

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN
First Session — Sixteenth Legislature
20th Day

Wednesday, March 13, 1968

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

On the Orders of the Day.

WELCOME TO STUDENTS

Mr. F. Meakes: (Touchwood) — Mr. Speaker, I would through you and to the Members of this Legislature introduce a group of grade 12 students situated in the west gallery from Dysart high school under the guidance of their teacher, Mr. Bill. I'm sure that all Members will join with me in wishing them an enjoyable stay in this Chamber and that their return home will be safe after having acquired further knowledge of parliamentary procedures.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. T.M. Weatherald: (Cannington) — Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to your attention a group of students that I am rather biased in favor of, they come from my home town of Wawota, There are approximately 80 of them here led by their principal, Mr. MacMillan, their teachers, Mr. Matvianko and Mrs. Wilson. They have toured the University campus this morning and are now looking at the Legislature. I'm sure all Members of this Assembly will hope that they have a most interesting time in watching our democratic procedures.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. H.H.P. Baker (Regina South East) — Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to welcome a group of grade eight students from Thomson school, accompanied by their very capable principal, Miss Gatton. This school has fond memories for me because my daughter took her public school education there sometime ago. Also during these years I had very close association with the Home and School Association there. We welcome them most heartily this afternoon. We wish them a pleasant stay here and trust that they will gain much from the deliberations this afternoon. Also a warm welcome to the Argyle students, as well as Holy Rosary's.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. D.A. McPherson: (Regina South West) — Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to introduce to you and to the Members of the Assembly, two groups of students from the constituency of Regina South West. First I would like to introduce the grade eight students from Holy Rosary, Mr. Speaker. They are 35 in number. They are here with their teacher, Mr. Halter. The second group, Mr. Speaker, I would like to introduce to you are the students from Argyle school and they are here with Mr. Hutcherson. It is my hope and the hope, I feel, the wish of this House that their stay here will be enjoyable and I want to congratulate the two teachers for bringing these groups, Mr. Speaker.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. J.E. Brockelbank: (Saskatoon Mayfair) — Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to introduce through you, Mr. Speaker, two groups of students from the constituency of Saskatoon-Mayfair. They are from Estey public school, a grade seven class, situated in the east gallery. They are here with their teacher, Mrs. Needham. There is a group of students from St. Edward's separate school which is very close to my residence in Saskatoon. I want to take the opportunity to welcome them both and hope they have an educational stay here in the Chamber and a pleasant trip back to Saskatoon Mayfair.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

CONDOLENCES

Hon. W.R. Thatcher: (Premier) — Mr. Speaker, I should like to officially draw the attention of the House to the death of Mr. W.S. Kerr, a long-time Member of this Legislature. Mr. Kerr was a former editor of the Regina Leader Post, and former Commissioner of the Red Cross for Saskatchewan. He was interested in Boy Scout work and for a number of years he was Minister of Natural Resources. I should therefore like to move, Mr. Speaker, seconded by the Hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Lloyd) by leave of the Assembly:

Resolved, That this Assembly records with sorrow and regret the death on Monday last of William Franklin Kerr who sat in this Assembly for Regina City from 1934 to 1938 and for Turtleford from 1938 to 1944. From 1935 to 1944 he held office as Minister of Natural Resources. He was born in Goderich, Ontario, on October 25, 1876, and educated at St. Thomas and Grand Rapids, Michigan: He was a journalist and a public servant.

Mr. R.H. Wooff: (Turtleford) — I would like at this time, Mr. Speaker, to extend to the family of Mr. Kerr my sympathy. Mr. Kerr filled a very important place in the life and history of our province. Coming into it in the very early years of the century, he was prominent in the newspaper field; he had also been prominent in the political life of our province. Mr. Kerr represented the constituency which it is now my honor to represent, from 1938 to 1944 as Minister of Natural Resources. Again I tender Mr. Kerr's family my sincere sympathy.

Mr. Thatcher: — Mr. Speaker, I move seconded by the Hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Lloyd), by leave of the Assembly:

That the Resolution just passed, together with the transcripts of oral tributes be communicated to the bereaved family, by Mr. Speaker.

Motion agreed to.

QUESTIONS

STATEMENT RE DISCONTINUATION OF FEES AFTER 90 DAY HOSPITAL STAY

March 13, 1968

Mr. Romanow: (Saskatoon Riversdale) — Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, I wonder if I might be able to direct a question to the Hon. Premier (Mr. Thatcher). In this morning's Regina Leader Post on the first page there is a newspaper report of a speech delivered by the Hon. Premier to the Saskatchewan Association of Rural Municipalities. One paragraph of the newspaper report, Mr. Speaker, said, referring to the Premier, that: "He said he hoped the fees would be discontinued after the first 90 days of a patient's stay in hospital" and I assume the Hon. Premier is referring to the deterrent fees on Hospitalization and Medicare. I'm wondering if the Hon. Premier would indicate to the House whether or not that's enunciation of Government policy on this matter.

Mr. Thatcher: — Mr. Speaker, I said I hoped that that would be Government policy, but such policy will be announced by the Minister of Health (Mr. Grant) when the Bill is in front of the Legislature.

Hon. W.S. Lloyd: (Leader of the Opposition) — Another question on this. The Premier said when the Bill is before the Legislature, can I take it from that that we will have the regulations which make the Bill applicable in the hands of the Members when the legislation is to be debated.

Mr. Thatcher: — I would think this is very doubtful.

TABLING OF ORDERS FOR RETURN

Mr. F.A. Dewhurst: (Wadena) — Mr. Speaker, I would like to inquire of the Government when we may expect the tabling of some of the Orders for Return? There have been 61 Orders for Return passed by this House, 44 of those were in February. So far, we have only received five Orders for Return, four of which were asked for in February, one which was asked for in March. Some of these Orders for Return we would wish to have before we get into Estimates and I wish the Government would try and speed these up for us.

Mr. Thatcher: — I will assure the Hon. Member that these Orders will be brought down before the end of the session if our civil servants can get to it.

ADJOURNED DEBATES

BUDGET DEBATE

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

Hon. A.R. Guy: (Minister of Public Works) — Mr. Speaker, when I adjourned the debate last night I had outlined the programs that my Department had carried out over the last year, and our plans for the coming year. Before proceeding with the Budget itself, there were two more programs I didn't have time to mention last night that I would wish to mention briefly: the Municipal Airstrip Improvement Program

and the Assisted Passage Program.

The Municipal Airstrip improvement Program has proven very popular and has been instrumental providing financial assistance to many smaller communities across the province in improving their local airstrips. With the increased industrial growth and tourist traffic throughout our province, these local airstrips are becoming of even greater importance. The program provides financial assistance up to \$2,500 for improvement projects on local airstrips. Since the inception of the program, over \$90,000 in grants have been approved for 42 towns across the province, and an additional 13 applications are presently being considered, representing an additional \$20,000. This program will be continued during the coming fiscal year.

The Department of Public Works is also responsible for the financing and administration of an Assistance Passage Program for teachers and certain classes of professional employees for Government service. A total of \$103,000 has been expended to date on this program, resulting in approximately 475 immigrants and their dependents coming to the province. This program has been particularly helpful in supplying teachers for Saskatchewan schools. This program too will be continued during the coming year.

Also last evening I said how disappointed I was with the speech of the Member from The Battlefords (Mr. Kramer). I was sorry he was not in his seat last night and I notice that he is not in his seat again today. I'm sure that there are many people in the North Battleford area who wonder why they ever elected him to this Legislature for the few moments that he takes the time to spend here. Now, Mr. Speaker, when I concluded my remarks in the Throne debate, I pointed out the speech was worthy of support, because the Liberal Government under Premier Thatcher was doing what was right and it had acted for four years as the most responsible Government in Canada. I said also that I hoped the Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Steuart) in his Budget would follow the same policy of responsibility in doing what was right. Because he did follow that policy, the majority of the people in this province, I'm sure, are prepared to support it and I also am pleased to participate in the Budget debate at this time. The Liberal Government has put political expedience aside and is facing up to the problems that face the Province at this moment. We have a responsibility to keep our Province in a strong financial position, and to provide services based on the ability of people to pay. This is the policy that permeates the Budget that was brought down the other day.

It is true that the Budget was rather severe, but a severe situation demands severe action. The Provincial Treasurer and other speakers on this side of the House have done a good job of showing why such a Budget was necessary, and I am convinced that four years from now the people of Saskatchewan will thank us for our courage to face the problems of the day with honesty and integrity, that their future will be assured. They recall only too well what happened in our province when the Socialists placed politics ahead of people and ahead of responsibility. The irresponsibility and concern of the Socialists are still evident from the speeches of Members opposite. They have pretended real concern and shock for the people of Saskatchewan, but it is only pretence for while they are condemning the tax increases they are demanding services which if implemented would need many, many more millions of dollars, which would come only from the taxpayers of this province. The truth is, they can

March 13, 1968

hardly contain themselves. They are happy that taxes are going up because they think it will hurt us politically. Proof of this is the demands of each speaker that we resign and call another election. Rather than act as a responsible Opposition they would gladly plunge the Province into the expense of both time and money for another election campaign to satisfy their own political aims. Mr. Speaker, they never seem to learn. In 1964, they were so anxious to have an election they couldn't wait until June. They called it in April and ended up on the other side of the House. We hadn't been the Government for more than two years when they started challenging us again to call an election. To satisfy them, we called one last fall and came back with an increased majority of 11.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Guy: — Now less than six months after their defeat, they are talking election again. It will come and when it does there will be fewer of them to return to this House. However, before we do we have a program to carry out, of which this year's Throne Speech and Budget are part, and Members opposite would be advised to act as a responsible Opposition, something which they have failed to do up to this point.

So as we come down to the last stages of this debate, it is evident that Members opposite are wallowing in a slough of confusion. Inconsistency is apparent in every speech we have heard. This is to be expected from new Opposition Members to this House, who after all would like to get re-elected at least once, but it should not be tolerated from the old guard that sit in the front benches. New Members think they must criticize tax increases because they have been told to do so, but at the same time they want to do what is right for their constituency, but they can't do both. If the Liberal Government is so wrong and as irresponsible as the Opposition have claimed, they have certainly had the opportunity to prove us guilty, but to this point, they have failed to do so. I hope to show you by reference to some of the arguments that they have used that they have failed completely to understand the Budget that is before us or to offer any clear alternatives to the Budget under discussion. One can't help but wonder how long some of the Members opposite will be in this House, if they continue to make the speeches that they have made in this debate. The dominant characteristic common to each and everyone of them has been confusion and irresponsibility. The other day, the Member for Kinistino (Mr. Thibault) made a serious charge against our Air Ambulance Service in an attempt to discredit it in the eyes of the public. I want at the outset to pay tribute to our Air Ambulance Service. There is no more conscientious and dedicated group of public servants anywhere in Canada. They have become true angels of mercy and the remarks of the Member opposite are totally unwarranted. The MLA for Kinistino raised a specific case whereby he charged that a serious case occurred whereby a call was made to the Air Ambulance in Saskatoon at 1:00 p.m. and the plane didn't arrive until 7:00 p.m. In checking out the facts of this case, Mr. Speaker, it appears that at 3:30 p.m. a call was received from Melfort requesting service. Radio contact was made with an ambulance flight that was returning from La Ronge and the aircraft arrived at Melfort at 5:55 p.m., picked up the patient and returned to Saskatoon. So the actual facts are, Mr. Speaker, the call was received at 3:30 p.m. rather than 1:00 p.m. as claimed by the Member. The plane arrived at 5:55 p.m. not 7:00 p.m. as claimed by the MLA.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Guy: — Total elapse of time was 2 hours and 25 minutes, not 6 hours as he' reported. And what is more important, Mr. Speaker, there was no evidence in the medical record that would indicate that the ambulance call was of a serious nature. If it had been, a plane would have been dispatched immediately from our Regina base. So it is obvious that the Member opposite had deliberately distorted the truth in an effort to discredit the Air Ambulance and the Provincial Government. This is a cheap, but typical action of Members opposite to distort a specific case of sickness or misfortune in an attempt to gain political position.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Guy: — The former Member for Melville, Hon. J.W. Gardiner, had to work hard to get his colleagues to support demands for a Provincial building in Melville. Finally he did convince them and plans were finalized and tenders let for the construction of such a building. It must have been a shock to the Melville city council, Chamber of Commerce and others who pressed so hard for this building to hear their new Member in his first speech say that they didn't need a Provincial office building, but they wanted a new high school instead. The second shock must have been when he asked the Minister of Highways to cut \$20 million of the Highway budget which of course means he opposes the completion of paving from Yorkton to Melville, the oiling of No. 15 from Melville to Fenwood and the completion of grading and gravelling from Lemberg to No. 10 highway. I'm sure his constituents will have second thoughts about his election to the Legislature, and I'm sorry he is not in his seat today to hear it.

The Member from Weyburn (Mr. Pepper) was somewhat different in his approach. He's not in his seat either. He spent a minute bemoaning the high taxes apparent in the Budget, then for 10 minutes he outlined the greatest spending spree ever heard in this House. He advocated much greater expenditure on agriculture, more money set aside for Welfare, higher social aid payments, a drug program, higher teachers' salaries, free bus fares for senior citizens, a new comprehensive high school and three highways in his constituency which should have top priority. So while the financial critic on his side of the House gave 10 ways to cut taxes, the MLA from Weyburn in his irresponsible manner, suggested 10 ways to increase taxes.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Guy: — I am sure that his constituents will have some second thoughts about re-electing him to the Legislature.

The Member from Regina South East, the Mayor, (Mr. Baker), had to had to think of both his positions so his main request was unconditional grants to municipalities, no doubt so he can use them to make a good fellow of himself politically.

