

**LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN**  
**Second Session — Sixteenth Legislature**  
**16th Day**

**Tuesday, February 25, 1969.**

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

**WELCOME TO STUDENTS**

**Mr. W. S. Lloyd (Biggar):** — Mr. Speaker, I note that we have today, as we have almost every day, a number of students from various parts of the Province and I want to welcome them all. In particular today, Mr. Speaker, may I welcome a group of students from Perdue, I understand the grade 8, 9 and 12 classes. If there is any doubt about the location of Perdue in the minds of the Members, may I say that Saskatoon is about 40 miles east of Perdue.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Lloyd:** — The students attending the Perdue high school at least come from some of the other communities around and the general rural neighborhood. This is an entirely agricultural community, very active and very energetic. They have made their mark at times in the field of junior sports and other competitions. I am sure all of us here, Mr. Speaker, through you, welcome them here and hope that they have had a good stay in Regina and that they will have a safe trip back home to their homes in that community.

**Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. W. G. Davies (Moose Jaw South)** — Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, may I on your behalf introduce to the Members of the Legislature a class of 23 grade 10 students from the Riverview high school in my constituency of Moose Jaw South. They are in the east gallery and they are accompanied by Mr. Norman Sanders, who is the composition and literature teacher. The House will probably be interested to know, Mr. Speaker, that this class has organized itself in a mock parliament and are looking with special interest therefore to the conduct of the proceedings this afternoon. Mr. Speaker, Members will want to commend them for this activity and I hope that they will learn something valuable and interesting here this afternoon.

I would also like to welcome two other groups from Moose Jaw North — Mr. Snyder will be doing this — Pallister Heights school and Lindale school. I hope that all three high school classes this afternoon will have entertaining and interesting experiences and return home safely.

February 25, 1969

**Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. I. H. MacDougall (Souris-Estevan):** — I want to welcome some students this afternoon that didn't show up. I don't know why they didn't show up. They were supposed to come in and I was about to blame the Minister of Highways for that little road he got through Weyburn, because it is such a mess. You can't tell whether you are going to Estevan or coming to Regina.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. MacDougall:** — We tried to talk them out of putting that road through Weyburn in the first place. We wanted to go around Weyburn. This was planned by the former Government, so I guess they went ahead with it.

On the other hand, I am not so sure, maybe they got stuck when they got to the outskirts of Regina, because in Estevan we are used to cleaner streets. With the Major here, maybe he can get up and welcome the students that haven't arrived this afternoon for me. This is also in conjunction with my Resolution, Sir, that you welcome students in the first place. I would say that any students coming from the south would be better to proceed right straight through to the beautiful city of Saskatoon, where the streets are wide and clean. If the Major would want to welcome my students, when his time comes, maybe he could show his good faith by buying them a cup of coffee.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. G. T. Snyder (Moose Jaw North):** — Mr. Speaker, my pleasure is doubled today in welcoming two groups of students from the constituency of Moose Jaw North. I want to first of all welcome a group from Lindale school, some 60 of them. They are situated in the west gallery behind me, accompanied I understand by Mr. Scoraback and I am sure that all Members will want to welcome them here.

Additionally in the east gallery, Mr. Speaker, are 30 grade five students, one of the younger groups that we have had attending this Legislature. I am sure that all Members will want to join with me in welcoming this class of students accompanied by Mrs. Wood, to the Legislature today. They have had a tour of the steel mill and had a very full day. I am sure they have enjoyed their day and we trust that the proceedings here won't in any way destroy the image they have had of the Legislature so far.

**Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. R. Romanow (Saskatoon Riversdale):** — Mr. Speaker, I would like to introduce through you and to the Members of the House, 44 students of the grade 7

class of Pleasant Hill school in Saskatoon Riversdale. Members will know that Pleasant Hill school is one of the oldest and I might add one of the finest schools in the Saskatoon school system. The students are accompanied by Mr. Rathgeber and Mr. Giddons. I wish them a good trip back home.

**Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

## QUESTIONS

### ANNUAL REPORTS — SASKATCHEWAN HOSPITAL PLAN, MEDICARE PLAN

**Mr. W. E. Smishek (Regina North East):** — Before the Orders of the Day I would like to direct a question to the Hon. Minister of Health (Mr. Grant). I am wondering when we can expect the Annual Report for the Saskatchewan Hospital Services Plan and the Medical Care Insurance Plan tabled in the House.

**Hon. G. B. Grant (Minister of Health):** — Mr. Speaker, well before the deadline.

### BILLS 36, 37 AND 38 NOT RECEIVED

**Mr. F. A. Dewhurst (Wadena):** — Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Government. I see on the Blue Paper for second reading today are Bills Nos. 36, 37 and 38, yet we have not received them on our desks. I wonder when we may receive these Bills.

**Hon. D. V. Heald (Attorney General):** — Well, I am sure you will be receiving them momentarily, but I will look into it. Nos. 36, 37 and 38?

**Mr. Dewhurst:** — I would suggest Mr. House Leader that maybe the Bills won't be called today for second reading, because we haven't had a chance to look at them.

**Mr. Heald:** — I think they are coming behind you. That's fair enough. I think the Bills will be there in a minute or two.

### CUSTOMARY HONOR TO SPORTSMANSHIP

**Mr. G. R. Bowerman (Shellbrook):** — Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, I am of the opinion that it has been a custom of this House on previous occasions to honor various of its worthy Saskatchewan champions for their endeavors and for their activities in sportsmanship. I am wondering, Sir, if this honorable custom is being planned with respect to the Canadian Schoolboy Curling Champions, the Bob Miller rink from Shellbrook.

February 25, 1969

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Hon. W. R. Thatcher (Premier):** — The matter is under consideration.

## STATEMENT

### MISQUOTE IN LEADER POST

**Mr. D. W. Michayluk (Redberry):** — I rise on a point of privilege to bring to the attention of the Hon. Members of the House and to the members of the press. Appearing in this morning's edition of The Leader Post, a statement has been attributed to me by the press that the Liberal Government has, since its election, imposed \$80,000 increase in taxes. If my memory serves me correctly, Mr. Speaker, I think that in the course of my Budget Debate speech I mentioned that an increase was \$80 million, I mean \$80 million instead of \$80,000. I don't mind being misquoted, but when I am misquoted 1000 times downwards . . . I would ask the press for a correction on this statement.

## QUESTIONS

### COVERAGE UNDER SASKATCHEWAN GOVERNMENT INSURANCE

**Mr. E. Whelan (Regina North West):** — Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day I would like to direct a question to the Minister in charge of Saskatchewan Government Insurance Office. In view of the fact that any changes will take place very shortly in either The Automobile Insurance Act, the compulsory section or Saskatchewan Government Insurance rates, can the Minister (Mr. Boldt) assure the House that the coverage in both instances will remain the same.

**Hon. D. Boldt (Minister of Highways):** — I won't assure the House that the coverage will be the same. The coverage will be increased.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. A. E. Blakeney (Regina Centre):** — Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, I would like to put a supplementary question to the Minister of Highways, the Minister in charge of the Insurance Office. Will he assure the House that he will give an announcement to the House of any changes in coverage prior to the time that he gives a public announcement with respect to it?

**Mr. Boldt:** — No, I can't do that. The SGIO Agency Conference is on Friday and Saturday and the proposed changes will be brought forward to the agents. A discussion will take place at Saskatoon this coming weekend. I don't intend to make the announcement to the House before the agents will know about the changes.

**Mr. Whelan:** — Mr. Speaker, may I ask a supplementary question. Could the Minister assure us that there are no reductions in coverage.

**Mr. Boldt:** — I think that question was answered before.

### LOCATION OF SPRUCE HOME ROAD

**Mr. W. J. Berezowsky (Prince Albert East-Cumberland):** — Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, I note in the press in a report of yesterday's debate that the Minister said once again that the road from Spruce Home to the mill was not in my constituency. Would the Minister be so kind as to correct that statement or tell me what constituency that road has been built in.

**Mr. Boldt:** — Yes, Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Member knows that I did not say that that road was not in his constituency. I said that was not his road, that is the road for the pulp mill!

### ADJOURNED DEBATES

#### BUDGET DEBATE

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

**Mr. P. Schmeiser (Watrous):** — Mr. Speaker, it is with pleasure that I rise in this Budget Debate.

The years of drought back in the thirties was more than a disconcerting factor in the hearts and souls of the farmers of Saskatchewan. It left Mr. Farmer almost in a realm of despair. At the time, with debts piling up higher than could be casually observed with any sense of values, with the soil being moved around faster than even the most modern machinery of that day would be expected to cope with, there appeared to be no ready answer to a situation that could only lead to a complete loss of land financially, and a growing feeling of insecurity as to the potential value of the agricultural industry. But a sudden miracle happened, and at the time when almost everyone had given up all hope, there suddenly appeared on the scene, a ray of sunshine. In July, 1933, the Regina Manifesto, a program offered by a Socialist party was promising under its Section 4 security of tenure for the farmer upon his farm, on conditions to be laid down by individual provinces; insurance against unavoidable crop failure; removal of the tariff burden from the operations of agriculture; encouragement of producer and consumer co-operatives. This Section 4 was a grand and ideal plan,

**February 25, 1969**

which could give security to the farmer, promise him adequate protection as a small farmer, and relieve him of any doubts as to the possibility of ever losing his land. But, Mr. Speaker, the only sad part in this true philosophy of this great Magna Carta was more truly expounded in the first part which stated:

We believe that these evils, insecurity and hardship can be removed only in a planned and socialized economy, in which our natural resources and the principal means of production and distribution are owned, controlled and operated by the state.

This spirit of controversy which was a part of the first document ever put out by the Socialists of Saskatchewan has since been the basic method of operation. Although the clamor has always been — help out the farmer — the true nature of their policies has been aimed at destroying the same group that at various times helped them get into power.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Schmeiser:** — In 1935, *The Case for Socialism* was written by Fred Henderson, and published by the Socialist party. This publication was sold at Socialist meetings around the time of the 1938 election and was intended for use in Socialist study groups. On page 21, I quote:

It is this private ownership of land and capital which we Socialists indict as the root cause of poverty. We challenge its justice and its right to exist or continue. We trace directly to it the ruin, the wide-spread misery and destitution of the mass of the people.

Again from the same book on page 23, I quote:

The fight against private ownership of land and capital, the fight for Socialism, for the nation's control of its own resources, is the last fight in the age-long struggle of humanity for freedom; a struggle which can have but one end. And that end is the final disappearance from human society of the right of an owning class to live upon the labor of a subject class.

Mr. Speaker, this, I believe, makes it rather obvious that the Socialists did not have in 1938 the desire or the intention of assisting the farmer in protecting his rights of ownership, and the astute observer can readily see that there was now only a time factor involved before a realistic application of voiced policies could be effectively made operative.

Increments of land socialization became more evident as the years progressed. In a radio broadcast reported in *The Commonwealth* of December 13, 1944, Joe Phelps, the Minister of Natural Resources, of the Socialist party in power said:

The new Mineral Taxation Act was perhaps one of the most important pieces of legislation. It is a new tax and is the first step by the Department in restoring the natural resources to the state.

The Commonwealth of November 14, 1945 was a bit more explicit when it said, "Mineral rights over large areas will revert to the Crown." That is in fact what happened, and because many farmers defaulted on paying their mineral tax, their mineral rights were confiscated.

It might interest our Socialist friends to be reminded that the present Government has abolished this mineral tax.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Schmeiser:** — Another step taken by the Socialist Government about this time to assist in proving their true intentions in regard to farmers was their refusal to sell provincially owned lands to veterans, but rather to offer them 33-year leases.

Mr. H. D. Hainley, on January 10, 1943, said:

The CCF has considered socialization of land. There are many advantages to the farmer from some sort of socialization. We can learn much from Russia in this respect. Social security cannot be obtained as long as we leave the control of our production in the hands of private individuals.

Then Colin Cameron in the CCF news on January 27, 1944, ventured on a criticism of the CCF's official position with regard to the place of the family farm and suggested that such a position was an illogical one for the Socialists to take in theory, and that in actual practice we should have sooner or later to accept the idea of collectivism in agriculture as in other lines of production.

Mr. Speaker, suddenly bad weather occurred in 1951 and 1952. The grain companies were refusing to take damp grain into country elevators because terminal drying facilities were overloaded. To help meet this situation what did the Socialists do to a maximum of 1,000 miles on one-way travel for grain dryers brought into the province for farm drying. Sixty-five commercial dryers were brought in under this policy and assistance paid was about \$11,000.

Just a method of comparison, the present Government is faced with a similar plight, but already 1,340 dryers are operating across the province.

In the month of August, 1956, the Winnipeg Declaration of Principles of the CCF presented what appeared to be a change in

**February 25, 1969**

policy and said:

The CCF will protect and make more widespread the ownership of family farms by those who work them, of homes by those who live in them, and of all personal possessions necessary for the well-being of the Canadian people.

It was only a few weeks later that all illusions were dispelled when on September 7th of the same year, David Lewis, National Chairman of the CCF said:

The party's Winnipeg Declaration represents no change in the policy. In my opinion, the people of Canada have had a false idea of the goals of the CCF. This is why the Regina Manifesto has been superseded by the Winnipeg Declaration, but the goals are unchanged.

