

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN
Second Session — Sixteenth Legislature
8th Day

Thursday, February 13, 1969

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

WELCOME TO STUDENTS

Mr. J.J. Charlebois (Saskatoon City Park-University): — Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to introduce to you and through you to the Members of this Assembly some students from North Park school, in Saskatoon. They are here with their teacher, Mrs. Leona Averbach. We hope that they enjoy the proceedings of this House and that they have a very pleasant trip on their way back to Saskatoon.

Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. W.A. Forsyth (Saskatoon Nutana South): — It is my pleasure to introduce to you and through you to the Legislature a group of students from Queen Elizabeth school in the constituency of Nutana South in Saskatoon. They are here with Mr. Fleury and I am sure that we all wish them a very pleasant visit to Regina and their other activities this afternoon. I hope they find their stay in the House educational and instructive.

Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

ANNOUNCEMENT

FEDERAL-PROVINCIAL CONFERENCE

Hon. D.G. Steuart (Provincial Treasurer): — Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day I would just like to take a moment to report to the House on the Constitutional Meeting that has just concluded in Ottawa. First I would like to thank the delegation, my own colleagues, that attended this meeting with me and were so helpful. The observers that went with us, Mr. Murphy, of the SARM, and Dr. Spinks, and the Leader of the Opposition, Woodrow Lloyd, who was very helpful from the background of his experience. Without in any way closing out any of his options in recognizing that he may or may not have agreed with anything we said, he did offer constructive suggestions and these were appreciated. In fact in the lighter vein, he offered the suggestion that may have put to rest a long standing problem, and that is when we were reminded very forcibly on one occasion at least of the great debt we owed to Eastern Canada for the help they gave us in the 1930s. It was Woodrow who suggested to me that we might repay those five carloads of cod fish with ten carloads of damp grain, which I passed on to them.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Steuart: — But seriously the Conference I think was a success. If

it did nothing else but to show us how much farther we have to go, and to show the Canadian people the complexity of the problems that we face as a nation in changing, updating or in fact re-writing our Constitution.

From the point of view of Saskatchewan in particular, we went down determined to at least have the problems that faced us as a Province given priority equal to other problems that face other parts of Canada. I think we have succeeded in doing this. I recognize there is a great deal more to be done, that many segments of the Canadian people may be impatient with us to move along with it, I think that we did also agree on some more streamlined and better methods of proceeding in the future. All in all I again say that I think the Conference was most worthwhile, from the point of view not only of Saskatchewan and Western Canada, but from the point of view of this nation, and I was privileged to be part of that delegation that attended that Conference on behalf of the Province.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

1969 OILRIGHT SALES

Hon. A.C. Cameron (Minister of Natural Resources): — Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, I think Hon. Members would be interested in the results of the first 1969 Oilrights Sale which was held in the Department of Mineral Resources on Tuesday. Tuesday's sale of oilrights netted slightly in excess of \$1 million.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Cameron: — I might mention incidentally that this is more for a January sale that at any time, except in 1967. I believe in January of that year, the sale netted \$1¼ million. In this sale it was the western part of the province that came to the fore. Those areas topped the bidding. A comparatively new area, west of Luseland, incidentally, commanded a bid of \$153,000 for a permit. This was closely followed by \$110,000 bid for a permit just south of the town of Maple Creek. The top bid for drilling reservations was received for a parcel just south of Gull Lake. This parcel brought \$337,000. I think the sale indicates that Saskatchewan got off to a good start in 1969 and that it is still a good hunting ground for oil.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

QUESTIONS

TRANSFER OF MOOSE JAW TELEPHONE OFFICE

Mr. G.T. Snyder (Moose Jaw North): — Before the Orders of the Day are proceeded with, I want to direct a question to the Minister in charge of the Department of Telephones concerning information that was relayed to me. I would like to ask him whether there is any accuracy in the suggestion that there may be a move to transfer a portion of the operation of the Department of Telephones presently in Moose Jaw to Regina. I wonder if the Minister can give an indication as to the possibility of the truth of this rumor.

Mr. Cameron: — Mr. Speaker, I am not aware of a move like that, I haven't heard the rumor myself, and I am not aware of any.

RADIO BROADCASTS

Mr. J.E. Brockelbank (Saskatoon Mayfair): — Before the Orders of the Day I would like to ask the Government what success it has had in getting coverage for that area of the province that was blacked out from the radio broadcast of this session?

Hon. D.V. Heald (Attorney General): — In answer to that question, Mr. Speaker, I think I could tell the Hon. Member and all Hon. Members that arrangements are nearly completed. They will be completed perhaps today with CFQC, so far as the Budget Debate is concerned. We may not have the arrangements completed, there is only today and tomorrow in this debate, but certainly for the Budget Debate, it looks like CFQC for that central and northwest part of the province. I think by tomorrow I will be able to confirm it definitely.

Mr. Brockelbank: — Mr. Speaker, at that time could the Minister comment about the other area of the province, further northwest? I am not sure that some of them are not in the fringe area of CFQC.

Mr. Heald: — Mr. Speaker, it was my understanding in discussion this matter with Members on that side of the House that, if we were able to complete the arrangements for CFQC particularly, that northwest area in its entirety would be covered by CFQC. It was on this basis that negotiations were entered into with the CFQC. It was my understanding that would be satisfactory.

HIGH POWER AND GAS BILLS

Mr. A. Matsalla (Canora): — Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Minister in charge of Saskatchewan Power Corporation. Over the weekend I had a number of complaints in my area with regard to abnormally high power and gas bills for the last month. Would the Hon. Minister inform whether there has been a recent increase in rates?

Some Hon. Members: — Colder weather!

Hon. G.B. Grant (Minister of Public Health): — Mr. Speaker, I am sorry I did not hear the last portion of the question. Would the Member please repeat it?

Mr. Matsalla: — Would the Hon. Minister inform whether there has been an increase in power and gas rates?

Mr. Grant: — Mr. Speaker, there has been no increase in rates, but there certainly has been an increase in consumption in the last six weeks. I hope it keeps up, because it helps the profit for

the Corporation.

FEDERAL GOVERNMENT GRAIN ADVANCE

Mr. Messer (Kelsey): — Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question before the Orders of the Day to the Minister of Agriculture. As he is no doubt aware the forms for the advance from the Federal Government are available to prairie farmers and are now in the grain purchasers' hands. However, I wonder if he is aware that these are laid out explicitly on specified acreage for oats, barley and wheat to the point where you can get only a 10 cent a bushel advance on six bushels per acre, per specified acre and this does not include the drying of cash crops, such as rape seed and flax seed. I would like him to comment to the point as to whether he thinks this is any sufficient help to the prairie farmer at the present time. An example would be that a farmer with 100 acres of wheat . . .

Mr. Steuart: — If the Member wants to make a speech . . .

Mr. Messer: — . . . Just giving a little information in regard to the question, so he can answer it properly. I don't want the Member to be confused.

Mr. Steuart: — If the Members opposite abuse this question period — They never did it when they were the Government, they wouldn't answer questions.

Mr. Messer: — The floor, Mr. Speaker . . .

STATEMENT ON ORAL QUESTIONS

Mr. Speaker: — Now as I have done on previous occasions I draw the attention of all Members to the fact that we have no formal procedure in this House for the asking of oral questions at any time during the sitting, either before the Orders of the Day, or at any other time.

In other jurisdictions, in the House of Commons at Westminster and the House of Commons at Ottawa, all questions that are to be asked, whether they are to be replied to in written form or oral form, are subject to notice. Notice is given on the Order Paper. In the House of Commons at Westminster, those questions to which an oral answer is expected, are called 'starred questions' because a star appears opposite these on the Order Paper. The Minister then knows that he is going to be expected to give an oral answer to an oral question after such due notice has been given. In this House we have allowed by courtesy certain oral questions, short, sharp and to the point but we have no formal procedure for it. Indeed in fact if we adhere to the strict line, all oral questions are out of order. But we haven't adhered to the strict rule. We have allowed some oral questions. But I suggest that if they are to be continued, that is if there are to be any oral questions at all, at any time, they should be subject to a proper form of procedure. I would hope to that the Committee that this House may set up will have this under discussion when they meet throughout the coming summer and that they will come up with a solution to the problem. In the meantime

I suggest that, if oral questions are to be asked, they must be allowed by the House only as a matter of courtesy. During this time, they should be short, sharp and to the point and of an emergent nature.

Mr. Messer: — Mr. Speaker, if I may, I believe it is of an urgent nature. I just wanted to bring forth for the Minister's own information that if it was 1,000 acres or something . . .

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Messer: — Mr. Speaker, I direct the question to him then. Is he aware that it is on a specified acreage that it does not include cash crops such as rape seed and flax; and if he is, is he prepared to make any further requests to the Federal Government to include these crops?

Hon. D.T. McFarlane (Minister of Agriculture): — I think the answer to the Hon. Member's question is this, Mr. Speaker. We are aware of all the developments that are going on in our province at the present time. Whenever we see something that may affect the farmers concerned, we bring it to the attention of the proper authorities promptly.

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. H.E. Coupland (Meadow Lake): — Mr. Speaker, in rising to take part in this Debate I would first like to congratulate the mover and seconder in the Throne Speech Debate. They are to be commended for the job they did. It is a good document, Mr. Speaker. It has a lot of good things in it, one of which is the setting up of a separate Department for our Indian and Métis.

First I would like to wish the Premier a speedy recovery and hope to see him back in his seat before too long.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Coupland: — Mr. Speaker, I want to say how sorry I was to hear of that terrible incident at Buffalo Narrows a short while ago and offer my condolences to the bereaved relatives of this family.

Buffalo Narrows which is in my constituency has been getting a lot of bad publicity lately, and not all of it factual. Mr. Speaker, any of us are just as safe walking down the streets in Buffalo Narrows today as we are in any town or city in Saskatchewan. If there is one place where there is no racial discrimination, where the people of all races, color and creed work together, it is in Buffalo Narrows. In fact, later in the sessions, we will have a group of 40 students visiting our Chambers, and you will see for yourself the fine group of students who will be coming from Buffalo Narrows.

Mr. Speaker, I am going to use my time in this debate to say a few things about our native people. The northern half of Saskatchewan has been represented in this House by people of Indian ancestry longer or for more years than by 'white' as some of the radicals like to call us. There have been Métis Members in this House continuously from 1908 until 1952. Most of that time there were two Métis MLAs. I am proud to say, Mr. Speaker, they were all Liberals.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Coupland: — Joe Nolan, who was the first one, was elected in 1908 and served until 1925. Jules Marion who was Joe's right-hand man, until Joe died, was elected in 1926 and served to 1934 and again elected in 1938 and served until 1941. Alexander Hall sat in these Chambers for a total of 30 years, from 1913 to 1944. In 1934 the constituency boundaries were changed to combine Cumberland and Athabasca into one constituency. Mr. Hall and Mr. Marion ran against each other, both Liberals, Mr. Speaker. No other party had the courage to run in that election.

The story is told that when they called a nominating convention, Mr. Hall and Mr. Marion decided that, if neither one of them was to get the nomination, they would have an acclamation into the Legislature and that their people in that area, the northern part of Saskatchewan, wouldn't get in on any of the election money. So, by mutual agreement they decided to both run, two Liberals. They were the only ones that ran. MR. Hall won that election, so this was why Mr. Marion was out from 1934 to 1938. In 1938 the constituency was split again into Athabasca and Cumberland. Mr. Hall and Mr. Marion each won their respective seats back again. It may be interesting to note that in the 1938 election, in the Athabasca seat, two Liberals were the only candidates in that election, Mr. W.J. Windrom and Mr. Jules Marion. Mr. Marion won and served until his death in 1941. His son Marcien was elected in 1941 and again in 1948 and served until 1952. So you see, Mr. Speaker, that Métis have been elected to these Chambers. These men were elected to this Legislature on their own merit, hard work and a sincere desire to help their own people, without any special concessions by anyone. They didn't go around shooting rabbits or making radical statements, trying to incite race riots as some are in the province today.

Another good example of their ability, Mr. Speaker, is Len Marchand, Liberal MP from British Columbia who defeated Davie Fulton and is the first registered or Treaty Indian to sit in the House of Commons. He is a fine young man. I heard him tell a group of Indians and Métis that anyone offering them a job because of the color of their skin would be doing them a disservice. They should get jobs because they are qualified for it and they do qualify.

It is interesting to note, Mr. Speaker, that only eight years after the Socialists took over the Government, we had no more representation by people of Indian ancestry. In fact, Mr. Speaker, it was about that time, the Socialists moved into the northern part of the province with their welfare programs to try and get votes. The Leader of the Opposition has said that we should set up a committee to find what caused such incidents as happened the other day. I am sure, Mr. Speaker, he would find a lot of the blame rests with the programs implemented in

the North by the Socialists, mainly welfare and the lack of constructive programs.

