

**LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN**  
**Second Session -- Sixteenth Legislature**  
**7th Day**

**Friday, February 7, 1969**

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

**WELCOME TO STUDENTS**

**Mr. E.I. Wood (Swift Current):** — Mr. Speaker, I would like to introduce to you and through you to the House some 44 students from St. Patrick's school, along with their teachers, Sister Charlotte and Miss Campbell. They are in the second and third rows of the gallery. This is a very fine group of students from a very fine city, Mr. Speaker. They have been very pleased to have a talk from you in regard to Parliament procedure. I know they have enjoyed it very much. They also had a tour of the building and I hope that their visit with us will be both profitable and enjoyable and that they will have a safe journey home.

**Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. F. Meakes (Touchwood):** — Mr. Speaker, I would like to introduce to you and through you to the Members of the House a fine group of 30 students from grade 11 and grade 12 from Punnichy high school under the Principal, Mr. Wood. They toured the University this morning and are spending an hour or so here this afternoon and then going home. I wish them and I am sure you all do, an educational and entertaining afternoon and a safe trip home.

**Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. T.M. Weatherald (Cannington):** — Mr. Speaker, I would like to introduce to you a group of students in the west gallery from Lampman school. Lampman is a thriving community in southeastern Saskatchewan with a large development of oil in that part of the province. I believe to my knowledge, Mr. Speaker, that this is the first time that a group has been here from Lampman community. I believe they will find this experience will broaden their outlook and understand our province and democratic processes in a better manner.

**Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. G.G. Leith :** — It gives me pleasure to welcome on your behalf and on behalf of other Members of the Assembly a group of grade eight students from Dinsmore Composite High school. They are accompanied by Mrs. Hopkins, Mr. Purcell and their driver, Mr. Banting and by their teacher, Miss Smale. I hope that you will have a good afternoon and I hope that you will enjoy yourselves and have a safe journey home.

**Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

## ANNOUNCEMENT

### FEDERAL-PROVINCIAL CONFERENCE

**Hon. D.G. Stuart (Provincial Treasurer):** — Before the Orders of the Day I wish to make a statement to the House on a matter of very great provincial and national importance. I have today received on behalf of the Premier communications from the Prime Minister replying to messages sent to Ottawa by the three Prairie Premiers after their meeting on February 1st. I very much regret to say that these communications demonstrate that there has been no change whatsoever in the Federal attitude towards matters which will arise next week at the Federal-Provincial Conference.

The communications received today in effect reject outright some of the positions by the Prairie Premiers, and in my view fail to give adequate consideration to others. It is a source of regret that the Prime Minister has seen fit to send these communications on the eve of a conference which would have had a better chance of success without this apparently unbending Federal attitude. It appears to us, Mr. Speaker, that any request from the Prairies receives very casual attention at best in Ottawa. With the utmost respect I suggest that such is not the case with all Provinces. The Prairies I believe are becoming annoyed with the attitude that their problems are of relatively minor concern when the problems of Quebec, be they large or small, are automatically matters of national urgency. I say this, Mr. Speaker, with no feeling whatsoever of animosity towards Quebec. It is well known that we are prepared to go to great lengths to assist in achieving the legitimate aspirations of French Canada. We have already gone at least as far as any other Province in Canada. We are prepared to go even further should it prove reasonable and feasible. I suggest, however, that Confederation is an equal partnership and that it is high time equal consideration was given to the problems of all parts of this country. Surely Confederation is not so easy that it can be said that everyone must jump immediately to attend to the problems of one partner, while those of the other partners can be held in abeyance and that is if this is not done then Confederation is in danger of immediate collapse. This Government, Mr. Speaker, does not believe we have reached that point. We do believe it is time that the voice of the Prairies was heard with equal impact. Whether it is realized in Eastern Canada or not, prairie grain is at least as important to the well-being of the entire country as such matters as the official language Bill, bilingual judges and so on. We are not prepared to sit back and allow the problems of the Prairies be swept aside or pushed into dark corners indefinitely. I assure the House again, Mr. Speaker, that we are going to the Conference next week in a spirit of co-operation, but we are also going with an absolute determination that the voice of the Prairies shall be listened to in the councils of this nation.

Mr. Speaker, a Confederation that is not an equal partnership is just as unthinkable as a Confederation without Quebec. This attitude will be the keynote of all we say and do at the Federal-Provincial Conference next week.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. W.S. Lloyd (Leader of the Opposition):** — Mr. Speaker, it is a very important indication which the Deputy Premier has just put before us. I am sure that in speaking for the Members on this side of the House, we share concern for the future of Canada. If I may say so, however, Mr. Speaker, we would have been in a much better position to share the concerns of the Government and possibly support it if we knew what its position was going to be at the forthcoming Conference. It is some matter of regret to me that the Government of Saskatchewan has not as yet made known its specific proposals so that there could have been a chance to discuss them in this Legislature. We are left in the dark entirely I may say. The Deputy Premier (Mr. Steuart) has spoken in generalities with some strength of feeling, some of this strength of feeling some of us will share. My only regret is that we didn't know about the specific proposals of the Government, so that we as a Legislature could have determined better our position and the position to advise on behalf of the Saskatchewan people.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Steuart:** — Mr. Speaker, I would point out to the Leader of the Opposition that we will of course acquaint him with our position. The Premier did offer to take him into his confidence, I believe, at the beginning, but my understanding was – and I may be wrong – that the Leader of the Opposition – I don't argue this point or say that there is anything wrong with it – reserved the right to take his own position and so we felt that this stand must then be the stand of the Government. If I am wrong – I see the Leader of the Opposition shaking his head – then I am sorry. Then I am quite prepared to meet with the Leader of the Opposition and discuss our stand today before we leave to go to this Conference.

**Mr. Lloyd:** — Mr. Speaker, if I may say so, let me put the record correct. At no time as I understood the very brief conversation which I had with the Premier did he offer to say, take into his confidence with regard to this. He did assure me that I would know, before we went, of the position that the Government was going to take and he expressed the hope, which I concurred in, that we might be able to support it. I obviously can't support it if I don't know what it is. That's my point. But the major point is this, that I think it is just not enough to let me know, to take me into their confidence. My point was that I would have hoped that we could have discussed the whole thing in the Legislature.

**Mr. Steuart:** — Well, I think the Leader of the Opposition knows that I certainly am prepared to acquaint his with the stand of the Government. This is the Government's stand and I am not aware that at any of the Conferences that were held in the 20 years they held office or that any Government brings in its stand before-hand and debates it. A great deal of anything they had to say would be public knowledge, a great deal of what they had to say would be held up for weeks. We would have days and days of debate before we could come to consensus – if we ever could. We hardly ever can come to a consensus on anything, and I doubt if we could come to a consensus on anything so vital as the constitution of this country. But I certainly will meet with

the Leader of the Opposition before we go to Ottawa so that he is aware of the position that we are taking.

## QUESTIONS

### BILL NO. 14

**Mr. A.E. Blakeney (Regina Centre):** — Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day I wonder if I might put a question to the Attorney General (Mr. Heald). We have now on our desks Bill No. 14 and I am asking the perennial question; when may we expect the marginal notes with respect to these bills to be coming on our desks?

**Hon. D.V. Heald (Attorney General):** — Mr. Speaker, I will give the perennial answer to the perennial question, that is, I will see what I can do.

### NATURAL GAS HOOK-UPS

**Mr. J. Messer (Kelsey):** — Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day I would like to put a question to the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. McFarlane). Some time ago a policy was announced on behalf of the Saskatchewan Power Corporation and the Department of Agriculture that natural gas hook-ups would be made free of costs to farmers for drying or to committees that have been set up for drying. I wonder if it has been brought to his attention that a great many of these farmers and committees that were set up for this purpose have been turned down, simply because it isn't convenient for the Power Corporation to hook up where it is convenient to establish a dryer. Could he just comment briefly on this and also tell me the number of dryers that have been hooked up.

**Hon. D.T. McFarlane (Minister of Agriculture):** — Mr. Speaker, the problem has been brought to the attention of the Department of Agriculture and I imagine the Saskatchewan Power Corporation. In some areas there have been requests to set up dryers in a location where it would mean tearing up a hard surface highway, hard surface street and all this type of inconvenience. These of course have not been agreed to. The amount of facilities that have been set up at the moment would indicate there are about 11. There are two more in the process of being set up and there are many applications in.

## ADJOURNED DEBATES

### ADDRESS-IN-REPLY

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Mr. Charlebois (Saskatoon City Park-University) and the proposed amendment thereto by Mr. Lloyd (Leader of the Opposition).

**Mr. F. Meakes (Touchwood):** — Mr. Speaker, yesterday when I adjourned debate I had said all the nice things to the different people in the House, I am not going to bother repeating them today.

Through the years that I have represented Touchwood I have

every year tried in the Throne Speech Debate to review the economic conditions and the problems that Touchwood is facing. It would take much longer than the time that I have allocated myself, Mr. Speaker, to cover them. I must take a choice and talk about what I believe is the most urgent and the worst problem facing the people of Touchwood, and that is the terrible condition in which the farmers are finding themselves in regard to damp wheat. I know my friends across the way, one of them said the other say that we are trying to make cheap political hay out of this problem. I want to disregard and deny that statement, because certainly it is the most pressing problem there is. If I were not to talk about it, it would not be safe for me to go back to Touchwood.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Meakes:** — Anybody with any common sense knew by the middle of October that we were in for a very serious problem. None of the harvesting was done. At that time another thing happened when the Wheat Board increased the quota to three bushels, and I think this was one of the gravest mistakes that the Wheat Board ever made. I am curious as to where they got their advice, I hope it wasn't from the Department of Agriculture, the Province of Saskatchewan, because what has happened, in my own community and in most of the communities of my constituency is that over 60 per cent of our farmers haven't delivered one bushel as yet. A few people were able to fill the elevator with what room there was on the three bushel quota and left our farmers in this position.

The Minister of Agriculture (Mr. McFarlane) for this Province at that time was going around the Province of Saskatchewan and his men were also. They remind me of a hen with her head cut off. They were bouncing up and around and letting gravity bring them down. What were they saying? They were saying that the farmers would have to dry the grain themselves, that they would have to do it all. Let us put ourselves in the position of the farmer. Every day on the radio and on television the authorities were saying that the farmers were going to have to dry the grain themselves. But every day also there was announcements from the Board of Grain Commissioners warning the farmer that 30 per cent of the samples that were coming in were being burned. Who was the farmer to believe? Nobody seemed to be doing anything constructive.

I for one am glad that I was one of four who went to North Dakota. After all North Dakota was a very ideal comparison where farming economy is wheat; its weather is very similar. I was very amused yesterday when the Member for Estevan (MR. MacDougall) referred to North Dakota as being the bulwark of private enterprise. Well he only lives about 12 miles from North Dakota. He can't have studied the grain handling situation in North Dakota or he wouldn't have made that statement. The great majority of grain handling in North Dakota is done by co-operatives, the Farm Union Co-operative Elevators, certainly not the private enterprise he referred to.

**An Hon. Member:** — Private enterprise!

**Mr. Meakes:** — If my hon. friends will keep their mouths shut, their ears open, they might learn something.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**An Hon. Member:** — Not from you!

**Mr. Meakes:** — We found the conditions down there that about 50 per cent of the grain had been taken off dry. They had taken that off before the wet weather hit, and then they had the same weather and about 50 per cent of the grain was damp and they had the same conditions as Saskatchewan. We found something else, we found that nearly all the grain by the middle of November had been dried. We found most of the elevators had dryers attached to them. The grain trade and the farmers down there look on a dryer along side an elevator the same way as they look at a cleaner, just part of the elevator service. We talked to farmers and directors of the elevator companies and to operators. They all said the same thing. There was only one place for a dryer to be and that was at the elevator. They gave three reasons. One, capitalization, that is was far cheaper for the elevator companies, the farm-owned elevator companies to own a dryer together than to own dryers separately. The second reason they gave was that when they bought collectively and had a dryer at the elevator, that they were able to buy a bigger one and a better one, more foolproof in terms of spoilage of wheat. The third reason they gave was that the elevator agent who was on wages was operating the dryer and there was no chance of rushing grain through, to try to get paid by the bushel. I think another reason that is certainly obvious is that the small farmers were able to make use of the dryer at the elevator and it was the proper place to do it.

I was interested in what one of the operators told me. He said that he wouldn't take \$1,000 a month to operate an elevator where there was no dryer. He said, "I would never go back to the days of when we had to worry about a bin of wheat heating in the elevator," never had to worry any more about shipping damp grain and losing a car enroute. We found out that ever since 1951 they have been drying grain in North Dakota from the elevators. By the mid 1950s 50 per cent of the farmers of that area of North Dakota we were in had their own dryers. None of them have got them any more. They have sold them. As one farmer said, "We don't need them any more, we find out it is better to have them at the elevators, we sold them to you Canadians."

I couldn't help but think of his remarks, afterwards when he said, "In my opinion your grain trade is 20 years behind the times." Well at one place we went to, Agate, North Dakota, we saw a 300-bushel dryer and they also had a 1,000-bushel an hour dryer. Another place at Rock Lake they had three 300-bushel an hour dryers and they are talking about buying another 1,000-bushel an hour dryer. What was the cost to the farmer? They were charging five cents to bring the wheat down to dry from 16 and one per point about that, meaning to say you could get wheat testing 18 or less dried for eight cents.

Well, we come back to Saskatchewan to hear governments and elevator companies still saying the farmers are going to have to do it themselves. The Prime Minister with that eloquent shrug of his on TV said that the farmers grew it, it was up to them to dry it. Then we were told it was against the regulations of the Board of Transport Commissioners that they wouldn't allow us to put dryers next to elevators. Very interesting, Mr.

Speaker, and now I quote from the Leader Post of January 19th, 1969, headed Ottawa:

There is nothing in the Regulations of the Board of Grain Commissioners to prevent installation of grain dryers in country elevators, Agricultural Minister Olsen said Thursday in the House of Commons.

The Minister gave the information in reply to a question by Les Benjamin, NDP, Regina Lake Centre, who had asked if the Board of Grain Commissioners of the Federal Agriculture Department of the Government was considering regulations that would permit the grain dryers to be installed in the country elevators. Mr. Olsen said that some companies had hired commercial drying equipment and some companies had been set up next to the elevator with adjoining spouts and the Board of Grain Commissioners had no objection to this.