The Member for Regina North West (Mr. Whelan) carried on his government's vendetta against industry. Like others opposite, he is gloating over the problems facing the potash industry today. Nothing would make them happier than to see the

March 13, 1968

potash industry fail in this province for their own political gain. His anti-American remarks were only tempered by his great concern for his Communist friends throughout the world. But I can tell him and other Members opposite that without American and other foreign capital, there would not be a potash industry in Saskatchewan today.

I was pleased to see that the senior Member for Moose Jaw (Mr. Davis) brought more consistency and responsibility to his speech than his colleagues. He was concerned about the staggering tax load and he called on the Government to reduce spending wherever possible. In reply to his plea, I am pleased to announce to the people of Moose Jaw today that as a result of their Member's request for us to reduce spending that my Department will not be building an office building in Moose Jaw this year.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Guy: — While the Members I have mentioned may be forgiven for the confusion, it is not so easy to forgive the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Lloyd) and their financial critic (Mr. Blakeney) for theirs. After all they are both former Provincial Treasurers and as such should know better than to make the kind of speeches that they have made. The arguments of the two Members opposite must be weighed in two respects. First of all, are their arguments based on facts, and secondly, how do they relate to the actions and speeches of the CCF Government when they were in office and when they were the Provincial Treasurers?

It was difficult to sit through the speech of the Leader of the Opposition yesterday. Not only was it boring, but it was full of the same renunciation of his former speeches that we found the financial critic resorting to. He seemed to forget that he too had presented a Budget in this House. But I am going to remind him of his thinking on that occasion. Yesterday the main theme of his speech was the tremendous tax increases. It is true, our Provincial Treasurer stated that we had several alternatives — we could reduce services and maintain taxes at the same level. We could increase services and have deficit finance, or we could increase services and increase the taxes on those who would use those services. We chose the latter course because it was the responsible approach to our economy at this time. What did the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Lloyd) do when faced with a similar problem in 1961? Did he choose one of the possibilities that I mentioned? No, he did not. He did all three. He decreased services, deficit financed and raised taxes all at the same time. He could say with apologies to Shakespeare, "Yon Woodrow had a lean and hungry look."

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Guy: — In fact these are his exact words from his Budget debate of that year. He said:

We faced three alternatives: one was to reduce the level of capital expenditures; a second was to deficit finance, the other was to increase taxes.

And he went on to say that:

And I'm proud that the Government decided to accept the combination of all three.

The only Provincial Treasurer in the history of the province to deprive people of services at the same time as he increased their taxes. He said yesterday that our Provincial Treasurer should be removed. Well, he was removed a short time afterwards by his own leader. Let's look at his record. This too was in the Budget debate of that year. Mineral and Natural Resources Department cut \$1.1 million; Agriculture was maintained at the current year's level; Public Works construction reduced; construction expenditure on highways, reduced; grants for municipal roads, reduced. Five Departments up, five Departments had their services cut. Now what about his record with the important Departments he is always referring to as the Departments where people come first. He was a big sport in the education field. He increased the operating grant by \$550,000 compared to our \$3.6 million this year. What about capital grants? Well here are his exact words:

It has been, agreed with the University to defer a portion of the Province's annual construction grant to a later time.

No, increase, but a decrease, and it was actions like this, Mr. Speaker, that built up the backlog of University construction that the Liberal Government is trying to overcome.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Guy: — What about his concern for health? Again his words condemn him:

But it seems to us that the hospitals must bend every effort to find administrative economies and to eliminate the least essential services.

Strange words when one considers the great spending spree he would like to see the Liberal Government embark on today. So, Mr. Speaker, two more Departments came up, two more Departments came down. A total of seven Departments felt the knife of the Leader of the Opposition when he was the Provincial Treasurer. So services were down, now what about taxes? Again here are his exact words: "The Saskatchewan Liquor Board has been asked to increase the prices of alcoholic beverages." Then he turned to the gasoline tax, what did he recommend here? He increased the fuel petroleum products tax by two cents per gallon, and as an additional blow he raised the tax on diesel fuel by five cents, and this cruel blow came when he reduced the highway program. Talk about deceit, nothing could be more deceitful than this. So, Mr. Speaker, services were down, taxes were up, and on top of this he budgeted for a deficit of \$2.6 million. This was a fiscal program for the people of Saskatchewan as outlined by Woodrow S. Lloyd in 1961. The same type of budgeting was followed in 1962 under his successor, the Hon. Member from Regina Centre (Mr. Blakeney), the Opposition financial critic. Never

March 13, 1968

in the history of the province have there been two Provincial Treasurers as irresponsible and blind to the needs of the people of this province as those two Members who sit in the front benches opposite.

No wonder they criticize the Budget based on responsibility, it is completely foreign to their thinking. I must say the Member for Regina Centre gave one of his better performances the other day. I call it a performance because it was one. For two hours and fifteen minutes we saw him wave his arms; point his finger and beat his chest like a modern day Tarzan of the Apes. He is certainly more entertaining than his Leader, but he has to be at his best with the leadership hopefuls breathing down his neck. But what he said was far more revealing than the antics he went through while saying it. He started out by singing "What a Difference a Day Makes," but on reading his Budget speech delivered in 1962, I'm wondering at the difference that a few years make. Either he believes what he told us then or he believes what he tells us now. It has to be one or the other, because any similarity between the two speeches is purely coincidental as I will point out. The main point of his speech the other day was high taxes and he referred to the Liberal promise in 1964 to lower taxes. Mr. Speaker, the Liberal Government did honor that commitment made in 1964. For three and one-half years, while every Province in Canada was either raising taxes or deficit financing, Saskatchewan was reducing the taxes and balancing the Budget.

No better comparison can be made than with our sister Provinces of Manitoba and Alberta. Manitoba increased her sales tax in one year alone from nothing to 6 per cent and Alberta had a deficit of over \$100 million in the past year. In fact almost every Province in Canada is in financial trouble today because they have failed to show fiscal responsibility over the past few years. What was the Saskatchewan record on tax reduction? I'm not going to take the time to repeat what was repeated by the Member for Milestone (Mr. MacDonald) so well yesterday. But the fact is that we did reduce the taxes. So, Mr. Speaker, the Liberal Government did keep its promise and because we did, the people of Saskatchewan had the benefit of four years of reduced taxes that they would never have had under a Socialist Government, and which no other Province in Canada has had in the past four years. With these reduced taxes the Province received more services and higher standards of living than ever before in its history.

Naturally we would have liked to continue a policy of increasing services and reducing taxes, but we know that this can't go on forever. What we did prove was that under the Socialists the people were over-taxed and had the highest per capita tax in Canada, which we reduced to where we are now one of the lowest. Now that we have reached this position and have also reached the position where productivity and services are in line, from here on it means that for new services we must have more productivity or higher taxes. We have increased our productivity and the efficiency of our Government over the last four years, but the demands for services have outstripped this, so higher taxes or deficit financing must result. We chose the former as the more responsible approach.

It is these tax increases that we are proposing that the financial critic said the other day were so shocking, and which he argued against most strongly. But how his views have changed: In 1962, he said in his Budget speech, and I would like to

quote:

It is easy enough to argue against taxation, but to argue against taxation is simply to argue that material goods that the tax money might have purchased are more important than the health and welfare of our people. What is more, this view could well lead to a slower rate of economic growth.

What a difference six years make! This is just the opposite of what he is saying now. Did he mean what he said then or was he trying to deceive the public? If he believed it then, then he must be trying to deceive the public now.

No, Mr. Speaker, the Liberal Government is not prepared to barter education and other Government services, so let us look at what our Provincial Treasurer did compared to the Member opposite who was so severe in his criticism the other day. This year our Provincial Treasurer increased our spending in education by \$19.1 million over last year, compared to \$4.1 million over the previous year by the financial critic that sits opposite. We increased our operating grants to the university by \$3.6 million compared to his \$300,000 and our capital grants increased \$8 million compared to his \$500,000. That is why we need more money today because we can't afford to be as niggardly as our friend opposite was, if education is not to suffer the way it did under the former Government.

He was also critical about our expenditures on agriculture, but again we increased our Budget by \$2 million this year compared to the \$800,000 when he was the Provincial Treasurer. What a friend of the farmer he turned out to be. Later in his speech, the financial critic bemoaned the size of the tax increase. He said the increase of the sales tax from four to five per cent represented a stunning increase of 25 per cent. If that is true, what about the increase under his Government when the sales tax went from two to five per cent, an increase of 150 per cent.

Then he went on to the increase in the gasoline tax, this is a 13 per cent increase, but he didn't tell us that his seatmate the year before increased it by 16 per cent and the tax on diesel fuel by 43 per cent, all in one fell swoop. He also reminded us that the total increase in taxes was a savage one, I think he called it. But the people of the province remember that when he was Provincial Treasurer he couldn't wait for a regular session to dig his fingers into the taxpayer's pocket. He had to call the Legislature into a special session in the fall of 1961 in order to gouge the citizens of the province. In case he has forgotten, I will remind him of the staggering tax increases his Government placed on the people all at once. Sales tax increased from four to five per cent, corporation tax increased one per cent, six per cent surcharge on the income tax, hospital and medicare tax increased by 38 per cent, and in spite of these increases, they had a \$4 million deficit for the year and budgeted for another \$4 million deficit for the following year.

This, Mr. Speaker, is the fiscal responsibility shown by our friend opposite when he was Provincial Treasurer. He said it was for medicare, but he collected it for months before medicare ever started or any benefits were provided.

March 13, 1968

In fact, Mr. Speaker, if his Government had not constantly played politics with the hospitalization fee before every election, we wouldn't have to be looking at utilization fees today. By lowering the fees each year before an election for political purposes, the hospital plan never did get a fair opportunity to be financially sound. I would remind you our Government has refused to play politics with this premium.

The former Provincial Treasurer suggested several ways that money could be saved. Most of these have been capably answered by my colleagues, but there was one suggestion I would like to comment on. He placed first on his list the elimination of key personnel from the Government service. I must say his suggestion to remove deputy ministers, the permanent heads of a department, is unique, but I'm afraid so ridiculous that it isn't even worthy of comment.

What was his record when he was Provincial Treasurer. Two items are enough to answer. The Economic and Planning Board during the NDP's last year in office was 15; we have reduced it to nine by eliminating all the former defeated CCF candidates that were harboring there. We have reduced spending for information services from \$236,000 to \$197,000, again by eliminating the propaganda and sticking to the information that our citizens require.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Guy: — In fact, Mr. Speaker, I was surprised the former Provincial Treasurer would even raise the question of patronage and people on the Government payroll. I am only going to refer to one example of the waste and extravagance practised by the former NDP Government. I have here an Order in Council dated March 8th, 1955, whereby a person was appointed to Government service at a salary of \$6,900 per annum. Eight months later on November 18th, 1955, another OC was passed which raised this same gentleman's salary from \$6,900 to \$7,500 and the only reason given for the rapid increase — that it is deemed advisable and for the public good. Eleven months later another OC appeared raising this man's salary again from \$7,500 to \$9,300, and as if this wasn't bad enough it also provided another \$400 effective one year hence. Who was the man that had become so valuable to the NDP Government that in 19 months his salary had been raised \$2,400 or 29 per cent, while the other civil servants received almost no increase. It was none other than Allan Emrys Blakeney, Chairman of the Saskatchewan Securities Commission, and former Provincial Treasurer.

Some Hon. Members: — Shame, shame!

Mr. Guy: — This is the way the former Government abused the use of Orders in Council to reward their friends. I mentioned that the only reason given for the increase was that it was in the public good. But again I would question this, because when the Member from Regina Centre (Mr. Blakeney) was Chairman of the Securities Commission it was open season on the unsuspecting citizens of this province. Dozens of companies were organized in eastern Canada and the United States, came to Saskatchewan, were registered without any questions asked by my friend opposite, with the result that millions of dollars were literally stolen from the people of Saskatchewan, and mostly from widows and retired people who could ill afford to lose their life's

trusted the Chairman of the Securities Commission to protect their interests.

An Hon. Member: — What was his name?

Mr. Guy: — From 1955 to 1958 while the Member opposite, the Member was Chairman 33 companies he registered became defunct.

An Hon. Member: — What's his name.?

Mr. Guy: — Mr. Blakeney. Many of them had as many as three or four prospectuses approved by the Commission so that they could fleece the public again after each prospectus was approved. It wasn't until the Liberal Government was elected in 1964 that our Attorney General (Mr. Heald) put an end to this dastardly practice with a tightening up of securities legislation.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Guy: — The former Provincial Treasurer failed to convince the people in the province that our Budget is not in the public interest, because in his heart he knew his criticism is wrong. To prove this I need only to conclude by quoting again from his Budget speech of 1962 when he says what we as a Liberal Government believe today. He says:

It is far easier to call for increased services than to oppose the raising of the funds to provide the services than it is to acknowledge that reduced taxes mean reduced services and that broader services mean increased taxes.

And then he ends up his Budget debate:

Bankruptcy is the price paid by people who believe that you can have and can continue to have something for nothing.

Mr. Speaker, from his own mouth in 1962 he has accepted the principles embodied in the Budget that we will be voting on in a few hours. We regret that he did not have the honesty and integrity to say the same things that he said back in 1962, the other day. Naturally we will expect him to support our Budget and oppose his own amendment. In fact I challenge him to prove whether or not he was lying to the people in 1962 or whether he was lying to the people when he spoke in his debate. It is unfortunate that his colleagues do not think the same way as their financial critic, because bankruptcy would result from the speeches they have made.

Mr. Speaker, I had some comments I wanted to make in regard to the Water Commission and Saskatchewan Supply Board, however, my time has run out. I would like to table these remarks in case Members on either side of the House might wish to know of the programs carried out by these two bodies.