Mr. Speaker, I have said it before and I will say it again, the people of the north are good people. They don't want welfare, they want the opportunity to earn their own living. There needs to be welfare for the aged or the sick or the disabled, but this is the same anywhere. I have had numerous old people of the area tell me that welfare is spoiling their young people. They are the ones that should know. Even as late as the last election, the Socialist candidate was promising more welfare in that area if elected. Mr. Speaker, Abraham Lincoln's words are as true today as they were in his days, —You cannot build character and courage by taking away man's initiative or independence. You cannot help men permanently by doing for them what they can and should do for themselves.”

Mr. Speaker, I am proud of the Liberal record, especially where it applies to our native population. Never has the Government been more concerned about their well-being and is doing something about it. The Premier has set up the Task Force to assist these people to assume their rightful place in society and has a lot of good people dedicated to the task. It has captured the imagination and the support of industry and the people of Saskatchewan. Mr. Speaker, we have set up programs to assist these people, some of which are flying them into trap lines, grub-staking fishermen who have to go into isolated lakes, also set up credit to help them purchase ski-doo's to go out on trap lines.

Our Government is clearing land for agricultural purposes to help our native people get established in farming and ranching. There is a large project at Cumberland House. Green Lake has been going for some years. Now we are clearing land at Ile-a-La-Crosse and La Loche and hope to get cattle established in these areas.

In education, Mr. Speaker, over 1,000 adults are taking training courses ranging from basic literacy to vocational grade 12. Increasing numbers who have attained entrance requirements in previous years are entering our technical schools and taking a wide variety of courses — motor mechanics, carpentry, electrical, building construction, welding — and many others. Many of the girls are taking commercial courses, and such as lab technicians, nursing and nursing aide courses. Mr. Speaker, almost 6,000 people have been placed in jobs by our Indian and Métis Branch since it was set up. This is a great achievement.

We have an all-native pulp-cutting operation set up for the Indian Band at Montréal Lake and one for the Métis community of Molonosa. There is also a logging operation established north of Hudson Bay for Indian and Métis. These programs are being run entirely by the native people. Mr. Speaker, when we involve the native people in the programs that are established in their areas, they have the feeling of belonging to the program. The chances of success are multiplied one hundred fold. This is so much different to the attitude of the Socialists who tried to tell the people what they had to do, whether they liked it or not. Mr. Speaker, I will support the motion and vote against the amendment.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. C.L.B. Estey (Minister of Municipal Affairs): — Mr. Speaker, I join in with the other speakers in congratulating the mover and seconder of the Address-in-Reply for the excellence of their addresses.

At the outset, I wish for a few minutes to discuss the resolution which has been mentioned in this House briefly and which was passed at a recent meeting of the Saskatchewan Young Democrats, being the so-called youth branch of the NDP party. This resolution as we all know called for the nationalization and socialization of farm lands in Canada. Mr. Speaker, I quote from the Moose Jaw Times Herald of January 20, 1969, which reads:

Saskatchewan Young New Democrats Sunday voted to press for the nationalization of all farm lands in Canada.

I am not surprised, Mr. Speaker, that the NDP party is now promoting the nationalization or socialization of all our farm lands. For this is the very point which they set out in the Regina Manifesto in 1933 after the famous meeting here in Regina, which set up the CCF party.

For the NDP party to be supporting the socialization of our farm lands in 1969 merely demonstrates the fact, Mr. Speaker, that their platform and philosophy have not changed in 36 years.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Estey: — It is interesting to note that in 1944, the NDP party was able to literally kick the Regina Manifesto under the carpet and keep it there for approximately 20 years. I can assure the NDP party that they will not be able to kick the socialization of farm land and the socialization of other things under the carpet at the time of the next provincial election. As you know, Mr. Speaker, the Regina Manifesto, which some of the people across the way would like to forget about, seeks to establish a socialized state. For the benefit of those opposite, and especially certain businessmen opposite, one of whom I understand is the Member from Kelsey (Mr. Messer), who is not present. I want to quote from the Regina Manifesto. One section of that document reads as follows. This is what the CCF party wanted in the Regina Manifest:

The socialization (Dominion, Provincial or Municipal) of transportation, communications and electric power . . . must come first in a list of industries to be socialized. Others, such as mining, pulp and paper and the distribution of milk, bread, coal and gasoline, in which exploitation, waste, or financial malpractices are particularly prominent, must next be brought under social ownership and operation.

I am quoting directly from the Regina Manifesto.

Insofar as agriculture is concerned, I want to quote again directly from the Regina Manifesto. This is how it reads . . . Mr. Speaker, the Member from Shellbrook (Mr. Bowerman) reminds me of the Greek philosopher, who said to one of his students, —You are basking on the shores of the lake of intellectualism without getting your feet wet.”

February 13, 1969

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Estey: — Now I quote directly from the Regina Manifesto on the question of agriculture. I draw this to the attention of the House.

Security of tenure for the farmer upon his farm on conditions to be laid down by individual provinces.

Nowhere in the Regina Manifesto, Mr. Speaker, when they come to talk about agriculture – and for the benefit of the younger Members opposite I have a copy of the Regina Manifesto here – does it refer to a man owning farm land? It refers to the word ‘tenure’, which by itself implies something like a lease. The Hon. Member from Riversdale (Mr. Romanow) knows that such a document gives you security for a fixed term and not ownership?

Now some Members opposite, Mr. Speaker, will take the attitude that the Regina Manifesto has been rejected by the NDP party and was rejected at the party’s Winnipeg convention which I believe was held in 1956. But the evidence that the Regina Manifesto was not rejected is a statement made and reported in the Regina Leader Post of September 7, 1956, and it was made by Mr. David Lewis, who was then national chairman of the party and as we all know is an MP at the present time. Mr. Lewis is quoted in the Regina Leader Post on the date I have given you as saying, “That the party’s Winnipeg declaration last July represents no change in policy.” In other words the Regina Manifesto survived the Winnipeg conference and is today the basic philosophy of the NDP party.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Estey: — Then, Mr. Speaker, we come to Mr. Clarence Fines, who we have been told has recently been Canada’s unofficial ambassador to Australia and New Zealand. He was reported in the Regina Leader Post on June 11, 1956, as having addressed a crowd of 40 people at Imperial school in Regina. This is what Mr. Fines said:

The basic truths in the Regina Manifesto are as true today as they were in 1932 when it was drafted.

Certain of the Members opposite regard themselves as philosophers and tell us ad nauseam the NDP is the only party in Canada with a philosophy which meets the present-day conditions. Mr. Speaker, as I have previously said, the only basic philosophy of the NDP is the socialistic philosophy and as I said, Mr. Speaker, they were able to hide this philosophy for 20 years. But it has been rejected by the people of Saskatchewan in two successive elections and will be rejected in a third.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Estey: — Mr. Speaker, I now want to say something about the Department of Municipal Affairs. Mr. Speaker, I think one of the greatest advancements which has been made in municipal government occurred at the last provincial convention of the SARM, when that body authorized its executive to hold meetings throughout this province with a view to ascertaining if we could have

changes in boundaries or amalgamations in our rural municipalities. I know that many meetings have been held during the year and it is the hope of the committee that in 1969 we will have some amalgamations. I do not have to remind this House that many of our municipal boundaries were established in 1911 and 1912 when the means of transportation and communication were most difficult and administration facilities did not just exist for larger areas.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to turn for a moment to the question of housing which is an important topic today. I do not intend to refer to the Hellyer Task Force Report but hope to have the opportunity to deal with that at a later date. The number of housing starts in Saskatchewan during 1968 was probably affected by the high-interest rates, at least to some extent, although the exact extent is rather hard to determine. For example, from January 1 to December 31, 1967, according to CMHC figures there were 4,081 construction starts, that is housing units, while for the same period in 1968 the housing starts in our province increased to 4,600. To give you another illustration in this housing program, the housing starts in Regina for the year 1968 amounted to 1,600 or an increase of 465 over the same period in 1967, while in the city of Saskatoon the number of housing starts in 1968 amounted to 2,200. Therefore the situation is that we did have an increase in housing starts in Saskatchewan in 1968 and the construction of residences in our two major cities remained at a high level. Now, as the House is aware, during 1968 we continued our program and policy of providing additional subsidized housing in this province. As of this date we have 814 occupied subsidized house located in 19 urban centres. We have a further 209 under construction which I would hope would be occupied within the next few months. The situation is, therefore, Mr. Speaker, that by the spring of 1969 in our subsidized housing program alone we will have occupied just in excess of 1,000 subsidized housing units. During 1968 we occupied in this province 222 subsidized units and when you add the 209 under construction the policy of this Government will have increased the number of subsidized housing units occupied I the last 18 months from 592 to 1,023.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Over and above this housing program, Mr. Speaker, we did in 1968 conduct two experimental programs for those of Indian ancestry. Firstly, we have built or have under construction at La Ronge 14 units and the majority of these units have been built on lots which were owned by individuals who occupied those lots with very substandard homes. These homes will cost around \$9,500, there will be a down payment of approximately \$350 and the monthly payment will be based on income. The program is being carried out in co-operation with CMHC and the Government. The benefit of such a program is that it only provides very good housing and the opportunity of home ownership, but such a program removed from the community of La Ronge a group of very substandard dwellings.

Now the second experiment which we commenced late in 1968 and which I may say, Mr. Speaker, I think is the only experiment of its kind in Canada and was used as an example, I believe, in Mr. Hellyer's Report. We started in about November of 1968 to purchase older homes in Regina, Saskatoon and Prince Albert for those persons of Indian ancestry. The homes are valued

prior to purchase. We install a fridge and stove in them. They are all single dwellings and well located. The occupants of these homes are persons of Indian ancestry where the husband is employed in the urban centre or has come to the urban centre to take training with the promise of employment. I admit that these families are carefully selected. It is our hope that good housing accommodation will assist these families in their transition to urban living. I am not proud of this fact but I think it points out the problem involved. Two of our homes occupied in Regina were occupied by families where the husband worked in or near Regina at steady employment and those families had lived in tents during the summer and part of the fall. They are now occupying fully modern houses in the city of Regina. In Prince Albert we had one family of 10 living in an unmodern two-room shack and that family is now occupying a modern four-bedroom home. To date the venture has been most successful and some of the families have already expressed their gratitude. It is our intention to initially purchase 50 of these residences in the three urban centres which I have mentioned, and then extend this program to other urban centres where opportunities for employment exist. As of this date, we have purchased 30 of these homes and we have others under negotiations. I want to pay tribute to the Task Force on our native people as this program is a direct result of the housing committee of that force.

The real benefit of this program, Mr. Speaker, is that it places those people of Indian ancestry and those of not of such ancestry in the same residential area each occupying the same type of accommodation. This program incidentally, I submit, also illustrates the fact that there is accommodation available which may be purchased for a reasonable price in this day and age when people are continually shouting about the lack of housing accommodation. I should point out that the local municipality is not concerned in the purchase of these homes. These homes are purchased by CMHC and the Provincial Government.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I wish to turn to another subject and that is the subject of equalization grants which we as a Government pay to the rural municipalities. During the fiscal year ending March 31 next, we will have paid out equalization grants to the rural municipalities of this province, \$2.4 million. In 1968, 74 rural municipalities in 1968 received grants in excess of \$10,000 from this Government, the highest grant being paid to RM 494 in the amount of \$28,388 which represented a contribution of eight mills. I would point out that the highest grant paid by the NDP Government to RM 494 was \$4,866. Now if you take another municipality, take RM 501. Our grant in 1968 to 501 was \$24,526, which represented 11.79 mills. The highest grant paid by the NDP Government to the RM of 501 was \$6,842. To illustrate the payment of equalization grants in other parts of the province, Mr. Speaker, I would point out that RM 211 received in 1968, \$16,918, while RM 43 received \$16,432. This, Mr. Speaker, merely represents another example of the extent of the assistance which this Government is giving to the rural governments of our province.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Estey: — Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to also refer to the potash-tax sharing. You will recall at the last session of the Legislature we provided legislation whereby the municipal portion of

the tax levied on a potash mine would be distributed amongst certain rural municipalities and urban centres based on their location and on a formula. I have been informed by the Potash Sharing Board that the first distribution of funds will be made in 1969 to those RMs and urban centres. It is estimated that there will be available for distribution in 1969, \$936,726 and that amount will be distributed between 41 rural municipalities and 43 urban centres. The sharing rural municipalities it is estimated will receive in the vicinity of \$843,000 while 43 urban centres will receive \$94,000. These figures are slightly higher than we estimated last year, and I would think that in 1970 the amount available for distribution will probably exceed \$1 million. I want to add that in my opinion the Potash Sharing Board has done a great deal of work in getting this program underway. As a point of interest other provinces have asked for copies of our legislation and have investigated the mechanics of its operation.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is quite obvious that I will support the motion.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. H.H.P. Baker (Regina South East): — Mr. Speaker, I am sorry that the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Estey) got a bit off on a tangent and got away from his prepared speech and thus dipped into a little of my time. However, Mr. Speaker, it has always been a custom here that we pay tribute to former Premiers of this province and I am sure that you and all Members of this House would want to recognize and congratulate a former Premier of Saskatchewan, namely Mr. T.C. Douglas on his tremendous victory I Nanaimo to the House of Commons.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Baker: — The Member from Nutana (Mr. Estey) got off on a tangent, as I mentioned, and started to talk about socialized medicine or socialized land when his own Liberal Youth group in Saskatchewan and across Canada passed resolutions time and time again for socialized medicine throughout this country. Not until they pressed this Government and the one in Ottawa did we get any results. So this is a direct plank taken out of the Regina Manifesto. I could go on and on mentioning points that they are now supporting which are under public ownership, and were spelled out in the Manifesto some years ago.

