

**LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN**  
**Second Session — Sixteenth Legislature**  
**17th Day**

**Wednesday, February 26, 1969.**

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

**WELCOME TO STUDENTS**

**Mr. J.E. Brockelbank (Saskatoon Mayfair):** — Mr. Speaker, I want to take this opportunity to introduce to the Chamber two groups of students from Saskatoon Mayfair. The first group that I will introduce are from St. Goretti school, in Saskatoon Mayfair. There are 45 students, I believe, situated in the east gallery and are accompanied by two of their teachers, Mr. Morari and Mr. Reager. I might say at this time that Mr. Morari was a workmate of mine for about 10 or 12 years, so I know him quite well. The other group of students are from Caswell public school in Saskatoon Mayfair, and other Members of this Assembly may be acquainted with the fact that there is a Caswell public school in Saskatoon. This grade seven class is doing a project, a scrapbook project on MLAs — that might be an appropriate place to put MLAs, in a scrapbook. They have been soliciting Members of this Chamber for biographical sketches and signatures and pictures, I think it may happen today when that class leaves the Chamber that everyone in the Chamber may go out to meet them, because they have extended an invitation to quite a few to go out and meet them. However, I will be out there and attempt to answer any questions they may have. Perhaps other Members may care to supplement my comments.

I hope that the stay of these groups is interesting and educational, and we all hope, I am sure, that they have a safe journey back to Saskatoon Mayfair.

**Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. J.B. Hooker (Notukeu-Willowbunch):** — Mr. Speaker, I might add a few words to what the Hon. Member for Mayfair has just said. I would like from the Members on this side of the House to congratulate the students of Caswell school for the interest they have shown in getting information on different Members in this Assembly and also for the interest they have shown in finding out something about our parliamentary procedure. I certainly endorse what the Member opposite has said and we hope the students have a very enjoyable afternoon with us.

**Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Hon. G.B. Grant (Regina South):** — Mr. Speaker, up to the present I haven't participated in this contest in introducing students that has been going on back and forth, but now I have joined the club as well. Through you I would like to introduce to the Members of this House a class of grade six students under the direction of their teacher, Mrs. Ellis, from Massey school, in the Speaker's gallery. It goes without saying that they come from the best constituency in Saskatchewan.

February 26, 1969

**Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. H.H.P. Baker (Regina South East):** — Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to welcome a group of students from St. Andrew school in my constituency, a separate school and one of the newer ones in this constituency. They are accompanied here by their principal, I might say for the Premier's sake it is the largest constituency in Saskatchewan by number. I don't know when they are going to start dissecting but they can only make it better not worse. We do welcome these students here today and we hope their stay here will be most fruitful and I want to welcome them most sincerely.

I would like to extend a welcome to the Caswell school too. They had written me a letter and asked for a picture, just as they have done with others. I think it shows the initiative of that community in that school. I do welcome them most sincerely, even if they do come from my counterpart, or my sister city, Saskatoon, where we have our friendly rivalry. We welcome the others as well.

**Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

### PRESENTATION TO MR. BAKER

**Mr. I.H. MacDougall (Souris-Estevan):** — Mr. Speaker, I have no students again this afternoon to introduce in the House, but I do have a little presentation which I should like to make to the Member for Regina South East, if he stays in his seat long enough. We don't expect him to use it to shovel out the city streets, but I thought that he might use it to go out and find some of his snow removal equipment before the winter is over. You will note that this piece of equipment which I am about to present His Worship is nicely painted and shined up. I should think that most of his snow removal equipment looks like this, because we haven't seen too much of it since we've been in Regina.

On behalf of the Hon. Members on this side of the House, Mr. Speaker, I should like to present his Worship the Mayor with this token of our appreciation of the city snow-removal program.

