

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

Thursday, March 7, 1968

The Assembly met at 2:30 o'clock p.m.

On the Orders of the Day.

WELCOME TO STUDENTS

Mr. J.J. Charlebois: (Saskatoon City Park-University) — Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to draw to the attention of all Hon. Members to a fine group of students seated in the Speaker's gallery. They are boys and girls from the Richmond Heights school of the City Park-University constituency of Saskatoon. They are here under the direction of their teachers, Mr. South, Mrs. Knash and Mr. Berg. I am sure that all Members would wish to join with me in extending to them a very warm welcome to the Legislature of our Province and to wish them a very safe journey home.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. W.E. Smishek: (Regina North East) — Mr. Speaker, I would like to draw to the attention of the Members of the Legislature that we have both in east and west galleries a group of 26 students from St. Michael school. They are accompanied by their school principal, Mr. Joerisson. On behalf of the Members of this Legislature and on your behalf, Mr. Speaker, I extend to them a warm welcome and I do hope that their stay this afternoon will be both educational and a pleasant experience.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. D.G. MacLennan: (Last Mountain) — Mr. Speaker, I would like to draw to your attention and to all Members of the House, a group of 29 students from the community of Drake. They are here under the supervision of their teacher, Mr. Bickert and they are accompanied with their drivers, Messrs. Loken, Ewert, Bartel, and Gibney. These students, Mr. Speaker, are located in the first rows of the east and west galleries. And I know that all Members of the House wish them a most enjoyable stay and a safe journey home.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. H.H.P. Baker: (Regina South East) — Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased through you to also welcome a group of students, 56 in number, I think, accompanied by their teachers from St. Joseph's school in my constituency,

Mr. Kartusch, principal and the vice-principal, Mr. Hornung. I believe that they are all in the east gallery. I want to welcome them most sincerely to this Legislature. St. Joseph's school has historic significance in our city in the educational field. I might add that Mr. Kartusch, the principal, has made a tremendous contribution to our educational system in Regina, to youth and sports. I am sure that his name will be recognized in many ways in the future. We welcome them. I would also like to add a welcome to St. Michael school and their principal and also to the St. John school, even though they are not in my constituency. I hope that they will gain much from the proceedings here this afternoon.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. G.B. Grant: (Regina South) — Mr. Speaker, I think that I hit the jackpot today. I have 80 students from Regina South in the west gallery representing the St. John school, grade seven and eight. They are under the direction of two of their teachers — I don't know if that is a good or bad sign — the principal, Mr. Reyda and their teacher, Mr. Lipp. I am sure that you and other Members join me in extending a word of welcome to them. I appreciate His Worship also including them in his welcome.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. L.P. Coderre: (Gravelbourg) — Mr. Speaker, I have a special association with St. John school. I have my youngest daughter in there and I think I should mention it to the House. I would like to welcome her here, as well as members of her class. I would like to ask the Members of the Opposition to be careful of the decorum of the House this afternoon for the benefit of my daughter.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. C.L.B. Estey: (Saskatoon Nutana Centre) — Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, I would like to introduce to you and to the Members of the Assembly, students from Haultain school in Saskatoon who are in the Speaker's gallery. Unfortunately these students arrived after the sitting commenced and I have not yet met the teacher, but we welcome these students here today and trust that they will enjoy their stay with us and return safely to their homes.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

QUESTIONS

DETERRENT CHARGES ON HOSPITALIZATION

Mr. G.T. Snyder (Moose Jaw North) — I would like to direct a question to the Minister of Health (Mr. Grant). I would like to know whether the Government

March 7, 1968

is entertaining a proposal to exempt those people over 65 from deterrent charges on hospitalization.

Hon. G.B. Grant: (Minister of Public Health) — Mr. Speaker, this is a matter of Government policy and will be announced in due course.

RETURNS NO. 5 and 31

Mr. W.E. Smishek: (Regina North East) — Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day I would like to ask the Minister of Education (Mr. McIsaac) when I might expect an answer to the questions that I placed early after the opening of the Legislature. These were questions No. 5 and No. 31, which were turned into Orders for Return, an inquiry as to the number of students that were turned down from our technical schools because of lack of space. It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, there has been sufficient time to answer these questions. Can the Minister now give me an answer?

Hon. J.C. McIsaac: (Minister of Education) — I'm not sure. I'll look into the two questions that the Member refers to. The information hasn't come to my desk as yet. When it does it will certainly be passed on.

ADJOURNED DEBATES

BUDGET DEBATE

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

Hon. D.V. Heald: (Attorney General) — Mr. Speaker, I welcome the opportunity to participate in this Budget Debate and to outline for Hon. Members some of the programs in my department. I may say it is with a sense of pride and accomplishment and gratitude to the members of my staff that I make this report this afternoon. Before doing so I would like to congratulate my colleague, the Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Steuart) for the forthright manner in which he delivered the 1968 Budget last week. Mr. Speaker, no one deludes himself that the Provincial Treasurer had a pleasant task last Friday afternoon. It is never pleasant or easy to increase taxes but the Provincial Treasurer's Budget was and is a responsible Budget. It was the product of many, many painstaking hours of study, consultation, and soul-searching, and Mr. Speaker, I am convinced that it was the kind of Budget that is necessary in this Province at this time. I congratulate my colleague for his presentation. last week.

Mr. Speaker, I have listened with interest to the Opposition

replies to the Budget for the past two days. For a few minutes this afternoon, I would like to analyze what the Opposition is saying about this Budget. Dealing first with the speech of the Opposition financial critic (Mr. Blakeney) and stripping it of its emotion, its demagoguery, its bitterness and its frustration, what did the Opposition financial critic really have to offer by way of constructive and intelligent criticism.

He said first of all that, if the Government needed more revenue, we should have raised personal income tax and corporation taxes. Well, let us look first of all at personal income tax. The facts are that at the present time Saskatchewan has the highest personal income tax in Canada. It has a 5 per cent surcharge on income tax, only one other Province, Manitoba, has such a surcharge. The Government believes that personal income taxes in our Province are higher now than they should be, and we look forward eagerly and confidently toward the day, when it will be possible to remove the 5 per cent surcharge from income tax in this Province. This will be possible, Mr. Speaker, when this Government by its policy and the continuation of its policies has been successful in encouraging more business and more industries and more mineral development in this province, thus widening our tax base. This we started in 1964; this we have continued to do and will continue to do so long as we are the Government of this Province. But, Mr. Speaker, I repeat at the present time it is not possible in our view to increase the income tax burden on our citizens.

Then the Opposition financial critic said that we should increase corporation income taxes in the province. Well, the position of the Province at the present time is that Saskatchewan's corporation income tax is the same as in most of the Provinces of Canada, one per cent lower than Ontario's and Quebec's, and one per cent higher than in some other Provinces, but about the same as in most of the Provinces in Canada. In corporate income tax we are competitive with most of the other Provinces, with whom we have to compete for new industry and for new enterprise. Sharp increases in corporate income tax would probably result in industries and enterprises, which we have a good chance of inducing to locate in Saskatchewan, moving to other provinces where the corporate income tax is lower. Now the other thing, of course, about corporate income tax is that it will result or would result in an increased cost of living, because the business enterprises involved, if they are faced with increased corporate income taxes, would simply add, I suppose, the increased tax to the cost of the service or product which they are selling. This would simply add to the inflationary spiral and increased cost of living and this, of course, would be a self-defeating move. So for these reasons, Mr. Speaker, the Government decided that this was not the proper time to increase either the personal income tax or the corporate income tax. When we are in the position of Ontario and Quebec, when we have large numbers of corporate businesses in the Province of Saskatchewan, then I suggest is the proper time to look seriously at increasing corporate income tax, if the need is apparent at that time, not now, when we are trying to induce

March 7, 1968

corporate enterprise, business and industry to come into this province, to widen our tax base, which of course when accomplished will result in reduced taxes for those of us who are privileged to live in this fine province.

Then, Mr. Speaker, the Opposition financial critic (Mr. Blakeney) advocated delaying construction of a four-lane highway between Moose Jaw and Swift Current. Well, Mr. Speaker, I don't know whether the four-lane highway between Moose Jaw and Swift Current is in the Minister of Highway's proposals for this year, I am sure he will enlighten us when he speaks in this debate. I would be the first to agree that four-lane highways in Saskatchewan should not in the general picture of things have a very high priority, because first of all it is far more important to improve and make dust-free the other highways in our province and to provide far more in the way of funds to our municipalities for grid road construction. I am very much in favour of giving a high priority to taking more grid highways into the highway system, and we made a good start on this in our first four years in office. How many miles of grid road did you take into the highway system when you were the Government? None, not one mile. I am in favour of stepping up the oiling program, but, Mr. Speaker, there are highways — and the Moose Jaw-Swift Current section of the Trans-Canada is one of them — where in the interest of traffic safety, and in the interest of reducing the terrible toll of deaths on our highways, it may be necessary to continue construction of this four-lane highway where the traffic warrants it. Mr. Speaker, engineering surveys and accident surveys clearly indicate that the incidence of accidents and the seriousness of accidents are greatly lessened where we have four-lane highways. I will only ask Hon. Members to reflect on the tremendous volume of traffic on the Trans Canada Highway, particularly in the summer months and I would ask them in all sincerity to consider honestly whether or not it is highly desirable to continue construction of the four-lane highway at least where the traffic density is at its highest. So, Mr. Speaker, I wonder whether the Opposition financial critic is being sincere, and whether he is really giving the Government and the people of Saskatchewan good advice when he suggests that we delay construction of this four-lane highway.

Then, Mr. Speaker, he suggested a reduction in the publicity programs of the Government. And I really wondered if he was very serious about that. You know, Mr. Speaker, in the last four years in the departments, for which I have responsibility, I think we have passed some good legislation, and I am glad that other people agree. I have in my hand the Family Herald issue of February 22, this year, and I commend it to the reading of the Hon. Members opposite particularly. "Consumer Protection — Saskatchewan Leads the Way." It's a very good article and it tells about our Consumer Protection legislation. We passed the Citizens' Protection Code of course. Well, I am still amazed, Mr. Speaker, at the number of people who make inquiries to my department, both in person and by letter, who don't know about The Direct Sellers Act, who don't know about the four-day cooling off period, who do not know that door-to-door agents are

licensed and bonded, who don't know their rights and who don't know their remedies. And so, Mr. Speaker, I have to say that it is one thing for a Government to pass good laws, but I feel that their responsibility does not end there. There is also a responsibility on what Government, on that department of Government, to see to it that the members of the public, who after all in this province are very busy people most of them, are informed. I think it's incumbent upon departments to engage in public information programs, the object of which is to acquaint the members of the public with new legislation, with new programs and with new rights and remedies which accrue to the public as a result of this legislation. So, Mr. Speaker, I feel that the Government in publicizing its programs is carrying out its public duty and responsibility. I am sure the Member for Regina Centre (Mr. Blakeney) really agrees with me.

Then the Opposition critic was critical of the Government for using a plane in discharging its duties. This was when I was absolutely certain that the Member for Regina Centre was really not very serious in his criticism and certainly was not very constructive because I well remember a conversation I had with him a couple of years ago, in which he told me he thought it was a good idea for the Government to have an aircraft to be used in discharging its responsibilities throughout the province and when occasion makes it necessary, outside the province. Mr. Speaker, one of the reasons why the gentlemen who now sit to your left were defeated in 1964 was that they had lost touch with the needs and wishes and aspirations of the people of this province. They were out of touch, and one of the many reasons they were out of touch was that they persisted in the last number of years that they were in office in closeting themselves in their offices with the Socialist bureaucrats, who advised them, and refused to get out from behind their desks and meet the people of this province and expose themselves to the problems of the people of this province, which they had been elected at least to try to solve. Mr. Speaker, I have not used the aircraft often, but I have used it when it has been necessary. I can think of one occasion when my presence was rather urgently required in the northern part of the province to try to solve a particular problem which had come up. The use of the aircraft saved three days, a day up and a day there and a day back. Many of my colleagues have need much more than I do to use this aircraft by virtue of the kind of duties that they have in their various departments. Companies and businesses, not nearly as large as the business of running the Government of Saskatchewan, have found it absolutely essential to use aircraft in the discharge of their duties and responsibilities. Surely, Mr. Speaker, in the second half of the 20th century, it is not a waste of public funds to have one aircraft at a modest cost to enable the Premier and the Government of Saskatchewan to better serve the people of Saskatchewan.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Heald: Mr. Speaker, no one likes higher taxes, but higher

March 7, 1968

taxes seemed to be the order of the day in all parts of the world, and in all parts of our country. Neighbouring Alberta last year had a deficit of about \$100 million; for the coming fiscal year it is budgeting for a deficit of \$70 million. It can well budget for a deficit, because I understand it has liquid surpluses somewhat in excess of \$600 million. Mr. Speaker, we are not so fortunate in Saskatchewan. Because of private enterprise policy the Government of Alberta has been able through the years to attract industry, to attract resource development, thereby widening the tax base in that province, thereby providing revenues far in excess of budgetary needs, with the result that it has acquired this rather large liquid surplus. But in Saskatchewan, Mr. Speaker, during the years when Alberta was able to save for a rainy day, the unfortunate people of Saskatchewan were burdened by a Socialist Government which drove enterprise and business and resource development companies out of this province and into other provinces. Mr. Speaker, this is one of the legacies of 20 years of Socialism, and this is one of the reasons why it is not possible for our Government at this time, in a time of rising budgetary expenses, to dip into a piggy bank, because there wasn't a piggy bank there. There was no large substantial liquid surplus which we probably would have had, as much as Alberta, if during the years 1944 to 1964 we would have had a Government that believed in resource development, creating jobs, creating employment, creating revenue, not only for the people but for the Government of the people. And so, Mr. Speaker, my Hon. Friends opposite must accept some of the responsibility for setting the stage, setting the scenery for tax increases in this province, for making it necessary to have tax increases.

Mr. Speaker, government, be it local, provincial or federal, is essentially the passing and making of rules, regulations and laws for all of our people. The basic concept of our democratic society is the rule of law and the vocation of law-maker, be it at the local, provincial or federal level, is a most challenging and rewarding vocation. Public life affords to human beings the opportunity to utilize one's ability, one's integrity, one's judgement and one's sense of justice and fair play toward the end that everyone in our society can lead a happier, more useful and more productive life. I would like to express the hope that every Member of this Legislature would pay more attention to the making of progressive and enlightened laws, laws which will benefit all of our people and that less attention be paid to persons and personalities in public life. Mr. Speaker, law and law enforcement cannot remain static in the face of demonstrated need for change. The law must be dynamic and, where the protection of life and property demands change, we must have change. Society is constantly changing, society in this second half of the 20th century is becoming more and more complex. New problems are arising, new social evils are arising, and our laws must be changed and adapted to meet these new problems and to combat these new evils.

First of all I would like to talk about law enforcement and the rising crime-rate in our society. All of us have to be concerned with the increase in crime in our society and the need

for more intensive police protection. Vandalism and deliberate destruction of property is on the increase in our society. More sophisticated and more organized crime is on the increase. In an attempt to combat these trends it has been deemed necessary to substantially increase the number of police all over Canada, and certainly Saskatchewan is no exception. For example the RCMP strength in Saskatchewan, including officers and civilian employees, in the fiscal year 1964 and 1965 was 691, which was an all-time high to that point. In this coming fiscal year 1968-69 the over-all RCMP strength in the Province of Saskatchewan will be 933, up from 691 to 933. All departments of the RCMP have been increased considerably, that is to say traffic patrol, criminal investigation, conspiracy and fraud and so on. Another reason for the substantial increase is the fact that in 1966, this Government negotiated a new contract with the Federal Government, under which the RCM Police agreed to enforce municipal by-laws in rural municipalities and in villages and towns up to 500 in population.

Last year I announced that commencing April 1 of 1967, the RCMP would do everything possible to enforce municipal by-laws other than certain exempted matters. So far as RMs are concerned one of the most important by-laws is the weight restriction by-law. We have been encountering some difficulty in having the RCMP enforce weight restriction by-laws due to the present wording of The Municipality Act. However, I am pleased to say that my colleague, the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Estey) will be proposing amendments to that Act which, when passed, will enable the RCMP to effectively enforce weight restriction by-laws in all municipalities in the province. This will be without additional charge to any of the municipalities concerned. Would my friend from Regina Centre (Mr. Blakeney) have us effectively reduce the strength of the RCMP in this province? Would he have us charge the rural municipalities and the towns and villages under 500 for this additional service?

You know, Mr. Speaker, the debate in the last few days has disclosed an interesting side light. This is the day of leadership campaigns all over Canada, and Saskatchewan is no exception to a leadership campaign. We have in the last few days in this House witnessed a leadership campaign going on amongst the Members who sit to your left, Mr. Speaker. Two of the gentlemen who spoke in this debate thus far, the Member for Regina Centre, (Mr. Blakeney) and the Member for Regina South East (Mr. Baker), I think made rather creditable leadership speeches for the leadership of their party whenever it comes.

Now I am going back to the police situation. Since 1966 we have been in a position to offer extended policing to towns and villages over 500 in population and under 1,500 in population. Since 1966 we have entered into contract with over 50 villages and towns in this category to have their policing carried out by the RCMP. Additionally the RCMP have entered into new contracts with towns over 1,500 in population, three towns, Battleford, Fort Qu'Appelle and Wadena. Our information is that this extended policing is working most satisfactorily and the

March 7, 1968

towns and villages concerned are quite satisfied with the service, the quality of service they are receiving. This extended policing is substantially subsidized by both the Provincial and Federal Governments. Would the Members opposite have us withdraw this subsidy from the rural areas of our province in an effort to reduce the Budget?

On September 1, 1967, we also instituted a new system of legal aid in this province. The rationale behind this move is once again directly related to the increasing complexity of our society, and the innumerable laws which we as citizens are required to obey. Mr. Speaker, one of the fundamental principles of our democratic system of law and justice is the right of an accused person to be represented at trial by a legal counsel. In our society you are presumed innocent until proven guilty. You walk into court a free man and you are entitled to be advised as to your rights when you are arrested and put on trial. Often, however, people who are in difficult financial circumstances and who are charged with an offence, have trouble obtaining the services of a lawyer. Up until last fall there was no comprehensive plan of legal aid, and the legal aid system set up and administered by my Hon. Friends when they were the Government was a hit-and-miss proposition, operating on a minimal budget and with minimal results. Under their system an accused person, if he had no money, pretty well had to depend upon the charity of his own lawyer. Our new plan has put this on a comprehensive basis and it's receiving a great deal of satisfactory comment all through the province. It has been going now for about four months in most of the cities of the province.

Then I would like to mention of course briefly, The Criminal Compensation Act, which was passed last year and it is now in operation. Would my Hon. Friends opposite cut the appropriation for this exciting new program out of the 1968 Budget? No review, Mr. Speaker, or discussion of the problems or evils existing in our contemporary society would be complete without a discussion of the terrible accident rate all over the world; and Saskatchewan is no exception. For sometime I, along with other Members of this House, have advocated the creation of a new offence in the Criminal Code or in the various provincial Vehicles Acts, if constitutionally possible, prohibiting anyone from driving with an alcoholic content in excess of .08 per cent in the blood. I am pleased that the present Parliament of Canada has put forward an amendment to the Code which will make it an offence to drive with a specified alcoholic content in the blood. However, the alcoholic content specified in the proposed legislation is .10 and I've said publicly and I say again that this percentage is too high. I have over the past three years made numerous representations to the Solicitor General and the Minister of Justice with respect to this matter, and, when I was in Ottawa last month at the Federal-Provincial Conference, I renewed my representations to Mr. Trudeau in this regard. I sincerely hope that it will be possible to have the prohibited level reduced from .10 to at least .08. Studies have established beyond a doubt that in a very high percentage of accidents one or other of the drivers had been drinking. As

indicated in the Speech from the Throne this Government will in this session be introducing amendments to The Vehicles Act to complement and make tougher and stiffen the proposed Federal legislation. I can tell you that the prohibitive level so far, as we are concerned, will not be more than .08 per cent.

Many other things have been done and need to be done to control accidents. I will only mention a few, for example, the Comprehensive Driver Training Program which started in the Department of Education September 1, last year. A stepped-up and intensified program of driver interviews and compulsory vehicle inspection is being considered. I've attended conferences on this. There are many pros and cons. My present view is that it should be seriously considered by the Government, and I will be urging my colleagues to do something about compulsory vehicle inspection before too long. We have surcharged bad drivers, this probably is having some effect. Then there will be Vehicles Act amendments introduced at this session which will enable us, we hope, to get at the bad drivers more so than under the present .system of coloured licences and the present point system, which has proven itself to be really too rigid and too inflexible.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to say a few words about The new Saskatchewan Securities Act which was passed at the last session of the Legislature. The Member for Notukeu-Willowbunch (Mr. Hooker) in this debate has detailed for this House and for the people of Saskatchewan the tragic and sordid story of weak securities legislation and weaker administration and enforcement, when the gentlemen who now sit to your left formed the Government of Saskatchewan. Last year we passed a new Securities Act which was patterned on the new Ontario Securities Act. On October 1, 1967, British Columbia and Alberta as well as Saskatchewan brought their new Acts into force. All of these Acts are patterned after the Ontario Act of 1966. This lends some uniformity within these four jurisdictions. The policy of The Saskatchewan Securities Commission of going beyond the full and true plain disclosure principle, when dealing with prospectuses, is I believe a good one. The case of the Prudential Finance Corporation of Ontario is a case in point. Had the Ontario Securities Commission looked into the feasibility of this setup, many Ontario investors wouldn't have suffered the loses which they did, The Ontario Securities Commission would not have left itself open to the criticism which it is today receiving. Our policy of course makes it necessary to use professional opinions and more thorough investigation of facts. We have a tough policy in the Saskatchewan Securities Commission, we are known throughout Canada as being a tough Commission. We believe that this policy of thorough investigation of facts, using the opinion of professional accountants and professional engineers, is paying off in the form of added protection to the investing public in Saskatchewan. However, Mr. Speaker, let me offer a word of warning to the investing public in our province. There is in my view a saturation point beyond which securities legislation should not attempt to go. The element of risk must always be there, and no amount of securities legislation can guarantee the

March 7, 1968

investor against loss. He must at all times take the normal precaution of a reasonably prudent investor and make his own investigation.

