

**Legislative Assembly of Saskatchewan
First Session — Sixteenth Legislature
18th Day**

Monday, March 11, 1968

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

On the Orders of the Day.

WELCOME TO STUDENTS

Mr. E. Whelan: (Regina North West) — Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to introduce to you and to all members of this House, 40 young citizens from Regina North West. These visitors are the grade seven and eight students from St. Mary's school. They are located in the Speaker's gallery. With them is their principal A.J. Driscall and some of their parents. I am sure all Members will join me in extending a warm welcome to them and expressing the wish that their stay with us this afternoon will be pleasant and educational and informative.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. W.E. Smishek: (Regina North East) — Mr. Speaker, it gives me a great deal of pleasure to introduce to you and to this House a group of grade seven and eight students, 54 in number, from St. Michael's school located in the constituency that I represent in Regina North East. They are accompanied by their Vice-Principal, Mr. Ryan and by one of their teachers, Mr. Zenkawich. I am sure that the Members here welcome them this afternoon and we do hope that their stay in the House this afternoon will be both educational and pleasant. I do hope that all of us here will be on our good behavior and give them a good example.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. C.P. MacDonald: (Milestone) — Mr. Speaker, through you and to the Members of the Assembly I would like to take the opportunity of introducing a group of university students from Notre Dame College at Wilcox who are seated in the Speaker's gallery. There are 30 of them present accompanied by their professor, Mr. Tom Shoebridge. I am sure that all Members of the Assembly are well acquainted with Notre Dame and the contribution of the College and Father Murray to education in Saskatchewan and, of course, to the youth of the province. It is rather interesting to note that many of these students come not from Saskatchewan but from other provinces in Canada as well as the United States. This College has a very soft spot in my heart. It is here that I went to school and spent the majority of my adult life in the teaching profession. I am sure also that all Members of the Assembly and particularly the Opposition are well aware that Father Murray is the kind of

March 11, 1968

a man that has the courage of his convictions and never hesitates to make them known. I hope that they will have a very pleasurable and enjoyable afternoon in the House and that they will learn a little about democracy in action.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. I.H. MacDougall: (Souris-Estevan) — Mr. Speaker, I want to introduce to the House today a special guest who comes to us all the way from the Philippines. He is sitting in the Speaker's gallery up here right at the end. I asked him over here for a visit and we may have him as a permanent resident. He has been working for the Philippine Government and I would welcome him here today on behalf of all Hon. Members.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

QUESTIONS:

MOTIONS FOR RETURN

Mr. C.G. Willis: (Melfort-Tisdale) — Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day I would like to bring to the attention of the Provincial Secretary (Mr. Heald) that there seems to be a little slackness in getting Returns down into the House. Two have been ordered by the Legislature here, regarding the expenses for the Member for Nipawin (Mr. Radloff), and the second one, on February 29th regarding the purchase of machinery by Highways. We would certainly like to have these as soon as possible and would like to ask the Provincial Secretary when we could expect these two Returns.

Mr. D.V. Heald: (Provincial Secretary) — Mr. Speaker, I will table them of course as soon as they come to hand. While I am on my feet I would like to lay on the table the answers to Return No. 23, Return No. 62, Return No. 26, and also while I am on my feet, Mr. Speaker, I would like to lay on the table the amendments to the bylaws of the Association of Professional and Community Planners in Saskatchewan.

RETURNS NOS. 34 and 35

Mr. F.A. Dewhurst: (Wadena) — Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the Provincial Secretary when I may expect Returns Nos. 34 and 35. They have been asked for over two weeks now.

Mr. Heald: — I am sure they will be in my hands before the end of the session and I will table them.

EXPLANATORY NOTES

Mr. E. Kramer: (The Battlefords) — Mr. Speaker, regarding the explanatory notes I wonder, I notice that we are not getting too many of them, and I would further like to ask if it isn't too much trouble to number the Bill as well as title on them. I notice there are no numbers and this makes for some inconvenience.

Mr. Heald: — Yes, I agree with the Hon. Member and I caught it the other day and spoke to the legislative counsel and that will be remedied, as far as the numbers and the titles are concerned.

PATIENTS IN THE WASCANA HOSPITAL

Mr. Whelan: — Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the Day I would like to direct a question to the Minister of Public Health (Mr. Grant). In view of the recent letter to relatives of patients in the Wascana Hospital, formerly the Geriatric Centre, advising them that the Saskatchewan Hospital Services Plan will apply to them after April 1st, is the Minister going to quieten or incite their fears by forthwith announcing the deterrent fees that will or will not apply to them?

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

ADJOURNED DEBATE 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 amendment thereto by Mr. Blakeney (Regina Centre).

Hon. C.L.B. Estey: (Minister of Municipal Affairs) — Mr. Speaker, as you were not presiding over the House when I spoke in the Speech from the Throne debate, I wish to take this opportunity to congratulate you on your re-election to the high office of Speaker. The tributes which have been paid to you by both sides of the House are evidence of the efficiency with which you handle the affairs of this high office. The other day when we conveyed our birthday greetings to you, you declined to give the number of anniversaries which you have celebrated, but we hope that you were able to celebrate this anniversary in the same fashion that you have celebrated former anniversaries.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

March 11, 1968

Mr. Estey: — Mr. Speaker; several speakers from the Opposition have referred to a loss of academic freedom by our University due to various meetings which took place last fall to discuss our University budget. Whether a government interferes with the academic freedom of an institution such as a university should best be judged by those who operate the university. I direct the attention of this House to an article which appeared in the Star Phoenix, March 5th, which was an interview with Dr. J.W.T. Spinks, the president of our University, and in that article Dr. Spinks is quoted as giving his opinion on this question of academic freedom. I quote from Dr. Spinks:

All winter they, the provincial Government, have been saying they would not interfere with academic freedom and they did not.

I would also draw the attention of the Opposition to this same article in the paper which quotes Dr. J. M. Naylor, who will be well known to Members of the Opposition, and you will find that Dr. Naylor is himself also quite satisfied with what has been done by this Government insofar as the University is concerned. We are all proud of our University and I think for the benefit of that institution the speakers who have referred to the loss of academic freedom should cease such utterances. Our University in the past has been able to attract teachers and students of high quality and will continue to do so.

Mr. Speaker, our Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Steuart) in a forthright manner presented us with a Budget calling for expenditures in the next fiscal year of \$338.4 million which represented an increase of \$35.6 million over the previous year. A Budget such as this which calls for an expenditure of \$111.9 million in education, an increase of \$19.1 million over the previous year, and health programs having a cost to the province of \$136.7 million, cannot be financed without increasing the tax-base and our taxes, unless we are prepared to reduce expenditures in certain fields. Education which accounts for over 32 per cent of our expenditures cannot be reduced. Education is, and has been, the number one priority of this Government. Expenditures for Public Health, Medical and Hospital Plans, and Welfare, account for approximately 25 per cent of our expenditures and there has been no suggestion in this House that these expenditures be reduced.

Our Highway and Grid Road Program will account for approximately 20 per cent of our expenditures in 1968-69 and in order to properly develop our province our highway system must be improved and maintained. It is interesting to note that while the Opposition have cried about the increase in taxation, they have not suggested any real method of reducing expenditures in the areas which I have mentioned. The majority of Opposition Members who have taken part in this debate want improved highways. The Member for Regina South East (Mr. Baker) wants a per capita grant to urban municipalities of \$10. Indeed, 90 per cent of the Members of the Opposition who have spoken in this

debate have recommended increased expenditures. It is elementary you cannot increase expenditures and at the same time reduce taxes.

There is, I think, Mr. Speaker, general agreement in this House that the Hospital and Medicare Plans are good plans, but they are very expensive when they have to be financed by less than one million people. The Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Steuart) in his address referred to the fact that, since our Hospital Service Plan was introduced some 22 years ago, the costs of the plan have increased by \$66.5 million or 880 per cent. To give an example of the rapid increase in cost of this plan, the Provincial Treasurer stated that the Plan will cost an additional \$8.3 million in the fiscal year 1968-69.

We know that in the next five years, the costs of post-elementary education are going to increase substantially and the Province must be in a financial position where it can allot additional funds both for capital and operating purposes in the field of education. This Budget, I submit, Mr. Speaker, is a real attempt by the Government to see to it that there will be more funds available for education in the next few years.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Estey:— Mr. Speaker, I now want to say something about the Department of Municipal Affairs in relation to the Budget. At the outset I would like to announce that, since my taking part in the Throne Speech debate, the Province has entered into agreements with Central Mortgage and Housing for the construction of 34 low-rental housing units in Prince Albert and 78 units in the city of Saskatoon. The Prince Albert units are now out to tender. Insofar as the Saskatoon units are concerned, these have been specially designed and will be located on property in a manner which we think will make living more enjoyable to tenants and be an asset to the area in which they are located.

Mr. Speaker, the Government in partnership with Central Mortgage Housing Corporation has agreed to take over from the city of Saskatoon under its Land Acquisition Program, a further 315 acres in the extreme eastern portion of the city, and with the acreage previously acquired from the city of Saskatoon, the total holdings in the Land Acquisition Program is 900 acres. This acreage will when required be available for housing development. The purchase price will be approximately \$1,500 per acre, of which the City will pay five per cent or \$75 per acre and will recoup that \$75 per acre on the sale of each lot.

I now want to deal, Mr. Speaker, with the provisions in the Budget relating to housing. At the outset I would point out that this Budget which we are considering calls for an expenditure in the next fiscal year of \$1,450,000 on low-rental housing. That figure represents an increase of 100 per cent over the amount provided by the Province for low-rental housing in the period 1967-68. The Budget further provides that the

March 11, 1968

Department of Municipal Affairs, in co-operation with Central Mortgage and Housing and the municipality concerned, can enter upon a low-rental housing project, having a value of \$5.8 million. The Budget also provides a continuation of our Land Assembly Projects by allotting for this purpose \$625,000. The amount allotted in this Budget for economic rental housing is \$500,000, and we intend to actively pursue the matter of economic rental housing. There is also provision in the Budget for constructing homes for employees engaged in our resource industries, and when those houses are constructed we will sell them to the employees involved. It is quite evident, Mr. Speaker, that there will be a very substantial increase during 1968 in the number of low-rental housing units in this province. A great deal has been said by Members of the Opposition as to the rent charged to tenants in the low-rental housing, and I would again point out that there are 200 tenants as of this date in low-rental housing accommodation who are paying \$50 per month and less for that accommodation. The average rental paid in our 600 odd units is as of this date \$65 or \$66 per month. This program of low-rental housing, of which we have heard so much, has been available to the Province for many years. While certain Members of the Opposition continually refer to the lack of program on behalf of the Government, I would point out that, when the NDP Government left office in 1964, there were only 234 subsidized rental units in this province. And in only three construction seasons, and only two of those seasons has this program been under the Department of Municipal Affairs, this Government has increased that figure to nearly 600 low-rental units, and we have a further 150 under construction which will be occupied prior to July 1st.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Estey: — I would like at this time Mr. Speaker, to pay tribute to those Members of the Local Housing Authority in each centre where we have low-rental housing. I wish to thank them on behalf of the Government and I am sure on behalf of the tenants occupying these units, for the time and effort they have spent in connection with low-rental housing, and I would point out that there is no remuneration for such work. The policy of this Government insofar as housing is concerned is to provide low-rental housing for those who cannot afford to provide adequate housing out of their own resources.

Mr. Speaker, I now turn to the subject of the Municipal Road Assistance Authority. And I would like to point out initially that during the construction season 1967, 1,090 miles of road were constructed to grid road standard. The total completed mileage in the grid road system is now approximately 14,000 miles. We expect that at the end of 1968; provided that we have a good construction season, the grid road program insofar as construction is concerned will be completed in 135 rural municipalities. As the grid road program reaches its completion, the emphasis will switch from the construction of grid roads to

the maintenance of grid roads and to the construction of main farm access roads.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Estey: — In 1967 this Government initiated a policy of constructing main farm access roads and 460 miles of such type of road were constructed. The Provincial Government's contribution to grid road construction and farm access construction in 1967, exclusive of maintenance grants and equalization grants, amounted to \$6,100,000. The total cost of this program, including the municipality's share and the Provincial Government's share, would be in the vicinity of \$10 million.

In addition to construction costs, the Government spent \$600,000 towards the re-gravelling of grid roads. We further contributed 50 per cent towards the municipalities' cost of maintaining the grid roads up to a maximum of \$85 per mile. And for this purpose, that is for maintenance, we paid out through our Municipal Road Assistance Authority, \$1 million in the form of grants to our rural municipalities. During the present fiscal year the program was continued of assisting in the construction of grid roads through towns and villages, the Provincial Government's contribution being 70 per cent of the cost. We continued the program of assisting in the removal of snow from the grid roads and those roads which are used by school buses and made grants totalling \$:500,000 to our municipalities for this purpose.

We also during the past year constructed grid roads on 11 Indian reserves and spent \$320,000 on this work. I am glad to report that several of the Indian bands involved made a request for assistance in the maintenance of these grid roads. Arrangements have been made for a contribution from the municipality in which the reserve is located, and the Government through the Municipal Road Assistance Authority will make the usual maintenance grants directly to the Indian band involved.

A few months ago our Municipal Road Assistance Authority received a request from the Department of Indian Affairs in which that Department asked that the Municipal Road Assistance Authority take over and assume the construction of roads in all Indian reserves. We have approved of this plan in principle. The contribution which we have discussed is an 80 per cent contribution by the Department of Indian Affairs and a 20 per cent contribution by the Municipal Road Assistance Authority. We expect that, within the next month or six weeks, details of the agreement will be worked out and are hopeful that this plan can be inaugurated during 1968.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Estey: — This, I think, is an acknowledgement by the Department

March 11, 1968

of Indian Affairs of the efficiency of our Municipal Road Assistance Authority. These roads which we will construct to grid road standards will not only be integrated with our present grid road system and connected in many cases to our highway system, but will provide better transportation on Indian reserves and for those passing through these reserves.

The budget that is before the House for the Municipal Road Assistance Authority is almost identical with the budget for the previous year. The expenditures for re-gravelling, maintenance and snow removal remain the same. It is expected that there will be no reduction in 1968 in the mileage of grid and farm access roads constructed. The prices that we have obtained to date from contractors have not increased over 1967 and in many cases they are less than paid for the same work in 1967. The total amount available for the grid road authority in the Budget which is before us is \$11,605,000 as compared to \$11,589,000 in 1967. It is also interesting to note that there has been no reduction in the amount available for equalization grants and \$2,400,000 will again be distributed to rural municipalities on the basis of financial need.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to point out the actual assistance which was given to certain municipalities in the form of equalization grants and these payments were made during the year 1967. The RM of Fertile Belt received \$16,692 which, when based on the 1967 assessment, represented a payment equivalent to 5.88 mills. The RM of Canwood received \$28,910 which represented the equivalent of 8.24 mills. The RM of Redberry received \$18,960 which represented 10.40 mills. The Hon. Member for Redberry (Mr. Michayluk) in his address a few days ago referred to the stagnation which this Government is causing at the municipal level. I am quite certain that the council and the people of the RM of Redberry are appreciative of the fact that the Government grant is equivalent of 10.4 mills of their present mill rate.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Estey: — The RM of Frenchman Butte received \$22,371 which represents an equivalent of 10.74 mills based on the 1967 mill rate. I would suggest to the Opposition that it would make good reading to compare these grants with the grants made during the years of the NDP Government. I pointed out the other day that the RM of Garry which was referred to by the Hon. Member for Touchwood (Mr. Meakes) received \$2, 000 odd under the NDP Government and received \$15,000 under the present Government.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Estey: — This program, I submit, Mr. Speaker, merely represents another phase of the Government's program in assisting rural municipalities to ease the tax burden on the taxpayer.

Now I want to turn for a moment to the question of homeowner grants, which I know is rather a touchy subject, especially during the last election in three seats in the city of Saskatoon. Some of the NDP Members running for office in those seats, which are now all represented on the Government's side of this House, were in favor of the homeowner grant; another was against it; another didn't know where he stood. But I want to point out to this House that during 1967 the present Government paid out in homeowner grants in excess of \$8,500,000 as against \$8,183,000 in 1966. We received 6,000 more applications in 1967 than in 1966. The number of applications processed for 1967 was approximately 177,000. I want to point out that we have reduced the cost of this program so that the cost of processing an application is now 43 cents and with experience we hope to reduce it further. There is no question, Mr. Speaker, that this has proven to be a most popular program and one that is appreciated by the people of Saskatchewan. The amount provided for homeowner grants in the present Budget is \$8.6 million.

I now want to turn for a moment to the work of the Assessment Branch in the Department of Municipal Affairs. The work of this Branch insofar as the assessment and re-assessment of our rural municipalities is concerned has been hampered over the years by lack of qualified personnel. However, a few weeks ago, our people made two or three visits to the University and we have found real interest in assessment work among certain young people, who graduate from that institution and are presently in the college of Agriculture. We are hopeful that we will in the next six weeks obtain at least five graduates for this assessment work, and there is a possibility that we may obtain as high as eight or ten. The work of this Branch, I am sure all Members of this House will agree, is most important, and it is equally important that the work be performed by qualified personnel. Indeed fair and equitable assessments are absolutely essential to the success of local government. To give you an idea of the work of this Branch, during 1967, 21 of our rural municipalities were re-assessed together with one LID and a number of towns and villages.

I now want to deal with the assessments of the various industries in our Province, to point out to the House during 1967 the assessment of potash mines increased by approximately \$4.5 million and the total assessment is now in excess of \$15 million. The assessment on our sodium plant increased \$500,000. The assessment on our base metal mines increased \$282,000 and the assessment on base metal mines at the present time now stands at \$5.8 million. The assessment of pipe lines during 1967 increased by \$1 million and we anticipate a very substantial increase during 1968. Our oil well assessments increased over \$2 million. The total assessment as at December 31, 1967, of mines, pipe lines and oil wells amounted to \$83,325,895. I also want to point out that the total assessments of our rural municipalities increased in excess of \$15 million. Our urban areas, each one of them, the smaller and the larger cities likewise increased in the assessment. If you take the cities of Moose

March 11, 1968

Jaw, Prince Albert, Regina and Saskatoon, the assessment in those four cities alone increased in 1967 by \$59.5 million. It now stands at \$488,594,000. I submit, Mr. Speaker, that one of the best evidences of the progress of our Province is the value of the assessment both in industry and on property. At the present time in the Department we are investigating the feasibility of putting all of our assessment information on the computer. The indications are, from the investigation to date, that this would be economically advantageous and provide a real service to rural municipalities and those urban municipalities which are now assessed by the Department. We look forward to the time when we can supply to municipalities, not only assessment rolls, but tax notices, and there is great interest I might add in this program in the municipalities.

I now want to turn to a branch of the Department which is increasing in importance and will continue to do so, that is our Community Planning Branch. To accommodate the urbanization which is taking place in our towns and cities, we must plan so as to make the best use not only of our land for housing, but to move traffic and provide services. The Branch is now concerned with planning the town site for Jan Lake and making improvements in the La Ronge towns site. The Branch has also worked with those firms engaged in the present potash survey. We are continuing to provide fellowships for persons who take post-graduate courses in planning, and the first holders of these fellowships are now returning to our province. It is interesting to note — and I point this out to the Hon. Member for Regina South East (Mr. Baker) — that the first graduate of our Fellowship Program is presently employed in the Planning Department in the city of Regina.

Just to give you an idea of the service that this Planning Branch is rendering, its drafting division completed 574 new sub-divisions for urban centres in 1967 which was an increase of 13 per cent over 1966. We are now in the process of studying our Community Planning Act and the Regulations with a view to major revision at the next sitting of the Legislature. The town is now being planned near Jan Lake is a direct result of money being invested by what the mover of the Speech from the Throne referred to as a private sector, especially those engaged in mining and those in the tourist industry. We hope that this new town will serve as a model for future development of northern towns, for I think that, if we expect people to take part and to live in the northern areas, we must create towns which will have the necessary services.

I now wish to turn for a moment to the Green Lake project which comes under the Department of Municipal Affairs. This project as you, are well aware deals in the main with those of Indian ancestry who reside in the Green Lake area. Many years ago in this area the land was divided into 40-acre plots and one family was located on each plot. But as time went on it was discovered that a person could not make a living on: a 40-acre plot, and the Department of Municipal Affairs a year or two ago commenced getting these leases back and dividing the acreage

into farms of approximately 800 acres. In the spring of 1967, five Métis families selected by a local committee were placed on five farms in the Green Lake area and are purchasing those farms under an Agreement for Sale. The central farm operated by this Government at Green Lake placed 30 bred cows on each one of these farms to be repaid in kind by the farmer. The present plan is to eventually divide the central farm into two or three farms and make these available to persons of Indian ancestry. On three of these farms we built new homes. I might say that last fall I visited this area with the Hon. Member for Meadow Lake (Mr. Coupland), and the home which we visited was certainly a credit to the husband and wife who resided therein.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Estey: — We have also entered into an agreement with ARDA whereby 1,800 acres will be cleared and seeded to grass over a three-year period on the Silver Lake community pasture near Green Lake. 800 acres are now being cleared. The purpose of this project is to permit the farmers in the Green Lake area to develop a cattle industry. We know perfectly well that the problems of Green Lake will not be solved by placing all families there on farms, but nevertheless I think that this is one project which has been commenced in that area and which will succeed, insofar as those families are concerned. We hope that our lumbering project at Green Lake will break even in the year 1968.

Now as you know, the Department of Municipal Affairs has an LID Branch, that is Local Improvement Districts. During 1967 the ratepayers of LID 926 decided to dissolve after a vote having been taken, and on January 1, 1968, LID 926 which is located in the southern portion of the province was dissolved and its area divided between four neighboring municipalities. We now have ten LIDs in Saskatchewan, seven in the north and three in the south. It is expected that during the present year, two further LIDs will be dissolved and divided between adjoining municipalities. There will also be boundary changes in our northern LIDs incorporating areas into neighboring municipalities. By the end of 1968 there will probably be eight LIDs in our province, seven in the north and one in the south. I think, Mr. Speaker, the situation insofar as LIDs are concerned is a very healthy one, as it illustrates that the residents of these LIDs are prepared to assume the responsibilities associated with municipal government.

Mr. Speaker, the Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Stuart) in his Budget Speech summed up in my opinion the problem facing Saskatchewan today, when he said, and I quote:

Great Britain is a sad example of what happens when a Government pushes its expenditures on welfare past the point where they can be supported by the productivity of the nation. When this happens, everyone suffers, the poor even more than the rich, because they can afford it less.