But I am not here to discuss the Manifesto today. I am very happy, Sir, to enter the Throne Speech Debate during this session. My customary remarks naturally would be to extend a warm welcome to all Members here, to their capital Queen City of Regina, the centre of inland Canada, also to say hello to our radio-listening audience and a special welcome to all my constituents in Regina Southeast, the largest constituency in the Province of Saskatchewan in numbers. A very warm welcome to the galleries. I think the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Estey) chased them out but anyway to those of you who are left I extend a warm welcome to you.

Having young John Brockelbank as my seatmate from Saskatoon does at times generate interesting discussions and remarks.

February 13, 1969

However, I must say he is a credit to his constituency there. It is pleasing to note that his city is so interested in investing money in Regina. We know Regina is the most thriving and the most progressive community in Saskatchewan. I told him, if they did buy our four-storey city hall, it has been stated that it would be the highest building in Saskatoon.

Well, it is customary to congratulate the mover and the seconder and while I don't have to agree with their remarks they did present their opinions well.

As we now move into the Address from the Throne I was pleased with some steps to be taken but extremely disappointed in not seeing other proposed legislation. I looked for the Throne Speech to say that a minimum wage of at least \$1.50 per hour would be set for the working people of Saskatchewan because of the rapid increase in the cost of living. I looked for an income continuance pay plan which I advocated over the years for our citizens throughout this province. I looked for the Government adopting a form of the education foundation plan to relieve property owners of further education tax increases. All Regina gets is about 29 per cent of education costs from the Province, while some provinces pay more than double that toward education grants. Surely you would have made mention to look after the chiropractors of this province in providing funds to place them under the medicare plan. Practically all provinces in Canada give full recognition for the services of this fine profession. I looked for an extension in providing physiotherapy and radiological services to our people, not cutbacks. With all the increasing millions you are getting from Ottawa each year, it is obvious that medical services should be extended and not curtailed. I looked for a comprehensive drug plan for the people of Saskatchewan, at least for our senior citizens and for our children. I looked for plans to establish a dental program for all boys and girls under the age of 16. Optical services should not only encompass eye services but should cover a portion of the cost of glasses too. I looked forward to hear that this Government, when it went to Ottawa, would press to have the means test removed so that all pensioners would get the full pension of \$108 per month. I am sincerely hoping that those on welfare will be given a \$25 to \$30 per month increase for food, clothing and rent when the Budget is brought down. I suggest that in many cases welfare recipients take-home allowance appears to be reduced this last while. A policy of greater financial flexibility must be brought in to send transients to their destination and this must be provided through the Department of Welfare. What had happened to the policies we had before this Government took over whereby people were assisted when stranded in urban areas? The Administration is trying to do a good job but it hasn't the money to look after these people. I believe this could be one of the reasons why there are so many more break-ins and enterings because they are refused assistance. The civil servants of our province are a dedicated group of employees. Their wages have fallen far behind those of other provinces and major cities of Western Canada to over 16 per cent. I hope the Government in negotiating a new contract will take this under consideration.

Regarding senior citizens accommodation, it is most important once again that monies be provided for housing our senior citizens as well as special-care facilities. It is unfortunate that his Government put a freeze on this type of capital expenditure this last while. Because of this a tremendous

backlog has been built up. In our Pioneer Village alone we have more than 225 applications on the waiting list. I am sure the same exists in all other centres for the aged. The closing of the geriatric centre, turning it into the Wascana hospital was a serious mistake. Here we had provisions for 300 more people needing aged assistance. I have recommended to city council that we contract for another 100 to 150 units in Pioneer Village for bachelor suites and hostel accommodation. We need it now. The city administration has already been asked to get this under way. I look forward also to the support of this Government and the Federal Government to get my proposed Indian and Mentis Centre under way for their aged people too in our city. This centre I suggest would give priority to the senior Indian and Métis people. We need to have capital funds available at all times so that we can keep abreast with the demands for the care of our senior citizens and pioneers who built this country, who made it a good place in which to live for you and me. We owe it to them.

I now turn, Mr. Speaker, to homeowner grants. While the Throne Speech does not mention homeowner grants it is only fitting that I who advocated homeowner grants first in my maiden speech five years ago and recommended to this Government that this be done for the people of Saskatchewan, have the right to bring it up again. At that time I recommend in my 14-point program that grants of this type be made available to relieve the taxpayers. In my talk in this legislature at that time I also pointed out that \$150 a year be paid to our pensioners for their taxes on homes to cover education costs on properties or portions thereof. I also stated that those pensioners renting to be paid \$120 a year because they too were paying taxes indirectly. So far the Government has only given a \$50 grant for owners in urban centres and on the farms. I am looking forward, Mr. Speaker, when the Budget comes down to an increase in the homeowner grant to at least \$100 this year or even more. I also look forward to the Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Steuart) paying the homeowner grant to those who rent homes or suites as well. The Premier said the NDP got the ball away from them last session and during this one they would try to get it back. I tell you that this homeowner-grant ball, you are not going to get back because it belongs to me.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Baker: — The homeowner grant was first recommended by myself in my first speech in this House during that session. Check the records, Mr. Members from Athabasca (Mr. Guy), check Hansard. Yes, the homeowner grant belongs to me and I intend to hang onto it.

I will now refer to agriculture. It is somewhat amusing to hear our Members across the way trying to pacify the farmers for their own tremendous errors and those of the Ottawa Government in not looking after the farmers' needs, which I term a disastrous year with references to the marketing of grain, and in not looking after the damp and tough crops that needed to be dried, lying out in the fields, rotting away because of acting too late. Outright cash grants should have been arranged last September for farmers to dry the grain and to alleviate the situation or to have followed the plan as submitted by this side of the House. It should have been up to this Government to get Ottawa to declare the wheat situation a national emergency in Saskatchewan and the Prairies.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Baker: — When you think of the 240 million bushels of wheat that needed drying and I believe only 25 to 30 million are completed so far, what is the answer by this Government? Diversify, feed livestock, cattle, hogs, sheep and swine. Where in the world are they going to get livestock overnight to feed them the damp and tough grain? I suggest to the Government that they get Ottawa to do some research and develop a pill so that livestock can be reproduced within 30 or 60 days for this purpose and tell them not to spend so much time trying to depopulate Canada through abortions. What did Trudeau say regarding the selling and marketing of wheat? Cut the price, grow less. Imagine the Government leaders of this country who claim to be such humanitarians! When most of the world's population goes to bed hungry at night, when for many all they have for breakfast is the water from last night's rice, the Prime Minister says grow less, when in essence he is saying, you can starve. The population of the world, Mr. Speaker, is increasing by 67 million people a year, in five years we will have 350 million more people on this earth. They are going to be hungry, and they are going to want to eat. We in other lands better start looking now to sell and distribute our surpluses, for the time may come when the hungry and needy will come and take it from us. We should not be thinking of growing more wheat. Now are we going to sell it? Let's get a dynamic sales organization and send them off to far-off lands and create trade, have barter trade agreements, have a good distribution system, do more on long-term credits to help those consumers. Yes, amortize loans over longer periods. How did the farmers in Canada develop their farms? By long-term credit too. Credit today is a must to keep the farming economy buoyant. We must set up facilities now for long-term storage too.

Yes, how can we help the farmer another way? I take you back to the recommendation in my first speech in this House at which time I advocated and have been advocating these past five years. I said then, pay more for the first 2,000 bushels and let anything sold over that be disposed of at prevailing prices. Because of the small quotas, particularly this past year this would have been most beneficial. I said last year, pay \$2.95 to \$3.00 per bushel for the first 2,000 bushels sold. What would this do? It would put cash into the farmer's pockets to look after his immediate costs, particularly for the smaller or average farmers. It would give money to pay his local implement dealer. It would buy clothes for his family and it would put money in circulation in his town, village or city. Much of this money would find its way back into the Provincial and Federal Treasuries. It would keep our economy on a fairly even keel instead of being faced with booms and busts every so often which only jeopardizes the business climate. It would certainly be the only way to keep and preserve the family farm. In the Throne Speech I looked for a plan to help young farmers purchase farms through special loans without interest for the first five years. There was nothing there. Where in the Speech from the Throne is the provision made to pay for surface rights to farmers living in the area of oil and potash if they do not own their mineral rights? They do deserve a share of the royalties paid, too. I looked in the Speech from the Throne whether you are going to pay the farmers the \$400 they put down for electrical installations. You promised you would do this in the election campaign

of 1964. Yes, this Government and the Federal Government have hood-winked the farmers of this province for the last time.

I would like to turn to the university problem and university student housing. The Student Housing Plan for our University campus was promised by the Premier some four years ago. What has happened to this announcement? You know we wonder why there is such unrest amongst the students and faculty members at Regina campus. We wonder why these teach-ins and sit-downs are being staged. I don't go along with some of those articles in *The Carillon* either. I want to make this abundantly clear. But, Mr. Speaker, what has caused most of this ill-will, insurrection, distrust, in trying to break out from under the heels of authority? I'll tell you why. It's because there is no authority here in Regina at the campus within our administration and faculty. They tell me it is difficult to initiate sensible programs without getting authority from a board 180 miles away and a president 180 miles away. Also the reason you have all this trouble is because the campus has not been able to fit itself in the Regina community or in the southern part of this province because it is being run from somewhere else. I've been telling this Legislature that a separate board be set up, a separate university be set up here, free from all domination and dictation from a central board and the president in Saskatoon. We need our own local board here. We need our own president of the University here. Until this is done, I think there will be continual trouble. In France where all universities were under one jurisdiction, they have now given autonomy to all the universities with separate jurisdiction and control. In Ontario, all their universities have autonomy — their own boards, presidents and chancellors. In Alberta, the Calgary and Edmonton universities have been separated. If you consider that the board is over both campuses, why in the world would they discriminate by refusing to collect student fees here in Regina and not at Saskatoon. This in itself shows downright discrimination. By this action it would appear that you want them separated. If so, let's do it now during this session. Bring in the necessary amendments to the Act and set up two universities, namely, Regina University and Saskatoon University. I ask you to give full autonomy to Regina campus now and I sincerely believe these problems will resolve themselves. I will not accept any other course of action in this House until this is done.

This Government demonstrates day by day a callous disregard for the health care needs of our citizens.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Baker: — There is more concern for the friends of the Government than for the basic needs of all citizens.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Baker: — There is more tender mercy and care for other endeavors than for the babes and children of today. This Government imposes deterrent fees on citizens for health and hospital care. The Government by the imposition of deterrent fees is saying, "We care not if the people are denied the opportunity for better health." It proposes to make some changes. It now recognizes it was a bad mistake by introducing deterrent fees. So it will

do a patch-up job and what a retreat! What a recapping! We all know preventative medicine is the key stone to a good medical care program. If a limit were to be imposed on deterrent fees, it might have said, "Make it \$5 or \$10 per month." But no, it makes it \$180. When I proposed some relief from these iniquitous deterrent fees by removing the deposit or prepayment for patients at the Regina General Hospital, some Government Members tried to mislead the citizens. The Government apparently regards human emotions as not worthy of consideration. The Members across in their cold, cool and calculating way rely more on a computer and a cash register. We must be concerned with love, with fear, with pride and all the emotions of people. Deterrent fees are repugnant because they disregard human emotions.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Baker: — We felt that this should not happen at a time of stress and strain. The Government way is to expose these emotions to more stress and strain. The way it should be and the way it will be at the Regina General Hospital now is to eliminate the emotional barrier by removing the \$25 deposit or prepayment, which is called for in most hospitals throughout Saskatchewan, a stigma of embarrassment and harassment. I suggest that we have at the General and make it applicable to all hospitals across the province now.

I turn to the matter of pollution which has been mentioned in the Speech from the Throne. I am pleased to see that legislation will be brought in to help communities meet the future costs of pollution control. Note the word "future." Not until Saskatoon and Prince Albert were put on the spot to have sewage treatment facilities do we get assistance. I'm all for it but it is many years too late for other cities, towns and villages. Since I have had the privilege of serving as mayor for the past 10 years, Regina has had to spend between \$5 and \$6 million for sewage treatment.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Baker: — Cities like Saskatoon dump and are dumping raw sewage into the South Saskatchewan River without treatment.