Permit me now, Mr. Speaker, to say a word or two about another exciting new program which commenced in my Department last year. And this is a program of legal education for Indian and Métis. From June 27, to June 30, 1967, a legal education course for Indians and Métis was held in the city of Regina. This course was very favourably received by the native people present. Further requests for such legal courses have been received from various other areas of the province. This course was sponsored by my Department, by the Indian and Métis Branch of Natural Resources and by the Federal Indian Affairs Department. Government solicitors as well as solicitors in private practice were the instructors. The judges and the RCMP and Regina city police were also represented. This year because of the very strong satisfactory response and because of the approval of the Indian and Métis people from last year's program, we are expanding this program. There will be two courses held this year, one at Prince Albert and one at Yorkton. No fees are charged for the courses. The courses take four days and during the period there are panel discussions and lectures. These courses enable our native people to more easily understand the white man's law, the various provisions of The Game Act, the various provisions of The Indian Act, their rights and privileges in a white society, their rights and privileges when they run foul of the white man's law, and so on. Mr. Speaker, this course I believe is making a significant contribution to easing the problems of our native population, as they approach and progress through the various stages of integration into our society.

Mr. Speaker, before I sit down I would like to tell the, House about another new program which was commenced in November of 1966 by this Department. This is the Indian and Métis Driver Training Program, under the Highway Traffic Board. Under this program, adult people of Indian ancestry and Métis people are trained in every phase of the safe operation of a motor vehicle. They receive a minimum of 20 hours of classroom instruction and a minimum of eight hours of in-car training. Besides the Provincial test, conducted by our driver examiners, every student has to pass five rigid tests during the course of instruction. Every successful student receives a special certificate at the completion of the course. This program has been a tremendous success, under the guidance of the Highway Traffic Board, an instructor-supervisor of Indian ancestry and three Indian instructors do all phases of the training. Up-to-date they have trained 345 people on many reserves like, Red Pheasant, North Battleford, Moosomin, Cochin, La Ronge, Montreal Lake, Sturgeon Lake, Witchehan Lake, Mistawasis, Marcelin, Cote and Key Reserves, Kamsack, Peepeekisis, Kenossee, Balcarres and so on. The most outstanding result of the Indian and Métis driver training program has been the large number of students who have been able to obtain gainful employment because of this training. At La Ronge for example, three young boys have been taxi drivers since

last May. Many of the students from Montreal Lake are engaged in driving heavy trucks to the pulp mill at Prince Albert. This program has had a great impact on the native people and is gaining wide universal acceptance by our native population. We are making preparations to widen and enlarge this program this spring by training an additional two instructors with the cooperation of the Department of Education. Mr. Speaker, would my Hon. Friends opposite have us discontinue this program? Is this a program they would wipe out, these self-styled protectors of the down-trodden who place people before dollars? Mr. Speaker, this is a fine program, and so long as this Government is in office, it will be extended and expanded so long as it is needed by our native population.

Mr. Speaker, I've tried in the last 30 minutes or so to give Hon. Members an idea of some of the programs that are going on in the departments for which I have responsibility. They of course are part of this Budget; they are good programs for the people of Saskatchewan. This Budget is going to do many things for the less fortunate people in our society. And because of this and because of the other reasons that I have stated at the outset, I of course will be voting against the amendment and will be voting for the main motion.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. W.S. Howes: (Kerrobort-Kindersley) — In rising to participate in this debate, I first of all want to congratulate you on your election as Speaker of this Legislature. I think, perhaps more than any other Member of this Assembly, I can appreciate what your position is and also I appreciate the help that you have given me in my position in this House. I would also like to congratulate all Members on their election or re-election last October 11.

I am sure that the new Members will find, as time goes on, the work of this Assembly and its Committees, very enjoyable and I am also certain they will make a great contribution to this Legislature and the Province and the people they represent. I must admit, however, Sir, that I would be remiss if I did not extend my sympathy to all defeated Liberal candidates, but I hope next time around they will have more success. I would also at this point, Sir, like to congratulate the Member for Athabasca, the Member for Pelly, the Member for Nutana Centre on their appointment to the Executive Council. I believe these Members will in their positions do an excellent job and be a credit to their constituencies and, I think, along with all other Members of the Assembly, we hope the Member for Pelly (Mr. Barrie) will soon be back with us.

Mr. Speaker, I would also like to say thanks to the people of my constituency for returning me to this 16th Legislature. It was, I think, an indication of the satisfaction of the people of my constituency for the work the Government was doing. In my seat our plurality in numbers was a few less than in 1964, but

March 7, 1968

on the basis of an over-all percentage of those voting, the results from seats showed a slight increase in majority and of course, as all Members know . . .

Mr. E. Kramer: (The Battlefords) — There are lots of people leaving there.

Mr. Howes: — Oh that's a matter of opinion — . . . as all Members know the election of 1967 in my constituency was conducted on the same boundaries as the election of 1964. Although of course I feel that these boundaries are in error because they are based on the re-distribution of 1952, which took from my constituency a row of Liberal polls on the north boundary of the seat, probably with a plurality in those polls of a couple of hundred. If these had been retained, my constituency would have gone Liberal in 1960 as well as 1964 and 1967 and possibly even before that. Nobody seems to want to give the polls back though.

During the campaign, Mr. Speaker, in my constituency, a great deal was made by the Opposition of the development of the sodium sulphate plant at Alsask and the deposit associated with it. A statement was made in the campaign by my opposition that the Government sold this deposit to the developer for approximately one cent per ton. Well, Mr. Speaker, this is not so. The Government, or perhaps I should say its Crown Corporation, transferred the lease to the developer and under this lease he received the right to develop the deposit, subject of course to the payment of royalties to the Provincial Treasurer, based on the amount of sodium sulphate taken from the deposit. He also received some buildings that were absolutely without value. Mr. Speaker, sodium sulphate deposits are never sold. I do not believe any have ever been sold in this Province. Results of the election show that the people of my constituency are pleased to see this deposit being developed. This deposit and its development are providing employment for many young farmers in my constituency. As we all know, it is difficult to start farming at this point in time, and the employment that is being provided allows these young chaps to get started, which perhaps they would be unable to do otherwise. This alone is a great thing for the area and is a benefit to agriculture in general. The revenues that accrue to the Provincial Treasurer from this deposit also have, of course, contributed to keeping down the general level of taxation. Mr. Speaker, deposits such as sodium sulphate were placed there to be used. It is being used to develop this Province, and I think that it is better to make use of it than to leave it to sit and stagnate for fifty or a hundred years. The people of my constituency in the election of last October 11 have expressed their opinions on this subject, and I hope that no more will be heard of the matter.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I would like to say something about this Budget. We on this side have been accused of not talking about it, well I'm going to say a little bit. You know that those who sit to your left feel that it is a terrible Budget, that it

provides for tax increases. They also claim the tax increases are in the wrong place. Well, Mr. Speaker, I don't like tax increases any better than anyone else. I, like every other citizen in the province, will have to pay my share, but I think that it is better to finance as this Budget proposes to do on a cash basis rather than through the borrowing of large sums and the consequent increases in interest payments. I think also, Mr. Speaker, that it has taken a great deal of courage for the Provincial Treasurer to institute charges for the utilization of medical and hospital benefits under the respective plans. I realize that these charges will, in some areas, not be popular, but in parts of my constituency before the implementation of Provincial Medicare, we had utilization charges on municipal medical schemes and they were of value in keeping those plans working satisfactorily. I believe, Mr. Speaker, the charges will be of value in keeping the Hospitalization and Medicare Plans of the Province working.

If we do not get the operation of these plans onto a sound basis, disaster could occur and I know the people of this province are not prepared to see these plans sacrificed, so therefore something had to be done. The Provincial Treasurer has done what was required, and rather than receiving barbs of criticism, he deserves commendation for taking the action he has.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Howes: — For example, Sir, I was secretary of the Eatonia Union Hospital for many years. If my memory serves me correctly, in 1955 the outpatient visits on a monthly basis totalled between 20 and 25, whereas in 1967 for the months of January, February and March they averaged 163 per month, a seven to eight-fold increase and of course the cost increased similarly. This fact alone, Mr. Speaker, indicates the drastic rise in hospital utilization. I do not know whether all of the visits in the outpatient departments of hospitals are required, but the level of health in the area served by the Eatonia Union Hospital does not appear to be appreciably higher than it was in 1955, so consequently I wonder.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I would like to say a few words about my constituency, the finest in the province, I think. The Department of Highways in the last few years has done a great deal to help the people of my constituency through the oiling and surfacing of various highways in it, and they appreciate the effort and the work that has gone into these improvements. We appreciate the roads that have been taken into the highway system, but you know, Mr. Speaker, we haven't quite got everything done that needs to be done. I would like to suggest to the Minister that the oiling on No. 372 from No. 30 into Coleville should be given a high priority as well as the oiling of No. 31 from Highway No. 30 to Doddsland. Highway No. 372, according to a question answered for the Member from Melfort-Tisdale (Mr. Willis), I believe carried 380 vehicles per day

March 7, 1968

last year. A large part of this traffic is composed of oil trucks hauling heavy crude for shipment out of Coleville, after being blended, so that it can be transported via Interprovincial Pipelines. I feel that this road is not just a road to serve a local area, but is a road to serve a great industry. I think from the revenues that accrue from this industry, consideration should be given to upgrading the road, so that the industry and the people of the area will both benefit. Also of course the same remarks would apply, although to a slightly lesser extent to the other road I mentioned, namely No. 31.

Mr. Speaker, before I take my seat, I would like to say something about municipalities. I was delighted to see that the level of grants and services to municipalities was not decreased in this Budget. A great deal is made of the increase in municipal taxation, but I can say to you, Sir, that without the increases in grants that have been given over the term of office of this Government, the taxation pictures in municipalities would be unbelievable and almost unbearable. For example, Mr. Speaker, the grid road grants in 1966-67 were approximately \$5,700,000 versus \$4,300,000 in 1963-64. For re-graveling, the grants in 1966-67 were approximately \$417,000 versus \$188,000 in 1963-64. Also, Mr. Speaker, in connection with these re-graveling grants, they are now on the basis of need to be done rather than on an arbitrary five-year basis as they were in 1963-64. I can tell you, Sir, that municipal annual meetings in my RM have been much more pleasant for all concerned since this policy was instituted.

For grid road bridges the figure is \$380,000 versus \$335,000 in 1962-63. Equalization grants have gone from \$579,000 in 1963-64 to \$1,955,000 in 1966-67. This increase in equalization grants has, in the case of municipalities in my area, made a difference in the mill rate that would have had to be levied of approximately one to two mills and more in one or two cases. The grant for grid road maintenance in 1966-67 was \$714,000 versus nothing in the previous years. For snow removal \$242,000 versus nothing in previous years. These latter two grants are improving the standard of maintenance of our grid roads and in isolated areas, such as exist in some parts of my constituency, are providing a sure outlet for school buses in the winter, something the people have never known before. Mr. Speaker, I think that the record of this Government so far as rural constituencies are concerned, is one of the best records in the history of any Government of this Province.

A great deal remains to be done in our rural areas, but a start has been made. No doubt as time goes on, the policies of the Government will be improved to further upgrade the rural areas. For that reason, Sir, I shall most certainly support the motion that you do now leave the Chair, but not the amendment.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. E. Whelan: (Regina Northwest) — Mr. Speaker, in joining this debate, I would like to

express my sincere appreciation to those who supported me in the last election and made my victory possible in Regina North West. The majority is gratifying and I shall continue to work in the best interests of all my constituents. My special thanks go to those who helped me in the campaign.

Mr. Speaker, when the Premier announced that there would be a new Provincial Treasurer, there was much speculation as to who would be appointed. Some people suggested that it would be the Hon. Member for Regina South (Mr. Grant), some suggested that it would be the Hon. Member for Lumsden (Mr. Heald). But when it became evident immediately after the election that the Province was in economic trouble and the Premier needed a hard-hearted, politically motivated member who would lose no sleep over the plight of the people he taxed, there was only one choice on the benches opposite, the Hon. Member for Prince Albert West (Mr. Steuart) who could draw riding boundaries, so that one per cent of the votes could give them an 11-seat majority, who could introduce into the Province the most heartless and inhuman mental health program ever witnessed by the people of the Province of Saskatchewan. Mr. Speaker, he has won his spurs. Not only did he introduce the program, but in a performance that would make Peter Lorre look like an amateur, he denied the circumstances, the suffering and the unbelievable conditions that he created in the interests of saving money on the Mental Health Program. He ridiculed those who confronted him, such a person now sits as Treasurer of this Province.

Well, Mr. Speaker, he must re-draw Prince Albert West to increase the miserable majority he now has. Three, four, five years from now he must get together with MacLaren's Agency and just before an election, hand out baskets of money and try to convince the people of Saskatchewan it was all just good fun and they must have enjoyed it all. Mr. Speaker, there are probably no more upset or more despairing people anywhere in the Province than the handful of voters in his riding who didn't vote, who could have removed him from the public quite easily. When they see the financial calamity the people of Saskatchewan have to suffer as a result of their failure to exercise their franchise last October 11, I'm sure there will be weeping and gnashing of teeth in Prince Albert West.

Members on this side of the House have a duty and an obligation to the people of Saskatchewan, to call to the attention of citizens at every opportunity from now until we vote again, regardless of the handouts that will be made by the Liberal Government, just prior to an election, that the people in this Province were misled prior to October 11 regarding the serious economic situation of the Province; that reports of the economic situation were suppressed; that the only planning that the Members opposite did was the planning to mislead the people of Saskatchewan into voting for them on October 11.

March 7, 1968

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Whelan: — I wonder if I might talk about the potash industry in this province for a moment. Even at this date, even now, one has to look in newspapers 1,800 miles away to find out what's going on currently in the potash industry. A person who is a member of the press gallery here reported in a paper in eastern Canada just recently and I refer to that report. The report appears in the Toronto Globe and Mail, February 29, 1968, and quotes the Minister of Mineral Resources, the Hon. Mr. Cameron. This was just February 29, 1968, he says, quoting Mr. Cameron, "We do not believe that the efforts required to become a world producer should be left to the industry alone. The Government is conscious of the fact that for a few years in the 1970s there will be a world surplus in potash which will lead to lower prices and keener competition."

Well, Mr. Speaker, let's look at some facts. Certainly we're not getting any from the Government, we're going to get nothing but smart remarks. We seem to be getting nothing but verbosity and insults when we ask questions in this House. In the meantime what is happening? The Toronto Daily Star printed an article, not one word of which has been challenged, not one sentence in the article has been taken up or refuted by this Government. The article dated December 5, 1967, is headed, "Potash, A Young Canadian Giant in Trouble." It makes the following statements or comes to the following conclusions. All three potash companies operating in Saskatchewan at the present time are American-controlled. American legislation forbids them from trading with Communist countries, such as China or Cuba where a market for potash exists. Further, Mr. Speaker, it contends in the article, three more potash companies are scheduled to come into production next year, increasing the tonnage to more than 8 million tons annually from the present 4.8 million tons. There is an over-supply on the American market at the present time and the price has dropped by 25 per cent. One of the new potash companies that are coming into production has a contract with a Farmers' Cooperative in north western United States which will cut into the existing markets in that country. Mr. Speaker, I suggest to all Members of the House, if they are not already aware of the facts, that they read this article, in the December 5, 1967 issue of the Toronto Daily Star, complete with pictures. I am prepared to have the article Photostatted if they are interested in what is happening to our \$650 million industry, the royalties and the jobs that are involved.

What are some of the other developments? Well, the Government has told the people with potash holdings that they could have a very lengthy extension of time to develop their holdings. The Government has claimed that freight rates for potash are too high. The Government is considering the feasibility of a pipeline to the already over-loaded American market. What are some of the facts they haven't told the people of Canada, the people of Saskatchewan and when questioned, have avoided telling the people of this Province? Well, Mr. Speaker, one of the

large potash projects in the Yorkton area described as an investment of over \$80 million, in a moment of political ecstasy by some of the Members of the Government opposite, has locked its gate and left the Province because of the market situation and American control of their capital.

In answer to one of the Saskatchewan MPs in the House of Commons. the President of the Canadian Transport Commission, J.W. Pickersgill, who is very well known to all Members opposite, gave according to a report in the Leader-Post. February 13, 1968, as his opinion, that high freight rates are not responsible for the problems in the potash industry. The Commission further reported, "The rate may also be compared", talking about the freight rate, "with a general scale of rates on fertilizers, which produce an average ton-mile revenue in western Canada of just a shade under one cent."

The Commission also in its report to Mr. Pickersgill said that the rate of \$9 a ton on potash for export through west coast ports is no less favourable to the Canadian producer than corresponding potash rates from Carlsbad. New Mexico to Los Angeles. Carlsbad is a major potash-producing area in the United States.

Well. Mr; Speaker. this was the criticism that the freight rates were the cause of all the trouble. This was their explanation. When I asked in this House about marketing to Communist countries. the Premier said, "Well, the potash companies have never been in touch with the Communist countries, and the Communist countries have never been in touch with the potash companies." I suggest that the Premier is head of the Department of Industry and Commerce — isn't that a fine setup. What good is a Department of Industry and Commerce. what good is it? Is it just a front for making anti-Socialist speeches and tours of the United States as far south as the Bahamas. I suggest that the Premier has let the people of Saskatchewan down badly, if he does not get in touch with the Communist countries interested in buying potash.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Whelan: — When some of the ablest economists in this country. and some of the most capable men on this continent wrote a report, a report on foreign ownership which was submitted to the House of Commons by the Chairman of the Privy Council, the Hon. Walter Gordon, who is also the campaign manager of the Federal Liberal party, he submitted a report which said that Saskatchewan potash could not be sold to Communist countries. The Premier did not answer. He did not comment; he did not say whether the report was correct; he didn't say whether it was incorrect. His only answer was a tirade and wild criticism of a very courageous man, with whom we in this group may differ politically. but who is first, last and always an honest Canadian.

Mr. Speaker, what is the answer to this situation? For

March 7, 1968

years the Liberal Government of Canada refused to sell wheat to the Communist nations. For years they took the same position as the Premier opposite. For years the interests of Canadian farmers took second place. Then the Government of Ottawa was replaced and another Government sold wheat to people if they wanted it, regardless of their political thinking. Mr. Speaker, I want the Premier of the Province to get on his feet in this House to tell us that in the interests of the potash industry, in the interests of the investment and the royalties and the employment involved, that as the Minister of Industry and Commerce he has to get down to business on this problem . . .

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Whelan: — . . . that he is going to send representatives to talk to these countries that use potash; that he is going to quit making slighting remarks when anyone expresses serious concern for the potash industry, as did the Hon. Walter Gordon; that he's going to ascertain, whether the American-controlled companies are forbidden to trade with Communist China and other nations, through his Department either directly or through the Federal Department of Trade and Commerce. He should go to every Communist representative and every potash market in the world to find a market for our potash.

Mr. Speaker, there is more than just the royalties at stake; there's more than jobs at stake; there's more than the investment at stake; there are a couple of principles involved. Let's look at one of them. Are we going to allow a foreign-controlled company operating within our province, developing a resource that we own, to control and designate the market for that resource? I say No, if we are Canadians. I say it is time that we stood up and were counted on this issue and that, instead of wearing his shoes on his knees around these people, the Premier should set out guidelines for developing industries in this country. Mr. Speaker, it is time for leadership, and I suggest we expect leadership from the Premier.

The other issue is the long-term issue which is more important. Like the wheat which grows above the ground on these prairies, potash from below the ground means food for the millions of people in the world who are hungry. Selling potash to the people who need it to provide food for hungry citizens around the globe is a must. It is an investment in the future, in our future relationship with other countries. Providence was good enough to give us this resource; it is a resource that can feed the world. It cannot be withheld; to withhold it is to starve people. Starving them to death is tantamount to taking their lives. If we take someone's life when we could have saved it, we must ask ourselves, will we be forgiven?

The potash picture in Saskatchewan is not rosy, but it is about time the Government opposite used the expenditure in the Department of Industry and Commerce to get on with the task of locating markets for this chemical which produces food. The

Department must work to make sure that potash is available to any nation, anywhere, that wants to buy it.

Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I could turn for a moment to the new deterrent fees. This is a very painful and disappointing aspect of the Budget. It imposes a hardship on the people I represent; a riding like Regina North West has a great number of senior citizens within its boundaries. My telephone has rung persistently since last Friday. For instance, a senior citizen has to see a doctor for a hypo once a week, the taxi comes to \$1.50, 75 cents each way, now there is a deterrent fee, \$1.50, that comes to \$3 a week, four times three, \$12 a month. What a kind-hearted and gentle way to collect taxes! A more calculating and cruel approach to balancing a Budget has never been unveiled. However, there was nothing in the Budget that said there was going to be an extension of medicare, nothing of that sort. If the long-promised drugs were to be added, this would have relieved the burden from the senior citizens, from the young family; no such promise is carried out, no indication that it will be. There was to be an increase in the coverage for those who must seek specialized care outside the province, but such is not the case. There was to be coverage for mileage for those in outlying districts, those who live in rural areas, but on the contrary this Government withdrew the coverage for mileage and as a result the patient has to pay for it.

Let me tell you, Mr. Speaker, if I may, about the lack of coverage that exists at the present time in medicare. In my constituency a young man developed a heart condition. He required a very delicate heart operation. The Saskatchewan doctor referred him to the Mayo Clinic. The total bill for surgery, for hospitalization, for drugs and the 8 per cent exchange on Canadian money, amounted to a total of \$4,992 and the Medical Care Insurance Commission which is supposed to be covering medical bills, we're supposed to be insured against this sort of thing, paid the magnificent sum of \$1,509. The original payment was \$1,349, but the Medical Care Insurance Commission increased it to \$1,509 after the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Lloyd) took the matter up with the Minister of Health (Mr. Grant). Mr. Speaker, this isn't coverage. This is a farce, this is unrealistic. This 28-year-old man thought he had medical insurance. When we were the Government and we introduced Medicare, extension of coverage was in the cards. The present Government's refusal to recognize increased costs and to increase payments and coverage for out-of-the-province care has resulted in this most unsatisfactory condition. A \$5,000 bill and a \$1,500 payment from Medicare.

Mr. Grant: — You know that's not true.

Mr. Whelan: — Throughout my riding there are cases like this, cases where long periods of hospitalization and special care were not covered completely. And the patient, upon leaving the hospital, had a bill as high as \$600 or \$700 for extras that were not

March 7, 1968

covered. There has been no extension of coverage. As a matter of fact coverage that was included has been withdrawn. Let me be specific, in 1965 Medicare under this Government withdrew the coverage for mileage in rural areas. This has resulted in some physicians charging anything they like at any time for mileage. I have some bills. Some of these charges run pretty high, \$1 a mile. These patients are no longer covered for mileage under the Medicare Care Insurance Commission. You know that a Girl Guide or Boy Scout who wants to go to a camp, or a young person who wants to engage in athletic contests, has to have a medical examination, but that this is not covered by Medicare. I have one family in my constituency where this added up to a \$60 cost last year.

An Hon. Member — I'm going out for some fresh air!

Mr. Whelan: — I am suggesting that you give some extension to the present coverage. That's all I am suggesting.

Mr. Thatcher: — Yeah!

Mr. Whelan: — Just listen and you'll hear some good advice. With national Medicare mooted for July 1, 1968 and a \$10 million payment from the Federal Government coming into the Provincial Treasury, it seemed logical to expect the Government to increase coverage, rather than to introduce deterrent fees against the old people and the children, for they are the people that are sick.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Whelan: — I think we have every right to expect an extension of coverage for those who must go outside the province and for mileage in rural areas. In regard to the mileage in rural areas I wrote the Minister and I received the following reply. This is what he said in a letter to me:

In reply to your letter of October 18, it is certainly true that the Medical Care Insurance Commission does not pay for mileage. It is probably also true that this places the rural patients at an economic disadvantage for the costs of their medical attention. However, it must be remembered that mileage is an additional cost borne by rural residents in many instances other than medical attention. He must pay travel costs to buy groceries, to visit the hospital, etc. This additional travel cost is perhaps offset by other economies of rural life.

I suppose, Mr. Speaker, the economies include the drop in price of wheat and hogs and the increase in the fuel tax. are the economies he was talking about.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Whelan: — A deterrent fee is not justified, least of all for senior citizens. I hope they don't impose one on senior citizens. They have one on them now in the mileage payments and that certainly is an innovation that they introduced in 1965 when they took the mileage payments out of the medical care coverage. We should have an extension of coverage to include mileage in rural areas, drugs for senior citizens, and the care of children's teeth. The .increase in the sales tax plus the payment from the Federal Government should provide ample funds for the programs that I have outlined. Many people in Canada are saying today that they should have medical care like the plan in Saskatchewan. I say to these people the present Government in Saskatchewan is chopping away at the coverage and increasing taxes to the breaking point to give those who live outside the province an unfavourable picture of Medicare, and trying to turn residents within the province against the Plan.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Whelan: — Mr. Speaker, I would like to turn for a few minutes to the Automobile Accident Insurance program. Two years ago, in a high-handed and dictatorial fashion, every driver of 25 years or less, whether their driving record was good or bad, paid an extra \$2 for their licence. They were fined \$2 without a trial; they paid it only because of their age. The bad drivers in other age brackets were not fined, just all the young people in the 25 and under age bracket. Some may have sincerely thought that this would improve the accident rate in this province. Last year a new levy was brought in. Anyone who has ever had a fender dented, anyone who was supposed to be at fault in an accident was levied \$25. It was a case of being guilty until you were proven innocent because you had to make an appeal. You were levied the \$25 and that was it. Again we were told this would reduce highway fatalities. What has been the result? Mr. Speaker, this past year we set a record for the number of highway deaths in this province. More people died on the highways of Saskatchewan than at any other time in the history of our province, 275 people died. Why? Perhaps the answer to the question is in the fact there are more liquor outlets, longer hours for taverns. There are no restrictions or system for testing drivers to find out if they have been drinking. One would almost think the Government opposite was working in cahoots with the liquor interests, the way they have shied away from using scientific equipment to prevent deaths on the highways. Perhaps there is an arrangement, perhaps that is why nothing is done, no concrete, positive steps taken to get the drunken killers off the road.

I sat on the Legislative Committee on Highway Traffic and Safety with Members opposite. It was a good committee, an excellent committee, they were all nice people, but until Members opposite get up sufficient courage to use the legal genius

March 7, 1968

of the people in the Department of the Attorney General to draft legislation, that will banish from the highways the drunken killer at the wheel of the automobile, we will go on setting records for highway deaths. It doesn't matter, Mr. Speaker, to someone who has been killed, whether the driver paid \$2 or whether he didn't. And it doesn't matter whether he paid a \$25 surcharge, and it does not matter if the insurance fund is satisfied. It just doesn't matter to the 275 people in this province, some of whom died because the Attorney General ignored the minority recommendations of Members on this side of the House who sat on the Highway Traffic Committee. I quote the recommendation:

The Committee unanimously agreed that immediate action be taken to make it an offence to operate a vehicle with a blood alcohol level in excess of 0.08 per cent. However, we disagree strongly with the proposal that action by the Province to incorporate this proposal in The Vehicles Act should be delayed until after it is seen if the Federal Government will incorporate this proposal in the Criminal Code. It is useful to press the Federal Government to incorporate this provision in the Criminal Code. However, the delay involved in following this procedure would nullify the impact of the basic recommendation which calls for immediate action. The Committee's study indicates clearly that alcohol is a major factor in a large proportion of the growing number of traffic fatalities. The evidence makes it clear that immediate action by the province is required for the sake of saving many lives.

Dated December, 1966, it is on page 32 of the report, signed by Arthur Thibault, MLA, Kinistino; Ed. C. Whelan, MLA, Regina North; G.C. Willis, MLA, Melfort-Tisdale.

Two years and two months ago this minority report was written. How many people have died on the highways of this province, innocent people, mothers of small children, fathers who left widows and orphans because no effort was made, no legal action was taken to test impaired drivers on the road. To sit idly by and watch innocent people die may not have been their purpose, but that in fact is what has happened. Mr. Speaker, in Great Britain where they used the breathalyzer, over the recent Christmas holidays, 50 fewer people died on the streets than one year ago, when they didn't use the breathalyzer. Reports were made available to us when we sat on the Highway Traffic and Safety Committee, reliable reports such as "The Role of the Drinking Driver in Traffic Accidents", usually referred to as the "Grand Rapids Survey", which show beyond any doubt that liquor is involved in more than half of all accidents which take place on the highways. To hesitate is to cause traffic deaths, and this Government has now hesitated for two years. What a sad commentary on the type of leadership we are getting from them, for in the meantime it has made liquor available in more places for longer hours. We do not oppose this development, but with it goes responsibility, the responsibility to introduce

legislation that will eliminate and remove from the front seat of an automobile a driver who is impaired, according to a breathalyzer test.

If anyone is under the impression that the breathalyzer is not accurate, and if anyone thinks he can drive a car with better than 0.08 per cent reading, I suggest that you take the test. The Highway Traffic and Safety Committee conducted such a test. The original intention was to recommend 0.10 per cent. The Committee was in favour of 0.08 per cent, or less, when the test was completed.

Mr. Speaker, about the first week of last August a prominent member of the Liberal party told the people in my riding: (1) that the election would be on October 11; (2) that if the Liberals were re-elected, there would be deterrent fees; (3) that Government Insurance would be either sold or emasculated so that it would not interfere with the private insurance business. Well, Mr. Speaker, the election was held on October 11. The dastardly deterrent fee has been introduced, and the February 14, 1968 Globe and Mail carried a story from Regina, headed: "Share in Saskatchewan's Business Delayed — Thatcher Keeps Auto Insurance Companies Waiting." I am sure they are breathless. I quote from the story:

Private auto insurance companies will have to wait at least a year to share in Saskatchewan's auto insurance business, according to Premier Ross Thatcher. Premiums collected annually under the Province's compulsory plan amount to about \$23 million. Premier Thatcher has confirmed that the All-Canada Insurance Federation has submitted several proposals in accordance with the Provincial Government's pre-election promise to maintain compulsory insurance while allowing motorists to purchase coverage privately.

Well, Mr. Speaker, to allow private companies into this field can do nothing but run up the costs. At the present time compulsory insurance has an acquisition fee of less than 1 per cent, and I quote the Globe and Mail story of February 14, 1968:

The private insurers will face cost difficulties trying to match the Government in basic coverage. Agents' commissions average about 12.5 per cent, while the Government, using its car licensing machinery to collect premiums — and paying no commissions — has an acquisition cost of 1 per cent. Even should the private insurers eliminate agents' commissions in some way, it is doubtful they could get their costs down to 1 per cent.

Mr. Speaker, the story and the details are available for anyone who wants to read it; it tells exactly what they intend to do; the type of proposal that has been submitted to the Government. These companies would enter the field and run up the cost. There is no doubt about that. It would be a pay-off to the

March 7, 1968

insurance companies promised by the Government before the election. I just want to say this. Once more the people are going to pay through the nose for having trusted the Liberals. But any insurance companies that come into the compulsory automobile area can rest assured that, when we become the Government, they will get pushed out. Every survey, every source possible proves beyond the shadow of a doubt that private insurance cannot meet and does not meet the cost of compulsory Government automobile insurance.

In addition, there are a number of things that are taking place in the private field, according to Consumer Reports of January, 1968, and I quote: This article is entitled "Auto Insurance Reform." It's a careful research of the automobile accident picture and insurance picture all over the North American continent. I quote two short sections:

Insurance companies cancel policies on the flimsiest of pretexts, or, without explanation, refuse to renew them.

Another section:

Furthermore, insurance companies are becoming terribly selective about whom they will insure in the first place.

Once the private insurance companies get in the field in Saskatchewan, we will have the same experience they have in other parts of Canada and in the United States. These experiences cause extreme discontent among the motorists.

Mr. Speaker, the administrative cost of compulsory insurance under The Automobile Accident Insurance Act is the lowest in the world. To enter, as suggested in this story in the Globe and Mail, February 14, 1968, into an arrangement with private insurance companies would introduce extra costs to the consumer, would be the thin edge of the wedge that would eventually destroy the plan.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Whelan: — The compulsory aspect of the plan is what has reduced the rates. To handle insurance in any other way is bound to increase costs. I say to the Government opposite, and to any private insurance companies, we serve fair warning that they can expect that The Automobile Accident Insurance Act will be restored to its original form, and any concession they have won from their friends in the Government opposite will be discontinued when the New Democrats are re-elected.

Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I could turn for a moment to another area. I know it is disturbing the Hon. Member from Prince Albert West (Mr. Steuart) but after a Budget like that what could you expect.

Mr. Steuart: It really doesn't disturb me.

Mr. Whelan: — In order to assist the farmer in his economic difficulties, in order to make sure that recognition is gained, in order to help him out of the financial jackpot he is in, (You know he is in a terrible financial mess at the present time, look at the rural constituencies, look at the way the farmers are leaving the land.) well this Government has added 2 cents per gallon to farm fuels. Fill up with 500 gallons — they're helping them — pay \$10 extra to fill up the tank. Isn't this a wonderful way to help the farmer with his costs. But not a word from the Government regarding machinery costs, not a word regarding the profits of the machinery companies. Massey-Ferguson, for instance, increased its profits between 1964 and 1966 from \$18 million to \$45 million, an increase of 150 per cent, although the sales increased by some 56 per cent. These are the profits of these companies. Not as much as a peep out of the Government on behalf of farmers when these profits were reported. The Government opposite recognizes the plight of the farmer. Yes, it does, it adds 2 cents per gallon on to farm fuel. It participates, it is right in there, in the cost-price squeeze. Just squeeze them for all they are worth. Members opposite maintain that the New Democrats have stated that, if they were elected, purple gas would be taken from the farmers. There is no statement anywhere and no record any place to this effect. This is a figment of an active Liberal imagination. Mr. Speaker, with the price of farm machinery going up, with the price of grain and hogs and beef going down, any Government Member who would add any cost to the farmers' operations has only one objective — and he is certainly working on that objective — he will put the farmer who is already hard-pressed out of business.

Yes, Mr. Speaker, they are the farmers' friends. Aren't the Liberals a friendly bunch, \$10 for every 500 gallons, pay \$10 extra on every 500 gallons of fuel used by the farmer, a good measure of their friendship. With friends like that the farmers don't need any enemies.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Whelan: — Mr. Speaker, this Budget taxes the sick, the sick people, the children, the older people, maternity cases. It refuses to extend coverage for Medicare, provides no assurance that compulsory Automobile Insurance will be retained. There's nothing in the Budget that indicates that there will be a program which will result in a reduction of highway deaths. This Budget was concocted to make ordinary people suffer, to try the patience of those who are not well, to bring hardship to those in the lower income bracket.

Mr. Speaker, there is no reason, no justification, no explanation, and no possible motive a Member might have for supporting this Budget. I defy those in the Government benches to explain it to their constituents. I intend to support the amendment, and I am absolutely and completely opposed to the motion.

March 7, 1968

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. J.J. Charlebois: (Saskatoon City Park-University) — Mr. Speaker, speaking in favour of the Budget I would like to compliment this Government on the favourable atmosphere it has created for industry in this Province, an atmosphere in which private enterprise is recognized as an essential to the proper development of our resources, and to the very important secondary industries that result and are presently expanding and being attracted to Saskatchewan. This includes foreign investment, Mr. Speaker, something with which our Socialist friends say they disagree but their own record was each year to put on a fancy new tie and a big cigar and go straight to Wall Street and come back boasting of the millions of American dollars they were able to borrow.

An Hon. Member — . . . five-cent cigars . . .

Mr. Charlebois: — For many years we were dependent on the single base of agriculture, over 75 per cent of our total production as a Province was from this source, whereas now our prime resources are giving us a very broad and diversified base for our economy. We are now on the threshold of a generation that will reap rich benefits indeed for the hardships of survival experienced during the earlier stages of our history as a province. Certainly we owe this survival to the grace of God and a rich soil, but certainly too the spirit and initiative of free enterprise have played their part.

Each farmer that homesteaded is an example of an entrepreneur, and because of their initiative and hard work and study, we now have an agricultural industry which has the best know-how, the best technology and the best productivity of any in the world.

Now as we look at the over-all picture of industry in Saskatchewan, we can see the vibrant effect that private enterprise is creating on our new horizons. Indeed the base has widened considerably. As we look to the north we see more than 90 mining companies exploring. Certainly not all of these companies will discover the untold mineral wealth and riches that we hope will be uncovered. Primary enterprise is prepared to take this risk. Some will lose, but we have every confidence that some will be successful. The people of Saskatchewan will share in the benefits, not only through taxes, but through the steady employment of our people and the addition of knowledgeable men of private enterprise to our society. To say that we are giving away our resources, that we are not interested in people when we create jobs through private enterprise, is a despicable and an illogical charge. We are developing our resources and we have only started because we are creating an atmosphere in which people can use their vision and their initiative.

Our north country is a vivid reminder of the thrilling work that lies before us when we consider the potential of the

tremendous water resources. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Herb Larson of Saskatoon and I operated a tourist camp at Cree Lake Lodge for 10 years. One day I was out on the lake with two fellows who were seeing this beautiful lake for the first time. One said to the other, "My God, Mack, if we could pipe this thing into the city of Denver we'd be millionaires overnight." I say, here was a man of vision, believe me. The technologies that we now have available permit us to see clearly many possibilities that could not be contemplated 10 years ago. In recent years we have seen major changes and improvements in transportation; and competition is responsible and will continue to be responsible for further new developments. Truck transport competing with railroads has advanced both methods.

We have seen the gigantic accomplishment of pipelines for gas and oil. Now, we are about to see the economic benefits to this province of the pipeline movement of bulk goods to and from our province. While we contemplate the challenging transportation needs of our potash industry in this manner, we will, at the same time open up new horizons for our manufacturing industries with the potential import of raw materials at rates that will permit us to develop new industries that will add to the diversification presently taking place.

With new imaginative transportation we can look with renewed interest to the Churchill Route, and I would like to give recognition here, Mr. Speaker, to Mr. J. S. "Woody" Woodward, the present President of the Hudson's Bay Route Association and to the other members for their dedication and realization of the potential value of this route to our economy, and for the very practical presentations that they have made to have more use made of this shipping route. We are aware too of the northern experiments with the hovercraft and we realize its feasibility. We need only to look at the aircraft industry to be assured that the development of this hovercraft transport to Europe via the Churchill Route is a distinct possibility. Transportation, which has been one of our major economic difficulties, is to be one of our major assets in this coming generation.

As we look at our timber belt, we now see private enterprise companies such as Simpson Lumber Company Limited, MacMillan Bloedel, and Parsons and Whitmore. These people who know their business represent investment made to our benefit. This means, Mr. Speaker, that we are looking at the start of a new generation with a stabilized economy, which will give full employment and will benefit and upgrade the standard of living of the people in this area. Now our people can benefit from our forest resources instead of devoting them to the support of a parasitic Socialist bureaucracy.

And on our plains besides the great new discoveries of helium and light gravity crude oil, we have our most exciting potash industry. Every time this industry is mentioned, the Socialists jump to claim credit for it. I would like here to

March 7, 1968

point to the hypocrisy of Socialism when, in one breath they claim credit for industry, and in the next they condemn absolutely the investment of American capital in our resources. They voice their doctrine, which still says "We will not rest until capitalism is eradicated. Capitalism belongs on the manure pile." Well let's take a look at the manure pile that they left behind them and see the healthy mushrooms of industry that are popping up under the sunshine of a free enterprise atmosphere.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Charlebois: — I would like to take the example of what is happening in the Saskatoon area because I am personally familiar with the industry in this area. Here we have the thrilling picture, Mr. Speaker, of six potash mines, Potash Company of America, Allan Potash Company . . . Did I hear a gentleman ask a question . . . the Potash Company of America, in case you don't know it is producing — Duval, Cominco, Noranda, and Alwinsal. This represents a half billion dollars of capital investment. At least \$150 million of this is Canadian capital; Alwinsal represents a substantial investment of German-French capital and the major portion is American.

And I would like, at this point, to comment on the much discussed subject of foreign investment and the so-called danger of foreign control of the Canadian economy. In discussing this subject, Mr. Speaker, the most important point is to distinguish clearly between the word "ownership" and the word "control." Far too many people, who should know better, continue to talk and write about foreign ownership and foreign control, as if they were one and the same thing which, of course they are not. Ownership provides the opportunity to earn money or to lose it, and ownership brings with it responsibility for managing the affairs of a company but ownership does not mean control in any absolute sense. In our modern industrialized society, political control on behalf of the whole society is final control, as it should be. When we start to talk about the danger of foreign control of our economy we have to ask ourselves how many American citizens there are with seats in the House of Commons or in this Legislature. The answer, of course, is none. In fact, no American citizen even has a single vote in a Canadian election, let alone a seat in the House of Commons or a Provincial Legislature.

Foreign capital investment is most welcome, because besides the investment itself, it brings with it a very large number of men who represent the best engineering brains and the best management abilities in industry. For example, each one of the potash companies has its own jealously guarded techniques. Each one is giving us new citizens with knowledges and abilities we have been lacking, men who are experts in productivity and the latest technologies in their field. We have witnessed the tremendous challenge presented by the Blairemore Sands, the heartbreaking experience of the pioneers with this strata, and

the methods devised to overcome this grave problem. It is interesting to note that two distinct methods for shaft linings through the Blairmore have been used, and this in itself is a tribute to the initiative of private enterprise. These people do not need a Socialist bureaucracy to tell them how to run their business; they are quite able and prepared to cope with their marketing problems. If Mr. Whelan's friends in Cuba and Russia want potash let him show us the orders and we'll see that they are filled.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Charlebois: — What is happening to secondary industry in the Saskatoon area?

An Hon. Member — You can ask your friends in Cuba.