March 11, 1968

The emphasis which this Government places on increased productivity is evident today in many fields, but in no field is it more evident than in the field of mining.

The Minister of Mineral Resources (Mr. Cameron) has already told us of the prospecting activity in the north. Mr. Speaker, the Provincial Treasurer has by this Budget sought to preserve our social achievements to date, and at the same time place emphasis on such things as education. We live in a province richly endowed with human and natural resources, but we need trained personnel to develop those resources and trained personnel can only be obtained through education. For years the NDP talked about the democratic Socialism of Sweden and Denmark, these countries are now in trouble. Denmark, I understand, has recently changed its Government and Sweden is attempting to change its policies. Mr. Speaker, it is quite obvious that I will oppose the amendment and vote for the motion.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. I.H. MacDougall: (Souris Estevan) — Mr. Speaker, I want to say a few words in this debate, but first a few comments about several of the speeches made by Hon. Members opposite. I've heard much crying and weeping and tightrope walking emanating from the mouths of the Regina Curtain Hanger and the loud Member for The Battlefords (Mr. Kramer) and the big one from Moose Jaw. You know, Mr. Speaker, there are a lot of big men in the Opposition, but they're big from the shoulders down. Mr. Speaker, I want to advise my friend from Prince Albert East-Cumberland. (Mr. Berezowsky) that, after listening to these fellows from across the way, I think I have discovered three more peanut mines or should I say three new peanut minds. You're looking for them all the time in the north and we've got three right here in the House.

Let us Look at some of their solutions for high taxes," Mr. Mr. Speaker. (Now that didn't take very long did it?) Believe me, Mr. Speaker, with my Highland heart I do not like higher taxes anymore than anybody else. I should ask the Provincial Treasurer for my tie back, I'm darn good and glad I didn't give him my kilt.

We told the public during the last election that the more that they demanded from Government the more taxes we would have to collect. Money to cover the cost of public projects comes out of the pockets of the people of the country and let's not make any mistakes about that. Rising costs of education, health, well you name it and you will find that nearly all costs have gone up. We have tried to relate taxes to cost and this Budget is an honest one in that we attempted to show the people which costs have gone up and how we are going to raise the money to pay for them.

I might, however, suggest to the Provincial Treasurer (Mr.

Steuart) that there was one area where we could have saved the taxpayers of Saskatchewan a considerable amount of money and maybe we should still do just that. We could have, as I said before, cut the Budget by eliminating the expenditure on the Regina auditorium. My people in Estevan see no good reason for the Province to bail out the city of Regina and the mismanaged affairs of this auditorium. Regina's Mayor, the Member for Regina South East (Mr. Baker), is now undoubtedly taking the credit for the financial aid given him by the Province. This fiasco which, even if it is built, will never, never pay for itself. How could it? The auditoriums in Edmonton and Calgary don't pay, and these cities have populations of 400,000 plus. Each year, however, the Alberta Government subsidizes these two auditoriums by half a million or more each. I might point out here there has never been any suggestion that the Alberta auditoriums have been mismanaged.

Why, Mr. Speaker, if the steel work was sold for scrap (and that would mean a \$2 million loss) and the whole project started over on a less pretentious basis, the project would probably go over much better with the people of the Province of Saskatchewan. I can't see in the next 20 years how we can afford this project. Saskatoon must have a better system of management than Regina because they have completed their auditorium. The MLA for Regina South East should hang his head in shame for allowing the auditorium situation to get so clearly out of hand. Believe me, Mr. Speaker, the Premier in my opinion should not have been so generous in bailing the project out of such serious difficulty.

Original grants for the auditoriums were designated for the Provincial capital cities, but that benevolent NDP or CCF or NSF, or whatever they are going by this year, the Government which preceded us, chose to split the available grant between Saskatoon and Regina. Then they, first and foremost, must accept the greatest share of the responsibility for Regina's problem. Next, Regina's Mayor, the great benefactor of his people, helped to snarl the project to the point where they could never have solved the problem by themselves. About all he does for Regina is shake hands, kiss babies and give away buffalo hats, but by all means he puts politics first.

All NDP Members during the 1967 election campaign put forth extravagant promises to the people of the province. The Member for Regina South East criticized the homeowner grants on the one hand, then he turned around and he tried to give homeowner grants to all renters. Now at what cost, Mr. Speaker? Well probably another \$10 or \$12 million; but he never told us where the money was going to come from. Mr. Speaker, again I think of the Members opposite during the campaign promising anything and everything just to regain power. Oh, we all remember how they reduced hospital insurance premiums the session before an election. Without fail they went right back up after the election was over. How short do they think the memories of the people of this province are?

March 11, 1968

Then the other night, Mr. Speaker, we were treated to a real entertaining speech. The Member from Redberry. (Mr. Michayluk) spoke about everything from the Canadian Senate to Mr. Thatcher's old speeches. Well, like the Hon. Member sometimes I think the Senator is for the birds too, but we won't argue about that. When he refers to ethnic groups as being different, and that's what he does when he infers that Ukrainians should be chosen to replace Ukrainians in the Senate or Germans to replace Germans, Scotch to replace Scotch or what have you, Mr. Speaker, this sort of garbage does not tend to unite Canada, but divide Canada. What are we in Saskatchewan anyway? We are Canadians first. Sure, we have our traditions of which we should be proud, but why differentiate? I must suggest that the best way to overcome these ethnic differences, is to marry them. I know. I guess I'm the closest thing the Premier has to a Ukrainian Member, since I married a girl of Ukrainian origin. But at the same time, we regard ourselves as Canadians first and I commend this thought to the Member for Redberry. I suggest, however, in his case he is an NDPer first, second and last, and he'll use anything for political advantage — just another case of putting politics first.

An Hon. Member: — Think of the Premier.

Mr. MacDougall: — There are many over there who put politics first and foremost, and I was very glad to see the Mayor of North Battleford rap the knuckles of his MLA for the statements he made in this House last week when he spoke of North Battleford as being a city of "fear and locked doors." The Mayor told the people of this province that once again the Member from The Battlefords (Mr. Kramer) was attempting to make political hay out of one or two unfortunate situations which were highly overstated. Another case of a politics first Socialist. Should anyone take The Battlefords Member's remarks seriously, it won't do much good to promote his own city.

I noticed the other day when the Highways Minister (Mr. Boldt) put forth his highway program for the year, the Members who were present were sitting on their hands while the Minister gave out his remarks. Mr. Speaker, there weren't very many of them that stood up and said they would give away any part of their paved or oiled programs to pay for medicare or any other program. They sat silent, as they usually do. But nevertheless, they'll talk.

I want to thank the Minister of Highways for including in his program the two highways which we consider vital to Souris-Estevan, that was 47 north of the city and No. 9 south of Alameda. And these indeed I might say will be greatly appreciated by the people in my area. My next project, of course, Mr. Highways Minister, will be Highway No. 8, but we'll leave that for another year.

I'm going to turn briefly to health and I am happy to note

that the age of the computer has entered the child health field. Computerized records of the immunization profiles of all new born children in the Weyburn-Estevan Health Region will be kept starting April 1, this year. The names of new born children will be recorded on magnetic tape, and the computer will schedule immunization shots for children beginning at about two months, and automatically issue an invitation to the parent, and at the same time notify a public health nurse, to expect the child's attendance at an immunization clinic. After the shot has been given, information will be entered on tape to keep the immunization profile up to date. We expect to use this process for about 1,200 children alone this year.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I want to say a few words about some of the Opposition's remarks during the election campaign about the sell-out of our natural resources. In this particular case, I will only mention the Agreement which was entered into between North Canadian Oil Co. and the SPC concerning a \$4 million development of the northern portion of the Hatton Gas Field. This is a firm price Agreement with the gas produced to be delivered to SPC's own system. The SPC now estimates that it has sufficient gas reserves to meet the province's needs for the next 24 years, at the present rate of consumption. This year, however, there are 20 new communities to be added to the system.

I heard some Hon. Members opposite saying that we were charging higher rates to some areas than to others. Mr. Speaker, these areas were refused gas by the former Government on the grounds that service in these areas would be too costly. They have agreed in advance to take gas from us at a higher rate just in order to get the gas in their communities.

The Agreement with North Canadian Oil Co. reflects the long-range, wise planning of the SPC. The present Manager of the SPC is a man of vision and a man that will make sound, wise decisions in the best interests of SPC and our Province.

We have already received some of the benefits of the Agreement with North Canadian Oil Co., since two billion cubic feet of gas burned by SPC customers in the south part of Saskatchewan were delivered as part of that agreement. By that Agreement the SPC will have been able to get development of a part of its gas field five years ahead of the time it could have developed the area by itself, at a cost less than it estimated it could have produced the gas for itself.

An Hon. Member: — How about tabling the Agreement.

Mr. MacDougall: — In addition, the SPC is to have a bonus payment of over \$450,000. This is a bonus of \$7.00 per acre. Compare this, Mr. Speaker, to a similar agreement by the former Administration, the old, worn-out CCF to be specific, in 1961 whereby

March 11, 1968

the same Company was able to obtain 99,000 acres for development for just not over \$7.00 an acre, not \$4.00 an acre, not \$1.00 an acre, but 25 cents an acre.

Hon. W.S. Lloyd: (Leader of the Opposition) — How about tabling the Agreement.

Mr. MacDougall: — Again in early 1964, the same Company obtained a further 99,400 acres, not for \$1.00 an acre, not for 25 cents an acre, but just over 10 cents an acre. How about that, Mr. Speaker? The same Company approached the SPC in 1965 to ask for rights to some 5,000 acres controlled by SPC and we let them have it. It is true that a company which has been used to dealing for 25 cent and 10 cent bids wasn't so easy to deal with, but we settled for a price of \$9.00 an acre. Quite a jump in one year from 10 cents to \$9.00.

I put the facts before the House, Mr. Speaker, this afternoon, because the SPC management saved the Province a capital investment of some \$4 million. And yet it is said that it has sold out its resources. Gas received, at an attractive price, five years ahead of schedule; royalties received by the Government, at other people's expense, and yet we were accused of selling out to the big business. The whole deal took several months to conclude, Mr. Speaker, but all I can say is that it was part of the normal business of running the corporation efficiently. By reducing its demands on the Provincial Treasury and financing more of its expansion from its own resources, it has been of greater benefit to the Province and the Government.

Mr. Speaker, my time has run out, and I will support the Budget motion obviously and reject the amendment.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. R. Romanow: (Saskatoon Riversdale) — Mr. Speaker, I couldn't help but notice the last remarks by the Hon. Member for Souris-Estevan (Mr. MacDougall) about the Saskatchewan Power Corporation Agreement on the sale of the Hatton Oil Field. If the Hon. Member seriously wants to hold out to the people of Saskatchewan that that Agreement was in the best interests of this Province, let him table the Agreement.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Romanow: — But of course, Sir, he won't . . .

Mr. MacDougall — We never refused to.

Mr. Romanow: — . . . because those who enjoy some of the writings of the world's great novelists will have read with relish I am sure,

Mr. Speaker, the works of Joseph Conrad. And I refer Hon. Members particularly to one novel entitled, "Victory." You know, listening to the speeches of the Members opposite, I am reminded of Conrad's description in "Victory" of an all-ladies orchestra conducted by a rather fascinating gentleman called Zangiaco. For, Mr. Speaker, this House has been treated to a performance by various kinds of players of a rather large orchestra, far too large for the benefit of the people of Saskatchewan, now we know, singing any tune so long as it isn't the Budget tune and so long as it is one of the good old standards.

Member after Member opposite sings the praises of the Government, condemns the Opposition with specious arguments of the 1950s and at all costs, Mr. Speaker, avoids talking about the Budget. Now Conrad, Mr. Speaker, in his novel "Victory", in describing Zangiaco's rather off-key, old fashioned, out-of-date and off-beat ladies orchestra, said that the orchestra didn't really provide music. It was rather a mutilation of silence and that, Sir, is about the best description that Members can offer to the Members opposite in their contributions to the Budget and the Black Budget debate that we've been going through since March 1st.

Now individual characters who have taken part in the charade of the past few days, Mr. Speaker, would be a delight I'm sure for some of the literary giants, both past and present if they described them. For example, how would someone describe the Hon. Attorney General (Mr. Heald) when he woefully told this House that there had been a great deal of study, thought and soul-searching in preparing the Black Budget? What he didn't tell this House was the proportion of the time allotted to the soul-searching that would enable him to rise in his place and defend a Budget that taxes the sick, taxes the afflicted, taxes the young. Now how would someone characterize the Hon. Minister of Mineral Resources (Mr. Cameron) who, in his mellifluous tones, Mr. Speaker, complained that some Saskatchewan people were on a talkathon about the Saskatchewan Budget? Well with increased gasoline, increased tobacco taxes, increased liquor and all, little wonder that he and this Government doesn't want the people in Saskatchewan to talk about this Budget.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Romanow: — I really think, Mr. Speaker, that Conrad would have had a masterpiece, if he could have seen the Hon. Minister of Highways (Mr. Boldt) last Friday. How would one describe a gentleman who, firstly, imputes bias to one of Saskatoon's leading newsmen and, secondly, suggests collusion between the New Democratic party and the Saskatoon Star Phoenix. Well, I'm afraid, Mr. Speaker, that such a suggestion would even unite the New Democrats and the Saskatoon Star Phoenix against the Minister. But, to be charitable, perhaps the Hon. Minister had forgotten his own counsel when he telephoned the CFQC news editor reportedly and this is reported in the paper — and told the news editor that

March 11, 1968

it wasn't Russia yet. On the other hand, I could see that some articles written by the Saskatoon Star. Phoenix would understandably upset the Minister and his Government. An example of the Government's and the Minister's dilemma would be the editorial of just Saturday last, March 9. It talks about deterrent fees, I know, a topic rather that the Government Members don't want to discuss, but it is an interesting one and may I quote, Mr. Speaker, a part of the editorial. It says:

It was suggested by the Provincial Treasurer that this would help discourage abuses of the health plans. Critics suggest it would go further and would deter some people from obtaining legitimate and needed care.

The editorial goes on, Sir:

Unquestionably it would either do this or else pose a significant financial burden on the chronically ill who have low or fixed incomes.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Romanow: — And then, Mr. Speaker, this newspaper had the audacity to conclude by saying:

By all means let the critics attack the fees. But let them do it where errors can and should be corrected at the Provincial level.

If the Hon. Highways Minister (Mr. Boldt) was really serious, Mr. Speaker, in his reported statement that my colleague from Saskatoon Mayfair (Mr. Brockelbank) and I would have been beaten in the last election, then, I say to him, you come to Riversdale anytime and defend your Black Budget to the electorate.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Romanow: — Well, of course, Mr. Speaker, other Members didn't upset much the silence and tranquillity of this House, notably the Hon. Minister of Agriculture (Mr. McFarlane) and we can be thankful for small mercies. Back benchers wandered around in political philosophy of another generation and another era. Their contributions I thought could be best summarized, if one carefully observed my good friend from Saskatoon City Park-University, during the discourse that he had on the country's economic ills, one would have expected him to say at any time, "What this country really needs is a good eight cent cigar." Well, we do have one, Mr. Speaker, but somehow, I am afraid that the smokers of Saskatchewan don't think that cigars are quite as mellow and good-tasting, as they were about a year ago or a few months ago.

Mr. Speaker, the Budget and its debate is the reaffirmation again that Saskatchewan is out of step with modern Canada. This Government has predicated its Budget on old economic fallacies

that dictate a balanced budget under any and all economic conditions. This old theory on the economics of Government spells out no other alternative to a Government but a balanced budget, no matter what the consequences may be to the programs of the people. Rather than serving the people under this theory, the programs then become the very vehicle or mechanism on which to tax the people. Under this theory, the Provincial Treasurer is really not worried about the people and the welfare of their programs as much as he is about the international bond-buyers and the money market. And, Mr. Speaker, it is a mistaken notion to think that big business must visibly see a balanced budget and, as a result, under this theory the interests of big business are placed paramount to those of the interest of the people of the Province of Saskatchewan. Modern-day economists will say that Keynesian economics now says that this mode of economic operation is outdated: The theory held by the Treasurer and this Government is no longer a valid basis on which you would submit a governmental budget. Even modern-day industry recognizes this. The end result is that the international money market is neither satisfied nor appeased but the programs of the people suffer irreparable harm.

Now having adopted this philosophy, Sir, it is only natural that this Government would follow methods of taxations which were equally regressive. Taxes on consumption expenditures, for example a sales tax, are burdensome on those who have low or fixed incomes. It has been stated by authorities that Canada's sales tax is about twice the average in the United States. The United States has long recognized that the most progressive form of taxation is on personal income and corporation tax. And it is based on a simple proposition that the more you earn, the more you are able to pay. So in other words, Mr. Speaker, the foundation of any good tax system should be the ability to pay the tax. I ask you, Sir, was this criterion followed when the Budget indicated deterrent fees on the old age pensioners? Was this criterion followed by the Government when it decided to levy hospital deterrents on the chronically ill and those who are admitted to hospital by their doctor and have no say in this process? What ability to pay the deterrent fee for doctors and for hospitals does a family with two or more children have? Sir, it has been an absolute negation of disability.

I have here, I received today a letter and I'm prepared to table it if Hon. Members so request. It says:

Dear Mr. Romanow:

You are our MLA and we voted for you. We trust you will fight this new deterrent fee on medicare. We are old age pensioners and do not have the income for these new expenses. Thanking you . . .

Members on this side and I'm sure Members opposite are being flooded with this type of reaction and the tragic result is that medicare and hospitalization will be seriously jeopardized by the deterrent fees. It is estimated that only \$5 million

March 11, 1968

will come to the Government ultimately from the \$7.4 million they collect. Apart from the fact that any good businessman would know that this is poor business, the imposition of the deterrent fees really hurts the intrinsic worth of these two great programs for the people. When the times are tough, this Government has chosen to penalize the people and that, I say, is immoral. No matter how one shuffles the deck of cards, one cannot change the spots on them. The plain facts of the matter are that this Government has dealt a cruel blow to the people of Saskatchewan.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Romanow: — And I'm worried, Mr. Speaker, because on page 30 of the Budget Speech, the Treasurer (Mr. Steuart) speaking of the imposition of deterrent fees, and referring to the Provinces of Alberta and Ontario, says that those Provinces have adopted a realistic attitude with respect to hospitalization and medicare. Now I assume that the Hon. Treasurer picked his words very carefully because if he says Ontario and Alberta are realistic with respect to medicare and hospitalization, does he say that Saskatchewan's medicare and hospitalization program is unrealistic? I'm fearful that the imposition of the fees may be the beginning of a wholesale attack on the body of medicare and hospitalization by the Liberals opposite.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Romanow: — I may be accused of being holier-than-thou, but I say that today Saskatchewan will no longer stand for an erosion of those things that the people of this province have fought for so long to attain.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Romanow: — Medical services are a matter of birthright, and I say to the Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Steuart) — and I'm sorry he is not in his chair — that if you withdraw deterrent fees on hospitalization and medicare, you will go a long way in allaying the fears of our citizens as to medicare's safety. My generation views, Sir, deterrent fees as being iconoclastic and antiquated. Emerson once said — and I direct this to the attention of Members opposite:

Everyone has his choice between truth and repose. Take which you please, you can never have both.

Now, Mr. Speaker, earlier I talked about characters and many will recall the recent Batman television series. Batman had a character named Robin as his everlasting companion, confidant, advisor and general aide de camp. Wherever Batman was, there was Robin. Boy Wonder they used to call him. No better description can be used to liken the Hon. Premier (Mr. Thatcher) and his

Treasurer (Mr. Steuart), Batman and Robin.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Romanow: — I can imagine some months ago, Mr. speaker, how the Budget; when it was first being mooted, must have gone. The dialogue must have gone something like this. The Treasurer saying, “Holy hospitalization tax!” And the Treasurer being complimented by the Premier, “Good thinking, Davey. Pow. The sick, the old and the afflicted. They can’t fight back. But we need more.” The Treasurer, “Holy gasoline tax?” And on and on, it goes, Mr. Speaker. The tax story progresses.

Mr. Speaker, you may sum up the dynamic duo opposite in this Budget in one short word, no matter what the Liberals say, and that is taxes, taxes, and if you are in doubt, more taxes. Fortunately for the people of Saskatchewan, Mr. Speaker, every television series with its cast of characters goes off the air. I am told, in fact, that the Batman show has already faded from our television screens. This Government’s rating is at an all-time low. Come next election, the people of this province will once again switch back to the channel that provided programs for people, the New Democratic party. Needless to say, Sir, I cannot support the motion, but will support the amendment.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. R.H. Wooff: (Turtleford) — Mr. Speaker, before I take up the general remarks of my address, I would like to say Thank You to the electors of Turtleford constituency for another vote of confidence which I will endeavor to be worthy of. As you see, Mr. Speaker, I am back again in spite of many Liberal predictions to the contrary. I am here in spite of an election called in the middle of harvest time which cost us just about 50 per cent of our campaign time. I’m here in spite of a Liberal organizer sent into Turtleford constituency for the duration of the election, a certain Mr. Vance, I believe from Saskatoon. I’m here in spite of the attention given us by the Liberal Cabinet Ministers, including the Premier himself. And I’m here finally in spite of a Regina Liberal lawyer sent in to guide the final count. And please, Mr. Premier — I’m sorry he is not in his seat — remember that this is a strictly rural riding. The majority may not be large, but I took my seat following a proper recount and the full and complete expression of all voters which is more, Mr. Speaker, than can be said for the Government benches opposite. The Premier shouted long and loud about Liberal gains, certainly more noise than fact in many cases. But, Mr. Speaker, I challenge the Premier to demand a complete recount in Nipawin and Kelvington and then tell this House where the Government and the Opposition sit. Never once in all the 20 years of CCF Administration did they resort to the kind of tactics to gain a majority that the Liberal party has used not in one but two elections already. Power by any means, Mr. Speaker, it is going

March 11, 1968

to take a lot of irrigation to wash away the Liberal stains of the last four years. On and off the air the Premier has tried to make much of a one per cent majority in the popular vote. He has done a lot of fear mongering about Socialism both at home and abroad which proves only one thing. It is he himself who is frightened. He didn't wipe Socialism out as he had boasted he would. Now he is too frightened to call a by-election anywhere in Saskatchewan.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Wooff: — In the fall of 1966, I wrote the Minister of Highways (Mr. Boldt) — I'm sorry that he is not in his seat — requesting that he consider oiling No. 26 Highway from Dulwich to a point some ten miles north of St. Walburg. In fact my request covered any highway in Turtleford if it fell within his plans. I wish to express my appreciation and that of the people in the area that that we have now a dust-free surface as far as St. Walburg. However, it would have meant a great deal to the town of St. Walburg and people to the north had the Minister seen fit to include the last ten miles that I suggested. Again in the fall of 1967, I wrote suggesting oil be laid from St. Walburg to Loon Lake and from St. Walburg to the North Saskatchewan River on No. 3 Highway and from Glaslyn to Spiritwood or No. 24 from Spiritwood to Leoville. I'm very happy that he has included in his 1968 program one of these projects, the one from Glaslyn to Spiritwood. Once more I would like to remind the Minister of the need for a connecting road from Leoville or Chitek Lake area to Meadow Lake or a junction with Highway No. 55 somewhere in that area. And I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that the tourist traffic from St. Walburg to Loon Lake does warrant oil as early as possible. I think even the Hon. Member from Meadow Lake (Mr. Coupland) would have no quarrel with me on that account.