Now, Mr. Speaker, our Socialist friends are deprived of their mandate and are now resorting to political expedience in their quest for getting votes. All of us who have lived in Saskatchewan are well aware of this Socialist trademark. Their motto has always been, "If it doesn't bring you votes don't do it, but if it does bring you votes, try it over and over again." What the old party members are afraid to voice in the ranks of the farming population is still openly confirmed in the Young NDP. The Times Herald of Moose Jaw reported on January 20th of this year, "Saskatchewan Young New Democrats Sunday voted to press for the nationalization of all farm lands in Canada."

Mind you, Mr. Speaker, this is nothing new for the people of Saskatchewan, as there was a time when the Socialists were in power and did nationalize practically everything but the farmers' land. The little interest, which is becoming more and more evident, that these Socialists have for the farmers, would make any farm owner cringe with fear at the remote possibility of their return to power. This could only mean that every farmer in Saskatchewan would lose his lands to the state. The natural forthcoming step also becomes more evident. As soon as the land becomes state-owned, there is no need for any kind of municipal government, as has happened in Russia and China and as would naturally happen here in Saskatchewan

Mr. Speaker, the history of the Socialist party in Saskatchewan bears out the fact that it has always been dominated by a certain segment of our society. In its early years and humble beginnings it was a farm-dominated movement. Since it changed its name from CCF to NDP it has become dominated by the labor unions. At its last convention the treasurer reported that the party is financed by membership fees and by affiliation of trade union organizations. He went on to show that out of an income of \$292,000 in 1967, \$21,000 came from membership fees and \$271,000 from trade union fees and other miscellaneous contributions. If we are to quote Tommy Douglas who once said, "He who pays the piper, calls the tune," I feel that every Saskatchewan farmer has reason to be scared of the baited promises



that appear on individual platforms and never become a real part of their national policies of our Socialist friends.

If you are still suffering under the delusions that are sponsored by the leaders of the NDP, who maintain that they are a party for all classes, keep in mind the words of Len Wallace, an official of the Wholesale Retail Workers Union, who told the convention:

The party had better make up its mind, that is, make up its mind to the fact that labor is dominant in the NDP, and the farmer is of little concern.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Schmeiser:** — I, as a Member from the Watrous constituency, as a farmer and as a Member interested in the general welfare of all those in my constituency, am very disturbed with this marriage to labor unions. I am very disturbed by the policies that are now part and portion of these various labor unions. I am very disturbed by the economic conditions that are sometimes created by the philosophies which guide their every movement and the means that are too often used to obtain a certain questionable end. I am also disturbed by the pitiful and immoral issues that are brought forward as an excuse to create havoc, and break down a society of well-being. The economic discomforts that the pawn workers have to suffer while leaders living in plush surroundings are mapping their everyday steps and force them to voice an unwilling yes to devastating policies. Workers should no longer be held like pawns in a giant chess game but treated as individuals. Many times I have had the personal experience of seeing parents who had to send money to their children who were out on strike against their will, to meet payments on homes, cars and other belongings.

Mr. Speaker, the very valuable potash industry in and around my constituency is disturbed with labor problems, and a closer analysis can lead a person to suspect that much of the labor unrest is caused by persistent agitation of labor union officials. We have frequent problems which the union workers could easily solve by conciliation. There are times when a strike is necessary and the right of the workers to withdraw their services should be upheld and maintained. However, strike measures should never be used as a lever of labor officials, or a method of throwing their weight around.

At the Noranda Mine it is estimated that 35 per cent of the time wasted as a form of strike between June 30 and September 20th, 1968 was actually due to illegal work stoppages. In January the unions struck over what they considered to be inadequate toilet conditions. But investigations showed that the alleged and also actual inadequate toilet conditions were the result of vandalism and destruction of private property, for which the union members were themselves responsible.

**February 25, 1969**

Mr. Speaker, trade unions exist for the purpose of assisting workers in obtaining a greater share of products or services, which the members produce for the benefit of the public. The economic burden of practically every strike is usually borne by our primary producers. As such we have to admit that our friend the farmer is hit the hardest, as every price increase is then built up into the costs of materials and services he must have in order to operate.

Under The Trade Union Act, a union that truly represents a majority in a particular unit can insist that the employer deduct union dues from a worker's wages. By the same token it appears to me that the employee should have a say in his union. Now, Mr. Speaker, I would like to see a union call for a secret ballot on which at least 75 per cent of the members would have to vote before any strike action can be called, also with a cooling-off period of a certain length of time. Unless this is done both the union and the individual strikers could be sued for damages by the employer or anyone else who is legally inconvenienced by said strike. Both the companies and the unions must stop saying that they want more light on the subject, because there is ample light to reveal the nature of the problem, and the solution that should be applied. It would also create a better picture of justice if the charges laid during a strike, were not dropped as soon as the strike ended. It should be up to the courts of our land to decide if a crime has been committed, if the accused is guilty and to assess the proper penalty. By so doing, it would increase the usefulness of our courts and would certainly discourage any intimidation and violence.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to emphasize that keeping the peace in labor relations is a two-way proposition. Employers and unions have a conscious choice in the kind of relationship they wish to have. The management should have a positive acceptance of the union by collective bargaining while yet running the business profitably. The union leaders on the other hand should not police the company, but should act as a protest organization and yet remain partners of management. Unions that are strong, responsible and democratic, understand and realize that the job interests of their members depend upon the economic success of the business, with which they are presently associated. This is what unions and strikes were intended to be and, Mr. Speaker, I am wondering if this is what our Socialist friends are presently doing. Is their warm shoulder towards labor unions a step towards solving present day problems, or is it a dying person's last hope and attempt to get back into the driver's seat? Is it that at last our Socialists are becoming honest and are now endeavoring to show their true colors, to socialize the farmer and let the labor unions run the country with the same philosophies that are being used when strikes are engineered and promoted. I believe, Mr. Speaker, the farmers of this province will have no part of such a policy.

Mr. Speaker, with great pleasure I will support the main

motion and vote against the amendment.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Hon. J. R. Barrie (Minister of Natural Resources):** — Mr. Speaker, in rising to take part in this debate, I hasten to congratulate the Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Steuart) on the Budget he presented to this House last week. I also wish to compliment him on his usual capable presentation. The Budget has been aptly described as a responsible one. I couldn't describe it better.

During this period of inflationary trends and extremely high interest rates, I believe the policies adopted by the Treasurer for the coming fiscal year are desirable and commendable. To have produced a balanced Budget without any significant tax increases indicates the competency of our Treasurer. It is evident that he is well qualified for his present important position.

Despite their lengthy and usual loud outcries, I am certain the Opposition speakers have not impressed and will not impress anyone except possibly themselves. This is a good Budget. The public recognizes it as such and my friends of the Opposition know it is too. I don't envy them the task they consider they must perform in criticizing everything and anything emanating from this side of the Chamber, even a good Budget.

I am not convinced that they are advocates of more and higher taxes, borrowing money at current high interest rates, nor deficit financing. Yet, Mr. Speaker, to implement their suggestions and to be able to satisfy even part of their criticisms, the Treasurer would have to resort to one or a combination of all these methods, to provide the huge sums necessary. Again, I say, the general public know and the Members opposite know that the financial program proposed by the Treasurer in the Budget is the proper and responsible one at this time.

Mr. Speaker, due to health problems during the 1968 session of this Legislature, I was not able to participate in the debates. Hence this is the first session and first occasion I have had to speak since my election in 1967.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Barrie:** — I therefore, wish to take this opportunity, Mr. Speaker, to thank those both in the House and outside, who rendered their assistance, co-operation and consideration during my illness of a year ago. I sincerely appreciate the many kindnesses extended to me at that time.

During the eight-year period I had the honor and pleasure of representing the Pelly Constituency in this Legislature,

**February 25, 1969**

from 1956 to 1964, I became acquainted with many of those who are still Members in this House. Of course, now on both sides there are a number of new faces and I hope I shall have the opportunity of becoming better acquainted with them as time progresses.

Mr. Speaker, now I propose to deal briefly with a few items directly associated with the Department of Natural Resources. During the year past, production of forest products was dramatically up from previous years. 1968 production will be among the highest recorded in the province. Members of our staff have been busily occupied in pulpwood and saw timber cruising as well as performing such duties as logging inspection to assure conservation, and good logging operation practices are being observed by the operators in our forests.

During the past year our two nurseries at Big River and Prince Albert produced 17 million seedlings and transplants. In Northern Saskatchewan 440,000 plantings took place and 330,000 in southern locations. The perpetuation of our forest resource is our constant concern.

The past summer was a bad fire season, particularly in the early part. We fought 328 forest fires last season and over 340,000 acres were burned over. Cost of forest fire suppression exceeded \$1.5 million. With the abundant moisture received last fall and heavy snow fall this winter, we are hoping for a light fire season this coming summer.

Production of pulpwood for the Prince Albert Pulp Mill, of course, accounted for much of our 1968 forest production increase. This mill will utilize more than 500,000 cords of pulpwood annually in the production of bleached kraft pulp. I hope all Members in this House have had an opportunity to visit and inspect this large plant. It is one of the most up-to-date pulp mills in operation anywhere.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Barrie:** — From the wood obtained in our forest area, a very high grade of pulp is produced, which is in demand on the world markets. There is no question but that this large development, representing an investment in excess of \$65 million, will be a successful project. If not now, in the future this venture will be recognized as one of the real achievements of this Government. The effect on employment possibilities in the northern part of our province is already noticeable and the benefits will increase as time passes. This is especially true when related to our citizens of Indian origin. It has had, and will have, a beneficial effect on the economy of Northern Saskatchewan.

I have been rather amazed at some of the disparaging remarks made by some of my friends across the way in regard to this industry. It would appear they are hopeful it will fail.

All I can say in this regard is that it appears to me to follow the line of the old fable of Sour Grapes as far as they are concerned and indicates their wishful thinking.

I recall over the years hearing great forecasts from the former CCF Government regarding the establishment of a pulp mill in Saskatchewan. This usually occurred shortly before general elections. Unfortunately it never materialized during their term of office, and little wonder with the philosophies and Socialist theories regarding private enterprise they consistently expounded in those years, and still do.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Barrie:** — At long last we in Saskatchewan have a pulp mill to utilize forest products which were going to waste for many years and costing the taxpayer annually substantial sums to protect from fire and disease with little or no return. Future demand and prices for pulp are of interest to not only the pulp producers, but also to the Government. These two features determine the extent of production and the success and prosperity of the pulp industry. It appears we need have no concern in this connection. The future demand seems most favorable.

In an address by R.N. Fowler, President of the Canadian Pulp and Paper Association, delivered at the annual luncheon of the Association in Montreal on January 31st last, which is very recent, he stated prospects for pulp production and sales are much brighter for 1969 and for the future. He said for the first time in several years the increase in world demand for chemical pulp exceeds the increase in world production capacity. This means, of course, good markets and likely more favorable prices.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I wish to deal briefly with our parks and recreation in the province. Almost two million people visited our major Provincial parks during the past season, as compared to slightly over one million in 1964. There was also a decided increase in use of our camp grounds and recreation sites, particularly in the northern forest areas. A great portion of this interest can be attributed to improved roads and camp facilities, which have received top priority by the Department. Camping permits issued within Provincial parks increased from 10,000 in 1964 to 26,000 in 1968. Camping permits issued at the four Trans-Canada highway camp grounds increased by 21 per cent per year from 1964 to 1968.

General park revenues have more than doubled in the past four years. Capital expenditure has risen likewise during the same period. Park improvement capital expenditures for the five-year period prior to 1964 amounted to slightly over \$3 million. Since 1964 and up to date over \$8 million have been spent on capital improvements. From this record, Mr. Speaker, the Government certainly cannot be accused of any neglect of

**February 25, 1969**

outdoor recreation facilities.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Barrie:** — Supplementing our parks and recreation areas, our highway camp and picnic grounds program provides rest stops and overnight camping facilities for highway travellers and tourists. There are 120 such sites scattered across the province. They range in development from sites with such amenities as showers, laundries, running water, modern rest rooms and electrified sites to simple rest stops providing only picnic tables, a drinking water supply and modest rest rooms. Twenty-three new sites have been added and developed in recent years. The addition of two more in 1969 will probably bring this program to a close, for the time being at least.

Mr. Speaker, I believe it will be of interest to the Members of the House to quote a few of the comments received from park and camp ground users during the last season. One stated:

The best Provincial park in Alberta, Saskatchewan, Manitoba, Ontario and Quebec. We plan on stopping here every trip, possibly one week next year.

Another is:

Three years travel coast to coast. This park still tops. Puts Ontario and British Columbia to shame.

Another is:

We are over 2,000 miles from home and this is the nicest park we have been in.

Another comment:

The best laid-out park, the neatest, the best kept of anything we have yet seen which includes British Columbia, Alberta, Washington, Idaho, Montana and Wyoming.

The final comment was:

Provincial parks across Canada should use your parks as examples.

Such comments are very gratifying and point out the high standard of planning and maintenance carried out by our staff members.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Barrie:** — There are three new park and recreation areas

receiving special development attention by the Department of Natural Resources. One is Lake Diefenbaker, where approximately 40,000 acres have been set aside for public enjoyment. This area has three Provincial parks under development. There are eight lake access points, which are boat launching ramps, already constructed. Three cottage sub-divisions are under development. In this area 1,300,000 trees have been planted in the last 2 ½ years.