Mr. Charlebois: — Without attempting any more than a few typical examples, I mention Canada Cement at Floral which has added a substantial addition to bring its plant to a total \$5 million establishment. The British-American Construction and Materials Company has just completed a \$5 million gypsum board and precast concrete products complex. This is a Canadian company that originally contemplated establishing in Manitoba, but the President publicly stated that they were so impressed with the job being done in Saskatchewan by the Liberal Government that they changed their mind in favour of Saskatchewan.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Charlebois: — Three chemical plants, one of which is already adding a \$4 million addition. Mid-West Litho is soon having the official opening of their new \$350,000 plant. FABCO Engineering in Sutherland is progressing with a substantial addition to their Steel Fabricating and Structural Metal Work Plant. The New Smith-Roles Limited \$500,000 plant. This company manufactures 20 products, including farm equipment and now has world-wide markets. Stodola Concrete in Sutherland has during the past year completed a \$500,000 Redi-Mix addition. John East Iron Works have installed the first electro-magnetic furnace in Saskatchewan, an example of the concern of our pioneer firms for the best possible quality control over the increasing range of the products they produce.

Canadian Laminators Limited is a new industry in Saskatoon with an initial \$250,000 plant, Inland Cement a \$350,000 plant, United Chemicals, local Saskatoon people who have completed a \$750,000 plant presently producing sulphuric acid and aluminium sulphate for the first time in Saskatchewan.

These are examples of the mushrooms of free enterprise, Mr. Speaker. These industries are headed by producers. For those

March 7, 1968

who think that industry is not concerned about people, with people, these are real honest-to-God people who are not parasites in our society.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Charlebois: — They are producers who are, through their initiative, creating jobs for the workers in industry and these workers are also producers and real people and consider their jobs as important in spite of what the Member from Prince Albert East-Cumberland (Mr. Berezowsky) may think. I have listened with interest to the condemnations of private enterprise from the other side of the House and I would like to make an observation about their ideas.

From time to time we have listened to the Members opposite discuss the minimum wage. And I would like to remind them of the great free enterprise member of the NDP, Max Saltsman the Member of Parliament for Waterloo South, considered by their party as one of their great authorities on economics. I would like to remind them of Saltsman's recommendation for a minimum wage of \$1.75 per hour. But when his own workers in his dry cleaning establishment in Galt, Ontario, asked for the \$1.75 per hour, a strike resulted and Mr. Saltsman declared that he could not pay it, that his kind of business could not stand it.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Charlebois: — Mr. Speaker, for those who are concerned about the welfare of the worker, I would ask you to look at Saskatoon, the second fastest-growing community in Canada. Saskatoon is bursting at the seams as a result of primary and secondary industry.

An Hon. Member — . . . crop next year . . .

Mr. Charlebois: — You bet! Let me tell you, Sir, that I can speak from my own experience as one who has been connected with secondary industry, as one who has had experience as an employer, of seeing a business triple in size in the last three years as a result of heavy industrial type of work being added to commercial and institutional work. Let me say simply that I have seen payrolls during the past year with tradesmen receiving weekly pay cheques of \$235 with subsistence added. Weekly cheques of \$175 are not unusual for construction workers. Let me say, Sir, Saskatchewan workers are grateful for free enterprise . . .

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Charlebois: — . . . and free enterprise is grateful for competent qualified workers. Saskatchewan is proud of its Liberal Government which is doing what is necessary to see that workers are

trained for industry and that industry has a chance to flourish. When industry thrives, our revenues are assured for the Government to provide for the needs of the people. I would like to commend the Hon. Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Steuart) on the Budget he has presented. While it indicates that our economy is at an all-time high, it is at the same time a very sharp reminder that, whatever we ask the Government to provide in the way of services, we must do so in a responsible manner because, whatever is provided, we the people must see that it is paid for. Mr. Speaker, I will be voting against the amendment and for the motion.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. F.A. Dewhurst: (Wadena) — Mr. Speaker, I am glad to see that you are feeling better today and in your place. I understand that you were not feeling too well last night and weren't able to attend His Honour's banquet, but I am happy to see that you are feeling better today. But I may say, Mr. Speaker, after listening to the very dry tirade we heard yesterday afternoon from the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. McFarlane) it is no wonder that there wasn't a bunch more of us sick. He mentioned, I'm not going to deal much with his speech, but he mentioned how everything was increasing, how the number of sheep was increasing. I have here the Annual Report of the Department of Agriculture, as laid on our desks a few days ago. For the last five years it showed that the number of sheep and lambs in this province has declined every year from a high in 1961 of 188,900 down to 1966 of 138,000. And yet he tried to say that sheep production is on the up-turn. I think some poor lamb must have lost its way some place or other.

Now Mr. Speaker, this Budget that we are dealing with is a budget of vultures and vampires. The vultures will take all the flesh off the bones of the public, and the vampires will even take the blood. At no time in the history of this province have we ever seen such a Budget brought in that would heap tax upon tax on the people with the least ability to pay.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Dewhurst: — And at the same time see all the back benchers of the Government getting up and supporting this increased tax on old pensioners, widows and their dependents, children, orphans and all the other people, the unfortunate citizens of our society. They seem to think that this is fair play for them to be able to heap taxes on these unfortunate people. Then they will turn around and tell us that the Liberals have as much kindness in their heart as anyone else. That may be true, Mr. Speaker, they may have much kindness in their heart, in fact they may have more because it never came out, they never used it. So they may have the kindness there, but it's about time they started using it.

I notice, Member after Member on the Government side of the

March 7, 1968

House, including the Treasury benchers, have done little or nothing to justify the increase in taxes that they are bringing on to the people of this province. They talked about taxes being reduced, and how they were going to reduce taxes, but their actions speak louder than their words. All that they have done is play politics with the people of this province and at no time are they really concerned about the people. We have seen time after time how they do not believe in democracy. Questions have been asked in this House, Orders for Returns which have been refused, not only at this session, but on previous sessions. On previous occasions information has been refused. Last winter in this Legislature when I asked for an Order for Return, as to a copy showing all the accounts which made up the Premier's expense account between May 25, 1964 and January 31, 1967, I have here the Return for the fiscal year of 1965-66. The Public Accounts for that same year showed the Premier's expense account to be \$12,528,03. Yet this Return covering this same fiscal year only showed \$7,014.25. There are from this Return the vouchers missing for \$5,513.78, and then the Government will try to tell us that they believe in democracy. Yet when we get Returns we cannot believe the Returns. They are not actual and do not give us the information which they ask for.

Within the last few months we saw an election in this province. We also saw prior to that time a redistribution in this province. To my constituency was added a considerable area, including the towns of Raymore and Semans, the equivalent of a rural municipality plus one Indian reserve. We were told at that time, when this area was being added to Wadena, the reason for adding it was because Last Mountain constituency was growing so fast that, even before election came, the population would be larger in Last Mountain constituency than it is in the Wadena constituency. Well the facts do not bear out those statements. My constituency is considerably larger than the Last Mountain constituency, and I know and the Member for Last Mountain (Mr. MacLennan) knows and so do the rest of the Members, Mr. Speaker, that he would not be here today if there had not been a gerrymander in the Last Mountain constituency.

In my own constituency we had a returning officer there who by and large did a good job, but he played politics all the time he was doing it. He was making house to house calls, canvassing house to house on behalf of the Liberal candidates and in some areas he was even going around introducing the Liberal candidates. Those are the things which evidently the Member for Yorkton (Mr. Gallagher) seems to feel were quite within order . . .

Mr. B.D. Gallagher: (Yorkton) — That's what you used to do . . .

Mr. Dewhurst: . . . and he even went into one poll, one of the advanced polls and started to bawl out the Returning Officer there because the Liberals didn't have a scrutineer. He said, "Why over in the other advanced poll the Liberals have a scrutineer, why don't you have one here?" That is the type of work they were getting from the Returning Officers.

Now in Kelvington, we saw quite a shemozzle in the Kelvington constituency. We saw there were a number of ballots that were not counted in that election. I have here, and I would like to put it on the record of this Legislature, as printed in the Thursday, February 1st paper of the Wadena News. A message is from Mrs. Anita M. Kubat and this is what the message reads, and I quote:

A Message to the Voters in Kelvington Constituency.

On February 15, Mr. Bjarnason is to take a seat in the Saskatchewan Legislature representing Kelvington constituency.

On October 23, 1967, Mr. Bjarnason's representatives, in his presence, refused to allow the Returning Officer to open the envelopes containing 26 hospital votes of Kelvington constituency voters. These voters, prior to the casting of their ballots, all signed a firm declaration that were eligible for voting in this constituency.

Is Mr. Bjarnason accusing these voters of making false declarations?

Is this what Mr. Bjarnason and his Liberal party call a democratic election and justice?

I'm asking Mr. Bjarnason to allow these 26 votes to be counted before taking his seat in the Legislature, or to resign and allow a by-election.

As food for thought, if you will compare Mr. Thatcher's pre-election statements to his present ones, you will readily discover the answer to why he called the election a year and one-half early.

Anita M. Kubat.

Authorized by Kelvington Constituency Progressive Conservative Association.

Now, who were some of the people that were challenged. I'm not going to go over the entire list, I have the list here for the whole 26, but I'll just take a few of them at random. There was one lady that was challenged, a Mrs. Hazel Kowalchuk. Her citizenship was challenged by Mr. Bjarnason's representative.

Mr. Speaker: — Is the Member . . . I thought the Member was reading from a letter.

Mr. Dewhurst: — No, I said I was quoting from an article put in the Wadena News of Thursday, February 1, 1968, as printed in the Wadena News signed by Mrs. Anita Kubat, the Progressive Conservative candidate in Kelvington Constituency. This paper is

March 7, 1968

in the Library if anyone wishes to check it. Among some of those that were challenged was Mrs. Hazel Kowalchuk. Her citizenship was challenged by Mr. Bjarnason's representative and she has been a school teacher for approximately 20 years. There was another, Steve Kresowaty. The Liberal representative, Mr. Summerville argued that he did not know Mr. Steve Kresowaty. Now, Mr. Kresowaty was a patient in the Foam Lake Union Hospital on election day and Mr. Summerville practices medicine in Foam Lake and he is a doctor at that hospital. But Summerville claimed Bjarnason's legal counsel advised them Mr. Kresowaty was not a resident of the constituency, yet his residence is only five miles from Foam Lake. Then there is another fellow at Invermay that is known as Jimmy Smith. He was challenged on residence. Now, Mr. Smith was one who had been associated with the Invermay Rural Telephone Company in the 1920s and he has resided in the constituency long before and ever since either Mr. Bjarnason or his two representatives were born. And there is another one, Mike Bilokraly at Invermay. He was challenged on citizenship and he was born in Canada over 60 years ago. And Mrs. Marg Dickson of Invermay, a Sunday school teacher for years and an elder of the church, one of Invermay's most highly respected pioneer ladies, is nearly 80 or 90 years of age now. And Charles Joynt of Kelvington, a veterinarian who had lived in Kelvington for several years and he is an elderly gentleman. And then there was also a lady from the Fishing Lake Indian reserve, Mrs. Wahweage. She was challenged on the grounds that she was not a resident of Kelvington constituency. Yet she lives in the Fishing Lake reserve, that is her home. The Fishing Lake reserve is entirely within the Kelvington constituency.

I feel, Mr. Speaker, that these problems should be settled if we are going to have democracy in our country. I am told by some of the close friends of the man who is sitting here and claims to represent Kelvington that he would like to resign and have a by-election, but Regina won't let him. Well, I ask him; is he going to be a man or a mouse? Is someone going to stop him from seeing that democracy is really carried out? I am sure, Mr. Speaker, what I said about Kelvington could equally apply to Nipawin.

Now I'd like to turn to a few other matters. I'd like to discuss a little bit about highways and I wish the Minister was in the House. We have seen that highway expenditures have been up terrifically these last few years. I have here in my hand a clipping from the Saskatoon Star Phoenix of Tuesday, November 7, 1967 and the heading says: "Four Highway Contracts Awarded." It says the largest contract was for \$336,400. This was for grading of an industrial access road from Rocanville to the new Sylvanite potash mine site, a distance of 9.7 miles. Now this was just for the grading of an industrial access road. This works out to be over \$34,600 per mile just for grade or, Mr. Speaker, if you had to take the dollar bills you could lay dollar bills end to end three times over and you could cover that grade for the amount of just the cost of grade. This isn't the cost of gravel or surfacing it. It is no wonder when we highway contracts like that being let that this Government

has to increase taxes. I am sure that if you take the waste out of the Department of Highways, that there is enough money there many times over which would pay the per diem charge which they are intending to levy for both medical and hospital calls on our sick people. I think this is a disgrace to humanity when we see this type of thing being carried on. I would like to see a full scale investigation into highways the same as the Frazier Commission did into mental health. Then we could read the report and you would hang your head in shame.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Dewhurst: — It is about time this Government put things on a business-like basis and quit playing politics with the people of this province and with their money. In my own constituency we have Highway No. 5 running from Watson through to Wadena. It has been under construction for four years now. It is by no means finished yet. It wasn't able to be travelled on at all the biggest part of last fall due to the way they were constructing it and there are no detours. The heavy traffic had to use grid roads some miles away and, when we had a week or two of wet weather in the fall, raised havoc with the municipalities' grid roads, but no consideration is given to the municipalities because the highway traffic is diverted onto the municipal roads. I hope before this session closes to be able to find out in detail what is being spent on Highway No. 5 and see what is really going on with the building of that road. I can assure the Minister (Mr. Boldt) right now that before his estimates are through, I'm going to want a full report on what has been the cost on Highway No.5.

Highway No. 14 from Elfros through to Dafoe, we've seen the same thing there. We have seen this highway impassable for any traffic. Last fall we had the touring caravan come into Wynyard on behalf of the Federal Government. They came in from Humboldt into Wynyard. They had to be pulled into Wynyard with caterpillar tractors to get them through. The highway crew did the best they could to try and get the road in shape for them that day. When they left they were to go to Foam Lake, a distance of 30 miles. They had to go back 15 miles west from Wynyard, south from Dafoe to Raymore across to Leross, back north to Elfros and over to Foam Lake, a distance of some 100 miles, because there were 15 miles they couldn't get through. And their loads were heavy enough that the municipality couldn't let them go over their road, because their bridges weren't built to stand that type of traffic.

I think I could pretty well describe to you, Mr. Speaker, and to the Members of this House as to what the condition of Highway No. 14 was like all last summer and I'll read in part, from the Wynyard Advance of Thursday, August 10. This is a reprint taken from the Yorkton Enterprise. And it pretty well describes the condition those people around Wynyard on that section of Highway 14 had to endure. And I'll quote:

March 7, 1968

There must be lack of communication between the people who are trying to promote use of Saskatchewan's Northern Trans-Canada route and the people who oversee the building of roads.

Getting tourists to use Highway 14 on a cross-Canada trip rather than the more direct but less scenic route that runs through Regina is good business for Yorkton, because this city is a logical stopover point on the northern route. To this end, much work has been done and publicity has been given throughout North America.

But you can bet your boots that any visitor who has had the misfortune to use Highway 14 this year will never pass this way again. Driving the distance between Wynyard and Kandahar is like being caught in the cross-fire between opposing forces on the Sinai Desert — and just as dangerous. All the ingredients of a desert war are in evidence. There are huge craters in the middle of the road; monstrous machines charge at you like tanks; missiles in the form of pebbles . . . threaten your windows; and if you leave your windows open, the dust settles in so thick you can't see the dials on your dash.

To make it worse, if you drive this distance during the day, you will find no traffic direction, no flagmen to warn of danger and keep you separate from oncoming traffic. If you drive it at night, you will find that the contractor has blown the whistle at precisely 5:00 p.m., leaving the craters on the road unmarked as though to trap the unwary motorists. When it is raining . . . forget the whole thing because chances are you don't get through anyway.

Such are the perils of Highway 14. It is almost as if someone somewhere is trying very hard to undo the work of the committee which is trying to urge cross-country travellers to use Highway 14.

And I may say, Mr. Speaker, that does not exaggerate the conditions which were on Highway 14 last summer. About one mile east of Kandahar where there is a deep coulee, only half the road had been built and the other half remained unbuilt. They had a barricade there but there was no light on it at night. The road was so dusty for anybody travelling east after dark meeting oncoming traffic. The south side or half of the road was out with a 20 to 25-foot drop there, and then there was just a barricade there, as I say, with no lights on it. On one occasion a car did touch the barricade, knocked it over the edge into the ravine but was able to swerve back and didn't go over itself. It was amazing to me that a good number of people weren't either killed or injured on that stretch of road due to the conditions they left it in for the travelling public — no flagmen, no nothing. Then we wonder why the accident rate goes up. The Minister of Highways (Mr. Boldt) carries on highway construction in this fashion, and he is responsible for helping to create highway

traffic and hazards in this province. Then he turns around and increases the insurance rates because the drivers are not careful. No driver can be careful under those conditions. To drive Highway No. 14 coming out of Saskatoon to come back to Clavet is like driving an old Titan tractor with three of the lugs missing on it. The car just wobbles and bounces all over the place. There is no excuse for that, Mr. Minister, with today's modern equipment of patrolling. I know that highway is not completed yet, but with the big patrols that highway could have been levelled off so that we could drive it in comfort as far as roughness is concerned. I know there would be some dust left until the surfacing is completed. Yet this year, we see, according to the Estimates, highway spending is going up by \$11 million and I would like to know for what. For more holes, more death traps and more ill-managed contracts?

Now, Mr. Speaker, this Budget deals with taxes. The Liberals say that in the past they have reduced taxes in this Province and that this is the first time they have increased taxes. During the Throne Speech debate I put on record a list of some 20 odd taxes where they had increased, they had gouged the coffers of this Province in reserve funds of one kind and another to over the tune of \$100 million, in addition to the increased taxes they had imposed in previous sessions. When you deducted from that the amount of reduction, there was actually a \$50 million increase in taxes.

But what has happened in the municipalities? The municipalities have not been given that extra assistance to hold the taxation down. It is true that all of this increase may not be the responsibility of the Government but a good portion of it is, according to questions I have asked in this House over the past four years. I don't have the latest statistics because the 1967 statistics as yet are not available to me. I know the Minister can get them for his use if he wishes, but as far as we are concerned we cannot ask questions because that report is not tabled. But in the urban municipalities, between 1963 and 1966, in that 3-year period, the tax for general municipal purposes has gone up by 38.7 per cent of an increase. In the urban municipalities for school purposes, it has gone up by 29.7 per cent. In the rural municipalities and the L.I.D.s, the general taxation for municipal purposes has gone up by 18.2 per cent, and for school purposes, by 18.9 per cent. For municipal and school purposes, in the last three years from 1963 to 1966, there has been an increase in property tax in this province of over \$22 1/3 million. Then the Liberals say that they are the Government which is helping the people of the province in keeping taxes down.

Last fall we saw, during the election campaign, on radio and TV and other advertisements, the Premier and his other colleagues saying that they would bring in drug care but only after a plebiscite. He said, Mr. Speaker, drug care could cost as much as \$5 million a year and no Government should have the right to bring in a program costing \$5 million a year without a plebiscite. Well now, this is a new one. If the drug was going

March 7, 1968

to cost \$5 million there should be a plebiscite. But the increased taxes in this Budget that we see here in my estimation are much more than the Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Steuart) has told us. I will say it is much closer to the \$50 million a year than \$35 million. So if we should have had a plebiscite for drug care, surely we should have had 10 plebiscites before we had this tax increase.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Dewhurst: — We see in the Budget, tax increases up to 5 per cent, and it is not only on the commodities that used to be there before some years ago, but soaps and detergents have been added. Other things have been added, but now this goes on to rooms, and meals, and on telephones. Yet they are only estimating an additional \$15 million from the extra one per cent. I say, Mr. Speaker, that it will be much more than \$15 million unless our economy breaks all together, because, if the 4 per cent last year which their Estimates showed brought in \$50 million, the 5 per cent this year, when it is enlarged to a much wider scale, is going to bring in more than \$65 million.

The \$2.50 per day in the hospitals — this I think is one of the most hardest slaps in the face that our old and our young, sick people have ever received from any Government.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Dewhurst: — As our financial critic (Mr. Blakeney) pointed out, this is not only going to cost the people of this province \$7 or \$8 million as estimated by the provincial Treasurer (Mr. Steuart), but the people of this province are only going to benefit half that amount. Half of this amount goes to the Federal Government because it reduces their share of the care by that much. And in addition, the cost of administration will become considerably increased, and already the reeves of the municipalities are saying they are going to have to make provisions to be able to guarantee to the hospitals the \$2.50 per day for people who don't have the cash to pay cash on the doorstep. A person may not be indigent, may not qualify for any social assistance from the Government for their \$2.50, but they may not have the cash. Farmers today have got granaries full of grain because they cannot sell their grain. If they have to go into a hospital, they may not have the cash. The municipalities are going to have to guarantee it and the same will hold true with the \$1.50 after the 30 days or the visits to the doctor's office. We will find that the municipalities are going to have to get back in the field of guaranteeing hospital and doctor bills for our old, our weak, our sick and our needy. I say this is a disgrace to humanity. When the Member for Regina North West (Mr. Whelan) was speaking a few moments ago, the Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Steuart) told him he could turn clean around if he wanted to, when he said he would like to turn to some other topic. He said, "You can turn clean around if you want to." Well I can assure

you, Mr. Speaker, if he did turn clean around, he would be going in the same direction as the Liberals and that's walking backwards.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Dewhurst: — Also, Mr. Speaker, one of the things we don't see in the Budget is the proposed increased cost on credit unions of \$50,000 this coming year. Credit Unions have told me that they have to pay \$50,000 now for credit union inspection from the Department for the ordinary services of inspection. They have no say as to when they must ask an inspector to come in, but when an inspector walks in, collectively they must pay for the inspection and pay \$50,000. The co-op movement in the co-op stores is expecting the same type of treatment. Well, Mr. Speaker, I am not surprised from this Government that that is the type of treatment it would hand out because for the past three and one-half or four years, we have seen it give lip service to society but nothing else. Oh! their hearts will bleed for the farmer, the labourer and for the small businessman, but their policy is very much against the farmer, the worker, the small businessman and the small industry. And if one doesn't believe that it is against the small businessman and the small industry, all we have to do is take a look at what happened to the Wisewood plant at Hudson Bay, when the meat axe fell and this Government arbitrarily closed out the Wisewood plant and sold it out to MacMillan Bloedell. MacMillan Bloedell made a huge killing on that deal. The investors got 57 cents on the dollar.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Steuart: — They went broke.