I'm very sorry that the Minister of Highways is not in his seat, Mr. Speaker. I wish to reply to him regarding some of the remarks I believe he made last Friday. After setting himself up on a pedestal of righteousness above the Opposition and incidentally, Mr. Speaker, above his own colleagues, he then climbed into the gutter, lower than his opponents to level an attack of hatred and venom, muckraking in personalities the like of which this House has seldom, if ever, been disgraced with. He suggested in no uncertain terms and in no veiled language that his opponents were liars, were blackguards, were Communists, and atheists. He then seized upon the Old Testament passage, "In the sweat of thy brow shalt thou earn thy bread." Because of this I'm going to take him for a very brief trip through the scriptures. He painted his case with a wide brush and with indiscriminate strokes and many colors. And I have no quarrel with the idea that when physically fit men ought to work for a living, when and if work can be found. I also believe returns for that work should be adequate for a decent standard of living. However, I notice the Minister spares the sweat of his brow by driving a car at public expense, that the Minister spares the

sweat and frustration of a puckered brow by using an office staff supplied to him by Mr. John Public. And I rather think that when he farmed he didn't do it with a hoe in the blazing sun like millions of his fellow men do but with a modern tractor. I'm finding no fault, Mr. Speaker, with any of these approaches and labor-saving devices, but the Minister might be humble enough to admit that, while he is using many of these conveniences of daily routine including an aeroplane at public expense, there are many "John Does" in the country, who through no fault of their own are paying for his comforts and conveniences from the business end of a pick or a shovel or a hammer. In my opinion, Mr. Minister, you took a position little short of pure blind prejudice. In Leviticus, Chapter 25, verse 10, the Hebrew people were admonished to keep jubilee every 50 years, when every man should be made free to return to his family and every man return to his own possessions. Just imagine the consternation, Sir, of our so-called free enterprise, freebooting independent sector at such a suggestion in the business world of today. In Psalm 24, verse 1, the writer says: "The earth is the Lord's and the fulness thereof; the world and they that dwell therein." Not some of them but all of them. And again in Psalm 50, verse 10: "For every beast of the forest is mine, and the cattle upon a thousand hills." May I respectfully suggest to the Hon. Minister that be it you in all your wisdom or be it myself, we are stewards of the bounties of the earth and when we aspire to positions of power, we automatically extend our responsibilities as to how we use God's bounteous gifts, not on behalf of ourselves alone, but on behalf of our fellowmen. In Micah, Chapter 6, verse 8, the prophet writes, "He hath shown thee o man, what is good; and what the Lord requires of thee, but to do justly, to love mercy, and to walk humbly with thy God." May I be so bold as to suggest that the Minister reads again the parable that the Master of men told of the two men who went to the temple to pray, the one a self-righteous man and the other an outcast. So that the next time the Minister stands up in this House and says, if not in so many words, at least by words and implication, "I thank God I am not as this man or even as this indigent person who lives off the crumbs of social welfare." I would ask him to read the rest of the parable where it says: "The sinner went down to his house justified rather than the other man." I would ask you, Mr. Minister, to read Galatians, Chapter 6, verses 2 and 3, "Bear ye one another's burdens and so fulfil the law of Christ. For if a man thinketh himself something when he is nothing, he deceiveth himself." Again I suggest the reading of James, chapter 2, verses 15 and 16. "If a brother or sister be naked and destitute of daily food, and one of you say unto them, Depart in peace, and be ye warmed and filled; notwithstanding ye give them not those things needful to the body. Your profession is barren as the desert sands."

These, Mr. Speaker, and Mr. Minister are the real foundations of a humanity-before-dollars policy that would lift much of the strife, the hunger and the want and sickness out of daily living. So may it be. I'm very sorry that I couldn't address my remarks directly to the Minister.

March 11, 1968

There has never been a time in history, I think, when planning played so great a part in everything we do from the Government down. Yet, Mr. Speaker, I submit that if this Government had purposely tried to do so, it could not have made a better job of returning Saskatchewan to its former state under a Liberal Government of austerity, debt, and insecurity. Fear of losing jobs and fear of losing a farm or a home and fear of being driven to abject poverty are things that one meets every day both on and off the farm. And if the Members opposite are inclined to disbelieve, I have on my desk a note here that I received just today of a man who lost his insurance business without any good reason being given. In my humble opinion the much talked about austerity program has a hollow ring. It sounds to a large extent, phoney. It seems to depend so much, Mr. Speaker, out of which corner of their mouth's Government Members happen to be speaking whether we have a boom or a bust. Even the Provincial Treasurer used his well practised two-way stances when delivering his Budget address. To a large extent it is a deception perpetrated against the people of Canada and Saskatchewan, firstly by a Federal Liberal party that wants an excuse for once more failing to fulfil a 50 year old promise of medicare; secondly, by a Provincial Liberal Government that has so mismanaged the Province's affairs that it needs an excuse to raise taxes; thirdly, Mr. Speaker, by a Government which gives the profit-hungry minority who escaped the heavy hand of the tax-master a chance to reap a bumper harvest at the expense of the little people, the sick people and the old people, the so-called independent sector.

Independent of whom I wonder? The workers, blue collar, white collar or what have you? The farmers, the fisherman, the small businessman, the consuming public? No, Mr. Speaker, their independence is only special privilege bought and paid for by devious means, on the right occasions. We used to be told inflation was too much money chasing too few goods. But the public can't even begin to purchase the goods we are capable of producing and have on the shelves in our warehouses at the present time. One thing is certain, the Liberal party and the Premier were strangers to the truth, either before October 11th or after and, Mr. Speaker, they can't have it both ways. Even a poorly managed farm can't go broke over night.

I have on my desk some copies of Saskatchewan Today. All the same issue, all arrived in my post office box by the same mail, all the last issue before the election. I am not sure what I was supposed to do with them. Probably use one in the campaign myself, give one to the Liberal candidate and one to the Conservative and keep one in abeyance in case the Social Credit happened to come into the field. Was it just I, who got four copies of this issue or did everyone on the mailing list receive election extras? I don't know. What I do know is that Saskatchewan Today is printed on expensive paper, and is printed and mailed at public expense. No austerity here the night and the day before the election. But the Premier and the Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Steuart) must have had a wild night on

the 11th of October and a terrible nightmare on that evening of October 11th, to waken up in the midst of an austerity program the next morning. Some hangover. Or could it possibly be that it was all planned that way? What makes this austerity program so hard to accept is that it falls so mercilessly on the low income people.

Let us look at what has been happening in various areas of our economy. Taxes have steadily gone up since the Liberals came into office, regardless of their promises. Returns to the taxpayers in services have steadily declined. Now the Budget has opened up the flood gates of taxation, the like of which this province has never seen.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Wooff: — Health costs have gone up, hospitalization and medicare by about 40 per cent. Health services have steadily declined. Because of pressures, Mr. Speaker, by the Department of Public Health, on doctors and on hospitals, some patients are sent home before they are recovered sufficiently. Now, the “most unkindest cut of all,” the tax that leaves the sick sicker, the poor poorer, but the independent sector fatter, sleeker, and more secure.

Farm production costs have gone up. Fertilizer up by almost one-third. Weed spray has gone up. Tractor fuel has gone up. Machinery up. Repairs up. What does the other side of the coin look like? Wheat down 22 cents. Also quotas are down. Rape is down 50 cents per bushel. Cattle down. Hogs down. Now with farm costs up and returns down comes a Budget full of taxes. Higher property taxes, higher sales taxes, higher gas tax, higher health tax, tax on meals, tax on hotels, tax on accommodation, tax on farm fuel. Tax to the right of us, tax to the left of us, tax all around us, over and under. Treasurer spouting, Premier like thunder, shouting like mad while farmers go under.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Wooff: — Shades of ‘The Charge of the Light Brigade!’ and apologies to Lord Tennyson.

Once again, Mr. Speaker, we hear the cry of diversification of farm production and the Budget is setting aside funds to assist to this end. I have little quarrel with the assistance that is being promised. But, Mr. Speaker, those already in the livestock business are at their wits’ end today to know how land and machinery needed in the livestock enterprise will be paid for at the present prices. Some 10 or 12 years ago when beef prices on the hoof ranged from 33 to 35 cents, the late Hon. J.G. Gardiner, the then Minister of Agriculture, said that cattle

March 11, 1968

at parity. Since that period production costs have gone up 25 per cent and cattle prices have dropped anywhere from 5 to 12 cents. How then is diversification going to solve the problem that agriculture is faced with at the present time? It has long been the trick used by Liberal Governments to play the farmers back and forth from grain to livestock and back again. But at last, Mr. Speaker, they have reached the ultimate. They have grain, rape, livestock, all down to the profitless line at the same time. And to add insult to injury, we are told that 1969 is going to be worse than 1968. This is a most serious situation that is facing our most important and basic industry, agriculture. Yet this Government has not lifted a pen or a telephone receiver to try to do anything about it and now brings in the highest tax-loaded Budget in Saskatchewan's history. This, Mr. Speaker, is like kicking the farmer when he is already down. This is the kind of situation when the natural resources, the people's rightful inheritance, should have been carrying a greater share of the tax load, instead of being bled off for higher and higher profits for the independent sector. I do wish the Premier would stay with his so-called free enterprise theory instead of getting carried away and mixing it up so thoroughly with Socialism. When he is going for broke for a Primrose Products' free enterprise concern, he uses Socialist money to build a Primrose path, and he just simply doesn't know how.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Wooff: — The free enterprise concern never did materialize and \$2 million of Primrose path built on Socialist money sank in the muskets of capitalism. Enough money was lost in the Canoe Lake project to oil all the remaining highways in Meadow Lake, Turtleford and Redberry. When he is going all out for a free enterprise pulp mill, he uses all kinds of Socialistic approaches, public money, public timber, public roads, Socialism applied to costs, Mr. Speaker, but free enterprise for the profits.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Wooff: — Heads I win and tails you lose. And the public is getting further out on the tail where the slap is harder.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Wooff: — This is not a case of Socialism versus free enterprise. It is a case of applying Socialism to free enterprise to do what they can't and won't do for themselves. The independent sector of society is the most spoon-fed sector that there is in the country today. The cost of living has gone up and continues to rise. The average wage keeps dropping further behind the national average. Now we have a Commission report on the cost

of living saying many of the things that the New Democrats have been saying for years. The Minister of Highways (Mr. Boldt) proposes the old, old answer of the independent sector to labor, a pool of unemployment to keep wages down. I wonder if the virtuous Minister has ever pondered the thought that to deny a person the right of work and wages is paramount to murder. If people had not run away from Saskatchewan the last four years, he would have had unemployment on a large scale. The cost of housing has gone up, 11 per cent on building materials, eight to nine per cent interest on loans. We have now reached a place in Canada where half the people in Canada cannot afford that basic necessity to family life, a home. Interest rates were raised on housing loans, we were told, to fight inflation. Mr. Speaker, housing is one of the last factors in our economy that should be used as a balancing element to keep the economy on an even keel. Homes are like food, neither should be treated as luxury goods, taxed to control our monetary policy. They are part of the life-blood of our nation and to use them in such a way is nothing short of monstrous unemployment is up, population down. Teachers, nurses, workers, farmers gone by hundreds with the winds of Liberal austerity and mismanagement. I wouldn't be a bit surprised, Mr. Speaker; to see legislation before long, forbidding people to leave Saskatchewan.

Let us turn for a moment to social welfare. This is not a program and policy of helping people to help themselves, to a place in society where they can live with a little pride and dignity; but a policy which tends to drive them toward, or keep them in, abject poverty; a policy which says we won't help till you have sold your property and spent the proceeds, in other words, until you are penniless; a gradual repetition of the Liberal policy of the 1930s in all its sordid ugliness. I have a letter on my desk which is evidence of these pressures, nor is it the only case I have had to deal with since this Government took office. Social welfare, Mr. Speaker, is the unwanted child, born and bred out of the evils of our reactionary and so-called free enterprise system. Evils such as unemployment, excess profits, special privileges to minorities, this is the group some people are pleased to hallow by the sanctimonious term, the independent sector. Social welfare is one of the ways we must take to redistribute some of our wealth in order to keep the system viable at all. We take the crumbs from the rich man's table and much from the lean man's living in order to keep the recipient just, and in many cases only just, in the land of the living.

This is all too evident in the proposed hospital deterrent fees. Once again, the poor are to become marked as indigents. The whole needless business of deterrent fees has come about because this Government has always, and at all times, been unconditionally opposed to hospitalization or medicare. This Administration has neither the will to make it work nor the desire to finance the schemes on behalf of every citizen of Saskatchewan. The independent sector is clamouring to get these public services into the private hands of our large insurance companies

March 11, 1968

and this Government will sell the people down the river. I was talking over the weekend to a nurse, whose husband is back at school to improve his standing. The situation is becoming more and more difficult at home, owing to the new Budget taxes and it is only heightened by the intolerable pressures of conditions at the hospital, where they are understaffed. But when RNs apply, they are told we don't want anymore RNs. And so the staff is worked on rat-race basis, with overtime and little pay, at a killing pace, all because of pressures from the Government, in an attempt to save money, but really, in an attempt to kill the scheme before the Federal Government has a chance to implement its 50-year old promise.

I think there must have been an evil connection between the Budget with its deterrent fees and the austerity policy. I think that the Government knew such a Budget could only increase the sickness among the people, so they were going to set up barriers to keep people out of the hospitals. There is just the chance the Government is going to back up on some phases of the application of deterrent fees. They are very much like the old lady caught half-way across the intersection, fearful to go forward and frightened to turn back. This is the result of a dollar-before-people policy, which the Budget now before us will only aggravate and multiply.

I want to say just a few words on behalf of our native people. I have some figures here that I would like to read into the record because they point up some of the difficulties facing these people. They are taken from an article by Matthew Bellegarde in *The Commonwealth* of February 28, 1968. One, of course, is land itself. To me these were very interesting figures.

Of the 251,700 sections of land contained in Saskatchewan, the reserves cover 1,913. This would show that each of Saskatchewan's 28,914 Indians represents possession of an enormous 42 acres. The quotation of 28,914 represents a 77.3 per cent population increase when compared to the 16,308 in 1949. As of the year ending December 31, 1964, however, there were in actual fact 24,581 Treaty Indians on reserves which total 123 occupied by 67 bands. The remaining 4,333 Indian people reside either on Crown lands or, and I wish that you would note, "anywhere off the reserves."

There is also another paragraph I would like to put on the records. The figures that I have just quoted, Mr. Speaker, spell out some of the difficulties facing our native people and those who desire to help them. Forty-two acres of land of mixed quality per person create an almost impossible economic problem, but one we cannot afford to bypass very much longer.

As I said a moment ago, there is another paragraph that I would like also to read because it is quite relevant to the whole economic problems of the Indian people and I quote:

The majority of Saskatchewan's Indian population are supposedly supporters of the 34,000 member Federation of Saskatchewan Indians. The chances of the Federation of Saskatchewan Indians achieving any notable progress, in my opinion, is quite doubtful. Poor financial status, lack of communication, disagreement of many with the Federation chief, and the lack of a solid program are the reasons for my sense of doubt. These major drawbacks are soluble and if the Federation is to accomplish anything, it must definitely put itself on a solid platform.

It is evident, Mr. Speaker; that the Federation of Saskatchewan Indians is too poor, too short of funds, to do an adequate job in giving the necessary and the right kind of leadership. Surely, this can be overcome by a grant or a matching grant to aid in doing the kind of independent job that is necessary. I was quite sympathetic with the Premier's announced intention of inviting some of the people, who are now clamoring to enter Britain, to come to Saskatchewan. However, Mr. Speaker, if they are to become hewers of wood and drawers of water only, I fear that they will not be with us too long. I could suggest, Mr. Speaker, that our own native people, who are without any consistent way of making a living, might also fit into the gap created by those who constantly leave the province.

Let us take a closer look at this much eulogized, so-called free enterprise system. The top one-fifth of Canada's population takes 45 per cent of the national income. They own the means of production and set the prices. This is the independent sector, Mr. Speaker. This is the group who cut the economic pie, who bring on wage disputes and higher costs of living. I am going to use two old quotations. I have used them before and I make no apology for using them again. The first is that of Lincoln when he said, "No country can endure half slave and half free." "No country can endure half rich and half poverty-stricken. The other is Oliver Goldsmith's quotation from his *Deserted Village*, "Ill fares the land to hastening ills a prey, Where wealth accumulates and men decay." I see little or nothing in the Budget to cope with the serious matters I have dealt with, Mr. Speaker. Does this Government raise its voice against the conditions I have mentioned? No, Mr. Speaker! In fact it aids and abets those who like Shakespeare's Shylock, in his *Merchant of Venice*, demand their pound of flesh with the last drop of blood from closest to the heart.

What I am about to say, now, Mr. Speaker, I say with regret, and I am saying it for myself and for myself alone. When the Liberal Party comes up with a flag issue under existing conditions, to me it is a sign they are in trouble and in real need of a red herring. Give the common people economic justice. Give them economic liberty, make it possible for that one-fifth of the population at the bottom to obtain a decent standard of living, and flags will fly from every housetop and 10,000 voices will sing, God Bless Saskatchewan.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

March 11, 1968

Mr. Wooff: — I will not support the motion, but I will support the amendment.

Hon. G.B. Grant: (Minister of Public Health) — Mr. Speaker, I predicted earlier that those who played politics with mental health in Saskatchewan would identify themselves in debate in this House. That is exactly what the most blatant offender did and of course I am referring to the Member for The Battlefords (Mr. Kramer). While he has made a political career out of that sort of thing, I am sure that even his more ardent supporters must have cringed when he chose to link rape, murder, child molesting, etc., with Mr. Thatcher's leadership, in this Province. Such statements are laughable, but also tragic. They might border on the criminal as well, and I expect the more responsible Members of his party would censure him for these statements, as did the Mayor of North Battleford.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Grant: — I know that on numerous occasions the city of North Battleford has been petitioning the Government for industry for that city and statements such as the Hon. Member for The Battlefords (Mr. Kramer) has made are certainly not going to enhance the image of North Battleford. Our Government has made it extremely clear that we are concerned about our mental health program. No Government could have done more to publicize the difficulties involved, and I have personally stated in this Legislature the measures we are taking to correct our problems. For Members opposite to ignore this and to encourage fear, suspicions and ignorance for their political advantage, shows a gross disregard of responsibility. Listening to Mr. Kramer's remarks last Tuesday, I could not help but conclude that he is encouraging public dissatisfaction and that he does not want a satisfactory program to evolve, for it would affect his approach to these things. I also conclude that he must have been deaf to the measures I announced in my speech.

I would like to use my time today to consider this Budget as it relates to health. Before dealing with some of the specific difficulties we face in the Saskatchewan health field, I would like to consider the question of health economics in general. From what has been said by the Opposition, it would seem that the terms health and economics should not be uttered in the same breath. I submit, on the contrary, that the two terms must be considered together and that any one who refuses to do that must be considered not only unrealistic, but also irresponsible. I know we have been called alarmists for pointing out increasing health costs. But let me assure you that the factors affecting health economics are known and the escalation we are experiencing is entirely predictable. It is in a word, frightening. We know for example that our experience in

Canada will be roughly the same as other countries. First, let us consider the experience of Britain. Medicare is firmly entrenched in Britain and no politician in his right mind would call for its repeal. But everyone is alarmed that the cost is far surpassing the original estimates. When first introduced, the total cost for health services was estimated at \$400 million a year, roughly about four times what we are currently paying in Saskatchewan. The more optimistic felt this figure might even decrease once the existing backlog of untreated illnesses was cleared up. However, costs quickly soared. Even by 1951, the Labour Government, to their embarrassment, were forced to put a \$1.2 billion ceiling on annual health spending. Charges were introduced on false teeth and spectacles which had previously been free. The resulting furore within the Labour party resulted in the resignation of Messrs. Bevan and Wilson, but the charges stayed on. In 1952, a Conservative Government introduced a nominal deterrent fee for prescriptions. That fee was doubled in 1961, then abolished in 1965 when a Labour Government under Harold Wilson came back to office. In three years of no charges for drugs the cost rose from \$315 million to \$438 million, 58 per cent. In a complete turn-about, Mr. Wilson was forced to re-impose deterrent charges this year on drugs. Some of the Opposition may not consider this a legitimate analogy. Britain after all is a long way from Canada.

Let us then consider the picture in the United States since we are in the same economic sphere. In 1967, the National Advisory commission on health manpower told the President of the United States that health costs were rising at twice the rate of overall prices. The commission predicted that by 1975, just seven years from now, the largest employer in the nation would be the health industry. At present the leading expenses are hospital costs. Hospitals surveyed by the commission ranged in cost from \$34 to \$96 per patient day. On the average their costs were rising at 9 per cent per year. Between 1955 and 1965, the overall national rise was 126 per cent.

