, to find new sources of revenue to balance its 1968 Budget displays conflicts between gross extravagance and miserly penny-pinching on the other. The Minister of Social Welfare (Mr. MacDonald) — and I'm glad he's in his seat — will recall when a Boy Scout Jamboree was held on the south shore of Buffalo Pound Lake last summer and he attended, I believe, as Minister in charge of the Youth Department. Ten of the mentally retarded boys that belonged to that Scout group at the Saskatchewan Training School attended this jamboree. It was a matter of real pride and satisfaction to these ten mentally retarded boys that belonged to that Scout group and to their group leader that these boys had all received their proficiency awards before the meeting was over.

This group of Scouts, Mr. Speaker, has a weekly meeting at the Saskatchewan Training School, every Thursday I believe, and

it has been the practice in the past for the institution to provide bread, bologna, margarine and hot chocolate to round out the evening of their weekly meeting. However, Mr. Speaker, the austerity program caught up with this frivolous caper. The Boy Scouts had their bologna sandwich and their hot chocolate cut off, as have all the rest of the patients on the wards who formerly had a cup of hot chocolate before retiring. This is a small and perhaps insignificant matter and it involves the expenditure of a few dollars, Mr. Speaker, but I believe it demonstrates the futility, the desperation and a frantic grasping at straws, while ignoring matters of real consequence to the great majority of Saskatchewan people.

In the four short months since this Government was re-elected in October last year, more people have been alienated during that period of time than during any ten or 15 years in our entire history. This Government, Mr. Speaker, is neither trusted nor respected by the vast majority of Saskatchewan people.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Snyder: — A general election today would mean oblivion for the Government opposite, because it deliberately misled and confused the people of this Province and because of the heavy-handed attitude that it has used in dealing with sensitive matters in recent months in particular. There are only a handful of Members opposite, Mr. Speaker, who could be elected as dog-catchers in their own constituency if an election were held today . . .

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Snyder: — . . . and I think this is rather a shame, Mr. Speaker, because there are a large number opposite that I believe would make excellent dog-catchers. Mr. Speaker, for the reasons I have outlined, I will be voting against the motion and I will be supporting the amendment.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. D.V. Heald (Attorney General): — Mr. Speaker, in rising to take part in this debate, I will not this evening make many comments with respect to the contributions of those who have spoken before in the Budget Debate. I would like to make one or two comments about the Hon. Member who has just taken his seat (Mr. Snyder). First of all, I would like to thank him and also the Member for Wadena (Mr. Dewhurst) for their kindness in perhaps giving me a few more minutes than I had otherwise anticipated this evening.

I would like to make a brief comment on the Member for Moose Jaw North who just took his seat. He was critical about

March 6, 1968

my colleagues, the Minister of Mineral Resources (Mr. Cameron), and the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. McFarlane), for talking about their programs in their departments. He said they should be talking about the Budget. Mr. Speaker, they were talking about the Budget. They are Ministers with very substantial shares of the Budget and they're quite within their rights, and as a matter of fact quite in accordance with tradition in this Legislature in advising the Members of the Legislature about the programs in their Departments for which they have responsibility. So for the Member for Moose Jaw North to say that they weren't talking about the Budget, of course is not correct; they were following the time-honored custom of dealing with the fairs in their Departments.

I'm going to do the same tonight. However, I promise you that I'll start my speech even before the radio comes on tomorrow, unlike the Member for Regina South East (Mr. Baker).

But tonight I would like to talk to you for a few minutes in the time at my disposal concerning the Federal-Provincial Constitutional Conference that I attended along with the Premier last month. I think that Members and the people of Saskatchewan are concerned about the problems which divide us in this country and about these constitutional conferences, and so I am going to take a few minutes to place on the records of this Legislature for the benefit of the people of Saskatchewan the position which our Government took at the Confederation of Tomorrow Conference in Toronto in December, and the conference which was called by the Federal Government last month.

First of all, Mr. Speaker, let me say that Saskatchewan took the position at these conferences that we favor the early repatriation of the Constitution to Canada so that Canadians can themselves amend the BNA Act without reference to the British Parliament.

Perhaps at this point, Mr. Speaker, it will be useful to review the position of previous Federal-Provincial conferences on the Constitution which have taken place over the past several years. We became the Government of this Province in May, 1964. The position at that time was that, in prior constitutional conferences, all of the Provinces of Canada and the Federal Government, excepting Saskatchewan, had agreed to the repatriation of the Constitution. Saskatchewan was the lone dissenting Province on the basis that the amending formula which was approved by other provinces was too rigid and inflexible and it would, therefore, not consent to the bringing to Canada of the Constitution, unless an amending formula more favorable from its point of view was agreed upon. I think it is fair to say, Mr. Speaker, that the position in May of 1964 was that Saskatchewan was holding up the repatriation of the Constitution to Canadian shores.