Then coming back to about 10 days ago, I am now going to quote again from the Leader Post. When the weather was 40 below, that was January 25, Leader Post said this:

Agriculture Minister McFarlane has issued an appeal to farmers to continue to dry grain as much of their own damp grain as possible.

Further on it says:

The survey indicated that due to cold weather only 25 per cent of the dryers in the province were being operated.

Then he says:

However, if drying is not accelerated the damp grain situation will become very critical.

I wonder if the Hon. Minister has ever tried drying grain when it's 40 below. I know this, talking to some of the farmers who were drying in December when it was only about 5 below and 10 below, they said it was the coldest job they had ever had. I understand that some elevators now at last are waking up. It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that coming back to what I have been saying, common sense says that the place for a dryer is at the elevator, rather than either the terminals or on the farms. They don't have to ship moisture to the elevators in terms of damp grain. There is no grain to be spoiled in box cars: it is going to be dried before it leaves. There is going to be no heating in the elevators. All the grain in the hands of the grain trade at any given time will be dry and available for sale.

My hon. friend the Minister of Agriculture reminds me of that old story of my Johnnie, all the rest of the army being out of step, but my Johnnie.

Take the more important problems, even more than this. It is the complete lack of either interest or know-how of the Federal Government. The elevator companies are blaming the railways, the railways are blaming the elevators. Both are blaming the Government. Everyone is passing the buck. I know in my home town for eight days box cars sat on the side track

February 7, 1969

before they were spotted at the elevator. In the meantime the poor farmer is holding the bag.

I want to say that it is easy for the Government to say that the farmers' responsibility is to get the grain dried. But I am not scared to say that most of the farmers in my area do not have enough money to buy a dryer, and haven't even enough money to pay for the drying.

I said that up until a week ago 60 per cent of the permit holders in my town haven't delivered a bushel of grain. Let us look at what has happened. The farmer will take out \$1 a bushel advance and many of them have done this, because they owed debts and they were trying to pay their debts. But they were only going to get \$1.07 a bushel because it is a five and six wheat. They just know that they are not going to get anything, let alone for the drying. Their credit is extended to the limit. I hope I am wrong, but I am very scared that some of our farmers are not going to be able to sow their crops next spring, because the businessmen in our community are finding themselves in the same position.

One fuel dealer told me the other day that he had \$75,000 of charge accounts in his books. He said these are good customers, but he said, "How can they pay me when they haven't sold a kernel." Our machine agents are in exactly the same position. Their credit is impaired and many of them will be unable to carry their customers as they did last year. Many of them are on COD. They have good customers and they know they have good customers. How can a farmer pay, I ask again, if he hasn't sold anything? And here we have these two Nero's, the Ministers of Agriculture for Saskatchewan (Mr. McFarlane) and for Canada fiddling while Rome burns.

I want to say that if ever the Liberal party should hang their heads in shame, it is right now.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Meakes:** — It is a record of inaction, of inaptitude, of blundering and bugling. Now the Federal Government is offering a \$600 loan. As I said before, the farmer has already spent his wheat. He has taken the \$1 a bushel grant. He knows that he will owe money the next fall as it is. I want to quote from today's Leader Post in regard to the 600 bushels. This is this morning's edition, February 7th, telling about the debate on the Cash Advance Bill:

On the Cash Advance Bill, the Government rejected Opposition demands to pay demurrage charges on ships awaiting grain cargo in Vancouver. Otto Lang, Minister without portfolio —

I can understand why he hasn't got one . . .

with special responsibilities for grain, said it would be out of step for the Government.

Out of step with whom? Certainly not out of step with the farmers who are in need of help.

He also agreed with Trade Minister Pepin under fire for



the grain congestion at Vancouver that a specially appointed controller was not needed now to look after the movement of grain for export.

He went on a little further and it says . . .

He said a personal tour of the west convinced him that drying would cost between 8 and 10 cents a bushel.

That is one of the most stupid remarks, Mr. Speaker, I have ever heard. I can lead the Hon. Minister of Agriculture (Mr. McFarlane) or the Hon. Mr. Otto Lang to 100 farmers who will tell you it costs between 14 and 20 cents a bushel, by the time they add the cost of trucking and all the rest.

I want to say that this is just a complete insult to the farmer. I suggest that this Minister of Agriculture should resign his seat.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Meakes:** — I can well understand why this Government is scared to call a by-election in Kelvington. They know very well that the conditions as they are, the Liberal candidate will lose his deposit.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Meakes:** — I'll challenge the Government to call an election on this issue and we'll fight it on nothing else, but on the record of what this Government has done to help the farmer.

Well I've done quite a bit of criticizing. Both Governments should have offered loans to elevator companies to install elevator-based dryers. I am convinced that if this had been done early enough, much of our problem would be gone. I know that at Agate they told us they bought a new 1,000-bushel dryer. They had ordered it on October 7th and they were in production on October 8th. Now if these Governments had made this kind of an offer to elevator companies at that time, the greatest part of the grain would be now dried. I believe that the Federal Government should pay outright grants of at least 10 cents a bushel to help the farmer for drying. As I said, I believe, the cost of trucking will bring it up to close to 20 cents. I just read that the Liberals don't believe in controllers but I believe that the Federal Government should establish a controller to have the power: 1. To compel railway companies to place boxcars at needed points. Certainly this isn't being done. 2. To compel elevator companies to keep adequate space at terminals for loading the ships. 3. To see that the quotas are raised fairly. 4. I believe that the Federal Government should declare a moratorium on interest charges on overdue machinery payments to farmers. I know there are farmers who are paying a large percentage of interest on used machinery bought, as high as 20 per cent, and this goes on even though they can't sell their grain. Certainly nobody can say that it's their fault that they're not paying. 5. I believe it should be prepared to make available loans to the fuel dealers and the machinery dealers so that they can

February 7, 1969

carry on. 6. I think it should outlaw any seizure of farm machinery at this time for money owing.

Mr. Speaker, this program that I suggest will not really cost money. It will enable the farmer to survive. It would put some money into the economy. It would create business for our business people.

Very interesting, one of the large car dealers of this city told me recently that his sales this year are running at 40 per cent over last year. He said that roughly speaking his business normally is about 60 per cent rural and 40 per cent urban and he said: "We're practically selling no vehicles of any kind to the farming community." This is just the sign of the economic condition of agriculture because certainly I think all Hon. Members will admit that without agriculture being healthy the rest of the business community is going to suffer.

Now, I'll leave the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. McFarlane) alone for a minute or two and go on to a couple of other things.

One of the things I look to the Minister in charge of the Saskatchewan Power Corporation (Mr. Grant) for and I plead with him to do something about getting natural gas through that line from Ituna through to Watrous. I said last year, and I want to point out again, that in 1964 both the Liberal candidate (who later became the Minister of Education) and myself, promised gas for that area in 1965. The great problem was this. It meant that, because of this promise, many of the people in these towns who built new homes, instead of installing furnaces run with fuel, installed them with propane, because they knew that they could convert to natural gas. They thought it would only be burning propane for a year or so, then they'd be able to convert their propane furnace for a matter of about \$10. And so they went to propane which they thought was saving money, but now they're finding that the cost of propane is so high. They can't throw their furnace out and some of these people who have waited five and six years for natural gas are getting impatient. I'm not now necessarily talking about my supporters. I'm talking about the people all along that line. Let's look what's on that line. We have Ituna which has a hospital, an orphanage, 22-room school, population of 1,300. We have Kelliher with a large school with about 20 rooms, population of 500. Lestock (my home town) has a hospital, 20-room school, population of 550. Punnichy with a large school of over 20, 500 of a population. Raymore, a large school with a population of over 500. Semans, the same. Nokomis, the same.

I want to suggest to the Hon. Minister (Mr. Grant) that these people deserve natural gas the same as the other areas. I sure hope that the Minister (Mr. Grant) will consider and announce this very necessary addition to the natural gas system when he brings in his budget.

As I said at the beginning, Touchwood has many other problems. One of the outstanding problems is the sick tax. The Premier and the Government have been running around making, what I consider, irresponsible statements. I'll admit the Minister (Mr. Grant) tried to put some figures on the records yesterday, but I think our stand of a year ago has proved right. There are people who are not receiving the attention that they should have because of dollars and cents. They don't have the money but they have some pride and they don't like to go and ask for

assistance or a bed to get it for nothing. Certainly for cancer patients – I know this summer that several people were forever coming in and out of hospitals and every time having to pay \$2.50. I think of the young parents with several children who have to go to the doctor. These children are not frivolent calls. The just have to go to the doctor regularly. Again this charge and it really doesn't deter the rich. I'll admit it doesn't stop me. If I needed to go to the doctor, I'm going to pay him \$1.50 if I have the money, but a good many working people haven't got those dollars. As far as the \$180 ceiling – this to me was a shock – if he'd have made it \$50 I still might not have gone along with it, but at \$180 of a ceiling this is really a joke, far worse than a joke. And again I would like to challenge this Government to go to Kelvington and call a by-election on this issue.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Hon. D.T. McFarlane (Minister of Agriculture):** — Mr. Speaker, much has been said both inside and outside this House by the Socialists since this debate started regarding the volume of damp and tough grain in the province. They have tried to make the people of this province believe that practically nothing has been done by the farmers, by the farm organizations, by the Wheat Board, the elevator companies or the Government, to deal with or try to cope with these problems. They would try to lead the people of this province to believe that when they were the Government, for 20 years, either there were no years where this type of situation existed or, if there was, then they gave the farmers massive sums of money to dry damp grain to bring in dryers to overcome shortages of income because of this type of emergency.

Now, to set the record straight, I want to indicate to this Legislature their complete disregard in assuming any measure of responsibility when similar circumstances arose during their term of office. Let us review the record.

In 1950 early August frosts destroyed the quality of much of the grain, harvesting was prolonged, winter set in with the result that 980,000 acres were harvested the following spring. Surely there was some tough and damp grain at that time because of low grades with resulting low prices. The farmers were, by the theory of the Socialists, entitled to financial help by the then Provincial Government. How much did they give? Not one cent!

In 1951, a year similar to 1968, with a wheat crop estimated at 325 million bushels, wet harvest weather, harvesting was suspended in November with the result that 5,700,000 acres of grain were left in the swath to be harvested the following spring. Of the crop harvested, 40 million bushels of wheat were damp, 40 million bushels of coarse grains were damp. No estimate was made of the tough grain. How much did the Socialists give the farmers that year? Not a red cent! But this is the year that they would have us believe that they had a program for helping the farmer dry his grain. They did, and I want you to compare theirs to what has been done by this

February 7, 1969

Government so far.

A survey of dryers in the province at that time placed the numbers not at 1,350 dryers but at between 15 and 20. Indications were that most of these dryers were home-made. I suspect these may be the ones the Member for Regina-West (Mr. Benjamin) was referring to in the House of Commons the other day when he mentioned obsolete dryers in the province.

The Socialist Government's program that year was to pay 30 cents per mile to a maximum of \$300 for transportation on dryers coming into the province. They paid a total for the year of \$11,000 on 65 dryers. Big deal! A total of about 80 to 85 dryers in the whole province, but once again, Mr. Speaker, not one cent paid to the farmer for drying grain. If the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Lloyd), who is sitting across the way, who was a Cabinet Minister in those days, presented his nine-point program that year, what happened to it? Not one point of his nine-point program put into effect.

The next year was 1959. Bad weather in the fall delayed harvesting operations and an estimated 2 million acres lay out till the spring of 1960. Surely there was tough and damp wheat harvested but once again no assistance provided to those farmers who had to contend with the problem. But it is significant that in late November the Federal Government offered to share with the Province up to \$3 per acre in payments to farmers who had less than half their crop harvested, but only on a maximum of 200 acres of crop. Certainly this policy penalized all those farmers who, through their initiative, tried and succeeded in getting the larger percentage of their crops off regardless of moisture content. Once again, they did not receive one cent, while those who left it unharvested, received payments and still harvested the balance of their crop in the spring. Out of approximately 100,000 farm units in the province at that time, only 1/5 received any assistance by the time these payments were completed in the spring of 1960. The Province's share amounted to \$1.32-1/2 per acre, about the amount of the one bushel of wheat per acre. And this is what the Government of the day gave to the farmers of this province at that time.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. McFarlane:** — And I suggest, Mr. Speaker, the only reason the Socialist Government shared in this program was because there was a Provincial election in the following June.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. McFarlane:** — And the whole of Southern Saskatchewan wiped every rural CCF Member out. That, Mr. Speaker, is the record of the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Lloyd) and his Socialists in the 20 years in office. In spite of what they would try and have you believe, they never paid one cent to the farmers for the drying of grain as long as they were the Government. Where was their nine-point program then? The NDPers opposite have stated that they realized a problem would develop regarding the harvesting and movement and storage and conditioning of tough and damp grain, as early as last September. Well, they were three months late. The problem didn't start in September, it started

in June. The farmers no sooner had their crops sown and it hardly had time to emerge through the ground when, once again, they were confronted by a crippling strike on the St. Lawrence Seaway. At the time when farmers desperately needed to get some cash and to deliver what was termed a record surplus of grain on the farm and to make room for a new crop, all movement came to an abrupt halt. Once again, as in previous years, we never heard one word from the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Lloyd) or his vocal colleagues across the way. They did not express any concern at that time in having the issue settled so the grain could move to meet export orders. Almost a month was lost to the movement of grain.

Mr. Speaker, in early June, Saskatchewan had the honor of hosting the conference of Ministers and Deputy Ministers of Agriculture from all the Provinces of Canada, along with the Federal Minister of Agriculture and his staff. It is significant that the Ministers from every Province felt that the strike would be disastrous not only to the farmers in the Western Provinces but to the whole of the nation. One of the first resolutions passed was that the Ministers of Agriculture in the Provinces collectively would give the Federal Minister every assistance in order to end this strike.

The strike ended on July 14th and before the farmer could even get his truck loaded, the grainhandlers went on strike at the Lakehead. This was another cruel blow to the whole farm economy. The strike never ended until the middle of September. Where were our Socialist friends then? Where was the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Lloyd)? Did they plead with some of their labor boss friends to end this calamity? Did the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Lloyd) plead on behalf of the farmers at that time? Did he indicate to his friends that this was jeopardizing the whole agricultural economy? Where was he, Mr. Speaker? Well, it appears that he was on the rocks. In fact, the only statement the people of the province can remember him making was that he had gone into the mountains of B.C. for three weeks and grew a beard. Talk about Rip Van Winkle being lost for 20 years. The Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Lloyd) has been lost period!