Naturally I will not support the amendment, but I will support the motion.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

March 13, 1968

Mr. T.M. Breker: (Humboldt) — Mr. Speaker, I want to congratulate you on your performance as Speaker during the past four years. Judging from your performance it is small wonder that you have been re-chosen to chair the proceedings of the Sixteenth Legislature.

I would also like to take this opportunity to publicly express my thanks to the people of the Humboldt constituency for once again placing their trust in me to serve them for another four years and I humbly accept their confidence. May I continue to merit their support.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to say something about a topic which doesn't directly affect me. However, as a Canadian and as a Saskatchewanite, the problem has bothered me and it will continue to bother me until a satisfactory solution can be found. The problem I refer to is the Indian problem.

In our one hundred years of Confederation, Canadians have been given a once-in-a-lifetime opportunity to know their land and their people, through a great chain of events sponsored by all forms of government and by the Centennial Corporation. But the ringing of church bells, centennial trains and home-town hoopla will not be enough to muffle the notes of discord which have long sounded on our Indian reservations. The Canadian Indian can be excused if he was reluctant to share in the birthday celebrations. Centennial bells may toll for the whites, but they held no message of joy or hope for those of the dark skin. For many years the Indian has been a beggar standing outside the walls of a mansion and looking into a mansion that he once owned. Our native citizens have played a mediocre role in the development of Canada in the past century. Every reservation in Canada has its anvil of experience, but the forgings have not been those of progress and of affluence. Instead, the Indians have only known poverty, apathy and despair. The Indian lost his stature little by little; he traded his energy and his industry for the white man's beads and trinkets; he exchanged his sanity for the white man's whiskey. He-surrendered his soul to the white man's missionaries. There is ample evidence that today's Treaty Indian has two strikes on him from birth, the color of his skin, and the kind of education that he will receive.

A survey in 1965 of a cross section of Canadian Indians showed that they had a per capita income which was four fifths less than that of the average Canadian citizen. Only 11 1/2 per cent of the householders earned more than \$4,000, more than a third were on relief, 61 per cent were employed fewer than six months of the year, and half the Indians worked in the resource-based industry of forestry, fishing, trapping and handicrafts. A big percentage of them were caught in poorly paid seasonal jobs, prevented from moving to better paid work by the lack of education, the lack of vocation skills, racial prejudice and physical isolation. The fast growing Indian population, which is increasing at twice the rate of the general population, in many areas is outrunning its resources. Mr. Speaker, I have four suggestions as to how we could help the Saskatchewan Indians: I think friendship centres should be established in towns and cities bordering the Indian reserves; the rapid extension of Provincial Government services in the fields of adult education and recreation to the reserves; thirdly, let us develop the Saskatchewan River Delta Area for the benefit of the Indian and for recreation.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Breker: — In the Throne debate it was suggested that huge sums of money be spent on the Saskatchewan River Delta Project. I think, rather than develop the arable land for the sole use of agriculture, I believe that it should be developed with an eye to serve both recreation and to serve the native population.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Breker: — In the reports of the Saskatchewan River Delta Development Committee, it states that some 400,000 acres consisting of the Cumberland marshes and the stagnant bog area of Birch River be developed as a wild life management scheme. Total estimate cost of the wildlife management scheme was put at \$2.3 million. The Report estimated that this scheme if initiated would provide an annual income of \$4,000 for each of about 60 families.

This area of the Delta, would also serve to meet the future demands for hunting, fishing, boating and the recreational demands that arise with increased levels of urban living. The present skills of the native population are most closely associated with trapping, hunting, guiding and lumbering. Improvement of the natural resources of the area would directly benefit the employment and the rehabilitation of the Indian and Métis residents. Further, the lack of technical knowledge regarding agricultural development would indicate the Delta is unsuited for immediate and large scale agricultural development. Hence, I would say to the Minister in charge of the Cumberland project, let us develop the area, first of all though to help the native population, to help him in an area of work that he is naturally inclined in; and secondly, to produce an unlimited source of recreation for the whole world, for Saskatchewan and Canada. Once the Delta-Cumberland area is drained, once the area is subject to the ravages of the plough, this area can never be reclaimed.

My fourth suggestion, Mr. Speaker, on how to better the lot of the Indian is this. I believe that the Indians should be represented in this Legislature. The Indian people in Saskatchewan, in my estimation, are not politically astute and in many areas have no knowledge of party differences. They only recognize that an elected Member is someone to whom they can turn for assistance regardless of party. They have had a long association with the Federal Government and sometimes this association has been an unhappy one. In many cases, they view government with suspicion and think this is particularly true of a Provincial Government. They are loath to deal with the Provincial Government for many of the many services available to them, because of an imagined fear of the loss of their Treaty rights. They must be constantly reminded that their treaties were signed with the Queen and that no Provincial legislation therefore can affect their Treaty. I think that a purely Indian election could be held in Saskatchewan, probably organized and run by their own organization, the Federation of Saskatchewan Indians. I would suggest that they elect two members; one would represent the trapping, fishing and lumbering element of the north, the other would represent the agricultural element in the south.

I believe-many white men sitting here in this Legislature

March 13, 1968

today, sincere as they may be, cannot possibly understand the deep-seated problems of the Saskatchewan Indian. They may realize or they may know the results and the conditions on the reserves, but I do not think they know the deep-rooted cause that eventually leads to the results of the conditions on the reserves and the conditions of the Indian off the reserve. I realize that we are setting up a group of people, we are setting them apart, we are making them different, we are making them unique by giving them their own MLAs, but let us face the problem. They are different, they are unique. I do not suggest that this special legislation continue indefinitely. I would suggest approximately ten years, and I would say that in ten years the Indian people might be in a position to put up a candidate in a normal election in one of the areas heavily populated by Indian people.

Mr. Speaker, I would like now to congratulate the teachers in my constituency on the way they treated the situation regarding The Teachers' Salary Negotiations Act, and the way they treated me. I met with many teachers on many occasions, and I am proud to say that they presented their case rationally and completely aloof of politics. Secondly, I would like to congratulate the people of Leroy on their concern and the way they handled the hospital closure situation. On December 27th the heavy hand of government snuffed out the hope and the light of the Leroy hospital. The whole community was stunned. Even the CCF at the height of their popularity dared not to carry out the recommendations of their 1951 Master Plan. Even the CCF dared not to carry out the recommendation of the Saskatchewan Hospital Survey and Master Plan of 1961, which recommended that between the years of 1961 and 1970 eighteen of the small hospitals be closed and thirty-two be converted to alternate use. We in our wisdom have used the same arguments that the CCF used, the arguments that I think were largely responsible for the defeat of the former Government.

To use a portion of a speech made by a Member opposite, he said the Government attacked the University and some regressive legislation was produced. There are a lot of people involved in this, a lot of them in the position of strength. There was organized public protest and as a result the Government changed its course, backed down here and veered away there. Then the Government proposed some regressive and repressive action with respect to teachers. Again there was organized opposition and public protest and again the Government changed its course, backed down here and veered away there. The Government proposed the closing of some eight small hospitals in small towns but at least they called a temporary halt. In those cases where there was aroused public opposition, where there was a possibility of people speaking out as a group for themselves, the Government backed down. I wish to point out that the Leader of the Opposition in this statement seems not so much concerned whether we are right or wrong, but he insinuates the backing down shouldn't be the course of good government. Mr. Speaker, we have been chided by Members opposite for back pedalling, and I commend the Minister responsible for the back pedalling. The people of Saskatchewan have chosen us to run their affairs; we as a Government have not chosen them as our subjects. Just because we are the Government, let us not confuse good government with sheer unswaying obstinacy and a complete disregard of right or wrong, or the complete disregard of the wishes of Saskatchewan people.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Breker: — Mr. Speaker, I am proud to be a Member of any Government that could or would reconsider its position unless it has the unique position of having an infallible judgement. The idea that we will have medicare with or without doctors, the idea that we could have area bargaining with or without teachers, the idea that we could have. country systems with or without the municipalities would surely get a Government defeated.

I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that if the former Government had not used their heavy hand, or had listened a little more attentively to the wishes of Saskatchewan people and if the back benchers of the former Government had the courage that the Members of this Government have, and had had the courage that the Members of this Government have and had to reconsider its stand from time to time, they would be the Government of the day.

I am particularly pleased with the Minister of Health (Mr. Grant). He announced that the closing date for the Leroy hospital would be postponed until further negotiations could take place and that a proper settlement be made in the best interests of the people of Leroy and in the best interests of giving good health services. I am sure that the people in Leroy realize that in years to come, if the population in and around Leroy continues to decrease, that they will have trouble first of all to give the kind of service that the public needs and secondly to give the service at a reasonable rate. If however the hospital were closed, then I think it should be the Government's responsibility to make sure that adequate facilities are provided to look after the needs of Leroy and district. My suggestion is that, if and when the Leroy hospital is closed, it could be very easily made into an old folks home, and in my estimation, it probably could look after 20 or 30 guests. An arrangement could be made with a doctor from a neighboring town to come into that area once a week to look after the old folks and to look after the people in that area. This is a similar arrangement and a very satisfactory arrangement that is presently going on in Middle Lake. Once again I am particularly pleased that the Minister reconsidered his decision and I am sure that the people in Leroy and district are very, very pleased.

I support the motion, I will not support the amendment.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. C.G. Willis: (Melfort-Tisdale) — Mr. Speaker, after listening to the Budget address delivered Friday, March last, I took the time to review the Budget presented to this Legislature in 1964, by the then Provincial Treasurer, the former Member for Kelsey. In the light of this Liberal Budget now under consideration, the 1964 address makes interesting reading. Mr. Brockelbank said in part:

I tried last year, Mr. Speaker, to describe the central objective of the Budget of this government. May I repeat what I said: 'We are seeking to achieve through the programs of positive government, a dignified, a better and more varied life for the individual. It will be evident to all of us, I am sure, that as we succeed in achieving this goal, we will succeed also in finding and in reaching new horizons for the community as a whole. Individual self-fulfilment cannot be

March 13, 1968

achieved in a static or a stagnant community; to reach out to new horizons of social and economic development, is to create the conditions of individual self expression.

This it seems to me, Mr. Speaker, is the pride of our province. The willingness to experiment, the willingness to reach for new horizons.

The story of Saskatchewan is in a sense a story of firsts, the first to establish producer co-operatives; the first to experiment with public developmental utilities; the first to introduce more popular control into political parties and governments; the first to establish public hospital insurance; the first to establish public medical care insurance.

Mr. Brockelbank continued:

There have been times — the older of us remember them well — when these dynamics of our society seemed to have been destroyed. We emerged from the depression and from the war years with dilapidated capital facilities, with little prospect for economic and industrial growth, and what was worse, with little hope for the future. For a decade after that we had to preoccupy ourselves with overcoming these problems.

We in this province had to develop new and modern hospital facilities. We had to reconstruct our roads and schools. We had to find ways of bringing modern facilities to a depressed Saskatchewan, electric power, telephones, natural gas and modern amenities. We had to discover what were our resources and to stimulate an interest in our economic potentials. We had to persuade capital to come to Saskatchewan, to find people to drill oil wells, to sink potash shafts and to establish new industries.

Such was the work of the 1940s and early 1950s. It was in the next decade that the people of Saskatchewan rediscovered their province. We found that we did possess a rich resource endowment. We found that we could greatly increase our agricultural productivity. We found that we were capable of industrial growth. We found that we could finance a first-class educational system, a first-class road network, and first-class community facilities. Above all we rediscovered our optimism. Out of this, Mr. Speaker, we began to reassert the pride of this province; we began to reach again for new horizons. No one can visit this province without sensing this restored confidence, this renewed dynamic.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Willis: — This 1964 Budget address, Mr. Speaker, was indeed a Budget for people, for all the people, a humanitarian Budget in tune with the times. It was a Budget of progress. It was a Budget of pride in what Saskatchewan people had accomplished, a Budget of confidence in the future of the people of Saskatchewan as they strove for new horizons. It is interesting to read this passage Saskatchewan's growth, made by a man who played a leading role in this Chamber for 29 years, from 1938 to 1967.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Willis: — Who, since 1944 was in the forefront of Saskatchewan developments. And in contrast, Mr. Speaker, we have this Budget presented on March 1st in this Legislature, so callous in its treatment of people, so repressive in its overall effect, that the Member for Regina Centre (Mr. Blakeney) said he was prompted to name the day of its presentation Black Friday. And Black Friday it is, Mr. Speaker, to more than 900,000 people in Saskatchewan. The 1964 Budget should be prescribed reading for all Saskatchewan citizens, particularly for Members opposite, for it sets out in clear forthright terms the changes resulting from 20 years of CCF Government. Mr. Brockelbank has to be congratulated for the part that he played in those 20 years of CCF Government, years in which he served as the first Minister of Mineral Resources here in our province. He must have taken particular pride in reporting in his Budget Address that in 1963 the value of mineral production reached \$280 million, over \$40 million in excess of the previous all-time high. He calls the potash industry the most exciting development in Saskatchewan today and says multi-million dollar plants are operating or being established at Esterhazy, Saskatoon, and Belle Plaine, and with a fourth to start at Lanigan in the near future. And this, Mr. Speaker, was in 1964. We see from this that potash development was well under way prior to 1964. This part of the Budget Address must come as quite a shock to the new Members opposite, Mr. Speaker. The present Minister of Mineral Resources (Mr. Cameron) followed the Member for Regina Centre (Mr. Blakeney) on the Budget debate. He would have us believe that there was nothing much doing in mineral development before 1964. Well, his speech on Friday, proved two things for sure, Mr. Speaker. First, that he has good lung power. Someone probably told him that when you have a weak case, you yell like hell. And two, that the public address system works okay.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Willis: — On Monday, on radio, he was more subdued, but just as weak in his arguments. The Minister criticized statements by the Member for Regina Centre (Mr. Blakeney). Following the Minister's address, I checked the Saskatchewan Economic Review for 1967 and found that the Regina Centre Member was right in that production of minerals in the north half of the province had indeed fallen off in the years since 1964. In 1964 copper, zinc, and uranium produced in the far north had a value of \$44 million. In 1965 this had fallen to \$40 million. And in 1966 mineral production in the north was only \$39.8 million. And the same table in the Economic Review showed mineral production reached a high in 1962 of \$71 million, almost twice the production of \$39 million in 1966. No wonder the Minister of Mineral Resources (Mr. Cameron) yelled so loudly on Black Friday. I looked through the oil production figures, Mr. Speaker. There was a little oil production in 1944, some 16,000 barrels. Oil production increased rapidly from the 1950s under the CCF until by 1964, 81 million barrels were produced. New minerals were discovered and in production in Saskatchewan in the period 1944-1964. In 1964 new minerals in production since 1944 were oil, natural gas, helium, salt, uranium and potash. And the Minister of Welfare (Mr. MacDonald) in his address yesterday, said we had frightened mining people because of high royalty rates. What rubbish, Mr. Speaker! Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Mineral Resources (Mr. Cameron) can rant and rave