Mr. Dewhurst: — Mr. Speaker, that is not true. His statement is not true, they would not have been broke . . .

Mr. Steuart: — It is true.

Mr. Dewhurst: — . . . because the Federated Co-ops were in the position of trying to make negotiations to take over the loan and go in partnerships with Wisewood. This Government did not give them the time, it closed them out before they could do it. It didn't want the Co-ops in business in this province, because they felt the Co-ops represented little people and not international monetary finance. The Provincial Treasurer knows that is a fact. If he doesn't believe it, let's have an investigation into it, let's have a full investigation into it. That brings out more facts than we can get from the Government.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Dewhurst: — So it's no wonder, Mr. Speaker,

March 7, 1968

that the businessman of this province, the small businessman, the worker and the farmer, the young and the old are losing confidence in this Government. And I'm going to be interested to see how these Government backbenchers vote. Are they going to vote to tax the old and the sick and the weak, or are they going to vote for the amendment which deplors taxes being put on the farmer and those with no ability to pay? Mr. Speaker, I shall support the amendment and vote against the motion.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. D.W. Michayluk: (Redberry) — Mr. Speaker, before I proceed to the main context of my remarks in respect of the Budget before us, may I take the liberty to add to the already numerous congratulatory remarks on your reappointment to occupy the honoured position of Speaker. I am certain that under your experienced and able guidance, the established tradition, the rights and the privileges of the elected Members and that a decorum of this Legislature will be preserved.

I will at this time, Sir, congratulate the newly elected Members and the re-elected Members who sit on both sides of the House. In the debate just concluded and in this Budget debate, Sir, the newly elected Members have and I'm sure will, discharge their duties very ably and efficiently, and for this reason, the electors of the respective constituencies have chosen well.

May I, Sir, make specific reference to the new Members who sit to your left. Surrounded as I am on three sides, the young, able, intelligent men in their early 20s and 30s prompt me to re-assess myself and the New Democratic party which I represent. The Members who have participated in debate have added immeasurably to the proceedings of this Legislature and because of their willingness to make themselves available to the New Democratic party, Saskatchewan and its people will be the richer.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Michayluk: — Mr. Speaker, I want to take this opportunity to extend my sincere thanks to the electors of the Redberry constituency for re-electing me to represent them for a third term. I want to reassure my constituents that I will do my utmost to serve them to the best of my ability. My re-election, Sir, to again represent the Redberry constituency is deviation from tradition and past voting patterns of the constituency established over the years. Not since the days of the late George Coburn has a Member been elected for two consecutive terms. The very fact, Sir, that this constituency has accorded the New Democratic Party a consecutive tri-term representation through me, should be sufficient indication to this Liberal Government that the benefits through the evolvement of beneficial legislation by the CCF Government was and is appreciated by my constituents.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Michayluk: — This, Mr. Speaker, Hon. Members will agree, undoubtedly is the main reason why I sit here today. I want to thank all those who made it possible for me to be here on their behalf. Now the Premier, Mr. Speaker, his Deputy, and practically, his entire Cabinet trudged throughout the length and breadth of the Redberry constituency before and during the election. It must be that some of the Cabinet Ministers know the Redberry constituency better than they know their own. Is it any wonder, Sir, that two of their Members no longer sit on your right?

May I, with your permission, Sir, revert briefly to some remarks made by the junior Member representing Saskatoon City Park-University (Mr. Charlebois). It is surprising to me, Mr. Speaker, that since the bringing down of the Budget last Friday, none of the Members in the Government or any Minister in the Government dared rise in his seat and speak in defence on the Budget. What did they speak about? They spoke about free enterprise. They spoke about The Sellers Act. They spoke about Socialism; They spoke about stagnation, the Hudson Bay Route Association, but not a one, Sir, dared rise in defence of this brutal Budget. May I say that the junior Member for Saskatoon City Park-University (Mr. Charlebois) has a lot to learn in this Legislature. I am sure that before his entry into this Legislature, he was busy taking training in the virtues of free enterprise. This is why, Sir, he is such an exponent of free enterprise. I said that the junior Member has a lot to learn and I want to read, with your permission, Sir, just several quotes from the speech made by myself in this Legislature when I moved the Address-in-Reply to the Speech from the Throne in 1964. And I quote and I want the junior Member for City Park to pay special attention. I quote:

Because of the development of power and the extension of gas . . .

And this all happened during the stagnant days of Socialism.

. . . industry has come with increasing tempo. This has refuted long cherished notion held by the doom singers, that outside investors were scared away by a Socialist Government. Well, it has been proven over and over again that where there is sufficient resource in sufficient abundance, so will investment capital be interested, providing the general climate is found to be favourable, and investors have found in Saskatchewan an eminently favourable climate. To demonstrate, may I quote several statements by people familiar with Saskatchewan. The President of a company who has invested over \$40 million in Saskatchewan potash development, Mr. Speaker, said, 'How lucky we are to find an appreciation in your wise Government of the economic laws with which a company must operate, and to realize a host of services from your Government in many other ways.' The President of an oil company is reported as saying, 'The incentives for continuing to operate in Saskatchewan include favourable

March 7, 1968

prices, a healthy market, and a good governmental atmosphere.’

Mr. Steuart: — I wonder if the Member would lay on the table what he is reading from?

Mr. Michayluk: — You will find that this is my speech made in this Legislature when I moved the Address-in-Reply in the 1964 session. This is for the benefit of the junior Member for City Park-University, who is on your side, Mr. Provincial Treasurer. May I quote again:

Not the least has been a fair-minded Government, which has bent backwards to co-operate even to the extent of establishing a Saskatchewan Research Council with financial assistance since 1948. The Research Council operates on a plane compatible with highly trained technologists in today’s industry — we talk the same language, Mr. Speaker.

The establishment of the Saskatchewan Economic Development Corporation is further proof of the length that this Government will go to co-operate with and to assist industry. All this has led to last year’s phenomenal development and those of previous years, but sad to relate, we have those across on your left, Mr. Speaker, whose vocabulary extends in the dictionary to the letter “s” and the word “stagnation.” They have seized upon the word, become obsessed by it, hypnotized by it. As achievement follows achievement in this province, so do they chant louder and louder. Five thousand oil wells in production in 1963, Mr. Speaker — Stagnation.

Another shaft to triple production at Esterhazy — Stagnation.

This refers to potash, Mr. Speaker, that these gentlemen across the way take credit for. May I quote:

A \$30 million Potash of America plant at Patience Lake — Stagnation. Alwinal Potash at Lanigan, a \$50 million investment and Continental Potash at Unity — Stagnation . . . The Interprovincial Co-operative Chemical complex with the nearby Armour Company plant at Saskatoon, and just recently word of the \$5 million fertilizer plant of the Consolidated Mining and Smelting Company of Canada at Regina.

I want to thank the Hon. Member for The Battlefords (Mr. Kramer) for the confidence in both the people in the Redberry and Turtleford constituencies. And it is understandable why the Premier worked hard in north western Saskatchewan in an effort to win these two seats. In spite of all efforts, he failed. and I am somewhat happy.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Michayluk: — The Hon Member for The Battlefords (Mr. Kramer) reminded the Premier at the opening of this Legislature of a commitment made at the prorogation of the last session of the 15th Legislature. To counteract the concentrated effort of both the Premier and his Cabinet in my constituency, my key workers and supporters were spurred to greater effort. I know that you are disappointed, Mr. Premier — I am sorry that he is not in his seat — that your Liberal candidate was defeated in the Redberry constituency, but may I at this time congratulate you for making good your obligation to my Hon. Friend from The Battlefords. Through your many visits you guaranteed my election.

The two defeated Cabinet Ministers, Mr. Speaker, found that they were among the ranks of the unemployed. Therefore positions had to be found with dispatch. Fortunately, or unfortunately as many co-operators feel, the Department of Co-operation and Co-operative Development got its new Deputy Minister. The defeated Minister of Education according to press reports was to guide this fledgling Minister of Education for an unspecified period, and with the disputes with teachers one would have hoped that he would have stayed longer. But with indecent haste, the former Education Minister was shunted out of his best field of training and knowledge and moved to a newly-created position with the Saskatchewan Power Corporation. With mission accomplished, the management of the Saskatchewan Power Corporation created a new position within its framework to accommodate the defeated Minister of Education, so that his position as Administrator of Personnel Training for the Power Corporation, Mr. speaker, is just one more example of the extent to which this Government will bend over to accommodate their kind.

Mr. Coderre: — How about Miles Buchanan? Want me to name some . . .

Mr. Michayluk: — I personally did hope that the defeated Minister of Education would have remained on the coaching staff of the present Minister. Had this been done, the present crisis in education may not have occurred. By George! was a remark once used by my Hon. Friend for Regina Centre (Mr. Blakeney), Mr. Speaker. George knew that the 1949 Teachers' Salary Negotiations Act was implemented in consultation with all parties interested in the welfare of education.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Michayluk: — Before this Act was implemented, several years of consultation between the Saskatchewan School Trustees' Association, the Saskatchewan Teachers' Federation, and the Department of Education had taken place. Many of our school units and school boards had employed the basic concept of this Act in their

March 7, 1968

negotiations prior to the implementation of this Act.

Mr. Speaker, the performance of the Thatcher Government follows the past performances of Liberal Governments. Since 1964 practically most of the defeated Provincial and Federal candidates in Saskatchewan have been accommodated by this Government. I want to name a few: Emergency Measures Organization — the man who always went to Korea when he was in this Legislature, Workmen's Compensation Board, Local Government Board, Executive Assistants to the Premier, Power Corporation, Deputy Ministership, Judgeship of Citizenship Court, Senatorship, Civil Service, Members of Commissions, while others were appointed as Executive Assistants to Cabinet Ministers doing janitorial services . . .

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Michayluk: — . . . Mr. Speaker, back in smaller communities it's insurance agencies, highway patrol work, crown leases, land deals, and so forth. Saskatchewan, Mr. Speaker, has established several election precedents under Liberal Administrations prior to 1944 elections and since then. Hon. Members will recall that the Patterson Government held onto power for six years before calling a Provincial election in 1944. Constitutionally five years was normally considered or normally a constituted period. The only reason, Mr. Speaker, was surety of a defeat, as it did come in 1944, so the then Liberal Government stayed in power, not for four years, not for five years, but a full six. The calling of an election on October 11 of last year with just three years is another precedent set by another Liberal Government in Saskatchewan's brief electoral history.

Mr. Steuart: — We won the election.

Mr. Michayluk: — This is the last one for you, Davey. The Thatcher Government was well aware that if it remained in office, not six, but a full four years, it again would be defeated.

Mr. Steuart: — A landslide!

Mr. Michayluk: — The only recourse was to call an election at the time when our basic agricultural industry was engaged in harvesting a crop. Mr. Speaker, this Government knew that the economy and the finances of this province due to this Government's mismanagement were not in the shape that they were purported to be. And in order to capitalize on the fact that many of the Saskatchewan people were not aware or were not prepared to concede that the Provincial economy was so mismanaged by the Liberal Government, this prompted the calling of a snap election.

Mr. Speaker, Hon. Members who sat in this Legislature a year ago will recall in its 1966 Budget a 100 per cent increase in the amount allocated for information. The Liberals used, prior to the announcing of the election and shortly after the

prorogation, the most extensive and expensive advertising campaign at public expense ever known to the people of Saskatchewan.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Michayluk: — Propagandizing, Mr. Speaker, at public expense, knowing full well that the people were preoccupied with harvest, they blatantly called a snap election in the midst of harvesting, so that the facts as presented by the New Democratic party would not become known. What reason, Mr. Speaker, did the Hon. Premier give to the Saskatchewan people for calling this election? In the daily Regina paper, under heading “CCF Threat to Industry”, the Premier gave as reason the following persuading remarks and I quote:

I will ask the people in the next election whether they are Liberals, CCFers or Conservatives, whether they are in favour of what we have done or whether they want to listen to a lot of CCF Socialist criticism.

And then he goes on, and may I quote again, Sir:

New industries and new capital will be hesitant to come to Saskatchewan as long as the threat of another Socialist Administration hangs over the heads of this Province.

This, Mr. Speaker, has some resemblance to the Premier's many criticisms. However, I want to make reference to another article under title “CCF Defended by Thatcher”, appearing in the Moose Jaw Herald Times of November 2, 1953, which contains the following positive remarks and I quote:

‘Since 1945’, Mr. Thatcher said, ‘private capital has invested in our city and province at an unprecedented rate. Never has Moose Jaw been so prosperous.’

‘As a businessman’, he added, ‘I am getting tired of intimations from my Liberal and Conservative friends that the CCF party automatically scares away investors.’

This, Mr. Speaker, is commonly known as double standard and double talk. Mr. Speaker, what is the state of the Saskatchewan economy under the Liberals in 1967? Saskatchewan's total personal income for 1967 dropped 6.4 per cent. Increase in oil production has not kept pace with the previous years. Our population growth began to stagnate under the Liberals. The Government opposite, according to the past words used by the Premier, shipped out, not only wheat but people in increased numbers; in the period 1964-67, some 22,000 people have left the Province of Saskatchewan. Between June 1, 1967 and December 31, 1967, some 900 families have left Saskatchewan. Production of cattle, hogs, sheep and poultry has declined and so have the prices for these commodities.

So buoyant was our economy that Burns and Company in Regina

March 7, 1968

laid off 60 of its employees. The Robin Hood Mill in Moose Jaw laid off 160 employees in August, 1967, and one week ago the mill was completely closed so that only four men are now employed in the elevator. The winery in Moose Jaw reduced its staff to just over five people. And they are not even making wine. They are importing made wine and are reselling it. The British American Oil Company of Regina transferred 22 of its employees to Calgary in 1967. Prairie Bag Company of Moose Jaw closed in September and affected almost 10 people. Cement plant in Regina did not operate on full time. The South West Potash Corporation of Canada closed its office at Yorkton as was mentioned by my Hon. Friend of Regina North West (Mr. Whelan). This company, Mr. Speaker, had drilled numerous test holes just south of Yorkton near Bredenbury and has now closed up and pulled out. Mr. Speaker, I have met with some of the employees who were laid off work because of the closing of the Robin Hood Mill in Moose Jaw. I have reports from people who were in the employ of this mill that jobs are just not available in the area.

I met a couple, who were laid off last September and to this day, hard as they have tried, they have been unable to find employment in Moose Jaw. Yet the Premier and the Minister of Labour (Mr. Coderre) have the audacity to say that Saskatchewan virtually has no unemployment. No amount of double talk, no amount of concealing of facts will bring prestige to or elevate this Government in the minds of the people whom they have so blatantly deceived in the election of 1964 and again in 1967.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Michayluk: — Mr. Speaker, in a press report in the Moose Jaw Times Herald, March 2, 1968, only a few days ago, under a title "Jobless Total Rises Slightly", the Premier boasts that in Saskatchewan there is virtually no unemployment. What does the press report say? May I quote:

'There were 1,695 persons registered at the Moose Jaw office of the Canada Manpower Centre at the end of February, a Canada Manpower Centre official said Friday.

This was an increase of 189 over the January total . . .

The Premier, Mr. Speaker, and the Minister of Labour have their heads buried ostrich-like in the sand and are deceiving this Legislature that unemployment has not reached serious proportions.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Michayluk: — Among this total of 1,695 unemployed men and women, as reported by the Canada Manpower Centre, are heads of households who due to unemployment are unable to meet their family obligations for lack of work. A far cry Mr. Speaker, from the 80,000 new jobs which the Thatcher Government promised in its

1964 election program.

Could I call it 5:30, Mr. Speaker.

The Assembly recessed until 7:30 o'clock p.m.

WELCOME TO VISITORS TO THE ASSEMBLY

Hon. D.V. Heald: (Attorney General): — Mr. Speaker, I would like to draw to the attention of the Hon. Members to the presence in the gallery this evening of a fine group of young Scouts from 49th Troop St. Timothy along with their Scout Master, Mr. Duke. I am sure that all Hon. Members are glad to see them here this evening and appreciate the fact that they have taken the time to come and observe the proceedings in this Legislature. I am sure that you would wish me, Sir, to express to all of them our best wishes for an, interesting and informative stay this evening and a safe journey home.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Michayluk: — Mr. Speaker, I would too, like to welcome the 49th Troop of St. Timothy's Scouts. I am sure that they are prepared and no doubt each has done a good deed for the day. Their presence in the galleries, Mr. Speaker, takes me back to the time when I was a member of this noble organization.

When the House rose at 5:30 o'clock, I had in the course of my remarks castigated the Government for calling an election prior to the normal duration, and the tactics used by the Hon. Members opposite in the Redberry constituency, the state of the Saskatchewan economy, and with your permission, Sir, I would like to continue with the debate.

Mr. Speaker, the presentation of the Budget to this House was no easy task, and I want to commend the Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Steuart) for his effort. In past sessions, I usually enjoyed listening to the somewhat flamboyant, vigorous, and enthusiastic speeches, although rather removed from fact, made by the Hon. Member for Prince Albert West (Mr. Steuart) in this Legislature. However, Sir, in this Budget on Friday, he appeared depressed, abandoned, and forlorn as did the rest of the Members on the Government side of the House. Relegated to this unfortunate position by the Premier who messed it up, is there any wonder that he was uneasy in his position, Sir. He had to face up to the cold fact, and admit to the Saskatchewan people that they had been led astray and deceived by himself, the Premier, and by every Member who sits to your right, Sir.

I want to congratulate the Hon. Member for Regina Centre, (Mr. Blakeney) the financial critic, who so ably and at length carried out a post-mortem on this ruthless Budget.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

March 7, 1968

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Michayluk: — I want to congratulate him for giving it the going over which he did. The Government Members haven't recovered from the shock as yet. Those Hon. Members who sat in the last Legislature will recall that when the Budget and Estimates were brought down one year ago, I asserted at that time that it was a plump, presumably juicy, spiced-up, healthy financial bird and not the real specimen, but an adulterated species contrived to deceive until its real identity was recognized a year hence when it came home to roost.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Michayluk: — Well, it did come home to roost, right on the lap of the Government and the Provincial Treasurer. Mr. Speaker, after watching and listening to the performances of the Members of this Thatcher Government, I have the feeling that what I will say will be an exercise in futility. There are new Members on the Government benches, however, who no doubt have some integrity and some political honesty and self-respect. The now Premier, who as Leader of the Opposition, in the Throne Speech Debate on February 11, 1964, and recorded in Debates and Proceedings on page 39, had this to say, and may I quote:

In 1944 the NDP or CCF damned the sales tax which was then 2 per cent, from one end of the province to the other . . . As soon as they achieved office, they first of all raised the sales tax to 3 per cent, then a year or so ago they put it up to 5 per cent. Instead of taking \$4 1/2 million as the last Liberal Government did from the sales tax, this year the NDP will take more than \$40 million. At a time when our fellow citizens in Manitoba and Alberta have no such thing as sales tax.

Well, since that time, Mr. Speaker, Manitoba boasts a six per cent sales tax, one per cent higher than Saskatchewan, and the Alberta Government is seriously considering instituting a sales tax.

What are the facts, Mr. Speaker? This Thatcher Administration in the next fiscal year will take in not \$40 million but \$65 1/4 million from the same source. This represents a 65 per cent increase over the amount the CCF Government took in in 1964. Furthermore, when the CCF raised the sales tax to three per cent, exemptions were extended to cover various commodities connected with the basic agricultural industry from the sales tax.