While I am at it, I have a sign that I would like the page-boy to take over there, it says, 'For Rent.' Mr. Speaker, I think that as the Mayor goes by the Imperial Bank of Commerce building, he probably would be pleased to hang the sign up.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Baker:** — Mr. Speaker, I accept most gracefully the little gift. I might suggest, Mr. Speaker, that he give it to the Ministers of Public Works and Highways because I couldn't even find a place to park around the Parliament Buildings today.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Baker:** — He talks about the roads, take a look at the couple of miles he's got here. You had better give it to the Public Works Minister or the Highways Minister, they need it more than I do. Thank you very much, I'll accept it.

**Mr. E. Kramer (The Battlefords):** — I might suggest to the Minister of Public Works that he could use it for other things as well.

**Hon. A.R. Mr. Guy (Minister of Public Works):** — Mr. Speaker, to make sure that the record is straight, it is not the responsibility of Public Works, but the Wascana Centre Authority, on which the Mayor is also a member.

**Mr. Baker:** — I would like to say, Mr. Speaker, but Public Works hires them and pays them for it.

### CONDOLENCES

**Hon. W.R. Mr. Thatcher (Premier):** — Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Lloyd) by leave of the Assembly that this Assembly records with sorrow and regret the death on February 8, 1969, of Omer Alphonse Demers who sat in this Assembly for the constituency of Shellbrook from 1934 to 1944. He was born in Ham Nord, Quebec, on March 2, 1893, and was educated at Victoriaville. He was a general merchant at Debden and a member of the Benevolent and Protective Order of Elks, and the Knights of Columbus.

**Mr. G.R. Bowerman (Shellbrook):** — Mr. Speaker, the late Mr. Omer A. Demers was one of the early settlers of the Debden district in the constituency which I now represent. He came to this community in 1912 and as has already been said started a small store in that community. They tell me he purchased and loaded grain into boxcars, before there were any elevators constructed in that community into which he came as a pioneer. In 1921 he sold his store in Debden and started a partnership farming operation a few miles distant from that community at Mattes. It is this farm that I remember well as a boy, and it became one of the real hubs of an enterprising operation which first branched into such a unique farming operation as the development of a large marsh there for the production of muskrat pelts. During the succeeding years when the marsh dried out, he developed a large enterprise consisting of something over 600 hogs, and for that day it was a remarkable farm. Later in his expansion of his farming operations he again developed one of the outstanding herds of purebred Hereford cattle known in that northern part of Saskatchewan. As has been said he represented that constituency in this House from 1934 to 1944. He sold his farm in 1945 and retired to British Columbia where I am informed that he was residing at the time of his death.

Mr. Demers was a Saskatchewan pioneer and a leader in our community. Although I was very young during his period of office as a Member of this Legislature, I did know him, and knew of the contribution that he made as a citizen and a leader of our community. The contribution which the late Mr. Demers has made to this Province and to the constituency he represented is a creditable evident of the personal interest that he shared for the welfare of those that he served. I would like to express on behalf of the people of the Shellbrook constituency and extend to the bereaved family and close friends our most sincere and deepest sympathy.

**Mr. Thatcher:** — Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Hon. Leader of the

Opposition (Mr. Lloyd).

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

Motion agreed to.

## 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 moved by Mr. Blakeney (Regina Centre).

**Mr. J.E. Brockelbank (Saskatoon Mayfair):** — Mr. Speaker, in my haste to introduce the students from Caswell school, I neglected to mention that they are escorted this afternoon by Mr. Beacon.

The Liberal party was elected on a solemn promise to reduce taxes and hold the debt of this province in check. Since their election in 1964 and re-election in 1967 they have increased almost every tax and fee, and in addition introduced a host of absolutely new taxes and fees. Alone, last year, after the 1967 election, they increased taxes and fees by \$35 million.