Blackstrap Reservoir provides a major recreation site currently under development. This should prove of real benefit to citizens in the Saskatoon area. Camping and picnic facilities will be provided here together with several cottage subdivisions.

As a result of improved access roads, expanded new camp facilities, and the opening of new areas of high recreation attraction, patronage of our Provincial forest areas has shown a marked increase. In the Candle Lake area for one example, usage has more than doubled in the past four years.

In recent years, emphasis has been given to providing an adequate supply of good drinking water in parks and at recreation sites. For this purpose 138 new wells have been developed. Water distribution and sewage systems have been installed in three Provincial parks and at two Trans-Canada highway camp grounds. This program will be proceeded with until all our major parks and major camp grounds have the benefit of these services.

Now I wish to mention, Mr. Speaker, our Regional Parks Program briefly. This is a program in which the Provincial Government, local governments and citizens are involved in joint development. They are designed chiefly to serve local citizens within a radius of 25 to 35 miles. There are 70 of these parks in operation in the province, 40 of which have been established since 1964. They involve the participation of over 300 municipal governments of all levels, representing over 300,000 people all contributing their share toward 40 per cent of cost assumed by the municipal participants. Capital assets in the 70 regional parks are estimated in excess of \$2.5 million. Records indicate over 600,000 people made use of these park facilities in the past season. The involvement of local people creates keen interest in the development and protection of regional park properties and assures success of this program. It is a cost-sharing park program unique to the Province of Saskatchewan and is not practised elsewhere in Canada. In my opinion, this is one of our finest programs.

It has been decided that we have arrived at the point where we must pause and assess what has been achieved in park and recreational development, and survey, study and plan for future expansion of facilities. We must also endeavor to determine the need, the proper locations and extent of new development which will be required in the future.

**February 25, 1969**

Periodically, such studies and assessments are essential for adequate planning, if the funds available for this purpose are to be utilized in the best advantage. The first step in this study is underway. It will provide a province-wide inventory of recreation facilities, and is scheduled for completion in the latter part of the current year.

A modest development and expansion program will proceed during 1969. It will not be as extensive as during the past four years. Once our future requirements are determined by the studies under way, I anticipate increased activity in capital projects related to our recreation and park areas.

Mr. Speaker, for the next few minutes I propose to deal briefly with the problems confronting our native people, the registered Indians and Metis. We in Saskatchewan are not alone with such problems but we do seem to have a large proportion of them. This is credited to the fact that we have in excess of 70,000 people of Indian ancestry here. The Government fully realizes the difficulties experienced by a large number of these citizens and the low standard of living most of them have to accept. These are not new problems, Mr. Speaker, they have been with us for a long time. No one is more concerned and sympathetic to this situation than the Premier of this Province (Mr. Thatcher). The Government, led by him can rightly claim to have achieved more, initiated more programs and been more active in attempting to provide solutions than any other Provincial Government in Canada heretofore.

The early establishment of a Department of this Government to deal exclusively with our native people indicates the search for solutions, and the rendering of assistance in various fields and will continue to receive top priority. Education, technical and vocational training, assistance for these citizens, will be expanded and intensified without delay. Only by providing such assistance to the younger people of Indian ancestry can we hope to achieve the results so desirable. Currently there are close to 1,000 native students attending special courses in various parts of the province. They are being trained as surveyors, barbers, heavy equipment operators, welders, skilled construction workers, mechanics, dental nurses and X-ray technicians, as well as in a number of other vocations.

Some of these people are undergoing training in various branches of the Government and Crown corporations, in the mines, in the forests, in offices and hospitals, and generally throughout much of the economy of the province. Most of these citizens would not have had this opportunity for training and subsequently gainful employment but for the action of the Government in providing these benefits.

During the past year the Indian and Metis Branch placed over 1,400 native people in all types of jobs and positions, many of them in the Public Service. In the majority of cases, these new employees have done extremely well. The records of



the Public Service indicate that the job stability and achievements of these new recruits compare favorably with those of other national origins entering the Government service. The job placement results have been impressive and encouraging.

Last August the Premier established the Task Force on Indian and Metis Opportunity. The interest shown by every sector of our society was amazing and most gratifying. The Task Force has been an outstanding success. Its activity has made a real impact on the general public and in particular, on prospective employers in business, industry and local government. The five committees of the Task Force have each accomplished a great deal, and all have done a remarkably good job in their respective field of activity. With co-operation and support from the native people, which is essential, we can look forward with optimism to the future and to the availability of many more opportunities and a better living standard for these native citizens than ever before.

The Government, by adopting a realistic approach to this problem, has made significant progress and produced significant results. However, there is no reason for complacency. In order to secure a positive advantage in this regard for all concerned, continuous and consistent effort and expansion will have to be employed for extended periods of time.

The majority of native people recognize and appreciate the genuine interest this Government has taken in them. They, the recipients, are in the best position to assess the degree of achievement obtained during a relatively short period of activity. Their response to and comments on the program are most favorable, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, the Pelly constituency which I have the honor to represent is chiefly an agricultural one, with fine farmsteads and the best of soil. Wheat and coarse grains are the chief field crops and livestock production is an important item. Some of the finest cattle and hogs in the province are raised and marketed from this area. Diversified farm production has been a benefit particularly in years such as last season when large quantities of tough and damp grain resulted from poor harvest weather.

This matter of damp grain is a serious problem. There is no question about the difficulties it has caused many of our people. Much as been said about it in recent weeks both inside and outside this House. It appears certain that individuals and groups have chosen to attempt to make use of this unfortunate situation for purely political purposes.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Barrie:** — In my opinion they have grossly exaggerated the facts in many instances. Also they claim tremendous losses are

inevitable. These same people, of course, try to imply that the fault for delay in drying grain is wholly that of the Governments, Federal and Provincial. From the record of the interests and activity of our Provincial Government and our Provincial Minister of Agriculture (Mr. McFarlane) from the outset, it is evident that this type of criticism and condemnation is certainly not based on fact.

A large portion of the constituency I represent was affected by wet harvest weather resulting in as large a volume of damp grain as possibly in any other area in the province, and much more than some. Due to the resourcefulness of our farm people, large quantities of grain were dried early in the season and drying has been progressing throughout the winter. It is true, quite true, that some of the farmers in my area lacked ready cash to pay for the drying. However, these very people, when assured of interest-free cash advances being provided by the Federal Government, are generally satisfied that this immediate problem of cash has been resolved for them. From the information I have gathered, this provision has met the general need in this area. Most farm people have pride and are realistic enough to know that no one receives anything for nothing. They were not clamoring for a hand-out, as so many vociferous critics have been doing recently.

I have lived in this province most of my life and have been always closely associated with farm people. Over the years, particularly in the area I represent, farmers have been confronted with many problems and difficulties, frost damage, rust, hail, drought, and in some years an over-abundance of moisture, low prices for their production, quotas, storage problems, along with others. I have noted that irrespective of the problems confronting him from time to time, the farmer, with his characteristic resourcefulness, industry and sound judgment, has persevered and chiefly by his own initiative he has overcome these problems, come what may. The damp grain problem is just another unfortunate circumstance the farmer has to deal with. Those who have been and are critical, spreading gloom and doom, do the farm people an injustice. They fail to give them credit for what they accomplished in the past, even under more serious conditions than at the present time. Personally I question if there will be any substantial spoilage of grain, come early summer. I still have faith in the ability of our farm people to cope with the problem so that such losses shall not occur.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Barrie:** — Of course I readily admit that the most serious and important problem affecting our farmers and rural economy is the inability to dispose of the grain produced and currently in storage on the farms. If the grain disposal problem can be solved, and I hope it will, then all other problems affecting our farm people will be very minor indeed compared to this one.

At this time I wish to voice my appreciation for the support I received from the good people of the Pelly constituency who once again in 1967 elected me as their representative.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Barrie:** — Also, I know they fully appreciate the honor bestowed on the constituency and myself with my appointment to the cabinet a little over a year ago. It is 25 years since the Pelly constituency was honored by being represented by a Cabinet Minister, when the late Hon. R. J. M. Parker held the position of Minister of Municipal Affairs in the Government of that era.

For many years, Pelly constituency was sorely neglected by the former Socialist Government, particularly as concerning highway construction. Currently, thanks to the Minister of Highways (Mr. Grant) and (Mr. Boldt) since 1964 we have in this constituency dust-free, oiled and paved highways throughout the constituency. Our towns and villages, with the exception of one or two, enjoy the benefits of natural gas service, water and sewer systems and paved main streets.

Our rural municipalities have benefited from substantially increased equalization grants. The assistance received by the rural municipalities in the construction, gravelling and maintenance of grid roads has been most beneficial, as indicated by the decided improvement in our municipal roads within the constituency in recent years. Marked improvement and progress by both urban and rural municipalities since 1964 is quite evident.

Appreciation of the Liberal Government's consideration and assistance in their first three and one-half year term of office, as compared to that of the former Socialist Government, and endorsement of the Liberal Government was amply expressed by the people of the Pelly constituency in electing me to represent them in this House in the last election.

Pelly constituency is one of the most attractive areas in the province. With its rivers, the Assiniboine and Swan, numerous lakes and beautiful countryside it can well claim the generally accepted title of The Garden of Saskatchewan. The population is very cosmopolitan. Those of Ukrainian and Russian ancestry predominate but many other groups of varying national origins are represented. Native Indian population on three sizeable Indian reservations add to those of many national and racial origins. I am happy to say they are all Canadians working and mingling together in harmony.

Mr. Speaker, because the 1969-70 Budget provides for so many worthwhile programs during the coming year, and because I am satisfied it is an honest endeavor to provide our citizens with realistic and efficient use of the tax dollar, I shall oppose the amendment and support the Budget.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. M. Kwasnica (Cutknife):** — Mr. Speaker, last year when I listened to the Provincial Treasurer present his Budget I was dumbfounded by the vast array of depressive taxes heaped upon the Saskatchewan people. On Tuesday last, when I listened to him again, I was dumbfounded by the absolute lack of new policies and programs and by the curtailment of others. I had expected to see some real action from the revenues of the oppressive taxation of last year's Budget, some \$35 million worth of new taxes. But instead the Budget of 1969 is a hold-the-line cut-services Budget and the people of Saskatchewan must be deeply concerned that this Government can so boldly provide so little with the huge sum extracted in the last year.

Does this Budget provide some assistance to the old age pensioners or for all the people of Saskatchewan in the form of a drug plan? No. Does it provide some help for the farmer? Very little. Or the businessman who has extended his credit to the limit? Does it provide anything for new jobs especially for the university students? No. Instead it cuts capital building expenditures. Does this Budget provide some relief from the increasing cost of living? Of course not. This Liberal Government never had any intention of implementing any of the findings of the Batten Royal Commission on Consumer Prices.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Kwasnica:** — Turning to education, Mr. Speaker, we find that the Government boasts education expenditures for the coming year will be \$10 million more than last year. But, Mr. Speaker, this increase is \$9.1 million less than the increase was last year and at a time when demands for university expansion and classroom space are so definitely needed. This is a disgraceful allotment for education indeed. The Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Stuart) needs to check his arithmetic too, Mr. Speaker, I am sorry he is not in his seat. In last year's Budget on page 23, he said and I quote:

We propose to increase operating grants to schools by \$2.7 million, a total of \$60.3 million.

And in this year's Budget Speech on page 19 he said, and I quote:

Operating grants will account for \$61.3 million, up \$4.4 million or 7.7 per cent over the current year's estimate.

Now, Mr. Speaker, if grants totalled \$60.3 million last year and totalled \$62.3 million for this year, that makes an increase of \$2 million in my books, not \$4.4 million as the Provincial Treasurer said. All I can say it is no wonder he has only got a majority of approximately 100 votes in his riding and with that kind of mathematical ability he should be downed by at least

that many votes next time around.

This \$2 million increase in operating grants will never even begin to cover the rising costs of education. Even a 4 per cent increase in teachers' salaries would cost boards about \$3 million. And this makes no provision for back pay or no provision for more teachers. This is the smallest increase percentage-wise in at least 15 years. What will this mean? Well it is simple, school boards will be faced with another crucial financial year. By holding the line on operating grants this Government will force school boards to increase mill rates again, as they have had to do quite regularly since this Liberal Government took office in 1964.

In the Kinistino unit, for example, rural mill rates did not increase for eight years from 1955 to 1963. Then when the Liberals took office, mill rates jumped from 31 to 40, nine mill increase in four years. In the Yorkton School Unit, mill rates for urban centres jumped from 39 to 49 mills between 1965 and 1968, up 10 mills in three years. And the trend is the same in all units across the province. Ask any unit secretary, he will tell you. In 1967 local ratepayers across the province paid some \$65.7 million in local taxes. That's almost \$70 for every man, woman and child in Saskatchewan for local school taxes. Add to this the most recent announcement to curtail the 25 per cent grant paid to school boards for the purchase of school buses.

For the coming year, no doubt, mill rates will skyrocket again. The Saskatoon Public School Board has suggested that a 6.48 mill rate boost is necessary to keep abreast of the needs of the education in that city. But since this Government has demanded its hold-the-line memorandum, that city is now faced with paring its services and delaying its kindergarten classrooms, reducing its staff by about 11 while expecting a 450 pupil increase. This means only one thing, pushing the pupil-teacher ratio to about 5 to 1. And a similar situation, Mr. Speaker, is building up in many centres across the province, Lloydminster, Prince Albert, North Battleford and others.