March 13, 1968

all he likes, but he can't change the facts that under the CCF, Saskatchewan developed into the third mineral-producing province in Canada, third only behind Ontario and Quebec, and laid a firm foundation for the development presently taking place.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Willis: — Today, Mr. Speaker, it is true that this present Government is spending a large sum of money on highways, but I want to point out that you don't evaluate the highway program just in terms of money. It doesn't mean much to say that there are two times X dollars in your Highway budget, if that two times X dollars produces in 1968 only what X dollars did in 1963. And, Mr. Speaker, that is very close to being the situation. The cost of highway construction has risen dramatically since 1963. I can't agree with the statement of the Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Steuart), when he said on Black Friday, "We have contributed little as a Government to the forces of inflation." The truth is, Mr. Speaker, that this Government has contributed a great deal to the increase in highway construction costs. The truth is that highway construction costs would have gone up some, along with other costs, but actions of this Government are directly responsible for the tremendous increase in highway construction costs in the period from 1964 to 1967. Almost the first action taken by this Government was to announce that there was to be a great increase in the amount of money to be spent on highway construction. There was reference to a crash program, to build a four-lane highway from Regina to Moose Jaw — at once, a crash program with little or no regard to total cost. Further, the Premier announced that work on our total system would be available for every road construction machine in the province. Outside road contractors were invited to contribute to the great effort. Advertisements were even placed in United States papers in an effort to attract contractors from south of the border. In short, Mr. Speaker, there were more highway construction projects thrown on the market than there were available contractors. Any businessman would recognize the inflationary pressure in a system like that. And the result was a drastic increase in contract bid prices, the cause of which can be laid directly at the door of the present Government. Take paving costs, as an example, Mr. Speaker, and compare paving costs of 1963 with 1966. Figures for base course materials show an increase of two and a quarter times what they were in 1963. The base course material cost was 75 per cent greater in 1966 than it was in 1963. For resurfacing material a 41 per cent increase came about within three years under this Government, Mr. Speaker.

Cost of gravelling showed the same upward trend. Gravel surfacing aggregate went from 37 cents a ton up to 80 cents, more than double within three years. Average grading costs increased from 17 cents per yard in 1963, to 26.7 cents a cubic yard in 1966, a jump of 60 per cent. And these, Mr. Speaker, were unit bid prices. Cost on the mileage basis increased accordingly. I repeat that this Government was directly responsible for most of this huge increase in highway construction costs. It saturated the market with tenders, announced the crash program under which construction work was to be done, with little or no regard to the cost. And while bid prices in themselves were high, there were often significant cost increases after contracts were awarded. For instance, the Government

answered one question asked in the House last session, by stating that the projects originally let to contracts at \$3.4 million were paid out at a total cost of \$4.4 million, an increase of \$1 million over the bid price.

Now, Mr. Speaker, it is not uncommon for the Department to pay extra money, for extra work done on a contract, but to pay an. increase of \$1 million on contracts worth \$3.4 million, increased costs another 33 1/3 per cent for those contracts.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Willis: — The original bid prices were already high, having gone up to double in three years. And again, Mr. Speaker, I say that this Government is to blame for these dramatic increases. They treated money as if it were plentiful as dirt. So, Mr. Speaker, it is apparent that more money spent on highways doesn't always mean a similar increase in the miles of highways constructed.

The Minister of Highways (Mr. Boldt) facetiously or so I thought facetiously, asked the Members of the Opposition if they were anxious to cut the Budget and if so would they urge him to delete highway work in their constituency. Well, Mr. Speaker, the Member for Prince Albert East-Cumberland (Mr. Berezowsky) called his bluff. Let the Minister now put up. If he does I can already see the headlines in the Star Phoenix, two inches high across the front page, "Bolt Stops Project at the Request of Opposition Members." And then, after that, Mr. Speaker, I trust that peace will be restored between the Star Phoenix and the Minister following this second headline in less than a week. I am sure, Mr. Speaker, that some Members and their constituents wish that this offer to delay construction had been made three years ago. If the Member for Wadena (Mr. Dewhurst) for example, had known that construction on No. 5 between Watson and Wadena was to drag on for four years up to the present and heaven only knows how much longer in the future, I think that he would gladly have put up with the old highway until this present Government is turned out. The conditions have been appalling on that stretch of No.5 since 1964, with motorists having to put up with all the hazards of construction. The work dragged on at a snail's pace. This is waste, Mr. Speaker, for motorists especially. I am sure that those motorists using No.3 Highway west of Hudson Bay wonder why it should take any contractor two years to grade 8.2 miles of highway. In answer to a question asked by the present Member for Kelsey (Mr. Messer) it appears that there is still work to be done this coming summer — the third construction year for this 8.2 mile project. And last year, Mr. Speaker, was an ideal construction year. Surely there is no valid excuse for inconveniencing motorists for so long a time for only 8.2 miles of construction.

And then No. 5 between Lashburn and Lloydminster on the other side of the province has been the complaint of the Member for Cutknife (Mr. Kwasnica) this session, just as Mr. Nollet, the former Minister, complained last year and complained again the year before. Completion of the project was announced in 1967 and again in 1968. The Member and his constituents would object, Mr. Minister — and I am sorry that the Minister is not in his seat at the present time — but I can assure him the Member for Cutknife (Mr. Kwasnica) and his constituents would object to another completion announcement next year. Surely, the fact that the Provincial-Treasurer (Mr. Steuart) had a

March 13, 1968

disagreement with the city of Lloydminster isn't reason enough to inconvenience motorists for so long. And then political decisions re highway planning, Mr. Speaker, are nothing new to this Government. The amount of work that is being done in the Opposition Members' riding is insignificant, except for Prince Albert East-Cumberland and that is being done to convenience the pulp mill. And in, no field, however, is the result of political decision, so evident as in the adding of grid roads to the highway system.

The Department of Highways has a Planning Branch. This Branch isn't even consulted when the highway system was increased. At least it doesn't appear so when grid roads with traffic volume considerably less than 100 are added to the highway system. Indeed, the Department admitted in answer to a question in the Legislature that they haven't a traffic count on two grid roads taken into the highway system last year. No traffic count, and yet they take these roads into the highway system. It is significant that one of these is a grid road from No. 11 to Hepburn in the Highway Minister's constituency.

What standards are used to judge whether a highway warrants dust-freeing, Mr. Speaker? Again this appears to be a political decision mainly. We see that Highway No. 373 is to be oiled. Again a former grid road in the Minister's constituency. There are highways in the province which warrant oiling ahead of this, if volume of traffic is a major consideration. Mr. Speaker, I hate to become personal in this debate, but there is a grid road in my constituency, a grid road connecting Star City with No. 3 Highway. This grid road 1.3 miles in length has an average traffic volume close to 900 vehicles per day, according to the Department's own figures. Surely this road warrants inclusion in the highway system, just as much now as it did in October of last year, when the people of Star City had the assurance of the Hon. Minister that this road would be designated a highway in the following year. Surely it warrants highway designation as much as No. 375 from Junction 11 to Hepburn, where the Department has no information at all regarding a traffic count.

Since October 11th, the RM of Star City has been informed that it is entitled to 15 per cent above the ordinary grid grant if they reconstruct the grid. This is no concession, Mr. Speaker. This is only applying the grid policy which has been in existence for some years. To refrain from adding this heavily travelled road from Star City to No. 3 to the highway system and at the same time taking in roads that have traffic counts of less than 50 is to carry political discrimination to an extreme, and I could add, a costly extreme.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Willis: — There is waste too, Mr. Speaker, in building bridges on sliding foundations. Huge sums are presently being spent to correct the slide tendency in one of the banks of the North Saskatchewan River at North Battleford, which threatens the safety of the structure which has just been built there. And now, Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Highways (Mr. Boldt) referred to this in his address the other day — I am sorry that he is not in his seat. He referred to this in answering charges from the Member for The Battlefords (Mr. Kramer) — I might-tell the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Guy) who has just returned to his seat, that the Member for The Battlefords is at the RM Convention this afternoon, dealing with some of his constituents.

The Minister of Highways in answering charges by the Member for The Battlefords stated that I as former Minister had originally okayed the site of the bridge, so I was responsible for building the bridge on the sliding foundation. Mr. Speaker, the Minister is more knowledgeable than that, at least I hope. The Member for The Battlefords charged that highway engineers had made a report pointing out the unsatisfactory foundation conditions at the bridge site and that the report was disregarded. If this is so, one of the Liberal Ministers of Highway, either the present or the present Minister of Health (Mr. Grant) is responsible for disregarding such a report. I as Minister received one report only from the Department and that was to recommend the site following a visual above-ground inspection. No report re foundation conditions, adverse or otherwise, was ever made to me. If no foundation report was made to the present Minister or to the previous Minister, before tenders were called, then the Department erred. A foundation report should have been made and I think that it was made. If no report exists, however, the Minister should say so. If, however, such a report exists and is an adverse report, the Minister can't weasel out of his responsibility.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Willis: — And waste resulted too, Mr. Speaker, on building a highway in northwest Saskatchewan and in pulling out and leaving the job unfinished. At the southern end of this so-called Primrose path I notice that the latest traffic volume map shows a traffic count of five vehicles a day, and yet the Department spends hundreds of thousands building a road which goes nowhere. Surely, Mr. Speaker, this was a costly blunder.

An Hon. Member: — Waste, waste.

Mr. Willis: — And deficit financing too, is costly, Mr. Speaker. The Government borrowed \$6.5 million to carry out its program. The highways built for \$6.5 million will end up costing the taxpayers of this Province not \$6.5 million but more than \$12 million over the 20-year period when the debentures mature. The Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Steuart) who, too, is not in his seat this afternoon, says it is only right for future generations to assume some of the costs. Well, Mr. Speaker, many taxpayers of today will be paying taxes for 20 years or more. The Government with its deficit financing has decreed that they will pay double the original cost for these highways. If at the end of the 20 years, this \$6.5 million debenture is refinanced, future generations, indeed, will pay, and pay, and pay. In these buoyant times, Mr. Speaker, it is adding to inflationary pressures, not to follow a pay-as-you-go policy. I only hope that charge-it-please doesn't become a favorite expression with this Government before the voters have the opportunity to retire it. The Highway budget is indeed one of waste of the taxpayers' money. It is waste caused by high hid prices which have been put up by crash programs.

Mr. G.R. Bowerman: (Shellbrook) — Investigation!

Mr. Willis: — It is waste by political decision to take into the Provincial highway system, low-volume roads. It is waste resulting from delayed projects. It is waste resulting from building roads in the wrong place and then abandoning them. It

March 13, 1968

is waste through borrowing for highway programs and it is waste through payments of large force accounts over and above contract prices.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Willis: — All these, Mr. Speaker, characterize Highway budgets, and make it virtually impossible for the people of Saskatchewan to obtain value for their highway tax dollar. It is refreshing, after reviewing this record of waste and inefficiency, to look back on the highway achievements of the CCF in their 20 years of office.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Willis: — In spite of the fact that the entire revenue of the Province in 1944 was only \$30 million, just half of the present Highway budget, in spite of the fact a reliable highway system was non-existent in 1944, the CCF Government reconstructed or constructed all of the highway mileage and by 1964 had dust-free 50 per cent of the highway system, which accommodated 75 per cent of the entire highway traffic on dust-free highways. Quite an achievement for 20 years of stagnation, Mr. Speaker. Industrial growth, too, marked these 20 years of CCF Government, industrial growth. Sparked by provision of cheap reliable power by an expanding Power Corporation; by the building of adequate highway systems, serving Saskatchewan throughout the entire year; by the growth of an efficient communication system under our Saskatchewan Government Telephones. Industrial growth was aided, too, by the incentive programs of this Government, by the declaration also by Premier Douglas that there was room in Saskatchewan for private, for public, and for co-operative enterprise.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Willis: — Mining companies and industries were invited to come to Saskatchewan to help develop our province, and they came, Mr. Speaker.