The increased debt of this province is in excess of \$141 million greater than when they became the Government. Today, I am looking at their Budget which proposes the spending of \$365 million. If it is any distinction, Mr. Speaker, we now have a Million Dollar Government in Saskatchewan. We are being asked to approve the spending of \$1 million per day. We as legislators should not panic at the thought of approving the spending of \$1 million for each day of the coming year. Our duty as Members of the Opposition is to examine the direction and priority of this Million Dollar Government in full view of the needs of Saskatchewan people. The needs of Saskatchewan taxpayers are clear. We have enunciated them before, but this Government pays little heed. The taxpayers want waste trimmed from Government expenditures.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Brockelbank:** — In this field we have had some minor successes, but there is considerable distance to go in cutting down on Liberal Government waste. An example I could cite is the Government's hesitation in appointing further legislative secretaries. They were pure pork barrel, Mr. Speaker. Unfortunately this Liberal Government gave away \$33,241.43 of taxpayers' money before we could force them to stop that waste.

Secondly, the taxpayers of Saskatchewan are concerned about their various health plans. For a moment I want to quote the record of the debates from the House of Commons, October 30th, 1968, page 2211. A Member of the House of Commons was questioning the Minister of Finance, Hon. E.J. Benson, regarding Federal medicare:

The Member's question:

Is it the policy of the Government that a province which is receiving a contribution from the Federal Government toward the cost of its medicare program ought to reduce any premiums charged by it, and thus pass along the Federal contribution to the subscribers?

Mr. Benson's answer:

It would be the sincere hope of this Government, Mr. Speaker, that our contribution toward medicare would be reflected in a reduction of the premiums that are paid by Canadians for medicare rather than having the funds used for some other purpose.

The Member again questions Mr. Benson:

Was there ever any request made or agreement or understanding reached in a Federal-Provincial Conference between the provinces and the Government of Canada that the provinces would reduce any premiums in this regard?

Mr. Benson replied:

No, but we believe the provincial authorities will be honest and decent toward their own electors.

Obviously, Mr. Speaker, Mr. Benson wasn't thinking of Saskatchewan's Liberal Government when he spoke of honesty and decency toward their own electors.

This Government, after a hastily called 1967 election, put deterrent fees on our fine health plan without so much as a shred of evidence to prove their need. On the positive side of the ledger we showed beyond a doubt that the sick tax would be detrimental to good health care. We showed that they would work an economic hardship on people too poor to pay them, but not poor enough to get on welfare roles.

After last year's legislative session this Liberal Government began a series of inaccurate, distorted, politically motivated advertisements on 19 Saskatchewan radio stations which resulted in the complete waste of \$5,490.20 of taxpayers' money.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Brockelbank:** — Those advertisements were ghost ads, that is, they had no mention of who was their sponsor. Why, Mr. Speaker? The reason is obvious, the Liberals, deflated and defeated after losing the debate on medicare and hospital deterrents, were willing to put out \$5,490.20 of taxpayers' money to attempt to create a climate for the acceptance of their sick tax. That series of advertisement was placed by, you guessed it, MacLaren Advertising Company. The same company, when paid by the Liberals, sweet-talked the Saskatchewan voters about a booming Saskatchewan before the 1967 election, which as we all know was followed by a \$35 million tax increase.

In answer to a question I asked this session, the Minister of Health (Mr. Grant) stated that his Department had no statistical record to show how many family units had paid deterrent

**February 26, 1969**

fees in excess of their proposed ceiling of \$180 per family. Mr. Speaker, the Government is flying blind on these health plans, not to mention that it is demonstrating its ability to fly backwards on the mental health program.

Its flunkies continue to parrot words to the effect that it is guarding our Hospital and Medicare Plans.

I want to quote from a letter sent last April by a Liberal MLA to a constituent on the matter of deterrent fees:

I am not saying that the Government is doing the right thing. What I do say is that something, has to be done now, or our health plans are in real danger.

That Liberal MLA was . . .