In August of 1964 at Charlottetown at a Federal-Provincial meeting our Premier, on behalf of our Government, indicated that

Saskatchewan had changed its position and was willing to agree to the repatriation of the Constitution to Canada, while at the same time expressing reservations, as had the previous Government, that the important thing was to have the Constitution in a position where it could be amended in this country. We felt that this was the first important step and that the previous Government had been wrong in opposing the repatriation to Canada of the Constitution. We took this same position at later constitutional conferences in 1964 in the fall and in 1965 when the Fulton-Favreau Formula was approved by all of the Provinces and the Federal Government.

Then, of course, came the Provincial election in Quebec of 1966, in which the Union Nationale forces of Mr. Johnson made the Fulton-Favreau Formula and Quebec's acceptance of it by Premier LeSage one of the election issues. The Union Nationale won that election and the Fulton-Favreau Formula was dead, because it was not ratified by the Legislature of Quebec.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is most unfortunate for all Canadians and for Canada that the Government of the day in Saskatchewan, namely the CCF Administration of this Province, adopted such an inflexible and stubborn position with respect to repatriation of the Constitution when they were attending these conferences. Many other Provincial Governments feel that, had Saskatchewan co-operated in the earlier constitutional conferences, we would have had a Constitution repatriated to Canada long before the new amending formula became an issue in Quebec in 1966. At the last meeting Premier Bennett of British Columbia got on his feet and said that Saskatchewan back in 1964 held up the repatriation of the Constitution to Canadian shores.

Now at the conference this year, Mr. Speaker, Saskatchewan indicated still that it would be willing to adopt the provisions of the Fulton-Favreau Formula because we feel, as the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Lloyd) said in another debate and I agree with him, that there were many techniques in that amending formula which would certainly be an improvement on the present situation. We believed and we still believe that the technique of delegation by four Provinces up to the Federal Government, the technique of delegation by the Federal Government down to four Provinces would work. The Leader of the Opposition gave some examples, Securities legislation, Marketing legislation and so on. Mr. Speaker, at future constitutional conferences Saskatchewan will continue to press for the repatriation of the Constitution and for a workable amending formula which will be acceptable to all the Provinces and to the Federal Government.

Now, Mr. Speaker, in our submission to the February Conference we indicated that this Province accepts the majority of the recommendations of the B and B Report though not all. We expressed our belief that the extension of the use of the French language in Saskatchewan should be left to the Legislature of Saskatchewan rather than to be required by provision in the Constitution. We also have indicated steps which would be taken by this Government at this session which will permit the use of

March 6, 1968

French as the language of instruction in schools in areas where such a program is desired and where it is economically feasible. I said a moment ago that the Government of Saskatchewan could not accept all of the recommendations of the B and B Commission. I would like now to refer to some of the recommendations that give us difficulty.

In this connection I refer you to Book 1 of the Royal Commission Report, pages 147 to 149, where these recommendations are set out. The third recommendation is to the effect that once the French minority in this province reaches 10 per cent of the population, the Province would have to become a bilingual Province, with the courts, judges and other officials of government carrying on business in two official languages. Now the fifth recommendation is that bilingual districts be established throughout Canada, and that, by negotiation between the Federal Government and the Provincial Government, the exact limits of each bilingual district would be determined.

It is clear from the references in the report that, once a subdivision, which would appear I think to mean a municipality, had 10 per cent whose mother tongue was French, the district would then have to be operated on a bilingual basis as indicated in the third paragraph on pages 147 to 149. This would appear to mean, I think, that, if in a small town of 90 people, a French-speaking family of 10 moved into the community it would then have to carry on from that point on a bilingual basis. It's not altogether clear, but it is open to this interpretation. This would mean in effect that a good number of the employees would have to be French Canadian including perhaps the Municipal Secretary, and that all by-laws and regulations would have to be printed in two languages, all contracts would have to be in the two languages. I submit, Mr. Speaker, that this would be a very impractical position, even if limited to the municipalities, for example, in the Assiniboia census district and to communities within that district where the number of French equals 10 per cent.

Among other things it states that the judges hearing cases in that district would have to be bilingual which, in this province, would mean that they would have to be French Canadian with the result that the other 90 per cent of the community would be adjudged by a member of the 10 per cent. This would mean that we would have to recruit a magistrate who would be French Canadian and eh would have to operate in such areas. We would also have to have a French Canadian prosecutor. If all the proceedings were carried on in French, then the other 90 per cent of the community, while having the right to attend court to see that justice was done, would have no idea as to what the proceedings were or the judge's decision which would also have to be in French. In the case of an appeal we would have to have at least I think three out of five of our Court of Appeal judges who would have to be bilingual and this would present some difficulties.

So there are many difficulties. The cost of such a system

I submit would be prohibitive, and I think perhaps that the other 90 per cent of the municipality in my example would object to paying for the cost of bilingual services. Mr. Speaker, these are some of our concerns with some of the recommendations of the B and B Commission Report. We expressed our reservations at the meeting in February and we will continue to express our reservations and ask for further clarification as the consultation and dialogue continues.