Well, Mr. Speaker, speaking of the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Lloyd) heading for the hills, I have a copy of an article appearing in the Leader Post of August 23rd. It's captioned, "A Hemingway Touch." This is during the heart of the grainhandlers' strike, and it shows – I want you to look at it – horrible picture – it shows what turns out to be our swinging Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Lloyd) with a slightly unshaven appearance, which the article described as a "beard." It further states that he had just returned after three weeks at the West Coast during which, as he said, "stayed away from his political friends as much as possible."

Well, Mr. Speaker, it was Harry Truman that said, "If you can't take the heat, then get out of the kitchen." Apparently the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Lloyd) had no influence whatsoever with his big labor bosses. He couldn't bring himself to defend the farmers in this situation, so he says he, "stayed away from his political friends as much as possible." Well, Mr. Speaker, the strike finally ended in the middle of September, and the beard came back off about the middle of January, about four months later.

February 7, 1969

Mr. Speaker, these two strikes and the resultant tie-up of deliveries and movement of grain were the beginning of the whole problem that the farmers are faced with in Western Canada today.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. McFarlane:** — On numerous occasions, I had pointed out to the people of the province through the news media at the time that this could cause serious problems later on and this has turned out to be substantially correct. These strikes prevented the farmers from delivering any grain or receiving any income for four months, the four months of the best weather we had in the whole season in this province. Certainly this did more than anything else to cause a bottleneck in getting the right grades of grain to the proper places to be in a position to meet potential orders from our customers.

Mr. Speaker, the never-ending vicious circle of strikes over the years has done more to tighten the economic noose around the farmer's neck and the agricultural industry than any amount of inclement weather. The economic result of practically every strike is borne by our primary producers and certainly the farmer is hardest hit of all, as every resultant price increase is built into the costs of materials and services he must have in order to continue to operate. The farmers have never yet heard Members of the Opposition come to their defence against those politically-orientated labor bosses who have been involved over so many years in so many strikes.

Where was the voice of the supposedly farm Members opposite during these crises? Where was the voice of the Member for Turtleford (Mr. Wooff)? Where was the voice of the Member who just took his seat, the Member for Touchwood (Mr. Meakes)? Where was the voice of the Member for Kelsey (Mr. Messer)?

As I mentioned, the grainhandlers' strike did not end till September 14th but harvesting in the southern part of the province commenced the middle of August. The Member for Weyburn (Mr. Pepper) should remember this. The elevators were full so that no deliveries of new crops could be accepted. Even by this time those farmers who had their own drying equipment were putting it to use to condition the grain that had to be stored. Regardless of what the Member for Touchwood (Mr. Meakes) says of his trip to North Dakota, the farmers of this province still realize that the best insurance that they have against conditions like this is to be able to install their own dryers right on their own farm and could do it more economically in the years ahead than any other system mentioned.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. McFarlane:** — The elevators were full so no deliveries of the new crop could be taken. As of October 7th, it was estimated that 60 per cent of the wheat crop had been harvested and by October 21st only 65 per cent. We realized then that much would have to be dried. Dryers had been coming into the province, and I issued instructions to my Department that the drying of grain throughout the whole province was to get top priority by my staff at that time. In order to induce and attract dryers into the province, a letter was sent to the Federal Minister of Finance on October 24th, requesting a rapid depreciation write-off

on dryers for income tax purposes, which was granted November 28th. Agricultural representatives were instructed to do a survey of dryers in the province and as of November 1st their figure showed 800. Because we were concerned that damage could result from improper use of dryers, seminars were held in Saskatoon the last week of October and in Regina the first weeks of November in conjunction with our Mexabitions. Many operators and farmers attended these meetings.

On October 31st, the Canadian Wheat Board announced a special advance delivery quota for damp grain of three bushels per acre. In the next 12 days, Mr. Speaker, 93 per cent of the wheat crop had been taken off. The farmers evidently chose to harvest all they could rather than have their crop stay out over the winter. Harvesting continued in this province till the end of the first week of December.

In the first week of November, the Government met with the Saskatchewan Federation of Agriculture and as a result, the Federation agreed to work with officials of the Department of Agriculture in setting up a committee to organize and co-ordinate the many organizations and facilities within the province to dry grain on the farms and at elevator points and to report on the progress. At the request of the Saskatchewan Wheat Pool, this branched out further in the formation of the Provincial Grain Drying Committee comprised of representatives of the Department of Agriculture, the Canadian Wheat Board, the Board of Grain Commissioners, the Saskatchewan Federation of Agriculture, the Saskatchewan Farmers' Union, the United Grain Growers, and representatives of each of the line elevator companies.

Mr. Speaker, this has proven to be a most valuable organization and we have met regularly since its formation. Since its formation, as Minister, I have contacted all key elevator agents in the province at the request of the Committee asking these agents to organize local committees at their delivery points. These committees were asked: first to organize dryers in the area for maximum use; contact farmers and help arrange schedules for custom operation; locate available dryers if not enough in the area; locate property for custom dryers to set up on; and most important of all, to test grain samples before and after being dried.

Another letter was sent by myself to all elevator agents and elevator companies with a copy to key agents, asking that they request their agents to co-operate with the key agents in assessing how much grain would have to be farm dried at their individual shipping points. And to facilitate this organization, they were also advised that, if a local shipping point committee found it necessary to hire halls for meeting purposes, to incur telephone and publicity expenses or expenses to locate dryers, that such expenses would be accepted by the Government up to \$100 per shipping point. As I mentioned, the first committee that was set up was at the time of the annual convention of the Saskatchewan Wheat Pool. This small committee was made up of members of the Saskatchewan Wheat Pool, the Saskatchewan Federation of Agriculture, and the Department of Agriculture. This committee was asked to attempt to assess the situation and to make some suggestions as to measures that would have to be taken. The committee held three weekly meetings starting on the 8th of November, finishing on the 21st of November.

They reported an estimate of 90 million bushels of damp

wheat plus 100 million bushels high tough (over 16 per cent) that would need drying. They reported a total estimated terminal drying capacity to April 30th as about 106 million bushels of tough or 62 million bushels of damp. The estimated about 100 million bushels would have to be farm dried. The Saskatchewan Federation of Agriculture reported to the Wheat Board the opinion of the committee that some publicity needed to be given due to the fact that terminal dryers couldn't handle the whole problem. They issued a press release on the situation on November 16th and the committee recommended establishment of broader-based provincial committee on the problem. Following estimates of the situation that were produced in mid-November, arrangements were made for a meeting of agriculture representatives and the grain company officials on the 18th and 19th of November at Saskatoon. The meeting was called to present information on the economics and techniques of grain drying to the agricultural representatives so they would be prepared to assist farmers with accurate information. During the meeting it was agreed to stage a 10-minute extension blitz to carry information on the situation and techniques of grain drying to farmers. These meetings were staged between December 2nd and the 6th, not on Christmas Day as the Member for Turtleford (Mr. Wooff) said, and with the co-operation of specialists from the University of Saskatchewan, the Saskatchewan Power Corporation and the Family Farm Improvement Branch and many meetings have been held all through the province ever since.

The main purpose of these meetings was to advise the operators of the drying equipment, whether they were farmers or custom operators, the precautions that should be taken in order that damage to the grain would not result from improper operations. This was most important as time, money and markets would be lost in the event the grain was damaged. It was also pointed out that the facilities of the Board of Grain Commissioners' laboratory were available to the farmers on a 24-hour basis in order that samples both before and after drying could be taken to check on damage. This is a most important service and results are phoned or wired back directly to the farmer or the operator concerned immediately after completion. Those present at the meetings were made aware of the number of dryers available in the province for custom work. These meetings were well accepted and well attended. In fact in some instances as many as 500 persons attended. Representatives of the Engineering Department of the University along with the staff from the SPC and the Department of Agriculture conducted the discussions.

The first reasonably good picture of the situation was developed by the Saskatchewan Wheat Pool and presented to the committee composed of the Department of Agriculture, the Saskatchewan Federation of Agriculture and the Saskatchewan Wheat Pool. The picture for Saskatchewan, as estimated on November 1st, was as follows: estimated damp wheat – 90 million bushels; high tough, over 16 per cent moisture – 100 million bushels; estimated amount to be dried – 190 million bushels; harvested tough below 16 per cent moisture – 70 million bushels; total estimated crop – 370 million bushels; estimated terminal drying capacity – 160 million bushels, tough or 62 million bushels of damp. And so it was estimated to that time that farm drying would be required to meet the problem of about 100 million bushels of wheat.

In early December the Board of Grain Commissioners offered the estimate that in the three provinces – Alberta, Manitoba



and Saskatchewan – 280 million bushels had to be dried. The terminal drying capacity was 130 million bushels leaving 150 million bushels to be farm dried. And on hand to cope with this volume were about 1,700 dryers on the Prairies, which appeared reasonably adequate at that time. At 2,000 bushels per day, 1,700 dryers would dry 170 million bushels in 50 days, less than two months. As I mentioned earlier, a quick survey in early November by agricultural representatives showed 800 dryers in the province. A later more detailed survey by the Saskatchewan Wheat Pool completed in late November showed 1,340 dryers, certainly a tremendous difference to the 80 or so the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Lloyd) bragged about when he was in the Government.

The facts of the situation as of January 1st, determined by the Canadian Wheat Board respecting Saskatchewan, are as follows: amount of grain to be dried – 107,802,000 bushels; amount still to be delivered on advance quota of three bushels – 27,823,000; still to be farm dried – 80 million bushels; number of dryers on hand – 1,340; amount already dried by our farmers – 16,850,000 bushels. Certainly a long way ahead of their record of 1.5 million bushels.

The co-ordinating committee has been meeting regularly since December 6th and has rendered a great deal of assistance throughout the province in trying to harness all the resources possible to make sure that any losses will be kept to a minimum. Because it was felt that lack of available finances was one of the problems delaying drying operations, the Provincial Government arranged for a meeting of Provincial and Federal officials. The United Grain Growers' Association and the Saskatchewan Wheat Pool were each invited to send a representative to accompany the Provincial Treasurer and myself to meet with the Federal Minister of Agriculture in Ottawa on December 18th. Mr. J.O. Wright and myself met with the Federal Minister and the Hon. Mr. Steuart met with the Prime Minister. We were advised that arrangements would be made whereby finances would be made available by the Federal Government to those farmers who requested it. And on December 24th, the Federal Government announced that special cash advances, interest free up to \$600 at the rate of 10 cents per bushel, would be available through the Wheat Board when necessary legislation could be put through Parliament. Mr. Speaker, this is the first time in the history of our province that financial assistance has been made possible for the drying of grain.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. McFarlane:** — The co-ordinating committee will be meeting again in a few days to assess developments to date and determine what must be done in the days ahead. And I feel certain that a new survey will show an increase in the drying facilities at the Lakehead, the West Coast, at the provincial terminals and the number of farm dryers. I know that indications are that grain companies are providing use of their facilities at many points in the province. I know that the Government, the Department of Agriculture, and they many organizations mentioned are doing everything possible to promote the farm drying of grain despite most adverse weather conditions.

Those so-called politicians and groups who are so ready and free to criticize should remember four things: 1. This is the

first time in the history of Saskatchewan that it has been necessary to dry substantial volumes of grain on the farm. The only situation that was nearly comparable was 1951 when only 1½ million bushels were farm dried. 2. Over the years those responsible for handling our wheat and our sales have not been enthusiastic about farm drying except where it was done by competent operators at low heat. 3. The bulk of damp and high tough grain was harvested after the third week of October and much during November. 4. Since the third week in December, we have experienced bitterly cold weather, especially in the areas of the province where the bulk of the problem lies.

Anyone who has had experience starting and operating tractors, trucks and grain augers in 40 below weather – and the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Lloyd) has certainly never had this experience – will not be too critical of farmers for deciding to wait for at least some moderation before undertaking to dry their grain. To say, as the Leader of the Opposition and his cohorts have, that nothing has been done, nothing accomplished, is of course ridiculous and an insult to the people of the many organizations involved and the farmers themselves. We have enlisted the full support of all the grain handling organizations. Not only are hundreds of elevator agents working on this problem, but companies have agreed where possible to make binning facilities available to dryers who set up near their elevators. Literally hundreds of meetings have been held. Our agricultural representatives have given this matter top priority since early November. Shipping point committees have been actively promoting drying at their delivery points. Close contact has been kept with the Board of Grain Commissioners and Wheat Board throughout. Grain dryers have been accepted for fast write-off on income tax. The Federal Government increased the amount available by way of interest-free cash advances and will extend further advances, interest-free, for grain drying. The SPC has offered free connections to grain dryers in urban centres where feasible. The Provincial Government has stated that propane gas and heating fuel used for the heating of dryers is not subject to the two cents tax. By mid-November 1,340 dryers were available in the province and more have been purchased since. And as of January 1st, 17,000,000 bushels had been farm dried. Further, even during the very adverse weather conditions of January, over a quarter of a million bushels per day were being dried.

I want to express my appreciation to the individuals of all the organizations mentioned and to the individual farmers who have done so much to help in this crisis, for their time, and for their effort, their sacrifices and yes, even in many cases, personal expense in working on this important problem. I am sure that they will find little consolation in having their efforts described by the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Lloyd) as “inept, inadequate, impractical, improvident and inexcusable.” They realize that much of his so-called nine-point program has already been done and that it rings a hollow note, when in previous years he had the responsibility and except for the urging of other people to assume the responsibilities, nothing was done by himself or his Government. One of the acute problems at the moment is to get dry grain off the farms and into the terminals in order that those farmers who have been deprived of even delivering a one-bushel quota have an opportunity to get some cash. These farmers are equally deserving of having their problems recognized and action taken to alleviate them. In fact, many are in areas of the province that have had less than average yields for two consecutive years. They are not interested

in who is or who is not to blame for present conditions at the West Coast. They know that they can provide the grades of grain that are required; they are told boxcars will be made available; they know ships are waiting for loading; they are anxious, and rightly so, that those who have the responsibility for receiving, for loading, for transportation and shipping out of the grain get on with the job immediately.