**Mr. Speaker:** — Is the Member prepared to table it?

**Mr. Brockelbank:** — Mr. Speaker, I understand the rule is that, if I don't wish to take responsibility for this letter, I may table it. You can bet your three-cornered hat that I am not taking responsibility for this letter. I will table it. That Liberal MLA was confused about what he should do . . .

**Mr. L.P. Coderre (Gravelbourg):** — Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, I think the term of 'I'll bet your three-cornered hat,' to the Speaker, is most improper in this House and should be withdrawn.

**Mr. Brockelbank:** — Mr. Speaker, I will . . .

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order! I'll take into account he hasn't got the manners his father had and forget about it!

**Mr. Brockelbank:** — Mr. Speaker, I will name the person, I will not do what the Minister of Labour did yesterday in this House and refuse to name people after making charges . . .

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Brockelbank:** — Mr. Speaker, if I have offended the rules of the House, I will most certainly withdraw the remarks about the hat.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Offended the rules! You offended the propriety!

**Mr. Brockelbank:** — In that case if I offended the propriety, I will withdraw the remark about the hat.

As I was saying, that Liberal MLA was confused about what he should do. I suggest that last year he should have used his influence to force his Minister of Health to produce the facts and figures so he could decide what the proper action was.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Brockelbank:** — The letter incidentally is from the Member for Watrous constituency (Mr. Schmeiser). He states, “Increasing the premium would soon place the rates out of reach for some people, and those are the people who need the service most.” As you can see, Mr. Speaker, confused thinking still seems evident in his letter. Obviously raising the premium would not put the service out of reach of as many families as would the sick tax. Judging by his letter, the stand of that MLA will be most awkward if the Minister of Health does raise hospital and medicare premiums this coming fall.

Mr. Speaker, Liberals are guarding our health plans in the same manner that a weasel guards a chicken coop, and for the same reason. It should be crystal clear that the only people who are committed to guard and improve these plans are New Democratic party legislators. Our party believes, Mr. Speaker, that citizens of Saskatchewan should have equal access to health plans, and that is not the case. In addition, we believe the people of Saskatchewan are prepared to move forward to added benefits such as drug care and the beginning of dental care, and to that New Democrats are committed.

Thirdly, Mr. Speaker, we are concerned that this Liberal Government has seen fit to continue putting bulging Department of Highway budgets in a priority position to action in the field of consumer protection and increased grants to education. A large budget for highways is not in itself a matter for concern. It becomes a matter for concern when it can be shown that bloated budgets for that department result in less value for dollars spent than is now the case. It was shown that Saskatchewan’s highway unit costs had ballooned beyond comparative costs across Canada. The Hon. Member for Regina Centre (Mr. Blakeney) cited the case of a recent highway built in Saskatchewan which cost \$6½ million. The Government borrowed money at 7 per cent for 20 years. As a consequence this \$6½ million highway will cost \$15½ million.

The Government shows other wasteful practices in the Department of Highways. It is clearly illustrated by the Government’s own figures that since April 1, 1968, this Government spent \$7,636.16, on politically inspired official openings. It is also interesting to note that over one-third of that amount was spent in the constituency of the Minister of Highways (Mr. Boldt).

Just out of curiosity, Mr. Speaker, I asked for some information from the Department of Highways for which I had received an answer last year. I wanted to see if the Minister could come up with the same answer two years in succession. Mr. Speaker, he couldn’t Here is what I found. The total cost of opening ceremonies of the Balgonie to Fort Qu’Appelle cutoff reported that the same function cost \$1,639.17. The figure had been pared \$8.49. I attributed the paring down to a typographical error. However, on further checking, I found that the cost of the opening ceremony for the Regina to Moose Jaw Expressway was reported at \$3,811.66 last year, but was pared down \$10.00 to \$3,801.66 in this year’s answer to the same question. I thought, Mr. Speaker, that’s a coincidence, two typographical errors in the one answer I received. At this point, Mr. Speaker, my appetite was whetted and I began to compare some other figures. For example, the Saskatoon to Dundurn Freeway opening ceremonies apparently necessitated the expenditure of \$2,446.02 of taxpayers’