What can you expect, Mr. Speaker, from a Minister of Education (Mr. McIsaac) who has little or no understanding of the term "quality education"? What can you expect of a Minister who has the philosophy, "Save a buck, quality in education is of no significance for the people of Saskatchewan?" What can you expect of a Minister of Education whose knowledge of the classroom and the needs of teachers and students is practically nil? And what else can the people of Saskatchewan expect from a Minister who, when speaking to the Saskatchewan School Trustees Association last November, said that increasing the teacher-pupil ratio by one, just one, would result in a net saving of \$3½ million? This reminds us of the big corporations and their assembly lines, Mr. Speaker. When employees in a car factory get a raise in wages, we are told that the assembly line is speeded up just one more notch. And so our

misguided Minister of Education is using a big business approach to education in our province. Pack those classrooms so that no real meaningful exchange of ideas can be encouraged. Stifle initiative and creativity in students. Treat them like robots, since teachers in large schools can never really get to know many students on a personal basis with large classes. Pack those classes so that teachers are forced to rule with an iron hand. Mr. Speaker, assembly line production may be fine for huge corporations but it has no place in our modern schools in Saskatchewan today. It is unfair. It is degrading. It does not produce quality education. It is almost inhuman. But what can you expect from a Liberal Government whose election coffers are filled with finances from huge corporations? But I didn't think this would rule their philosophy of education, Mr. Speaker. And this is what is happening in Saskatchewan schools today because of the Minister's complete ignorance of the needs of education.

**Mr. McIsaac:** — What's the ratio?

**Mr. Kwasnica:** — In short, Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Education is trying to portray himself as the constant guardian of educational spending while doing irreparable harm to education in our province.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Kwasnica:** — I would like to turn for a minute, Mr. Speaker, to teachers' salaries. This Government by its meagre grants to schools puts the pressure on school boards to hold the line on salaries. And so the fight is on again between teachers and school boards. This is a frustrating exercise, Mr. Speaker, but a calculated plan by this anti-education Liberal Government to drive a deeper wedge between teachers and boards, and teachers and the general public. Why doesn't the Government see the narrowness of its policies? It may get teachers to accept meagre salary increases, by pressure, but when May 25 rolls along, that's resignation day, teachers will be leaving by the hundreds, something that the Government opposite doesn't worry about, at least not by the remarks made in the previous debate by Government Members, in spite of the fact that some 500 teachers left Saskatchewan last year and that's a total of 4.3 per cent of the total teaching force. That's the highest exodus since the '30s. No wonder teachers are leaving when one looks at the salary scales in neighboring provinces and I would like to look at some with you.

The median starting salary for class 1 teacher in Saskatchewan's school units is \$3,650 — and I choose the units because they are higher than the cities — \$3,650. Alberta pays \$360 more for that same teacher; Manitoba pays \$700 more and British Columbia pays \$1,500 more for that same class 1 teacher.

Let's take a look at a class 11 teacher. He gets a yearly median starting salary in Saskatchewan of \$4,200. Alberta pays \$500 more; Manitoba \$700 more and British Columbia, \$1,575 more. If the Hon. Minister of Education (Mr. McIsaac) and his Government are too naïve to see the implications of these statistics, then Saskatchewan is in a sad state indeed. If the Hon. Minister also thinks that his compulsory area bargaining is an asset to the whole matter, he should reconsider seriously. Instead, he sits in this Legislature very smugly with a know-it-all smirk on his face — you can see it every day. He refused to accept my amendment last year which would have allowed the negotiation of items other than salary grid at the area level. This amendment would have removed the number one stumbling block to date and made area bargaining workable, assisting friendly negotiations between teachers and boards.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Kwasnica:** — And this Minister goes around about his constituency saying, “I am not a Thatcher man, so take it easy on me.” If he is not a Thatcher man, what is he doing in the Liberal party? He stood up and voted for deterrent fees. He brought in compulsory area bargaining. He has been short-changing education ever since he took the Education portfolio, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, the people of Wilkie constituency must do all of Saskatchewan a tremendous favor next election. They must defeat this anti-education Minister at the polls and send a New Democrat to Regina.

**Mr. Heald:** — Why don't you run against him?

**Mr. Kwasnica:** — The ratepayers of Saskatchewan will be grateful. The teachers of Saskatchewan will be delighted. The students at all levels at the University will be grateful. And even the cows in Wilkie constituency will be more contented because then Mr. McIsaac could return to his veterinary practice in Unity and look after their needs there.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Heald:** — You run against him.

**Mr. Kwasnica:** — Mr. Speaker, one of the more glaring examples of neglect and short-changing in education and of a callous disregard for the needs of education can best be taken from the Kerrobert unit and the town of Macklin in the Minister's own constituency. And I know Macklin because I taught there some time ago. In this unit, little or no provision has been made for anything but an academic education and even that has been a disgraceful effort. There were 12 unqualified and five under-qualified teachers in this unit last year. And Macklin has

**February 25, 1969**

about 26 per cent of the student population in the unit. There is no place for the high school students to study except on lavatory and shower room floors which they frequently do. The present grade three room and the home economics room were condemned four years ago. Two additional old school houses were moved into Macklin to make a total of five old fire-traps to act as temporary classrooms for junior high school students. In January of 1968 students at the junior high level did not attend school for 3½ days because working conditions were intolerable. This winter they have already lost five days. The floor temperature of their outdoor classrooms was measured at 45 degrees while their heads swam in stifling hot air. None of these classrooms have been fire inspected; none have a second exit, and none have an outside porch. Mr. Speaker, welcome to the New Saskatchewan!

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Kwasnica:** — And all of this is a direct result of the present policies pursued by the present Minister of Education. Do we want more of this? Well, I am afraid there is little choice for the people of Macklin until 1971, the next Provincial election at least.

**An Hon. Member:** — Homecoming.

**Mr. Kwasnica:** — Homecoming 1971.

**Hon. A. R. Guy (Minister of Public Works):** — 1973.

**Mr. Kwasnica:** — Then of course there is that little bit of political patronage that teachers across the province often call “Keeseey capers.” Many teachers across the province are concerned that the man hired for teacher recruitment in Britain did not have the necessary background or qualifications for the job. This position I suggest was given solely on a political patronage basis with two main qualifications: 1. He was a personal friend of the Minister’s; 2. He was past president of the Wilkie Liberal Association.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Kwasnica:** — And I would like to suggest, Mr. Speaker, that this shows that the Minister was unable to find one single teacher friend among the 12,000 in the province that he could hire for this job.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Kwasnica:** — Mr. Speaker, turning to the University for a



minute, we find the situation there quite revealing when we examine the record of this Government. According to the Dominion Bureau of Statistics figures, Saskatchewan ranks third in Canada in per capita personal income, but seventh in Canada in per capita spending for university operating costs in the year 1967-68. Also under the guidance of our present Minister of Education (Mr. McIsaac) that same year, our province ranked eighth in the country in per capita expenditures for all education. Is this a record to be proud of, Mr. Speaker?

In the last year, 1968, the Dominion Bureau of Statistics also point out that, while Saskatchewan is sixth in Canada in the proportion of the Provincial Budget devoted to all education and tied for fourth place in the nation in proportion devoted to university education, it is first in the nation in the proportion of the Budget it devotes to highways and communications. Let's just review that record, Mr. Speaker. Third in Canada in per capita income, that is good; seventh in Canada in per capita spending for university operating grants; eighth, that's second from the bottom, in Canada in per capita spending for all education. But first in highway spending. It is obvious that this Government is against quality education.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Kwasnica:** — Mr. Speaker, judging this Budget in the light of today's educational needs, it has failed miserably; it has failed our teachers, it has failed our school boards, it has failed our ratepayers because taxes will go up again.

Mr. Speaker, I cannot in the best interests of education support this Budget, but I will support the amendment as moved by my colleague for Regina Centre (Mr. Blakeney).

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. E. Whelan (Regina North West):** — Mr. Speaker, in rising to speak in the Budget Debate, my first reference must be to the citizens of Regina North West whom I am proud to represent in this Legislature. It is an honor which I accept with the utmost humility. The constituency is a progressive part of Regina made up of working people, senior citizens, young executives and farmers who live in Regina and farm north and west of the city.

Mr. Speaker, when we begin to assess the value of this Budget, perhaps the first question we must ask is: what does the Budget do for the vast majority of the people of our province? Can we find out by asking some more questions, Mr. Speaker? For instance, does this help the unemployed construction worker? There are hundreds of them in Regina City without work, skilled tradesmen, laborers, machine operators, people who have the know-how, people who are idle, because of lack of leadership on the part of the Government. For them, this Budget

**February 25, 1969**

holds forth no promise. The Saskatchewan Construction Association held its annual meeting in Regina. The Leader Post, February 15, 1969, on page 5 ran a story under the heading: "Regina construction outlook said dim." I quote from that story:

The outgoing president of the Saskatchewan Construction Association said Friday it appears that the physical volume of construction in Saskatchewan in 1968 will be about \$30 million less than 1967.

And he continued:

John Lord said the Regina area was probably most severely affected by cutbacks in spending. Only half as many projects were tendered in Regina in 1968 as in 1967. The 1968 Regina building permits, excluding residential construction, showed a decrease of about \$6 million and 'the prospects for 1969 seem to be less encouraging.' He said he believed the industry was worthy of specific representation at cabinet level of the Provincial Government. Possibly a cabinet committee could be appointed to deal with the industry's over-all problems of growth, efficiency and welfare and to assist in planning.

Mr. Speaker, they are looking to the Provincial Government for assistance. Mr. Speaker, this Government, these hesitators, this group fumbling for leadership have cut back on their own expenditures, giving no leadership, no incentive to others. There is nothing in this Budget that suggests that they now or in the foreseeable future are able to supply any significant portion of the 80,000 jobs they promised the people of this province in 1964.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Whelan:** — A good Budget, they say, but the construction worker in my constituency, the unemployed citizen who lives in Regina, those on fixed incomes, those who look to the Government for assistance in order to survive, in order to pay their taxes, in order to pay their electric light bill, they must look at this Budget with despair. They can be sure of only one thing. They can be sure there will be no 80,000 jobs. They can be sure there are no long-term plans for pumping life into the construction industry. There is no imagination here in this Budget and there is no leadership in this Budget. This Budget, Mr. Speaker, does nothing for the construction worker, nothing to offset unemployment, does nothing to solve the problem of those in the low-income bracket.

Mr. Speaker, another question. What does it do for senior citizens? Senior citizens who have given their lives working for our province and are justified in seeking assistance, must have looked hopefully to the day when this Budget would be brought down. If they are well off and pensioners, they get the

cost of living bonus. But if they are on assistance from this Government, they don't get it. If you are in a geriatric home, and if you are able to breathe, by every verbal method, this Government tries to transfer you from public care to a private home and place you there at the expense of your relatives. There is a shortage of space, they say. Time and again relatives of some person who has given most of his or her life to this province, who pioneered and built Saskatchewan, are being harassed verbally and the family is being persuaded — and I use the word 'persuaded' with quotation marks — to move them out of the geriatric centre into a private home or out of hospital into a private home where the charge is frequently fantastic. There is nothing in this Budget to end this harassment. Oh, they will deny it. But I have interviewed too many of these people. I have talked to them and they know full well the method that is used. Nothing in writing, verbal persuasion, until in desperation the family takes on the responsibility of looking after someone who has for a long time been the responsibility of this province, a responsibility, I suggest, the people of Saskatchewan gladly accept. Mr. Speaker, elderly people come to the city of Regina because it is a centre of population. They are bound to come to be with their sons and daughters. In 1964 when this Government was elected, it promised the city a 600-bed geriatric centre. Five years later it has not been built. Five years later, it is not even mentioned in the Budget. In five years, Mr. Speaker, no attempt is made to solve the problem it claimed existed when it made its promise in 1964. Instead, it goes on insisting that the relatives assume the financial responsibility of looking after their parents and grandparents. This Budget, because it fails to explain or provide for publicly-owned and operated geriatric centres, fails to satisfy a desperate need.

Mr. Speaker, the rising cost of living is all around us. Every day the price of something goes up. Every day consumer organizations point out that we are not getting our money's worth. Every day they say it is necessary to teach families how to manage their incomes, how to buy to combat the high cost of living. No one feels this more than the low-income and fixed-income groups. The high cost of living haunts them like a wild nightmare that is with them every waking minute. The high cost of living picks their pockets. The high cost of living caused by the profiteers tears great chunks out of their pay cheques and their pension cheques. The high cost of living denies children clothing and footwear, denies people insurance on their homes, forces taxes to go in arrears, because they must have money for food. But what does the Government opposite do about it? What is there in this Budget? Absolutely nothing. No money to be spent to protect the consumer, to put something in the school curriculum about handling purchasing power; not a word challenging the profiteers in the grocery business; no assistance to the harried people in the low-income group. The very opposite is true. They will pay more taxes on their homes this year. The Government is jumping on the band wagon of the high cost of living. It is in favor of high profits because, if

**February 25, 1969**

the cost of living goes up, up goes the revenue from its sales tax. Just look at its Estimates if you don't believe me. Up goes the cost of schools, so does the cost of everything else. The Government is going along for the ride, an enjoyable ride they say. The Liberals have not raised their voice on behalf of the people who suffer the most. The high cost of living is the No. 1 problem in this Province today. For citizens purchasing farm machinery, citizens purchasing food and clothing, there is nothing in the Budget. They can look at it, but they look at it with despair for sure.