So, Mr. Speaker, this is a good Speech from the Throne. It indicates that the diversification program that has been carried out by this Government for the last four years has been bearing results, brought to the livestock men of our province and the agriculture industry of our province, an all-time record for the last four years in the value of income received by farmers from livestock and livestock products. Because this has been taken care of in the Speech from the Throne and because there are many more items that I want to deal with at a later date, you can realize that I am going to vote against the amendment and vote for the major motion.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Hon. J.C. McIsaac (Minister of Education):** —Mr. Speaker, I should like to begin my remarks in this debate by congratulating the mover and the seconder of the Address-in-Reply. I would like also to congratulate my seatmate, the Member from Lumsden (Mr. Heald) on this appointment as House Leader, and the Member from Shaunavon, Mr. Larochelle, as the new Party Whip. I don't know whether it is because of this new House management that so far the Government has taken complete control of this debate or not but I think it should be pointed out, Mr. Speaker, that the appointment of the Member for Shaunavon as Party Whip is very timely in the light of next week's Constitutional Conference. I know that he is fluently bilingual and I trust bicultural as well.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. McIsaac:** — I am a little concerned about next year, after the Kelvington by-election, when we have him and Mr. Bjarnason back in the House whom we will appoint for Party Whip.

Mr. Speaker, like any other important enterprise in our society, education is changing and changing very rapidly. The changes of course inevitably involve growing pains and stresses. Now I know that all Members of this House would agree that there are problems – and there are questions – in the minds of the many people involved and affected by our whole educational process. Because after all there is no other field that directly involved more people, directly or indirectly for that matter. There are problems of decision as to what direction we should take, as to how we should get there and how fast we should get there. There are problems of breaking new ground and leaving large parts of the past behind us. There are problems of adapting our large structure itself in education today to our present society and the needs and demands of today's society. And there are problems of communicating. I think above all there are problems of paying the bills. We could go on and on and enumerate many other such problems. There are some of course who will say that we are moving too slowly, others that we are moving too rapidly, and of course there are some who criticize merely for

the sake of criticizing. Now many of these problems, Mr. Speaker, are such that the passing of legislation or the establishing of new policy, or bringing in new regulations, or for that matter, spending increasingly large amounts of money will not necessarily solve in themselves. But I can say, Mr. Speaker, that we in this province and in this Government, need not apologize in any way for what we have accomplished both in a qualitative and in a quantitative sense in education.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. McIsaac:** — I would just like to touch upon a few of the points that could be used to illustrate these remarks, because many exciting and significant developments have been taking place in the educational scene of this province but of course not all of them of the nature that makes the headlines.

Today we have more adults in this province engage in academic upgrading than ever before in our history, over 3,000 people engaged in upgrading programs from basic literacy to Grade XII; last year 2,700, five years ago a mere 600 people. This year, Saskatchewan is the first Western province, at least, to make Grade XII upgrading programs available to its people. Almost 1,000 other people not eligible under Manpower programs are accommodated through other avenues such as the Vocational Rehabilitation of Disabled Persons in Welfare to rehabilitate people under welfare programs; ARDA programs; the Provincial Indian and Métis Department, and so on.

Our school boards as well are making a wide variety of courses available to people ranging from basic English and French to welding, ceramics and you name it, and they have been offering it. Over 16,000 people last year were enrolled in various courses of this kind. Five years ago in the high schools, in the technical and vocational fields, about 8,900 students were enrolled in vocational courses in our high schools and institutes. Now last year that comparative figure was 17,000, an increase of almost double.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. McIsaac:** — This Government, Mr. Speaker, continues to give a top priority to expanding and extending educational opportunities for people of Indian ancestry. We have worked closely with the Indian and Métis Task Force established earlier this year by this Government, and we will, of course, be closely associated with the new Indian and Métis Department that will be established very shortly. I think a good example of the work here, Mr. Speaker, is the establishment of a vocational centre this past year in the town of Broadview. This centre accommodates approximately 100 trainees. Transportation from the adjoining reservations is provided by the Department of Indian Affairs on a daily basis. While the Department operates the centre as such, we do have a small advisory board consisting of the local chiefs, members of the town council and other businessmen to assist in operating this program. Now this rather informal organization has assisted the Department in gaining insights into the particular problems of some of these people and the expectations that they have. And I think the proof of the success of the Broadview school lies in the fact that the high drop-out rate previously experienced in many of these upgrading courses has

been reduced to less than 10 per cent, a far cry from the much higher rate that used to be experienced when these people were brought to larger centres such as Regina, for example. I think that the experience with the Broadview centre would suggest that programs can be tailored to meet the needs of our Indian people, but that they must be offered within relatively easy access to their own communities. This success of the Broadview centre has prompted consideration of the establishment of further Vocational Centres in Northern Saskatchewan in particular.

In the North we continue to expand the classrooms and the space available. Our high school enrolment of the Indian and Métis people in Northern Saskatchewan continues to climb more and more. More and more of them are continuing to go on to high school.

Both of our major institutions, the one at Saskatoon and the one at Moose Jaw, are this year, Mr. Speaker, offering night course to something over 300 people, from mathematics to hydraulics. These are courses which will allow people to continue with their job while they improve their qualifications or their opportunities for advancement in their job, or if they like, for other fields of endeavor.

Curricular changes of note, Mr. Speaker, I think the fact that the teaching of French has been expanded through legislation last year, as well that it has been improved through new techniques and new teaching methods. Members will be interested to know that a new course has been developed for the teaching of Ukrainian in Grade VII, VIII and IX and over 20 schools and over 600 students are this year for the first time making use of that course.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. McIsaac:** — At the University work continues at the Curriculum resources Centre to develop more meaningful textbooks and instructional material for our Indian and Métis people. Now this work is supported in part by a direct grant from the Department of Education. The job being done in this regard is certainly showing the way for other Provinces and for the North West Territories. It appears, Mr. Speaker, that some of our educators have finally decided that the old school readers, of “~~run~~ Dick Run,” or “~~Jump~~ Spot Jump,” etc., with picture settings of American suburbs are perhaps not the most meaningful way to interest our Indian and Métis people in reading and in education generally.

The field of special education contains many highlights itself. This year there are six blind students from Saskatchewan attending University. And more interesting I think perhaps than this, a total of 57 blind students are attending local schools with the help of tape recorders, Braille and so on, which is a trend away from the institutional placement of the student. Many more from our school boards in the province are making arrangements for the teaching or are paying tuition or part of it, and in any event making arrangements for the training of the very slow learner or the retarded child who doesn't fit into the regular school system.

Now, Mr. Speaker, earlier in this debate, my hon. friend, the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Lloyd), made several references to education in the course of his remarks. As I recall

he used such words as “confusion,” “confrontation,” “chaos,” and so on. And after listening to his remarks he only added of course to the confrontation, the confusion and the chaos. He went on to charge that we have set group against group. I can’t recall exactly if he said in so many words, but he at least implied that one case in point was teachers and trustees in this province. Mr. Speaker, I suggest that, as an experienced educator himself, as a man who was in this position long before I was, he knows full well that the concern expressed in many aspects of education today is certainly not a creation of this party or of this Government, or even of his party, (despite some of their best efforts), or of any other government, provincial or national for that matter. As a Government we do have a responsibility to do our utmost to resolve some of the many complex problems faced in the field of education.

Now this Government and the Department of Education have worked and met with both teacher and trustee groups. And I don’t think there is any department of government today that has more advisory and policy-making committees attached to it, almost all of which are representative of both groups, as well as taxpayers, parents, students, and other interested people. Every right, Mr. Speaker, that teachers in this province ever had is protected by the new Salary Agreements Act, even though some of those rights might perhaps better be called by other names. I can give you the case of supervisory allowances which are written into almost all contracts, supervisory allowances for a principal and vice-principal. We have four-room schools in the province where a supervisory allowance is paid to the principal and the vice-principal. Now you might call that a right, Mr. Speaker, I would call it a windfall.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. McIsaac:** — The Act provided as well as a guarantee of these and many other rights teachers had earned, a timetable for negotiations, for conciliation and for possible arbitration. Both parties fully support the idea of specific dates for these various processes. Since the passing of the Act, however, both sides have seemingly paid very little attention to the timetable as such. The Act does provide for the first time in provincial legislation that “matters related to salaries” may by agreement be negotiated at the area level. Now because many of these items are covered in other legislation, the hours of the school day, the 200-day year, five-day week, statutory holidays and so on, and because of the great variety of other provisions that are now included in specific contracts in force in the province today, and as well because there is certainly no guarantee that, if we spelled out any or all of these items, still more issues would not be brought forward, it was left last year, when we framed that legislation, to the groups involved to decide what provisions to include in the area of bargaining contracts. Now, Mr. Speaker, experience with this local option may show that it cannot be left to the decision of the negotiating groups. If so, we will have to provide further legislation limiting the area of local decision on these matters and personally, I would regret the necessity to do that. That Act was passed last year, Mr. Speaker, because teacher-trustee relations in the province were not all roses and sunshine to put it mildly. As a matter of fact relations between the two groups have been deteriorating into seemingly endless bickering over salary levels and other matters. At least this was the general impression given to the

public. That this is so is supported by a survey conducted only last spring by the Saskatchewan Teachers' Federation, when they asked this hypothetical question of 700 people that they polled. The question went something like this: "If teachers were holding an urgent meeting in Saskatoon, what would be the likely topic that they would be discussing." Over 90 per cent of the respondents said salaries, working conditions or the intention to strike.

The Moore Committee was established to make recommendations for improvements in negotiating procedures between teachers and trustees, and almost all of the recommendations contained in that report are today in the new legislation. I think I made it clear last year, Mr. Speaker, to the House and to the teachers and trustees and the public, that the new collective bargaining legislation would not necessarily solve all of the problems in the process of arriving at teachers' salaries. Collective bargaining essentially means that organized employees and their employers sit down together to negotiate wages or salaries and other conditions relating thereto. And this I support, Mr. Speaker, is what the teachers and trustees of this province have not yet done this year despite the fact that it is almost a year since that legislation was passed. Now I can say, Mr. Speaker, that neither this Government or any other can legislate good will as such, and I don't intend today to become involved in assessing blame either one way or the other. I would hope my remarks today will not result in another round of denials, charges and counter charges, etc. We have for example one area where only two short meetings were held from last fall to January of this year. In a number of other areas three meetings were held, I think one area only had one meeting.

I think it is worth noting, Mr. Speaker, that many trustees and trustee spokesmen in the province seem to think that, because area bargaining would relieve them of their individual responsibilities for collective bargaining, it certainly did not relieve the Association or the group from their collective responsibilities to bargain with teachers over teacher salaries. Many teachers and Teachers' Federation's hired officials particularly, were never too enthused about the legislation. At the same time, I am not suggesting that either group hasn't tackled the job with sincerity but possibly with a little less energy and a little less gusto than they have done some other things. I am a little surprised and disappointed at the wide assortment of seemingly small and inconsequential items which are taking the time of the negotiating groups and preventing them from getting on with the real business of salary negotiating. I can say, Mr. Speaker, that the Government is concerned over the fact that until recently at least very little progress has been made in seeking settlements.

And what have we done about it? The Opposition asked the other day. Well, both myself and Department officials have been in almost daily contact recently with representatives and individuals on both sides. We have selected and appointed conciliation officers in every one of the ten major negotiating areas in the province, all of them responsible and respected men. And we have instructed them basically only to do one thing above all others, to get the parties sitting down around the bargaining table, day in, day out, if necessary. I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that the overall climate in this regard is not helped by school boards in the province who still persist in making unilateral policy decisions that directly affect their teachers, and boards

who choose not even to consult their teachers on matters that directly affect them. It is not helped by either, Mr. Speaker, by some of the comments we have seen from Teachers' Federation spokesmen. I think, perhaps the best example has to be a news release from the Leader Post of January 23rd that quotes a Mr. Joe Petreny of the Teachers' Federation as follows:

A negotiator for the STF told about 200 teachers Tuesday that they should be prepared to exert pressure through their students to persuade school boards to display the true spirit of collective bargaining.

There could be other examples cited in this regard. Suffice it to say, Mr. Speaker, that such remarks obviously are not helping the situation. We have suggested to both groups that bargaining should take place at the bargaining table and not in the press and news media of the province. I think, Mr. Speaker, that not only this Government but from some of the mail that I am receiving, the public at large as well, are getting tired of this continued bickering between teachers and trustees on this and other matters.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. McIsaac:** — In this whole question of education, teachers, and teachers' supply, the misinformation that is propagated has to be really remarkable. Again I could quote from a couple of the Bulletins of the Teachers' Federation to demonstrate what I mean.

The president of the Teachers' Federation, Mr. Gordon Merryfield in an article of September 13, 1968, —shows alarm over the teachers' exodus." Other articles complain about the poor quality of teachers. —Teachers are leaving the province in droves." I can well understand some of the confusion that exists in the minds of the teachers and interested members of the public in listening to this. Are the teachers leaving the province in droves, Mr. Speaker? I don't think so. What are some of the facts? In 1963-64 the teaching force in this province totalled 9,758 teachers. At the beginning of the fall term last year there were 11,784 teachers in this province. Now that is up nearly 2,000 in a few short years. Bear in mind that we have roughly the same number of students in this province that we had four or five years ago. The Leader of the Opposition mentioned the other day that I should not be talking about the teacher-pupil ratio. Well I won't deal too extensively with that today, but I can assure him that I will have a great deal more to say about it.

Yet we are told, of course, that there is a mass exodus of teachers to the promised lands of Alberta and British Columbia. Certainly there is a movement of teachers as there always has been. We would expect this. There is a movement of other people, of other professions, and other trades. I might say that there are a number of teachers that do come to this province as well, Mr. Speaker. In the last school year, for example, a total of 410 qualified teachers came into Saskatchewan and not all of them were British teachers either.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. McIsaac:** — Let's be clear about one



other fact. I don't think that ever in the history of this province have the qualifications of our teaching force been as high as they are today. The number of teachers employed during this school year with only one year of training is lower than ever, while the number and percentage employed with two, three and even four years of training is of course greater. You can look at the record here. Five years ago, 39 per cent of our teaching force had a standard certificate. This year it is 48 per cent, up almost 25 per cent. The number of teachers with a professional certificate five years ago was about 20 per cent, this year 29.4, up almost 50 per cent, Mr. Speaker. So I don't know where is this loss of highly qualified teachers. It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that some of our Teachers' Federation's spokesmen and the teachers themselves, are perhaps getting confused with today's modern mathematics. So it is little wonder that there is some of the statements that are made, if the only source of professional information for some of our teachers is the Saskatchewan Teachers' Federation Bulletin.