**February 26, 1969**

money to perform the ribbon cutting. Within that figure is an item listed as “advertising, \$48.90.” I have in my hand, Mr. Speaker, a photocopy of an ad which appeared in the Saskatoon Star-Phoenix dated August 17, 1968, which advertised the opening of the Saskatoon Dundurn Freeway. If any Member cares, I will upon request table this photocopy. This one advertisement didn’t cost \$48.90 as suggested in the Minister’s answer to the question. It didn’t cost twice as much. It didn’t cost three times as much. It didn’t cost four times as much. It did cost more than five times the amount the Minister reported in his answer to my question. Let everyone understand that my calculation of the cost of this advertisement is \$220.50, whereas the Minister reports only an expense of \$48.90.

One mistake could have been a simple error. Two mistakes, a coincidence perhaps. But three errors in the answer to one question stretches a credibility gap farther than I will attempt to jump.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Brockelbank:** — Last year I called for an independent investigation of the workings of the Department of Highways. This year, Mr. Speaker, I again call for an independent investigation of the Saskatchewan Department of Highways.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Brockelbank:** — Mr. Speaker, in any case, New Democratic Members from this side of the House will continue to demand a dollar’s value for a taxpayers’ highway dollar spent. Other areas of Liberal waste will be revealed in due course.

As I mentioned, bloated Highway budgets have priority over consumer protection and increased grants to education.

The people in Saskatoon Mayfair, the constituency I have the honor to represent, are seriously concerned about the escalating costs of living and the lack of consumer protection. They cannot understand why this Government continues to ignore its own reports in the field of consumer protection, and that is the Batten Report on Consumer Problems and Inflation. You see, Mr. Speaker, a great many people in Mayfair are wage earners, like myself, and like myself they see dust gathering on the Batten Commission recommendations and they wonder why.

Many other people live in senior citizen homes such as Jubilee residences, St. Ann’s Home, St. Joseph’s Home, Oliver Lodge and Saskatoon Convalescent Home. Many more are retired citizens living in their own homes. They are on fixed income, but they are facing rising costs. These pioneers need more help, Mr. Speaker, and they deserve a better break. Instead of assistance, they get Liberal tax increases, cuts in service such as nursing home maintenance grants and new deterrent fees on hospital and medical services.

The family groups with children at home will be hit with a steep increase in local property taxes or reduced service, because this Government is not holding up its end on grants to education.



The amendment that we have offered to the Government's Budget Address will recognize the problem of a sagging economy and a dangerous tax shift to local taxpayers.

I will support the amendment, Mr. Speaker.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. J.A. Pepper (Weyburn):** — Mr. Speaker, I rise to take part in this Budget Debate not because of any noticeable increase in taxation, but because of some of the obvious tax shifts that are taking place and because of the sudden change to gloom of the present Liberal Government from the buoyant economy that was supposedly taking place one year ago. Today this Budget leaves an overwhelming expression of austerity, so the Liberal Government opposite has decided to hold the line. But after tax increases last year (Mr. Steuart), the Provincial Treasurer, stated, amounted to some \$35 million of revenue for our Province, it is certainly time that a second look or a hold-the-line effort is taken in this whole field. But I am afraid, Mr. Speaker, this is going to apply only in words and that this is where the tax shift again is going to take place. Where the Budget has not set aside sufficient funds for various areas such as agriculture and the field of education, I'm afraid the burden is going to have to be imposed or shifted on some other form of government, and this is where I believe our local municipal government comes in. They are going to find it necessary to increase their mill rate considerably to help meet the great and growing need in this very important department. So you see, Mr. Speaker, just another tax shift and the ratepayer is called on to pay the bill, all because of mismanagement and neglect of an irresponsible Liberal Government which should be budgeting greater amounts along with some more assistance from their Federal partners to cover the educational needs of today. Today, Mr. Speaker, our costs of education are going up each year and that is inevitable, but it is very interesting to note that our educational grants are getting smaller each year accordingly. As costs rise the grants should also rise in proportion to the costs, instead the grants are getting smaller in proportion to the cost. It is quite evident that to carry on an educational program this way, our education system is going to deteriorate or larger sums are going to have to be raised by higher mill rates imposed on our already over-burdened taxpayers.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Pepper:** — And this, Mr. Speaker, is being forced on us by a Government that was elected to office on the firm promise of a tax reduction. It is quite interesting to note that under the Liberal Administration for our last four years our property tax has increased some 10 mills. Under the former CCF Administration, during their last six years of office, the mill rate went up two mills. Liberals four years in office, up 10 mills. CCF six years in office, up two mills.