Saskatchewan had always had the reputation of an agricultural province, but by 1956, non-agricultural production was out-stripping agricultural production. For in spite of better than average crops in 1962 and 1963, agricultural production averaged only 40 per cent of our total production. During the period from 1957 to 1963 — in the last eight years of CCF Government — more than 60 per cent of Saskatchewan's total production was from non-agricultural production. What a change during the 20 years of the CCF Government, Mr. Speaker. Saskatchewan changed rapidly in 20 short years. Along with this change came increased population. The population losses of the 30s and 40s were stopped and total population figures began again to go up. During 1950 and 1960 under the CCF the population increased an average of 10,000 people per year. Since 1964, Mr. Speaker, population growth has averaged only 3,000 per year to the consternation of the present Government. What a commentary on progress being achieved under the Liberals: It is too bad that the 60,000 jobs promised by the Liberals were not more substantial than the sound of the wind blowing over the prairies. My mistake, Mr. Speaker, I should have said 80,000 jobs promised by the Liberals.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Willis: — Mr. Speaker I would like to refer to another matter here. Apart from the Saskatchewan road improvements, the industrial growth in the province and mineral developments, the population increases which all mark the years between 1944 to 1964, the greatest progress it seems to me that was made in that 20-year period was in our humanitarian program.

In health alone we instituted free cancer care, hospitalization, health regions stressing preventive medicine, Medicare, to mention just the highlights — I am sorry, Mr. Speaker, that the Minister of Health (Mr. Grant) is not in his chair — there was indeed a concern during the CCF term of office for the well-being of our fellowman, but how this changed after 1964. The Liberals in Opposition were unhappy with the programs for the people instituted by the CCF Government. In Government the Liberals are doing what they can to undermine the confidence of the people in these programs. In mental health, Mr. Speaker, Saskatchewan developed one of the world's more advanced community psychiatric programs, to quote Dr. Frazier. And again Dr. Frazier stated that Saskatchewan has for at least two decades been in the forefront of innovations in delivery of psychiatric care. From a man with Dr. Frazier's reputation, this is indeed praise for the Government which was in power from 1944 to 1964. With the election of the Liberal Government there was a change in intent in carrying out the mental health program. Many complaints over the past two years have been registered with the Government by Opposition Members because of the treatment accorded mental health patients. After two years of complaints and just before an election the Government appointed Dr. Frazier to consult with the Minister of Health (Mr. Grant) on the psychiatric services of Saskatchewan. Did the Government, Mr. Speaker, not have knowledge of what was happening in mental health, did it not know how to administer the mental health program? Mr. Speaker, the Government did know what was happening. It was responsible for the quota system of discharging from the mental hospitals. It was the one that gave a handful of pills to grossly psychotic, physically violent patients and pushed them out of the hospital.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Willis: — Its main concern was to reduce the population in the large mental hospitals and reduce the population it did. In some 20 years from 1944 to 1964 under the CCF the population of the Weyburn mental hospital was reduced by 1100, from 2600 to 1519, mainly by the construction of the training school in Moose Jaw and by concentrating on building up a competent, able body of doctors to treat those who are mentally ill. But by 1965 as Dr. Frazier says, the great push to clear the mental hospitals began, and in the two years from 1964 to 1966 the population of Weyburn alone decreased from 1519 to 421, to the everlasting discredit of this Liberal Government. Staff, frustrated and fed up, left too, Mr. Speaker. Mental Health Program conditions were indeed serious as the result of this Government. Then in the fall of 1967 . . .

Hon. G.B. Grant: (Minister of Public Health) — I wonder if the Hon. Member would accept a question?

Mr. Willis: — Not right now, Mr. Speaker,

March 13, 1968

if the Hon. Minister will return to his seat and hold his question until after I have finished.

Then in the fall of 1967, the Government called in Dr. Frazier. It is interesting to note, Mr. Speaker, that Dr. Frazier was appointed in September, 1967, his work was finished by December of last year. This period covered completely the election period. By this action of appointing Dr. Frazier to a committee the Government removed the mental health controversy from the issues of the election campaign. Charges made could now be answered by the statement that a noted psychiatrist was investigating, that the Government was awaiting his report and appropriate action would be taken in due course. This I contend, Mr. Speaker, was the real reason Dr. Frazier was commissioned. I charge, Mr. Speaker, that this Government callously used Dr. Frazier so as to nullify during the election campaign criticisms of their actions.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Willis: — This is not a responsible Government, Mr. Speaker. Indeed it is grossly and cruelly irresponsible. This is a serious accusation, Mr. Speaker, it strikes at the very integrity of this Government. Indeed, it is not alone held by me, Mr. Speaker, many people in the province believe the same. If the Government wishes to vindicate itself, I challenge them to call an election and place the matter before the electorate. I can assure the people opposite that they will get their just deserts. The sum of \$500,000 has been placed conspicuously, Mr. Speaker, very conspicuously in the Health budget for the purpose of carrying out Dr. Frazier's recommendations. This, Mr. Speaker, is mere window-dressing. Dr. Frazier in his report called attention to the fact that there had been a gradual financial squeeze on the branch. The financial squeeze will continue as long as we have the present Premier and Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Steuart) in charge, Mr. Speaker, and little improvement will result in staffing or in treatment. The same callous, inhumane treatment to mental health patients will continue. These two people, Mr. Speaker, have shown their arrogance by their attitude to this program.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Willis: — Deterrent fees, Mr. Speaker, are indeed a tax on the sick, they are more, Mr. Speaker, they are an attack on medicare itself.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Willis: — People of the province are asking why increased medicare fees just when the Federal Government is promising to take over 50 per cent of the cost of medicare. The amount of \$10.9 million is in the Estimates as reimbursement for medicare costs by the Federal Government. Either this Government has taken the action it has in order to wreck medicare or it doesn't trust the Federal Government to carry out its promise. Mr. Speaker, this year, 1968, will go down in the history of Saskatchewan as the year of the great tax Budget introduced on March 1st, Black Friday.

I must report, Mr. Speaker, that I am very pleased to see

The seats opposite filling up. Is it getting time for a vote? We would hate to see the Government being defeated here as they were in Ottawa because of the absence of Government Members. May I repeat for the benefit of those last six or so Members who have just come in, Mr. Speaker, that the year, 1968, will go down in the history of Saskatchewan as the year of the Great Tax Budget, introduced on March 1st, Black Friday.

That this Government had to impose 13 new or increased taxes is another measure of its incompetence to administer the affairs of this province. It is true, Mr. Speaker, as pointed out very ably yesterday by the Minister of Welfare (Mr. MacDonald) who is absent from his seat now, that the CCF Government instituted tax increases immediately after the 1960 election. This is true, Mr. Speaker. What the Minister conveniently forgets is that we had campaigned on a platform to institute Medicare, to transfer medical payments from the backs of the sick to the broader backs of all the people in the province. The people voted for the program, they voted for the program by returning the CCF, they voted for the transfer of medical payments from the individual to the group. This they voted for with their eyes open and this they got. We kept our promise to institute Medicare. But in 1967, did they vote for increased taxes? No. Did they vote for deterrent fees? No. With the promise of Federal participation lower medicare fees were expected. There wasn't a whisper about deterrent fees until the austerity period set in after October 11th, 1967. Did the farmers of this province vote to increase the farmer's cost of production at a time the farmer appears likely to be submerged by ever-rising costs? At this time I would stop and ask the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. McFarlane) if he is doing anything about the rising cost of farming, but unfortunately he is not in his seat. Did the people of this province, Mr. Speaker, vote for an wholesale increase in taxes thereby contributing to still higher costs of living in a period when costs have never been higher or harder to meet? I would ask that question of the Premier, Mr. Speaker, only he is not in his seat.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Willis: — The answer to all these questions, Mr. Speaker, is No. The people did not know what they were voting for, when they voted last October 11th. They were deceived by this Government and they are understandably aroused. And all the talk of all the Members opposite and the Members who should be opposite isn't going to smooth matters over, Mr. Speaker. In the words of the Member from Moose Jaw North (Mr. Snyder) . . .

Mr. Guy: — . . . Swift Current.

Mr. Willis: — If the Minister of Public Health is finished his speech I will go on, Mr. Speaker.

An Hon. Member: — Public Works, wake up George.

Mr. Willis: — Oh, Public Works, then close that Public Works, please. In the words of the Member for Moose Jaw North (Mr. Snyder) this Budget, these tax changes, Mr. Speaker, will damn this Government until the day it is removed from office, and that day, Mr. Speaker, can't come too soon for the vast majority of the

March 13, 1968

people in Saskatchewan.

In closing, may I refer to the fact that this Government has set up a Committee to investigate a new provincial flag. When they consider suggestions on the flag, Mr. Speaker, I hope they take into consideration the record of this Government and that as long as we have the Government opposite we should, it seems to me, have a flag that is bordered in black.

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

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. D.A. McPherson: (Regina South West) — Mr. Speaker, in rising to speak on the Budget, I would like to say that it has been a great education for me as a new Member to listen to the proceedings that have taken place in this House. Personally it has been an education in that I believe the Budget Debate could be cut down to about three days and get something accomplished. I feel this very sincerely.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. McPherson: — The Member for Moose Jaw North (Mr. Snyder) is the great builder in Moose Jaw and he hasn't built anything over there since he has been a Member. All he has ever done is rap everybody that ever tried to do anything in Moose Jaw. Mr. Speaker, every Member opposite in rising to speak on either the Throne Speech or the Budget Debate has had much to say about the independent sector and the private sector. The theme of my talk in moving the Address-in-Reply must have hit a very sore point with every Member to your left. Really, Mr. Speaker, I have not been embarrassed by what they have said about the old-fashioned ideas of the independent sector. The ideas are just good common sense and the Members to your left will finally wake up someday and realize they are good.

First, Mr. Speaker, I would just like to say a few words on the University of Saskatchewan that the Members opposite have battered around for so many days. I would like to read a letter from a student at the University of Saskatchewan which I received in January, Mr. Speaker. I am going to lay it on the table so that they won't worry about it being a put-up job or anything. Mr. Speaker, this letter I believe is one of the best-written letters I have ever received in all the years I have been in business. It has a message not only for the Members opposite but for every Member on this side of the House, also. I ask the Assembly to judge this letter as an example of how the largest percentage of our responsible young University of Saskatchewan students feel:

Dear Sir:

The Action Committee of the Regina Campus, University of Saskatchewan has requested that students send a copy of the enclosed leaflet to their Member of the Legislative Assembly. It is implied by the leaflet that I should rebuke Government policy concerning control of the University finances. This I cannot do. I find in this leaflet a number of faults which I have underlined. Premier Thatcher has continually stated that the University

autonomy and academic freedom will not be affected. Another complaint has been that the quality of university education will decline. I don't believe tighter budget control would bring about any such decline, money is not the only factor that influences the quality of education. It seems that the Action Committee either cannot or dare not name the prominent citizens and on-university organizations that object to Government University policy.

I feel that we as students should realize rising education costs cannot continue. Premier Thatcher's policy is only an attempt to curb sky-rocketing taxes which the citizens of Saskatchewan must pay. There is a great deal of extravagance which, if avoided, would greatly reduce expenditure. To name a few needless articles we have two reflection ponds, a heating plant with glass walls, and a carpet in the library entrance which is not only an extravagance but also an inconvenience. When the idealists who want free education have to start paying the taxes necessary for the so-called free education, they too will want tighter financial control. As a student I too would like to see free education but as a responsible student I realize that Saskatchewan cannot at this time support such a costly program.

Sincerely.

I am going to table that letter, Mr. Speaker, because it is one of the finest letters I have ever seen and it wasn't solicited. I feel, Mr. Speaker, every responsible citizen now feels that the expenditures at the University of Saskatchewan should be looked into. I am happy the President now feels satisfied, the administration feels satisfied and the Senate agree with the stand the Premier and the Minister of Education (Mr. McIsaac) have taken.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to say a few words about deterrent and also utilization fees which we've discussed in this House for some time. I would first like to say that the Swift Current scheme which started in 1946 has been a very successful scheme as every Member of this House knows. Those who were running the scheme looked at their financial statements year after year after the advent of the plan and finally realized that office and house calls were increasing at a very fast rate. As a result, Mr. Speaker, in January, 1953 an office-call utilization fee of \$1 was introduced and in January, 1953, the home-call fee was put in with \$2 being charged for day calls and \$3 for night calls. What were the results, Mr. Speaker? Well in 1954, and we'll use this as the base year, the office calls were cut over 15 per cent with net saving to the plan of over \$70,000. Taking the same year with regards to home calls, the home calls fell from 398 per thousand in 1953 to 158 per thousand, or a decrease of 60 per cent with a savings to the plan of \$49,000.

I point these two examples out, Mr. Speaker, to show Members of this House that over the years there has been a saving to the taxpayers with utilization fees on house calls and doctor's office calls. We heard no cry, or I don't remember anything happening in 1953 when these fees were put in by the Members opposite, and they were subsidizing the plan at that time to the tune of \$140,000 from the Department of Public Health. But not one word was said. The savings are there, and the facts and figures, and the Member from Kelsey (Mr. Messer) can check

March 13, 1968

them. They are there in the Thompson Report for him to see. Mr. Stuart Robertson appeared before the Thompson Commission, and he was an outstanding citizen in the Swift Current region having pioneered the first medical care plan in that region and certainly is well respected in health fields, not only in the Province of Saskatchewan but also over the Dominion. When he appeared before the Thompson Commission, the Member for Regina North East (Mr. Smishek) will recall this, Mr. Robertson reported to the Commission:

Now we come down to utilization fees. The history of Health Region No. 1 shows that at the start we had no utilization fees. For a matter of five or six years, we had no financial barriers to a patient attending his doctor, and conditions became such that for two-reasons utilization fees were inaugurated. The first was to try to control the number of patients who were visiting the doctor, and second, to give the plan some financial assistance. And over the years it has accomplished both of these things.