Mr. J.J. Charlebois (City Park-University): — We are paying for our own auditorium.

Mr. Baker: — They are going to have to spend money now. What about those centres which have been forced to spend on sewage treatment before this legislation? Are you going to make it retroactive, particularly for those centres not blessed with a river system? I say this should apply to all those centres which have already spent money on treatment facilities. What about providing water and water treatment? Do you know that Regina has had to spend between \$10 and \$12 million to bring water here from Buffalo Pound Lake, treat it and on top has had to drill 33 wells for 75 per cent of its supply . . .

Mr. Charlebois: — Put it in the wrong place.

Mr. Baker: — . . . as well as build reservoirs? The cities located on the South or North Saskatchewan are not faced with such costs. The CCF Government was generous in the early 50s and gave Regina and Moose Jaw \$750,000 for water facilities but our taxpayers had to raise the rest. So between sewage and water capital costs, Regina has had to find around \$16 - \$18 million over the past few years. I would hope that the Government would make it retroactive for those cities, towns and villages which have already completed treatment facilities.

I want to mention the Municipal Loan Fund, Mr. Speaker. I note with some interest that the Government intends to establish a municipal Finance Corporation to assist municipalities with marketing debentures. For several years I have been pressing for the establishment of some form of loan fund or provincial bank. I have reached the conclusion that the Government was unable to comprehend the desperate plight of the municipalities which has been getting worse each year. The lifeblood of the province is a strong, financially sound local government. It is at this level that the people of our province can most readily indicate their needs and expect a reasonable standard of living. Far too long we have had the spectre of high interest rates used by the Province as a means of delaying capital work so urgently needed in our municipalities. Projects deferred or deleted by the Local Government Board in former years must now be undertaken at interest rates which are much higher than those existing at the time such projects were proposed. I know that the finance corporation envisaged by the Government will prove to be of benefit to towns, villages, and rural municipalities. However, I shall be watching carefully to ensure that some measure of relief as well is to be afforded the cities of this province whether they be large or small. In Alberta their funds look after all municipalities in this way. It is the cities generally which must house the influx of new residents of our province as well as absorb the steady flow of people from the rural areas. It is the cities which must find huge sums to finance land assembly, serving and the provision of many amenities expected by the urban dweller. The report of the Task Force on Housing gives some indication that this problem is being recognized. Mr. Speaker, it is my hope the forthcoming legislation will recognize the problems I have outlined and provide a measure of relief for all municipal governments, whether it be a town, village, city or rural municipality.

On February 4 in the Throne Speech, the Member for Last Mountain (Mr. MacLennan) – I see he has gone out again, I guess he expected I'd refer to him – I should say the juvenile Member for Last Mountain and I could add a few more remarks but they wouldn't be parliamentary. He stated the alderman on city council in Regina do not deserve an increase in their indemnity because of the way they have operated. The irony of it is that those to whom he is referring last year who are now off council were members of the CVA and members of his own political party.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Baker: — The other new members have been there six weeks. It is pretty difficult to judge them in that short a time. However, I support an increase in the indemnity for aldermen in every city in the province. The MLAs got an increase to \$9,000 last year. We in the House supported it, so did the Member from

February 13, 1969

Last Mountain (Mr. MacLennan). May I say to the good people of Last Mountain and my many friends out there in places like Strasbourg, Earl Grey, Duval, Southey, Bulyea, Serath and other centres, I am sure that you are most disappointed in your Member to whom you pay so much and from whom you receive so little.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Baker: — He stated two homes for the aged were built, one in Strasbourg and one in Southey. Well I can tell him these were planned and organized before he ever got here.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Baker: — Why doesn't he stand up in this House and help me get the \$10 unconditional grant per person that we in the city of Regina have asked the Government for towns, villages, cities, and rural municipalities. A town like Southey would get around \$8 - \$10,000 a year; Strasbourg would get nearly \$8 - \$10,000 a year. This would be a great benefit to all the towns, villages, and rural municipalities. But no, his speech was full of innuendoes, sarcasms, using words he couldn't even pronounce. I know the speech was written for him, Mr. Speaker. Next time he should be tutored as to how to read it by the person who wrote it.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Baker: — And to the Member for Athabasca, the Hon. Minister of Public Works (Mr. Guy), may I say that I am so pleased that in his remarks in which he devoted one-third of his speech in extolling my great virtues and referring to my good qualities as being a strong leader, I thank him for it.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Baker: — I want to say that the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Estey) touched on housing and has given a fair rundown as to what is taking place in the province. We also made a presentation to the Task Force, the Hellyer Task Force, and some of the things that I had mentioned there, I will refer to in a few remarks on housing. One of the most trite phrases in connection with housing is, —A man's home is his castle." The cherished ambition of the citizens of Regina is to be the owner of his home. The philosophy of home ownership has tremendous value. It stabilizes social values, contributing more than anything else to a sense of personal proprietorship in our community. It is very important today in the rapidly growing urban centres, such as the city of Regina. A solution to our housing problems is urgently needed, Mr. Speaker. I outline for the Members of this House two valid proposals.

First, the adoption of an extended policy for the upgrading and subsequent refinancing of older homes, provided that each building involved is structurally sound and overall cost of upgrading does not exceed the cost of providing a new unit; loan provisions for purchase and upgrading to be comparable to or better than those for new homes. This is what we as a city proposes and it appears as though the Hellyer Task Force is taking strides in this direction to do something about it. In

actual practice the older homes are structurally sound and adaptable to modern-day renovation techniques. School and other services are normally in place for the older home. It is extremely important to the city which has to secure funds for schools and other services through sales or debentures at high-interest rates. This is one type of project that can be carried out during the winter months when work is so urgently required for the builder at little or no extra cost. We also support the idea to provide homes for those under the \$7,000 mark, which has been enumerated by the Minister in Ottawa. In order to do that there must be subsidization of interest rates, if we are going to bring down the downpayment and the monthly payments to where a man earning \$5,000 a year will be able to qualify.

So, Mr. Speaker, I see that my time is running short and I want to say again that I cannot support the Throne Speech when you find that \$35,000,000 of taxes had been extracted from the pockets of the people of Saskatchewan, where there is no real help given to the cities, towns, villages and rural municipalities by way of unconditional grants. The Province of Saskatchewan is a wealthy one. The CCF built up our credit to where it is recognized as the best risk by private capital. You today are riding on the crest of our programs. But if you keep on following your methods, even our credit ratings will decrease. There is not real benefit, Mr. Speaker, in this Throne Speech and therefore as one of the Opposition Members, I have to oppose the main motion and support the amendment in order that we might bring something worthwhile into this House, which may, we hope, will come about in the Budget Speech. With that, I thank you, Mr. Speaker, for these few moments and the finest reception I ever received from the other side. Thank you very much.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. F.A. Dewhurst (Wadena): — Mr. Speaker, it is now two weeks since we received this document which is before us, namely, the Speech from the Throne. The Speech from the Throne was very weak two weeks ago and it is not a bit stronger in the last two weeks. It is not improving with age. It is like a bowl of bean soup — one bean and a pail of water. It is a very weak Speech from the Throne. It is one of the weakest documents this Legislature has ever been presented with. The Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Estey) this afternoon gave us a good, nice little chat, going back for 35 years in history. But, Mr. Speaker, if he believes what he was trying to tell this house about the ills and the pitfalls of the former CCF and now the New Democratic party, why doesn't he convince his colleagues along with him that they shouldn't dilly-dally around, they should have called a by-election in Kelvington before now. We could have discussed it on the husting. The people of Kelvington could decide on whether we are wrong or whether we are right, but they are holding it off. The mover and the seconder had very little to say about this anemic document and I can sympathize with them. There was nothing much for them to talk about. About the main thing the mover said was that he had attended the Premiers' Conference at Waskesiu. Well I don't know whether he was invited or whether he crashed the party but evidently there weren't too many that were invited and no one on this side of the House was invited. The seconder of the motion, his main theme throughout his speech was that the farmers cannot expect any help on their problems in the way of cash assistance or really something being done, that they must not look for handouts;

February 13, 1969

they must help themselves. That was the main theme of his speech. I'm sorry to listen to a speech like he made seeing he represents a rural constituency and is a farmer by occupation himself.

I would like, however, to congratulate the Leader of the Opposition on the speech that he presented to this house when he spoke on this document.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Dewhurst: — You will recall, Mr. Speaker, that he went over what has happened in the past few months in this province and documented date, time and place, the brief presented by different organizations to try and help the plight of this province. I would suggest to any of the Members of the Legislature, if for any reason they didn't hear his speech or to anyone else for that matter, that they get a copy of his speech and read it. There is a lot of information, and worthwhile information, that cannot be refuted; it is documented evidence. I congratulate Mr. Lloyd on the wonderful speech he gave. Also, the Member for Moose Jaw North (Mr. Snyder) made a wonderful contribution in his speech in this House. But as yet, Members of this side of the House have raised problems but Government spokesmen or Members of the Government who are not in the Cabinet, have as yet not answered the points raised by speakers on this side of the House.

The year 1968 was a tough year for the farmers. It started off with a very dry spring, poor germination in some areas for the grain, poor pastures and a poor hay crop. Then in midsummer when the rain came, there was too much wet weather. It spoilt what hay there was; a lot of the hay crop was spoilt right in the field. It was cut and in some cases spoiled in the bales. Then on top of that there was a bad harvest with a very damp grain situation. The damp grain is a problem of all the people of this province, not just a problem of the people on the farms. The Speech from the Throne says:

Working with the Federal Government, the grain companies and individual farmers, my Government has made every feasible effort to make certain that adequate, drying facilities are available.

I think instead of saying every feasible effort, it should have said, every feeble effort, because that is what it has been, feeble efforts and not feasible efforts.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Dewhurst: — Mr. Speaker, one of the first actions this Government took four years ago, after the 1964 election when it became the Government was to do away with the AMA, that is the organization which was set up for the administration of The Machinery Act, an organization which did testing of different machines for the farmers of this province. We on this side of the House at that time warned them that the farmers would be losing a valuable piece of information by doing away with the AMA. We were told that the AMA would be attached to the University of Saskatoon and would give us the same information as before. No farmer has received one pamphlet from the University along with the lines that the AMA used to put out since that time. If we still

had the AMA today it could have gone out and tested dryers and assisted the farmers in setting up their dryers. Too many dryers went out into the country this fall that were not properly tested or set up in the first place. I know of dryers which the farmers were using. They would use the gauges and try to use the best information available to them, but when they got an official test on their heat gauge, in many a case they found the gauge was registering from 30 to 35 degrees out. In early every case the gauge was under and not up to what the heat was. They were using 30 to 36 degrees more heat than the machine showed, consequently the farmers had a problem with some spoilage of grain. AMA could have prevented this mess. AMA could have gone out and assisted every farmer setting up his dryer, but, no, this Government through the lobbying of some of the major machine companies saw fit to do away with the AMA.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Dewhurst: — Dryers, Mr. Speaker, should be, as our Leader said, connected to the elevators. That is where the dryers really should be, like they have in North Dakota. I think that it is about time pressure is put on to try and help to get dryers into the province connected to the elevators. Every year they could be of some assistance and a year like this they could be of considerable assistance. The cost is much cheaper to operate than farm dryers.

This past year has seen considerable increases also in expense to the farmers. The farmers have seen a 10 per cent tax on farm fuel, 2 cents per gallon or a 10 per cent tax on their farm fuel. Over the past few years in spite of what we've heard about reduction of taxes, the farmers any time they buy, or transfer land, have to pay increased transfer fees. Now we are told by our Prime Minister that it is up to the farmers to sell their own wheat and that they shouldn't be looking to the Government or the Wheat Board. The whole plot again is to take from the farmers some of the things like this Government took away when it took away the AMA. The Wheat Board is a good piece of machinery for the farmers of this province but it should be given the powers and the authority which a wheat board needs. It should have the right to set up its own selling agency so that it could have salesmen go to all four corners of the world to sell Canadian wheat and help to make trades and barter if necessary. I know six or seven years ago when I represented this Province in Nigeria at the Commonwealth Conference, the bakers there were on strike because they couldn't get Canadian wheat. Here we had so much wheat we didn't know what to do with it. The Wheat Board has to depend on the Winnipeg Grain Exchange and the Chicago Exchange, and other exchanges to sell their grain. You can talk to any officials of the Hudson Bay Route Association and they can give you the details how customers come here and say they can't deal with the Wheat Board. They have to go to private agencies to buy their wheat.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I would like to turn to the Speech from the Throne. It mentions livestock. It says that in 1968 the sale of livestock and livestock products will be amounting to about \$250 million. I don't know what the figure will be. That may be correct, but I can assure the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. McFarlane) and this Government that if that figure is true, it is not because the farmers are just selling their increased

February 13, 1969

production and realizing \$250 million. It is because on account of the policies of this Government that the farmers are having to liquidate their herds in order to pay their other expenses. To try and overcome a bad crop year, damp wheat and lack of sales, they are liquidating their stock herd in order to have some cash. Also this Government mentions that it is doing all it can to increase the production of livestock. I would like the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. McFarlane) sometime to tell us why then, is the increase in grazing fees in some areas almost three times what they were just previously. When grazing fees go up that way it puts up the cost of the farmer's production. Furthermore in some of the grazing leases, it is assumed that they can pasture the cattle for seven months. No livestock can exist on pastures in my part of the province for seven months on pasture, five at the most, three months on good pasture and two months on poor pasture. There is no such thing as seven months on pasture in the northern part of this province.