Of course, Mr. Speaker, we must not forget they gave us our homeowner grant, but I ask you: has our homeowner grant gone up each year the same as the climb in mill rate in taxation has? I say not, it has not. It hasn't even moved.

**An Hon. Member:** — Homecoming '71!

**Mr. Pepper:** — Let's just for a minute look at our tax situation over the last five years that the Liberals have been in office. I will only mention a few increases because if I quoted all of them it would take too long a period of time. There is a 38 per cent climb in hospitalization and medicare, the new tobacco tax, auto insurance rates increased three times, gasoline tax increased one cent, and then you remember last year there was another increase of two cents a gallon. Then a brand new tax, first time in our history, of two cents a gallon on white and purple gas and diesel fuel used in farm machinery. Then you remember last year the education and hospitalization tax went back up to five per cent from four. This tax was extended to cover other items, motels, hotels and meals, etc. Last but not least the tax on the sick, the deterrent fees. Now it is only fair, Mr. Speaker, that I mention the Liberal tax decreases; the homeowner grant, which I have already mentioned, is a maximum of \$50, the tax-free purple gas for farm trucks but note they have wiped out the tax-free part of it since last year. Oh yes, there is the tax concession to new industries and mines and pulp mills. Compare these increases and decreases, Mr. Speaker. I think it is quite evident the increases far outweigh the decreases for the average Saskatchewan citizen, and this, Mr. Speaker, from a Government that was elected on the promise to reduce taxes, you remember.

I say the greatest problem that faces our Saskatchewan people today is their high cost of living and the lack of leadership and initiative in a Government to cope with this problem. This has been proven to us in this Budget and in previous Budgets it has brought down, that its taxation priorities and inefficient management will never solve or begin to alleviate this great problem. When you see that there is even less than last year set aside for agriculture in this year's Budget — I believe last year was 4.3 per cent of the total Budget and this year it is 3.83 per cent of the total Budget — this proves to me just where its interest lies, Mr. Speaker, and how interested it is in our farmers.

Our farmers today are facing one of the most critical periods of their time and need every consideration that any government can give them. With spring fast approaching, damp and tough grain deteriorating every day, with their cash advances all used up, now their grain which they had hoped to sell and cover this advance with, is in many cases completely rotted. With last year's debts still owing, interest rates climbing, what hope, Mr. Speaker, has the farmer got and what assurance of any help has this Liberal Government given them by setting aside a 3.83 per cent of its Budget to assist them in this very serious and immediate situation? You will well remember, Mr. Speaker, that when the Saskatchewan Power Corporation, one of our Crown corporations was formed, its aim was to give to the people of Saskatchewan electrical power as close to cost as possible. The former CCF Government was able to cut the power rate some six times during its term of office by turning back in the extra revenue that kept accumulating. But under the Liberal Government this is not the case. It has apparently used this corporation for tax purposes, and has taken in over \$4 million and transferred it or shifted it over to the general fund. Another tax shift. This \$4 million could have been used to make available to our people of Saskatchewan a very substantial power rate

cut. I am sure every citizen would have appreciated and benefited from it. So you see again six power rate cuts under the CCF Administration, no power cuts under the Liberals.