What about Canada? Our situation is just as desperate. A current estimate of the Canadian Department of National Health and Welfare is that hospital payments will double by 1974. In 1967 hospital payments were \$1,300,000,000. In only six years they will hit \$2,600,000,000. It is difficult to get the latest statistics from the Department of National Health and Welfare, but an analysis of 1961-65 figures shows that there was a 25 per cent increase in persons employed in hospitals. Our utilization of hospitals in Saskatchewan for 1965 (this is a figure I want you to remember) was 37 per cent above the Canadian average excluding newborn. In fact, we had only 44 fewer hospitals than Ontario, the largest province in Canada. In terms of total hospitals we were second, only Ontario exceeds us, We even had 18 more hospitals than Quebec, 42 more than Alberta, 62 more than British Columbia and 72 more than Manitoba. If the only criterion for measuring quality of service was the number of hospitals we would be second to none. But 22 of the hospitals were under nine beds. our closest rival in that department was

March 11, 1968

Newfoundland, with eight hospitals under nine beds. Seventy-six of those hospitals were 10-24 beds. Our closest was Manitoba with less than half, 37.

The great tragedy of all this is that we have not been getting our money's worth for our health dollar and the people of this province have been conned into believing that because they have lots of hospitals and medicare they have nothing to worry about. Because of this blithe attitude, our hospital costs are rising about 10 per cent per year. Today we are facing a crisis in our health programs and the Opposition wants to lull us into a false sense of security. We say that if we do not act today, in 10 years our whole system could come tumbling down around us. It is up to us today, right now, to use what we have to peak efficiency. It is not just a question of getting more money, hiring more people, and building more buildings. There is an alternative. We can improve our ways of doing things and extend our services. We can avoid waste, duplication, abuse, and misuse. Politicians are fond of promising that you can have your cake and eat it too. Well, we're saying you can do this but you must improve your efficiency. We know that Government legislation alone is not going to solve our problems, but we feel we can lead the way. We are asking for the support of measures which involve private dedication and individual awareness. In my opinion to oppose this would be sheer lunacy. In the light of the problems we face in using our health resources, our real and imagined shortages, and our rising costs, it is important to make the best possible use of what we have.

I think we face one of our greatest challenges in the hospital question. The Opposition, Mr. Speaker, has done a lot of talking about increased road construction. They haven't said much about increased hospital construction. Perhaps it is because their record compares so unfavorably. In 1965-66, this Province made construction grants of \$2.6 million. This amount far exceeded any figure ever paid out under any Socialist Government.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Grant: — Last year, the figure was held to just under \$1 million, but this year we expect to hit close to \$2.5 million. During the 1968-69 fiscal year, the grants for construction and retirement of capital debt will be almost \$5 million. Laugh that one off. Moreover, the phase of hospital construction we are now in is so great that over the next five years annual construction grants will average well over \$5 million per year. Now that certainly exceeds anything that you fellows ever approached. It is estimated that the total cost for the construction of the addition to the University hospital in Saskatoon could be \$20 million. Mr. Speaker, the original cost of the entire hospital was only \$10 million.

But let me make one thing clear. This construction is not

just to give us more beds, but to give us better services. As it now stands, according to 1966 figures, the Canadian average of patient days per 1,000 people was 1,526.8. I wish the Members of the Opposition would write this one down: 1,526.8 patient days per 1,000 people, the Canadian average. Saskatchewan was the highest in Canada with 2,062.9 and our nearest competitor was Alberta with only 1,611.4. Does that mean that there are fewer deaths in Saskatchewan? No. Does it mean that we prairie people are weaker and need more hospitalization? I don't think so. It only means that we have more hospital beds so we are using them. In short, the old Parkinson law, demand is meeting supply. We hope that utilization fees will bring about a more responsible treatment in this area. We also hope to phase out hospitals which provide only minimal care, which duplicate other facilities, or are completely uneconomic units. The Budget critic, Mr. Blakeney, had a lot to say in this regard and he is really worth listening to. I regard the Member from Regina Centre (Mr. Blakeney) as something of an expert in this matter; For example, five years ago when he was Health Minister, according to a Leader Post article, he commented on the suggestion that 30 to 40 miles on all-weather roads and 60 to 70 miles on hard-surface roads was not too far to go to a hospital. He said,

It is no further than people have always driven in terms of minutes — I would think it self-evident that we can't have well equipped hospitals every 20 miles.

I couldn't agree with the Hon. Member more. There's a lot of things he says that I agree with and this is certainly one. Not only do we not need them, we cannot afford them, and we are going to face increasing difficulties in finding people to staff them. That is why hospitals that are outdated or underutilized should close and we suggested closure of hospitals earlier this year. The Hon. Member made the ominous warning that at least one of these hospitals will close by the end of the year. Indeed, I believe that more than one will close and negotiations are proceeding very cordially with the hospitals involved.

The initial reaction to closure was certainly a great alarm to put it mildly. This was necessary because of the procrastination of the previous Government. They sat on this very apparent deficiency in our hospital setup and did nothing. As Minister of Health, I must take full responsibility for the initial action and I will frankly admit that there would have been some advantages in entering into earlier negotiations with the hospital boards and I'm sure that everyone would appreciate that. Now that the reasons for closure are being made known to these boards, in most cases, negotiations are proceeding much better. For example, all of these hospitals serve areas which have experienced substantial population shift. One rural municipality, in particular, experienced a 31 per cent drop in population. I might also point out that none of the hospitals meet existing Provincial fire prevention standards.

March 11, 1968

We are negotiating with the hospitals to show them that the Government decision was valid and that the benefits of hospital closure will be shared by them and the rest of the people of this province.

It is time, Mr. Speaker, that this question was taken out of the political arena. The provision of medical services should be above political partisanship. The Opposition has been very critical of my actions, Mr. Speaker, yet it must be noted that though all kinds of abuse has been heaped on me and on the Government, not once have Opposition Members said that small hospitals should not be closed. Now I may qualify this, The Hon. Member from Regina South East (Mr. Baker), who is an expert on many things, I believe inadvertently stated that we should not close small hospitals, but I wouldn't be guided too much by this. I'd rather be guided by the former Minister of Health (Mr. Blakeney) over-there. The Hon. Member from Regina Centre said, "We will not oppose closure of small hospitals provided proper procedure is followed." Even their recent motion on hospitals indicates approval in principle of hospital closure. The people of Saskatchewan are not fooled, they know that closure was initiated by the CCF, because they had no alternative and that in all likelihood we have very little alternative also. The Opposition may quibble with our procedure but do not let this obscure the facts of the situation. Just to make sure that I'm on the right track now and will not be criticized later, I'm going to read a letter that will go to these hospitals. This is addressed to the chairman of the board of each hospital:

I was glad to have an opportunity to meet again with your board and be able to personally inspect your facilities. I appreciate the cordial reception given me and while I may be unpopular as far as some citizens of your community are concerned, it is gratifying to know that lines of communication are still open between hospitals and the Government. I am sure you realize that, while I could not help but be impressed by the energy of your board and your success in overcoming substantial difficulties, the Government nevertheless is faced with a serious problem of hospital bed distribution and standards. However, I'm sorry that our manner in announcing the decision created such an alarm in your area, for I realize now that many local citizens were not prepared for such a decision. Eventually I believe, a satisfactory resolution of our difficulties is possible and detailed arrangements can be worked out accordingly. As indicated in my press release of February 12, I have withdrawn my closure date of April 1, 1968. Where it appears that improvements can be made, we are prepared to continue negotiations. We will ensure that alternative services can be provided and no decision will be made without-full consultation with your board. I am confident of the sound judgment of local hospital boards and I feel I can rely on their desire to provide the highest quality hospital care for the people of Saskatchewan.

Mr. Speaker, I expect the Opposition to take a more responsible position in this gravely important matter. We cannot allow our hospital program to deteriorate to a point where we are not getting what we deserve. The crisis in health has been accelerating for years, it just hasn't happened over night. It has been going on for years, as reports prepared under the direction of the previous Government indicate, dating back to 1951.

On Government business and privately, I am constantly meeting citizens who are alarmed at what is happening. They say, "What is the Government going to do to control costs and increase services?" Our Premier (Mr. Thatcher) and the provincial Treasurer (Mr. Steuart), and individual MLAs are bombarded with the question from citizens, "What is the Government going to do about this problem?" Well, we are doing something about it now and we hope that others will accept a share of this responsibility. Not one of us is happy with the introduction of utilization fees but we must give it a chance to see what effect it will have on our health patterns. If it does not work, we can abandon it but we are asking for a fair chance. One of the problems of a publicly supported program is that citizens tend to let the Government take all the responsibility. We want to put individual responsibility back into medicine because we feel that is the only way we can preserve our medical care program. Let there be no misunderstanding. The Liberal Government has a deep and long-standing commitment to medical care insurance.

Let me remind this House that in the spring of 1944, The Saskatchewan Health Insurance Act was passed by a Liberal Government. The Act provided for a Health Insurance Commission which would set up Health Regions and institute a comprehensive health insurance program. That summer, a CCF Government was elected which chose for 18 years to ignore the purpose of that legislation. For 20 years the public of Saskatchewan were told that only the CCF cared about people and in the days of the Bad Old Liberals, nothing was ever done for the individual. Some people believed it but they don't any more. Today we are desperately fighting to preserve the spirit of our numerous health programs, but we will succeed only if we join together. The concept of a utilization fee is not new. It was not invented by the Liberals. Hospital utilization fees have been in force for some time in Alberta and in British Columbia. Medical utilization fees were introduced in Swift Current in 1953 and they are providing substantial additional funds for that program. Utilization fees are an integral part of a number of successful voluntary plans in North America. Norway, Sweden, and France are countries quite frequently referred to by the Socialists; they require 20 per cent of the costs to be assumed by the beneficiaries. In Saskatchewan we are suggesting less than 8 per cent. Australia and New Zealand have found it desirable to institute utilization fees. The Government has been under pressure for many years from individuals and groups who favored such fees. A report submitted to my predecessor, the present Provincial Treasurer, by the Saskatchewan Hospital

March 11, 1968

Association, stated,

The Saskatchewan Hospital Association has on several occasions presented resolutions to the Minister of Public Health requesting that hospitals in the province be allowed to charge co-insurance fees.

The latest release would indicate that the president at least is having some second thoughts about this but nevertheless this report was submitted. The report went on to state that the purpose of such fees would be to give the patient the feeling that he is participating in the cost of his treatment. We have received similar petitions from the physicians. As late as January of this year at a formal meeting with the College of Physicians and Surgeons and the Saskatchewan Medical Association, I was asked personally to bring in utilization fees for medical care. The Government has received these petitions in good faith and expects those who made them to give utilization fees an honest chance. When the former CCF Government introduced Medicare in 1961, it based the legislation on the Thompson Report. This Report felt that utilization fees should be introduced for the following reasons:

- (a) Utilization fees tend to limit overall costs to the insuring agency since they put part of the cost of service on the patient.
- (b) Utilization fees may limit the volume of service demanded by patients, since they may discourage frivolous and unnecessary requests. If frivolous or unnecessary calls are substantial, a decrease in them will allow the providers of service to devote more attention to persons in real need.

This is the Thompson Report.

- (c) Utilization fees may deter a doctor, who may be inclined to over service his patients, from doing so. This over servicing may take the form of suggesting repeat office visits, making unnecessary home calls or ordering unnecessary diagnostic services.
- (d) They may give the beneficiary a sense of direct contribution toward the services he seeks or requires. It is argued that some people, at least, appreciate this opportunity.
- (e) The selective application of utilization fees can be used to influence favorably the quality of care.

Based on the recommendations of the Thompson Report, the legislation of the Saskatchewan Medical Care Insurance Act 1961 made specific provision enabling the Government to institute utilization fees. It states specifically:

The Lieutenant Governor in Council may by regulation authorize a physician or other person providing services to make such charges against beneficiaries for insured services as are specified in the regulation.

That, Mr. Speaker, was legislation passed by a CCF Government. Today we are putting that legislation into effect. In line with the recommendation of the Thompson Commission, we intend to review the question periodically. If the fees do not bring about more responsible use of services they can be discontinued. We have been careful to ensure that those who are medically indigent and who are already provided for under the Saskatchewan Assistance Plan, will not be responsible for utilization fees. We contend that the amount we are asking beneficiaries to contribute will not bring about financial hardship but will encourage responsible utilization. This is an important Budget in the health area of this province, Mr. Speaker. It provides for expansion in areas of need and deals with the problem of cutting down where there is abuse or misuse. This is a Budget which deals with health systems, giving an overall picture of our needs. Rather than letting our programs decline into individual crisis, this Budget considers each matter in the light of its effect on the overall program.

The construction of a base hospital in Regina will change health patterns in the whole southern part of the province. Possible changes in the boundaries of health regions could have a great effect as well. This year we are creating an Alcoholism Commission which will face squarely the problem of alcoholism in all its aspects, medical, social, and economic. Since this is a special kind of problem, we feel there should be a special way of dealing with it. This fall, students will enter classes in Saskatoon and will graduate in a few years as the first graduates of the Saskatchewan Dental School. In numerous ways, the entire pattern of health in Saskatchewan is changing and our society is changing with it. It is important now to consider the nature of that change and establish that we are masters, not servants of our health programs.

Mr. Speaker, I will support the motion and oppose the amendment.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. W.G. Davies: (Moose Jaw South) — Mr. Speaker, I would like to make a few remarks this afternoon to begin with about the speech of the Minister of Public Health (Mr. Grant). He was speaking a few minutes ago about a deep and long-term commitment of Liberals for health insurance. I thought to myself, yes, 49 years of commitment in fact. This commitment, Mr. Speaker, and Mr. Health Minister, has not been redeemed yet and I say the kind of actions that we have observed in the speech of the Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Steuart) and the actions that are intended by the Government show what kind of action we can expect along these lines in the

March 11, 1968

future. The Minister talked about hospital construction grants and I think that he stands to be corrected here this afternoon. I have the figures before me. The amount paid in hospital construction grants in this Province from 1961 to 1964 was \$9.5 million. The amount paid in the three years since 1964 was \$7.7 million; \$1.8 million less, Mr. Minister, a decrease of 20 per cent.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. C.P. MacDonald: (Minister of Welfare) — Look at the last year.

Mr. Davies: — And I'm surprised that the Minister should have misused the figures here this afternoon as he did. The Minister, Mr. Speaker, had something to say about the disregard of the Opposition Members for health and economics. Well, certainly, we have never done any such thing. We have thought of health and economics as something to be integrated; we have consistently tried to produce the kind of a scheme which is viable in all respects. The Minister mentioned some examples about Great Britain. Whether we talk about Great Britain, Mr. Speaker, or the United States, or Canada, or any other place in the world, health costs are going up for a lot of reasons. Everyone knows we are in an escalating economy. I just want to tell the Minister this, however, because he brought up the example of the Labour Government's action with respect to a deterrent charge on drugs. I want to emphasize that the deterrent charge is on drugs, not on the other services. I want to tell him that those charges do not apply with respect to young people under 16, they don't apply to old people, they don't apply to chronic cases and they don't apply to long-stay cases in hospitals. So there is a considerable difference I suggest, when the facts from his example are considered.

The Minister says there is a crisis in health programs. Well, Mr. Speaker, how do we meet crisis of this kind? I say that the reason why we have not properly matched our responsibilities in this country is because of the lack of action, mostly by a Liberal Government in Ottawa over many years and certainly in this Province for many years in meeting these challenges and the lack of action in the integration of programs, the lack of research into all these means that will constructively attack the problems which the Minister spoke of this afternoon. And the Minister speaks about costs, as though the only thing that we have to consider when we talk about health programs, is the cost of those programs themselves. Has he ever thought that there is an immense cost when people are not hospitalized, when they are not getting medical benefits, when the full spectrum of health measures are not applied to the population at large? Because if he hasn't, he should read the reports. He read part of one report this afternoon. He should have referred to the report of Mr. Justice Hall, the Hall Royal Commission Report, and I'm quoting what he said in one section of the report.

There are gains made by keeping Canadians healthy and able to work. There are the benefits derived in returning to a productive occupation those who are handicapped or disabled. There is employment created for those who would otherwise be out of work.

And he followed this remark by presenting figures to show that in 1960 (And this was eight years ago), that there were 30 million man-days of labor lost, because of illness, in Canada. Project that if you like! You will have no difficulty in arriving at a loss in sickness in this country of some three-quarters of a billion to \$1 billion annually. And all my friend, the Minister of Health (Mr. Grant) can talk about this afternoon is the figures of the cost of the Health program. Mr. Speaker, we just simply can not afford not to have a full program that will protect the health of the people of this country. We are not getting it from the Liberal Government at Ottawa; and we are certainly not getting it from the Liberal Government represented by the Members that sit opposite.

Mr. Speaker, permit me to refer some of the remarks that have been made by other Government Members in this debate. Some of them, I think, a good many in fact, have attempted to distract attention from the staggering tax load, (and I think I can use that adjective here as it has been used often enough by the Hon. Premier), a staggering tax load that it is going to be imposed on the taxpayers of this province by diversionary tactics. I say that endeavor is hopeless, because they've got to return to the reality that they created by their own ineptness of government.

The Minister of Mineral Resources (Mr. Cameron) who rose after my friend, the Opposition financial critic (Mr. Blakeney), did his very best in this direction. One of the remarks that he made was with respect to the President of the Hospital Association. He seemed to suggest then that this gentleman had given his approval to deterrent fees for hospitals. Mr. Speaker, this is very far from the facts. The Hospital Association President is quoted in the Leader Post of February 7th, as saying that utilization fees may result in hard-pressed hospitals having less rather than more money available for operation.

And then my friend, the Minister of Highways (Mr. Boldt) added his own brand of diversion last Friday. I must say, Mr. Speaker, that his performance does arouse a peculiar brand of admiration for a kind of hide-bound consistency. There is just no doubt where the Minister stands philosophically and politically. He made that quite clear when he said he likes to stand up for what is right. Yes, indeed, Mr. Speaker, right indeed, far, far to the right. The Minister also provided a positively hilarious interlude when he said that the Star Phoenix stood opposed to the Liberals. He just can't understand why reporters should report him in literal terms. He evidently wanted them to report only the distorted reasons that he gives in extenuation for his public actions. It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that another peak in hilarity was suggested in his charge that the

March 11, 1968

New Democratic election campaign had been, I think he said, the most vicious in history. His examples were all from his own constituency and they were something less than convincing. But as usual the Minister has failed to see the mote in his own eye. Now, New Democrats may be a bit hard-hitting in their criticism at times and, if they are, they are certainly much more restrained than any of my Hon. Friends of the Liberal party. But at least we have not gone to such lengths as where the Minister of Highways (Mr. Boldt) in a recent speech on excessive educational expenditures, criticized his departed Cabinet colleague, Mr. Trapp, the former Minister of Education. Now if that wasn't gutter politics, it was dirty pool. I say, Mr. Speaker, we need no pious, puritanical lectures from the Minister of Highways about viciousness and distortion. May I charitably suggest to him, leave architecture alone.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Davies: — Your own experts in highways can restrain you from inflicting much damage to grade and paved surfaces, but please, please, don't permit yourself to become the arbiter of tastes in what you are pleased to call common-sense school buildings. That would be an evil day both for those who use the buildings and those that have to live with them in the community. Imagine, Mr. Speaker, what we would have in the way of architectural style in the University campus buildings in Regina, if the Minister of Highways and his Cabinet colleagues had their way, (and maybe they will, Mr. Minister of Public Works, Mr. Guy). One simply shudders at the prospect and the prospect is not altogether unlikely, because a gradually tightening control of this Government of the University, may produce barrack-like, unlovely structures that will be an everlasting discredit to the Province, if continual vigilance is not displayed.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Davies: — And the Minister of Highways has thundered away with others on his side of the House about Opposition irresponsibility. This, Mr. Speaker, from a Government that breathed not one word of the financial crisis that it created after its election. This group while in Opposition used everything that it could lay tongue to against the CCF Government. Whenever the now Senator McDonald, one time financial critic of the Liberals, and the present Premier then in Opposition, rose to talk, we asked for constructive proposals. We got the answer, "You are the Government, we are the Opposition. It is our duty to oppose." I say let's not hear anything about responsibility from those on your right, Mr. Speaker. Let them read history, let them read Hansard first.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Davies: — The Minister of Highways (Mr. Boldt), resents any

suggestions when they are made by the Opposition. On highway expenditures he arrogantly threatens cuts in highway spending in Opposition constituencies. "Don't tell me," he says, "about any Liberal constituencies."

Now, Mr. Speaker, this is an irresponsible attitude from the Minister in charge of this heavy-spending department. In a department that spends another \$9 million more than the preceding fiscal year, (it will be at least \$59 million this year), he should be the first to consider austerity which the premier says is the number one and prime duty of this Government. And I will tell you, Mr. Speaker, straightaway and I will tell you, Mr. Minister . . .

Hon. D. Boldt: (Minister of Highways) — On a point of order. He says that we are going to spend \$9 million more than last year. This is not so, because there was \$6.5 million that was amortized . . .

Mr. Davies — On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. If the Member has a question I'll answer it, otherwise I want to go on with my speech.

Mr. Boldt: — I would like to ask the Member whether I could ask him a question. And I think that your information is wrong. We are spending \$100,000 . . .

Mr. Davies: — Mr. Speaker, I do not mind answering questions. I got these figures from the Minister's own Estimates. I invite him to turn to his pages of Estimates and get his own answer there. I want to tell you straightaway, Mr. Minister, that if your Department spends the same as it did last year, and that's not an inconsiderable figure by any means, that this Government could completely cancel its deterrent fee impost and still have a couple of million dollars left over. And the Minister says, "Where will I take it off?" Just like Sally Rand!

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Davies: — Surely, Mr. Speaker, the first thing that the Minister should do in a case of a kind where he was making cuts, is not to threaten, but to make cuts in an equitable way all across the province so that no one area would suffer disproportionately.

The Minister very well knows that he's got dozens of capable professional people in his Department and they would give him that answer in 24 hours, if he would only ask for it. Mr. Speaker, the Government has chosen not to take such an obvious alternative, and the fact that it has not, leaves any reasonable person to only one conclusion — the action to implement deterrent

March 11, 1968

fees is first and foremost, not a cost-saving-policy. Its main objective is to attempt to discredit fine programs like Medicare and Hospitalization, to head off pressure for a needed drug insurance program and to try to convince people that it's the so-called welfare state and not the character and policy of their Government which is to blame for the high taxes.

Hon. L.P. Coderre: (Minister of Labour) — Bosh!

Mr. Davies: — The Minister of Labour says bosh, and I know that he knows all about that subject.

An Hon. Member: — What about the car?

Mr. Davies: — One of the Government backbenchers the other day, Mr. Speaker, made a slip and quite a prominent one, when he said that the CCF had “saddled” his party and Government with the Medicare Plan. This is the real attitude of the Government, and while it maintains power, both Hospitalization and Medicare Programs are in danger of their very existence.