Let's have a look at electricity. It took from Saskatchewan Power Corporation a fund of \$4 million. In many instances it was a difficult task to pay the electric light bill for the rural constituent who has little or no cash. In a time of desperate need, at a time when a few dollars would help him to pay for his grocery bill so he would not have to charge it, at a time when he could have used a discount, instead of giving him some relief by lowering the rates, the Government took the entire amount and dumped it in the general fund to make the Budget look good.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Whelan:** — Mr. Speaker, at whose expense? At the expense of the pensioner struggling to pay his electric light bill; at the expense of the low-income worker trying to pay for food and clothing for his children. They put up part of the \$4 million; at the expense of the farmer without cash who had to look to the local merchant and say to him, 'Please put it on the cuff.' He too put up part of the \$4 million. No concession to these citizens, it had to make the Budget look good. The Liberals have yelled so loud and so long about the Power Corporation, that the people should own it but this Budget certainly suggests that the people have nothing to say about it, about the way it is operated. On this issue alone this Government neither deserves the support nor is there a chance it will receive support when it comes time to go to the people to ask for it.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Whelan:** — Mr. Speaker, with so little judgment, with such complete failure to consider others, this Budget by the time it reaches the people of Kelvington will move the seat for Kelvington out of the washroom where it is and on to our side of the House where it belongs . . .

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Whelan:** — . . . if the Government opposite with all its whistling in the dark ever gets up enough courage to call the by-election.

Mr. Speaker, why is the economy slowing down? Why is Saskatchewan's economy feeling the strain? That is simple because a large segment of our population hasn't any money, because they can't ship their grain. They haven't any cash, therefore they haven't any cash to buy goods. They cannot even pay the expense of drying the grain they have. It is like dropping a pebble in the water and watching the ripples develop. Failure to sell the farmer's grain, failure to give some cash to farmers, means no money to dry grain that is damp, no money to purchase machinery. The machine dealer is in trouble, no money to purchase automobile parts. The automobile dealer is in trouble; no money to pay municipal taxes, so taxes go unpaid. This Budget, Mr. Speaker, should offer to the farmer, through a work-and-wages program in areas where it is needed, a chance to get some cash, and to earn some money. The time is speeding by, the hour is late, the opportunity to do so is almost gone. But there is no plan, no attempt is made to put some cash in his hands. The whole economy suffers along with the group that is suffering, the group in the greatest need. But the Budget talks about grants to industry. Rumor has it that the Government blows millions on industry. We really never hear about it, it never reports to us about those mysterious millions. But no cash for the farmers. He isn't really important apparently. This Budget fails to place cash in the hands of the people who need it most, it fails to place cash in the hands of the rural population of this province.

Mr. Speaker, the working man of the province will look at the Budget in vain. What does this Budget do for him? He will search for some place to find some help or some assistance. A department that looked after his interests, that helped him for 20 years, is being cut to a frazzle, is being reduced at the present time. If an employer owes money, if he fails to pay the entire amount due an employee, the department may write a letter. The employee may even go to court, but the employer may declare "Dixie" while the poor, unfortunate individual who actually works for nothing and therefore is a slave because the department fails to collect his wages.

The Workmen's Compensation Board, Mr. Speaker, in my estimation, has annoyed more working men in the past five years than it has helped. I recall even a Government Member telling me it was unfair. Through the years, compensation to people has not been high enough, but to sit quietly and refuse to review the compensation with the rising cost of living is hard-hearted and indifferent. In my constituency there is a man who was on a low wage for years and who lost an eye in 1953. The compensation he receives is \$27.40 a month. This is hard to believe. I raised this matter with the chairman of the Workmen's Compensation Board. I want to read his reply to the House and I read it in part:

It was necessary to employ his earnings in the 12 months prior to his accident in the computation of his award

**February 25, 1969**

which, of course, is not anywhere near today's standards, and provides the sum of \$27.40 monthly.

The Workmen's compensation (Accident Fund) Act as presently constituted, makes no provision for increases in the cost of living and, inasmuch as . . .

and I omit the man's name

. . . Mr . . . is receiving the maximum rating applicable for his vision loss, the Board is unfortunately without basis upon which to increase assistance to him.

Mr. Speaker, I want to know from every Member here what you would take for the loss of an eye if you were working as a laborer.

**Mr. Speaker:** — The Member I understand has read from a letter. I presume he is prepared to table it.

**Mr. Whelan:** — Mr. Speaker, I understand if you take full responsibility for a letter it is not necessary to table it.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Yes, the Member, if he chooses, can take full responsibility for what was in the letter. If there is a signature on the bottom and he wishes to do that, then the words which he has spoken in quotation will be the same as if they were made by himself.

**Mr. Whelan:** — Yes, I will take full responsibility and the signature on the letter is the chairman of the Board, J. Walter Erb.

**An Hon. Member:** — What's he doing there?

**Mr. Whelan:** — I want to know from every Member here what you would take for the loss of an eye if you were working as a laborer, a carpenter or a tradesman. The loss of an eye should be worth more than \$27.40, but this man's case is not going to be reviewed. Mr. Speaker, this is my complaint. I ask every Member of this House to put himself in this man's shoes. He lives in the country where he is working and loses an eye. He gets \$27.40 and they won't review it. This Budget does nothing to enhance the prestige, the security and the comfort of the working man, nothing whatsoever. True to their enunciations, true to the policies talked of and the often repeated phrases of Members opposite, this Government is not only anti-labor, but it is hard-hearted and different to the needs of others. One would have thought that in financial matters on the straits

in which this Government finds itself that it would have complained bitterly about the interest rates for money.

Mr. Speaker, in all of the palaver and all the loquacious nonsense, in all pages of rhetoric it calls the Budget, there is not one protest, not one line objecting to high interest rates. No one in their group would dare to say to the banks and mortgage companies: "Too much, too high. They can't pay it." Not a peep, not a sound, not a protest. In other words I guess they are in favor of it. On behalf of the people of this province if there was going to be a voice raised against the outrageous interest rates, it should have been raised here. And why wasn't it? Just look what it does to the price of housing. The Hellyer report recommends raising the maximum NHA loan to \$30,000 and extending the term of mortgages to 40 years. At the present going interest rate of approximately 10 per cent, a \$30,000 mortgage over 40 years when paid back in full will total \$120,000. In other words, at the end of 40 years the homeowner will have paid \$90,000 in interest: he pays for his mortgage four times over.

Members opposite would save the people of this province from decent citizens whom they label as waterfront gangsters, from the nephew of one of the Hon. Member's opposite whom they label as a Communist. They would save us from these people. I want to know from Members opposite who is going to save the people of Saskatchewan from these robber barons, these buccaneers, who charge 9½ and 10 per cent interest.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Whelan:** — Try a finance company. It is worse, it is higher, it is fantastic. But they don't even raise their voice. The reason they can't is because the Federal Liberals at Ottawa took the ceiling off the bank rate, when they amended The Bank Act. They know it and obviously they are in favor of it. They can't raise their voice at the banks and mortgage companies who are loaning money to build motels and apartment blocks, and they are loaning it at 12 per cent interest. Down at the end of the line who is paying 12 per cent, yes, and a lot more? The newly married couple who must have a place to live, the married couple who I hope will always remember the party that protected and promoted and aided and abetted the high interest rate barons.

You know, Mr. Speaker, in the Bible there is the story of the righteous wrath exhibited by the Lord when He chased the money changers out of the temple. I think it is about time the people of this country exhibited some righteous wrath. It is about time we upset the tables and it is about time the money changers were chased out.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Whelan:** — Mr. Speaker, nothing, not

**February 25, 1969**

a word is raised in this Budget. In my estimation Members opposite are prepared to lie down with the money changers. In my estimation, Mr. Speaker, it will be the people of this province who will exhibit their righteous wrath when an election comes, for the Government opposite does not represent the people. It does not represent those who are being exploited. I think the facts prove beyond the shadow of a doubt that this party opposite is a high interest rate party and it is a money changers party.

In summary, this Budget does nothing to solve the problems of the unemployed, of government administration for the working man, of assistance for senior citizens, does nothing to provide ready cash for the farmer. It does nothing to stop the rising cost of living which is the main threat to the economy which, affects all of us and particularly the low-income groups, and more than anything else, makes no attempt to stand up against the outrageous interest rates which confront those who want to build homes or enlarge small businesses.

Look at this Budget! One should ask the question: who does it represent? Who does it really represent? Those who have money to loan, those who make profits when the cost of living goes up, those who run private nursing homes, those who sell shoddy goods at exorbitant prices. Who does it take to task? Mr. Speaker, it takes to task the professional people, it criticizes the professional people involved in health and education. A Government which has allowed the price of highways to rise out of all reason and stands idly by without so much as raising a voice. It has a lot of nerve even if it has no judgement, to raise its voice against professional people. Here is a group which has watched the price of highways skyrocket. Here is a group whose priority is double-lane highways rather than technical education. I say, Mr. Speaker, it is these people who need to be lectured, whose judgement should be questioned, because it is the Government opposite which has allowed to run rampant the fantastic increase in the cost of highways.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Whelan:** — Now, Mr. Speaker, in this House each time the government of Regina is mentioned there is some raucous laughter from the benches opposite, and the loudest laughter comes from the Members from Saskatoon who sit on those benches. All I can say to them is that ignorance is bliss. They must be ignorant of the financial discrimination that is being worked against both cities. If one reviews the policies of the present Government, it is my feeling that Regina is hard done by. Regina taxpayers are even fortunate that their taxes are not 20 or 30 mills higher than they are. Of course, you could expect taxes in Saskatoon to be a bit lower if you can get along without a sewage disposal plant.

Mr. Speaker, if Saskatoon is so happy with their situation,



and if their Members are happy with the situation that exists regarding the Provincial allocation of funds, people from Regina are not.

In 1969-70, working from the Government's Estimates, Regina residents will pay over \$7 million in the gasoline tax. This amounts to \$50 per capita for all citizens of Regina. Based on the usual performance, they will get back about \$5 per capita, under Urban Assistance. The Government takes away \$50, it gives us back \$5 and then it has the nerve to criticize the city's mill rate. It has the nerve to criticize!

Citizens of Regina are asked to construct Provincial highways within the city limits, and they are asked to maintain the city streets that are part of the Provincial highway system. We readily admit that the bulk of the gasoline tax should go for Provincial highways, but we think that \$2.5 million of the money should be made available to the city for capital construction of streets, for maintenance of these streets. The Province contends that it pays 50 per cent of the cost of arterial roads. This is not so, because arterial roads are lighted and the Government pays no share for street lighting.

**Hon. L. P. Coderre (Minister of Labour):** — I'll run against you anytime.

**Mr. Whelan:** — I am going to run down in Gravelbourg. You said that you would resign if they shut the Hodgeville hospital and I expect you to resign if they close it. If you resign I am going to run down in Gravelbourg, that is what I am going to do.

Cities such as Prince Albert, because they are in a health region, receive grants as high as \$2.56 per capita for health services, while the cities of Saskatoon and Regina receive 75 cents per capita. Because its conscience was gnawing away at them, the Government has increased this amount to \$1 per capita, in spite of the fact that many of the duties that the City Health Department must carry out are specified in Provincial legislation. Because of this Government's new psychiatric program, the city's work includes psychiatric follow-up. A recent survey of 56 patients shows 34 of them were from outside the city. An Ontario study of this problem suggests that 50 per cent of municipal health budgets should be covered by a Provincial grant. Even this from a Conservative Government would raise our grant to \$1.40 per capita. When you compare \$1 with the rate for health services received by places like Prince Albert, \$1 is low and should be adjusted to meet the need.

Mr. Speaker, although the Province pays magistrates for the city of Regina, necessary staff for their work and facilities are provided by the city. In approximately one year the Province received \$70,000 in fines from the city of Regina. This sum is far in excess of the payment made by the Attorney General's

**February 25, 1969**

Department for services by the magistrates to the city of Regina. With the Attorney General's Department, this is a money-making proposition at the expense of the Regina taxpayers. That's exactly what it is.

The cost of police services in the city of Regina has become a larger portion of the city budget, rising from 10 per cent in 1962 to 11.6 per cent in 1968. Many of the functions performed by the city police department are in the best interests of the Provincial Government. We support the position that assist smaller centres with police services, but we also suggest there is full justification for adequate financial assistance for the police work done by the Regina Police Force.

**Hon. D. V. Heald (Attorney General):** — Why didn't you change . . .

**Mr. Whelan:** — Well, Mr. Speaker, they are in charge of the Government and leaders look ahead, you know. They have their heads and their eyes looking ahead. They don't look back all the time. I know that you people don't want to look ahead and I understand that. You are trying to put your heads in the sand all the time.

The cost of assessment in this province is a matter that certainly the four larger centres of over 15,000 should raise. At the present time the Department of Municipal Affairs is responsible for the assessment of all rural areas and all urban areas having a population of less than 15,000. Urban centres with a population over 15,000 can secure a grant of 35 cents per capita for reassessment. Reassessment in Regina would cost approximately \$250,000. This means that urban centres with a population in excess of 15,000 are put to the expense of paying \$1.40 per capita for reassessment. The other people don't pay it, but the people in the four large urban centres do. This is an expense that the four larger centres should not be asked to carry.