Mr. Speaker, our Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Steuart) states in his Budget Address that they are coming out with a bold new program for highways, one which will put an end to the slaughter on these roads. I will just say this, Mr. Speaker, if an example of this program is our recently constructed by-pass through the city of Weyburn, my comment is that safety is completely ignored in this project and if it is not changed, slaughter on our highways will become even more prevalent than it has in the past. I hope and I ask now that this particular area be given immediate attention.

I know that we in the Opposition are as interested in good highways and good highway programming as anyone, and we appreciate the fact that highways cost a lot of money. But, because of that, we feel the taxpayer who contributes to highways must get value for their money.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I would like to take just a short time to turn to what the Budget contains for the people of our province in the field of health and health costs. Since our national health grant is to be phased out over a three-year period beginning April 1, 1969, the hospital construction grant will terminate March 31, 1970, with the exception of those under construction at that time. So I am sure our Provincial Government will be scrutinizing any construction work in this area very closely. Now with the closing of some of the smaller hospitals during the past year, just what does the future hold for many of these hospitals that are presently waiting for the verdict or sentence from the Minister of Health (Mr. Grant)? I am afraid the future is not bright, and neither is the health of our province, Mr. Speaker. Last year deterrent fees were imposed. Some small hospitals were closed. This year grants are being phased out, a pretty bleak outlook for our sick. Let's take a look at our Psychiatric Service Branch. You will remember when the Budget was introduced last Tuesday, February 18th, the Hon. Member from Prince Albert West (Mr. Steuart) stated it was a hold-the-line Budget. Well in the Department of Psychiatric Services, Mr. Speaker, they are driving with a very loose line, so loose that this important branch is completely out of control, and the circumstances at Weyburn certainly verify this. The services branch of our Mental Health Program, Mr. Speaker, is starving for funds. Where have all the psychiatric doctors gone that instigated this so-called Saskatchewan Plan. No one remained to follow up this program. They have left, Mr. Speaker, and this Government is left struggling, in many cases apparently not adhering to Dr. Frazier's recommendations in his report and not implementing many of his findings. But, Mr. Speaker, this Government has in its construction branch renovated the Provincial Hospital at North Battleford, built two psychiatric wings on a hospital at Prince Albert at many thousands, yes, millions of dollars of cost to the taxpayers of this province. Here we have a building at Weyburn which was recognized as the greatest mental health treatment centre in North America almost closing its doors. To me, Mr. Speaker, this is complete folly and waste and displays nothing more than an irresponsible Government. I will have more to say on this when this Department comes up in estimates.

I would like at this time to commend the Government for

their increased grant to the Alcoholism Commission in Saskatchewan, a very worthwhile increase going to a very worthy cause and it should definitely be encouraged.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, this is my observation of this Budget. There was never a Government that so ably demonstrated its lack of leadership and its inefficiency in its operations. This Liberal Government reminds me of a ship bouncing around a fog, first trying to ride this wave and then that wave, all the time not knowing how to take any of them, with a tired captain at the controls, who one time had the strength to kick open doors, but now just periodically has the strength to blow the horn, his crew all frustrated and panicking, each minute sinking lower and lower into the troubled waters. But the sad part of it is this, Mr. Speaker, they are not sinking alone. They are dragging the citizens of Saskatchewan down with them. It is for these reasons, Mr. Speaker, that I have presented to you that I find it impossible to support the motion, but I will support the amendment.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. E.F. Gardner (Moosomin):** — Mr. Speaker, we all know that tax increases have become the order of the day at all levels of government and in all areas of Canada. It was therefore unusual and certainly welcome to have a balanced Budget brought down in this Legislature last week with no tax increases. And I repeat, Mr. Speaker, no tax increases. People all across Saskatchewan are pleased with the Budget and the ineffective manner in which it has been opposed in this House is certainly a true indication of its popularity. Instead of criticizing the Budget the Socialists have complained about property taxes which I agree are too high, but as everyone knows these taxes are the responsibility of municipal governments. Instead of criticizing the Budget they have talked about the damp grain situation and blamed this Government for the wet weather last fall, the quota situation, the price of grain, the frost, the movement of trains and boxcars, the Vancouver harbour difficulties and the unusually cold January. In their desperate efforts to make political capital out of an unfortunate situation they have tried to blame the Saskatchewan Liberal Government for all of these things. Now, Mr. Speaker, the farmers are well aware of the problems I have mentioned but they are also aware that these problems are largely beyond the control of any provincial government.