When it was necessary to raise the sales tax to five per cent in 1962, the Government seems to forget that this increase provided medicare to the Saskatchewan residents. I want to remind, Sir, the party and the Hon. Members now in Government, what the ex-Provincial Treasurer and now Premier had to say to

the people of Saskatchewan in 1964 in respect to the sales tax. And may I quote, Sir:

Mr. Speaker, I assure the House and the people of Saskatchewan that if the Liberals form a Government next June, one of our primary, consistent and determined purposes will be major tax reductions. (1) we will reduce 5 per cent sales tax immediately to four per cent, and in our first four years of office will endeavour to get it back to three per cent. (2) we will increase the list of goods exempt from the sales tax, to include such items as clothing, shoes, which are after all necessities of life,

Well, Mr. Speaker, quite a reversal, a complete somersault. Reported in the press a few weeks ago the Welfare Minister (Mr. MacDonald) said that we put politics above people. In the light of these words in 1964 and those of last Friday, I want to say to the Welfare Minister that if you can see only as far as your Front Bench you will see who have done nothing but played politics and put politics above people.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Michayluk: — Some say, Mr. Speaker, that history repeats itself. Some say that history is a good teacher. King Charles the First of Britain was beheaded for a much lesser offence than I have just mentioned. So it shall pass whenever this Government has the gumption to call an election. Here is a Government, Mr. Speaker, who inherited after the last election in 1964, a \$33 million surplus, a \$9 million surplus in the Medicare and Hospitalization Insurance Fund, \$3 million in the Student Loan Fund, \$1 million in the Administration Fund, and one-quarter million in Federated Co-op equity. All of these funds have been channelled into areas other than what they were intended for by this Government. Medicare premiums were increased by \$20 per family when this Liberal Government was elected. Add to this, increased gasoline tax, tobacco tax, soap tax, drivers' licence fees up, automobile licences up, insurance rates increased, telephone rentals, telephone calls and now a new tax, the price of liquor up three times, diesel tax, adding to this the vital statistics in respect to marriage and birth tax, bus rates up, power meter deposits from \$3 up to \$10, up, price of Crown lands up, rental fees up, higher rates for natural gas for new communities, pasture fees up and scores of other increases directly or indirectly. And, oh yes, Sir, lest I forget, they exempted the sales tax from the turkey saddles. This session, Mr. Speaker, that turkey is on the loose again, and a saddle should be put on him. In spite of an increase of 65 per cent in the sales tax since 1964, the Thatcher Government has the audacity to impose a tax on the unfortunate who may be sick. Mr. Speaker, the CCF Government had as its cardinal and basic principle that the Medicare Fund should be used solely for what it was intended; namely, for the payment of hospital and medicare payments. Proof of this fact was that, when in 1963 Medicare funds had reached an all-time high, the Government lowered the premium by \$20 to

March 7, 1968

each family in Saskatchewan. What has happened to the \$9 million surplus? Mr. Speaker, it is all too evident that the ex-Provincial Treasurer got his sticky fingers into the fund and misused it for other governmental purposes. Mr. Speaker, because of this misuse of the Medical Care Fund an ill-conceived plan to tax every sick person by charging \$2.50 per day for the first 30 days and an additional levy of \$1.50 per day for each day thereafter, is contemplated by this Government, and not satisfied with this, an additional charge of \$1.50 for a doctor's office call.

Unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, on those who may require hospitalization for a period of 90 days, the Government, according to press reports, will have a total tax of \$165. Is this the group, the sick, Mr. Speaker, that misuse the service and should be deterred? Mr. Speaker, I say, that a Government that has the courage and audacity to impose these costs upon the unfortunate and the sick should hang its head in shame. Its heart truly bleeds for Saskatchewan people and particularly the sick.

I was rather interested in the preamble during the presentation of the Budget and the reason given for the need of a deterrent or so-called utilization fee. Allow me to quote the exact words, Mr. Speaker, of the Provincial Treasurer and I quote:

In passing I would also note that in spite of an offer of Federal cost-sharing, rich Provinces like Alberta and Ontario are extremely reluctant to institute comprehensive medical coverage.

Then he goes on and I quote again:

Their fears are based on a realistic recognition of the tremendous burdens such a plan will place on their taxpayers, a problem we must solve or eventually face a serious financial crisis.

I want to ask, Sir, the Provincial Treasurer and ex-Minister of Public Health (Mr. Steuart) and the Premier of Saskatchewan (Mr. Thatcher): is this not gross misrepresentation of the true position of medicare in respect to added costs? Has he undertaken, Mr. Speaker, to be a chore-boy, and do the bidding for the insurance carriers who are and were against universal medicare? Signs are appearing on the horizon that the MSI and the insurance companies are organizing to re-insure the added costs. Is it the contention of the Provincial Treasurer and the Minister of Public Health that people of other provinces would pay less for their medical care services than they would if they had Medicare? Mr. Speaker, Medicare costs are today paid by the users of these services in other provinces. Therefore additional costs are not incurred by Medicare. However there is one basic principle in Medicare, as we know it, and the Government doesn't, and that is that this distribution of costs is based on ability to pay and an access to health care regardless of financial means. The so-called utilization fee, which I prefer to call a deterrent fee, that is being proposed will bring undue hardship to

thousands of low-income families that may require these services. Mr. Speaker, if more money was required, a more appropriate way could have been devised and was mentioned by Hon. Members who spoke before me from this side of the House to meet the increased costs rather than taxing those who unfortunately may be ill and require these very much needed services.

Are there, Mr. Premier, no Hon. Members in Government who would rise to defend and to speak up on behalf of those in our Province, who will be placed into intolerable financial positions because of the action of the Government? For this reason, Sir, I want to ask the Welfare Minister and I ask the Provincial Treasurer and the Members opposite; who is putting politics before people? Sir, I want to appeal to the better judgment of the Hon. Gentlemen opposite to oppose this Budget if for no other reason than for the humanitarian aspect which I have just mentioned. Mr. Speaker, it is worthy to note how all-encompassing and all-embracing are the taxes introduced by the Thatcher Government. If you are hungry and would probably want to have a steak, you pay the increased Thatcher sales tax. If you are in hospital, Mr. Speaker, you are forced to pay the increased Thatcher sales tax. If you are smoking, Mr. Speaker, you are forced to pay increased Thatcher sales tax. If you are driving, Mr. Speaker, you are forced to pay the increased Thatcher sales tax. If you are phoning, Mr. Speaker, you are forced to pay the increased Thatcher sales tax. If you are honeymooning, Mr. Speaker, in Saskatchewan, you are forced to pay the increased Thatcher sales tax. If you are ploughing, seeding, or harvesting your crop, Mr. Farmer, you are forced to pay the increased Thatcher tax. If your child requires doctor's care and examination, Mr. Speaker, you are forced to pay the unfortunately increased Thatcher tax. Mr. Speaker, so comprehensive, so all-encompassing, so all-inclusive, and so ill-conceived tax could have been more ably devised by no one except the Hon. Member for Prince Albert West (Mr. Steuart) and a Government which does put politics before people.

May I remind the Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Steuart) that this will be remembered by the Saskatchewan taxpayers in the years to come. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, any future manoeuvring to mislead and outwit the electors by the Members to your right, Sir, will be futile. I believe that no amount of sugar-coating, tax-baiting or rebating will have any appeal. If this, Mr. Speaker, in the words of the Premier, is a Liberal Government's tax reduction promised to the people in 1964 and in 1967, the Saskatchewan taxpayers will have a taxpaying bonanza.

Mr. Speaker, I do not want to impose upon too much time in this debate, but I would ask the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. McFarlane) who is in his seat, whether or not he is aware of the deep concern of the rural municipal council of the RM of Redberry 435 about the proposed Krydor and Petrofka community pastures? Several blocks of land have been acquired since 1964 and later, yet to this day, this land has not been utilized by farmers for its intended purpose. The RM of Redberry is concerned because of the loss of some \$1,089 in taxes, including

March 7, 1968

school tax. Requests have been made for the formation of pastures or to lease these lands to private individuals so that the land may be placed on the assessment role for 1968, and the municipality may obtain full value for taxation from this land. On behalf of the municipality and the farming community surrounding these parcels of land, I want to suggest to the Minister of Agriculture and to his Department that some appropriate measure be taken immediately to utilize this land. Some hay has been cut in the past two years, Mr. Minister, but this is negligible. I do realize that your Department may be encountering some difficulties in acquiring more land, but that should not deter utilization of the land owned by the Department for pastures with a look into expanding the area in the future. Mr. Speaker, I know that even the allocation of hay lots to farmers has caused the Department a great deal of grief. I would therefore suggest the setting up of small community pastures, locally administered until expansion is possible. I trust that the Minister will look into this matter in the very near future.

While dealing with the Agriculture Department, Mr. Speaker, I want to turn the attention of the Minister (Mr. McFarlane) to a desperate situation of which the Minister may not be aware that exists in the Mayfair area of my constituency. Reported in the News Optimist of February 27, 1968, appears the following item from a correspondent in the area and may I quote:

Farmers as well as residents of Mayfair district are having difficulty finding enough water to keep going. Farm dugouts have gone dry or more exactly, they have frozen solid, this means farmers have had to look elsewhere for water for their cattle. Some have resorted to melting snow; but that too is in very short supply, making the task all but impossible.

Cisterns which are normally filled from nearby dugouts are empty, and the water haulers have had to go farther afield in an attempt to find a clean water supply.

Urban and rural dwellers who have recently modernized their homes are beginning to look apprehensively at their old facilities and wonder how long it will take until they are once more put back into use.

Some farmers have had to sell part of their livestock herd; others are threatened with the same procedure. The situation is getting desperate.

I want to agree that this is a desperate situation, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Minister, I hope that you and your staff are aware of the situation and I would urge upon your Department to act upon this urgent matter immediately through the Saskatchewan Research Council which has made a water survey in that area. This desperate situation warrants and should receive immediate attention. Due to lack of water for livestock, the farmers may be forced to dispose and sell their basic herds and the cattle population

will go down further, Mr. Minister. This would threaten the diversified economy of the farming community of Mayfair. I would, therefore, request, Mr. Minister, that the members of your Department go into this community and see what assistance can be offered in this area.

I would, at this time, Mr. Speaker, make but brief reference to a recent Senatorial appointment from our area.

Mr. MacDonald: — . . . saving it for you.

Mr. Michayluk: — Well, I'm glad you're enthused, Mr. Minister of Social Welfare. We in the New Democratic party believe that the Senate is an obsolete and an out-worn institution. However, Sir, since it exists, and since in recent years under the Diefenbaker regime, some efforts seem to have been made to move away from the political pork-barrel type of appointment by appointing Senators representing people from various ethnic backgrounds. As a matter of fact, a Senatorial appointment was made by the Diefenbaker Government representing the first Canadians, our Indians, by appointing Senator Gladstone. Here in Saskatchewan he recognized the people of Ukrainian origin in the appointment of the late Senator John Hnatyshyn of Saskatoon. But what happens, Mr. Speaker, when this Liberal Premier has a hand in the game? Does he look for someone to replace Senator Hnatyshyn from the same ethnic group? Or someone who is recognized for his contribution to society and his community for something besides politics? It would hardly appear so. And once again, Mr. Speaker, it appears that Premier Thatcher has goofed. There was a time when the Premier seemed to be recognizing people of Ukrainian descent at the time when he was worrying about the next election. May I, Sir, quote from the Canadian of February 11, 1967:

But there was no hiding it any more. Thatcher had been seen talking to some Ukrainians. Any student of Saskatchewan politics knew what that meant. In a province that's one-eighth Ukrainian, a Premier — if he hopes to remain such — needs a good stock of Ukrainians on hand as candidates. So when Ross Thatcher goes Ukrainian-hunting, it means one of two things to a Saskatchewanian.

But now that he is temporarily back in office and safe for the time being, he is no longer interested in the people he courted so ardently a few short months ago.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Michayluk: — And if there is any doubt about the feelings of this group of people, let me quote from an editorial, a Ukrainian monthly, under the title "No Senator" appearing in the Mohyla Institute Newsletter. The Hon. Members from Saskatoon know this institution. Our junior member from Saskatoon City Park-University (Mr. Charlebois) knows of this institution. And I quote:

March 7, 1968

Our personal feelings on the appointment of Senator Sparrow to fill the Saskatchewan Senate vacancy created by the untimely death of the late Senator John Hnatyshyn are admirably expounded by the "Ukrainian Voice", an ethnic weekly, printed in Winnipeg, which has been a life-long supporter of the Liberal party. From the February 21st issue of this weekly, we quote the concluding two paragraphs of its editorial, "How to Lose Friends."

Now, Sir, may I quote from the "Ukrainian Voice" an editorial from a Ukrainian weekly paper that has, as the Mohyla Institute Newsletter says, been an ardent supporter or a life-long supporter of the Liberal party in Canada and in various provinces, and I quote, Sir:

Personally, we have nothing against Senator Sparrow and wish him every success in his new role. We believe, however, that the Ukrainian community in Canada and more particularly in Saskatchewan, have a right to feel hurt by Prime Minister Pearson and the Premier of Saskatchewan. They expected that in place of the late Senator Hnatyshyn an appointment would go to some Liberal of Ukrainian descent. Assuredly, there must be Ukrainians in Saskatchewan that were candidates on one or two occasions and also have made a contribution to the Liberal party. They remember that the former Prime Minister Diefenbaker, besides appointing Judge Orest Bendas, also appointed two Ukrainians to the Senate — Hnatyshyn and Yuzyk. He also appointed a Ukrainian to his Cabinet. He gave representation in the Senate to the natives of this country — the Indians. He saw Canada what it is today, comprised of people of multi-racial backgrounds. This we have to credit him with, irrespective of our party or our personal sympathies. To by-pass the Ukrainians in this instance, where there was a Ukrainian Senator before, will not gain the Liberals support among the Ukrainians in Western Canada, where it is absolutely necessary for them to extend their influence. This is the second occasion in the last few years, that Ukrainians were ignored. In Alberta recently, there were three vacancies. There was an excellent chance to appoint at least one Ukrainian. Now representation has been taken away from the Ukrainians in Saskatchewan. In my opinion, this has been a great political blunder. This is a poor way to make friends and influence people.

This is one more indication of how this Liberal party falls short in its recognition of people. This Premier who sits to your right, Mr. Speaker, was thinking only in terms of a man who might serve him well to assist him along the way of his political ambitions, both at Ottawa and here in Saskatchewan. The only real ability that his Senate appointment has, in my humble opinion, is that of being a fairly astute political organizer. It seems that our Premier has himself a full-time boy for this line of work to assist him in any future political ventures. If the Hon. Premier was being sincere with the Ukrainians, he would have

taken a second look. There must be some reason, Mr. Speaker, that not one single Ukrainian Member sits among the Liberals to your right. Let us take a look at another editorial appearing in the Mohyla Institute Newsletter in the 1967 issue under the title "Provincial Elections" and I quote:

Our congratulations go out to two of our former "bursaki" . . .

This means, Mr. Speaker, students who were in that institute.

. . . Bill Berezowsky and Dick Michayluk, on their re-election to the Saskatchewan Legislature. They will be joined there by other Ukrainian members elect; Roy Romanow of Saskatoon, J. Kowalchuk of Melville and Adolph Matsalla (Polish-Ukrainian extraction) of Canora. It is noteworthy that all these Members were elected on the NDP ticket. Although the Liberals ran a couple of good men and former bursaki, (Benny Gulak) and (Alex Procuik), they failed to elect a single Member of Ukrainian descent. It seems to us that the Liberals run Ukrainians only in what is usually termed as safe CCF seats. If that is so, perhaps someone should smarten that party up.

I might add, Mr. Speaker, that the Hon. Member for Cutknife (Mr. Kwasnica) sitting behind me should have been mentioned but inadvertently his name was omitted.

Mr. Speaker, it is too late now, the people of Ukrainian descent and other prominent ethnic groups have seen the second face of the Thatcher party. They know that his only interest is to use them when they are needed and after an election has been won, he goes on with his own pursuits, suiting his own end with no regard for his friends and support of a few months ago. Just one more nail in his political coffin, Mr. Speaker!

Mr. Speaker, mainly because this Government has failed to keep its promise to cut taxes, and has done the opposite by increasing taxes, and deceiving the public, and placing the burden of those tax increases upon the sick, the old, the farmers, and the low-income groups, I shall support the amendment and oppose the motion.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. G.F. Loken: (Rosetown) — Mr. Speaker, in rising to take part in this debate, I first want to congratulate you on your re-appointment to the high office you hold. I also want to congratulate the three Members appointed to the Cabinet. I want at this time to express my appreciation to the people of the Rosetown constituency for the wonderful support they gave me in the election last fall to again give me the honour to represent them in the Legislature for another term.

In the constituency of Rosetown, situated in west central

March 7, 1968

Saskatchewan, our only industry is agriculture, you might say mostly grain farming. The two main towns in this area, Rosetown and Outlook, are aggressive and show a steady increase in growth and population. Rosetown has made more progress in the last three years than in any other period since its incorporation. This is due to the assistance from the Provincial Government, one of these the Urban Assistance Grant for drainage and paving of main streets. Since this program was completed, the business people started a program to improve their places of business. Many of these are now completed and this adds a new look to our town. In addition to this, in the last three years, a new pioneer home, a new nursing wing added to our hospital, a new low-rental housing unit, a new library, a new 10-room addition to our school, a new school unit office and workshop, these were made possible with the assistance of grants from the Provincial Government.

Much the same has taken place in the town of Outlook. The main street and a portion of the business section have been paved, a new pioneer home and a new Town Hall complex just completed. Natural gas was also extended to Outlook last year and these people are now enjoying the use of this fuel. This service was denied them for many years by the former Government.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to be associated with a Government which is attempting to make Saskatchewan a place of unlimited opportunity, a place to attract those with a belief in the future, a place for those convinced that free enterprise is the main building block in the structure of democracy. Regardless of how good we may feel our system is, the fact remains that it does have its inequities, the main one of which is the unequal distribution of financial resources as between units of local government. My purpose today is to spotlight what this Government is trying to do to alleviate this problem, and to that end I will be speaking about some of the grant programs in effect at this time.

Grant programs, as you are well aware, are a device to more equitably share the tax dollars and sundry revenues accruing to the senior government. We in the Government are well aware that people object to taxes of any sort on general principles, but at the same time our society is such and our standard of living is such that taxation is inevitable; and it does not appear that the level of taxation will decrease. Rather it is more likely to increase. All we can do is interpret the wishes of the people as to the services they want, and to the best of our ability and for the least cost possible make a distribution of tax money to those in need.

We hear much today about urbanization and the cry is, "How are we going to keep 'em down on the farm?" It is a fact that from 1961-66, our total population increased by some 30,000 people. During the same period, our urban communities increased by almost 66,000, while our rural communities decreased by nearly 36,000. Regardless of these figures, we are still a province with a strong rural characteristic, where the well-being

of the farmer forms a base for the well-being of all sectors of our economy. It is fitting, then, that our most ambitious grant program should be directed to improving the amenities of our rural people. We are doing this through our municipal road assistance authority grants. For the year 1967 to 1968, some \$11 1/2 million was budgeted, an increase of \$1 million over 1966-67, and some \$3.8 million over 1965-66. Included in these increases are two new programs, grid road maintenance for \$1 million and snow removal for some \$300,000. A further sum of \$400,000 was added to a previous increase of \$2 million in the equalization grant.

Equalization grants for the Rosetown constituency in 1967 were \$54,642 compared to \$13,882 in 1963. It is only fair to say that apart from the equalization grant, all these grants are of the shareable type. The response of the municipalities to them has indicated their acceptability. The continued importance of these programs in the mind of the Government is to continue the grants at their present level, in spite of demands for cutbacks due to the tightness of money today. The next grant I wish to mention is one which affects both rural and urban communities, the homeowner grant. This grant, in its second year of operation, has received enthusiastic reception from everyone. It is one program objected to by my Hon. Friends opposite as being undesirable and unneeded, but at least it is one program which is doing something they hesitated to do, reduce property taxes at the local level. To indicate its level of acceptance, in 1966, almost 171,000 payments totalling over \$8 million were made. In 1967 approximately 175,000 payments totalling \$8,528,000 were made.

A third very worthwhile program is that of municipal water assistance. This year some 75 communities shared \$575,000 towards the cost of installing water or sewer and water systems. Of these, 23 took advantage of the new grants offered for plastic systems of \$100 per service connection servicing over 700 homes. It is expected that the demand for these grants will increase as each year goes by and people look for a better standard of living.

We hear considerable talk these days about our housing problem, the shortage of housing for low-income families and the high cost of construction. This Government is doing everything in its power to alleviate problems in this regard. In the public housing field, for instance, the Government now shares in rent subsidies on some 633 units to the tune of over \$40,000 annually. It is in this area that the most concern is felt to the degree that there are 196 new units under construction at the present time in 10 centres with a further 170 units due to start in the spring of 1968. Further, another 11 centres are negotiating for an additional 412 units. It should be realized that the provision of public housing is essentially the responsibility of local areas, with the Government sharing 20 per cent of the cost of construction and of the rent subsidy.

Because of housing shortages in certain areas and the

March 7, 1968

inability to qualify for low-rental, the Government has undertaken the construction of some 45 units for resale. It has built 13 units at Green Lake and Uranium City families of Métis ancestry. In addition to the above, the Housing Branch has participated in land assembly projects which have made 163 new lots available in two communities and is helping in a number of others involving 645 new lots. Urban renewal studies have been completed in 10 areas. Another 19 studies are in progress. The Province assists by paying 12 1/2 per cent of the cost of these.

Another relatively new program is the Air Strip Improvement Program. Under this, centres of over 500 population may participate. If less than 500, and not within 30 miles of an adequate air strip, the Provincial Government pays the total cost up to a maximum of \$2,000. Twenty-seven communities have qualified for assistance and a further 12 are under consideration.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I have not attempted to be all-inclusive in my coverage of grant programs, as this would take much longer than the time allotted to me. I would be remiss, however, if I did not make broad mention of certain programs of other departments. I would like to single out the grants made by the Department of Education which are probably the largest of any, being estimated at over some \$80 million for 1967-68. I am sure that these grants can be expected to increase as a normal course of events. We are proud to say that percentage-wise this sum of money represents the first time that more than 50 per cent of the cost of education has been paid by the Government.