The Library Inquiry Committee in 1967 recommended that grants be increased annually beginning in 1968-69 until they reach a level of \$2 per capita. Mr. Speaker, the rate of 15 cents last year has been raised to 20 cents per capita. At an annual increase of 5 cents it is certainly going to take a good many annual increases to get the rate to the amount of \$2 per capita as recommended by their Royal Commission. It is going to take about 36 years. Regina citizens pay \$5 per capita to support their libraries. The Budget increased the grant by 5 cents. The Government ignored its own Library Committee.

Industry on the borders of the city of Regina is not within the city limits for tax purposes and yet the citizens of Regina provide them with services. This financial burden borne by the taxpayers of Regina goes unrecognized in this Budget and unrecognized by this Government. In other provinces unconditional

grants are made to combat this type of problem. Mr. Speaker, representations to the Provincial Government by the city of Regina have gone unheeded.

After looking at the money that this Province exacts from the city of Regina and after looking at the services the city of Regina has been asked to pay for and after looking at the Government's refusal to help to bear its fair share of the cost of educating our children, looking after the health needs, libraries, police protection, reassessment of property and street construction, one must conclude that the Mayor of the city and his civic administration know how to stretch a dollar.

Just look at education alone and the gap between operation costs and Government grants. In 1963 the gap was \$6.7 million. In 1967 it rose to \$11.2 million. The gap was wider in 1968 and it will be wider still in 1969. Under these circumstances could anyone wonder that there will be a mill rate increase in the city of Regina. When you look at the burden the taxpayers of Regina are carrying regarding the cost of education, the building of urban streets, health services, magistrates' services, police services, cost of reassessment, libraries and the services to industries outside city limits, why is it that any Member of the Government opposite could point at the administration of any city in this province and accuse it of wasting money.

The Government opposite never gives them the money they should receive. Its treatment of cities, and that includes the city of Saskatoon, it is not to be fair with them but to penalize them. It is unbelievable to me how the Hon. Members for Regina South West (Mr. McPherson) and Regina South (Mr. Grant) could sit on a platform and could run on a platform, and speak from a platform, talking about reducing taxes to homeowners and then vote for this Budget, that they could look at the amount allocated to education and then vote for this Budget,. Imagine voting for this Budget after what they have promised when they were elected! It is unbelievable, just fantastic!

Mr. Speaker, this Budget does not solve the problems of the day. It does not solve the farmer's problems. It does not solve the worker's problems. It does not solve the problems of the aged, the problems of the ratepayers, the problems of the farmer who is without cash. Mr. Speaker, I just cannot support the main motion and I must support the amendment.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Hon. L. P. Coderre (Minister of Labour):** — Mr. Speaker, in rising to speak on this debate I can assure you that this Budget delivered by the Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Steuart) the other day shows one of responsibility, a personal responsibility as Provincial Treasurer and a responsibility of the Government. I can assure you, Sir, that I will support the motion without hesitation and I will not

support the amendment.

It is customary at this time to congratulate the mover and the seconder and all those who have spoken thus far in the Debate. While we are on the subject matter of the Budget, I challenge the Members opposite to vote against it because it is a balanced Budget; the only province in Canada that has a balanced Budget. It is a responsible Budget, not a irresponsible promise like the guys across the way make.

I would like to throw a few challenges to my friends across the way, the preachers of gloom and doom That is what they preach. I will never let the Members opposite forget what happened when the Young NDP called for the farm nationalization in Moose Jaw, not one single Member across that floor, the capitalist Member like the Member for Kelsey (Mr. Messer) . . .

**Mr. W. Romanow (Saskatoon Riversdale):** — How do you know he is a capitalist?

**Mr. Coderre:** — . . . these farm Members, not one had the guts to get up and say that they will not nationalize the farms. That indicates, Mr. Speaker, that they believe in this.

**Mr. E. Kramer (The Battlefords):** — You boys are going to get rid of the Queen.

**Mr. Coderre:** — I suppose that our Socialist Members from Moose Jaw were at that convention and I suppose that they were the ones that promoted this resolution because the Hon. Member from Moose Jaw is a well known Socialist and did try to promote that, so that it was made to appear to come from the Young NDP forum. But what concerns me, what amuses me, is that not one, not one single farmer Member refuted or said that they would disassociate themselves with it.

And then the Hon. Member from Cut Knife (Mr. Kwasnica) said that we were not interested in education. Mr. Speaker, how stupid can a person be . . .

**Mr. M. Kwasnica (Cut Knife):** — Thank you very much.

**Mr. Coderre:** — . . . to make such a statement. Some of my children are in the gallery and I have some at home. Do you mean to say that I would stand here and let education go by the wayside? We are just as interested in education as you are, each and everyone of you. It takes a childish mind to make such a statement. And then, of course the Member from Regina North West (Mr. Whelan). You know he was misnamed when he was born. They called him Ed and they should have called him Clancy. You know the quotation from when Clancy lowers the boom, his preaching

of gloom. You know he hasn't done his homework. He was mentioning something about unemployment, something about business and everything else, but he hasn't read the Department of Labour Annual Reports. The lowest average unemployment rate anywhere in the North American continent, the lowest, lower than the United States. One small province, one small sector of the North American Continent with the lowest average unemployment rate.

Then he criticizes actions regarding the wet grain and what the farmers can't do. In my constituency I have enterprising farmers. Some of them have wet grain, probably not as much as in other places, but they are enterprising. They think for themselves. And what do they do? They will put a pipe into their grain bin, put in a blower and let it run for hours and it will dry the wheat with hardly any cost. Have you suggested that? No! You preach gloom.

Then the Hon. Member from Regina — the most audacious, I think the most brazen thing that any Member can do — writes letters to members of my staff and raises Cain. He hasn't got the courtesy to write to the Minister as a Member of the Legislature, tries to take it out on the staff.

The Department of Labour has a good staff and I am proud of them. You should be ashamed of yourself to write these types of letters to them. Imagine an MLA of this Legislature taking his ire out on employees, ordering them to take every step possible to collect, and if they cannot, they might as well shut up shop. Imagine an MLA of this Legislature writing to a staff member who is not responsible for the policies. Aren't you ashamed of yourself? You should bow your head in shame. You should apologize to this gentleman. The letter was written to the Department of Labour and any letter that comes addressed to the Department of Labour comes to my desk and then directed to a member of my staff. What a despicable thing to do.

I want to tell you something insofar as this type of labor legislation is concerned. Last year we made changes in the legislation that brought in the third party demand, something that should have been brought in 20 years ago. If you would do your homework and take The Labour Standards Act — which I don't want to discuss — there are still more provisions to assist greater and better in every respect. You had 20 years to do something about helping these poor people. You didn't do it. There are less uncollected wages now than ever in the history of this province and a heck of a lot less than when the CCF or Socialists were in power.

At this point, Mr. Speaker, I would like to say, of course, there have been many arguments given from across the floor against the Budget. They have been ably handled by this side of this House. I don't think there is very much need of rehashing the trivia that have emanated from that side of the

**February 25, 1969**

House.

To start with, Mr. Speaker, I would like to compliment my deputies of both Departments, that is Mr. Ron Parrot and Mr. Wilf Gardiner of the Department of Co-operation and the chairman of the Workmen's Compensation Board, for the good work that they are doing.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to take some time this afternoon to touch on the question of labor-management relations. This is a topic which is under pretty close scrutiny across Canada these days and rightly so. Canada is entering her second century as one of the leading industrial nations of the world. In this setting, the importance of harmonious labor-management relations can hardly be exaggerated. We are all aware that strikes can seriously weaken our economy. In this sense, the problems associated with labor-management friction affect the well-being of every citizen of this country. And I, Mr. Speaker, as Minister of Labour, will not stand idly by and see people, the working people, used as a pawn in a game between labor and management.

The growing incidence of strikes and lockouts in recent years is causing a great deal of concern in Canada and provides a significant indication of the sensitive state of labor relations today. The total number of man-working days lost in strikes in Canada in 1966 and 1967 was 9.2 million man days. You multiply that by about \$20 roughly average and probably much higher and you can well imagine the tremendous loss to the economy. This would provide many of the services that my good friends opposite so often say that are not being provided. This is greater than the combined total of the previous six years, Mr. Speaker. And time losses during the first nine months of 1968 exceeded the record during the same period of 1967 by 40 per cent.

It is quite true that the situation is not as serious in Saskatchewan as it is elsewhere. As a matter of fact, over the period of 1963 to 1967, average annual working time lost in Saskatchewan in strikes under our Provincial jurisdiction amounted to only 29 minutes per non-agricultural wage-earner. The corresponding loss for Canada as a whole was 362 minutes per wage worker, or 12 times greater than the Saskatchewan figure. However, every individual strike which takes place, regardless of its size, is wasteful and harmful to our economy. The employees involved and their families suffer a loss of income which seriously reduces their standard of living for as long as the strike lasts. It takes months and in some cases years before a pay increase which follows the strike makes up for this loss. The employer, of course, must forego his profits for the duration of the strike. To a growing extent, the public suffers inconvenience and even hardship. The economy as a whole suffers in terms of decreased production.

There are less obvious effects of labor-management disputes

as well. A strike very often generates bitterness between the parties involved which continues long after the dispute has been settled. Union members sometimes institute slowdown, work-to-rule policies, which result in the operation of the enterprise at half speed. As a result of the strains and tensions which exist, efficiency suffers. Staff morale is lowered. There are absenteeisms, tardiness and a high staff turnover. The employer and his employees come to regard each other as enemies rather than as partners working towards a common goal.

So much, Mr. Speaker, has been said about labor, about disputes, but I, as Minister of Labour, have naturally been very concerned about labor relations in this province and the causes of labor disputes. Having been involved indirectly or directly in about 350 disputes since assuming office, I now feel that I should express my thoughts on this matter in the bluntest of terms. A great many of these disputes and the actual strikes, which some of them have resulted in, have been caused by stupidity, ignorance, dishonesty, political manoeuvring and bungling, on the part of some individuals representing both labor unions and even management.

**Mr. R. H. Wooff (Turtleford):** — And Government.

**Mr. Coderre:** — You will notice, Mr. Speaker . . . I was going to give an answer there, Mr. Speaker, to that casual remark but I didn't think it was worth the time to even answer it.

You will notice, Mr. Speaker, that I have said individuals, and those to whom I refer comprise a very small fraction of the persons who represent labor unions and employers in this province. But it has now reached the point that I can anticipate where our disputes are going to crop up in advance, because in most cases they originate with one or more individuals that I have in mind.

The back-stabbing actions of these persons, Mr. Speaker, are hamstringing me as Minister of Labour in my attempts to further improve the industrial relations climate in Saskatchewan. They are making it extremely difficult for me and my staff to do an honest and effective job in promoting labor-management harmony. The Department of Labour should, by definition, be impartial and non-political, if the Department is going to do a good job in the area of industrial relations. I can state without reservation that the Department has an excellent staff for this purpose. They are highly skilled, competent and loyal and they do a first-class job in carrying on the functions of the Department. The effectiveness of their work is widely recognized. I have letters from both labor and management complimenting these individuals who do the relations in this area. Our Industrial Relations Officers travel all over the province on any day of the week, as required, under all kinds of roads and weather conditions, at all hours of the day or night, and I am not exaggerating. Indeed, I often think that

**February 25, 1969**

as many settlements are effected after midnight as before. The success of our voluntary conciliation program is demonstrated by the fact that of the total number of disputes in which conciliation is provided by the Department of Labour, for example, four out of five are settled before reaching the strike stage. The conciliation staff, the Deputy Minister and I are always willing to take whatever steps may be necessary to speed up and bring about settlements and resolve disputes. My door is open to management, to labor, to individuals at any time.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Coderre:** — But our efforts are severely hampered by the actions of the type of persons that I have mentioned.

Let's talk about some of these individuals, Mr. Speaker, and I am not bluffing. I know many of them and at this stage, let's talk about the employers and management representatives in this category. I tell you quite frankly that I wouldn't want to work for some of them. I am not the least bit surprised that they have labor difficulties. They run their business as modern-day tyrants and they attempt to operate in a manner which suggests that they want to be modern in 1969 but operate under 1869 conditions. These people are very good businessmen when it comes to the question of their dollars and cents in handling their business, but they are totally naïve and immature when it comes to the operation of a sound and stable labor-relations policy. It appears to me that their employees are mere chattels, faceless instruments of production from whom to derive the maximum amount of work. These employers would do well, Mr. Speaker, to consider the story of the great discovery which a chairman of the board of directors of a large corporation made known to his board of directors, and I quote:

Gentlemen, he said to his board, I have before me a report of the greatest significance. Some months ago we appropriated \$200,000 for a nation-wide survey to find out through hundreds of personal interviews the reply to the question which must be answered, if we are to survive and prosper, both as individuals and as a free enterprise. The question we wanted answered, the question we paid heavily to have solved, is: what makes this country tick? This question has been answered by the experts we hired. The answer is on this single sheet of paper, he said. It consists of one powerful word. The answer, and I warn you never to forget it, is PEOPLE.