Now to return to the developments in the salary negotiations. I can say that the Government will be prepared to extend the time limit for conciliation if we are requested to do so. Neither I nor this Government has any intention of allowing this haggling over salaries to lead education in this province into a situation, such as exists today in the province of Quebec with teachers, of all things, going on rotational strikes. I have enough faith in both groups, Mr. Speaker, that I am convinced that this will not happen. Some of the steps that we may have to consider will probably not find favour with either group. The power and the right today to settle salaries lies in the hands of our boards and our teachers and this is where I think it should be.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. McIsaac:** — This is where I think that it should remain. I believe that enabling legislation as such should show more flexibility than rigidity. I am convinced today more so than ever that the new Act perhaps with some amendments is completely workable. However, if we do have to make the legislation more specific, it will of course be more rigid and more confining. Because let there be no misunderstanding, Mr. Speaker, in the interest of the school children of this province we do not intend to see this session of the Legislature prorogued while this whole question goes completely unresolved.

I am able to say, today, that the scene is somewhat more optimistic as a result of our contacts with our conciliators in the last day or two. Some of them tell us that they feel genuine progress is now being made in their areas. And we are arranging for a meeting of all conciliators for tomorrow in the city, and I am confident that we will be able to offer some concrete and helpful suggestions to both sides as a result of that meeting.

On the basis of information and suggestions available thus far, it would seem that teacher negotiators could greatly facilitate negotiations by giving recognition to some of the serious economic realities facing this province as outlined so eloquently by them Member from Touchwood (Mr. Meakes) here this afternoon, and that trustees could similarly greatly facilitate the whole

process by being less adamant about the items which they refuse to negotiate or even to discuss, even though many of them may be entirely within the realm of school board policies as such.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to refer for a few moments to another situation that has been in the news during the past year in respect to education in this province. I refer to the whole picture of student loans. Student unrest, of course, has been exhibited in many forms in a wide variety of places in this country and this world last year. We have had marches almost everywhere. We have had riots in Mexico, take-overs in Paris, Tokyo, West Germany and so on. We have seen the school teachers in New York, Florida and other American cities involved in very long disputes which nobody won, least of all, of course, the pupils in those schools affected.

This province joined the international set last year, Mr. Speaker, in this regard with a march of the Regina students on the Provincial Legislature during an official visit to this province by our Prime Minister. Mind you I realize full well that there are no simple answers to any of these situations that I have mentioned. There are no simple solutions either. The reasons are complex and they differ somewhat from one area to another. There have been reams of newsprint and TV footage and goodness knows what devoted to this whole complex problem. Certainly we are all aware that the era of protest extends far beyond the educational scene. It is cause for concern for people other than the educators directly involved.

Closer to home, Mr. Speaker, the march on the Legislature last year. Ostensibly the reason given, of course, was the lack of student loans. No specific facts or reason as such were advanced by those students who advocated the march. You couldn't get anything by way of a specific answer from them, but an attempt was made to create the impression that few, if any, loans were being granted, that the regulations were horribly stringent and that the miserable Saskatchewan Government was being as miserable as they could be. Now what are some of the facts involved? Some of the regulations, Mr. Speaker, concerning the Student Aid Plan were changed last year. They were changed to bring about greater uniformity in the plan from one province to another. They were changed as a result of thorough study by officials from all provinces, from universities and at the Federal level. They were changed to avoid some of the loopholes that had developed in the plan since its beginning four or five years ago. This year, Mr. Speaker, up to the end of January, over \$6.3 million in loans was made available to something over 8,000 students attending university and technical institutes in this province . . .

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. McIsaac:** — . . . with the average loan working out to some \$780. Now only six years ago, Mr. Speaker, when our hon. friends of the students opposite were the Government, \$390 odd thousand was loaned to 900 and some students. So you yourself can compare the figures, sir.

Now with the advent of the Federal scheme, of course, the decision was made, and rightly so, to avoid unnecessary duplication to discontinue lending from the Provincial fund. The House will be interested to know, I think, that the original

quota for this province for student loans was \$3.2 million. The Federal authorities have agreed to boosting the total greatly in excess of that amount, provided of course criteria were strictly adhered to. I think, Mr. Speaker, that it is worth pointing out here today that this scheme was not and is not intended to replace parental responsibility as such for the cost of post-secondary education. Neither is it intended to replace the individual responsibility on behalf on the student. I can tell you that the Liberal Government of this province is anxious that every grade twelve graduate who wishes to further his education has the opportunity to do so.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. McIsaac:** — I think, also, we are just as concerned about our other young people who chose to pursue other occupations, Let us take for an example the case of the high school graduate who chooses not to go to university but to farm instead and he wishes to acquire land under the Farm Credit Corporation. If he is lucky enough he can get an earlier start than most by having some land given to him by his father. In any event when he goes to the Farm Credit Corporation he has to prove himself as a competent operator. He has to be 21 and he has to qualify under a number of regulations. He has to have some definite assets of his own before he is even considered. When and if he does get a loan, Mr. Speaker, he pays a reasonable rate of interest on that loan. On the other hand his brother who decides to attend university or the technical institute, can get up to \$1,000 merely having the academic requirements for university entrance and meeting the other criteria of need. He doesn't have to be 21. he doesn't have to prove that he is a dedicated student, even completing one year's work. It is worth noting that something over 10 per cent of our first-year students do not successfully make the grade and, on top of that, his loan is interest free as opposed to his brother under the Farm Credit rate.

Last year when concern was expressed by the group trying to agitate with respect to student loans, some of the loudest squawks came from some students who wish to consider themselves financially independent of their parents. Now independent status in the eyes of such students only goes part way, however. In order to obtain that status they don't mind being very completely dependent upon the Government for a loan to attend university, but independent of their parents' means.

The other category of loudest complaints came from students and parents whose net worth, or net income, or both was such that the loan criteria in use indicate that the parents could well afford to meet the costs involved. Now why it should be a status symbol, Mr. Speaker, to get a student loan as such is beyond me. I suggest that a reasonable rate of interest on these loans might be some of the answer to the problem.

Mr. Speaker, this year the interest-free loans scheme for this province will, I will estimate, cost the taxpayers approximately \$1 million. I suggest that, if loans were to bear a reasonable rate of interest, the bulk of that \$1 million cost could then be diverted to bursaries to those students who can demonstrate need for them. I suggest that such a move would put the whole field of student assistance on a much sounder basis that it is today. It would also enable our Federal

counterparts in Ottawa to fulfil an election promise they made some years ago.

**Mr. A.E. Blakeney (Regina Centre):** — Don't worry about that.

**Mr. McIsaac:** — Well, they have lots to go but they are doing pretty good. They are making real progress recently and they will get around to this one in due time. Mr. Speaker, I should point out to some of my hon. friends opposite that we have other forms of student assistance available. Someone mentioned student loans, but I did point out for some of them who are hollering that we do have upgrading and other courses available as well.

I am going to suggest, Mr. Speaker, that the present student loan plan is going a long way to meet the needs. It can be and it should be re-examined and revised and improved, because the present maximum of \$5,000 per student over the undergraduate period, that in itself seems to be satisfactory generally speaking. The present annual maximum, however, of \$1,000 I think should be changed so that for students in their last year or two particularly those who have need to use the plan, and did not need to use it in their first couple of years the maximum of \$1,000 could certainly be lifted to \$1,500 or even more.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. McIsaac:** — We have discussed the Plan with the students of the province. The Member for Saskatoon City Park-University (Mr. Charlebois) made reference to that in his remarks in this debate. We have also had continuing discussions with other students on an informal basis. Regulations pertaining to married students have already been improved as a result of these discussions. We have been able to make some administrative changes as a result, and we will make some further changes next year to facilitate the processing of the many thousand applications for loans that were received and undoubtedly will be received again.

Mr. Speaker, there are many other subjects that I could deal with in the course of this debate, but I know that there are others who are anxious to get into it. I will have much more to say on other subjects later on in other debates. Needless to say, Mr. Speaker, I will be supporting the motion and not the amendment.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. J.A. Pepper (Weyburn):** — Mr. Speaker, let me first congratulate the mover and the seconder of the Address-in-Reply, the Member from Saskatoon (Mr. Charlebois) and Cannington (Mr. Weatherald) for the manner in which they performed their duty. I realize it must have been very difficult under the circumstances because I believe in the five years that I have sat and listened to Throne Speeches as a Member of this House, that one will go down as the one which contains the least assistance and the least material to make good government for our people than any of the other five Throne Speeches.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Pepper:** — To me it certainly is lacking in every department and will naturally be criticized accordingly. I have always believed that, when a government provides good legislation or introduces Bills that are beneficial to our people, I as a Member of the Opposition have a duty to treat it as good, because right should be right no matter who or what government introduces it. As a Member of the Opposition we should try when we are criticizing it to do it in a constructive manner and it is only in this way, Mr. Speaker, that we can hope to provide legislation that is beneficial and workable to most of our citizens of our province. But I find that in this Speech from the Throne the areas, that should be of prime concern, the areas where most effort should be demonstrated as priority, are just vaguely mentioned.

As the Member from Weyburn constituency, I am as you know representing a constituency composed of both urban and rural people, a constituency which depends on the economy of agriculture and with considerable oil development in a good portion of the area.

In agriculture, we have one of the best wheat growing lands in the province if we receive sufficient rainfall. We can produce some of the best hard wheat in Saskatchewan. As for livestock, we produce some of the best in Canada whether it is for market or for the exhibition in show rings, such as the Toronto Royal and other A and B circuits throughout Canada, a constituency which is quite diversified in all respects. So it is only natural that agriculture is a field of great concern to the people of Weyburn constituency. Perhaps in the Weyburn area, damp and tough grain is not as great a problem as it is in the northern area of our province, but as the spring season approaches I predict, Mr. Speaker, we will find it more of a contentious problem than what now appears. I am certain the Government is just sitting back hoping that this problem will clear up by itself.

It is very interesting to read, Mr. Speaker, what Mr. J.L. McCloy, Saskatchewan Farmers Union Vice-President, has to say about agriculture and the severe economic plight of farmers. I quote from the Leader-Post February 3rd, titled "Action lacking says SFU."

The Saskatchewan Government has recognized the severe economic plight of farmers in the province but has no plans to alleviate their situation. Monday, J.L. McCloy, Saskatchewan Farm Union Vice-President said, "Planned government action revealed in the Speech from the Throne last week was totally uninspiring to farmers. There is no evidence of any new approach toward solving the spiralling tax burden facing farmers today." While Mr. McCloy welcomed proposed pollution control, he questioned the urgency of extending irrigation for increased agricultural production. Greatest priority today is the need for cash assistance to farmers for the removal of about 30 million gallons of water from the tough and damp grain presently on farms throughout Saskatchewan.

Now, Mr. Speaker, that isn't a Member from the Opposition speaking, but it is a member from one of the farm organizations endorsing what we have been telling the Government what is happening. And the Government is doing very little to alleviate the situation.

February 7, 1969

We are told there is the continuance of the assistance to farmers in the rural development areas of Saskatchewan with the construction of swine barns and equipment. I have many farmers who have tried to get this assistance and enquired into their eligibility for securing it. But because they are not in the proper area in the northern and eastern area of the province they cannot obtain this grant. So, Mr. Speaker, if the Government wants diversification in agriculture let's use all areas of the province that are making agriculture their main industry. Let's use them all in the same way and with equal opportunities for them.

The Throne Speech says that the Sewer and Water Facilities Program will be expanded in 1969. I would like to remind the Government that the Sewer and Water Facilities Program was instigated in 1960 by the former CCF Government . . .

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Pepper:** — . . . and many rural homes had made use of this program under that Administration. The present Government says it is going to continue and expand it. That's what it should do, Mr. Speaker, but it should also remember that this is not a new program but just a continuance of the original introduced by the former CCF Administration.

Now let's take a look at what the Throne Speech contains in its program for health for our people. This is a program which should be given every consideration. But I am afraid during the last year in particular our province has slipped and slipped badly in the care our unfortunate sick and hospitalized people, because only a year ago our first introduction of utilization or deterrent fees took place. This act, Mr. Speaker, will haunt the Liberal Members opposite for the rest of their lives. I contributed fairly generously to the coffers of the Provincial treasurer through deterrent fees during this past summer and fall. This I am not complaining about because when a Bill becomes legislation it should affect all of us. You know, Mr. Speaker, some of my colleagues and I have been criticized quite severely for the last year speaking in opposition to a raise in our indemnity and then after the Bill was passed we stuck out our grubby little hands — as the Member from Souris Estevan (Mr. MacDougall) said and took our indemnity the same as the other Members. Let me remind the Hon. Members across the floor that I spoke and voted in opposition to deterrent fees and then the Bill was voted on and passed, implementing deterrent fees. When I became ill last summer someone — and I would blame it on the Government — put their little hands in my pocket and I had to pay my deterrent fees in full also. When a Bill becomes law it means law for all of us. I am sure my constituents of Weyburn do not wish to become a second-class citizen to anyone.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Pepper:** — Let me also remind the Hon. Members across the floor that the New Democrats on this side of the House have always striven to give our citizens of Saskatchewan full value for their tax dollar. I do not think there would be a better way of demonstrating our sincerity than by using every cent of our indemnity increase to oust the entire Liberal Party in the next

general election.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Pepper:** — Now, Mr. Speaker, let me return to what I was about to say in regard to deterrent fees. I must say this, that you do not have to be in the hospital for any length of time until you see how a Bill of this type is accepted by the people within the hospitals, whether it is patients, nurses or many of our doctors. I can assure you that their opinion of deterrent fees, and in many cases of the Government that introduced it, well it just cannot be repeated in this Chamber. I urge you all to use your imagination, and if you do that I think that you will get the message, when you see those unfortunate sick people, particularly the aged and those with little income, who have sufficient worry in most cases as to how they will recover from their ailment, also burdened with the worry of deterrent fees as well. When you notice this I was more convinced that ever before that this Bill introduced in the last session by the Liberal party onto the Hon. Premier was not human and should never have been introduced. I would like to say also that I was more proud than ever before that I was a Member of a party which fought opposing the implementation of this Bill to the bitter end. And now the Liberal Government is admitting its mistakes and is trying to backtrack by asking us to improve legislation which will institute an annual family ceiling on such fees, fees that never in the first place should have been introduced and will only be abolished by the return of the New Democratic Government in the next election.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Pepper:** — Now I would just like to take a short time on commenting on the psychiatric program, the psychiatric program in the Province of Saskatchewan, but more in particular on this program in the Weyburn constituency and how it is affecting this area. The Liberals by the Throne Speech say they are going to strengthen our psychiatric program and implement the Saskatchewan Plan in accordance with the Frazier Report, and that the conversion from an institutional program to a community-based plan will require a change in the role of the hospital located in Weyburn. In my judgement, Mr. Speaker, there is still sufficient need for the Weyburn hospital to remain open. Many of our unfortunate mentally sick can be looked after more properly and with better care in this building, because it is constructed purposely for this type of care and treatment, and as yet has not been replaced in any manner equal to what was provided for them there. I think it is wise, Mr. Speaker, to just take a look at some of the remarks that were contained in the Frazier Report and I quote from page 13 on observations on the separate in-patient units, Saskatchewan Hospital, Weyburn. It says:

One striking feature of this institution is the separation of the in-patient facilities into 50 beds in the Weyburn centre and the remainder which are in the main building, containing the residual long-term patients but also providing in-patient services for new patients from Swift Current and overflow patients from Regina and Moose Jaw. There appear to be many artificial and unnecessary complex facets to this relationship. We found it hard to understand and some of the patients in the Weyburn area whom we questioned did not understand it either.