Another thing that this Government has done to show that it is not interested in livestock is its actions every session since it became the Government. Prior to this group across the way taking office, every winter since I've been in the Legislature and I've been around for a little while, the House would always adjourn on the opening night of the Regina Live Horse show and Winter Fair so that Members of the Legislature would have a chance to go down, take part in the Winter Fair, see the livestock, see what was shown and talk with the different farmers bringing their livestock in. On not one occasion since this group across the way has been the Government, have Members of this House been able to attend the livestock show unless they played hooky from their duty in the House. Then it says it is trying to promote the interest of agriculture. What hogwash! The farmers won't buy that any more because we know it is not being done.

The Speech from the Throne also mentions too that the Government is doing a lot for sewer and water of this province. During 1968 sewer and water facilities were brought to 3,800 rural homes with assistance from the Department of Agriculture. The other day I asked a question in this House and I got the Return. It shows a general trend in what is being done in the family sewer and water setup. In 1964 there were 6,400 persons who got material or advice from this branch, the Sewer and Water Branch. In 1968, only 4,000, a drop of 2,400. The number getting grants in 1964 was a little over 2,000; in 1968, 1,500. So again the amount of assistance being paid out to the farmers is less. What is further, Mr. Speaker, when we on this side were Government, the materials which were supplied by the branch were supplied at cost. That is not true today. There is an extra cost over and above the cost price, charged to the person who is getting the sewer and water put in. And if they happen to order too much material and wish to return the surplus or extra material to the warehouse, then they are deducted another 10 per cent. They have to take 10 per cent less than what they paid for it in the first place. The branch is set up now, not just for service, but set up to make money.

This has been a tough year too, Mr. Speaker, for small businesses. The things which affect the farmers and the laboring people also affect our businessmen of this province. If the farmer cannot get a fair return for his products, cannot sell his products at a decent price, he cannot employ the labor he should be using, nor can he buy from the small businessmen the

things which the small businessmen must sell in order that they may continue to stay in business. The things that really affect the small businessman is not the unfair competition from co-ops which our Members from across the way like to imply but it is the unfair competition from cartels and monopolies. I don't care which store you go into, whether you go into Loblaws, Safeway, the O.K., the private merchant, the co-op and buy a packet of Western's biscuits, you're paying the Western monopoly cartel. They have control in this country. Consequently the policies which are pursued by this Government is to try and lay the blame on the local storekeeper. The local storekeeper's problem is the same as the laborers' and the workers'.

Another problem which affects the small business and the working people of this province is our taxes – our tax situation. I have here the statistics as supplied by the Department of Municipal Affairs as to what has been our tax trend in the last four years. In 1963, the total tax levied in this province by the municipalities and L.I.D.s for local purposes, for municipal purposes – I'll just quote round figures -- Mr. Speaker, it was \$19 million. In 1967, \$24 million, an increase of \$5 million in the local tax for local purposes. But for school purposes in 1963, it was \$22 million; 1967, in the same areas, \$29 million, an increase of \$7 million, or a total increase of tax on the rural property of this province, of \$12 million.

In the urban taxes, the same story is true. In 1963, the local taxes for local purposes, \$19 million; 1967, \$29 million, a total increase of \$10 million over the past four years. In school taxes, in 1963, \$24 million; in 1967, the school tax on the urban centres \$37 million, an increase of almost \$13 million or a total increase in the urban municipalities of \$22.9 million. They're paying more in property tax today than they did four years ago when this Government took office. Or it's a grand total, Mr. Speaker, of \$34,852,000 of an increase more today on property taxes than it was four years ago. This is an increase in property taxes in this province of 41 per cent. These aren't the up-to-date figures because the 1968 statistics are not available to us yet. In addition to this you could add another from three to ten per cent for the increase of the taxes in 1968. We all know from the policies pursued by this Government that the local tax rate is going to have to go up in 1969.

The year 1968 has been a tough year for all the taxpayers that I have mentioned. In addition to the property tax last spring, we saw a budget brought down which brought on another \$35 million of new taxes, there was an increase in fees and land titles. This fall, by an Order-in-Council, the charges on caveats were increased in some instances from \$5 to file a caveat to over \$70, so there's going to be an additional revenue to the Province. And I don't know but I'm sure that our legal friends could tell us what some of the caveats really do cost, but I have been advised by some of my legal friends that in some of the cases they have dealt with, they now have to pay over \$70 to have a caveat filed, where up until this Order had been passed, it was only \$5. In total, Mr. Speaker, this past year from the actions tight in this Legislature, we've seen an increase of \$40 million.

The Speech from the Throne mentions that there's going to be grants to industry. This is just social aid for industry. They're going to hand out social aid to industry but it's not going to be available for other people of this province. We're

going to get tough with everybody else. There's no grants to the agricultural industry to help them in their plight, but there's going to be grants to other industry where such economic development incentives are needed to meet competition from other provinces. They could do all for industry but nothing for agriculture and nothing for the poor people of this province. Is this the reason why the Government is paying subsidies on the pulp wood which is supplied to the pulp mill? From \$6 per cord up it is paying subsidies on the pulp wood? Is this why it has refused to answer any questions in this Legislature or in the Committee for the next four years regarding the pulp operations? We were told last winter we would get no information for the next four years. It is time that the Government played fair with the people of this province. We are spending the money of the people of this province in paying those grants and subsidies, and it's time that the information was made available to this Legislature when members of this Legislature or member of the Committee ask for that information.

Grants to industries, we have seen some of them in the past. As an example, when it sold the sodium sulphate at Alsask for one cent per ton and the same at Snake Hole Lake. Millions of tons of sodium sulphate were sold to private enterprise for a pittance, for a mere few dollars. We don't know what kind of a deal was made on the natural gas out at the Hatton Field, but if the deal which was made on the sodium sulphate at Alsask and Snake Hole Lake, the type of deal which was done up at Prince Albert in the pulp wood operation, is any criterion of the type of deal that was made with the natural gas company which bought the natural gas in our gas fields, then we know again that millions of dollars of subsidies are being given to the natural gas company which bought that natural gas right. And the Government . . .

Mr. Steuart: — Where was your gas field?

Mr. Dewhurst: — You can tell us, you have the details, you refuse to answer any questions. It's no use playing Mr. Innocent, Mr. Speaker. You have all the facts. When you refuse to give information to this House, we have no other alternative than to rely on second or third class information and to make our own deduction, when we see that the Government refuses to accept their responsibility to make available to this House the details of information of what has been done on behalf of the people of this province. When as the custodian of the provincial rights and provincial responsibilities it refuses to give elected Members the information, then it must take the consequences. These are the things the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Estey) can go into Kelvington and talk about. See if the people of Kelvington or any place else will agree with the policies it is pursuing.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Dewhurst: — Now, I would like to turn for a few minutes to the Department of Public Health. I think the deterrent fees that have been imposed this past year have created great hardship[s] on many of the people of this province. Many of the people have been put to considerable embarrassment and many a family has had to pinch pennies off the children's back or food off the table in order to pay deterrent fees. Now he's going to

make it quite palatable, so he says, by having a family ceiling of \$180 per year. That's a big deal, real generosity. We see there's going to be industrial grants given to industry but we're going to take it from the sick people of this province, people who have to crawl to hospital. It says you must pay a deterrent fee. How kind, how generous.

I have one case in my constituency this past year where a man got beaten up by three or four other people. He was left in the ditch. They didn't know whether he was dead or not. He was picked up and taken to hospital. When he got to the hospital and to the doctor, he had no money. The doctor asked him for the \$1.50 charge. He said he had money the day before but he didn't know what had happened to it. Whether he'd lost it or what was the case, but he didn't have his money. The young fellow who drove him to the hospital to see the doctor put up the money to the doctor for the deterrent fee. At the hospital, they phoned him back to the municipal secretary to see if the municipality would guarantee any deterrent fees or guarantee that he had a hospital card to pay the bill. At least the municipality did. Now, those are pitiful circumstances when people in that condition who have been the unfortunate victim of some drunken brawl, that somebody picked on him, to be left in that condition and then thrown at the mercy of these deterrent fees because they can't get into a hospital.

We have seen the policy of the Department, in my opinion, Mr. Speaker, which it has pursued. It has been an attack on the old people in this province. In Wadena last spring there were several of the older people in hospital. A number of them the doctor had not released as active patients. They didn't have a place at geriatric centres or anywhere else, and according to the information I could get from the families, they had no help from the Department in supplying aid. Finally they said well there are geriatric centres in such places where you could apply, but they didn't know whether there was a vacancy or not. But these people were told that they had to pay the full per day rate in the hospital there and considerable hardship was put on those old people and on the families who had to assume the responsibility or, if they can't do it, the municipality must do it for them.

I think this Province not only needs a new Minister of Public Health but in order to remedy the evils of what happened, we need a new Government.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Dewhurst: — We saw, according to the press and listening to the news media, during the previous conference in Waskesiu last summer, that the main cry from our Premier here was warning other provinces, "If you go into a health insurance program, be sure and put on deterrent fees." His main cry was to put on deterrent fees and he wanted everyone else in all the rest of the provinces to put on deterrent fees to make it appear that that was the right and just and proper thing to do. Well, I hope people from other provinces will take a look at the evils that deterrent fees have brought on the people of this province and do away with the deterrent fees.

The main theme of this old Speech from the Throne seems to be, not what we can do for the people but what can we do to the

February 13, 1969

people, and that seems to be the policy of this Government, not to try and help people but to do things against them.

At a later date I will have more to say on highways in this province when the Minister (Mr. Boldt) is before us with his estimates. But I think it's scandalous the way that some of our highways are being looked after in this province.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Dewhurst: — Highway No. 14 is a good example. For the past three or four years it's been impossible to travel Highway 14. It has been built, rebuilt, torn up and rebuilt again. This spring when the contractor came in to start blacktopping it, he had to dig out Highway No. 14 all the way from Wynyard back to Elfros, some places eight and ten feet deep, repack it, rebuild it, before he could pave it. I'd like to know what the contractor was paid for, when the paving contractor had to do the work all over again.

Highway No. 15 from Watson to Wadena is equally as much of a scandalous story. The amount of money that's been spent there, the time they've spent on that highway and how people, in order to get through all last fall and had to avoid the highway to take the grid road and put extra load and stress and strain on the grid road because our highway wouldn't carry us. Furthermore, it's amusing to me, last fall, Mr. Speaker, when they had the official opening of a school in Wishart. The Minister of Education (Mr. McIsaac), according to the press, said that he was sorry, sent his regrets, that he couldn't attend the opening due to the condition of Highway No. 14, after spending all that money. But the joke of it, Mr. Speaker, is that going from Regina to Wishart, you don't go on highway No. 14. you go on Highway No. 15 and then the grid road, after No. 6. But No. 15 was just as bad as everybody knew No. 14 was bad but they were trying to hide the fact that No. 15 was bad.

I'm convinced, Mr. Speaker, that the Minister of Highways (Mr. Boldt) must be a genius – a real genius! Only a man with his organizing ability could organize a department in such a manner to spend so much money and do so little for the people of this province.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Dewhurst: — To be able to spend so much money and have the roads in such poor condition, both summer and winter. It's no wonder with his genius, organizational ability that he got the Department of Public Health in such a mess that they moved him . . .

An Hon. Member: — Welfare.

Mr. Dewhurst: — . . . Of Welfare, pardon me. Welfare in such a mess, they moved him out of there and asked the present man to try and straighten it up. I'll congratulate the present Minister (Mr. MacDonald), he's doing a much better job than his predecessor did.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Dewhurst: — But I can't say that for the Minister of Highways (Mr. Boldt) because his genius, organizational ability has the money that's allocated to highways. Over \$20 million a year is being wasted. He can organize a department of Confusion but we have no roads summer or winter.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Dewhurst: — Now, Mr. Speaker, some of the things which the Government let itself run away with, is misleading statements in the press. I have here a quotation from the Saskatoon Star Phoenix from Friday, September 27th, put in by Pat O'Dwyer. He's pointing out where Mr. Albert Kessell is going to harvest 104 bushels per acre on 100 acres. He says Mr. Kessell started swathing his wheat last Thursday (this is written on the Friday). Well, Mr. Speaker, you and I know that no farmer knows what he's going to get when he starts swathing, but this type of information is erroneous. I understand that later on it was a good field of wheat and it went into the 60 bushels to the acre, not 104. But these reports are erroneous, misleading to other parts of Canada. The people out in the west know a little about agriculture but when this type of copy goes into Ontario, Quebec, the Maritimes or even out on to the West Coast, no wonder people feel that the farmers are well off. They're producing 104 bushels of wheat to the acre and I think that people like Pat O'Dwyer should know better than write that type of a heading when it's only just being swathed.