It evidently simply doesn't occur to these employers that they will achieve more stability, a greater degree of permanency, and a more satisfactory return for their investment in the long run, if they ensure that they have the services of loyal, contented, long-service employees. I might add that I am not thinking only of employers who deal with unions. What is more, Mr. Speaker, the employers and managers within the group of



individuals I have made reference to, are sometimes — and I sometimes hate to use this word — two faced and sometimes less than honest in their dealings with me and my Department. They will come to my office in the midst of a labour crisis in their establishment and expect me to solve their difficulties at the snap of the finger. In my presence, or in the presence of the officials of the Department, they will agree to a certain procedure. Then they will go out and publicly repudiate what they have accepted. Or, if they do not get their own way completely in my office, oh, they will go to a personal acquaintance that they know, who is prominent in his community and have him put pressure on me to follow the policy of their liking. They will even approach some of my colleagues and attempt to persuade them to exert their influence in the matter in question. My colleagues have been very good in this regard but they have not exerted any pressure.

When it comes to the settlement of labor-management disputes, Mr. Speaker, I want to say this, that I don't give a damn about the politics of any individual groups. My responsibility to the people of Saskatchewan is to attempt, in a fair and impartial manner, to arrange for a speedy settlement which both parties will accept, which will permit the employees concerned to continue to earn a fair living, which will permit the employer to resume making the profits which he is entitled to, for his investment, etc., and which will permit the economy to return to normal. The activities of these so-called business leaders are hindering the attempts of my Department to do a proper job in this regard.

But, Mr. Speaker, I want to make it quite clear that the employers I am referring to represent a very extremely small fraction of the total number of employers in the province. Many thousands of Saskatchewan employers have a progressive and responsible policy toward their employees and have never been involved in labor disputes. I also want to make it plain that only a few of those employers affected by strike action are in the category mentioned. But just as a few bad apples spoil the barrel, so a few individuals are making it difficult to maintain peaceful industrial relations in Saskatchewan and are spoiling the image amongst the labor people of employers generally.

Now, Mr. Speaker, what about the actions of the representatives of labor unions? The majority of these persons are dedicated, they are sincere and hard-working. The welfare of their members is consistently uppermost in their minds. Some of them I don't agree with them politically, it is true, and I probably never will, but most of them are honest. They are square shooters. They put their cards on the table, we understand each other. Unfortunately, however, there are a few representatives and agents whom I can only describe as sneaky, unscrupulous double-dealers. They choose to regard their union position as a political office. We have seen it in this House, Mr. Speaker. Their words and actions in this capacity do little to protect the working interest of the working man, to promote

**February 25, 1969**

labor-management harmony or safeguard the welfare of citizens of Saskatchewan. In many ways these individuals are social parasites, feeding on the trust of their members to expand their own personal ambitions. Some of these men will go to no end to bring about the destruction of the Government, even at the expense of the well-being of the union members that support them. To these men a strike is a political victory and not the serious failure on their part to avoid a costly work stoppage which it actually represents. This is how they establish their reputation. They push their members into a strike to assert their own authority. They like to feel that they are dictating things. They strut up and down in a roost-like fashion and make known their demands in the most arrogant ways. And I've seen it. I have been in those places. If management doesn't immediately capitulate, they pull a strike just to show who's boss. I submit that this is one reason we have so many strikes over relatively minor issues. I want to say, Mr. Speaker, that any union business agent who allows three picketers or a handful to prevent 1,000 employees from performing their normal duties should bow his head in shame.

It doesn't matter to the union representative, of course, that the income of his members stops the moment the strike commences. It doesn't matter to him because his salary continues as before, at the expense of his members. Never mind that there's no bread on the tables of the employees. Never mind that the house payment may have stopped and their furniture may have to be repossessed. It doesn't matter that the company may lose its markets. It doesn't matter that the wage increase he eventually wangles may drive the company into bankruptcy, or force it to cut staff, and that has happened. No, it doesn't matter. The representative has won a victory, his victory and now he exercises his real power over management.

In the same way, a 25 or 30 per cent wage increase boosts the reputation of these representatives and this is their aim. They collect large wage settlements and then display them as a cannibal who carries shrunken heads on his belt. Years after such an agreement, reference will be made to Joe Blow and who got such and such a union a whopping big increase. This is how they get ahead. They are in constant competition with their counterparts across Canada to see who can come up with the biggest settlement. They might amongst themselves instead of trying to work at a common cause.

With regard to the relationship between the Department of Labour and representatives I'm talking about, I'm sorry to say that my departmental officials have been stabbed in the back by these people a number of times. They come to the Department and say one thing to us in my office and then they go out and take precisely the opposite action. They will make commitments to avoid strike action, which they will promptly break within a few hours. They will undermine the attempts of conciliation officers to avert walkouts. One cannot help but feel that these

people will go to any lengths to prevent the labor relations climate in this province from being completely healthy. This is what concerns me, Mr. Speaker, and not only concerns the men but the welfare of this province. We are on the threshold of great, great, great developments.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Coderre:** — But our Socialist friends opposite, their agitators, are constantly trying to destroy this.

**An Hon. Member:** — Shame, shame on you.

**Mr. Coderre:** — And what about the membership? What about the membership of the labor unions? What about the rank and file members in these unions? I am in a position to ask because I know, I've had calls upon calls at all hours of the day or night from them. I am in a position to say that the overwhelming majority of the employees of this province are loyal, conscientious and hard-working employees and are anxious to make a worthwhile contribution to the company which employs them. However, they are sometimes misled by their representatives into taking unwarranted, unwise strike action which they subsequently regret. They are sometimes duped into believing that they work for the union and not the employer. I have had men come into my office and say, "Why do I have to work for that union to get a job unless I take orders from the union representatives?" Accordingly, they will dutifully follow their representatives into a sea of labor problems like so many lemmings rushing to self-destruction. And you have heard about it at La Guardia Airport in New York.

**An Hon. Member:** — We haven't heard about that.

**Mr. Coderre:** — It's time, Mr. Speaker, and it's your duty, everyone of you in this House, it is the duty of every citizen in this province, it's time to ask union members to stop just going along. It is time that every member realizes that, along with the rights and freedoms inherent in a democratic society, there are certain obligations, one of which is to actively participate. And this is what I urge in this House that every member actively participate in the affairs of their organization. It is time that every union member starts paying attention to what is going on and starts thinking in a rational and responsible way, and acts in accordance with those thoughts.

I would like to say a few words about the role of the press and other news media. They have had a rough time this session — in the creation and preservation of an appropriate labor relations atmosphere. It cannot be denied that the media exert a considerable influence over the thoughts of the public. My gripe here is that too often one only hears of the negative

**February 25, 1969**

aspects of labor relations, the contract difficulties, the strikes, the violence. You know, when I look at this pamphlet here that came to my desk some time ago:

Without a strike, without a lockout, without disruption of production, family life or community, the potash workers at Duval have signed their first collective agreement.

I am not naming the unions because I don't think it would be quite right . . .

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Coderre:** — . . . but it goes to show that it is possible to do that. Too often one or both parties involved in a dispute rush into print to put their case forward, presumably to win public opinion on their side. To me, this is like a young couple, you know, who dash to their in-laws every time they have a quarrel. They rush to the press, they rush to somebody. A permanent solution is achieved, not by outsiders but by the two parties themselves who put their heads together and by making an effort to understand the other party's point of view can arrive at a mature and practical settlement.

Each year in Saskatchewan approximately 500 collective bargaining agreements are signed. Contrast this with the average number of strikes over each of the past four years — 17, which works out to only three strikes for every 100 agreements. This does indicate there are many responsible business agents, many responsible employers, employees, etc.

We should give credit at this point to the employers, to the employees who year after year sit down in a spirit of trust and co-operation and negotiate a new agreement without recourse to threats, counter-threats and ultimately to strike action. I will readily admit, Mr. Speaker, that I have put my case this afternoon in very strong terms, I feel, however, that strong terms are necessary to rouse some people out of their lethargic state of mind and perhaps motivate them to change some of the attitudes which are causing a good deal of labor-management problems. Unless there are improvements in the near future, Government action may have to be taken.

There is a growing feeling on the part of the Canadian people that the strike is an obsolescent instrument in the settlement of labor-management disputes. You can go over, look at the White Paper of Barbara Castle in England, a Minister of the Labor Government, who is absolutely concerned at what is happening in England. It is going to take some definite and positive action. Every government throughout this world is concerned with the tremendous loss of productivity, and governments are presently facing increased pressures to impose compulsory arbitration as the solution. We, in the Government

may not want this type of solution. We are looking at it. Labor and management do not want this kind of solution. This I know. The history of our country provides persuasive evidence that the orderly, progressive development of the Canadian economy depends on the unimpeded operation of the collective bargaining. However, as I said, governments at all levels of political stripes are going to be forced to take a closer look at some form of compulsory arbitration, if our labor-management difficulties continue. If this becomes necessary, the motions of a few will have had the effect of penalizing the majority. And here in Saskatchewan, as well as elsewhere, we will be ready to act if we have to.

Let me hasten to add at this point that I am not about to suggest, Mr. Speaker, that strikes should be abolished altogether. Under our democratic system an employee is entitled to withdraw services to an employer, if he so chooses. This is not a police state. The right of the employees to strike or withdraw services, subject to certain restrictions, is necessary to guarantee the freedom of the collective bargaining process. The threat of a strike represents a powerful economic weapon and possibly a legitimate one. I might even go so far as to suggest that sometimes when an employer is known to be making conditions so deplorable, probably making greater and greater profits, maybe the employee is entitled to part of the productivity. But if he refuses to grant his employees a legitimate wage increase, maybe a strike is justified. I do suggest, however, that the strike weapon is becoming over-utilized and there lies the danger. In many instances it would almost appear that a strike is called as an opening manoeuvre in the labor-management dispute rather than as a last resort.

And then some of my colleagues across the way in this Legislature may get up and say, "Oh, this dirty old Government is anti-labor." Evidence shows that the Government of Saskatchewan is not anti-labor union. It is proved by the fact that union membership increased by 4,103 between '67 and '68, which represents the largest annual increase since 1946.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Coderre:** — In addition to compulsory arbitration, a number of additional solutions to our industrial relations problems have been suggested from time to time. We have, of course, our famous right to work advocates who say that an employee doesn't have to join a union if he doesn't want to. As you know, in this Province and across the country the Rand formula applies. There is merit on both sides. You have to look at it objectively. However, these people would have a situation in which a non-union member reaps all the benefits won by the union while the whole membership pays the shots. Union security contracts are clearly in line with our democratic tradition. Majority rule is the very basis of our society and civilization. The union shop operates where a majority of workers have decided in its

**February 25, 1969**

favor. Unions represent all employees. This is not always the case. Sometimes the union reps will not work for grievances of an individual which they should look at because of his political disagreements with the union. It is only fair that all employees support them I would say. When a vote is held in a Saskatchewan municipality, for example, on a money bylaw and the result of the vote is in the affirmative, every taxpayer contributes his share towards the project agreed to, not just those who voted in favor of it. This is how our form of democracy operates in practice.

We, in the Government, have no intention of attempting to destroy labor unions. I believe that unions play a positive and constructive role in the development of our industrialized economy, providing they are responsible. Since their earliest years, unions have been responsible in large measure for increasing levels of income, improving working conditions, raising living standards, not only for their own members but in a more indirect way for all the working people in all of society. Members of labor unions are making a significant contribution to the improvement of industrial efficiency, and I say I am speaking now of those I have indicated who are not being involved politically or otherwise. For this reason, Mr. Speaker, it simply does not make sense to blame unions generally for labor difficulties which we are experiencing. As a matter of fact, 23 unions out of well over 1,200 unions in Saskatchewan have been involved in strikes since 1960.

I do not suggest that the Government does not have a role to play in the field of industrial relations. The Government is most anxious to reduce the areas of conflict between parties to collective bargaining agreements and considers that it has a duty and a responsibility to take action to improve effectively labor-management relations. To this end, as a result of the recommendations of the Labor-Management Legislative Review Committee, The Trade Union Act was amended in 1966 to produce the ground rules to make the processes of collective bargaining more systematic. In taking action in this area, the Government has no desire to arbitrarily interfere with the operation of the bargaining process — and this we have not done — but rather wishes to provide an opportunity for representatives of labor and management, nominated by the parties themselves, to sit down together to examine the many ramifications of labor relations policy and attempt to devise mutually acceptable solutions to the problems which exist. This is what motivated the Government to establish the Labor-Management Construction Committee in July of last year, to study all aspects of labor relations in the construction industry, in which a good many of our labor disputes arise. The membership of the Committee represents a high level of expertise and experience in the field of labor relations and industry, from both management and union points of view. They are doing an excellent job. As suggested in the Speech from the Throne, an amendment to further improve The Trade Union Act would be introduced during this session or has been introduced I should rather say.

Some people would think, Mr. Speaker, that The Trade Union Act is like a sacred cow — it should never be milked. It should never be reviewed with changing conditions and times are changing.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Coderre:** — However, we will have more to say on that when we get to that point.

I would like to conclude my remarks, Mr. Speaker, by pointing out that whatever committees may recommend and whatever legislative action may be indicated, peaceful and productive labor relations can only be achieved in a genuine and lasting way through more and better labor-management co-operation. Both parties, Mr. Speaker, must recognize that they share a common interest in the continuing welfare of the enterprise in which they work or from which they both earn their living and that they both have a responsibility for what happens to the economy as a whole. This implies that the establishment of a process of regular communication and consultation between labor and management, which, if it is to be fruitful, must be carried out in an atmosphere of mutual trust and understanding, and not with a feeling of downgrading the working man or looking at the employer as a slave driver.