Mr. D.G. Willis: (Melfort-Tisdale) — That's not bosh!

Mr. Davies: — Mr. Speaker, I said a month or so ago when I was speaking in another part of the province, that if the people of Saskatchewan had known on October 11th what they found out on December 1, 1967, there would not have been 20 Liberal Members elected in this House.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Davies: — I must go on to say that, after getting the details of this Budget, however, there is little doubt that, if the people of Saskatchewan had known on October 11th last what they discovered in the speech of the Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Steuart) on March 1st, 1968, there wouldn't have been five Liberal Members sitting in this House. It is evident, Mr. Speaker, in the first instance, as my friend the Opposition financial critic has already made plain, that the tax increases we face are the heaviest ever imposed on the people of Saskatchewan. The second thing that is abundantly plain, on analysis, is that Saskatchewan citizens have been hoodwinked and deceived on the largest and most universal scale ever encountered in this Province. Apparently it hopes that with some further demonstration of unprincipled promises and demagoguery, such as we have known from the Saskatchewan Liberal party, made some time in the future near election time, it will again be possible to regain enough support to form a Government.

Mr. Speaker, my friends the Liberals are going to discover to their chagrin that it never pays to underestimate the people, particularly in Saskatchewan. The Liberal party found that out in 1944. Public memory of some of the Liberal excesses of earlier years did, it is true, diminish from 1944 to 1964. But with the kind of actions and policies that we have witnessed from the present Government, we can be sure that both the earlier years and the more recent promises and pledges of the Liberal party will again be recalled by the voters more vividly.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Davies: — Mr. Speaker, the Saskatchewan Liberal party in 1964 bedazzled a number of voters and beguiled them into support by a program — a shameless program in, my opinion — of promises to relieve tax burdens. What is the situation then and what is the situation now? Mr. Speaker, the Estimates of the last CCF Government of 1964-65 fiscal year provided for revenues of \$215 million. A very rapid calculation will show any member of this House that four years later under a Thatcher Liberal Government, the citizens of this Province will be required to pay another \$124 million more than four years ago. If this is tax relief, Mr. Speaker, heaven help the poor! In 1964 at the spring session, the present Premier, then the Leader of the opposition, thundered the following:

The first major failure of the Throne Speech is that it has neglected to give the hard-pressed Saskatchewan taxpayer any sign of tax relief.

Well, Mr. Speaker, look at the position four years later with the same speaker as Premier. Not only is there no sign of any tax relief whatsoever, but the people of this Province are going to be paying \$33 million more than they paid the previous year in taxes. There is a thorny garland of new taxes around the neck of every taxpayer, and the list of items that were formerly taxed has been, as everybody knows in this House, substantially enlarged.

Let's listen again to what the now Premier had to say as Leader of the Opposition in 1964, when he was speaking in the same Throne Speech Debate. At that time he said:

We will reduce the 5 per cent sales tax to 4 per cent immediately and in our first four years of office will endeavor to get it back to 3 per cent.

The now Premier went on to say:

We will increase the list of goods exempt from sales tax to include items like clothing and shoes, which after all are necessities of life.

Now, Mr. Speaker, what an exhibition of pledge-breaking!

March 11, 1968

Instead of the 3 per cent sales tax promised this year by the Premier we have a 5 per cent sales tax. Instead of a decreased list of goods taxed so that some items like clothing, shoes, etc. are no longer taxed, we have a much extended list of goods from that which existed four years ago, so that one can't even make a phone call or send a telegram today without knowing that there will be a tax on that message. Other speakers from this side of the House, Mr. Speaker, have already forcibly commented with respect to the deterrent fees on hospital and medical care. I don't think there is any doubt, any doubt whatsoever, that these new taxes have come with the most stunning impact on the people of my constituency because most of the people in my constituency are wage and salary earners.

First, of course, the fact of the tax means that people who are the least able to pay will have the worst burden thrust upon them. Mr. Speaker, quite apart from the onerous and heavy taxes, the salient feature stands out that the Saskatchewan Liberal party has now eroded what was once an outstanding cornerstone and social principle of these pieces of legislation. It has been correctly pointed out on this side of the House that the only people who are really going to be deterred from the use of hospital beds or visits to a physician are those who are too poor to pay. It is certain that the richer and higher-income families will not find this an obstacle to using these services.

You know, Mr. Speaker, it was really ironic that the Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Steuart) should have read his Budget speech at the same time, on the same day, that the Batten Commission Report was tabled in this House. Here the Provincial Treasurer announced new taxes that would add to the already difficult circumstances of the average family, an extra \$175 a year in new taxes. Alongside of the Batten Commission Report recommending strong action to help consumers, the new taxes can only be considered as a crowning and injurious insult on the heads of the families of this province.

Not only has this Government failed in its four years of office to decisively face up to the problems created by higher living costs, they have decisively and wantonly aggravated the position by adding this whole string of higher costs for our people. It is very, very difficult to understand the logic that has prompted the Government to proceed with these tax-the-sick impositions. The other day I placed a question on the Order Paper which asked whether the Medical Care Commission could supply any information to this House with respect to deterrent fees on both medical and hospital aspects. As we all know this information was refused. Why, Mr. Speaker, did the Government refuse to have this information tabled? In my opinion it was because they feared that the production of that information would be most damaging to the argument they present in this House for deterrent fees.

The Government knows that there does not exist any solid or convincing arguments for deterrent fees. Certainly, there is some evidence to suggest that any deterring of people from

securing needed medical and hospital benefits may in the long run cause a higher expense to society. You know the whole theory of public medicine follows the preventive line of thinking. An ounce of prevention, as the saying goes, is worth a pound of cure. But if we discourage people from going to a doctor, if we tell people that they should not secure needed hospital care, then surely the results, in logic, must be harmful and ultimately more costly to the whole community.

I think that it is possible for people to mount a sophisticated, though I think, specious argument, in support of a deterrent on the medical fee. But there is no logic whatsoever as respects the deterrent applied to hospitalization. After all, the patient cannot commit himself to the hospital, he cannot discharge himself from a hospital. Both of these are the sole prerogative of the physician. In a measure, in a great measure, a deterrent on hospital use challenges the very good sense and competency of the physician himself, and indeed, the whole medical profession.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Davies: — It is true, Mr. Speaker, that well-to-do people are easily able to afford better accommodation in hospitals, such as private rooms. Certainly, for them the deterrents won't constitute any special difficulty. They will go on getting private rooms and add the cost of the deterrent fee without any special damage to their position. But certainly this cannot be said for the bulk of the Saskatchewan population. I must also point out to the Government that there are very numerous instances where people in ordinary circumstances, who go to the hospital, must, because of the nature of their disability or illness, often serious, get semi-private or private-room accommodation. And everyone in this House well knows of cases of serious illness where a private room in a hospital is quite essential to the recovery or comfort of the patient. In instances of this kind, Mr. Speaker, it simply means that the lower-income family is going to have to add to the other charges the amount of the deterrent fee. And I say that in these cases an even more intolerable burden will have been created. This is another obvious evil arising out of the Government's ill-conceived and misguided policies on deterrent fees. Mr. Speaker, we have come to know the tax on detergents and soaps as 'the dirty tax'. I say that the deterrents will become known as the 'sick tax', because that is what it is. Mr. Speaker, when one views the present proposals of this Government to institute the deterrents, one must hark back to 1964 when the present Premier pledged that there would be no changes of this kind. The Premier, as Leader of the Opposition when he was speaking in the 1964 session, said:

Liberals will aim not at the destruction of medical health insurance but at improvement. The Minister of Health says the Liberal Government will substitute an Alberta-type medical plan for the one now operating in

March 11, 1968

Saskatchewan. The Liberal party believes in universal comprehensive medical health insurance. I say categorically and without qualification that none of our citizens need fear that a Liberal Government will deprive our people of such insurance. The Liberal party insists that every citizen of Saskatchewan has the right to hospital and medical care regardless of his or her ability to pay.

Mr. Speaker, the Premier must accept the responsibility for a broken pledge. The fact of the matter is that deterrents unquestionably mean that citizens of the Province of Saskatchewan have their rights to hospital and medical care, public programs, badly abridged by reason of policies which discriminate in hospital care and medical treatment because of the ability to pay of the citizen involved.

Back in 1964, Mr. Speaker, with respect to Provincial development, our present Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Steuart) in speaking in the same debate said that it cost more to live in Saskatchewan than in any other province and that, because of the alleged heavy tax load in Saskatchewan, the Province could not compete successfully with Manitoba, Alberta or British Columbia in getting its fair share of business or industrial development.

Mr. Speaker, if we had high taxes in 1964, how much higher are these impost in 1968? If these high taxes prevented us from getting our fair share of business or industrial development, how much more difficult will it be for us to progress and to grow industrially and business-wise because of the very much heavier burden that we will have to endure this year and thereafter? You know, Mr. Speaker, in former years when the Liberals were in Opposition, we heard a great deal indeed about being the highest taxed province in Canada. This was said and repeated ad nauseam.

The financial critic, Mr. A.H. MacDonald, (now Senator) in 1963, in the Budget debate, said that Provincial taxes in Saskatchewan amounted to \$96.60 per person in this province. He went on to say that municipal taxes amounted to another \$92.50 per person. He raked his spurs up one side and down the other in this kind of bitter criticism. Well, Mr. Speaker, here we are after only four years of Liberal Administration. What's the position now? In 1968-69 fiscal year, per capita taxes will amount to \$207.30, well over double the figures that Mr. MacDonald was so horrified about as the financial critic then. Municipal taxes have gone up to \$135 per person in 1967, and they will be very much more than that at least \$140 in this calendar year.

Nothing, Mr. Speaker, illustrates better the gap between Liberal promises and deceitful final performance than these figures. My friends, who never used to open their mouths but to complain about waste, extravagance and high taxes have given us the ultimate performance in this respect. Mr. Speaker,
I

predict that the newly forged meat-axe of this Government is directed directly at the heads of the citizens of Saskatchewan. And most affected will be the people of ordinary financial circumstances. We have only, in my opinion, seen the beginning of what is intended by this Government. We are warned by some indications that this Government intends to make other changes that will be chiefly harmful to the public interest.

Mr. Speaker, I have a number of other remarks that I think might better be taken in context this evening and perhaps we could call it 5:30.

The Assembly recessed at 5:30 p.m. until 7:30 p.m.

Mr. Davies: — Mr. Speaker, when we rose at 5:30 I had just said that there was in Saskatchewan a newly forged meat-axe by the Government that was directed at the heads of the citizens of this province. I said that in my opinion we had only seen the beginning of this action, and that we were warned by some indications that the Government of Saskatchewan, the Liberal Government, intends to make other changes that will be equally harmful to the public interest.

Mr. Speaker, an article in the February 14 Toronto Globe and Mail by Mr. E.N. Davis, entitled “Special to the Globe and Mail”, datelined Regina, says:

Private insurance companies will have to wait at least a year to share in Saskatchewan’s auto insurance business, according to Premier Ross Thatcher.

And the Premier is quoted in this news release as saying that the latest proposal of the All-Canada Insurance Federation, and here I am quoting again:

comes closer to what we had envisaged in our auto insurance plan than any previously made.

Mr. Speaker, I say that ever since this Government took office it has been biding its time, waiting for an opportunity to gradually direct the public character of the Saskatchewan Government Insurance Plan, the Automobile Insurance Plan, into the channels of private enterprise and profit. One might well ask, what will be the excuse of the Government for doing what I fear will transpire? Well, the Globe and Mail article already referred to has this to say:

The private insurers will face cost difficulties trying to match the Government in basic coverage. Agent’s commissions average 12.5 per cent, while the Government using its car licensing machinery to collect premiums and paying no commissions has an acquisition cost of one per cent. Even should the private insurers eliminate agent’s commissions in some way, it is doubtful if they could get their cost down to one per cent.

March 11, 1968

Mr. Speaker, it is not only that a public car insurance scheme, such as we have operated successfully in Saskatchewan, can function more efficiently for the ordinary man and woman. It is also that such a scheme can be the most truly effective in designing programs that will make for automobile and highway safety to reduce accidents, deaths and injuries, as well as the huge amounts of money that we are spending because of automobile collision.

Now, may I offer the Government some advice? What it should be doing at this time is not considering ways and means through which it can put more of the public insurance scheme into the private orbit. In that way lies not only a further betrayal of the interests of the people of Saskatchewan, but also a neglect of a positive policy that will begin to arrest the highway carnage, and auto-accident tolls that we all know are increasing year by year. What I am suggesting is this, the Government should tie in its Automobile Insurance program with the SGIO Package Program, a truly preventive plan that will do something positive in the way of improving our highway accident record. I suggest that, while some punitive means have value, punitive means alone can't do the job that everybody wants done. It's all very well to say that the solution lies loosely in what everybody calls education. The details continue to remain obscure and it just isn't that simple. We should be securing the services of some top-flight person Or persons in the auto-accident prevention world in an effort to launch a genuinely imaginative program that will do something to halt the advancing costs of auto insurance, and more important, Mr. Speaker, to prevent injuries, deaths and maimings on our roads. We might for example, and as a suggestion, call upon such a distinguished person as Mr. Ralph Nader to come to this province to head up a program that would accomplish the kind of objectives that I have here suggested.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Davies: — Mr. Speaker, I look at the Budget and I look at my constituency and I can only conclude that the pleas of the Moose Jaw people and the representations that have been made by Moose Jaw's MLAs and others have fallen upon deaf ears and stony ground. Because nowhere can I see that anything decisive has been done to meet the circumstances that Moose Jaw, and I emphasize again, through no fault of its own is in. Mr. Speaker, the school boards of Moose Jaw and the city council just a week or so ago brought down their tentative mill rates for this coming year. The aggregate increase is going to be 11 mills.

It doesn't take any imagination to know how Moose Jaw people feel about this Budget. They look at the prospective 11 mill increase for Moose Jaw taxpayers, they think hard about all the promises that were made by the Thatcher Government to reduce taxes for local homeowners, and they will conclude, as I have heard already from a number of citizens to date, that the \$175 extra that each family will have to pay by reason of a

Liberal Government tax increases this year, will be further augmented by the large amount that they will have to pay in extra local taxes.

During the recent election campaign and indeed before that, as well as in this House, I have informed the Government about a proposed program to help Moose Jaw. There isn't one single line in the Budget Speech that I can detect, that will assist this program in my constituency. Mr. Speaker, I don't mind if the Government ignores the suggestions that I have made, so long as it follows out some genuine program of assistance to Moose Jaw to conform with the general recommendations that are made by city merchants, by the city council and by the citizens of the Friendly City. But I see no positive steps by the Government to follow this advice. Once again this Liberal Government has refused to proceed with the construction of a Provincial office building in Moose Jaw. Once again it would appear that nothing is to be done with respect to new construction at the Training School or additions at the Technical Institute. Mr. Speaker, the promises of the Liberal party to help communities in difficulties, the special kinds of difficulties that my constituency encounters, have indeed been empty and false in every way. Once again, I want to protest the disregard by this Government of proposals, that I have previously advanced and that others have previously advanced on this side of the House, for a municipal road assistance policy that will properly include urban areas within its scope.

I have certainly no objection whatsoever, and indeed I have supported a road assistance program for other municipalities. The fact is, however; Mr. Speaker, that with the enormous new responsibilities and the many new expenditures that they have to meet today, assistance, substantial assistance, in the way of aid for urban street paving, sidewalk construction, sewer servicing, to name a few, is absolutely required at this time in my constituency and in many other urban areas. I suggest that this discrimination needs to be overcome at the earliest possible moment. The citizens in urban areas like mine feel that it is high time that some new aid programs are adopted in this whole connection.

Mr. Speaker, I want to address some critical comments to the budget of the Department of Labour as revealed in the Estimates of my friend, the Minister of Labour (Mr. Coderre), across the way. In my opinion it is a very real shame that the amounts to be spent this year do not reflect the importance of this Department. Four years ago, the amounts that were provided in the Estimates were some \$1.5 million. The present Labour budget reflects an increase of only \$183,000 over four years ago, in the midst of increasing responsibilities that might well have resulted in a considerably higher amount than is allocated to this very vital area of government. Here I remind the Minister of Labour that his own onerous and restrictive labor amendments have made it all the more necessary that more money be spent. I know what my friend, the Minister of Labour, is

March 11, 1968

going to say — “You ask for extra expenditures while you criticize the size of this Budget.” I want to tell him again what I said a moment or two ago, and I say that paltry progress has been made in four years of Saskatchewan Liberal Government in the midst of burgeoning responsibilities of every Labour Department in this country to the tune of only \$183,000 more.

Let's take the research and planning service, Mr. Speaker. This has increased by \$2,000 over four years ago. Surely with so much needed new information about labor we have also the warning that we have from practically every quarter of society that there aren't nearly adequate enough statistics about management, about labor, about industry and business and employees. It is high time that we substantially expanded our research and planning activities in the Department of Labour. The very limited progress that has been made in the past four years is far short of what we might have and should properly have expected in this whole period.

Mr. Speaker, over the past four years too there has come into being a whole new host of conceptions about the need to develop programs and activities for labor and management that will improve procedures in collective bargaining, that will provide more information to the parties that are engaged in bargaining, and that will generally by the production of facts give to both labor and management and provide the kind of stimulus that will make for a new and progressive upgrading of management-labor attitudes and industrial relations. But nowhere in this Budget, Mr. Speaker, are there any sums provided for this purpose. I want to say again how disturbed I am that the very useful initial activities of the Productivity Council of Saskatchewan which was really a Provincial counterpart of the Economic Council of Canada has been discouraged by this Government to the extent that it has not continued to make grants to the programs and the activities of this very worthy organization.

I understand in consequence that this organization is planning its own dissolution. Mr. Speaker, I would have thought that this Government would have been interested in seeing to it that embryonic forms of management-labor co-operation should continue, should expand. Instead of that it has done all those things that apparently the Hon. Member for Regina South West (Mr. McPherson) believes to be unwise in the way of compulsory and restrictive forms, and has done absolutely nothing to improve the positive and forward-looking character of a modern, and I underline that word, modern, management-labor philosophy.

Not enough progress, Mr. Speaker, has been made either, in my opinion, in the administering of labor standards. We had some four years ago 19 persons on the establishment of the labor standards division of the Department of Labour. Today there are 20. Mr. Speaker, we need a better enforcement of labor standards in this province and especially after the taking over of power by my Hon. Friends opposite. We owe this to the bulk of the Saskatchewan employed population who do not have unions to

protect them. We owe it to the policing of the legislation that this House has from time to time deemed it advisable to create.

Mr. Speaker, I am also disturbed when I look at the fire prevention activities of this Government, also under the Department of Labour and my friend, the Minister of Labour (Mr. Coderre). The proposed budget for the coming year has been reduced from \$169,000 to \$158,000. There has been a reduction and I think this House is owed an explanation. It may be argued that the activities of many fire-fighting departments have resulted in an improved fire experience in Saskatchewan. But I don't think that this can be a very good answer. There are items like this, Mr. Speaker, that will require some very close examination in the Estimates. I shall personally look forward to the Minister providing explanations, and I want to serve warning that I intend to search for them.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I will yield to the next speaker who is anxious to enter this debate. I am going to vote against the motion and I am going to support the amendment. That I am sure will be no news to most of the people in this House. But in doing so I shall be registering not only my own feelings but those, I am convinced, of a very big majority of Saskatchewan citizens who are up in arms against not only the stupefying tax load imposed by this Government, but the deception and the promise-breaking that preceded it.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. L.P. Coderre: (Minister of Labour) — Mr. Speaker, in rising to take part in this debate, I feel that I should congratulate everyone who has participated thus far. You know, Mr. Speaker, many words of wisdom have been spoken in this House throughout the years, also quite a few others have brought down to the Chamber possibly more confusion than enlightenment which has been evident from what has come from across the floor. It is a good thing, Mr. Speaker, that Lady Nature or good nature cannot be confused with lengthy speeches and renditions. She is still doing her job though, as she always has, ignoring the hysterics of those across who vowed to unseat the present Government in a jiffy, that was three and a half years ago, also ignoring, Mr. Speaker, the grandiose statements of certain of the Opposition oracles who were predicting, not so long ago, that this province was heading for economic and cultural stagnation and collapse. I would say, Mr. Speaker, it's quite evident by what has happened thus far, that there is not stagnation, because we are progressing.

Now, if these attacks against the present Government, Mr. Speaker, and the philosophy which we stand for, were the result of honest error, I would not take up the time of this Assembly with my remarks. However, he who has erred in an effort to arrive at the truth is usually ready to admit his error

March 11, 1968

when he has recognized it. My Socialist friends across the way have recognized their errors but they won't admit it. What are we then, Mr. Speaker, to think of those who refuse to admit facts when fact turns out to be different from what they have been prophesying? I submit, Mr. Speaker, that from across the floor, the people who sit there in this Chamber, and who have not had the intestinal fortitude to recognize these areas, probably have a long list of virtues. It appears from what I have heard so far in this debate, from these virtuous men of this Legislature, that amongst all the virtues that they think they have, they lack objectivity and that occupies the last position in their minds.

During the Christmas holidays, I had the dubious privilege of wading through issues of "The Commonwealth". You know that paper, that rag,

Mr. D.W. Michayluk: (Redberry) — You may learn something.

Mr. Coderre: — As you may know, these issues contain resolutions passed at the recent conventions of what is now the NDP, what was then the CCF, oh, I don't know what it is but something to that effect anyhow. To say that it was a tedious document would be a gross understatement. It is not just tedious, Mr. Speaker, it can bore a man to the point of exhaustion. To my regret, I must ask you to bear with me for a while while I deal with some of these resolutions. When it comes to beclouding the issues which face this Legislature, some of these resolutions are unsurpassable. They can't be left unchallenged.

I am rather amused, Mr. Speaker, at this paper "The Commonwealth", this supposedly paper, The Commonwealth, the paper they say is for the electors of the province. You know they have a cartoonist there, Mr. Speaker, who calls the voters of the province "Rats". This is the respect that this paper has for the electorate of this province. You know they put a cartoon in there at one time and the Saskatchewan voters were depicted in this paper, this rag, as a rat. If you would like to have a look at it, it says here "Saskatchewan Voters". This is what they think of the people of Saskatchewan. I think they should be ashamed of themselves. If you would like to have it, I will pass it on to you. Have a good look at it.