Mr. Robertson went on:

If you will study the statistics of, say 1959, or last year 1960, of the volume of care applied in Health Region No.1, and the number of doctors that we have providing the service, you will find that the doctors are not overworked. It is very difficult, of course, to proportion these things evenly, but I would say that, except in the one-doctor small towns, the doctors are not overworked, and the people have become accustomed to payment of this utilization tax, and they accept it.

Mr. Robertson went on:

There are disadvantages, but nevertheless, they accept it, and it seems to have accomplished the overcrowding that there used to be in the doctor's offices. In any Provincial medical care plan . . .

And I would like you to take special note of this:

. . . we would suggest that serious consideration be given to imposing a utilization fee on office and home calls . . .

And these are the words from Mr. Robertson who is well respected.

Board and room under utilization, Mr. Speaker, is the normal responsibility of the individual. The Government does not attempt to meet other financial obligations of patients except as the responsibility of Social Welfare. Providing board and room for patients simply because they are in hospital had developed an incentive for in-hospital care which has been the major factor in unnecessary hospitalization. It is only fair to state, Mr. Speaker, experience has shown that the present fee, individual's or family paid for hospitalization, does not seem to instil a feeling of responsibility in the persons who pays it. Rather, it seems to give a feeling that the payment must be justified by the utilization of services.

One thing has become extremely clear to me, Mr. Speaker, since this Budget was introduced, and that is that the Socialists of this province are as fiscally irresponsible as they ever were. I shudder to think how Saskatchewan would suffer if

they were ever returned to office. One speaker after another has illustrated how the Socialists plunged this Province into debt during their 20 years in office. During that time they demonstrated the same fiscal irresponsibility that the Member for Regina South East (Mr. Baker) is giving the citizens of Regina.

I would like to deal with some of the wild suggestions in his 14-point program that the Member from Regina South East has made during this session. I have known Henry a long time and, Mr. Speaker, I have never heard him go out as far in any of his statements as he has in this 14-point program. I would like to outline his 14-points for the Members of this Legislature and the Members opposite, just so they will see just what he has put them into.

Well first of all, Mr. Speaker, His Worship proposed a \$7 per capita grant to all municipalities. This little gem would mean an increase in taxes of \$5 million. He probably thinks he needs this to make up for the deficit in the city of Regina. Well that's the first one. After all it represents just about the same amount he needed to finish the auditorium, after he managed to turn that project into a fiasco. Then on March 5th very glibly His Worship proposed that homeowner grants be increased in amount and extended to renters. Well, Mr. Speaker, here is another little gem. If we assume that the homeowner grant was increased from \$50 to \$75 and extended to all renters in the province, this little point in his 14-point program would increase taxes by \$10 million. This is about twice the amount that he needed for the auditorium he never finished. Then one day later, after he had a little time to bask in his press coverage His Worship really went wild. He proposed that the Provincial Government should assume the responsibility for the costs of all health, welfare and education now borne by the municipalities. Well, Mr. Speaker, I got this estimated by a chartered accountant, and if we estimate that the municipal share of health costs at \$4.7 million, welfare at \$6.4 million and education at \$61.4 million we arrive at a total of \$72.6 million. That's another little point in his program.

Well, if that wasn't bad enough His Worship went on to dream about a few other things, realizing that he had a lot of old age pensioners in his area of the city, and this just happens to be a municipal-election year, Henry felt he had better make a few suggestions. So what did he do, Mr. Speaker? He suggested that the old age pension be increased to \$105 a month without a means test and he indicated that the Province of Saskatchewan should bear this cost, if the Federal Government wouldn't agree to do it. This one would cost the people of Saskatchewan \$27 million, just so Henry could get a few votes in the city of Regina.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. McPherson: — He would never think of proposing anything realistic for Regina, no, Mr. Speaker, Henry must be all things to all people, but his record has shown that he couldn't administer a peanut stand successfully, let alone the city of Regina. Well, Mr. Speaker, His Worship looked around a little more and he realized he had a lot of students in his constituency and he didn't want them to feel left out. So he proposed that university education at the first year level should be made available throughout the province through the secondary school system.

March 13, 1968

Assuming that 4,000 students were enrolled in this additional year, then the cost of this year would be 4;000 times \$2,000 which adds up to \$8 million. Therefore I estimate the total of this proposal at \$8 million. Now we haven't got down to the 14 points, we are only at seven points, and I want to continue on.

Then after realizing there were a few farmers who would be living in Regina when the municipal elections are on this fall, he decided he had better have a farm program, Mr. Speaker. So he proposed that the farmers would have installed free electricity on their farms and this should be paid for by a rebate or an exemption from paying an amount of \$400 in the total cost of installation. Now this is quite a thing. Now if this rebate or exemption is paid, Mr. speaker, as a subsidy of the Government so that the Saskatchewan Power Corporation would not have to increase rates, this suggestion would amount to something over \$27 million. We're only at point eight, Mr. Speaker, and it is adding up very fast. I am coming to a total Henry, and I want you to remember this total.

Then I am going to deal with you, Mr. Pepper from Weyburn. His Worship then proceeded to touch up this program with royalties from mineral production on the farm land, free dental care for all youth under the age of 16. I estimate that the loss of revenues brought about by a 2 per cent royalty on mineral production on farm lands as \$7 million, and free dental care at \$2 million. Well, Mr. Speaker, this is quite a little package our Mayor wants delivered. It totals up and here is the total, Mr. Speaker. It totals up to \$158 million, and yet he couldn't find enough money to finish the auditorium for the city of Regina. This is what we call responsible government, responsible Members sitting opposite. I want to go on, Mr. Speaker, he asked the people of Saskatchewan for an additional program amounting to \$158 million. Mr. Speaker, His Worship's demands represent more than 50 per cent of the present Provincial Budget. Yet, I didn't hear His Worship tell us where we could get one red cent of this money. I didn't hear him tell us which taxes he would raise. Furthermore, Mr. Speaker, these are just the special projects the Mayor of Regina would like implemented. I wonder where we would find the \$7 million for that technical school the Member for Regina North East (Mr. Smishek) wants, and where will we find the \$1 million for the bridge in the Kinistino constituency. I wonder where we would find the \$1 million and a third for the Member for Kinistino (Mr. Thibault) who suggests that we need to increase the budget for municipal road assistance. I didn't hear the whiz kid from Saskatoon Riversdale (Mr. Romanow) suggest where we could find the \$1 million he needs to build his half-way house for juvenile delinquents. Nor did I hear the Member for Moose Jaw South (Mr. Davies) my old school pal who is not in the House, suggest how we are to raise \$1 million to build his public buildings in Moose Jaw. And this we have heard for years and years, that Moose Jaw needs help. The independent sector moved the other day in Moose Jaw, I noticed very well in the private sector, and they are doing something about building. We don't have to have Mr. Davies and Mr. Snyder crying that they have to have Government assistance.

Then, of course, Mr. Speaker, there is the NDP program which the Member for Regina Centre (Mr. Blakeney) outlined last week. First he suggested that the drugs should be included under medicare. We assume \$100 deductible per family and this would cost the Province of Saskatchewan \$5 million. Then if we

included chiropractor services under medicare, it would add another \$1 million. The financial critic (Mr. Blakeney) also indicated that his party would provide free tuition fees. This item alone represents an expenditure of more than \$7 million. When we throw in some of the other programs, such as \$5 million for their community colleges and another \$500,000 for the nursing homes, they would build up to a grand figure of over \$200 million. This is a fine responsible type of government that we have, Mr. Speaker, the NDP are recommending direct increases in expenditures of over \$193 million, then in face of exorbitant programs just outlined, the Hon. Members oppose and suggest that we abolish the two cent tax on purple gas. This would mean a loss of revenue of approximately \$2.5 million. Then they suggest that we wipe out utilization fees which will yield approximately \$5 million. They would abolish the tax on auto insurance which would yield \$500,000. All these add up to a loss in revenue amounting to more than \$8 million. Mr. Speaker, this would put the Budget out of balance by more than \$200 million, not even considering what the Member from Weyburn (Mr. Pepper) would like to have put in the Budget and this would add approximately \$150 million. We have never heard of such nonsense, Mr. Speaker. On the one hand they lay out additional programs worth \$193 million and on the other hand they cry out at the prospect of some tax increases. Mr. Speaker, this only serves to illustrate that the Socialists are as irresponsible as they ever were.

They have proven again and again that they are not fit to govern the people of Saskatchewan. They have proven that they would run this Province into debt just like they did during their 20 years in office. During their 20 years in office, Mr. Speaker — and you can take these and check them from your financial statement over your past 20 years — during that time, Mr. Speaker, they increased the net debt of our Province, and listen to this, to more than half a billion dollars.

Mr. A.E. Blakeney: (Regina Centre) — Rubbish!

Mr. McPherson: — That's right: That's what they did and you can check it. They put our Province in a financial position bordering on chaos. Then they have the audacity to suggest that we should put our Budget out of balance by more than \$200 million. You would think that they would learn, but apparently they are incapable of learning anything. Mr. Speaker, I won't waste any more time on such a hopeless group and you will gather from my remarks that I will support the motion and I am against the amendment.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. W.E. Smishek: (Regina North East) Mr. Speaker, I don't know whether the Hon. Member (Mr. McPherson) who has just taken his seat was trying to set his campaign to contest the next mayoralty election. I am sure that the Hon. Member from Regina South East (Mr. Baker) is ready, willing and able to take him on in the next mayoralty contest.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Smishek: — If that is the best he can

March 13, 1968

do, I am sure that Henry will have a 10 to one landslide.

An Hon. Member: — Just like last time.

Mr. Smishek: — He tried it once before and he failed, and he failed just one minute ago. Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Member tried to put a defence for deterrent fees. Well, Sir, I think that he would have been wise to do a little bit more study and more searching. If he compares the utilization of hospital beds in the city of Swift Current because they have had minimal utilization fees, he will find that in case of non-surgical cases. they paid in Swift Current \$52 per person in 1966 as compared to \$32 for the rest of the province. If we had deterrent fees throughout the province, the hospital costs in this province would be \$10 million more than they are.

Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Member for Regina South West (Mr. McPherson) has now served his apprenticeship; He knows something about professional: football and I think it is fair that we now tackle him on a proper basis. I don't know whether the Regina Member for South West was wearing his MLA hat when he defended deterrent fees or if he was wearing the Regina General hospital board hat. I ask him that he had better check with the hospital board whether this is their position, because I have a feeling, Mr. Speaker. that the people of Regina are not prepared to accept deterrent fees. And if the Hon. Member for Regina South West is that bold about it, I am going to challenge him to a plebiscite in this city.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Smishek: — And if the people in Regina accept deterrent fees, I am prepared to resign, but if they reject them I challenge him to do likewise.

An Hon. Member: — Talk about an irresponsible Government!

Mr. Smishek: — Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Minister of Public Works (Mr. Guy) was making some references while the Hon. Member for Melfort-Tisdale (Mr. Willis) was speaking — chirping along saying cheap. Well. Mr. Speaker. if there is anybody capable of muck raking and dragging out dirt then it is the Hon. Minister of Public Works (Mr. Guy). Any suggestions he made that my colleague from Regina Centre (Mr. Blakeney) got wage increases while he was a public servant, the Hon. Minister should also be reminded that he also was a civil servant and he also got wage increases, and that his wages were somewhat equal to those the Member for Regina Centre was getting at that time.

Hon. D.G. Stuart: (Provincial Treasurer) — He earned them!

Mr. Smishek: — Mr. Speaker, if there is need of any reminding of the Hon. Minister I suggest and I refer to him this story appearing in the February 16 issue of the Carillon. and he had better lay off any muck raking because if there is any dirt to be thrown, it is here.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Smishek: — It is no wonder, Mr. Speaker, that there are Members on the opposite side of the House who are advocating censorship of student newspapers. People who live in glass houses should not throw stones, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Steuart: — People who live in outhouses . . .

Mr. Smishek: — Well, the Hon. Member, the Treasurer, is an expert in that field. I am sorry that the Minister of Welfare (Mr. MacDonald) is not in his seat. The silver-haired fox of Notre Dame put on his Maclean smile the other day and Premier Thatcher's old suit. He used the speech the Premier has been making for ten years in regard to justifying the tax increases outlined in the Budget.

An Hon. Member: — Same old speech!