Now, we have seen in this house here, on a previous occasion, when we were fighting in this Legislature to get the Federal Government to establish a fair price for the farmers in this province. We've been asking for a special price for the wheat consumed on the domestic market and a fair price for what goes into export. We saw every Liberal Member of the House that was here vote against \$2.10 a bushel for wheat on the first 1,000 bushels of wheat. We saw them voting against a parity price. We saw them voting against using a fair means to give a fair return to agriculture. Then they come out and try to tell you that they are the farmer's friend.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that any Speech from the Throne should start off to devise and organize plans to build a better society for people. We should use our economic set-up to build a better way of life for all the people and not a better way of life for a privilege few, a privileged few corporations. We should have society serving all the people and not all the people serving a few people in society. We believe in this party here that society should be organized or the economics of the country should be organized so that we can serve the people better and give the people a better standard of life, and the resources of our nation, be they provincial or federal, should be so organized that these resources are going to be a part of the basis of building better programs for society, whether they're old people, young people, widows and mothers, or whether they're old people, young people, widows and mothers, or whether they're crippled. I believe if we could organize society so that we could give the people a good education and a good means whereby they could help to provide for themselves. During their working years they will do that, but if someone should be unfortunate to fall ill or have an accident, society should not leave them to the mercy of some other poor relative

February 13, 1969

to try and help them out. Society should be organized to help people and not just organized to serve a few privileged in society.

There is lots more which I wish to say at this time but I think I have used up the time which I had agreed to take.

I can assure you, Mr. Speaker, that I cannot support this anemic document. I will support the amendment and I will have more to say to the Minister of Highways (Mr. Boldt) when his estimates are before us.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. E.F. Gardner (Moosomin): — Mr. Speaker, I would like to congratulate those Members on both sides of the House who have preceded me in this debate for the adequate job they have done. Because they have done such a complete job, my remarks will be brief and will encompass several topics.

I would also like to congratulate our Whip (Mr. Larochelle) on his new and recent appointment. We are proud of the fact that we are the only political party in Saskatchewan with a bilingual Whip.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Gardner: — Mr. Speaker, I was interested in the concern expressed by the Member for Regina South-East (Mr. Baker) about the sewage disposal problems because Regina is not on a river. Now we know that the Mayor (Mr. Baker) has had some success, limited though it may be, in moving the city hall and he's quite an idea man. I'm surprised that the Mayor (Mr. Baker) hasn't suggested moving the city of Regina to a river. I must say also, Mr. Speaker, that I would agree with quite a bit that the previous speaker said about grain drying and AMA, but I was concerned about his good Samaritan story. He sort of left us up in the air. He didn't tell us whether the man got in the hospital or not, and I can hardly wait for the next thrilling episode to find out really what happened.

Mr. Speaker, the Throne Speech contained many items of potential interest to the people of Saskatchewan, but none gave me more personal satisfaction than the announcement that a special department was being set up to handle the affairs of the Indian and Métis people in this province. No other Government has been more concerned about our native people and no other Premier, Mr. Speaker, has been a better friend to our native people. Premier Thatcher has spent a great deal of time visiting reserves and discussing problems with the Indian people. Their affairs have always received top priority with this Government. The Indian and Métis Branch of the Department of Natural Resources has done an outstanding job and is now being upgraded to full departmental status, another example of the priority placed on this problem by the Liberal Government.

Mr. Speaker, while we are pleased to see this Department established, I believe that it will give us even more satisfaction when the day comes that it can be disbanded. It is being set up now because special programs and special efforts are needed at this time to see that our native people receive

the jobs, the social benefits and the consideration that they are entitled to and that have often been denied them. When this task is successfully accompanied, then the need for this Department may disappear.

Mr. Speaker, I am sure you have heard of the Task Force on Indian opportunity which was set up this past year by the Premier. It is a dramatic and exciting new approach to this problem and has received favourable and enthusiastic comment all across Canada. Its purpose is basically to find permanent employment for Indian and Métis people, but it fully realizes that this task cannot be accomplished without also examining the social, cultural and educational problems involved.

The task Force is made up of some of the leaders in industry, education, religion, labor and government and they have tackled their job with energy and enthusiasm. These men serve without monetary reward and their only reward will be the satisfaction they receive from a job well done and from helping their fellow citizens. The Task Force has already made an impact on the life of our native people, but much remains to be done.

Surveys have been made in both the public and private sectors of our province to indicate the numbers of native people in jobs and the potential jobs available. These surveys show wide variations in the number of native people employed by our major businesses. They show wide variations in the numbers of native people employed by different departments of Government and at different levels of Government. Some citizens for example with relatively large numbers of native people have apparently made little effort to provide them with any employment. I think that the city of Regina is one of the worst offenders in this regard. Surely it is reasonable to expect Government departments and large cities to employ native people at least in proportion to their percentages of the population of Saskatchewan or about seven per cent. Encouraging results in some local areas have convinced the Task Force that similar results are possible on a larger scale if the proper effort is made. Associated problems of education, counselling, housing, remote location and social and cultural differences are under careful study by the Task Force. The hopes of our native people have been aroused by the Task Force and I sincerely trust that they will not be disappointed.

Mr. Speaker, you can see from the above that this Government realizes the importance of finding employment for our Indian and Métis citizens. This Government also feels that the native people will not be fully participating in our society and in our economy until they hold some positions at the decision-making level. Our Liberal Government has demonstrated its feelings in this regard by appointing several native people to the Boards of Directors of Crown corporations. I am personally very pleased by the recent appointment of Chief Real Acoose to the Board of Directors of Saskatchewan Government Insurance Office. Mr. Acoose is a capable and respected citizen of my constituency and I am sure he will be a credit to his people on this Board.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Gardner: — Mr. Speaker, we often get involved in the House here in debate over the more obvious areas of concern and perhaps

February 13, 1969

neglect other problems which are important but are less obvious. I would like to refer to a problem which is costing us thousands of dollars each year, is a constant threat to the safety of our people and our livestock and is a serious reflection on the moral and social attitudes of our citizens. I am referring to the littering of our roads and ditches, our parks and beaches and the landscape in general, by disregarded beer and soft drink bottles.

This is a problem that is getting more severe every year and if left uncontrolled could be our most serious area of pollution. Already thousands of acres of roadside ditches are not harvested for hay each year because farmers are reluctant to risk damaging tractor and implement tires by broken glass. Even more important they are afraid of picking up broken glass in hay bales which would injure or kill their livestock. Our economy suffers from this aspect of the problem in at least two ways. The farmers lose thousands of tons of good feed annually which they often need badly. The Department of Highways spends a great deal of money each year for crews to pick up this litter and to cut ditches which would ordinarily be harvested by the farmer at no cost to the taxpayer. The Department of Highways alone has about 120,000 acres of grassland ditches, which indicates the extent of the problem. Bottles are thrown not only into ditches but on many rural roads are thrown directly into the farmers' fields. I am sure that almost every farmer living next to a well-travelled municipal road has had to remove broken glass from his property.

The number of automobile accidents caused by broken glass is difficult to estimate but is certainly substantial. A tire that is cut by a bottle on the road may not blow out until the next week or next month but a potentially dangerous situation is created. The dangers of broken glass and bottles on our beaches and in our parks are obvious to all and do not require further discussion here. Our cities are finding it increasingly difficult and expensive to dispose of the mountains of bottles they collect. Glass is almost indestructible and a bottle carelessly discarded now may cause serious damage many years from now. The average Canadian now uses about 94 bottles per year, which creates a substantial disposal problem. Bottles have been identified as a cause of forest fires in many parts of North America. Under extremely dry conditions and bright sunlight, parts of broken bottles may act as a magnifying glass and ignite dry materials causing prairie or forest fires. Again it is difficult to assess the costs as any forest or prairie fire can be expensive and dangerous. This problem, of course, is not unique to Saskatchewan. It is a source of growing concern to governments at all levels across Canada. I have here a resolution from the South East Saskatchewan RM Association which is sample of the type of concern being expressed. And this particular resolution says:

Whereas glass bottles continue to be a serious problem in maintaining road ditches and rights-of-way; and whereas the use of throw-away bottles has compounded this problem; therefore be it resolved that the Provincial Government bring in legislation prohibiting use of such bottles in the sale of beer and soft drinks.

Mr. Speaker, I do not pretend to have all the answers to this problem but I would like to make a few suggestions. The above resolution indicates that the rapidly increasing use of

non-returnable or throw-away bottles has greatly compounded the problem. And incidentally suppliers prefer the term one-way bottles. They shudder at the word throw-away which admits to the littering problem. SO, therefore, I think that we should first ask for the co-operation of the suppliers in restricting the sale of throw-away pop bottles and if this co-operation is not forthcoming we should consider stricter methods. We should ask for the co-operation of the general public in properly disposing of unwanted bottles. Here again, stricter methods might be required. Our \$25 fine for littering along the highways is one of the lowest in North America and convictions are seldom obtained. Perhaps the fine should be increased and a determined effort be made to get convictions. These littered ditches are bound to have an effect on the moral values of our young people, as they are a persistent end ever present reminder that hundreds of people are breaking the law and getting away with it.

Most other places in North America sell beer in containers other than glass bottles. The use of plastic, aluminium or other materials should be investigated and insisted upon in Saskatchewan. In the meantime, a much higher deposit on beer bottles would encourage their return and greatly help in solving this problem. Other provinces in Canada are making progress in this regard and I trust that Saskatchewan will not lag behind.

Mr. Speaker, the Opposition Members, as could easily have been predicted, have spent a good deal of time on the damp grain situation in the province, and instead of isolating this problem and suggesting something constructive, they have confused this issue with many other problems facing farmers. In their desperate efforts to blame the Provincial Government for the wet weather last fall, the quota situation, the price of grain, the frost, the movement of grain and boxcars, the Vancouver Harbour difficulties and the unusually cold winter, they have again tried to make political capital out of an unfortunate situation. Farmers are well aware of the problems I have mentioned and they are also aware that, unfortunately, these problems are largely beyond the control of any provincial government.

Mr. Speaker, in spite of all our superficial arguments, I have often wondered in my own mind about the basic differences between the Socialist Members opposite and the Members on this side of the House. I think it is well illustrated by the method in which we look at the difficulties facing a large number of our farmers today. The Provincial Liberal Government is doing everything in its power to alleviate these difficulties. The NDP, however, has taken a different tack and apparently feels that it can resolve the problem not by eliminating the difficulties but simply by eliminating the farmers. The group of young people who will be the NDP leader of tomorrow have recently made it quite clear that their policy is to nationalize farm land. This means, Mr. Speaker, that there will be no family farms, there will be no independent farmers, but only agriculture workers hired by the state and presumably supervised by the NDP labor bosses. This is not speculation on my part, Mr. Speaker, but is a motion passed by the New Democratic Youth Convention in Moose Jaw in January of this year. They have finally come out and admitted what their true intention is in regard to farm land and to farmers. We have long suspected this and they have now confirmed it.

Mr. Speaker, I consider this one the most important documents to be seen in this province in many years and I am

sure that its significance will be well noted by rural people in Saskatchewan, more important even than the Socialist Regina Manifesto which was mentioned earlier here today. Now many NDP Members have spoken in this debate and none have said that they disagree with the New Democratic motion. Therefore, we must assume that they are all in agreement with the Members of this House and the general public are entitled to a few more details of this plan from some of the Members opposite.

We all know, of course, the methods used to nationalize farm lands by other Socialist governments in other parts of the world. In the absence of specific details from our local Socialists we can only suspect that similar methods will be used here. I am already getting questions from rural people of my constituency and I would like to be able to supply some of the answers. For example, do they propose to house the workers in communes as the Socialists did in China? Do they plan on removing the surplus farm workers to remote northern areas as the Socialists did in Russia? The farm Members for Wadena (Mr. Dewhurst) and Turtleford (Mr. Woof) are perhaps getting a little old for this type of work, and I am sure, therefore, that they would welcome these answers from the Young NDP Members. Do they plan on letting the workers keep a small plot of their own to grow a few vegetables as the Socialists did in Russia? I think, perhaps the farm Members from Kelsey (MR. Messer) and Kinistino (Mr. Thibault) and maybe Prince Albert East-Cumberland (Mr. Berezowsky) would like to have a little plot where they could grow a few cabbages and turnips for their own use. I think that you will agree, Mr. Speaker, that it is only fair that they should have it. The rural people of Saskatchewan are eagerly awaiting for these and other details of this Socialist plan, and I hope they will not be kept waiting too long.