Another one, Mr. Speaker, writing into the Commonwealth, his name is Jack Morrow, I believe. However, he said that we must charge the Credit Union for a share of the responsibility of inflation. This is a political organ of the party across the way, Mr. Speaker, that discredits many good organizations and well-meaning people for the efforts they are making in our society.

An Hon. Member: — Charge them for audit fees.

Mr. Coderre: — Imagine, Mr. Speaker, this

rag, the Commonwealth, declaring that the growth of the Credit Union does not offer the real solution to the problems of the debt-ridden producer and then it has the audacity to call for a Government-owned operated system to replace the banks and put an end to interest payments on deposits. This comes from the Commonwealth, Mr. Speaker. That's the official organ of the party across, or the wiping rag or something, I don't know what. Then this paper goes on to say that they see no necessity or purpose for rewarding people from refraining from foolishly spending their money. Now if this is not the ultimate in preaching welfarism. "The Credit union principles have advocated and urged their membership to save." "Spend it", the Socialists say, "get on welfare tomorrow." If we let these Socialists get their way, they would be out out-promising, free-wheeling, giving away what they wish, so that they could establish their own little kingdom again, certainly increasing costs beyond the normal. It is quite evident, Mr. Speaker, that we have had an increase in the Budget. If we had gone on with the ever-spiralling costs that could be generated by their promises, you could well imagine what would happen.

The Hon. Member for Mayfair (Mr. Brockelbank) subscribes to programs, moon promises, but nowhere have I heard from him, or from any Members opposite any constructive criticism of what has been in the Budget. They have criticized it but offered nothing constructive. Then speaking of the free-wheeling and the free-wheeling Member for Regina North West, our friend Mr. Whelan stated that the Government was heartless and inhumane, was not concerned for suffering. He was extra-ultra-critical of the Budget and every tax, but he didn't have the fortitude or the guts to say what should be cut out. Did he suggest that the highway program should be cut? Does he suggest that the education program should be cut? Does he suggest that the welfare program should be cut? Does he suggest that we should hold back on health services that are now being provided, as is being done by the Socialist friends in England today, cutting back in every program that they have. Do you suggest that we have greater cuts in agriculture? In his usual free-wheeling way, Mr. Speaker, he went on being critical, on and on, and then he turned around and took a Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde attitude and promised extension for Medicare, promised drugs, promised mileage for people living in rural areas to come and see their doctor. You know, Mr. Speaker, he is a great emotional speaker. Sometimes, I think, he actually believes what he says but he is inconsistent as heck. Cut taxes — increase services, true, Mr. Speaker, to Socialist philosophy. Then, of course, to top it off, His Worship the Mayor, the Member for Regina South East (Mr. Baker) — he's never in his seat, of course — offered the ultimate. He offered the moon. His promises at all times, Mr. Speaker, go all out. He wishes to give absolutely everything, anything and then some more for purely political advantages. He was critical of the tax increases, he offered group life insurance to everybody, but then the most audacious thing of all he had the audacity to stand up in this House and say that during the 20 years of the Socialist regime that the churches

March 11, 1968

expanded their membership. I don't think that anymore comments should be made, these 'holier-than-thou' individuals making claim for absolutely everything.

An Hon. Member: — People ought to pray to get rid of them, Lionel!

Mr. Coderre: — You know I think we. Should put these guys on the Ed Sullivan show or some of these comedy. programs sometime. They might be a little better.

Then the Hon., Member, Mr. Speaker, the ailing one, I mean the Hon. Member for The Battlefords (Mr. Kramer), he was ailing and wailing all evening. He condemned the Frazier Report as a rubber stamp to the Administration, something sensational . . .

Mr. E. Kramer: (The Battlefords) — Never said a-word about it!

Mr. Coderre:—. . . something that's supposed to cover the failings of the Administration, to cover all and then he proceeded . . .

Mr. Kramer: — The Hon. Member has suggested that I condemned the Frazier Report. I would like to deny that at any time I condemned the Frazier Report, I condemn the way. the Frazier Report . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order, order! The Member has made his speech and he can't make another one. If he wants to ask a question, he can ask a question, but he can't make a speech on the question.

Mr. Kramer: — Very well, Sir. I ask him to quote anywhere where I condemn the Frazier Report.

Mr. Coderre: — Well, my dear friend, I'm sure, Mr. Speaker, he knows where he said it, he indicated as much about it. I don't think I need to repeat it. He knows, he has condemned it an . . .

An Hon. Member: — When it was announced, of course he did.

Mr. Coderre: — . . . he's quoted it on several occasions and he says it is supposed to cover the failings of the Administration. But then, Mr. Speaker, oh how wily he is, he proceeds to quote page by page of recommendations. It's no good on one hand and then it's good on the other. Childish isn't it? I saw him chewing his gum a while ago. And then I noticed, Mr. Speaker, that he was criticized by the Mayor of North Battleford for some of the attitudes that he is taking. I'm quite aware, Mr. Speaker, that on several occasions the people of North Battleford have been attempting to get industries in there. How in the

Sam Hill do you expect to ever get industries in a community like North Battleford, if my friend Mr. Kramer claims what he says that the people are afraid, they have. locked doors, it's a city of fear.

Mr. Kramer: — Correct.

Mr. Coderre: — What opportunity, Mr. Speaker, is there to develop that community.

Mr. Kramer: — You clean it up . . .

Mr. Coderre: — That is the type of individual that we have, Mr. Speaker . . .

Mr. Kramer: — You created the situation.

Mr. Coderre: — . . . trying to promote this Province. Then of course, we take the junior Member from Moose Jaw, (Mr. Snyder) and then we speak of inconsistency. My good friend states that we ignored priority. Then he doesn't indicate what priority it should be, and what order these priorities are. Frankly enough, Mr. Speaker, no one opposite, not one person opposite has indicated in any way what priorities the Government should take. What are their priorities? All we have, Mr. Speaker, is criticism, aimless criticism, aimless ramblings, requiring vast extra funds on one hand and criticizing tax increases on the other, criticizing Mental Health Programs, using the Frazier Report as a recommendation, trying to take credit for the Frazier Report. How small can a person get? Then to look at every corner, every page and every part of the Report and use it purely for political reasons and you did the same.

This Government, Mr. Speaker, had the fortitude to ask for the Report, knowing full well that it could possibly be showing some inadequacies in the Program, and had the fortitude to table the Report and has taken action on that matter. Then the Hon. Member for Moose Jaw went on to speak about utilization fees. He made a great story about it, indicating what would happen to the old gentleman who went into the hospital on the first of the month and left on the last day of the month when he was only receiving \$75. He should be broke. He asks what's he going to eat with. Strange how these Socialists go at it, Mr. Speaker, trying to becloud the issue. Just in case the Hon. Member — and he's not in his seat unfortunately — does not know, anyone who is receiving only \$75 a month has other means or other income under the present old age security regulations and welfare regulations. Consequently, it need not in essence provide undue hardship. Surely a person could pay his board and room while he is in the hospital. Then I've heard my dear friends wailing across the way that the Government is so hard pressed for money. This is not the case.

March 11, 1968

Then he went on to say that the Government ignored the legitimate needs of the people of Saskatchewan. I say far from it, Mr. Speaker, far from it. We have, Mr. Speaker, a good health plan, we have a good hospital plan, and if it may give the Hon. Members across the way any degree of satisfaction, they brought it in. Let's say we give them credit for it. Mr. Speaker, no plan, no program, if not reviewed from time to time, is going to give the services that it is set to do. Look at the wanton careless abandon of a health plan in England today. It is in great jeopardy. It is now a question of cutting their program back and the whole plan is in jeopardy. And on this point, Mr. Speaker, I have no intention as a Member of this Government to sit idly by and see our plan being jeopardized by abuses, by careless abandon or concern, by the Members opposite.

Then our financial critic, Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Member for Regina Centre (Mr. Blakeney) after his long dissertation, went into hiding. We didn't see him around for some reason. His absence was noticeable. Why did he do that? Did he go into hiding because his argument as the official critic of the Opposition, was so weak — it's no wonder with a five cent speech.

The statement had been made, Mr. Speaker, that there were no more people with jobs in 1967 than there were in 1964. This is not so. The total estimated labor force in 1964 was 337,000 people. In 1967 the total labor force was 354,000. That's the total labor force, non-agricultural and agricultural labor force, representing an increase of 17,000. This does not however provide a true picture of the employment situation. In order for the total labor force to increase by 17,000 the non-agricultural labor force has to rise by 43,000, because of the continuing decline in the number of persons working on farms. It is in the non-agricultural sector that sufficient new jobs have been created, Mr. Speaker, to absorb the persons who are the agricultural sector and also to permit an expansion of the total labor force. As a result of the vigorous industrial development policy followed by this Government, the 1967 non-agricultural labor force was more than 52,000 higher than it was in 1963, the last full year in which the previous Government was in power.

The impression has been created that the size of the increase in population automatically governs the increase in the number of jobs available. This is a false impression. Many thousands of new jobs have been created since this Government took office and have been filled by persons who were formerly employed in agriculture. Thousands more have provided employment for young people, Mr. Speaker, that is for a post-war baby crop, who have now reached the working age. Significant numbers of these jobs have also been filled by persons who were not previously in the labor force, but who have been attracted to employment by job opportunities which have emerged. The majority of persons in the latter category are women; and the labor force participation rate of whom is increasing each year. You will find that there are more and more women in the labor force each year.

An attempt has been made, Mr. Speaker, to belittle the figure of 2,587 unfilled job vacancies in 1966, shown in the 1967 edition of *The Economic Review*. To relate this figure to the volume of job vacancies which have occurred in 1966 is like saying that a sliver of pie is equal to the whole pie. That's what we call Socialist arithmetic. The figure in question is not intended to represent the sum total of job openings in 1966, rather it is a measure used to represent the number of job vacancies at any given moment during the year. This figure, Mr. speaker, is derived by averaging the 12 monthly counts of vacancies made at the end of each month, by the Canada Manpower Centre in Saskatchewan. With the continuous listing and filling of positions throughout the year and the eventual removal from the listings by the employers themselves of vacancies which cannot be filled, the actual number of jobs which have become available over the year would by many times be greater than the annual average. Moreover, it must be remembered that not all vacancies are handled by Canada Manpower Centres. Nevertheless the comparison of the annual averages unfilled vacancies reported by Canada Manpower Centres over the years provides a fairly good indication of the employment trends generally. Such a comparison, Mr. Speaker, indicates that the 1966 average mentioned is the highest record since 1947.

Apparently reference has been made to the figure of 11,068 unplaced applicants for employment at Canada Manpower Centres in Saskatchewan in 1966. I might point out incidentally that this is the lowest annual average since 1956. However, the number of unplaced applicants is at best a very broad measure of labor supply. Some of the persons registered for employment have jobs and are applying for better jobs and are registering with Manpower. Some have found jobs and their names have not been removed from the registration file when the monthly count has been made, and this has been verified. Some are no longer interested in employment for various reasons, others are applying for future employment after receiving training, and they are still on the roll. Most of the persons who are truly unemployed are unable to qualify for existing job opportunities because of lack of education, and this is why this Government is concentrating on the improvement and extension of education and training facilities. We have done a very good job of that. In three years we have doubled the total number of apprentices in training.

At any rate the official measure of unemployment for Canada is that published monthly by the Dominion Bureau of statistics and includes persons who are without work and seeking and those who are temporarily laid off. The annual average number of unemployed workers in Saskatchewan in 1967, according to the Dominion Bureau of Statistics, was 6,000, producing an unemployment rate of 1.8 per cent, the lowest in Canada. This, Mr. speaker, I believe is conclusive evidence and an indication of full employment, under anybody's definition except the Socialists' who don't want to believe anything. I believe, Mr. Speaker, that this Government can be called the "Fathers of Responsible Government".

March 11, 1968

We have been forced to increase taxes in a number of areas, Mr. Speaker. This is not a popular move, and nobody is particularly happy to learn that the Government is going to take more money out of his pocket. It is however a necessary move and a responsible move. It is a clear indication that the Government is taking this responsibility to the people of the Province seriously and does not intend to follow the path of least resistance at the expense of the stability of our economy.

I suppose I could quote what my young friend from Saskatoon Mayfair (Mr. Brockelbank) said a moment ago. Go right on and everything else. Don't increase taxes and put the burden upon the young people of the future. Deficit financing is what they think of.

I suppose the Government might have cutback some of its programs and preserved last year's taxation levels in this way. However, we recognize that the nature of society as it is today is such that governments are expected to provide and maintain services in a large number of fields. Accordingly, we are continuing to even improve the services which have been made available in the past. These services Mr. Speaker, must be paid for out of the revenue of today. The Provincial Treasurer might also have presented a deficit Budget to this Legislature and in this way have deluded the Saskatchewan taxpayers into believing that they were receiving the best service for the same cost. I suppose that could have been done. However, the Government does not intend to become involved in dangerous financing of this kind now. In commenting on this subject, no less a personage than Winston Churchill once said, "What is the use of being a famous race and nation if at the end of the week you cannot pay your housekeeping bill?" I suppose that Socialist financing is the way it goes, they want to be famous, they want to be a famous race, a famous something; and then they can't pay their bills at the end of the week. This is exactly what has happened in England now. We've had a Labour Government there for quite a while, a Socialist Government, not a Labour Government.

As I was mentioning a moment ago about the famous resolutions that were passed at conventions, in looking over the resolutions adopted last November at their annual convention of the Saskatchewan section of the New Democratic party — that's what it was known as at that time — I have been wondering what the cost to the province might be by implementing this long list of new programs and policies recommended by these resolutions. I am convinced, Mr. Speaker, that if it could be calculated in terms of dollars and cents, it would overwhelm even your own imagination. I don't know what you would do, I don't know what the taxpayers would do in order to implement all these plans. Here are some of the proposals contained in these resolutions.

Inclusion of dental services in the health services provided by the province, very desirable: extension of services provided under the Medical Care Insurance Act, very desirable;

the provision of telephone service to all rural areas; the establishment of a factory to build and maintain road construction equipment. I suppose that factory would probably end up like the woollen mills, the box factory, the shoe factory and some of these other things that they've tried. And then they want more assistance here, raising the basic exemptions for the provincial share of income tax; the extension of the kinds of expenses which are deductible from taxable income, plus what Henry has promised, plus what Walter has promised, plus what many others have promised.

One resolution even protests increases in the rates of Government Insurance. I would like to know, Mr. Speaker, how it is proposed to find the money to meet the progressively increasing costs of claims, for example, received by the Saskatchewan Government Insurance without raising insurance premiums. Nobody has mentioned how they'd like to do that. Irresponsible! Another resolution, Mr. Speaker, states that the large percentage of the highways in Saskatchewan are in a deplorable condition. If that is the case, Mr. Speaker, I shudder to contemplate what adjective they would have used in fact if it applied to the conditions prior to 1964. As everyone is aware, Mr. Speaker, this is a program area in which the Government has been concentrating heavily since assuming office. Expenditures on highways have increased by 133 per cent. Gravel highways have been oiled, hard-topped. Provincial highways have been increased, some of them are dust free; this is saving lives of people. All these programs that they've been wanting, have been talking about, would have cost many millions of dollars more and that money would have had to be raised somewhere.

Not one has suggested any alternative. Unfortunately Saskatchewan is not Utopia. There are financial realities to be faced. The highway needs indicate that it would take one billion and a half dollars to be spent on the roads in the next 20 years. Those responsible for that resolution at the convention might wish to spend the money all at once, if the Government would be old-fashioned enough to feel that such a trifle is unwise to ask the taxpayer to suddenly assume a tax burden.

Many, many resolutions were brought in by these people, Mr. Speaker. The cost involved would be enormous, the taxes imposed would be great, if the plan we're to only include some of the bare necessities, and this we are doing with responsibility.

I would also like to refer to a resolution which involves the payment of salaries to homemakers who work in the home only. You know, they had a resolution, they'd like to put in. Let us suppose for example, that ladies are to be paid at the rate of \$40 per week, as they suggested, the present minimum wage. The annual cost to the Government of a plan of this nature would be a staggering sum of \$300 million. This is what they suggested. Could you imagine what would happen to your taxes? Where would that money come from? Nobody has suggested who would have to pay the higher taxes of various kinds, which would be collected,

March 11, 1968

processed and organized and, after deductions for administrative costs, returned to the home in the ladies' names. This seems to be an inefficient and a roundabout way for a man to give his wife some spending money. That's the way the Socialists planned it.

I do not wish to create the impression, Mr. Speaker, that the Government is automatically opposed to all these resolutions. It is only natural that everyone wants to have the good part of life. All of us are in favor of many of the objectives embodied in their resolutions. The question is, however, one of priorities and of what we can afford now. The Government is not supposed to be like the young man who, as soon as he obtained his first job goes on deeply into debt and acquires everything in sight that appeals to him. The Government is supposed to demonstrate some leadership and a degree of self-control in the implementation and financing of Government programs, I'd like to draw this to the attention of the gentlemen across the way.

When services are increased, Mr. Speaker, taxes must go up. Nothing is free, Mr. Speaker, and there is no magic formula. To put the programs I have mentioned into effect would likely mean the doubling of the size of the present Civil Service and the tripling of the level of taxation. These are the resolutions that boys have thought, have suggested.

The Budget which is before us, Mr. Speaker, represents the best possible compromise . . .

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Coderre: — . . . I guess they don't like to hear that. The Budget which is before us, Mr. Speaker, represents the best possible compromise of conflicting pressures, involving the maintenance and the improvement of services, the holding of spending increases to a minimum and the most equitable distribution of unavoidable tax increases.

And while we are on the question of the economic welfare of the people of Saskatchewan, Mr. Speaker, during the last few days we have listened to many speeches in this House relating to the economic welfare of the people of Saskatchewan. I regret that during the debate very little reference was made to the co-operative movement in Saskatchewan, the position it finds itself in today and possibly the part that people can play through self-help measures to solve some of the problems existing at this time. The Report of the Batten Commission indicates the challenge that faces businesses, individuals and governments, Mr. Speaker, particularly in three Prairie Provinces. I regret that with the emphasis on Government action the control that individuals can exert on the economy has been almost lost sight of. Generally speaking, co-operatives have been formed in times of adversity, but strangely enough the days of comparative prosperity in the last few years have placed the co-operative movement, particularly in the field of finance in

a very prominent position in the economy. The record of the co-operative financial institutions which come under the supervision of the Department of Co-operation including the Credit Unions, the Co-operative Trust, the Credit Society, the Co-operative Insurance Firm, doing business in Saskatchewan indicates the prosperous conditions that have existed since the Government came into office in 1964. At December 31, 1963, total assets of the Credit Unions in Saskatchewan amounted to \$178 million, and as at December 31, 1967, the assets of the Credit Unions in the four-year period has almost doubled to a total of \$352 million — tremendous progress, in three years, almost double what had happened under the previous Administration in 20 years. As well, the membership, Mr. Speaker, of the Credit Unions in the same period of time increased from 190,000 to 282,000. Left alone, Mr. Speaker, co-operatives can do best for themselves. In addition, the loans in force by the Credit Unions over the same period of time have doubled from the total of \$115 million in December, 1963, to \$218 million in 1967.

I believe that the record of growth in development in the Credit Union movement in Saskatchewan indicates the faith of individuals in the future of our province and also relates better than any other fact the growing prosperity in Saskatchewan since 1963. And there it is the indicator of prosperity more than anything else. The tremendous assets in the Credit Unions, in the Co-operative Credit Society and in the Co-operative Trust Company, to a total of close to half a billion dollars, provide the people of our Province with a guaranteed reserve of capital to continued developing in many fields where improvements are so badly needed.

The field of housing is one today that most people feel is a vital one And I wish His Worship, Mayor Baker, would be here and listen to this. But we hope that the other Member from Regina city will try to guide him in that area. The co-operative movement in Saskatchewan is taking a renewed and revitalized interest in the possibilities of finding a solution to the housing problems through co-operative housing projects. During the past four years, Saskatchewan has seen development of the first relatively large. co-operative housing project in the town of Lanigan, and the Department has, within the last month, approved the registration of a second housing co-operative unit in the town of Colonsay. As well, the development of student housing co-operatives in both Regina and Saskatoon has indicated a new desire of individuals to help to find the answers to problems through the self-help. measures. The success of these ventures, Mr. Speaker, which have been assisted through the. financial efforts of the credit unions and the Saskatchewan Co-operative Credit Society will determine the future emphasis to be placed in these areas by the co-operative movement in Saskatchewan. Other areas of Canada, Mr. Speaker, and particularly the United States have seen large developments in the field of co-operative housing, and in many cases efforts have helped to find a solution for the serious housing problems in other areas.

March 11, 1968

I want to take this opportunity of congratulating the leaders of the co-operative movement for taking steps to assist in the solution of a very serious problem. The Report of the Batten Commission points up responsibilities which must be met by the private sector of the economy, the co-operative sector of the economy, and by governments, in order to meet the ever increasing cost of living. The recommendations of the Report carry with it particular responsibilities for the co-operative movement whose principles, in many cases, could possibly meet some of the recommendations laid down by the Report of the Commission. The challenges present a direct challenge to almost every sector of the co-operatives and the consumer co-operative, in Western Canada. In Saskatchewan during the past year, the relative portion of the retail trade, serviced by the co-operative movement, has remained relatively constant at about 10 per cent. The major portion of this trade is to be found in the rural area of the province where the co-operative retail agencies play a major part in the commercial development of rural community life. I know that the co-operative movement will be taking a close look during the next few months at the Report of the Batten Commission and considering its position in the light of the Report.

It would be my hope, Mr. Speaker, that solutions to the problems of the consumer could be found in the market place rather than through the dictates of government. Every free enterpriser believes in that. The private business sector and the co-operative sector must attempt to find answers to the problems directed to them by the Batten Commission or have to face the prospects of government regulation and interference, and gosh only knows, nobody wants that.

The work of the Department of Co-operation, both in the field of credit union and co-operative service, continues to increase with the expansion of the credit union movement and the new fields to be conquered by the co-operative movement particularly in the community service activities.

Many of our agricultural producers, Mr. Speaker, are looking to new methods to solve the cost problems on the farm. At the present moment, the main activity appears to be in the field of machinery co-operatives where active groups are demonstrating that by their application co-operative method costs of production can be reduced and problems of long hours, over-capitalization of operations on machinery and labor shortages can be coped with. And many experiments have been made in this. There are about 17 in the province which have shown marked progress in that area. Increased activity in the field of, machinery co-operatives is expected in the months ahead. The Saskatchewan Wheat Pool, Mr. Speaker, is taking a leading part in promoting the development of machinery co-operatives as one way of reducing farm-operating costs.