Co-operation, like motherhood, is something which everyone is in favor of. Like motherhood, however, some action is required to produce it. Oliver Wendell Holmes used to tell about the time all the people of the world decided to shout, boo, at the same time so that the great shout could be heard on the moon. When the time came for the great shout, there was nothing but spectacular silence. And I hope that there is not spectacular silence after today. I hope that everyone, unions, employers, the community as a whole make that effort so that everyone gets actively involved.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Coderre:** — As I said a moment ago, co-operation is something which must be practised and worked on, not merely talked about, whether we are employers, labor union members, politicians, or citizens. And I say to my Hon. Members who are very active in the labor-union movement, let's leave politics out of labor unions. Let's leave politics out of labor relations. Let's stop thinking in narrow partisan terms. Let's start thinking of our most important commodity, people.

We have the best labor force in the country, Mr. Speaker, and I am speaking of both employers and employees. Providence has endowed us with tremendous resources, which are now being developed by the resourcefulness of the free enterprise system, the policies of this Administration, the willingness of the employers to invest into our province, the willingness of our

**February 25, 1969**

employees to work in our province. This is the best commodity we have, people. Let's all put our shoulders together to the wheel in the spirit of co-operation for which our pioneers were renowned and let's build a better Saskatchewan together. I am confident that with a renewed and concentrated effort on the part of everyone, industrial unrest can be effectively reduced. In this way, the present system of free collective bargaining can be adapted to the new demands of our technologically-oriented society and will continue to play a vital role in the industrial development of Saskatchewan and in the attainment of our economic goals of full employment, a continuously rising standard of living and an equitable distribution of income.

I believe, Mr. Speaker, that you've noticed that Members on this side of the House are unlike the Members on the other side of the House who are ready to promise the moon to make it a possibility to put additional burdens on our young people in years to come, and would like to see the Government go into deficit budgeting. I think, Mr. Speaker, it is quite evident that I am going to support the motion, I cannot support the amendment.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. W. E. Smishek (Regina North East):** — Mr. Speaker, before the Member takes his chair, would he permit a question?

**Mr. Coderre:** — The Member for Regina North East, anytime, Mr. Speaker. I will answer a question, I will not get into a debate.

**Mr. Smishek:** — Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Minister made a number of allegations about certain individuals. He didn't name them and he may not want to name them. But, if he chooses, I would like to ask him whether he would name those individuals within a trade union movement who he said are double dealers and are sneaky and other words that he used. However, if he chooses not to name them, would he name the unions that they represent or, failing that, the industries that they operate in?

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Coderre:** — I was just going to say that. There is a couple that I could name but, however, I have no intention of mentioning the names of any unions, any business agent, or any employers.

**An Hon. Member:** — You are losing your argument.

**Mr. Coderre:** — I am not losing my argument, I was only trying to bring to this House the opportunity of realizing that somewhere in



business, or in management and somewhere along the line with the business agents, that there must be something lacking. It has become evident across this world that year after year, as I have indicated, that as contracts are signed without strikes or lockout, why not across the board . . .

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Coderre:** — He has asked the question, I'm answering the question.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Coderre:** — Mr. Speaker, on the point of order, the hon. gentleman asked me, "May I ask him a question before he sits down?" This gives me the prerogative to remain in my seat to speak for another two hours.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Coderre:** — Am I right, Mr. Speaker?

**Mr. Speaker:** — The Member for Regina North East asked a long-winded question, he's getting a long-winded answer.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Speaker:** — These questions should be short, clear-cut, to the point and the answer should be the same. Now, let him finish the answer.

**Mr. Coderre:** — I consider the answer concluded, Mr. Speaker.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. R. H. Woof (Turtleford):** — Mr. Speaker, one evident fact for the House is that the Budget has been brought down. And true to form it has been a tricky Liberal budget, claiming to be balanced. The Budget proclaimed as a balanced Budget is true to my forecast, that I have made for months, that once again the Treasurer (Mr. Steuart) would dip his sticky fingers into the funds of the Saskatchewan Power Corporation, and this time to the tune of \$4 million.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Wooff:** — Just imagine the cry, Mr. Speaker, that would have gone up from the Liberal rank had an NDP Government been caught taking funds from the Power Corporation to carry on the day to day affairs of the Province. What a laugh, Mr. Speaker, what a

**February 25, 1969**

laugh! Last spring when Members from both sides of the House visited the Saskatchewan Power dam, the Member from Moose Jaw South (Mr. Davies) asked a question of the Premier of all people, "When could we expect a reduction in power rates?" I don't think I have to remind the gentlemen to your right, Mr. Speaker, of the answer they got. If labor keeps on asking for higher and higher wages, we will not only have to hold the line but increase the rates. What an unmanly, what a deceitful slur on labor, knowing full well what the Government has done in the past and what it intended to do again. The Premier as exponent of free enterprise stoops to filching a public utility for money to make a sham of balancing a budget which neither he as ex-Treasurer nor the present Provincial Treasurer could balance by a reasonably planned fiscal policy. The alarming sleight of hand that is going on, Mr. Speaker, is the plundering of a sound public utility like Saskatchewan Power Corporation to guarantee the free enterprisers of our Saskatchewan Pulp Mill their pound of flesh is frightening. This, Mr. Speaker, robs the best single enterprise of the province and prostitutes it for an illegitimate end. This robs the Saskatchewan Power Corporation of its viability in paying off its loan capital and reducing power rates to the consumer.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Wooff:** — It reduces the Saskatchewan Power Corporation to a taxing medium. It robs the Province of a means of inducing industry to our prairie province by lowering the power rates. This Budget, Mr. Speaker, proves the myth of our expanding economy in Saskatchewan. During the 1968 session and I am sorry the Premier is not in his seat . . .

**Mr. M. Breker (Humboldt):** — It is too much for him.

**Mr. Wooff:** — . . . the Premier went off on his usual tirade on Socialism and he referred, I believe, no less than three times in my memory, to Socialist Sweden, that they were going to hold an election in the fall of 1968 and the Socialists would be wiped out. Well, Mr. Speaker, this just didn't happen. I have not heard a squeak out of the Premier about Sweden this session. The Socialist Democrats went back with a landslide majority.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Wooff:** — I had the privilege of taking my Swedish wife back to Sweden last summer and of visiting that fair land. I am too modest to suggest, Mr. Speaker, that I had anything to do with Socialist victory, but I did warn them that our Prairie Premier was endeavoring to breathe down their political neck all the way from Saskatchewan. But, Mr. Speaker, the Premier's forecasting was never further out. As I said a moment ago, the Swedish Government went back with the largest majority in its history.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Wooff:** — While discussing Liberal leadership, let me just say a word about our Prime Minister who went over to Britain for a Commonwealth Conference and according to Canadian press, made such an impression on Britain. Well, I had a letter from a cousin of mine — he doesn't happen to share all my political views — but he told me that, 'your Mr. Trudeau made very little, if any, impression unless it was unfavorable.'

Because of much that has been said about Socialism, I am going to spend just a few minutes on Sweden, as I said before, much as my hon. friends dislike the hard, cold facts. It was not until the Social Democrats became the dominant force in Swedish Government and politics over a 35-year period and have guided that country in a planned economy, not until that time, Mr. Speaker, did the Swedish people in all walks of life enjoy a decent and a good standard of living.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Wooff:** — It was under the Social Democrats that the tide of emigration, about the turn of the century when it was so heavy, finally stopped and gradually became another problem, a tide of immigration.

I am sorry that the Minister who just spoke (Mr. Coderre) left the House, after all the sound and fury that he produced. Strikes are unknown in Sweden on account of the policy developed and encouraged by this Socialist Democratic Government whereby labor, management and government sit down together and work out wage schedules on the level of the general economy of the nation. There is no waiting till contracts have expired, nerves have become frayed and tempers have become hot, before new agreements are signed. Just in case you think that I am not telling you the whole story, I have here the July 30th copy of Co-op Consumer, 1968, and I am going to read you just a short passage from what Mr. Boyes, President of Federated Co-op, had to say after his visit to Sweden.

Speaking of strikes and the anxieties confronting farmers, Mr. Boyes said he felt:

That in Sweden labor and management had discovered, with the aid of government, the means of recognizing they were partners in the nation's economy. They had recognized the goals of each segment could be reached only if they worked together to build an economy that could yield to both labor and management the economic returns they desired. It was an example of co-operation applied on a master scale.

As I said a moment ago, strikes are unknown in Sweden.

**February 25, 1969**

Compare this, Mr. Speaker, to the mailed fist approach demonstrated here in Saskatchewan with labor, teachers and students. Sweden is the only country in the world that guarantees everyone employment. The only country that does not believe any percentage of unemployment is acceptable. Naturally, full employment is a goal, a focal point to which they are constantly working and to which they aim. But it is worth noting that when the Social Democrats took over in the 1930s, unemployment was as high as 10 per cent and had been even through the better years prior to the Social Democrats. Since that time, it has been as low as one per cent and for short periods of time, even lower than that.

For some years Sweden has been increasing its accommodation for her senior citizens at the rate of some 3,000 beds per year. Just think of the Provincial Treasurer's (Mr. Steuart) cry of alarm if he had a comparable plan.

Housing is still a major problem but the Social Democratic Government has assisted in building apartments at the rate of 11.6 per 1,000 population. This, Mr. Speaker, is the highest rate in the world, 105,000 complete apartments per year.

Norway has a housing policy which says all investors must put 5 per cent of their annual investment into housing at a 5 per cent rate of interest.

Think again of the Provincial Treasurer's (Mr. Steuart) panic if he had the level of health services, hospital services, medical and dental, plus pensions, plus free education in the universities, to finance. He would certainly be both alarmed and unable to smile.

Mr. Speaker, I would be less than fair if I did not say a word about the cost of living. The cost of living is on much the same level as Canada's. Food is abundant, meals and hotel accommodation are on about the same level as in our own province.

I might point out that working people in Sweden can deduct the cost of working clothes and property taxes from their income taxes, but not in Canada. However, Mr. Speaker, there is one very real factor which leaves us far behind Socialist Sweden, and that is the value of service the Swedes get for their tax dollar. Not just that health services, wage adjustments, welfare assistance, and pensions as a whole are kept on a reasonable level with the cost of living, but these factors added together distribute the buying power of the nation throughout the population, giving the highest per capita income of any nation in Europe.

I believe, Mr. Speaker, my time is up and I will have to close. I assure you that neither from a monetary standpoint nor from a moral standpoint, can I support the Budget but will be supporting the amendment.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. J. E. Brockelbank (Saskatoon Mayfair):** — Mr. Speaker, in rising to take part in the Budget Debate, I am just wiping away the tears from my eyes after having listened to that speech from the heart from the Minister of Labour (Mr. Coderre). He has left me speechless. What I am trying to say is that he's just about crowded me off the timetable. His comments about labor were a collection of cliches that we have all heard time and time again, and I am sure we were really not impressed by his use of them, not impressed by the cliches but impressed by the very fact that the Minister of Labour would try to use them in this House to further the weak message he had for us.

The Member from Pelly (Mr. Barrie) this afternoon neglected to mention the cutbacks in park development. He neglected to mention the increase in park fees, double in some cases.

The Member for Watrous (Mr. Schmeiser) this afternoon, it seems a pity that such a young, young man gave such an old, old speech.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Brockelbank:** — Mr. Speaker, the time urges me to conclude my remarks at this point and since I have something else to say on this particular debate, I beg leave to adjourn the debate.

Debate adjourned.

## QUESTIONS

### BILLS 36, 37 AND 38 NOT RECEIVED

**Mr. Speaker:** — Just before I put the adjournment motion, I want to say a word or two in connection with a situation which I refrained from saying anything about at the time (when I possibly should have done) because I did not wish to interrupt any Member's air time, in connection with the point of order then raised by the Member for Wadena. I am reliably informed that Bills Nos. 36, 37 and 38 were tabled on Friday last, and indeed they were certainly on my file on Friday last. I have investigated the matter as thoroughly as possible, and I am satisfied that the correct number of these bills left the Legislative Assembly office at the correct time. May I suggest to Members that they look at their Order Paper. All of the Bills which are marked 'printed' have, I am informed, been tabled, if any Member is short a Bill, then if he will check at the Legislative Assembly office he will have no trouble in picking up a copy of whichever Bill he requires.

**Mr. F. A. Dewhurst (Wadena):** — Mr. Speaker, since I raised that at noon today

**February 25, 1969**

I have personally made a survey of every desk on this side of the House except for the Member from Melfort-Tisdale (Mr. Willis) who was not here today. Not one of us has either 36, 37, 38 or 44. We have the explanatory notes but not one of them, and I haven't checked Mr. Willis's desk because he isn't here, but I checked all the rest personally.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Now that is 36, 37, 38 and 44.

**Mr. Dewhurst:** — On 44, 44 wasn't marked printed so I didn't raise that at noon.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Well never mind. Are there any others?

**Mr. Dewhurst:** — No, those are the four.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Well all right. By tomorrow noon everyone on that side of the House will have a copy. If he has one already he will then have two of 36, 37, 38 and 44.

**An Hon. Member:** — We don't have them now!

**Mr. Speaker:** — If you will look through your files and check to see if you have any further Bills missing, I am sure that the office will make up the deficiency promptly and on time.

The Assembly adjourned at 5:30 o'clock p.m.