Mr. Speaker, we all know that Socialism does not eliminate poverty but merely spreads it out evenly amongst all citizens. The proposed nationalization of farm land is another good example of their relentless pursuit of complete Socialism.

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

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Romanow (Saskatoon Riversdale): — Mr. Speaker, I first of all would like to congratulate quite sincerely the mover and the seconder on their Address-in-Reply to the Speech from the Throne. I say quite sincerely that we all agree that it is an honor to be chosen to be the mover and the seconder. Mr. Speaker, listening to the Hon. Members I couldn't help but conclude that their efforts were something like a burlesque of quite long ago describing exaggerated deeds of the would-be chivalrous heroes that sit on the Front Benches of their party, more imaginary than real. It reminded me of two Cervantes' very famous characters in his novel. For those who are familiar with his works, the two characters are Don Quixote and his trusted squire Sancho Panza. Cervantes describes the two characters in this manner. He said, first of all, that Don Quixote was tall and lean, so lean that as Cervantes described it, "His cheeks appeared to be kissing each other on the inside." Panza was his neighbor, a very trusting neighbor, shorter in body, stouter features. He was described by the

author as ~~an~~ honest man if, indeed, that title can be given to one who was poor in ideas.” So as I listened to the mover and the seconder in their speeches and I tried to decide which of those two would fit the descriptions by Cervantes. There they were, two knights – errant, out on their bony nags, tattered and battered, and still tilting at windmills, and here are two heroes in the Legislature of the Province of Saskatchewan who were tilting at the imaginary windmills of Socialism.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Romanow: — The Member from City Park-University (Mr. Charlebois) cleverly and neatly set up in his own mind the dangerous battle ground against Socialism and then proceeded to lay it asunder and lay the whole assembled army sunder by his argument. But you know, Quixote fought a hostile army too. It was a flock of sheep and when he found out that it was a flock of sheep, he in wonderment exclaimed, ~~My~~, this must be the work of a magician.”

Well, Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Member from City Park-University fought the wrong army as well because the sheep are sitting over in the opposite side of the House.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Romanow: — I must agree with Cervantes. The Hon. Member certainly did deliver their speeches and they certainly were the works of a magician because you know, Mr. Speaker, they almost managed to make disappear the onerous taxes, the deterrent fees, hospital closures and on and on of last year’s Legislature. Unfortunately, unlike the novel which attempted to describe the pitfalls and the strengths of idealism and realism, the two Members shoed neither quality, neither idealism nor realism in their addresses.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Romanow: — In fact, Mr. Speaker, this Government seems to be stuck in a quagmire of logic that is both strange and contradictory. Sir, wasn’t it strange, for example, to hear Member after Member, including the last one who just took his seat, describe the evils of Socialism and put them at the feet of us, the humble members of the Saskatchewan New Democratic party. You know in reverse the logic went something like this: France is a private enterprise country and Charles de Gaulle is the head of a private enterprise government in France. Charles de Gaulle has a very big, large nose. Saskatchewan has a private enterprise government. For the time being the Treasurer (Mr. Steuart) is the head of the Government of private enterprise Saskatchewan. Therefore, the Treasurer has a very big, large nose. Well, I must admit that all examples fall down somewhat. I guess his nose has been poking too much into the taxpayers’ pockets, but nevertheless the faulty logic has been shown. Not only was the logic of it strange but it was a bit contradictory, Mr. Speaker. You take for example the Member from Cannington (Mr. Weatherald). He said in his speech, ~~You~~ know all farmers are in trouble financially. They have a very heavy load to carry. But this Government just can’t help them in their grain drying problems.” The Health Minister (Mr. Grant) says, ~~Deterrent~~ fees show no hardship whatsoever, but just to be sure, to be on the safe side, we are going to put a ceiling to protect any hardships.” The

February 13, 1969

Education Minister (Mr. McIsaac) says, —You know The Teachers' Salary Agreements Act is a very good Act, but just to be sure, we are going to tell the trustees and the teachers that they had better settle during this session or else.”

Mr. Speaker, all through the speeches of the Members opposite, we heard this strange and contradictory logic. All we have really heard, all the Speech from the Throne has been, is a cacophony of confusion and contradiction, no more, no less.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Romanow: — Mr. Speaker, I think that it is evident that we need new leadership for the new Saskatchewan.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Romanow: — They were quiet for a long time, Mr. Speaker, but I knew they wouldn't disappoint me.

Well, Mr. Speaker, it has been discussed in this House a number of times, but I think that it is one of the major problems this year, that is the question of agriculture. to say that I am not a farmer is the understatement of the year, but Hon. Members opposite and on this side, I am sure, will agree that one ca hardly live in Saskatchewan without feeling the vicissitudes of farm life. Perhaps, one should not limit the observation to this particular crop year. It appears to me, Mr. Speaker, that there are very deep major root causes for the problems of agriculture in Canada which almost makes every year a problem year. It appears among other things agriculture has these problems. Firstly, the farmer has no control over the price that he is going to receive for the products that he produces. In every other field there is some machines available to the professionals or the businessmen, the workers, whereby the products that they are going to produce and give to the market can raise proportionately with the increased costs. But in the case of the farmer, he has been placed in a position where he really is, as he has said many times before, a prisoner caught in the cost-price squeeze.

Now secondly, recent world developments, where les expensive farm produce seems to be more readily accepted, I submit, have resulted in a necessity to review traditional farming concepts in Saskatchewan and in Canada. Thirdly, there appear to be large scale inefficiencies and organizational errors in the way tat this country markets and transports its grain. Of course, as I have said, there are other basic concerns but essentially my talks with farming people reveal that these are the three most important general areas.

As a natural consequence of automation and other factors the farmer is under constant pressure to improve the size and the quality of his machinery and to extend his operation. As a result, as my colleague from Kelsey (Mr. Messer) has pointed out, he has fallen deeply into debt. His load of debt is inordinately high. To hear my colleague from Kelsey describe the situation it would appear the farmers' prosperity or so-called prosperity and affluence is merely a fool's paradise.

Now, Mr. Speaker, to me it is absolutely amazing that the

Provincial Government of the foremost grain-producing area in the world had failed to come to grips with this crisis in agriculture. This Government has failed firstly, to pinpoint the basic root causes and problems of agriculture and, secondly, failed to take the appropriate steps either at the provincial level or the federal level to help solve the problem. I feel that the farmer is getting tired of being caught in some giant shell game where provincial and federal governments are constantly telling the farmer, "Now you see our responsibility and now you don't see our responsibility." The Constitution says this and we can do this and this we can't do. Accordingly, one of two conclusions is inevitable. Firstly, either the Saskatchewan Government knows the areas of problem but has failed or refused to act on behalf of the farmers, that is, has failed to prosecute the case at the federal level or the provincial level where necessary. Or alternatively, it really doesn't know what the causes, what the root problems and the economic and political implications concerning agriculture's plight are. And in either case, Mr. Speaker, the blame for failing to help overcome today's problems in agriculture must fall directly and squarely on the shoulder's of the Minister of Agriculture ((Mr. McFarlane) and this Government.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Romanow: — So, Mr. Speaker, if you add to the basic weaknesses of the structure a crop year such as the one just concluded, it is little wonder that the entire economy of Saskatchewan is beginning to feel the pinch. I think the Government can do one of two things. It can sit by idly by and talk like the Minister of Agriculture did in his address in this debate in silly shibboleths, or it can take positive action about easing the financial problems of the farmer that have been documented both on this side and the other side of the House. Everyone recognizes the financial burden of the agriculture community. I am not going to belabour the point, but the Minister without Portfolio for Saskatoon-Humboldt stated in the House of Commons on February 4, in Hansard:

There is an extremely serious cash and credit position affecting agriculture on the prairies which has resulted in the difficult position which farmers find themselves in when tackling the work of drying grain.

And that is exactly what we, the Members on this side of the House, Sir, have been saying during the course of this debate.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Romanow: — Mr. Speaker, the Minister without Portfolio in the Federal House states and analyses the problem correctly. Having spotted the difficulty, what is his proposed solution? He gives the farmer the very generous opportunity of falling even more deeper into debt via a \$600 advance. As I have said, I am not a farmer, but it is clear that the current grain-drying programs have been started too late and are inadequate and are going to hurt the people of this province in the months ahead. When a government is prepared to make outright cash grants to industries but not to our own Saskatchewan people, then I say that they are flying in the face of Saskatchewan politics and needs.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

February 13, 1969

Mr. Romanow: — If the Hon. Member who just finished taking his seat wants to talk about drawing conclusions, this will allow the farmers of this province to rightfully conclude that his Government is concerned about industry but not them.

Mr. Speaker, may I repeat the plea made by my colleagues. Some form of direct financial assistance to farmers is desperately needed. This also applies, I think, to those who were able to get their crop off in a relatively good condition but are unable to sell it because of the marketing inefficiencies and, therefore, also are in the same position of being unable to meet their financial commitments much like the person who has grain that is wet and can't dry it. As I said, Sir, my remarks respecting the fundamental problems, as I see them, in the organization of the grain business apply to all farmers. No farmers should be penalized because the Federal Government for example, has failed to reassess the price paid for the farm product, or failed to look at agriculture in a total sense. I say to the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. McFarlane), because I think that he has forgotten the most important industry in Saskatchewan today still is agriculture, he had better get on the job.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Romanow: — It is time, Mr. Speaker, that there be a new deal for farmers in Saskatchewan.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I think that it is clear that Saskatchewan Liberals have proven themselves too old and too inept to govern modern Saskatchewan. They lack foresight. They lack imagination to solve today's problems. They relate only to political wars of yesteryear. They always run through old press releases, through old problem situations, relate back to 1944, 1954 or any other era, any other year, other than 1969.

An Hon. Member: — The 1930s.

Mr. Romanow: — The 1930s, yes, I am sorry they even go back further now. They go to England and use the Socialist documents and the problems there. They relate to every year going back to 1969. Saskatchewan, I say, Mr. Speaker, is really pleading to be governed with idealism and a little bit of vision and a little bit of progressive purpose, in tune with 1970 and the demands of the 1970s. Now I think the best example of this Government's failures is its mishandling of the university reform issue. I think Saskatchewan Liberals have been alienated at home. Liberals have been alienated across the country. Indeed all of Saskatchewan's society has been alienated by the actions of this Liberal Government when it comes to university reform.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Romanow: — Everyone has to acknowledge that there is a crisis in university government, and it is a time when the people of this province are really looking to the Government, because after all, they are the government. There is a duty on them to solve some of the problems. They are looking for acts of statesmanship,

acts of wisdom, a little bit of daring and imagination with respect to the university reform issue. They are being made witness instead of a tragic confrontation between the Government and the University. In their pronouncements and in their techniques, those inside this Legislature and outside the House, Saskatchewan Liberals are like the little boy who sticks his finger or his thumb in the dam trying to hold back the inevitable. Saskatchewan Liberals are like the young innocent who is in the Army and says, "Look I'm not out of step, it's the rest of the army that is out of touch." The end result has been a total and complete abandonment of this Government by society at large, as I have said, members even, Sir, of its own group.

Now this House has already heard documentation by my colleague from Moose Jaw South (Mr. Davies) respecting the Canadian University Liberal Federation and its outright and total rejection of this Government. Everybody knows that for quite sometime now the Federal Government has been estranged from the Members opposite. And now, as I have said, even Saskatchewan Young Liberals have given up on them as well. Now if there is any doubt about that, I refer Members to the Regina Leader Post, February 7, 1969, and an article written by Eric Malling on this question of university reform. Part of the article goes like this:

"Campus Liberals and the provincial government are so far apart in ideology that they can't see our point and we can't see theirs," said Dave Hawkes, president of the local campus liberals.

The article goes on to say:

The obvious points of difference that he listed all centred on attitudes toward reform in the University. He said that student Liberals don't demand immediate changes, but at least wanted to be listened to.

Well I think someone should tell Mr. Hawkes not to hold his breath if he is waiting to be listened to when it comes to this Government.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Romanow: — The fact that this Government doesn't act with dispatch is the understatement of the year. But nevertheless the story goes on further and I quote:

Brian Malley, Regina President of the Saskatchewan Young Liberals, says that University students in his organization are dissatisfied. And he predicts that resolutions opposing the provincial government's stand will come up at his organization's seminar next month.

Mr. Malley shows marvellous courage, Mr. Speaker, indicating opposition to his Provincial Government. I am sure that such courage is going to hold him well in the eyes of the Premier (Mr. Thatcher).

Mr. Guy: — Did he tell you his national identity?