Co-operatives relating to the beef industry are sound and the producers benefit from group action. These include

feeder, animal breeding, forage, and pasture co-operatives and more recently, the cow-calf development on a co-operative basis. It has been shown, particularly in the field of pasture co-operatives, Mr. Speaker, that those organized on a co-operative basis operate more efficiently and at a lower cost than pastures developed by any other basis. With the increased desire for diversity in agricultural production, the importance of producers working together to solve their problems of cost of production, as well as problems in the market-place, becomes that much more evident.

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to tell the Members in this House that our Department stands ready at all times to give assistance to any groups of individuals who desire in a co-operative way to try to solve some of these problems as well as that it is our responsibility to see that the requirements of legislation passed by the Legislature are met by these organizations. The major movements taking place in the co-operative field at the present moment deal mainly with changes in administration in the financial and consumer co-operative movement. As changes in organization and administration must be approved by the Department of Co-operation, our staff must be prepared at all times to meet and discuss with co-operatives suggestions in changes in their organization and development. It is the duty of the Department to assist there. During the past year, Mr. Speaker, just for the information of this House, there have been eight amalgamations of co-operative associations in the province; 27 associations have been dissolved. Most of these have been the consumer-type associations. During the same period of time, 16 new associations were incorporated. Of the new associations, four were housing associations, two of which I have already indicated were for university students. The newest association incorporated has to do with the distribution of propane gas to its members in the province. Most of the other new associations incorporated were of the community type of services, community pastures, community parks, halls and the likes. The Department does a good deal of work in the field of community service co-operatives, including halls, rinks, recreational groups, and assists them in organizing their book-keeping system and giving them general administrative advice.

At the present time there are 758 co-operative associations that are incorporated under The Co-operative Association Act as of February 29, 1968. Of these, Mr. Speaker, 263 are consumer types and there are 454 community service types of associations, five housing associations, four marketing associations, and 32 miscellaneous types. There are as well 12 other associations which are incorporated under legislation but which are registered under The Co-operative Association Act.

The work of my Department in the northern area of Saskatchewan, Mr. Speaker, amongst the native people of the province is quite extensive. It is felt that through co-operative methods the native people of our province can be given an opportunity to gain experience in operating their own businesses and

March 11, 1968

also providing themselves with some means of employment. During the past year, handicraft production operations have been assisted amongst native people. Some of you may have noticed that the Handicraft Co-op at La Ronge had a display in the city of Regina and they had wonderful wares for sale. I think this is becoming an annual trip from La Ronge to sell their wares. The interest is high in this type of program among the Indian women, and it would be our hope that this might develop an industry which would provide not only useful employment for the native people in the northern part of our province, but as well would mean again an investment in their community. In addition it would provide an understanding of small business and industry and an understanding of their relationship to the province, and the nation. It is most gratifying to see the interests and the efforts that people of Indian and Métis extraction take in their own organizations such as this. All of these types of development, Mr. Speaker, have been underway for sometime in the northern area of our province, and it is beginning to reach down to Indian people in other parts of the province. Our Indian people have shown renewed interest in developing means of assisting themselves through working in a co-operative manner. A great deal of the work done in the Extension Branch of the Department will be given over to assistance in these fields during the next few months, with the hope that we may be able to contribute to a quickening knowledge and responsibility of the native people of the province.

I can foresee in the months and years ahead, Mr. Speaker, increased responsibilities for the staff of my Department. The explosion, particularly in the field of finance co-operatives places an increased responsibility upon the Department and the Government to see to the protection of the individual membership. The record of the credit union movement, Mr. Speaker, to date in Saskatchewan has been excellent and is one that no doubt accounts for the confidence felt by the membership and by the people in the province generally towards the movement.

I know, Mr. Speaker, that the Government of the Province appreciates the responsibility that has been accepted by many thousands of our people in finding solutions to their own local problems by working together whether in a co-operative way or on a mutual basis. Whether it is in the field of producer-marketing agencies, consumer-retail agencies, community-service agencies, the individual membership has indicated the desire in a democratic way towards the solution of problems that face each other in every day life.

It has been indicated, Mr. Speaker, by some Members opposite that we have avoided to talk about the Budget. I think I've tackled it straight and fair; we are not ashamed of what we have done. We can stand proudly anywhere. No one appreciates taxes, Mr. Speaker, but we have assumed our responsibility as a responsible Government, one who is responsible in the maintaining the continuing of the services that we have in this province in a responsible way. Mr. Speaker, I'm proud to support the

Budget but I will not support the amendment.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. W.A. Forsyth: — Mr. Speaker, may I apologize to you and to the House for the super-efficiency of my press agent. I had no idea that they could be so eager. According to the 5:30 news, I gave this speech this afternoon. I'm sorry you missed it and now I have to live up to the notices which appeared that time.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Forsyth: — Seriously, Mr. Speaker, I would ask the indulgence of the House for a few remarks which some may dismiss as generalizations, but which I hope will indicate a desire on my part to grapple with some of the basic problems which I feel face us. As a freshman Member of this Legislature, perhaps I should not be in any hurry to record my impressions of its deliberations. On the other hand, if first impressions are to be of any value, they should be noted when they are fresh and untouched by the corrosions of repeated experience.

I must say that I have thoroughly enjoyed most of the presentations made by Members during the past three weeks. Even those which have generated the least light have provided interesting insights into the character of the speakers. What has disturbed me and what continues to disturb me is the lack of attention paid by some Members to basic issues and their corresponding preoccupation with superficialities. Now that the election of October 11 is over, one might consider it appropriate to stop rehashing the details of the campaign and to appeal to the citizenry as intelligent human beings.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Forsyth: — I am sure that a wise physician has no hesitation in attempting to alleviate pain suffered by his patient, but he knows that his primary responsibility is to diagnose and where possible, to attack the basic cause of the pain. Treatment directed to symptoms rather than to causes may be pleasing to the patient, but in the long run it is not enough. There are times when it is necessary to cause pain and discomfort in order to effect a cure. It is in the light of this analogy that I suggest we look at the Budget which is before us. Let us look at its long-term objectives rather than its immediate effects. None of us likes to raise taxes but at the present time neither of the alternatives of reduced services or deficit financing appears to be acceptable. There can be legitimate arguments concerning the proposed methods of raising Provincial revenues. I assume that the proper function of the Opposition is to spark just such a debate. What amazes me is the number of speakers from the other side of the House who in effect have

March 11, 1968

denied the necessity of increased taxation and have then gone on and on and on to propose programs whose adoption would cost tens of millions of dollars.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Forsyth: — Surely, Mr. Speaker, such behaviour can only qualify them for the title of Her Majesty's irresponsible Opposition.

I realize that many of our present programs of health care were instituted by the CCF and it is only human that they should accept and bask in the sunshine of acclaim which came to them as a result of this legislation. What they have not and are not prepared to accept is the accompanying responsibility of informing the public that the cost of these programs must be kept under control. When the share of the costs of welfare programs which is paid out of general revenue threatens to out-strip the taxes which can be raised from the productive sector of our economy, we have only two real alternatives. We can treat the symptoms for awhile by deficit financing, and stifling taxation of our productive enterprises, or we can attack the basic disease of suicidal over-spending. If we had chosen the first alternative, we would have achieved immediate popularity with the patient who in this case happens to be the public. However, by choosing this course, we would have been open to the gravest charges of irresponsibility for we would have ensured the ultimate destruction of the very programs which the public has come to depend. We would have guaranteed a climate of economic stagnation in which a vigorous, vital and healthy social life cannot exist. Health is more than the mere absence of disease. It is an attitude towards life, a capacity to meet challenges and to overcome them, an ability to react positively to stress, a confidence that the struggle for a meaningful existence is really worthwhile. To my mind, Mr. Speaker, the role of government in our society is to foster this spirit in our people, to intervene where necessary to make sure that the cards are not stacked against any individual or group and to ensure that provision is made to assist those who are unable to participate fully in the game. Certainly there is a place for spectator sports, but, when government activities become so ubiquitous that the majority of people sit in the stands and watch the government carry the ball, the standard of fitness in our society will be at a sorry state.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Forsyth: — Many sarcastic remarks have been directed at the Hon. Member for Regina South West (Mr. McPherson) for his defence of the independent sector of society. God help us if we ever produce a social order which lacks the initiative exemplified by that sector!

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Forsyth: — Earlier, I made mention of the apparent irresponsibility of some of the participants in this debate, and I intended at that time to draw attention to the irrelevance of many of their remarks. If anyone recalls the speech of the Hon. Member from Regina North West (Mr. Whelan), my meaning will be clear. Among other things, he appeared to be bidding for the position of agricultural critic. He took the floor immediately after the Attorney General (Mr. Heald), who had just explained with considerable clarity the type of legislation which he expects to introduce with respect to the control of the drinking drivers. In spite of this, the Member from Regina North West (Mr. Whelan) proceeded to castigate the Government for a lack of action in this field and devoted considerable time to making the same recommendations which the Attorney General had just outlined. Surely the House could have been spared the time taken by this portion of the Hon. Member's script.

Mr. Whelan: — . . . two years late.

Hon. D.V. Heald: — 20 years and you didn't do anything.

Mr. Forsyth: — Earlier in the debate, the Hon. Member for The Battlefords (Mr. Kramer) displayed a distressing lack of good taste and a completely callous disregard for the feelings of many unfortunate people when he trumpeted some of the findings of the Frazier Commission in an almost jubilant manner. Through the employment of this Commission, our Mental Health program was subjected to careful and expert scrutiny. Deficiencies were noted which require corrective action. I am confident such action will be taken. The long-term results which we all desire will certainly not be aided by the smear and the scare tactics of irresponsible headline hunters.

The oration delivered by the Hon. Member from Kinistino (Mr. Thibault) who obviously believes in Santa Claus but not in fairies, provided still more examples of the childish attempts which are being made to confuse and frighten the people of Saskatchewan. The Hon. Member sobbed out the story of a patient who had to wait for several hours for an air ambulance, virtually suggesting that this unfortunate delay was due to a sadistic desire on the part of the Government to cause suffering and inconvenience. How childish can you be? Incidentally, I think that I heard him commend his former Leader for economies by taking an air ambulance plane away from its normal duties to fly him hither and yon. The same speaker also introduced evidence of a relative of his in the United States who had incurred bills of \$10,000 for the care of a sick child. The obvious reason for this revelation was to frighten people into believing that the modest utilization fee which is being proposed in Saskatchewan would have the same effect. What imagination and what irresponsibility!

March 11, 1968

The Hon. Member for Kinistino continued to show a fine disregard for human feelings when he suggested that the slaughter on our highways is being aided and abetted by a cutback in driver training programs. The fact is, Mr. Speaker, that this program is being expanded to include schools and areas which have never benefited from it before. Having been a member of a school board which pioneered in the field of driver-training, I requested the records of payments by the Government to the Saskatoon Collegiate Board. These records clearly show that monies received by the Board on this account were higher for the last school year than for any term during the history of the course.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Forsyth: — I cite this as just another example of the irresponsibility of some Members of the Legislature. The very junior Member from Saskatoon Riversdale (Mr. Romanow), who quoted Conrad and Emerson so eloquently, failed to give credit to Lewis Carroll for his remarks on economics. Surely one would have to have a visit with Alice in Wonderland to come up with the conclusion that balanced budgets are completely out of fashion in economic circles. His advocacy of confiscatory income taxes under the happy Socialist's banner of "the more you earn the more you pay" must come out of some book of fairy tales. Certainly the name Grimm should be attached to any society which is emasculated by removing the incentive motive.

Mr. C.G. Willis: (Melfort-Tisdale) — You sounded better at 5:30.

Mr. Forsyth: — Did you like the early audition?

And now, Mr. Speaker, at the risk of being bold, brash, and, I hope logical, I would like to analyze further my reactions to the proceedings which have taken place in these Chambers over the past three weeks. I am most impressed by the actual efficiency and precision with which business can be conducted here and most depressed by the outward appearance of inefficiency and demagoguery which is sometimes projected to the public. Many of the Speeches which have been delivered in the present session — and I must say I will include my own in this category — have really not been delivered in the spirit of debate. I suggest that with some notable exceptions, they have confused more issues than they have clarified. In the era in which the present format was designed, communications were slow and unreliable and there was justification for drawing together Members from all over the province to an annual talk-fest. Today, when we have ready access to almost every home in Saskatchewan, should we not consider a reduction in the time allotted to these formal debates?

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Forsyth: — In the interests of reducing the so-called credibility gap between this Legislature and the people whom it represents, I believe that this matter is worthy of our attention. I am deeply aware that tradition has a great stabilizing influence on our parliamentary and judicial systems. I'd be the last to suggest that we should ignore the customs of the past, but I submit that we should not hide behind them. Though our basic principles and sense of values remain unchanged, we should not overlook the possibility of improving our methods of applying them. I respectfully suggest that Members of this Legislature might occasionally take a good look at its activities and sincerely ask themselves if the time spent in sessions is always well spent.

Returning to budgetary considerations, I will close my remarks by stating that the Budget is an honest attempt to meet real problems and I commend the Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Steuart) for his efforts.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Forsyth: — The true test of its effectiveness will come in the next year or two when we may be able to judge the full effect of the juggling act which is presently occupying the stage of the world's financial theatre. The Socialist Members of this House often appear to suffer from the delusion that we in Saskatchewan are the producers or the stars of this act. Actually, we are at best only bit players. However, we will continue to do our best to protect the people of this province from the ravages of uncontrolled inflation and we can only hope that other governments will have the courage to take equally strong measures. This is not an easy Budget to live with, but it is the type of Budget that we cannot afford to live without.

Obviously, Mr. Speaker, I oppose the amendment and support the motion which is before the House.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. W.S. Lloyd: (Leader of the Opposition) — Mr. Speaker, I can think of many happier circumstances in which to rise in the House and start talking about the Budget other than 9:00 o'clock after a full day of the debate. However, that is the spot in which we find ourselves and which the Members of the Legislature find themselves if they care to stay and listen, I guess.

I want to have something to say of criticism of the Budget, I want to have something to say by way of some suggestions of which I hope the Government will take note. Before I proceed to that I want to have something to say about some of the comments which have been made by those who preceded me in this

March 11, 1968

debate. Now, Mr. Speaker, this afternoon, the Minister of Health (Mr. Grant) was talking about health and economics, and I hope to have something to say about the false economics behind his proposal for deterrent fees. There is another matter I want to refer to tonight to show how the Government has ignored economics with respect to some of its health programs. We heard a lot a few years ago about the beginnings of a new psychiatric centre in Prince Albert. Construction was nearly completed in 1966. We were told during Estimates last year that the cottages, I'm speaking of, were completed by that time. The unfortunate part about all this, Mr. Speaker, is that the cottages completed in late 1966 or early 1967 can't be used until another building, the main building of the hospital, is completed. We heard in the Legislature in the Speech from the Throne, I think, that the Psychiatric Services Program in Prince Albert would begin some time in late 1968. In other words we have buildings completed in 1966 or early 1967 standing vacant during all of 1967, and possibly standing vacant and unused during all of 1968.

Mr. Speaker, what we need in this Province is not so much deterrent fees on hospital cases, we need deterrent fees on some of the waste and useless lack of planning of the Government sitting opposite.

I want to make a few references also to some of the comments of the Attorney General (Mr. Heald) when he spoke in the Legislature a few days ago. May I say first of all that this afternoon the Attorney General sent me a copy of the proposals of the Government of Saskatchewan at the Federal-Provincial Constitutional Conference in February. I have had the chance to briefly look through this document. I want to draw the Attorney General's attention to one statement in it. On page five I find this:

Only a year ago our Legislature took an initial step. Action was taken to permit instruction in French for one hour a day in any school which wished to use such a right.

My point is this, Mr. Speaker, that provision was in The School Act when I became Minister of Education 1944. It had been in there for at least 20 years before that, I am sure, and here is the Government of Saskatchewan at a conference of the Federal Government and the Provinces saying, "Last year our Legislature took an initial step." On the next page I find this:

Our Government of Saskatchewan is also taking steps in our Universities to provide instruction in French.

Imagine that!

On Our Regina campus a new bilingual college is being established presently, the first such college in Western Canada.

Correct and good! I submit this college was under construction and it had been agreed to before the Government ever knew about it, and here they are trying to take credit for it. Mr. Speaker, these are small things. What is needed in this Province is not so much deterrent fees on medical benefits as deterrent fees on misreporting events in the province by Members opposite when they go out.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Lloyd: — Now let me turn to some of the other comments of the Attorney General (Mr. Heald) when he spoke in the Legislature a few days ago. He, for example, talked about the amending of Canada's Constitution. He suggested that the former Saskatchewan Government should be blamed for having prevented a form for amending the Constitution being adopted. Now it is quite correct, as he says, that we did oppose, we did resist, the proposals for amending the Constitution of Canada. We resisted that which would have put Canada in a constitutional straight-jacket, had it been attempted. We resisted a proposal which would have allowed the Government of one Province to veto economic and social reform perhaps of no interest to that Province, but desirable and desired for others. In other words we weren't ready to accept constitutional handcuffs just because they were made in Canada, and as a result we did resist. May I, Mr. Speaker, point out to him a Resolution passed in this Legislature on March 28, 1961. This was a Resolution moved originally by the then Attorney General. After some discussion and consultation between the two groups, an Amendment was moved by the Hon. Member for Humboldt at that time, Mrs. Batten, now Judge Batten. The amended Motion was passed unanimously. This Resolution gave unanimous support to the position of the then Government which the Member from Lumsden (Mr. Heald) was objecting to the other day.

But even more important is this: what happened to prevent action between 1964 and 1966? After 1964 there was a Liberal Government here in Saskatchewan and it wasn't until 1966 that the Fulton-Favreau Formula was finally dropped entirely. There was a period of two years when there was no CCF Government to block it.

In 1964 after the election there was news emanating from the offices of the Government that the Premier and the Attorney General were on their way to the Conference to save Canada. Well, the difference, at that time after 1964, was that it was the Liberal Government in Quebec that resisted. My guess, Mr. Speaker, is that had Saskatchewan not objected previous to that time, the Liberal Government of Quebec may well have. Certainly they did during that period from 1964 to 1966.

He went on in his speech to try to place blame for the present exorbitant increase in taxes, on the previous Government. "Why", he said, "We had no great surpluses piled up."

March 11, 1968

Well perhaps not great ones, but we had surpluses piled up and my Hon. Friends opposite proceeded to spend them: Medical Care Insurance surpluses, Aid to Students surpluses, Public Administration Fund surpluses. Now had we had greater surpluses, my Hon. Friends would simply have spent them faster in the period before 1967 election. His explanation for increased taxes of 1968 because of lack of surpluses before, was as fatuous as it was factious. When he gets his Judgeship, Mr. Speaker, I trust that he will weigh evidence more judiciously than he weighs the reasons for the financial difficulties of the present Government.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Lloyd: — I am sorry that the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. McFarlane) isn't in the House, because I must say something about some of his comments. Like the other Members on both sides of the House, I listened to his address with most difficult interest. I couldn't decide whether he was practising for the Senate or simply trying to demonstrate his qualifications to be appointed to the Senate because that is the only place I can imagine a speech like that being made.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Lloyd: — I'd said earlier that in addition to lower production this year and lower deliveries and lower prices and higher costs, the farmers of Saskatchewan have to bear the added handicap of the Liberal Government. I really didn't know how big the handicap was until I listened to the Minister in this particular Budget debate. He talked about increased livestock prices in the period since 1964 and compared those with the period prior to 1964. He said that they were higher after 1964 and claimed some credit for this for the Liberal Government. Well, Mr. Speaker, the prices have been higher, so have costs. But I wish that he would tell me what the Saskatchewan Government, either his or ours, had to do with establishing the prices of livestock. The answer is of course, nothing at all. If he is going to accept or try to take responsibility for increased livestock prices, he must also then be prepared to take responsibility for the drop of wheat prices, our major agricultural product.

Now at a lower level of relevance or a higher level of asininity, I don't know which, he suggested that I should call on my alleged friends in the Communist countries to sign the International Grain Agreement. You know I haven't been invited to speak to any of my friends there, if they are such. It was his Leader who was invited to speak to an organization opposing the International Grain Arrangement. It was his Leader, so invited, who failed to speak anything about it. But I may say for his information that my friends tell me that countries like the United Kingdom, Sweden, Denmark, Germany, Italy, India and the Vatican, have in fact signed the International Grain Arrangement. I haven't been able to get in touch with the

Commissar for buying of grain in the USSR lately, but I am told that they don't look too favorably on signing it. And if one would get in touch with China about this, I am sure that their answer would be this: When Canada decides to recognize China as a nation on a diplomatic basis then we might be interested in signing the agreement. And I suggest that the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. McFarlane) instead of making asinine remarks about me getting in touch with my alleged friends in the Communist country, would be better engaged in talking to his friends at Ottawa about diplomatic recognition of China, one of our most hopeful customers with respect to the sale of wheat.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Lloyd: — Mr. Speaker, while he was talking, I was looking through the animal industry section of the report of the Department of Agriculture. He was telling us about the increased diversification of agriculture and yet the report of his Department in table, after table, after table, showed a drop of production in other than cereal grains. Table 1, table 2, table 5, table 6, table 9, table 22, — these relate to the production of livestock and livestock products — all down. Even field services under artificial insemination, Mr. Speaker, have declined. I turned to the back of the book, page 317, where we have listed the number of livestock on farms, and I find there in the years 1964 to 1966, the years that the Minister chose for his comparison, that the number of horses was down; the number of milk cows was down; the number of other cattle down; the number of all cattle down; the number of sheep and lambs down; and the number of hogs down.

Then I turned for verification to that elusive and much sought for document, The 1967 Saskatchewan Economic Review. I got there the same answers about livestock production in the province being down rather than up. Government Members sometimes give a favorable answer to this, by comparing figures at the end of June in one year to those at the end of December in another. The evidence says that livestock population is down. It is not necessarily the fault of the Government, but surely if they would face up to the facts and admit the truths that we might be able to get on with the business of doing something about it.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Lloyd: — Mr. Speaker, I said that I wanted to make some proposals which I hope that the Government might find worthy of giving some consideration to. Let me turn to a couple of those before I ask for the right to adjourn the debate this evening. The Budget has reference and properly so, to housing, schools, and added recreation facilities. We on this side of the House have already made some suggestions by Resolution for more comprehensive action than that dealing just with the building of houses.