In view of the demand by many people for the provision by the Government of assistance to local governments through a revolving loan type of money pool, I should point out that, while the idea has merit, it does not seem to be economically sound, especially at a time when all levels of government are being asked to limit their expenditures. What many people do not realize is the extent to which this Government does assist local communities with their financing problems. I am referring now to the policy of purchasing a share of local debenture issues. It will interest you to know that in 1967 some \$6,350,000 worth of debentures were purchased, representing 21 per cent of the total issues. As an indication of its confidence in the soundness of local governments, this Government intends to continue and if possible expand its assistance in this area.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, I would like to say that easily identified grant programs, operated by the Government, accounted for some \$156 million out of a Budget of approximately \$303 million. If one wanted to be fussy, it is very likely that from the \$147 million left over, after these grants, a further sum involving some millions of dollars could probably be classified as grants.

Mr. Speaker, all of these programs I have outlined cost money, money that must be raised through taxation. During the past year this Government has worked toward eliminating the frills in these programs. We have, in many cases, brought in

changes in the grant structure to ensure that everyone receives a fair percentage of the assistance he is entitled to. Many of these grants have been increased and their coverage extended. We have done these things to ensure the taxpayers' money was being spent properly. But, Mr. Speaker, public demand for these services and grants is increasing at an alarming rate. If we are to maintain these programs that our people have indicated they so badly need, we must provide the funds to finance them. We regret that we were placed in the position where we had to increase taxes. I feel that it was the proper course to take at this time. Pushing our Province into debt or borrowing at the present interest rates is both impractical and irresponsible.

I wish to congratulate the Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Steuart) for the manner in which he presented his Budget. It was frank and honest and the measures he proposed will enable us to maintain our present economic growth. I feel the foregoing capsule presentation backs up my assertion that this Government is trying to use its resources for the benefit of the people and, I maintain, doing a first class job of it. I will, naturally, support the motion.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. A. Thibault: (Kinistino) — Mr. Speaker, in rising to speak in this debate, first of all I want to thank the people of my constituency for having given me the support that made it possible for me to return to this House for four consecutive times.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Thibault: — If my people hadn't done this, I would not be in this House to congratulate you, Mr. Speaker. That's why I made a point of thanking my people first, not with any disrespect towards you. I also want to congratulate the young Members who have come into this House for the first time. Some are young, some are old. I am sure that they are going to find the work here interesting and I wish them all well.

I want to make several comments about my constituency. It is one of the finest in the province. It is part of the Carrot River Valley and if anyone wants to see nice scenery, you can find it in my constituency. I also want to say that we have one of the finest ski resorts in the province called the Domremy Ski Club. It is in the Travel Guide and it's got White Track beat all to pieces. If anyone wants to take part in winter sports, I want to say that my constituency likes to take part in some of this promotion of winter sports, because our country lends itself very well. I think that the Department of Natural Resources should try and help some of these resorts build themselves up. This year the Minatinas Ski Club, west of Domremy, has had already over 2,000 visitors. But like many public projects, they are all a little bit short of money, and due to the fact that the entire province is using this resort, I think that

March 7, 1968

it is only fair that the senior government come along and do a little helping in that regard. To say a few more words about this ski jump, they have two tow ropes; three slopes, the highest vertical slope is 300 feet; longest slope 1,500 feet; a 30 metre jump, club house, snack bar, open Monday, Wednesday, Saturday and Sunday; tow charges \$1.50 a day. For snow conditions, phone club house at Domremy — 4235728, also Gus Baudais at 4235947 and Ed Reine, who has been one of Saskatchewan's champions in the world of skiing on about 12 occasions. You can see that this ski club in my constituency takes a great pride in winter sports.

I want also to thank the large number of students that come to visit the Legislature. I would like to comment on some of the letters that they write back to me after they have gone home. I want to be quite frank. They enjoyed the trip here and I can show you some letters of what they think about the decorum in the House. And I'm going to tell you that it's not good. I think it would do a lot of good for some of the Members to read these letters. I don't want to spend time quoting them, but I think that, when the students are in the galleries we should make an effort to improve our behaviour. It's not for a long time, as it's usually at the beginning for about one half an hour. If we want to provide an example, you know we have to make sure about these youngsters, as they go back home and tell their parents. Some of you might not find your way back here because of these students. So it is a good warning to all of you.

I want to mention also that I was re-elected with no change in boundaries. You know it seemed to me when I looked at the map of redistribution, that a sheet of paper was laid on the table, a drunk caterpillar placed on it, and it drew lines all over the place.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Thibault: — But you know when it came around Kinistino, he couldn't change the boundaries because no matter which way they went, they made my position a little stronger. Anyway instead of winning by 208 votes as I did in 1964, I came back with a 538 vote majority. Usually on the fourth time you run, you have just about had it, but I was surprised that it was the largest majority that I ever came to this House with, some 54 or 55 per cent.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Thibault: — The last two times, they tried a two-way fight. They said, "We can't get this guy out with a four-way or three-way fight, so let's get together and we will make it a two-way fight." And in the two-way fight I have to thank the Conservatives and the Liberals and all those who supported me and made it possible for me to be here. I want to say to the people of my constituency that my doors are always open to all the people, no matter what their political belief is. When they come to see me with a

problem I don't take any blood tests, whether they are red, blue, or whatever they are. I would like the Cabinet to treat me the same way as I treat their people back there. When I have problems I want to be able to go to the Cabinet Ministers and be heard. I hope that they will treat me the same way that I treat all the people in my constituency.

Hon. A.R. Guy: (Athabasca) — Qu'est que . . .

Mr. Thibault: — Now just a minute. Now when you represent only about 4,000 people, you know I would keep quiet. Now if it was Charlebois (Saskatoon City Park-University) the junior Member from Saskatoon saying something, well he represents 16,000 people, but you just represent a measly 4,000. And you haven't the lady Member sitting along side of you this year to keep you quiet. A hopeless case, and with the pay you are getting, I'd keep quiet.

Mr. Guy: — I am doing better.

Mr. Thibault: — Well, so much for that. I think we'll go on to something else. I want to mention a few things about the highways in my constituency. We have Highway No. 3 that was started in 1963 from Melfort to Birch Hills, and this year it was finished. You can imagine from 1963 to 1967, four years! Sometimes we were wondering whether the poplars in the ditch were gaining on the road machinery or whether the road machinery were getting ahead, but eventually this road was finished. We are not complaining as it is a fairly good job. Anytime that you want to continue that highway across the Saskatchewan River, the people of my constituency will be very happy.

Now we have other things in our constituency that we are quite happy about. We have had an addition to the Senior Citizens' Home this year and I want to thank the Provincial Government for the help that they gave us. Do you know, we had several ribbon cutting ceremonies in the last three years in my constituency, but most of the projects were projects that had been started during the CCF Government. Believe you me, I never saw such a good bunch of ribbon cutters in my life.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Thibault: — I hope that this doesn't slow down. I hope that we will be cutting ribbons for years to come. And with all the money that they are going to collect this year, we should have lots of it. Now, I want to say a few words about the conservation and development project, and I'll be saying more about that during the Estimates. We have areas down there that have been organized. There was a letter sent to the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. McFarlane) to look into the matter of providing survey crews. You know you can have a lot of money voted, but if you don't provide engineers to do the engineering work nothing gets

March 7, 1968

off the ground. It can stay dead a long time, you don't have to spend much money. I don't intend to dwell on that very long, but I will say more during the Estimates. Now one of the complaints that I got on several occasions on the Cromartie Creek and the Peonan Creek was about the lack of engineering service and difficulty in obtaining estimates for right of way, difficulty in obtaining favourable votes to finance main channels. These are problems that the Provincial Government has to look at. The main channel sometimes goes through a farm which doesn't benefit the farmer at all. I think that there is an area here that the Department of Agriculture should look at and make sure that an improvement is done along that line. A lot of land could be salvaged, drainage programs and so on. But in the last years we have had a slow-down on this program, and I hope that the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. McFarlane) will find a little money to build it up.

I would like to say a few words about the Indian people in my constituency. I have visited them on many occasions. I want to put it this way; a few years ago, John Diefenbaker's Federal Government gave the Indian the right to vote. This was followed quite closely by Premier Douglas of Saskatchewan and his Government, giving the Indian people the right to vote. Well, we hear a lot of comments about the Indian problem. I think that the white people will have to face some of the facts. I think that the Indian is here and the white man is here. If we try to understand each other, we will find that there is a lot of room for all of us. For 100 years these people have been pushed aside. Now we have given them the right to vote and we expect too much from them. I think that we have to encourage them to be a part of our society. There are too many of us who go uptown, see a drunk Indian and say, "There's all the Indians, that drunk one there." And they look at the Indian people in that light. That goes for not only on that side of the House, but a lot of our people too. I want to put a word in to try and help the situation along. I think that we should not drag the Indian problem into the realm of politics. I think that there is an area where a committee of the House could be of assistance in approaching the Indian people.

Now on the reserve in my constituency, there are 63 families who are without homes. There is a housing building project going on, but I must say it is not proceeding fast enough. Speed it up a little bit. The need is great. If some of you have never visited Indian reserves, I suggest that you go and spend some time there and not spend it there for the reason that the Member for Touchwood (Mr. Meakes) was talking about. There is a great need on the Indian reserves also for adult education. I was quite happy with the remarks of the Member from Lumsden, the Attorney General (Mr. Heald) about the driver training program for the Indians. I am sure that that will help. But we have to look at every angle where we can help these people, because let us not forget that they have been pushed aside for 100 years. If we were in the same position, ask yourselves how would we like it if we had been pushed aside the way they have been.

I was a bit disappointed on the night of the election when the Premier chose to scold the Indians because of the way they voted. In my estimation, it was very ugly and I hope it never happens again. Nobody can be proud of a situation like this. I want to say that in my constituency, I have yet to ask someone whom he has voted for. Never, that's their business and none of my business. Now 71 Indians voted Liberal in my constituency, 118 voted CCF, and I can assure you that I didn't go out and scold the 71 that voted against me. I would defend their right to vote the way they like, and I'm prepared to accept the decision at the poll. There again, as I said a moment ago, let us approach this problem, and I say it's No.1 problem in my constituency. If you have never visited an Indian reserve, try it for a few days. You will find people who are just as intelligent as anywhere else in the world, people who are afraid of the Department of Indian Affairs. They are scared, and, let's face it, a group of people living in extreme poverty. I think this is one area that has got to get out of the realm of politics, so let's face it so that we can keep our heads high. Well, now so much for the Indian people, I hope I haven't wasted my time talking about them.

Now we've heard some remarks across the way about leadership. I know they've mentioned several names, the Member for Regina Centre, Mr. Blakeney, I don't know, there are so many seats in Regina; you'll excuse me if I don't have the proper location. They've mentioned Mr. Romanow from Saskatoon, Mayor Baker. I also want to say that we have a very good Leader and I want to congratulate him . . .

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Thibault: — . . . because we can put our Leader forward any day and we'll never be ashamed of him.

Mr. Thibault: — But I'm afraid the Liberal party is stuck with Davey.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Thibault: — And you won't have much choice; I think it is decided already.

This afternoon I heard the Member for Regina North West (Mr. Whelan) talking about highway safety, telling us about 275 people who were killed on our highways in the last year. Believe me it's a lot of killing. We had a committee set up and our report was brought in some two years ago. The report is quite clear that alcohol is one of the major factors in our accidents today. Well, I think we had better face the facts, something should have been done already. Our minority report stressed the importance of proceeding without delay. We have heard the

March 7, 1968

records of England. When they set the breathalyzer out how quick they reduced the death rate. Some of these 275 people would be living today had we gone ahead. We must not lose sight of the fact that, when the Government opposite was elected in 1964, it cut down the amount of money per student for driver training. It reduced the amount of money for alcohol education. I then said in this House, "You will have the results." The organizations on alcohol education were pleading for money but the meat-axe came down. They said, "No, no, we're going to save some money." That was a heck of a place to save money. I hope they've wakened up to the fact. Ever since 1959, I've been talking about traffic casualties on our highways. They are up now but they were somewhere around 150 a year at that time. They have kept coming up and they are still going up. I appreciate the work that's done by the Attorney General (Mr. Heald) but where I don't quite agree with him is that he has not proceeded fast enough after the Committee brought down his report. I'll let you explain that part of it.

Hon. D.V. Heald: (Attorney General) — I'll explain it.

Mr. Thibault: — Now, I'll probably have more to say when the Bill comes down. I could talk at length on driving safety, but since we are going to have a Bill before the House, then we'll let it go at that.

Now, in talking about highways and bridges, I would like to mention that we have a problem down there you know . . . where the Saskatchewan Dam . . . oh well, you know what I mean . . .

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Thibault: — . . . They seem to play around with the water, you know. I don't know whether they have a lot of fun with it, but downstream where we have ferries in the summertime, the ferries are having a heck of a time getting across. Now in winter it's the same thing; the ice is very unsafe. I think the time is here when the building of bridges across the Saskatchewan River should be proceeded with, at least a couple a year. I hope they build them solid enough so that they don't move downstream after they are built. There's a great need to serve the people north of Birch Hills, north of Weldon area, north of Kinistino with a bridge across the Saskatchewan River. That would serve the constituency of the Member for the Northwest Territories, the Member for Prince Albert East-Cumberland (Mr. Berezowsky) and the Member for Prince Albert West (Mr. Stuart). The main street there and the penitentiary . . .

Mr. Stuart: — . . . the jail . . .

Mr. Thibault: — By golly you got that too. Well, anyway I say the time for bridges is here and I hope you will proceed with accommodating the people along the river without any delay.

Now in the building of highways, there's a lot said about four-lane highways. I think we've got to bear in mind that when we spend money for highways, when we go ahead with the four-lane, it is very expensive. If we were to spend a little more on municipal roads, grid roads, we'd get a heck of a lot more mileage of grid roads if a few miles less of four-lane highways were built. I think it would serve more people. Not that I have anything against four-lane highways, but when I look at the Budget in 1965, you had a budget for municipal road assistance of \$10,500,000. Then you came up to \$11,500,000, a million more in 1966 and in 1967 you are up here now to \$11,600,000, only \$100,000 increase in that area. With the Budget coming up some \$30 million, I think you've certainly slowed down in the expenditure towards municipalities, helping the municipalities with their roads, with the result that I'm sure that municipalities are going to find another skyrocketing of the mill rate. My local governments are very conscientious people, and I say that the best spent tax dollar is spent by our local governments.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Thibault: — And I think any money you can give over to the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Estey) will certainly be appreciated by the people out in the country. You know, they like to say that we didn't do too much to build grid roads. I can remember when the grid-road program was started back in 1956, that's the program that took the cars off the blocks, yet Mr. Jimmy Gardiner speaking at Dysart, Saskatchewan said, "We've tried the grid road; it'll bankrupt the municipality; we've tried it and we've quit because it wasn't workable." It never got off the ground but this is a good program. Now that the grid-road program is coming towards completion, other programs must be started, winter maintenance, access roads. In many cases where you call them access roads, they should be grid roads, but you're saving some 10 to 20 per cent for your Government. Why don't you raise it up to the same level as the grid roads instead of 25 per cent? The percentage is not the same for access roads as grid roads. So there again this is a matter of opinion but I would like to see that estimates in Municipal Affairs for roads to farm homes up a little. There is lots of room for going up. Certainly you didn't come up in proportion to the total Budget, let's face it.

You know they say I'm breaking the rules of the House. It takes me a little more time because I'm not reading my speech, so, Mr. Speaker, will you bear with me?

Mr. I.H. MacDougall: (Souris-Estevan) — You can't read your own writing.

Mr. Thibault: — Talking about highway contracts, I would like to mention one of the Returns, No. 68, tabled in 1967, March 30. We hear a lot about highways, but you know when we look at the

March 7, 1968

contract price and the final payment, I'll be frank with you, some of them don't smell too good. There's one here that was contracted for \$339,014, the final payment \$509,358.97 — \$170,000 more than the contract price. There is a whole page of it that doesn't look good to me and I would suggest that they look at it. The price of grading and all the prices have gone up — it doesn't look good. I think we are spending a lot more money, but the miles are not showing up. Talking about population — you know, I don't want anybody to accuse me, I've got five kids, my wife and I —

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Thibault: — We hear all over that the population is coming up. Now in my constituency we had no change in boundaries. We had a lot of change in the polls to make people go 15 to 20 miles to vote when it's a strong CCF area. They will make them go further. By golly I think it helped me because they got mad and they said, "We'll show them." There were 445 names less on the voters' list than in 1964. Where did all the people go?

Mr. Steuart: Prince Albert.

Mr. Thibault: — You didn't gain that much.

Mr. Steuart: — Oh, more than that Arthur, we put them to work in the pulp mill.

Mr. Thibault: — Now I want to give you another figure. What about the province? Taking the records from the Family Allowance account in Regina — they keep pretty good track, a family moves out of Regina, out of Saskatchewan, they know immediately. One comes in, they want that family allowance, it's known immediately — now in 1964-65, there were 494 more families that left Saskatchewan than what came in. In 1965-66, 1,102 families that left Saskatchewan more than what came in. In 1966-67, 1,411 families that left Saskatchewan more than what came in. I don't know where they went — you can read the Saskatchewan Economic Review. I know the reasons why we can only get one copy. I used to be able to mail 12 copies out. Why they were keeping it locked up some place, we couldn't find it. I heard there were 5,000 copies printed, I would like to have at least 12 copies, it would save me a lot in campaigning, you know. I wouldn't have to talk so much. But there again, in 1967 for the first half of the year, talking about population in Saskatchewan, there are 578 families — and that was a report for just about half of the year of 1967 — more that left Saskatchewan than what came in. Yet they'll tell us the population has gone up. That's why they hid the Saskatchewan Economic Review for several months.

What about the population in the municipalities in my constituency? I would like to give it to you. Lake Lenore from 1961 to 1966, and that's not very long, 138 people less in Lake

Lenore; Three Lakes, 578 less; Hoodoo, 185 less; Fish Creek, 210 less; Flett Springs, 176 less; Invergordon, 324 less; St. Louis, 178 less; Kinistino, 435 less; Birch Hills, 188 less. Now I think the people are leaving Saskatchewan faster than they have ever left before.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Thibault: — Now I like to hear the Members across the way try to tell us that they represent the farmer more than we do. But we've got as many farm Members on this side of the House as they have on that side, more.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Thibault: — And if you doubt my statement, you can check it with the Leader of the Opposition's (Mr. Lloyd) office. The Clerk's office is so loaded we are having a hard time getting records. We'll have to ease off, I think they need some help in there. So there again, we have as many farmers here as they have over there. Yet we hear them try to implant in the heads of the people of Saskatchewan that we are getting money from the Labor Unions. Do you know I am quite happy to take money from the Labor Unions for campaign funds? I want it from the farmers and I want it from anyone that wants to work with us as long as it is good sound honest money.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Thibault: — If they doubt, well last year we had a Resolution in this House to ask that political parties declare where they got their campaign funds. Who voted for it? The people on this side. The people over there all voted against it. And yet they try to say, "Oh, you got some money from the unions and let's holler it over the radio and all over the place and make sure the people can hear about it." But where do the Liberals get their money? We have to hunt. Some don't trust the Commonwealth for its figures on that question. So I'm going to quote from the Prairie Messenger. On March 1, 1967 issue and I quote. I recall a headline in the Messenger of April 19, 1956:

Three Manitoba brewers donated \$28,000 to the Liberal and Conservative and Social Credit parties.

The Star Phoenix of February 18, 1967 had headlines: "Montreal Construction Company Contributes \$300,824 to both political parties, Federal and Provincial." Now that's one company. Now those are just a few we are catching at it, you know. But then when we talk about the Pacific scandal, when we talk about the \$50,000 given to the Liberal party, the party got \$50,000 providing they put Thatcher in instead of Cameron. Then if they want to go a little further where the Liberals get their campaign funds, they can read up the Dorian enquiry. That should finish

March 7, 1968

it. Our books are open all the time. We have our financial statement and anyone who wants to see it can see it for themselves. And so much for that.

There are quite a few farmers on this side. I've got five children. Some of them are going to be in the labor force and believe you, I'm not going to teach them to hate one another. When they come home for Christmas, I want them to get along like brothers and sisters . . .

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Thibault: — . . . whether they be farmers or anyone else. It has been the practice of old line parties, mind you, to divide and rule. This is why we've got a lot of difference down east between Quebec and Ontario, the Catholics and the Protestants and on you go. This year I was at EXPO where we saw some 60-70 nations built on a 1,000 acres of land. It was remarkable how these people got along. You could hardly understand it. There was no friction. There was a lot of propaganda. All the pavilions that were there were putting on a show trying to show what their country has. They got along fine. If there was a little more promotion of this kind of propaganda, our country would be better off.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Thibault: — I want to say that the world was made for all of us, and I'm sure if we learn to share the fruits of the earth properly, like we are taught on Sunday. Many of us like to be part-time Christians. That's the trouble in the world today. If your enemies are hungry, give them food. If they are thirsty, give him drink. But once they come closer to home, we say about the Communists, don't sell them wheat, don't sell them potash, don't give them anything. They should starve. I can't buy that. And the moment we suggest to explore the sale of potash or grain to the Communist nations, they say, "Mr. Lloyd, why don't you go out there." Instead of that they go down and sun themselves in Florida and heck knows where and they come back — Government defeated. Yes, and they say he walked back into the House of Commons the other day with a pair of high boots on . . .