It goes on to say there were very few criticisms of either the admission or discharge policy of the Weyburn centre and this appears to be serving its assigned catchment area well. There were many criticisms, however, of both admission and discharge policies of the main building. It goes on to say that one common theme was that recently admitted acute patients are discharged after a very brief time, still unable to function at an acceptable level, not well-controlled on medication, etc. Another common theme was that the Weyburn hospital, referring to the main building, had adopted a policy of discharging patients, no matter what the situation, or the patient's condition. Several mentioned that a statistical approach had replaced an individual psychiatric evolution of cases. It was implied that social workers had a quota of discharged to fill, at all costs. There were also statements that patients were being discharged from Weyburn who were totally inappropriate for this at the time and who would have much more appropriately been retained at the hospital.

Many of the questions and criticisms of Weyburn discharges were directed to the period of 1965 and later. This is seen as the time when the big push started. Dr. Frazier says prior to this the releases appeared to be well received, as noted by the Ad Hoc Committee. The discharge policy at Weyburn had been much more aggressively pursued than at North Battleford and this had resulted in greater community concern. Incidents were described in which recently-released Weyburn patients were grossly psychotic and physically violent. Now let's have a look at what Dr. Frazier recommends.

He recommends that for the present there be an easing off in the pressure for discharges from Weyburn main building, no matter what the effect on the hospital census. The discharge rates along with the type of patients being placed in the community is exceeding the capacity of the community care staffs. Weyburn appears to have reduced its chronic in-patient population to a hard-core residual group, and it is no reflection on the institution if fewer and fewer of these can be appropriately released, especially with the present community care facilities and staff. In selected cases, Weyburn main building should accept as transfers very chronic cases who could benefit from long-term hospitalization.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that due to some recent events that have taken place within our province over the last two years, I am saying this to cast no reflection on any government, that I think it is a warning for us as administrators to take a second look at the so-called Saskatchewan Mental Health Plan and to reassess or re-evaluate its complete program. At least we should take a good look at where it might lead us at the pace we are now implementing it.

I think this explains very plainly the situation of the psychiatric treatment at our Provincial hospital at Weyburn and why I believe there is sufficient need and necessity to keep it open, a building, Mr. Speaker, which we already have. Now this Government is phasing it out and asking the taxpayer to dig down and provide money to repair and build other buildings in other locations, especially when the Government is asking us to hold the line and curtail unnecessary spending. This just doesn't make common sense. Here we have a building which is equipped, can be staffed and has been recognized as one of the greatest mental treatment centres on the North American continent. It



is now to be phased out and Weyburn is left to endure the consequences and sit back and wait and see what the Government has to offer to take its place. Well, Mr. Speaker, Weyburn is not taking this lightly and has expressed their views in no uncertain terms as the Hon. Members across the floor already know.

It is my firm belief that the first area of concern in the phasing out of this hospital should be the welfare of the patients. And I have not had it proved to me – and many others feels the same way – that they are better looked after in privately owned homes, without a qualified nurse to administer their necessary drugs, and in some cases homes that do not any more than meet sanitation requirements. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I believe this first concern is very questionable.

I think the next area of concern is the attendants who have established homes and have helped to build the city of Weyburn. They have now reached an age when they cannot secure employment in other fields or areas and have not reached the age of retirement or superannuation. What has this group of people – and it does affect many, perhaps upwards to 300 – 400 homes – to look forward to by the phasing out of Weyburn Provincial Hospital?

I would say that the next area of concern is the effect and the blow that the city of Weyburn will receive itself. Here is a city of upwards to 10,000 population which is struggling to expand and to enjoy the advantages that expansion brings to any community. And to my knowledge, Mr. Speaker, we have not been given any assurance as to what Weyburn can look for to replace this huge vacuum or gap when our hospital is phased out. I do not believe it to be fair to the citizens of Weyburn to expect them to accept the phasing out of their hospital, unless the Government has something to offer that will, as I say, give equal or better treatment to the patients; to assure the attendants, that have established their homes and families which are working in the hospital, some definite proof that there will be no dislocation necessary; and that the city of Weyburn can expect an industry that will bring in revenue to the city, the schools, service clubs and churches in the same manner as it has in the past. I can assure you, Mr. Speaker, that I will do my utmost to obtain the same for Weyburn and Weyburn constituency.

There are perhaps some industries that Weyburn could not qualify for, but we could handle this industry very well. We were proud of our provincial hospital grounds. We were proud of the reputation it had built up throughout the years in its care and treatment for the mentally ill. We needed the revenue that it brought in to our city of Weyburn in various ways. I ask the Government now what it has to offer to take its place. Now, Mr. Speaker, there are other items in the Throne Speech that I could spend much time on but to avoid repetition I will perhaps have a chance to speak on them at some later date.

The Highways Program, which I notice in the Speech from the Throne, states that we will be asked to approve large expenditures for their expansion. Let me now suggest to the Hon. Member from Rosthern (Mr. Boldt), Minister of Highways, who is not in his seat, that his answers will have to be good for he will receive lots of questions requiring good explanations. When you know that the cost of highways in the last four years in Saskatchewan has gone up to 63 per cent, while in the same period of time in Canada, the cost went up some 26 per cent, that in itself requires a very good explanation. Highways and roads are a very important

February 7, 1969

department and we must strive to expand in this area, but the taxpayer must also see results and improvements for his tax dollar and I can assure you, Mr. Speaker, they are certainly questioning this. I invite all Members at this time to visit the newly constructed by-pass at Weyburn, the by-pass which goes right through the centre of the town, which is entering its third year of construction. I understand highway safety was forgotten when this was engineered.

Now, Mr. Speaker, there are other areas such as welfare, which I believe to be one of the most difficult areas to administer. At least it causes me great concern within my own local constituency. I believe in most cases too much say and power is left to the Government, that all cases handled by set rules and stipulations and that the actual need for each individual case is not adhered to.

Let me close, Mr. Speaker, by saying that I have tried to again be constructive in my criticisms, but I am sure you will gather from my remarks that I am not supporting the motion, but I am supporting the amendment.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. W.J. Berezowsky (Prince Albert-Cumberland):** — Mr. Speaker, may I first of all congratulate the mover and seconder of the Address-in-Reply. They both made a good delivery and ably expounded their political economic philosophy which fits the thinking of the Thatcher Liberals to a T. There was, however, very little in my opinion at least in the Throne Speech or anything of importance to commend it to this Parliament or the people of Saskatchewan.

Mr. Speaker, some few minutes ago you may have raised your eyebrows when I interrupted the Minister of Education (Mr. McIsaac) — I think he understood the situation — but the reason I did it is because the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Guy) in a very rude way interrupted his own Minister of the Crown to whom we were very patiently and seriously listening. I think it was a good speech and I did tell the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Guy) to shut his trap and I'll do that again under similar circumstances. This Minister, Mr. Speaker, -- and I want to bring this to your attention — has been obnoxious, insulting and his contribution to this House has brought no dignity to this Parliament.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Berezowsky:** — He not only interferes with us but, as I said, he interferes with his own Ministers. I can't help but remind you that he comes from Athabasca, and I can't help but think that there was another gentleman from Athabasca who was responsible for having some pretty vicious speeches sent into this House. He is now choreboy, the office boy for the Liberal party. I am quite sure that it won't be very long until the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Guy), because he likes garbage cans and because he likes wastepaper baskets, will be doing a job even inferior to the present or past Minister of Athabasca who you know.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Berezowsky:** — Mr. Speaker, I regret that the Premier is momentarily disabled. I sympathize with him as we all do and we all miss him. I'll not be wrong in saying that he is a partisan politician, always a politician as he says, but I do get interested when he turns red and when he shouts and derogates those who oppose him. This is the way I think that he warms up to a great debate and, as I said, we miss him. The Provincial Treasurer, the Member from Prince Albert West (Mr. Steuart), tried to emulate the Premier's style the other day but I think fell far short in his presentation. He did a very good job in reading the same speech that we heard from him for the past five or six years. Now I should reply to the Provincial Treasurer because he attacked us here in this Opposition because of our social democratic feelings. Then he referred to Great Britain and tried to persuade this House and the people of Saskatchewan that because of Socialist Government that there was no progress in a country. So I quote from a journal here, the Danish Foreign Office Journal, page 6, No. 64, 1968:

Affluence has grown so fast in Denmark that the standard of living has risen by 50 per cent in the last 10 years.

Mr. Provincial Treasurer, it goes on to say:

After this material progress the next social objective is the promotion of personal well-being and a fuller life.

Now you try to emulate that in your private enterprise Saskatchewan in 10 years.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Berezowsky:** — Because in free-enterprise Saskatchewan, Mr. Speaker, for the past four or five years, we are moving in the other direction, lower standards of living, fewer jobs and opportunities, and inferior health care, stagnation and all this,

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Steuart:** — Lower wages than they ever got working for the pulp mill . . .

**Mr. Berezowsky:** — I'll tell you about the pulp mill and you won't like it.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the Danes, having achieved material standards of living, now say:

From now on our aim is not merely to become rich but achieve a rich life, to achieve a state of well-being at home, at work and leisure in life generally.

And I could quote on. And I commend this report from the Danish office to the Hon. Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Steuart). If he is going to get up in this House he should know what he is going to talk about. He should take some visits into Western Europe where you have some of these Socialist countries and see the kind of progress they are making. It is strange that the Minister didn't mention West Germany which has one of the highest standards

February 7, 1969

in the world today.

**Mr. Steuart:** — Free enterprise, free enterprise!

**Mr. Charlebois:** — Socialist!

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Berezowsky:** — A social democracy, a social democracy as you know. Don't try to bamboozle this House or the people of Saskatchewan by trying to put smoke screens in front of them.

**Mr. Steuart:** — Free enterprise in West Germany, Socialists in East Germany.

**Mr. Berezowsky:** — Denmark has full employment which you haven't got in Canada.

**Hon. Mr. Steuart:** — Very low standard of living.

**Mr. Berezowsky:** — Denmark has satisfactory working conditions and they have it in West Germany and Sweden, anybody that has been there or read about them knows. You don't hear about strikes there. The people work together with their governments. You don't here it in Denmark. You've got countries down there that have an established social understanding of their responsibilities which you haven't got in Canada, because you are only a one-sided private enterprise and you are not thinking of the rank and file of working people and the amenities they should have.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Berezowsky:** — Mr. Speaker, I think I can truthfully say that about this Government and that includes the Member for Athabasca (Mr. Guy). He is already yapping again, Mr. Speaker, he can't keep his mouth shut. Open it a little wider so we can see what's inside — any brains?

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Berezowsky:** — Mr. Speaker, I say that we can truthfully say about this Government that it has been as blind and unwise as King George III. This Administration either refuses to tackle timely issues and problems which exist in our midst or because of its outdated, do-nothing, 18th century philosophy, which the Hon. Member from Saskatoon City Park-University (Mr. Charlebois) mentioned. This Government sits and fiddles, diddles while, as somebody said, —**Rom** burns.”

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Berezowsky:** — Yes, Mr. Speaker, there are three areas at the moment in Saskatchewan that we should be looking at very, very seriously and they are human, economic and political. This takes in education, the kind of things the Minister of Education (Mr. McIsaac)

was talking about. It takes in health, welfare, industrial development. It takes in the field of personal human rights, poverty and the high cost of living and particularly present poverty on the farms; burdensome taxes and medical costs, farm incomes and grain sales; the devaluation of our dollar. Of course it is a Federal problem but we have to be interested in that too; high interest rates which are higher than ever; political control of our money which is controlled in different ways in some countries and also the use or abuse of our natural resources.

In the short time tonight, I cannot begin to express the opinions and the anger and the sentiments of the people that I represent, but I must try, Mr. Speaker, to do the best that I can and touch on some of the more urgent and imperative situations that must be considered at this time. I want to preface what I intend to say with these words. Never before, Mr. Provincial treasurer, in the history or in the memory of any of us here has there been so much of high and unpopular taxes. Let that sink in.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Berezowsky:** — So much prejudice, so much interference with human rights and freedoms by your Government . . .

**Mr. Steuart:** — You're the interfering one.

**Mr. Berezowsky:** — . . . such high living costs and capital costs for the ordinary citizen whether it is housing or business or whatever it may be.