March 11, 1968

A home, after all, is more than just a house. We need to think not just of the shelter aspects of a house. We need to think of the needs of the people who live in that house, for work, for recreation, for education, for social contacts.

What I am trying to say is that we need more consideration of the total environment in which people live. A community after all includes where people live and where people go to work. It includes where they go to school, swim, skate, and where they are treated when they get sick. Equal opportunity is something we have to think more about. We must think in terms of equal opportunity to develop and use intelligence, equal opportunity to gain health and satisfaction from living. This means we have to talk in terms of housing along with schools, recreation, transportation and other services.

May I attempt to illustrate, Mr. Speaker, by using as an example an area which I know reasonably well, and that is the area around the city of Saskatoon. I have spoken in this Legislature before of the problems for example, of the town of Warman, a community of some 900 people north of Saskatoon. There is a big problem of getting water and sewerage for the people who live there. I have urged Government interest in this problem. The town council is trying very hard to arrange it, but its resources are limited. Between Warman and Saskatoon there is the community of Martensville of also almost 900 people. Their problem to get sewer and water is going to be even greater than those of Warman. And between Saskatoon and Martensville there are a number of industries and commercial establishments and hopefully there will be more. Now, Mr. Speaker, it is, I suggest, technically feasible to serve these industries and these urban communities by an extension of the water system from Saskatoon. Almost certainly it would be more satisfactory for these people and industries if this were done. I think that in the long run less public money would be involved. Many of the residents there work in Saskatoon but prefer to live in a smaller community. And with better amenities available, more people would choose to do so.

I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that the Government might even bring natural gas to Martinsville. The people there shouldn't be penalized any longer just because they happen to give the majority of the votes to the Conservatives and a fewer number of votes to the Liberals. I hope that the Power Corporation can correct this lack of gas.

On the other side of Saskatoon are urban communities such as Delisle, Vanscoy, and west of Saskatoon, the town of Asquith. In the vicinity of these towns there are two potash mines. There is as a result considerable pressure on housing. There is a great pressure on recreational facilities particularly in the town of Delisle. There has been added pressure on educational facilities. In the town of Delisle it was hoped to discontinue the use of an old school some several years ago. It is necessary to keep the old school in use and it is not a very satisfactory

building.

Many of the employees at the potash mine have been living in Saskatoon. A growing number of people in these communities around Saskatoon work in Saskatoon and live in the surrounding area. This trend, I think, will increase. Mr. Speaker, at the risk of offending my colleagues on either side of the House from the city of Saskatoon, I don't think that everybody necessarily wants to live there. I don't think that everybody necessarily wants to live in the city of Regina. My feeling is that there are many more people who would prefer to live in the conveniently located smaller communities, if the services and the amenities were there. And this kind of distribution, I urge, would be better for everybody including the larger centres.

I use this as an example only. The same kind of situation exists in other parts of the province. They exist to some extent in areas where you don't have one large urban centre as a main centre. In some areas we could make more use of the resources of ARDA and the machinery of The Agricultural Development Act. In order to do something about it in other areas such as I have spoken of, may I suggest we need to provide new decision-making processes in order to take care of this situation.

Mr. Speaker, I want to urge that we have an opportunity to provide more satisfactory living opportunity, a more satisfactory total environment for more of our people. This won't happen if small communities are left to act without relationship to the total work area for the people, and the total service area for the people, and the total opportunity area for the people. Area planning can prevent duplication and waste. Public transportation systems may have to be involved. Services in one area might have to be associated more with services in the other to prevent duplication and to prevent destruction. For example, the hospital at the town of Delisle is in the same position as some of those eight which the Government a while ago said would have to close on April 1st, in some two weeks' time. This is a hospital which has performed a useful service for 20 years and can continue to do so. I admit it can continue to give the best service, if it is in some kind of planned association, serving the needs in the whole area together with the Saskatoon hospitals. The same kind of thinking must apply to the provision of say division four educational services. The same kind of possibility is there with respect to the development of community colleges which hopefully we will get around to building in this province.

I submit, Mr. Speaker, that the need is very strong for consideration of the total environment for planning together the essential services and desirable amenities, providing for people to live effectively in smaller communities. I urge the Government to study this concept and develop an area planning procedure to meet these needs.

March 11, 1968

I want to turn next, Mr. Speaker, to some comments about education. Not all of them are budgetary in the sense that they call for development in terms of money. I do think that they merit consideration. There is much talk, Mr. Speaker, of scientific and technological change in the world. It is extremely extensive. And as a result of all of this technological and scientific change, then certainly work environment, social environment and home environment, all these too have changed. It is the responsibility of education to enable people to use, and to adapt and to alter the environment in which they live. This will require new institutions of education — particularly at the post-secondary level. The community college is educationally very attractive. In addition to its own values it is part of the answer to the present and future overcrowding of our campuses. This brings me to query the Minister again about the report of the committee studying post-secondary education. The Minister, I understand, has had the report since some time mid-summer or early fall. Three times I have asked for it since we came into the House and I hope that it is not too long before we get copies of it.

All of us recognize the extent and the importance of technological change. May I suggest, however, that there has been another change which is more extensive and more significant, but not as widely recognized. I refer to the change in young people themselves. Like technical change this is accelerating, I don't know of anything, Mr. Speaker, that has changed as much in the last ten years as the way in which young people look at the world, look at themselves, and approach their relationship with their fellows, their family, and their institutions. This has been the biggest revolution in our entire society.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Lloyd: — I submit that it's a fact of more real significance than the scientific skills which allow men to walk and to talk in space. I think we have all been slow in recognizing this fact. We even have been unwilling to admit it when we do recognize it. In the majority I think adults are afraid of it.

I suggest that there is a great potential in this fact of change in the young people. It's true, Mr. Speaker, that very frequently these young people can see problems quite clearly which are blurred for the rest of us because of our very experience. Very frequently the young people can see solutions which are blocked to us because of our inhibitions.

I want to emphasize, Mr. Speaker, the fact that young people today are not content just to be consumers of society. They are particularly not content to be consumers of a society which has been entirely designed, prefabricated and assembled by someone else. As their own education improves, as they see more and more of the world through reading material, through radio, through television, through records, as they are exposed more and more to sources of stimulation to all their senses, they

become more restless and they become more inquiring. Along with this, they become less willing to accept the traditional boundaries of thought and behaviour imposed by institutions including education.

This, Mr. Speaker, has great meaning for education. I hope we are grasping it, but I fear we are not. Young people today feel more competent because of this enlarged and extended experience to take part in determining the disciplines under which they live. They feel more competent to take part in deciding the goals of the game and the rules of the game. I submit they are more competent. I urge recognition of this competence by education officials and I urge that we take steps to make use of this competence. This competence is available to us at the level of the university and it is available to us at the level of the secondary schools. Recognition of this competence and use of this competence is one of the answers to high school dropout which is still one of our most serious problems. I urge the Minister of Education (Mr. McIsaac) and his staff to promote in high schools a part for students in making decisions about curriculum and courses. Let's have for them a part in making decisions about the structure of the school society which is their society if it is anybody's.

May I urge programs of teacher education, so that teachers will be better prepared to play their essential role in a school using the competency of its students to think and to responsibly decide about things that count for them. May I urge, Mr. Speaker, there be arrangements that the representatives of these students can get together not only in their schools but also in regions of the province and on a province-wide basis. Let's make available for these young people a forum and a challenge for them to organize their thoughts and articulate their ideas. You know we make these kind of arrangements for basketball, track and field, and curling, and this is good. Let's make comparable arrangements for those whose excellence of contribution is in other fields.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Lloyd: — Let's give them a chance to at least influence the major decisions about a major part of their society, their schools. And if we do this, we will all benefit with them. We will be happier parents, we will teach with greater satisfaction, as part of the dividends. Mr. Speaker, On another occasion I hope to have something more to say about the role for university students in this way.

I want to spend a bit of time in talking about the University needs, particularly with respect to buildings. Members will have noticed that the Budget provides capital for the University in the following amounts and the following ways: \$8.2 million certain, \$1 million conditional on private sources matching \$1 million, and \$1.25 million for servicing the debt of the last two or possibly three years. So if there is a private

March 11, 1968

contribution of \$1 million then the University will have available for building this year, as a result of this Budget, \$10.2 million.

May we note, Mr. Speaker, the situation last year. There was a \$2 million grant in the original estimate, there was, \$1 million supplementary estimate, there was a loan of \$9.3 million, making a total of \$12.3 million. In other words, last year our Budget provided in one way or another \$12.3 million for construction of University buildings. This year the maximum, Mr. Speaker, it provides \$10,2 million. There is \$2 million of money less for University buildings this year than last. Of Provincial money, there is actually \$3.1 million less in this year's Budget than last year.

What does this provide for during the years 1968-69 and 70? Well at Saskatoon it provides for the Veterinary College, partly paid for with grants from the Federal Government. This will be occupied in large part by August, 1968. It provides on that campus for the Education Building which will be occupied in large part in September of 1969. With the completion of the Veterinary College there will be some new classes to be accommodated so it is not all net gain. With the completion of the Education Building there may or may not be a phasing out of the what's called the Avenue A Campus, the old former Teachers College. This I know was the original idea and it may not be involved in this particular scheme.

In Regina, Mr. Speaker, the first new building for classroom space will be the Education Building which is expected to be largely finished on September 1, 1970. I think we must note for the Regina campus there is no added space in 1968, none in 1969 and nothing until September 1, 1970. By the time there is new space provided for by this program there will have been three new groups of high school graduates to be accommodated. We have to raise the question of adequacy.

About student housing we had an announcement over a year ago by the Premier (Mr. Thatcher) of the large development here in Regina. He said at that time there would be money in last year's Budget. There wasn't and there is nothing in it this year.

We have to admit that campus conditions are already crowded. Knowing the increased enrolment to come and noting the provisions made by this Budget we have to admit that the crowded conditions are certain to get worse. And I submit that the problem in a short time, if not now, will not be with university dropouts. The problem will be with university shutouts because there won't be enough space.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Lloyd: — I say all this, Mr. Speaker, realizing full well that there

is a great deal of money involved, and that the Government is providing a large amount of money in this Budget. But I wish they would quit pretending that this is going to solve all the problems or that it is even reasonably adequate to meet the needs. Here again, we would be better off if they admitted the facts and faced the difficulty squarely along with the people of the province.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Lloyd: — Mr. Speaker, in the Throne Speech debate, I reviewed at some length the Government's handling of relationships with the University during recent months. I won't repeat what I said at that time, but I did say and this I repeat. "The whole affair was unprovoked, unnecessary and unproductive." I don't wonder that the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Estey) this afternoon urged that it be not discussed in any detail or at any length.

Mr. Speaker, I have as much reason to be proud of the University of Saskatchewan as any Member of this House. I want to repeat the comment I made in an address several months ago:

Only a very strong position by faculty, university administration, students and friends of the University can save Saskatchewan and the University of Saskatchewan from very great harm. I fervently hope they are equal to the task.

That statement I submit is as true and as necessary now as it was at that time. In the meantime I'm happy that there has been enough public protest to change the Government's mind about a number of proposals. I am happy that there has been enough public reaction, so that they have decided not to proceed with a number of proposals which they made in public without any University consultation whatsoever.

According to press statements this Government had been prepared (1) to make widespread changes in The University Act. (2) to take complete control of University finances. (3) to treat the University as another department of government so far as estimates were concerned, (4) to present University estimates in a long series of sub-votes.

I am glad that there has been a change from those positions to the present one. This indicates that some progress and protection have been forced by official and public reaction to unwise and dangerous proposals. Mr. Speaker, I want to go on and say that the captain or the crew that judge the danger of an iceberg from the ice seen above the surface are neither seaworthy nor safe. I submit we have to view the Government's attitude toward the University as an iceberg. This Legislature will be on guard against any further signs of willingness on the part of the Government to exert unwise or destructive

March 11, 1968

influence on the University of Saskatchewan.

I want to deal briefly, Mr. Speaker, with just one more topic, because again it is a danger, I submit, that all of us need to be aware of. I was pleased to hear the comments of the Member who just took his seat before I rose (Mr. Forsyth), giving the speech which he had given this afternoon. He had some comments to make, as I understood them, about possibly changed procedures in the House. I agree this is something that we ought to look at. There is a new procedure which has crept up in this House which I think he and other backbenchers with him, ought to examine very closely. That is the tendency of the present Government to refuse information to this Legislature.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Lloyd: — Time after time, it has said to the Legislature and to the public of Saskatchewan, “You have no right to know these things.” I might just recall a few examples. Last year, The Manpower Report. We finally got it — refused at first, after it became known that an agency of the Federal Government had been quite willing to give us one, the Government agreed to table it. The Saskatchewan Power Corporation telecast of its so-called annual report, first refused, then agreed to, but held up by the Government until the session had finished. We wanted to know, and should have had a right to know, the number of students turned away from technical training because of lack of space. The Government agreed to give it to us and sat on the answer. No, it didn’t fail to table the answer because it didn’t know the answer. It didn’t table it because it knew the answer and it didn’t want the facts to be known.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Lloyd: — We tried to get the number of students receiving Saskatchewan Government loans. This was passed by this House. This was ordered by this Legislature, but the information was never provided. Again I submit it wasn’t provided not because the Government didn’t have the answer, it wasn’t provided because it did have the answer and it didn’t want it known to the public.

Let me move to this year. We are still waiting for the information about technical students turned away. We are still waiting for the number of students receiving Saskatchewan Government loans. In addition there is the report on post-secondary education which I referred to a minute ago. The Minister hasn’t denied that he has had it in his hands since about midsummer; these were the press report statements from his predecessor. We have asked three times about it since this session began. His first comment was that he (Mr. McIsaac) would look into it, his second comment was maybe, his third comment was yes, he would table it. He hasn’t done so yet and that was at least

a week ago. This House was denied information with respect to what property the Government owns in one constituency on the basis that the Government didn't know where the constituency boundaries are. We weren't able to get tabled in this House information as to the sale of Government property which had been acquired at the cost of three-quarters of a million dollars by the Saskatchewan taxpayers. We want to know the effects of the study made about deterrent fees in the Swift Current Health Region. We were told, "You have no right to know." The Government is saying there are abuses to this, and we want to know about these abuses. There is a study of conditions in our province which it has made and it refuses to tell us what is in this study. We wanted to know about the contract whereby the Government sold gas-bearing properties in south western Saskatchewan, about the sale price. We want to know what it is costing us to buy back this gas; the Government has said, "You have no right to know." We want to know about the Saskatchewan Pulp Company, the company which is described as "a wholly-owned subsidiary" of the Saskatchewan Timber Board. The Government says, "You have no right to know." We own it, we paid for it, we pay people to operate it, if there are losses we are going to pay for them. The Government says, "You have no right to know," until at least four years from now. Mr. Speaker, I suggest to my Hon. Friend who sat down awhile ago, talking about reform of the House (Mr. Forsyth) that he should look at some problems like that while he is looking at some other things.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Lloyd: — This Government has proven by its actions that it would like to reduce the work of this Legislature to a ritual, rather than use it as a meaningful exercise of self-government by elected representatives of the people. There was a column in the newspaper, Mr. Speaker, awhile ago by Peter Newman. He talked about the Federal Liberals and how they really never liked doing things in Parliament, how they much preferred doing things behind closed doors. I don't know how bad they are, Mr. Speaker, but they are pikers beside the group that sit in this Legislature as the Government now.

Mr. Speaker, may I ask the privilege of adjourning the debate.

Debate adjourned.

MOTION

FLAG COMMITTEE

Hon. W.R. Thatcher: (Premier) — Mr. Speaker, I would move, seconded by the Hon. Attorney General (Mr. Heald):

That the Special Committee constituted by resolution of the Assembly dated February 28, 1968, to consider the

March 11, 1968

matter of selecting a design for a distinctive flag for the Province of Saskatchewan be composed of Messieurs Gardner, Breker, Hooker, Schmeiser, McIvor, MacDonald, MacLennan, Davies, Pepper, Thibault, Matsalla, and Kwasnica, and that Standing Order 51 be suspended in relation thereto.

Motion agreed to.

SECOND READINGS

Hon. D.V. Heald (Attorney General) moved second reading of Bill No. 5 — **An Act to Facilitate the Division of Buildings into Separately Owned Units.**

He said: Mr. Speaker, this Act provides for the division of property into units to be individually owned and common elements to be owned in common by the owners of the unit. It also provides an administrative framework to enable the owners to manage the property. I could give the House an example where the Act might apply. It could be a high-rise building containing residential units, each of the units is individually owned and the remainder of the property including the roof, the basement or the parking area and the garden might be owned in common by the owners of the other units. Another example would be an industrial development including a cluster of small factories or shops. Each would be individually owned and the remainder of the property including the service facilities would be owned in common by these owners. In each an administrative framework enables the owners to manage the property for the common benefit and each owner must contribute to the common expenses. This is condominium of course.

Condominium provides the amenities of apartment living on a shared-cost basis with the advantages of home ownership. As contrasted with co-operative developments this type of ownership provides lower risks and greater flexibility in the financing. Lower risks result from the fact that each unit in a condominium is separately taxed and individually financed and accordingly no unit owner is liable on the default of another. Again because each unit is a separate property interest, greater flexibility is achieved in that each owner is able to vary the financing to suit his own needs and desires. An obvious question I suppose is whether this enabling legislation for condominium development is necessary in our province. We feel it is. The existing common law and existing legislation present in our view formidable difficulties. The general prohibition of positive covenants running with the land makes the imposition of obligations on subsequent purchases awkward or impossible; the rules of future interests limit and complicate provisions for the eventual termination of the interests of the owners; the attitude of the common law towards the ownership and sub-division of space may not be entirely clear; these are some of the problems.

Descriptions of cubes of space are more easily imagined than prepared; municipal taxes would probably be assessed against the property owned in common as one parcel, impairing the advantage of financial independence that might be expected to accompany ownership; mechanics' liens against the property owned in common would have the same effect; the express provisions of planning restrictions on the sub-division of land would probably apply even though the spirit might not. This enabling legislation will avoid some of the particular difficulties raised by the existing law, and perhaps more important will present a relatively simple and comprehensive framework for development. The bylaws which are contemplated may control occupation and use but not so as to prohibit or restrict the devolution of units or any transfer, lease or disposition or dealing therewith. Planning restrictions will undoubtedly affect both use and design.

Now I should tell Hon. Members that, when this Bill reaches Committee, I will be proposing House amendments to make it crystal clear and to ensure that a condominium plan would apply to row housing development. It is not completely clear in the Bill as you have it and as printed. We will be introducing House amendments to make sure it is clear beyond any doubt that it will apply to row housing development. I have had a number of inquiries about this. This follows a suggestion from the Builders Association and other people who are interested. There will be other minor House amendments which I think improve the Bill. There is a suggestion there will be a House amendment which will remove the requirement for an architect's certificate to be given to the plan under the provisions of The Saskatchewan Architects Act which apply to any building where the costs exceeds \$15,000 but not under \$15,000. Then we are going to bring in another amendment providing for the registration of a conditional sale agreement along the lines of the provisions for filing a mechanics' lien, already contained in Section 45. This would provide for the filing of a conditional sales agreement in the Land Titles Office against the unit where goods are fixed to the unit at the request of the owner, or against the plan where the goods are fixed to the unit or the common property at the request of the corporation. Then there is one other small amendment suggested by the Legislative Counsel for clarification. But, Mr. Speaker, these are the main principles of this Bill and with that explanation I would move second reading.

Mr. A.E. Blakeney: (Regina Centre) — Mr. Speaker, I wonder whether before the Attorney General takes his seat, he would be able either now or when he is closing the debate to deal with the questions of civil rights, i.e. are any of the provisions going to be able to operate so as to discriminate on the basis of race, creed or color; that sort of thing, and secondly the question of Land Titles' titles. How are you going to sell one of these things, how it will work at the Land Titles Office?

March 11, 1968

Mr. E. Whelan: (Regina North West) — Mr. Speaker, we are in favor of the principles contained in this Bill. We have been advocating this type of ownership for sometime. We think it is quite versatile and has some real advantages. It has operated successfully for a few years in other provinces. I think in one respect it does provide security against increased rents, particularly for retired people.

If senior citizens want to sell their homes they can move into this type of accommodation, buy ownership in it and they are safe from constantly increasing rents.

This procedure will automatically make available more family homes if a retired couple move from a family home and sell to another group with children.

For this reason and because of its versatility we plan to support the Bill.

Mr. Heald: — Mr. Speaker, in closing the debate, and in replying to the Hon. Member for Regina Centre (Mr. Blakeney), I think the questions he raises can properly be dealt with in Committee. I don't think there is any problem. If there are I will get an undertaking to bring in a House amendment, but I think it can be dealt with in Committee. With that in mind I would move second reading.

Motion agreed to and Bill read a second time.

Hon. D. Boldt (Minister of Highways) moved second reading of Bill No. 41 — **An Act to Amend The Automobile Accident Insurance Act.**

He said: Mr. Speaker, the Act to Amend The Automobile Accident Insurance Act sets out some changes in this Bill and they deal primarily with the administration matters related to the application of some clauses of The Automobile Accident Insurance Act. A change in one of the criteria in applying the \$25 accident surcharge is set out in Section 2 subsection (2) of this Bill. After one year of application of a surcharge on drivers we believe a number of equally negligent drivers are improperly exempted from the surcharge, because the degree of fault must be more than 50 per cent. This change will not impose a hardship on any drivers who are involved in a collision that is humanly unavoidable. Other changes related to the accident surcharge are designed to provide a consistent method of approval for changes in premiums to allow drivers to appeal their liability to pay the surcharge to purchase a valid licence without affecting their rights of appeal, and to ensure every driver, including police officers, the right to appear before a magistrate if they lodge an appeal.

Section 4 will allow for greater flexibility of payment under part 2 of the Act.

Section 5 is designed to encourage better ambulance service to accident victims by guaranteeing payment for services.

Section 6 applies the same limitation of action to The Automobile Accident Insurance Act as applied to all other automobile policies under The Saskatchewan Insurance Act.

Section 7 applies the same conditions to payments made on claims arising from hit-and-run accidents as are applicable to payments on claims arising from accidents caused by the uninsured motorist.

Mr. Speaker, this in brief, is the substance of the Bill, and I would move second reading.

Mr. Whelan: — I beg leave to adjourn the debate.

Debate adjourned.

The Assembly adjourned at 10:00 o'clock p.m.