Mr. Smishek: — Yes, the same old speech that we have heard over and over again. Mr., Speaker, I don't have as much time as I had hoped, but it seems to me in winding up this debate for our side, it would be worthwhile for us to recap the record of the Liberal Government in the last four years. I want to remind the Hon. Members of the promises the Liberals made to the people in 1964 and again in 1967 in respect of taxes. Everyone will remember that in 1964 they made this pledge, that they would reduce the retail sales tax immediately to four percent and make every effort to reduce it to three per cent within four years. Four years are up, Mr. Speaker. Let's reduce the sales tax to the three per cent promised. But what do we have? We don't have a reduction in the sales tax, we have an increase in the sales tax. They promised the use of purple tax-free gas in farm trucks. We did have in this province for a limited period of time, free tax in the case of the farm trucks, but no longer, Mr. Speaker. The tax is back on. They promised to increase grants to schools and municipalities to reduce municipal taxes. Well, Mr. Speaker, that's a story in itself. They promised to remove the five percent sales tax from children's clothing and shoes. Has anybody seen any reduction here? The truth is that there isn't any reduction or elimination of items from taxes; there is a wide expansion and addition of items that will be taxed from here on. They promised to provide from Provincial funds 50 per cent for all education, particularly in the city of Regina. Well, Mr. Speaker, the Liberals are not paying 50 per cent, they are paying less than what was paid in 1964 and the years previous. Only 28 per-cent of Regina's education cost is being paid by the Government. They promised to provide an equitable share of gasoline tax revenue for municipal road construction and maintenance. Has anybody seen any money contributed towards that? They promised to exempt municipal purchases from Provincial sales tax. We don't hear a word from the Liberals about that promise they made. In 1967, during the last campaign, they promised to continue local tax relief by increasing the homeowners grant, with a minimum objective of \$100. Mr. Speaker, where is the \$100 grant that they promised to the people of Saskatchewan? They promised to increase education grants to schools in proportion of total education costs. Will that be paid by the Province, a repetition of 1964? And do you know what this year is estimated in terms of grants? An increase of \$2.7 million. This would not be enough for the Regina

March 13, 1968

system alone to bring it to the level of percentage of grants that were paid back in 1964. They promised to abolish the Provincial share of the estate tax. Has anybody heard anything about this during this Budget? They promised to increase equalization payments to municipalities. Last year the equalization payment was \$2.4 million and this year it is again \$2.4 million, not a penny increase, Mr. Speaker. They promised to establish a loan fund for the purpose of making loans to municipalities and school systems at reasonable interest rates. Has anybody heard any reference to that by the Members of the Government? Well, Mr. Speaker, the Premier of Saskatchewan, when he was in Opposition, and in the first few months as Premier, used to talk about Saskatchewan taxes in these kind of terms. "Twenty years of Socialism resulted in oppressive taxes — the Socialists increased or imposed some 650 taxes in the period of twenty years." Well, Mr. Speaker, let us take a look at what this Thatcher Free Enterprise Government has done in a period of four years. Let us first look at the tax reductions promised, tax promises that were not fulfilled and the new taxes that were imposed.

Well, Sir, it is not a record of 650 taxes, it runs in the thousands. Firstly the education and health tax. They promised to reduce it to three per cent in a period of four years. It is now being raised to five per cent. If you take a look at the Budget of 1964, the last CCF Budget, you will find that the education and health tax represented a total of \$44 million, but in 1968, it has gone up to \$65 million. An increase of \$21 million, an increase of 48 per cent.

Now let us take a look at the list of new items that are going to be taxed. For the first time in Saskatchewan, food items are going to be taxed. During the last Legislature the 'dirty tax' was imposed — as my colleague from Moose Jaw South (Mr. Davies) described it. I am told that in our retail stores there is a variety of some 80 soaps being sold these days. Using the Premier's arithmetic, he would say these are 80 new taxes, Mr. Speaker. Remember it's being increased. Again using the Premier's arithmetic, we could say there are 160 new taxes imposed on soap alone. Look at their new taxes, the sales tax on hotels, motels, commercial cabins, cottages, and so on. This will net the Premier and the Provincial Treasury half a million dollars. Sales tax on meals consumed in hotels, restaurants and cafes will net another half a million dollars. The sales tax imposed on telegrams, telephones and etc., will net the Provincial Treasury \$21 million. The Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Steuart) told us that increasing the sales tax from four to five per cent will represent a net take to the Province of \$12 1/2 million. This is also adding the new items that he has listed. The Provincial Treasurer, either consciously or unconsciously, is trying to mislead this Legislature. The increase and the widening of the tax-base will net the Provincial Treasurer at least \$16 1/4 million, that is using last year's retail sales base. On the other hand, Mr. Speaker, the Provincial Treasurer may be predicting a serious depression and he may be correct.

Remember the Liberal new tax that was imposed during the last Legislature, the tobacco tax. They imposed it on cigarettes and cigars, cigarette tobacco, pipe tobacco and every kind of tobacco. Now I suppose if you took a look at the varieties of tobacco and cigarettes there are, I am sure at least 1,000 varieties, again using the Premier's arithmetic he would call this a thousand new taxes. Suffice to say that the tobacco tax is going to net the Provincial Treasurer \$5.6 million.

Gasoline tax increased by one cent in 1966 and by two cents this year. In 1964, Mr. Speaker, the net take to the province from the gasoline tax was \$29.7 million. This year it is going to mean \$45.7 million, an increase of 54 per cent, Mr. Speaker. They increased it on the red gasoline, on the orange gasoline, on the white gasoline, and the purple gasoline, on the diesel fuel, on every type of gasoline. How many new taxes is that, Mr. Speaker? The Liberal Government imposed the hospital revenue tax. They increased the grazing lease fees. They increased the vital statistics and other fees. They placed a one per cent surcharge on automobile insurance, increased the telephone toll rates. They increased liquor prices at least three times, on beer, whisky, scotch, gin, rum, wine, every item that is sold in a liquor store. Liquor taxes have gone up from \$15.3 million in 1964 to \$24 million in 1968, an increase of 57 per cent.

It is now interesting to note that the Premier can't wait for the Liquor Board to close its monthly statements. He is ready and waiting every month to take every penny of profit the Liquor Board makes. In the first nine months of current operation, this Provincial Government took \$21.5 million from the Liquor Board. This is more in 12 months than last year — \$2.5 million more. It is an indication of how desperate they are financially today and how bankrupt this Province is.

Operator's licences have increased from \$1 to \$2 — 100 per cent increase. Car and school bus licences increased by 50 per cent. Farm truck licences increased by 100 per cent. Commercial licences by \$5.00. Operators' licence fees on cars, buses and trucks will net the Province \$2.3 million of new funds. Automobile insurance has been increased four times, four years in a row, Mr. Speaker. This year a two per cent tax on automobile accident insurance premiums is being imposed. Pari-mutuel tax is increased by 100 per cent.

This is not a complete list, Mr. Speaker. The insurance tax in four years has gone up from \$1 million to \$1.8 million. Individual income tax has gone up from \$16 million in 1964 to \$56 million, an increase of 250 per cent, Mr. Speaker. Corporation taxes went up from \$10 million to \$16 million, an increase of 60 per cent. Licence fees went up from \$9 million in 1964, to \$13.8 million this year. Fines, forfeits and penalties have increased by 26 per cent. You know it is interesting to note the Provincial Government is relaxing the liquor laws and increasing speed limits and penalties. It gets you coming and going. It wants to get more money from liquor and it also wants to get more money from penalties people are paying. An item listed as "other taxes," in 1964 netted the Provincial Treasury a quarter million, this year \$1 million, an increase of 350 per cent and these are not all. I suggest to the Hon. Members who have taken their seats for the first time they may be well advised to take a look at the 1964 Estimates and compare them with the Estimates of this year. This would be a good lesson for them.

I have yet to mention the increase in the Hospital and Medical Care premiums. The Provincial Government, within a few weeks after getting elected, increased the premiums by 38 per cent, and now it is proposing deterrent fees. The Provincial Treasurer estimates that these deterrent fees will amount to \$7.4 million. The Minister of Health (Mr. Grant) has admitted that deterrent fees will represent between eight and ten per cent in the case of hospitals. They will represent twice that

March 13, 1968

amount in the case of medical care. My colleagues have described it as a sick tax. I believe that was a very appropriate description. It is a sick tax imposed on the people by a sick Government, Mr. Speaker.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Smishek: — I have yet to exhaust the list. There are many, many more taxes; there are the liquor permits increase, the Local Government Board fees increase, the park fees increase. University tuition fees have increased twice in the last two years, averaging \$110 per student. The premium fees in case of the Saskatchewan Power Corporation electrical installations have increased. And remember the big one, Mr. Speaker, because this Government has failed to provide the money to municipalities, in the last three years. municipal taxes have increased by \$24 million.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Smishek: — And I submit, Mr. Speaker, because this Government has not provided adequate funds for education and municipal assistance in the current year we can expect another \$10 million increase in municipal taxes. Add these together, Mr. Speaker, and you will find that since this Liberal Administration took office, the average person in the Province of Saskatchewan will have to pay on a per capita basis, \$75 more in taxes in 1968 than he did in 1964. The new taxes this Government has placed around the necks of the people amounts to \$75 per person. The important thing here is that, while we are being burdened with these new taxes, we have no new programs. There isn't a single useful program that has been introduced, any program of meaningful intent to the people. I would welcome the news media and particularly the press, publishing the Liberal party tax reduction promises, promises that they have failed to keep and the specific taxes, fees and charges increased and imposed. The list that I have mentioned is fairly comprehensive but it is not complete.

Mr. Speaker, I want to make some reference to the important question of technical education. There isn't an area of our education that has suffered more than the technical field. It is a scandalous record of the last four years. This Government, year after year, has been appropriating money, and year after year, has been doing nothing about spending the money that was appropriated. Let me give you a few examples. In the 1965-66 Budget, there was an appropriation of \$405,000 for the Saskatoon institute. Do you know how much of that amount was spent? \$85,651!

An Hon. Member: — No! No!

Mr. Smishek: — The year following, we appropriated \$2.6 million. Do you know how much was spent? \$668,000! The Hon. Member for Saskatoon Mayfair (Mr. Brockelbank) asked a question again this year if the \$2.6 million appropriated back in 1966 was spent. We find that only two-thirds of the \$2.6 million has been spent to date. Two years later! This Government tried to take the credit for the \$2.6 million investment in the Saskatoon Technical school. The fact is their investment to date, two years later, is \$256,000 only, ten per cent of what was appropriated. Last

year again we appropriated \$3.6 million. I doubt whether a penny has been spent of that. We are yet to spend the 1966 Budget. Mr. Speaker, two years ago I asked a question in this House of how many people were denied the opportunity of going to technical schools. I got an answer that 880 were denied because there was no room. Last year I asked the same question in respect of the year 1966. This House might be interested that the week prior to the election being called I telephoned the Minister of Education (Mr. Trapp) at that time. I asked him whether he would provide me with the answer. He told me that he had the answer but would have to check with the Government whether to give it to me. Mr. Speaker, six months have elapsed and I am still to receive the answer. I placed the same question again this year, on February 20th. Mr. Speaker, almost one month has gone by and the Minister of Education (Mr. McIsaac) has still to file the answer. It had the answer to that question six months ago, Mr. Speaker. What is it hiding? Why is it hiding the truth? Why is it refusing to tell the people its dismal record in respect to technical education?

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Smishek: — Now, there is much more that I would like to say in the case of technical education. I want to make one reference to the apprenticeship program of this Government. Mr. Speaker, this Government has been talking about a labor shortage. Month after month, the Minister of Labour (Mr. Coderre) and the Premier have been saying that we have a shortage of skilled labor. The question here is, what are they doing about it? The Apprenticeship Board which is the body responsible for developing apprenticeship programs has not met in over two years, Mr. Speaker, has not met in over two years and they have the audacity to tell us that they are interested in apprenticeship programs.

Mr. Speaker: — Order, order!

Mr. B.D. Gallagher: (Yorkton) — Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, I think according to Standing Order 46, the Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Steuart) has the floor.

Mr. Speaker: — He's overtime of but five seconds.

Mr. Smishek: — Mr. Speaker, I would like to have more time, but unfortunately my time is up. It is obvious from the remarks I have made, I will oppose the motion, but I will support the amendment.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. D.G. Steuart: (Provincial Treasurer) — Mr. Speaker, before I go on with the contents of my address, I would just like to point out one statistic for the edification of the Member for Regina North East (Mr. Smishek) in regard to technical and vocational education. In the four years that we have been the Government of this Province, the increase in enrolment in the technical and vocational schools has increased by 80 per cent.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

March 13, 1968

Mr. Stuart: — In other words, in our four years of office we have almost doubled the enrolment that it took them 20 years in their time to attain.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Stuart: — Mr. Speaker, I have listened for the last eight days to a torrent of abuse from the Opposition, probably unequalled in the history of this Assembly.

An Hon. Member: — You need it.

Mr. Stuart: — Words like deceit, lies, pay-off, criminal, and bribery have been the order of the day. But strangely, Mr. Speaker, the vicious attacks mounted by the NDP have had a hollow ring. This puzzled me at first, but after listening to the first half dozen speeches from Members opposite, I realize they all had a common theme and a repetitive sound. It was then I realized, Mr. Speaker, that 90 per cent of the NDP speeches in this debate had been churned out by the poison pen writers from the office of the Leader of the Opposition.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Stuart: — The backroom planners wrote them and the front and back bench Members alike parroted them off with little skill and without much sincerity. You know, Mr. Speaker, in spite of their cries of anguish, the Socialists are really not unhappy that we have raised taxes or proposed utilization fees. In fact, Mr. Speaker, they couldn't be happier. It showed up on their faces when I brought down the Budget, and they have acted like a kid with a new toy ever since. Now, Mr. Speaker, why are they happy? Because it gives them a chance to play their favorite game and play it to the hilt. This Budget gives our Socialist Opposition the opportunity to cry crocodile tears for the poor, the old, and the sick. It opens the door for them to spread fear and dissension with their half truths, smears and outright lies. You know, Mr. Speaker, having just been defeated and rejected by the people of Saskatchewan for the second time, they hope to use this Budget to crawl back into power.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Stuart: — Mr. Speaker, the NDP campaign has already begun and it should be recognized for what it is — a program of smear and fear. You know the open line radio programs are plugged by Socialist callers who smear the Members of our Government without the courage to reveal their names.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Stuart: — Mr. Speaker, they've even moved into the geriatric centres and spread fear and apprehension among the old and the sick. They have taken the problems of our Mental Health Program and stooped to a new low, spreading fear and doubt in their own communities. You know, Mr. Speaker, even a rodent won't dirty its own nest. But the Member from The Battlefords (Mr. Kramer) will.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Steuart: — Then they finish off by assuring the people that they won't forget. I think the line goes, "The people will remember." Well, Mr. Speaker, I hope they are right. I hope the people do remember the records, all of the record, because if they do the NDP Socialists will never again be trusted with the Government this Province.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Steuart: — Mr. Speaker, let's look at the Socialists' record for a moment and compare how they talk now in Opposition to how they acted as a Government. First they have charged our Government in general and myself in particular with deceiving the people of the province. Mr. Speaker, I deny these charges. In 1964 we promised to cut taxes and we did just that to the tune of 22 million. During the last campaign we promised responsible government and we are keeping our word in spite of the Opposition.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Steuart: — The Member for Milestone (Mr. MacDonald) yesterday proved to this House how the Socialist party had during election after election promised our people something for nothing and then raised the taxes without fail, once they were safely backing power. He also reminded us that the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Lloyd) when he was Provincial Treasurer in 1961 raised the taxes by over \$34 million or 25 per cent of his Budget. This is \$2 million more than the increase in the present Budget but almost three times as high percentage wise. Place this record beside his speech in this debate and then remember this is the individual they tried to sell to the public as a man of integrity. Mr. Speaker, no wonder the voters have rejected him at every opportunity.