Mr. Romanow: — Now continuing with the

article, Mr. Speaker, and I quote:

Mr. Malley says University Liberals in Saskatchewan are opting out of the party before exhausting its normal channels of influence. Part of the problem is their failure to understand what they consider the Premier's harsh approach to bargaining and to delegations which visit him.

I wouldn't have thought that the Premier was harsh to delegations that visited him. That's a new revelation by Mr. Malley. I can see though that he has many other things to understand yet about the Liberal party. The article further states:

While the Young Liberals at their December convention were passing a resolution which the mover explained would lead to abolition of tuition fees, their senior party was solidly supporting the fees.

It seems to me I read an article by the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Guy) on this point. I wonder what he would call the Young Liberals because of their stand on tuition fees.

Mr. Guy: — We are not nationalizing anything anyway.

Mr. Romanow: — You know someone should nationalize the Minister of Public Works as a monument to 18th century relics.

Mr. Guy: — They are not going to set up the Viet Cong government.

Mr. Romanow: — Well, come now, Mr. Minister, we are waiting for some epitaph for the Saskatchewan Liberals. All I can say, Sir, is with the frequency and the regularity of certain charges made by the Hon. Minister of Public Works (Mr. Guy) — and we hear them today — I am sure the Young Liberals wouldn't want to be left out of that rather exclusive club. Well let's continue further with the article and it says:

Young Liberals who pushed the Premier with some penetrating questions at a meeting two years ago say they have since lost all favour with him. If resolutions at the upcoming meetings knock the party line, any split could get wider and deeper.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I think it's the other way around. The Premier has lost all favour with the people of the Province of Saskatchewan and they are going to show it to him next time around in the next Provincial election.

An Hon. Member: — We've heard that one before too.

Mr. Romanow: — Mr. Speaker, this party opposite has been so divided from the rest of its party that it will never be pieced back to the main block of the liberal party. Mr. Speaker, by the actions of this Government on the university issues, the Members opposite have isolated themselves from all other local governments and organizations, both within the province and outside

the province. Now Saskatchewan has a history of receptiveness to change. People of this province recognize the need for change in many areas. Principal R.W. Begg of the Saskatoon Campus recently wrote on the topic of student unrest and he said this:

We are involved in the pangs of adaptation to change. The education system has become massive, and considerable inertia must be overcome to produce required change. The principles and mores of the past are being questioned and must be validated or replaced, not ignored and discarded. We will not return to the past, and must address ourselves to the future.

Now that is Principal Begg writing in an article of "Exchange." Now we have to ask ourselves this question, will this Government address itself to the challenge of the future? Will it hold up new hope of leadership in resolving this problem? Or will it try to hold back the sands of time and look back to the past? Well, Sir, I can say this that change will come in spite of the intransigence of the Members opposite. But today you see them there, sitting alone, proud and unhumiliated, unrepentant and unrelenting; they are, Sir, like General Custer's lonely and deserted band of men rushing headlong into the next Little Big Horn of the Provincial election. The Brave have laid out a very skilful attack that waits for them the next time around.

Mr. Heald: — We can't afford another mixup.

Mr. Romanow: — I know the Hon. Members want us to get this part of it over rather quickly but they are going to have to sit it out and listen to the truth, you know.

Mr. Speaker, to be sure, the Saskatchewan Liberals are going to be defeated at the next election. That is clear, but in the meantime irreparable harm has been done now to one of the finest learning institutions in Canada. The harm is partly due to lack of knowledge about the nature of a university, partly due to a stodgy and conservative inflexibility by this Government and mainly due to a purposeful attempt to drag the university community into a crossfire of partisan political debate. There have been many definitions of what a university is. I am one who subscribes to the generally well accepted term, "community of scholars" where there is a dedication to the preservation, transmission and increase of human knowledge. It is an institution, Sir, I think we will all agree, that is dedicated to the search and pursuit of truth. It is a body composed of men and women who have learned to work creatively at the forefront of their discipline, and also people who are learning and who will either use the knowledge that they have learned in the society outside or perhaps later on in imparting further knowledge to the future generations. Every university I think tried to hold true to this ideal of a community of scholars in the pursuit of truth. Because of this relentless search it is only going to be natural that a university will be, as one of its aims and objectives, objectively and constantly criticizing all facets of our society or at least putting it under scrutiny. If our University of Saskatchewan is dedicated to the pursuit of truth, and I submit that it is, it only stands to reason that Saskatchewan's imperfections, structures and social values will too be placed under the microscope by the University of Saskatchewan. Hopefully,

February 13, 1969

somewhere along the line the end result will be a much better and improved university, and a much better and improved society.

In a way, the existence of a university is the creation, Mr. Speaker, of an elite, one of many in society, but an elite, and it's also not unusual because of the nature of a university that this elite is going to come into conflict from time to time with some of the other elites of society, economic, political, professional, military, whatever they happen to be. But objective and honest evaluation of all institutions and values of Saskatchewan can be nothing more than a self-renewing process for this province in our society. The objectivity of a university and how freely it is allowed to flourish in Saskatchewan is a test of how vital and democratic our society is. I can only use one quotation in support of this argument, Mr. Speaker, and that is the noted educationalist, Northrup Frye, and I quote:

The society incapable of forming an articulate criticism of itself and of developing a will to act in its light is a social nightmare.

Mr. Speaker, Saskatchewan is big enough to accept and to encourage a community of scholars like the University of Saskatchewan which will articulate constructive criticism of this province.

As I said, tension is almost naturally built into the University. If this Government is really sincere when it talks about its concern for the University, the test will be whether or not it is big enough to adhere to the principles that I have outlined above and accept the criticism that comes from time to time. Sometimes members of a university will criticize the very society that supports them. I know this is awkward. This is difficult. But, in many ways, Sir, that is the price we all have to pay for having a thought-provoking, beneficial and stimulating institution like the University of Saskatchewan in our midst. I fear that this Government is not prepared to pay the price for a truly independent and great University of Saskatchewan.

In 1967, Mr. Speaker, the principal of Queen's University talked about the students' role in today's society. He didn't smear them. He didn't generalize them in a category or in a class. He didn't use innuendo or half truth, he said this:

The most hopeful sign in this situation is that students more and more refuse to take all this lying down. They have become alert to the issues of the world outside the university and are determined to say their say about these as well as domestic affairs within the University . . .

And then later on he said this:

Commitment with passion is miles ahead of neutrality and indifference. One of the commitments of students that is laudable and seems likely to be enduring is the determination to . . .

and I emphasize this

improve the university for those who will follow them.

Mr. Speaker, all things can be improved. There is room for improvement in our University of Saskatchewan. Because students are the very reason for a university I submit that this improvement should be centred around incorporation of university students in the decision-making process at all levels of university government. As Principal Begg stated:

Students participation can improve the learning process and the instruction . . .

Students make a large contribution to the intellectual and social life of our communities, and I might also add for the Members of Regina and Saskatoon, a large economic impact on those cities that can't be overlooked. When I was president of the Students Council at Saskatoon campus some years ago, students were involved in music, art, drama, debating societies, shenanigans from time to time I suppose that the outside community frowned upon. There was a whole variety of activities. Whatever their choice of endeavor, it didn't really matter and it doesn't matter. What matters is that students give and receive in the interplay of university life and, as a result, they have a legitimate cause in requesting participation in the decision-making process.

If there be any doubt among the Members assembled here today, the presidents of Ontario universities in 1968 struck a special committee to report to them on this very problem. They said that the case for student participation appears to be —so strong as to be practically incontrovertible.” Mr. Speaker, we all reject senseless violence. Acts of hooliganism have got to be condemned and I am one of the first ones to do the condemnation, but by the same token this Government is doing a disservice to the youth of this province. The young men and women, the Saskatchewan farmers, the Saskatchewan working people, the Saskatchewan businessman, when it uses the isolated examples in some far away and remote areas of the world and tars the entire young population of this province, tars indeed the entire university community.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Romanow: — The Saskatchewan taxpayers will not be led to believe that the University wants to tear itself down from within. They are not going to be fooled by this Government into believing that there is something more in their agitation other than the desire to supplement the University and make it a stronger and better institution for this province and this country. It is shameful the way this Government has dragged mature people, young and old, into a mud-raking and unintellectual squabble.

Now I said at the beginning, if this Government had idealism and compassion and imagination, it would begin to work together with all sectors of the society as a whole, taxpayers, professionals, trade unionists, students, professors, to bring about this much needed university reform. So I call on this Government, because it is the leader of our society for the time being, to end the bickering about the University and adopt a positive and statesmanlike posture. Let it be the leader, Sir, in getting together all people of this province to work for a greater University of Saskatchewan.

I don't want to outline a lengthy program in this regard,

but I think essentially six points could very well be a good framework for which this Government could begin some action. Firstly, it should outline a well-reasoned program of orderly change in the university organization whereby students and faculty may participate in the decision-making process of the University. This program, after consultation, probably could very well mean legislation to allow students and faculty to sit on the Board of Governors or the Senate. Secondly, there should be an immediate beginning of the abolition of tuition fees at the University and, indeed, all levels of education. It has already been well documented in this House before that abolition of tuition fees will greatly increase productivity a thousand times over the initial investment it costs us, the taxpayers of this province, to eliminate at the beginning. And I think more importantly, Mr. Speaker, it will eliminate discrimination and open the door of educational opportunity and equality to all Saskatchewan young people. Thirdly, there should be a program of increased financial assistance for the university and education as a whole. I think it is poor economic to cut down on expenditures for education and I hope the Budget isn't going to do so this year. This Government must at all times support emphasis for spending tax dollars for education. Fourthly, there should be a cessation of accusations by the Government against the university community and there should be an immediate cessation. Members opposite, the backbenchers, should summon all of their statesmanship qualities and stop once and for all the question of the mud-raking that I have referred to. At the same time, as I said in the beginning, all of the society must not condone any violence and must caution the students at all times that change along the lines I have outline has to be democratic and moderate. Fifthly, there should be a reaffirmation of the beliefs upon which the University was founded, namely, independence and its search for truth in the community of scholars.

Now, Mr. Speaker, that is a goal which I think would be a good start for the Government to begin on. I am afraid that this Government can't fill the Bill. It has adopted a holier-than-thou attitude when it judges individuals and institutions of this University in terms of its own outdated and old concepts. Let Members opposite get up and tell Members on this side about a holier-than-thou posture when time after time, speaker after speaker, from their side adopts and makes moral values and judgements of the university community. Mr. Speaker, the Speech from the Throne is silent with respect to this very vital and important areas.

When it comes to judging the Speech from the Throne I must judge it in terms of whether or not it has the aspirations of today's Saskatchewan, whether or not it is really setting out a social policy for the 1970s. And I can tell the Government opposite that the Speech from the Throne isn't going to be number one on the hit parade for 1969. In the typical, old-fashioned and old style of this Government, it waltzes along oblivious to the problems of today at a time when our society is subjected to a rock-and-roll change in a fast paced world. It is not listening to the beat. Through all the confusion we expected this Government in its Speech from the Throne to chart a social policy with the objective of fully developing human well-beings for the 1970s. Everyone has the right to social security and economic, social and cultural rights for the free development of his personality. The Speech from the Throne should have been outlining its objectives, its social policies for the 1970s along that guide line. I just have to

ask myself this questions: has this Government embarked on a program that relates to human well-being for the future? Is Saskatchewan really developing human resource along the lines discussed? Does the Speech from the Throne outline the vision of the future? It can't because the Government is old and continually looks backward. The answer is obviously a loud, "No." this Government is complacent and indifferent. Its world, Mr. Speaker, is entirely unrelated to the worker or the average citizen, farmer, labourer, professional of Saskatchewan. It hasn't got the move of the energetic and vital youth of this province. Mr. Speaker, I can only repeat again, we need new leadership for the new Saskatchewan. The Speech from the Throne and the Government speakers, one after another, have failed to provide the leadership. I cannot support the motion but will support the amendment.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

The amendment was negatived on the following recorded division:

**Yeas – 22
Messieurs**

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

**Nays – 31
Messieurs**

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

The debate continues on the motion.

Mr. W.E. Smishek (Regina North East): — Mr. Speaker, it is customary in this House to congratulate them over and the seconder of the Address-in-Reply and I do so now. Mr. Speaker, I felt sorry for the two gentlemen. They had a hard time to defend the document of empty of ideas and recommendation, to deal with the problems requiring urgent attention.

Mr. Speaker, I also want to express my regrets that the Premier of the Province has not been with us in the past while. I understand the Premier is out of the hospital. I want to wish him a speedy and complete recovery and I hope that he will be able to join us soon in this Legislature.

February 13, 1969

I also want to congratulate, Mr. Speaker, my seatmate for a job well done. As usual his speeches are full of ideas and well delivered.

Mr. Speaker, because of the time and since I intend to deal quite extensively with a couple of topics, tomorrow, needing further discussion and debate, I would beg leave to adjourn the debate.

Debate adjourned.

The Assembly adjourned at 5:27 o'clock p.m.