**Hon. Mr. Steuart:** — Such high wages.

**Mr. Berezowsky:** — Where? Where? Your high wages? Maybe high wages but not for the people back in your home city! Neither have we seen so much inflation — and that answers high wages — nor so much high interest rates as I've said, devaluation and what not, and I could talk about stagnation but I haven't got time today.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Berezowsky:** — Mr. Speaker, the authors of this Speech do not admit these facts, as you can see, and once again they present a smoke screen hiding the real Saskatchewan economic picture. Only in their actions and in the reports is the truth indicated. This Government have failed in efficiently and economically governing this Province of Saskatchewan. Mr. Speaker, history will record that the period of the Thatcher Administration is not a Liberal one but a far right-wing Administration that has no concern for the majority of people as it has so very well demonstrated.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Berezowsky:** — This Government is bent on destroying the achievements and goals and programs, such as we brought into this province; medical care, educational and welfare achievements and in the field of conservation of our resources through their give-aways.

February 7, 1969

This Government is trying to punish the Saskatchewan people, yes, trying to punish the Saskatchewan people. It insults their intelligence and uses cheap and insidious smoke screens, brain-washing the public to cover up the true facts.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Berezowsky:** — Let us take a moment and look at their performance. The Minister of Public Health (Mr. Grant) spoke the other day. He didn't announce it here yet, but he has announced to the public that the Federal Government will be contributing assistance towards the hospital costs of rehabilitative physiotherapy, radiology and possibly some of the other services now provided very conveniently and very efficiently in some of the medical clinics of this province, be they private or co-operative. The Minister said, "Well we can save \$8 million if my Department would opt out from paying clinics for these services." This Government guaranteed these could be provided by the clinics and so a number of communities spent hundreds of thousands of dollars to build these clinics to provide these services. Now the Minister is going to tell us that he is going to save money. He is going to opt out of these services. They are not going to be provided in these clinics in spite of the fact that the services could be provided there. He forgets, he forgets one point, that it really doesn't matter whether you provide the services in hospitals or whether you provide them in doctors' offices or in clinics. It has to be paid for one way or another. Whether you get the money from Ottawa or you provide it in other ways, it is still paid initially by the people who need the services, the taxpayers of the country. It is regrettable to me that the Minister of Public Health (Mr. Grant) so threatens the Saskatchewan people with higher hospital and medical taxes. He has not indicated in any way that he has looked at other areas of cost. I think he would be on safer ground, Mr. Speaker, had he indicated to us that he would investigate medical and other related costs by appealing a Royal Commission to make a thorough study similar to the Hall Commission or the Batten Commission that we've had for obvious reasons. And there is already information for those who want to read. Private surveys have been made in the United States. I am sure also in this province we have had surveys made which indicate to me that savings could be made of anywhere from 30 to 50 per cent of the cost of our medical and hospital care if we did what should be done.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Berezowsky:** — And I'm not criticizing that the Government isn't doing a good job everywhere because much was initiated by the former Government. We set up a very good establishment to provide medical and hospital services. But I do say that I believe there are many hospital admissions now due to minor surgery, and the Provincial Treasurer is partly to blame for that. He took minor surgery out of the clinics directing this service into hospitals. There are many people now going to hospitals who have to stay a night or more in those hospitals, which means \$35 per day extra to the plan. If he wants to blame anybody he should blame himself for this kind of situation.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Berezowsky:** — These should have been out-patient cases. You go to the clinic and go back home. But he has taken the service out of the clinics and this forces people to go to hospitals now.

**Mr. Steuart:** — I don't believe that, Bill.

**Mr. Berezowsky:** — You know it is true and you are trying to do the same thing with radiology and physiotherapy, to send people down to the hospital, put them in line, let them wait a week or two until they are really sick and then they are committed to hospitals. So it will cost the people ever so much more money.

**Mr. Steuart:** — What are we doing to radiologists, Bill?

**An Hon. Member:** — Going to cut them out.

**Mr. Steuart:** — No, we aren't.

**An Hon. Member:** — Up goes the balloon, Davey.

**Mr. Steuart:** — I don't know what you're talking about.

**Mr. Berezowsky:** — We may have an opportunity at a different time to talk more about this particular subject, but I would say this that what he has done, the Minister of Public Health (Mr. Grant), what he has done has been a vicious attack against the medical insurance plan. I can only call it a betrayal of government responsibility by this Liberal party. Remember, Sir, it was not so long ago in the last election that the Liberals promised to bring in drug care, to make improvements in medicare. This was just another broken promise and I can only say, Mr. Speaker, God help us from such friends and from such liberal promises. And now the Minister says — here is another new one — that the “hospital and medicare premiums are too low” and he suggests substantial increases.

**An Hon. Member:** — Who said that?

**Mr. Berezowsky:** — The Minister of Public Health (Mr. Grant) and I will quote from the Leader Post, February 3:

Premiums are too low, Health minister Grant said Friday he personally feels hospitalization, medical care premiums in Saskatchewan are far too low. The Health Minister told the annual meeting of the Southeast Regional Hospital Council he feels this way because the premium should have a relationship to the actual cost of providing service. Originally the premiums provided 58 per cent of the actual cost but now provide only 16 to 17 per cent and he said the rate should be adjusted periodically.

The minister doesn't consider whether the people have the tax money to pay more, the Minister doesn't consider the needs of our society. He just sees it so! He can't see it any other way because he is well-to-do. That is his perspective. But things have gone up, he says so let's pat it. He'll pay less income tax if he gets enough bills but the poor fellow in the

February 7, 1969

constituency of the Hon. Provincial treasurer (Mr. Steuart) is not in that position. He is going to resent this. I hope you resent it, Mr. Minister, and that you tell the minister of Public Health (Mr. Grant).

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Berezowsky:** — Just a few minutes ago, the Minister mentioned something about the pulp mill. I'm going to ask the Minister, Mr. Speaker, just a few questions . . .

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Berezowsky:** — Tell us honestly and truthfully how much money the public through the Government have put into the Saskatchewan pulp company which produces pulp.

**Mr. Steuart:** — Pulp mill -- \$1½ million.

**Mr. Berezowsky:** — this is not true, Mr. Speaker, the Province put in \$1½ million. I said public money. He knows that he persuaded the Federal Government to commit itself to \$10 million in addition to the \$1 ½ million.

**An Hon. Member:** — \$5 million.

**Mr. Berezowsky:** — It gave five and it promised another five, if you remember at the meeting when they opened the pulp mill – and I was there. You got half a million then and there and promised another \$4 ½ million to come. You're not going to make a liar out of me. I was there and heard it.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Berezowsky:** — That's what you said once, Mr. Minister from Athabasca (Mr. Guy), that's what you said once, and all you do is insult Members of this Legislature. The sooner you learn to keep your mouth shut, the better it will be for you and you'll have some respect.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Berezowsky:** — What about Saskatchewan Pulp Mill and how many millions have you actually spent in building roads for the pulp mill and for potash companies at the expense of the people of Saskatchewan whom you are forcing to pay deterrent fees. Give us some of these answers, and there's more questions to come.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Berezowsky:** — Tell us how many friends and associates are involved in some of these corporations that are producing and hauling pulpwood.

An Hon. Member: — I can't hear this. Would you repeat that?



**Mr. Berezowsky:** — Yeah, you tell us these things.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Berezowsky:** — Yes, Waskesiu Holding, Saskatchewan Pulpwood, Woodland Enterprise, tell us of your friends, who they actually are, who are the directors and shareholders.

**Mr. Steuart:** — I'll tell you right now.

**Mr. Berezowsky:** — You tell me when you get your opportunity . . .

**Mr. Steuart:** — You've been running around asking questions . . .

**Mr. Berezowsky:** — You tell me . . .

**Mr. Steuart:** — You've been running around spreading these little filthy lies. . .

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order, order!

**Mr. Berezowsky:** — I'm not spreading, never did.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order, order! Now that's the end of the tit-tat. We've been listening to the Member for Cumberland.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**An Hon. Member:** — Stick to the truth.

**Mr. Berezowsky:** — I do! Anyway, be that as it may, it will all come out in due course of time and I only suggest to the Minister that he be honest with the Members of this Legislature and that, when we go into Crown Corporations, at that time he give us facts and true figures so that we will know what's going on, because we are the Members that represent the people of Saskatchewan and are entitle to know.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**An Hon. Member:** — Sock it to 'em, Bill, sock it to 'em.

**Mr. Berezowsky:** — And the reason for that, as I said, and I say again, is because I'm afraid that the people are losing respect for the Government, everybody, even Liberals, because of these smoke screens, these half-truths and this denial of information to members of the Legislature. Even when I say the Government is asleep, that the Government doesn't understand, that it bullies, that is insults, I have every right to believe it that way because this has, to me, been its performance.

A lot of people, Mr. Speaker, cannot afford any more increases in taxes of any kind in the field of education, whether it's for the University, for old-age security — that's what the Premier says. .

February 7, 1969

**An Hon. Member:** — Louder, louder!

**Mr. Berezowsky:** — That's what the Premier says. I should quote you a few of the things that the Premier does when he's not in Saskatchewan. He sent a copy of his speech to quite a few people, I have it here and it's remarkable, remarkable.

**An Hon. Member:** — . . . a good speech.

**Mr. Berezowsky:** — No, it's not a good speech at all because — here's what he says when he's talking about medical care insurance, I'll comment on why it's not a good speech. I quote from his speech; the office of the Premier sent this down, it's a speech of the Hon. Premier delivered at New Orleans.

**An Hon. Member:** — Oh, New Orleans!

**Mr. Berezowsky:** — We have it all here and you've seen a copy of it. I can table it if you like. Here's what he says in this one paragraph and I quote:

We were forced,

that's the Government

we were forced to the conclusion that our people could not afford these huge annual increases without endangered funds which would be available to such fields as education, to the University, to old-age security,

I thought that was Federal

and as a politician, I must tell you that the welfare trend is extremely difficult to reverse. Once people are given something for nothing, it's politically perilous to interfere with that service. However, this year in Saskatchewan our Government concluded that, regardless of political consequences, we are obliged to take some action which would restrain health expenditures. We thus decided to introduce utilization fees at the past session of the Legislature.

Now, please not, Mr. Speaker, according to the Premier, the legislation was not brought in because of abuse — that is what we heard in the House from the Minister of Public Health (Mr. Grant) — abuse, abuse — it was brought in to restrain the sick. That comes from the Premier. He said his party would like to reverse welfare trends. That is what he said and that's what the Government does. It needed money for other purposes. The Government wanted to have the money for — as they say — education (and it's a good place to put it in), and it needed money for the roads for a private company up there — in the north in my constituency — probably \$7 million worth.

**An Hon. Member:** — Do you like the road?

**Mr. Berezowsky:** — I like the roads but I don't like you to rob the people of Saskatchewan to provide roads for millionaire corporations.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Berezowsky:** — Do you blame me, Mr. Speaker, for charging the Minister of Health with trying to destroy our health plan when we couldn't get the true facts out, when he wouldn't admit the true facts? Yet the Premier says this was the reason.

**An Hon. Member:** — That's right.

**Mr. Berezowsky:** — Once again the Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Steuart) will be cutting down on our health and welfare in order that he may spend more millions for roads, for pulpwood, mining companies and now for potash companies.

**Mr. Steuart:** — Nothing for potash.

**Mr. Berezowsky:** — And you're going to give grants to mining companies, poor millionaire corporations. They can't find \$25,000 to dig a hole down through the Athabasca sandstone.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**An Hon. Member:** — Hundreds of thousands!

**An Hon. Member:** — Give it back . . .

**An Hon. Member:** — Give what back?

**Mr. Berezowsky:** — Mr. Speaker, I'm going to ask a question of this House. I've been here a long time, I don't profess to be a debater, I'm just an ordinary farmer from the north who's trying to represent the people . . .

**An Hon. Member:** — Doing a great job, Bill, doing a great job!

**Mr. Berezowsky:** — well and I assert this: is not the Government required to give us information? Is it not required to be just and efficient? Honest and fair? Moral and without prejudice? Is it not supposed to conserve and make the best use of our material resources and human potential? To pave the way towards higher moral living standards for our people? To bring forth recreational opportunities, healthy and cultural aims for the good and common ends of our people? I say, of course. Mr. Speaker, it is to such goals and purposes that we, all of us in government, must be dedicated and anything less than the best is, in my opinion, abrogation and shirking of responsibility and duty.

So, I must say, having weighed the performance of this Government opposite, that it has been found wanting. Our health services have lost ground. Freedoms have been restricted. Dignity has slipped. The Government has failed to meet the challenges of youth and our society and it is not deserving of further trust or confidence. I say that the Government should not only call a by-election up in Kelvington but that the Government should resign.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

February 7, 1969

**Mr. Berezowsky:** — And I will tell you why, Mr. Speaker, I'll tell you why. This Premier and his Government have lost the confidence of their own party. In the Saskatchewan Liberal December 1, 1968, an article on the last page states that there is no room now in Saskatchewan for the Conservatives. It surreptitiously suggests that the Thatcher Liberals have moved away over to the right. Of course, this is very true, Mr. Speaker, as you know. As a matter of fact, very close to Fascism, which, as you know, is defined in any dictionary as a totalitarian, right wing party in the service of private enterprise.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Berezowsky:** — Be that as it may, I am not calling them Fascists. But your Premier is very close to it. The fact remains that this Government is not a Liberal Government any more.

**Hon. C.P. MacDonald (Minister of Welfare):** — Bill, you don't like to be called a Communist . . .

**Mr. Berezowsky:** — They admit it right in this paper. I ask my Liberal friends — I didn't call you, I am not a name caller like you are, my friend. Anybody that you don't like — is a Communist. That is all that you know.

**Mr. MacDonald:** — You just called us Fascist.

**Mr. Berezowsky:** — I did not! I am asking you this. What about the Liberal Party, the liberal people who supported a true Liberal organization? What do they think about this? They are now Conservatives subject to the authority of one man who, when they speak up, calls them timid and lacking in courage. I hope there are some there with some courage who will stand up. But no more are they allowed to criticize their Leader. Of course not. So I don't blame a great number of Liberals in the Province of Saskatchewan and even in this House for being disenchanted. But it is their problem, not mine.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Berezowsky:** — I wonder also about the traditional Conservatives and whether they are prepared to accept this new development of having Mr. Thatcher as their leader. Do they agree there is no room for their party and that the Liberals who have moved over with Mr. Thatcher will remain there? Ultra-Conservatives? Years ago, Mr. Speaker, Henri Bourassa said this and I quote from the House of Commons Debates, 1935, page 105, 118:

Unless the two old parties mend their ways, disillusionment with parliamentary democracy will grow to such proportions that it will cause a violent overthrow of our traditional system of government.