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Thibault: — . . . and a shovel. Hell of a mess. They didn't attend to business. Instead of doing that they should be out trying to sell our grain. You know we had to get rid of the Liberals to get a Wheat Board. We had to get rid of the Liberals to sell grain. Diefenbaker did it — not that I'm a Conservative, I don't agree with his politics — but I like to give the devil his due.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

The South Saskatchewan Dam and you know I'll tell you another thing about the Dam . . .

An Hon. Member: — The Gardiner Dam!

Mr. Thibault: — Oh, that's right. You know when they called it the Gardiner Dam, "By golly", said the Premier, "I made a mistake." He went even a little further, he ruined the films Diefenbaker was on. He paid three thousand and some dollars to the producer to get rid of that part of the film because, by golly, we can't give credit to the Socialists for that. And then he said, "By golly, we'll lose a Conservative vote now." Well he said, "We'll move Diefenbaker's shack into Wascana Centre and that should fix everything, and then we'll get the Conservative vote. Well, Mr. Speaker, you know it's bad, but you've got to get rid of the Liberals to get something done. And I think of selling our grain and the shape agriculture is in now, by golly, I hope the people of Canada are going to get rid of the Liberals.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Thibault: — Anything else is better.

Mr. MacDougall — No; no, the NDP . . . =

Mr. Thibault: — Yes, I think Tommy Douglas knows the West best and I would support Tommy Douglas.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Thibault: — Now I think we've said enough about that. We go on to medicare. I remember . . .

Mr. Guy: — . . . purple gas. . .

Mr. Thibault: — Yes, purple gas, you taxed them. I told my people that your purple gas was a way to get their head into the guillotine and after it was in, bang, down it went. That's what you did with the purple gas and I told my people exactly what you would do, that were opening the door to taxation on farm fuel and that's where we are today.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Thibault: — They don't brag about purple gas anymore. They say tax-free gas, it's in a hell of a mess now.

Now we talk about deterrent fees. You know, these deterrent fees in plain language, I would say, are sort of an intoxicated decision. It's bad! I can recall the days when we had to beg

March 7, 1968

at the door of the hospitals to let people in. When the hospital would phone the reeve of the municipality and say, "Will you pay for so and so if we let him in?" I'm sure the older Members across there remember those days. I don't like to look back, I tell my people, don't look back, let's go ahead. But when we bring deterrent fees into our Hospital Plan we are going back and let's look back to where we are going.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Thibault: — When we ask them, are you going to charge those over 65, people who have paid into a plan for 20 years who have never used it? Now when they are going to use it, they go up to the hospital and beg to get it. Ridiculous. What is it being done for? It is being done for their God-free enterprise people who think more of money than they do of their souls. That's what it is being done for. They are moving medicare and hospitalization into the private insurance field. That's where they want it. The Premier hinted the other day that he is going to be here for five years, because he thinks it will take that much time to ruin the thing properly. I could say quite a bit more about hospitalization. I can remember in 1924, when eight students in my classroom died from diphtheria inside two weeks. The discovery of a vaccine for diphtheria was made in 1917. I can remember that so well because the two boys that sat in front of me on Friday were dead on Monday.

Now, you say, oh, it would happen the same under the CCF Government, I don't argue that point, but the discovery of a vaccine for diphtheria was in 1917 not 1923 or 1924. You can recall when the Salk Vaccine was discovered and was made available that in Saskatchewan within a year with a well organized hospital plan, we just about wiped out polio. Saskatchewan led the way, yes, we had other people on this continent who were copying Saskatchewan. But there isn't much to copy anymore in the medical field.

I also want to say a few more things about deterrent fees and why they say they abuse the hospitals. Well if the can find abuse, I think they should deal with the abuser, and not punish the whole classroom because one kid didn't behave properly . . .

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Thibault: — . . . one doctor who abused the hospital, that is the boy that is doing the mischief. Deal with him: And leave the innocent people alone. Now what about the mother that's coming to the hospital, pregnant, expecting a baby? Is she abusing the plan, her husband or who? But she's being charged two and a half bucks and if it's not a miscarriage it's going to be an extra buck. That's the way the Members across the way operate. Another. dollar.

Now we'll go on and talk about the Air Ambulance. We were quite proud of our air ambulance. Believe you me what went a long way into winning my election this time was on account of a little boy who fell off a tree and drove a splinter into his back and waited at Melfort for the Air Ambulance in good flying weather from one o'clock in the afternoon to seven o'clock in the evening to be moved from Melfort to Saskatoon. Fortunately with our hospital in Saskatoon we didn't have to run down to Rochester with a situation like this. It was done in Saskatoon and in about two months' time the little boy was riding a bicycle. When I drove up there, the mother said — it happened up by Beatty — "I'll call my little boy and I want to show you what the University Hospital did." The little boy drove up on his bicycle; she opened his clothes and here showed an incision from under his ribs all the way down as far as they could go, turned him around and here he had; an incision of almost, a foot long in his back. I'm sure they could see daylight through the little boy. But she said that waiting period from one o'clock until seven o'clock was along wait. Now I know if the weather had been bad, these people wouldn't feel bad, but there was a good flying weather. What was going on?

Mr. J.A. Pepper: (Weyburn) — No personnel.

Mr. Thibault: — I don't know, but we know that the Premier has an aircraft. I remember the days when Tommy Douglas used to use the Air Ambulance whenever he needed it. And these boys over there said, "It's a crime to use the Air Ambulance. He should use his car." But instead of using the Air Ambulance, the Premier got himself a plane, at Government expense.

Now I want to read a letter here that my mother got in 1964. We like to say that it didn't matter what Government we had, we would still have a Hospitalization Plan and a Medicare Plan. Let us never forget that the CCF are the people who started this kind of plan on the North American Continent . . .

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Thibault: — . . . and if it hadn't led the way we wouldn't have a Hospital Plan today. Now this is a letter from Manchester, New Hampshire, USA, the country that sometimes some people like to suggest we should belong to. Now I'm not going to read the whole letter. This is from one of my cousins and it goes on. I'll read it in part, and I quote from the letter:

Here everyone is living from day to day hoping that Eddie will recover to some degree, and live a half normal life. But I don't think it will work out that way. He had an operation on April 1, and came home from the hospital in Boston the middle of May. He was doing pretty well, when he got pneumonia and they took him back to Boston in an ambulance, and he was there another three

March 7, 1968

weeks. Now last Saturday, August 15, they took him back again and his lungs were closing and he could not breathe. The doctor says he has pneumonia again. He is in an oxygen tent and he is fighting for his life. His doctor bills and hospital bills are past the \$10,000 mark, so far. A sickness like this drains you of your life's savings and you can spend it faster than you can save it. Pray for him and Mary Rose. They both need all the courage and the support the good Lord gives them. Every little prayer will help.

Mr. Speaker, this letter was written in 1964, not 1944, in a country that is supposed to be so much better off than we are. I know that this man, I saw him in 1950, he was no lazy slouch. He was up at five o'clock in the morning and he worked late hours. His whole life's savings were gone in a matter of a few months; from April 1 to August 15, the whole caboodle was gone. And when I see deterrent fees, oh, they have private plans out there too, with limits. Choose their patients. I tried a private plan before we had hospitalization and medicare in this Province. They said we'll insure the rest of your family, but as you have had trouble with asthma and heart condition, we won't take you; we'll take the rest of the family.

An Hon. Member: — The healthy ones.

Mr. Thibault: — We'll take the healthy ones, we'll insure the brick houses and leave the wooden houses alone. Free enterprise! When I hear them cry free enterprise, it makes me sick when we talk about the health of our people.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Thibault: — I'm going to table this letter, I've had it all Photostatted, the postage is on it, the postmark is on it and anyone who wants to read the whole thing, then you'll know it is not a fraud. Here you are.

Now I hope that I've covered the subject of medicare. I would like to say a few words about our hospitals, the closing of our hospitals. I don't agree with the high-handed way and the way things are being done. The eight hospitals that were closed or set to be closed, they heard it over the news. It has dealt a death blow to a lot of our communities, when a lot of the old people come to retire, what do they look for? First of all they would like to retire in their own little home town, the part of the country that they helped to build. They look at the facilities in that little town. The CCF Government did all we could to bring facilities to those small towns. We helped them with natural gas, with power, sewer and water, hospitals. Overnight, you know, hospital is closed. What did it do to all those hospitals that are on the list for possible closing. The meat-axe is hanging over their heads. The protest has been so strong that I'm glad that the Minister of

Public Health (Mr. Grant) has reconsidered his position; he backed down a little bit. I hope that the Government will back little bit on the deterrent fees too.

Now what does it do? The drop in population in the towns will be affected, the people in my constituency are disturbed about this movement, but there again it's a question of people or dollars. During the 1964 campaign the Premier was in my constituency and he said, "We are not against hospitalization and medicare; you just give it to us .and we'll take care of it." Certainly you can all recall when Satan's army marched on Regina to try and upset things by kicking in the doors and everything else. Now he comes along and says, "We will take care of it." This is like the story of Little Red Riding Hood. What did he do with it? What is he doing with it? You can see it now. Anybody knows very well that the Liberal party did all it could to prevent the Medical Care Program from being born. If somebody has in his mind that the Medicare Plan can be well looked after, by someone who doesn't believe in it, you farmers should try and raise chickens with a skunk in the chicken coop. and you'll have just as much success . . .

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Thibault: — . . . and I'm very afraid the skunk has rabies. Now, I don't want to dwell on this too long, I want to say a few words about the Mental Health Program.

I think we were well warned by Mr. Blakeney, the Member for Regina centre, and the Member for Moose Jaw North (Mr. Snyder) and many others who spoke in previous sessions about what was happening with our Mental Health Program. I know that there again the Government sitting across the way tried to tell our people, "We'll take good care of it, but the people that were lost, our psychiatrists and our top doctors, our top nurses that have left this province don't come by the dozens, and I am satisfied in saying that it will take at least 10 years of good work to repair the damages that have been done. I don't want to go through the Frazier Report, the Member from The Battlefords (Mr. Kramer) did a good job of that.

Another thing that disturbed me was that I had a hard time to believe the Members from Regina when I sat in here while they talked about mental health. I thought that maybe they were pulling my leg, making a mountain out of a mole hill. But last summer a family came to my place and said, "Would you try to use your influence to get a member of our family into the North Battleford hospital?" He said, "We've been trying and we can't do it. The doctor has sent me to your place, so that you will use your influence on the North Battleford hospital to get this patient into the hospital." I said, "Now I can't believe that." "Well", he said, "The doctor said that he is hopeless." "Well", I replied, "I tell you put this off for a day or two." "Nothing doing", he said, "We have to do something tonight, this member is getting hostile and dangerous." "So", I said, "Okay I'll

March 7, 1968

phone North Battleford.” I picked up the phone and phoned North Battleford, and a doctor answered. I said, “I would like you to know, this is Art Thibault, the MLA for Kinistino speaking, and I want an explanation why patient so and so is not being admitted to your hospital. What’s the trouble out there?” “Oh”, he said, “No trouble, just get the doctor to fill out his form and get the patient down here and we’ll take him in.” Well I said by golly this is something unusual. I had a hard time to believe that the doctor had sent the family over to my place. I know some people I’d like to get into Battleford, but I hate to be the psychiatrist. I don’t feel competent enough for that. So the next day I drove out to see the doctor. I said, “Now did you send that family over to my place to use my influence to get this patient into the hospital?” “Yes, I did.” I said, “Why?” It’s the first time in all my life and I’ve been in public life for over 20 years, that I’ve ever met up with a situation of that kind. What’s the reason? He says, “I can’t get to first base with them.” All right, there’s where it lay. The patient did get into the hospital, and the next day he was admitted. The doctor signed the form. What I resent is that I had to phone North Battleford when that family was sent to my place by the doctor and the doctor said that . . .

Hon. G.B. Grant: (Minister of Public Health) — On a point of order, would the Hon. Member care to identify either the doctor or the patient, so I can check as to why that admission was denied, because I think this . . .

Mr. Thibault: — I’ll make it easier for you. I can give you the names of the doctor, the family and the doctor in North Battleford, privately. If you want it that way, you can have it that way. If you want the names in public, we can call the doctor and the family on the phone and they’ll tell you and you can have it the way you want.

Mr. Grant: — Mr. Speaker, I didn’t ask for another speech, I merely asked for the identification.

Mr. Thibault: — I’m quite prepared, I said you can have it the way you to accept the names in private, I think I’ve covered the intention to repair the damages that were done as pointed out in Dr. Frazier’s Report.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Thibault: — Now it’s regrettable to see a mess like we’ve had of this kind. When you read the reports it makes you sick. I hope, when we work with the Estimates, that \$500,000 in the Estimates, where Dr. Frazier recommends \$2 million, that another mile or two of highway or two will go to fix up the mess that has been brought about in this province. \$500,000! It appears that there is no

intention to repair the damages that were done as pointed out in Mr. Frazier's report.

Now we've heard a lot about the Queen by the Member for Maple Creek (Mr. Cameron), saying that we don't have any respect for the Queen, he hinted as much, not in so many words . But I'm going to tell you something. I think that the Members over on this side have as much respect for the Queen and the Commonwealth as any Member of the other side. But if we want to talk about someone way out in Montreal saying we should do away with the Commonwealth, why should we be blamed for everything everybody else says? But I would suggest that the Members over there clean their own House. When somebody goes across the way into the USA and says we should belong to the States, what is he trying to get rid of? Where is the Queen? Where is their loyalty? That's all . . . well, well by golly I'm not going to dig up all . . .

An Hon. Member: — The Premier in Montreal . . .

Mr. Steuart: — No, you're not going to give any names or anything . . . Who said it? Give us a name . . .

Mr. Thibault: — When the Premier said that if Quebec wants to break away, we should consider joining the USA and it appeared in many clippings when . . . I can dig up the clippings and I'll table them tomorrow or any time, but you know as well as I do that has been said.

Mr. Steuart: — Give us the name of the doctor, give me the quotation.

Mr. Thibault: — I'll produce the clipping soon as I get around to it.

Mr. Steuart: — Oh yeah, you bet you will!

Mr. Thibault: — Now, sure it appeared in one of the local papers, and don't try to weasel out of it to try and catch me that I haven't got a clipping here. I'll produce the clipping in due course . I'll assume responsibility for that statement.

Now talking about agriculture, the cost price squeeze; I don't know if these people know what the squeeze is, but they sure as heck got it on the farmers again. Now I heard the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. McFarlane) say he is going to help the people build hog houses. I have no objection to that, but the main thing is to see that, if the farmer gets a decent price for his product compared to the price of the cost of operation, he will build his hog houses and he'll find the money for it. When we sit on piles of grain, surpluses, borrowing money to operate on, waiting seven or eight months for the final payment

March 7, 1968

because the Government says Ottawa is short of money, who's paying interest? The farmer! Now I must say that a lot can be done to help the farmer if we had price control or a price review board and could lay the blame where it belongs. Any time a machine goes up a thousand bucks, right away they cry labor! Labor is to blame. Let's get the people fighting against each other. I can remember when the strike was going on in Vancouver, the grain loaders' strike. By golly the Ottawa Government just sat there and let it fester until the Farmers' Union went down. As soon as the Farmers' Union went down to Vancouver, the Ministers at Ottawa just couldn't get there fast enough, because they were scared the farmer and labor were going to get together.

I want to tell you that I started my public life with the Farmers' Union, and I'm going to tell you something I recommended to every farmer to belong to the Farmers' Union. Because the day that the farmers and labor get together and start understanding each other, believe you me you fellows won't even have a ghost of a chance to be back in.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Thibault: — Now, Mr. Speaker, I think I've taken up quite a bit of time, but we will have to set the record quite straight, as far as I'm concerned. I think the voters of this province will have to make up their minds about something, that when they vote for somebody they make themselves a part of the things they vote for. If we want to give credit to someone for hospitalization in this Province, we've got to give credit to the people who voted CCF in 1944. Give credit where credit is due. Then if we want to give credit to someone for the Medicare Plan in 1960, you've got to give credit to the people who had the courage to vote CCF in 1960. And today if we've got deterrent fees and I hope the Government reconsiders, we must lay the blame at the foot of those who voted Liberal in 1964.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Thibault: — Now I will excuse them a little bit for the three years that this Government across the way was able to play around and cover up. When it called the election almost a year ahead of time before the term was up, it reminded me of a son that inherits his dad's property and he goes on a field day for three or four or five years, and all of a sudden he's broke. That's what happened. The Government had a honeymoon for three years and when it saw the bucket was just about empty, it said, "Let's have an election, let's get this over quick, it's catching up to us." So that's what it did. In 1967 it sneaked in with crooked boundaries eleven seats more with one per cent difference.

I'll give you a good idea how the constituencies were divided. Athabasca had 3,911 voters on the list. The junior Member for Saskatoon has 16,000 and I don't blame him for hollering a little louder than the rest, because he is representing

over 16,000 people. Now you can go all the way down the list, the Member for Hanley (Mr. Heggie) some 5,000; Mr. Brockelbank another Member for Saskatoon, some 16,000. By golly, you know we've had three redistribution bills, one every year since we came in here. The Liberals would go out and check just how it's going to work, another redistribution bill. They redistribute so often that finally pieces of the province were left completely out, and they had to bring in a Bill to include these parts that were left out. That's why I said the lines were drawn like a drunk caterpillar on a sheet of paper. Some were in twice. Now, Mr. Speaker, I think that men like M.J. Coldwell, J.S. Woodward, Tommy Douglas, Woodrow Lloyd have dedicated their lives to bringing social programs into operation.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Thibault: — They have proven to the entire North American continent that these plans can work. They worked here and they would still continue to operate without deterrent fees if we were not going to cater to the insurance companies and try to sabotage the plan.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Thibault: — Mr. Speaker; I think I've gone long enough. I think that you can see by my remarks that I don't intend to support the main motion, but I will support the amendment.

Some Hon. Members: — **Hear, hear!**

An Hon. Member: — Mr. Speaker, it's indeed a pleasure to follow . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order, order!

Mr. Guy: — Mr. Speaker, I wonder if before the Member takes his seat if you will permit a question.

Mr. Willis: — An intelligent question?

Mr. Speaker: — Order!

An Hon. Member: — If it came from you it wouldn't be.

Mr. Speaker: — Order, order! We are not going to have a chit-chat debate as to whether or not a question is going to be asked or whether it isn't. The Member says: can he ask a question? If the Member wishes to answer, he'll rise and answer and that'll be the end of the matter.

Mr. Guy: — Could you give me the name

March 7, 1968

of the patient and the date of the Air Ambulance flight to Birch Hills?

Mr. Thibault: — I could get you the approximate date . . . Just a minute. You want an answer. Would you keep quiet until I get done. You weren't around when your mother dished out the manners.

An Hon. Member: — You weren't around when they dished out the brains!

Mr. Thibault: — I made this statement about the Air Ambulance and I am going to read a letter that was written. Yes, I'll give you the approximate date. We'll get the date when that patient went into the hospital, and the name of the patient, because there was a letter written by Woodrow Lloyd's office to Wilf Gardiner, asking him the following questions: How many planes were in the Air Ambulance Service during 1963 to the present time? What was the composition of the fleet in these years? During each year, how many planes were stationed in Regina and how many in Saskatoon? This is Mr. Lloyd's letter to Art Thibault — after waiting for some time we finally got a reply — I am attaching a photo copy of the reply and I'll read the reply to you. This is to Woodrow Lloyd from Wilf Gardiner. He's not here any more. He was in my constituency and he helped me a great deal. And I quote:

I am in receipt of your letter of August 15th, in which you make the inquiry with regards to air ambulance service. I would suggest that these questions are ones that you can properly ask the Legislature. If that is your desire I would suggest that you do this at the first opportunity. It has not been the policy of the agency to give out information of this type except by proper inquiry during the sitting of the Legislature. With best personal regards, I remain,

Mr. Wilf Gardiner
Dated September 7, 1967.

This is what led up to this letter, is the accident that happened at Beatty. The flight was made from Melfort to Saskatoon and the date . . . I will get it to you. It may take a little while as I'll have to write to the family. I could give you the name of the family involved and I think that with that you'd be able to get the records. Is that fair enough?

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. J.A. Pepper: (Weyburn) — Mr. Speaker, I would first like to take this opportunity to congratulate you on being again chosen and duly appointed to the honourable position as Speaker of this House. I know that you will again fulfil this position with fairness and equity to all and with the dignity, which you have always displayed in this position in the past. It is with pleasure, Mr. Speaker,

that I extend sincere congratulations to all the new Members in the House. I can assure you that the new recruits on our side of the House add a great deal of charm and youthful talent, which they have already displayed during this session.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Pepper: — I can assure you that this is just the beginning. I am very proud to have them as my colleagues and I am looking forward to their many suggestions and recommendations, both in session and out of session, constantly striving to build and pass legislation which the people of our province can be very proud of. After the redistribution of our Provincial boundaries during the last term in the Legislature, a Member naturally is anxious to know just how it might affect him in the next election. Well, Mr. Speaker, I survived the first test in spite of Weyburn's Liberal candidate, having the highest expense or election account of any Liberal. candidate within the Province.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Pepper: — Now, Mr. Speaker, I would like to express my words of appreciation to my constituency of Weyburn for returning me as their Member for another term in the Legislature. I can only assure them that I will endeavour to represent them, as I have in the past, in a manner which I hope is worthy of their respect and confidence, fully realizing at all times my responsibilities to them, their elected Member.

Mr. Speaker, may I act this time beg leave to adjourn the debate.

Debate adjourned.

The Assembly adjourned at 9:41 o'clock p.m.