Another matter that was discussed was the matter of the Bill of Rights. The question was considered whether Canada is to have a Bill of Rights, as an integral part of our Constitution. Presumably when an amending formula is agreed upon, the Bill of Rights sections will be one of the entrenched portions of the Constitution, subject to change only if unanimous approval is forthcoming by all the Governments, that is the Federal Government and all the Provincial Governments. Saskatchewan indicated its position that we have no objection to imbedding a Bill of Rights in the Constitution, if such action will promote national unity, provided the Bill is confined to fundamental democratic rights. We consider that it would not be desirable to include additional provisions in this Bill of Rights which is to become a part of the Constitution. We feel that it is better to leave to Parliament and the Legislature the power to amend and review Bill of Rights containing provisions other than fundamental democratic rights to which I have already referred.

We have some reservations about how all the various additional rights which have been suggested have been interpreted in other jurisdictions, and I refer to the United States of America and the decisions of the Supreme Court of the United States of America. I said a moment ago that, once a right is imbedded in a Bill of Rights, it would be very difficult to alter or to revoke it, even if it becomes necessary to restrict the right in the interest of law and order.

Some people have been critical of our present Canadian Bill of Rights on the basis that the courts have not held that it was intended to alter specific pre-existing, inconsistent, statutory provisions. The courts have said so far that Parliament would have made an express amendment, had it intended to alter its own previously self-enacted laws. I submit that Parliament did not do this and has not made such an amendment since it was enacted in 1960, as it is not considered that such an enactment would be in the best interest of law and order. In view of this, Mr. Speaker, in my view it seems rather extreme now to suggest that it be imbedded in the Constitution and be made applicable to both existing legislation and all future legislation. I feel that the Bill of Rights passed in 1960 should not be made applicable to pre-existing, inconsistent statutory provisions contained in Federal legislation, for the reason that it is rather uncertain just how it might be interpreted with respect to the provisions of the Criminal Code and the Canada Evidence Act, as they now stand. The effect of the Bill of

March 6, 1968

Rights on these two Federal statutes has not been determined by the courts because of the decision that they were not intended to be subject to the Bill of Rights.

You might get into a situation like we have in the United States, where they had some very difficult decisions, where a policeman stopped an accused person leaving an apartment building with a pillowslip full of furs and other valuable services. He found the articles and on checking the apartment building found that an offence had been committed. The Supreme Court held that the policeman had no right to stop and search the accused without a warrant, therefore, the fact that the accused was found leaving the apartment building with the stolen articles could not be received in evidence. The result — the prosecution failed because of lack of evidence. There are thousands of cases I am told along these lines. This is the kind of difficulty you can get into if you entrench too many of these provisions in the Bill of Rights and that's the situation that they find themselves in in the United States.

Mr. Speaker, if I may be permitted to deal or refer to a cartoon, Captain Easy, it's an American comic, of course. It goes this way. It shows two fellows who don't seem to have much means of subsistence. They look like bums. One says, "So justice ain't dead, buster, I see they've turned Uncle Jake loose on a technicality." The son says, "Dawh, what's a technicality, Pop?" "A loophole in the law to protect the guilty, son. Dere's two ways to keep out of jail, lean over backwards to not break the law." The other fella says, "What's the other way?" He says, "Beat the Sheriff to the draw, confess before he can warn you it will be used against you." And that's what happened in the United States. I don't think, Mr. Speaker, that we want to get into that position in Canada, so we do have some reservations about entrenching all of these rights in the Constitution. We feel that the courts, and the Legislatures and the Parliament are more properly places where some of these rights at least can be looked at from time to time and adjusted in the light of changing conditions.

Mr. Speaker, I had hoped to have an opportunity to deal with the Senate and I'm sure my Hon. Friends would be glad to talk about the Senate. I want to mention one thing — we are going to be making representations about the Senate and perhaps we can get some good suggestions from the Hon. Members opposite. One of the points we've already made is that of course it is hardly fair for the four western provinces to only have six senators each, when Nova Scotia has 10, New Brunswick has 10, Newfoundland and Prince Edward Island had 4, we so are going to make representations, constructive suggestions which will improve the quality of the service of the Senate to the people of Canada.

Mr. Speaker, Saskatchewan's delegation to these meetings, as they continue, will approach the meetings in a spirit of co-operation, of constructive co-operation on the one hand and on the other hand, in a spirit of frankness and determination

to make clear to all the partners in Confederation that co-operation is not a one-way street, and, if Canada as we know it, is to survive, there must be co-operation and good-will on all sides and from all Governments concerned. Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to adjourn the debate.

Hon. W.S. Lloyd (Leader of the Opposition): — In connection with the presentations to both the Toronto and the Ottawa conferences, does the Government have papers which will be distributed to us on the Province's position?

Mr. Heald: — I'm trying to think back to the Conference for Tomorrow. Certainly there was an opening statement prepared and is in existence. As far as the February meeting, I think there was also an opening statement for the Confederation for Tomorrow. As the Hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Lloyd) knows, because he has been at these meetings, the procedure is for each Province to state its opening position. These papers are available if the Hon. Member would like one. Would you like one for each Members? That may take a bit of doing.

Mr. Lloyd: — Four or five . . .

Debate adjourned.

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