And that is what is happening right now in our country. That is why you have Trudeau in Ottawa who someone here said is a Communist. That is why we have other progressives but always someone says that they are Communists. They are overthrowing

the whole traditional system because of people like you.

**An Hon. Member:** — Name caller!

**Mr. Berezowsky:** — Mr. Speaker, I remember when the Communists were supporting MacKenzie King . . . This doesn't mean that the Liberals were Communists.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Berezowsky:** —As a Social Democrat, Mr. Speaker, I fear the menace of not only Communism but also of reactionaries and Fascists.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Berezowsky:** — And the Premier's remarks and some of his colleagues – and there are some very fine gentlemen there – are too often dangerously reactionary in my opinion. And it is not fair play to the people of Saskatchewan whom they represent. Their remarks are loaded with vicious rightist propaganda incompatible with truth. The speech of the Provincial treasurer (Mr. Stuart) is a typical example. In particular, the kind of speech we heard from the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Guy) is the extreme case of this kind of thing. It is disgusting.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**An Hon. Member:** — No, no!

**Mr. Berezowsky:** — You are saying no, no! Well read the speeches. Read your own speeches and you will see what I mean. Read the speech of New Orleans where the Premier said and I quote:

I presume that the invitation to me was extended because the Province of Saskatchewan had a Socialist Government for two decades, about the only one I supposed in North America . . .

And then he couldn't hold back and said,

except Castro's.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Berezowsky:** — What nonsense, Mr. Speaker.

**Mr. MacDonald:** — Is it true?

**Mr. Berezowsky:** — No, it is not true, because we are not Castroites, we are not Communists, we are Social Democrats. If you went to grade eight you should know what a social democrat is.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Berezowsky:** — Is this not a vicious insinuation, Sir?

**An Hon. Member:** — What kind of a dumb question is that?

February 7, 1969

**Mr. Berezowsky:** — We need not defend ourselves. For years the Premier was an ardent Member of the CCF. He needs no lectures comparing Socialism and totalitarian states.

**An Hon. Member:** — You are getting to them, Bill. Sock it to them!

**Mr. Berezowsky:** — He knows the difference. He is not that simple. The only reason the Premier talks that way outside in particular, out of the province, is because he wants to show himself as a great private enterpriser and he talks another way here in the province because he wants to have power in this province over the people of Saskatchewan.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Berezowsky:** — Mr. Speaker, is somebody doesn't know — I didn't say the Member were Fascists. If somebody doesn't know what it is, just read out of Mein Kampf, the Nazi Bible and here's what it says, by Professors Corrine and Hodges on page 47 near the top. It states bluntly Hitler's estimate of human beings:

Individually they were ignoramuses and incompetent, collectively a rabble marked by indolence, stupidity and cowardice.

**Hon. A.R. Guy (Minister of Public Works):** — Quit talking about . . .

**Mr. Berezowsky:** — And individuals are therefore to be regarded as a means and not as an end on themselves. Isn't this what we've heard from the Minister of public Works, just this kind of stuff.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Berezowsky:** — What do you expect me to think of you?

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**An Hon. Member:** — You have no faith in people.

**Mr. Berezowsky:** — Mr. Speaker, the Throne Speech indicates no hope for the Indians and Métis in resolving their problems. Let me point out to you that these people are anxious and ready to try resolving some of their problems. I've said this on a number of occasions. Given a chance, they want health, they want shelter, they want education, they want roads and jobs, just as we do. But this Government continues to be paternalistic, continues to expand its bureaucracy at tremendous cost to the people of Saskatchewan. They're going to set up a new Indian Department. Well, I hope it isn't a counterpart of the Indian Department at Ottawa because the Indians wouldn't have anything of it. The Minister of Education (Mr. McIsaac) did give us some information and it looks like it won't be too bad, but at the same time I don't know and I'm scared. But I will read you something that I cut out of the paper only today and it says, "Indians offer views" and this happened in Edmonton. It's from

the Leader Post, February 5th of this year.

Alberta's Indians are tired of well-meaning whites,

Listen to this, Mr. Minister,

who think they can bring social change overnight. This was the prevailing sentiment of the second day of the University of Alberta's International Week. "You can't come in as an outsider and expect to bring about social change," Doug Cuthand of Edmonton told a predominately white audience at a non-hour forum on campus Monday. "First you have to know the people."

You read it for yourself. And I'm glad to see that the Minister of Natural Resources (Mr. Barrie) has authorized his Deputy to say well, "The Government could spend \$300 million (I don't know where it's going to get it from because it's broke) but we are going to spend \$450 million for northern development," he says. Fine! But don't you do what you think is right. Find out from the Indians first what they want. If they want education, if they want schools, all right. So they need a high school in Cumberland House and build them a high school in Cumberland House.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Berezowsky:** — What about that road, Mr. Minister of Natural Resources? You are one of the gentlemen in this House — and I respect you for this — but what about the road to Deschambault? Fifty families have been begging for some years now. Representing them, I have been asking for a trail so they can go out into the settlements, commute, get jobs, see what the world is like, see that their children get out too, so they can become citizens like we all are. When are we going to get \$20,000 — not \$50 million, when are you going to put in \$20,000 in co-operation with the Federal Government? Give them a trail so they can get out.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**An Hon. Member:** — Nice going, Bill.

**An Hon. Member:** — We're putting that road up as fast as we can.

**Mr. Berezowsky:** — You haven't started yet! This is not unreasonable what I'm telling you. These people are citizens of Saskatchewan, they're Canadian people, they're entitled to a road, just like the people in Cumberland House who are entitled to a road and the people up in other parts of Saskatchewan are entitled to roads. Both the previous Government and this Government have been doing something but you're not doing enough. It won't help you to say we're going to spend \$50 million — big idea, when you can't find \$20,000 to build a road to Deschambault.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Berezowsky:** — And if you don't do it, Mr. Minister and you have the petitions on file — you had one last year and this year — and

February 7, 1969

if you don't do it, I can only conclude, as I've concluded so far that the Government is blind, parsimonious – that means stingy, in case you don't know!

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Berezowsky:** — Well, just in case some of you don't understand good modern English, inconsiderate and irresponsible, and that's why I say they should resign.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Berezowsky:** — But I do think that the Minister of Natural Resources (Mr. Barrie) is an understanding person and that he will try to do something about it. He knows about the situation but I am forced to bring it up again to get action.

I'd like to say this too about Indians, I'm not an expert on Indians but I have worked with them and lived with them and I think that we must agree . . .

**An Hon. Member:** — . . . a good MLA.

**Mr. Berezowsky:** — . . . that sheltered, protected people – and you say that yourself – that sheltered, protected people are by bad environment prone to be depressed people. Right? So I think we should grant the Indians some of the things that they desire to have and not what we think is going to shelter them or protect them, or that we're going to do this for them or that, or that we're going to set up an Indian Department or do the things that we think are good for them. For goodness sake, let's go and do the things that the Indians want to do themselves so they can lift themselves up by their own bootstraps.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Berezowsky:** — And I say to this Government it is wrong to enforce social and economic levels on native people, any people. It just won't work and we should know it by now. Paternalistic policies, Mr. Speaker, bring down even a stronger, imaginative and hard-working individuals down to the level which bureaucracy sets up. Economic, social and other improvements must rise from the lower level itself, from the people themselves, from those who have wanted to be something better. Just like Ukrainian people who wanted to be something better and so we've raised ourselves. I'm proud of it and other people are no different. No people are any different. And all that any government can do is to help people in the direction of their aspirations and objectives. Don't hinder them! If they have the potential and if they have the desire, they'll get whatever goals they set for themselves, believe me. We can help them, as I said, to lift themselves by their own bootstraps.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Berezowsky:** — I don't have anyone write my speeches, I make them up myself, Mr. Speaker, and they're not as smart-alecky as yours, Mr. public Works Minister (Mr. Guy). I was just going to say something else.



**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Berezowsky:** — I wan to say this before my time is up – I have another five minutes – an that’s in reference to the farm problem. I will say right now that a lot of people are being hurt because of inflation, farmers, pensioners and others, and you’re doing nothing about it except for the Civil Service pensioners, but there are other than Civil Service pensioners – I could ask, Mr. Speaker, what kind of legislation is proposed for them. Particularly, what is this Government or the Government at Ottawa, doing for farmers?

**An Hon. Member:** — Nothing.

**Mr. Berezowsky:** — And the hardest hit sector of our society is the farmers. I’m a farmer and I should know, not one of these rich, you know, two-township farmers or someone like that. I’m just an ordinary farmer with just a few quarters of land and I say that it’s a tragic situation. It isn’t a temporary situation, it’s chronic. Farm incomes have been decreasing. Everybody knows that for 20 years now, and the fires of dissatisfaction and fear are blowing up in our face all around it. The farm industry is sick, very sick. Over the past two or more decades, farmers have become more efficient but prices for grain have not increased. Cash receipts have remained for too low, and farmers, because they were told by the Government, by the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. McFarlane) – he’s trying to do a good job, I admit. We don’t agree with everything he does but he’s trying to do the job – but he’s told farmers time and time again – he should have known better – to become more efficient. More efficient they are, using fertilizers and this and that, and now they’re overproduced. They’ve borrowed heavily, spent much on capital. They’ve subsidized the Canadian economy so far. They can’t subsidize any more. Farm machine companies have thrived but they won’t thrive any more. Our farm taxes, interest and charges have gone up. We’ve failed to help the farmers. We’ve even failed to use the Churchill facilities where we could have shipped out about 30 million more bushels of wheat last year. We did nothing. We heard nothing from the Government here or the Government at Ottawa. It’s more important to this Government for the railways to ship potash than to ship wheat.

Subsidies, oh yes, you can find subsidies and incentive grants to industries and mines that don’t need the money. There are, I grant, times that you should give incentive grants. I’ve not been against them, as you know, but not in this year when you need this money to save the farm economy. Our Federal Government still goes on giving incentives to ship-building companies, as long as they’re big industrialists, or millionaires from the States. Our Government even brought 100 of them up to Prince Albert to the big \_do\_ there and I’m sure the Government paid their way. The minister (Mr. Steuart) can tell us if I’m wrong.

**Mr. Steuart:** — You’re wrong!

**Mr. Berezowsky:** — OK, who paid their way?

**An Hon. Member:** — Always suspicious.

**Mr. Berezowsky:** — I have to be, seeing we have a Liberal Government here.

**An Hon. Member:** — Rightly so, rightly so.

**Mr. Berezowsky:** — Mr. Speaker, farmers are now at a point of no return. If our economy is to survive, then income must be distributed to make the system invulnerable to economic shocks. Wealth distribution is not, as the Premier says, robbing the rich and giving to the poor. It's not robbing them at all. When we give to the poor and the money begins to circulate, the rich will become richer. This is not a new idea. It was tried in 1929 after the great crash by Franklin D. Roosevelt, as you will recall, Sir. At that time the United States was unable to solve basic production, marketing problems, unable to put together human beings, capital and land so as to produce a satisfactory level of output in the nation. A remedy had to be found and they found it and I'm not going into that because I haven't got time.

**An Hon. Member:** — Go ahead, Bill.

**Mr. Berezowsky:** — But the United States resolved their problem and you, and the Canadian Government can resolve our present problem if you see to it that the farmer gets a basic income.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Berezowsky:** — I have letters here. Do you know what it costs to dry feed grain in Prince Albert? I'll read it here, just a section for you. "I dried 709 bushels of feed wheat which was hauled to the elevator." It cost the farmer \$214. Mr. Speaker, the farmer will get about \$400 or \$500 for this feed wheat. It cost him \$214 to dry. Where is he going to get the money to dry his wheat? The wheat in the north country is going to rot, it's going to spoil because you only provide 10-cent loans. They don't need those loans. They want cash. They need to get paid because they haven't got any more money and can't do anything about it.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Berezowsky:** — now, Mr. Speaker, it's 5:25, I have a long speech but will leave it for a later time. However, at this time I do want to show the Hon. Minister from Prince Albert (Mr. Steuart) that after all I'm not so bad, after all.

**An Hon. Member:** — You're a very nice guy.

**Mr. Berezowsky:** — I know. We're still friends no matter what happens. Recently I was down at Caribou Creek Lodge and I was asked to present this to the Minister (Mr. Steuart). He's going to retire pretty soon so he needs a retirement fund. To show that I have no malice or prejudice against anybody, even the Minister from Prince Albert, I'll pass this on to him with my best wishes and put the first penny in for this retirement fund.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Berezowsky:** — And any of you gentlemen that would like to do likewise, you're welcome.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Berezowsky:** — Mr. Speaker, you can see that I'm not going to support the motion but I am going to support the amendment.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Steuart:** — Mr. Speaker, I wonder if before the Member takes his seat if he'd answer one question: What do you really think of the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Guy)?

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. H.E. Coupland (Meadow Lake):** — Mr. Speaker, due to the time, I beg leave to adjourn the debate.

Debate adjourned.

### ANNOUNCEMENT

#### APPOINTMENT OF THE BOARD OF CO-OPERATIVE FISHERIES LIMITED AND THE BOARD OF NORTHERN CO-OPERATIVE TRADING SERVICES

**Hon. L.P. Coderre (Minister of Labour):** — I beg the indulgence of this House, Mr. Speaker, and by leave of the house, I have an announcement to make which would be of interest to Members of this House. Mr. Speaker, in regard to the appointment of the Co-operative Fisheries Limited and the board of Northern Co-operative Trading Services, it was originally planned when these co-ops were formed to reduce the Board and to give the native population a greater opportunity into it. I wish to announce that a new Board has been appointed and I would like publicly at this time to thank and give appreciation of the Government for the services of the directors of these two organizations who will no longer be members of the Board. That is, Mr. Robson of Saskatoon, Mr. Whiting of Pleasant Valley, Mr. Melvin Breen of Regina, who have given of their time to these Boards over the last 10 years. These three men have assisted in providing the leadership for the co-operatives in this area. The new members who have taken their place are native people or people who are fishermen in the North.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

The Assembly adjourned at 5:28 o'clock.