Hon. W.R. Thatcher: (Premier) — Six out of seven.

Mr. Steuart: — And I'm afraid his party will soon follow suit. You know, Mr. Speaker, the old CCF promise to take off the sales tax, give us free drugs, free nursing care and free dentistry makes a mockery of their sanctimonious preaching in this debate. We in the north will never forget the pulp mills they promised us before every election since 1956 . . .

Mr. Thatcher: — You remember that, Bill.

Mr. Steuart: — . . . nor will we forget their efforts to sabotage the one we succeeded in obtaining. Mr. Speaker, bad as the Socialist record is in regard to taxes and broken promises, they don't really show their true colors until they come to dividing, frightening and confusing people, especially those who need our help and assurance. Read their speeches on the small hospital problem and then look at their record. You know, Mr. Speaker, when I took over as Minister of Health, they referred to the former Minister of Health, the Member from Regina Centre (Mr. Blakeney) sometimes as the Pope. Well when I asked them why, they said it was almost impossible to get an audience with him.

March 13, 1968

The present financial critic, when he was Minister of Health, hid in his office and was generally unavailable, especially to the boards of small hospitals. He had nothing to say to the small hospitals, he had neither the courage to rebuild them or the guts to close them down. Worse yet, Mr. Speaker, he allowed many to stay open even though they were fire traps and he didn't allow them to rebuild. The former NDP Minister of Health showed an equally callous attitude concerning the medical standards in many of our small hospitals. This was another mess that we had to clean up. You know, Mr. Speaker, even when you wade through all the trash they have uttered about small hospitals in this debate, they have yet to have the courage to say exactly what the Socialists would do about this pressing problem. Mr. Speaker, the NDP really crawled into the gutter when they came to our Mental Health Program. No, Mr. Speaker, I withdraw that. The only one of their Members that deserves that distinction is the Member from The Battlefords (Mr. Kramer). The others while they were critical, they showed a measure of restraint that is needed in such a sensitive area as mental health. Now I don't intend to answer the outbursts of the Member from The Battlefords. When one considers his record in this House and when one considers his record as a citizen of this nation, his actions are predictable and beneath contempt.

However, I want to set the record straight in regard to Saskatchewan's Mental Health Program. Now, Mr. Speaker, I have no hesitation in saying that we inherited a good and enlightened Mental Health Program. I have in the past said it and I do now give the professionals who developed the Saskatchewan Mental Health Plan and the CCF Government who sponsored it, full credit. Our Administration has been criticized by the Frazier Report and as a former Minister of Health, I accept my share of this criticism. At the same time, Mr. Speaker, I have no intention of letting the Opposition get away with their claim that under their administration all was well in the Mental Health Program and that we destroyed it, or that because we placed \$500,000 in these Estimates that we don't intend to correct the faults pointed up in Dr. Frazier's Report. When I became Minister of Health in May of 1964, I found the Saskatchewan plan for mental health was in full operation. I also found many difficulties with the program, the facilities, the staff and the public. Let me quote from the Annual Report of the Department of Public Health for the year 1954-55:

During 1954 the Saskatchewan Hospital, Weyburn extended its policy of permitting certain patients more freedom. The purpose was related entirely to improved treatment procedures. The number of patients in open wards consequently increased from 300 to more than 600. Under the circumstances it was anticipated that the occasional patient might at first wander away.

And this did happen. Occasional patients, they flooded the city of Weyburn and two or three of them they never did find until the next year when they found them dead somewhere near the confines of Weyburn. Again in the Annual Report of 1955-56, it says here:

There has also been an increase in the use of the trial visit or convalescent leave. Ideally the patient should during this period have regular contacts with a hospital social worker or with a mental health clinic. In practice it has not been possible to give this supervision to an adequate extent because of the great distance of the

homes of many patients from the mental hospital and because of the lack of sufficient social workers.

Mr. Speaker, again in the Annual Report of 1960-61 we find this statement:

The difficulty in maintaining even close to a full complement of professional staff and therapeutic disciplines, such as psychiatry and occupational therapy, mitigates against further improvements in treatment program.

Mr. Speaker, these reports indicated some of the problems being experienced, and just some of them, as a result of the new policy. It shows they had problems with patients running loose, lack of staff to treat them at home and even a shortage of professionals which hampered treatment in the mental hospitals. During those years the public complained bitterly about patients in the community. Some of the top staff quit. Dr. Osmond left in 1961, Dr. Clancy in 1962, Dr. Grunberg in 1961. These were just some of the top men. Many, many other psychiatrists left in those years as well.

Let me tell you about wage increases during the last five the CCF Government to the employees of our mental hospitals. During the last five years of the CCF, wage increases to the employees in our mental hospitals averaged less than 3 per cent a year. One year they got the magnificent sum of 1.5 per cent increase. We have just settled or we are in the process of settling wages for the same people at the highest level ever given to them in the history of this province.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Steuart: — Mr. Speaker, in view of these problems did the CCF Government slow down the rate of discharge from the mental hospitals? They did not. The record shows that the rate increased from 1960 until we took over in May of 1964. The number of patients in Weyburn mental hospital dropped by over 30 per cent during that period, from 1, 574 to under 1, 000. Again, while I give them full credit for helping put the plan into effect, I also charge them with a share of the responsibility for the problems we now face. Mr. Speaker, I would also point out that when the Socialists ran into trouble, they swept it under the rug. We hired an independent authority and we accept his criticism and we intend to correct the faults that he found.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Steuart: — You know, Mr. Speaker, I think it is necessary at this time to point out that while Dr. Frazier found many problems he also commended the program in general. On page one he calls it one of the world's most advanced community psychiatric programs. On page 20 and 21 he states: "We emphasize that many briefs and letters spoke favorably of discharge practices and standards." And on page 37 Dr. Frazier says and I quote:

It should be stressed that any program can be criticized. At the present time, the Saskatchewan program is providing reasonably satisfactory care.

March 13, 1968

Mr. Speaker, I don't point these things out in any effort to whitewash the shortcomings that are listed in the report, but I do think it is important to assure the people of Saskatchewan of two things, (1) that while our mental health program needs upgrading, it is still among the best anywhere and, (2) that we do intend to take whatever steps are necessary to correct the problems that presently exist. We have never pretended that \$500,000 will do the job. If you read the Estimates it says to implement the first stage of the Report. We will spend whatever money is necessary to ensure a good, sound and safe Mental Health Program for this Province.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Steuart: — You know, Mr. Speaker, Members opposite have heaped criticism after criticism on us for our failure to bring down a responsible Budget. Well the Member for Regina South West (Mr. McPherson) listed item after item of expenditures that they say they would put in if they were the Government. I have 20 of them here and they amount to over \$208 million. This was just part of the list but in fairness the Opposition did suggest some cuts. They suggested, I think it was the Hon. Member for Regina Centre (Mr. Blakeney) who doesn't live in the country, we could cut the highway program by \$20 million. He said we could fire a few civil servants. He suggested the ones that were hired because of politics. I can assure them if we did this, about half of his friends would be unemployed. We could sell our aircraft, we could cut out the Information Service. This comes rather odd from the Government who spent three times as much money as we ever did and had twice as large a staff in Information Services.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Steuart: — But anyway, Mr. Speaker, when you add up their cuts, they come to about \$21 million. The increases they suggested come to at least \$208 million, a \$187 million difference between the suggested Budget of the irresponsible Opposition and the Budget I brought down.

What is their answer? Raise income and corporation tax and raise royalty rates. Let's assume we raise the royalty rates by double; this could bring in \$26 million. I don't think we'd have any potash mines left, I don't think we'd have any oil wells left, I don't think we'd have any resources to base our tax structure on. Secondly, the Opposition said, "Let's raise the corporation tax." To raise \$50 million that they think we need, corporation tax would have to be increased from 11 per cent to 46 per cent. Such a rate of taxation would drive corporations out and certainly rule out any chance of more industrial development like we have had in the last four years. Then they advocate we should raise the individual income tax. Well this left \$100 million for Henry's program and all the rest of the programs. We would have to raise it from 5 per cent to 65 per cent. Well, let me tell you, Mr. Speaker, the rate of exodus we saw going out of this province-in the 20 years of the Socialists would be tripled, if they ever got back in power and put those taxes in. You know, Mr. Speaker, the irresponsible attitude of the Members opposite is clearly revealed in these figures. The choice of the people of this province is clear, either to support a responsible Government or the pie-in-the sky Budget that the Members opposite proposed, with

Complete disregard for the economic well-being of the people of the province.

You know, Mr. Speaker, they saved their most hysterical irresponsible outbursts for utilization fees. I just wanted to quote to see if they always felt this way. I want to quote T.C. Douglas, speaking in the House on October, 25th, 1961, as reported in the Debates and Proceedings. Mr. Douglas said at the time:

The matter of utilization fees is still under consideration.

Later in the same debate he said:

I want to say again the Government is not seeking to shelve its responsibility with reference to utilization fees . . .

The initiative of going to the doctor lies with the patient. All he has to do is pick up the phone or go into the doctor's office . . .

Again I quote, he said:

The second thing that has to be kept in mind is that it will cost \$1,800,000 less by having this deterrent fee.

He goes on to say:

You could build a regional mental hospital with \$1,800,000.

And he concluded by saying:

So it has to be thought about. The Government is not trying to evade responsibility. When the time comes to make this decision, the Government will accept full responsibility.

Mr. Speaker, you note the NDP were the Government then and utilization fees were spoken of as a responsibility and as a little extra payment that could be used for other Government services. Mr. Douglas was the Premier and he was there for 16 years. I think he had some responsibility. Possibly that is why the present leadership has been so unsuccessful at the polls because they are completely lacking in responsibility. They say, show us the need for utilization fees. The two plans cost \$105 million, they'll be doubled in seven years. If they don't recognize that as a need, they won't recognize anything. The utilization fees will be in \$7 million, \$7 a person a year. The Premier has said we will keep no one out of our hospitals because of money. If they don't recognize the need to take a responsible attitude towards these plans, Mr. Speaker, then they don't know the meaning of responsibility. You know, Mr. Speaker, if any Government failed to keep the cost of these health plans within bounds and as a result they had to be seriously curtailed, that Government would really have betrayed its trust to the people of this province. This is what the Opposition would do if they were in office, it's what the provinces of Alberta and Ontario have done and I think it is a disgrace to responsible government.

Mr. Speaker, the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Lloyd)

asked me to resign, and I won't resign because I have done what is necessary. Although he himself has proved to be totally irresponsible and thus unfit to lead even the Socialist Opposition I won't ask him to resign. As the Leader of the Opposition he has got the saddest record of any leader, political leader in Canada, dead or alive. He even replaced R.B. Bennett as the saddest flop of the century. I won't ask him to resign, in fact if he gives us a membership card we'll come and support him when they try to oust him next June. Mr. Speaker, this Budget is a responsible and a timely Budget. It recognizes the needs of our people in health, welfare, education, recreation and protection. It also recognizes that in good times such as you have now, you pay as you go. It's a Budget that will maintain our present prosperity and ensure our great future. I ask all Members to vote for the motion and reject the amendment.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

The amendment was negatived on the following recorded division:

YEAS — 24
Messieurs

Lloyd	Meakes	Brockelbank
Wooff	Berezowsky	Baker
Kramer	Romanow	Pepper
Willis	Smishek	Bowerman
Wood	Thibault	Matsalla
Blakeney	Whelan	Messer
Davies	Snyder	Kwasnica
Dewhurst	Michayluk	Kowalchuk

NAYS — 33
Messieurs

Thatcher	Grant	Radloff
Howes	Coderre	Weatherald
McFarlane	Bjarnason	Mitchell
Boldt	MacDonald	Larochelle
Cameron	Estey	Gardner
Steuart	Hooker	Coupland
Heald	Gallagher	McPherson
McIsaac	McLennan	Charlebois
Guy	Heggie	Forsyth
Loken	Breker	McIvor
MacDougall	Leith	Schmeiser

Motion agreed to on the following recorded division:

YEAS — 33
Messieurs

Thatcher	Grant	Radloff
Howes	Coderre	Weatherald
McFarlane	Bjarnason Mitchell	Mitchell
Boldt	MacDonald	Larochelle

Cameron
Steuart
Heald
McIsaac
Guy
Loken
MacDougall

Estey
Hooker
Gallagher
McLennan
Heggie
Breker
Leith

Gardner
Coupland
McPherson
Charlebois
Forsyth
McIvor
Schmeiser

NAYS — 24
Messieurs

Lloyd
Wooff
Kramer
Willis
Wood
Blakeney
Davies
Dewhurst

Meakes
Berezowsky
Romanow
Smishek
Thibault
Whelan
Snyder
Michayluk

Brockelbank
Baker
Pepper
Bowerman
Matsalla
Messer
Kwasnica
Kowalchuk

The Assembly adjourned at 5:28 o'clock p.m.