Mr. Speaker, let us look at some of the ways in which rural areas such as mine benefit from this Budget. A Municipal Financing Corporation will be set up to assist local governments with their financing. The savings made available to municipalities will benefit all rural taxpayers. The grants to rural municipalities have been one of the most popular programs of this Liberal Government. I am pleased to see that an extra million dollars is being provided this year. A program is being initiated to help towns and villages to gravel streets. This financial assistance will make it possible for towns and villages to provide better streets for their citizens. The sums budgeted for hospital construction will make possible extensive renovations and the addition of three beds to Broadview hospital this spring. A fund of one quarter of a million dollars is being provided to construct roads to grid standards on Indian reserves. I hope this will benefit some of the reserves in my area. The

Budget Speech indicated that the Premier will call a conference this year to discuss problems with municipalities. It is refreshing to note that any changes in municipal organization will come as a result of full consultation and will not be rammed down their throat as the CCF tried to do with the county system.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Gardner:** — Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to see that this Government is continuing to co-operate with ARDA and make use of available funds. The agreement with ARDA for the Last Oak Park development north of Whitewood, Broadview and Grenfell is being finalized. It will result in a multi-million dollar park development which will eventually be one of the largest in Saskatchewan.

Mr. Speaker, of particular interest to me was the announcement that a special Indian and Metis Department was being set up and that \$1 million would be available in the coming year to carry out the program. This has been discussed by other speakers. I will not go into the details here.

Mr. Speaker, I was concerned last Friday when the NDP Member for Swift Current (Mr. Wood) referred to our Indians and I quote. "Their situation is becoming a continuing festering blight on our society and our economy." Now, Mr. Speaker, the CCF may consider the Indians a festering blight on our society, but I do not and there are many decent Indian citizens in my constituency who will also resent this type of statement. Certainly there are problems, certainly many things need to be done and this is the reason for the new Indian and Metis Department. To solve these problems is a job and a challenge for the new Department and I am sure the results will be encouraging. But when the Socialists refer to the Indians as a festering blight on our society they are aggravating problems that exist.

Mr. Speaker, there is one area where the Government could budget a relatively small amount of money and greatly benefit our rural people and this is in the field of farm tractor safety. Accidents involving farm machinery have killed over 600 people including 200 children in the past five years alone. Instead of improving, the fatality rate is increasing at an alarming rate, having doubled in the past 10 years. The large modern farm tractor used on our prairie farm has become a safety engineer's nightmare.

I would like to give you a few examples of the problems involved. About 80 per cent of machinery fatalities involve tractors and about half of these are from overturns. Safety frames or roll bars could save the lives of about 75 farmers per year, but they are essentially not available. The use of tractor cabs have compounded the problem and it makes escape almost impossible in an upset. Manufacturers have increased tractor horsepower and speed while callously disregarding the problems they are creating. Tractor brakes are often ineffective. Separate wheel brakes should be locked together at road speed and a single device could do this automatically when the tractor is shifted to road gear. The manufacturers are not doing it. But even this locking is not the complete answer. Separate brakes wear unevenly due to the large number of field turns in one direction, therefore different pressures are needed for safe stops. Hydraulic brakes with a pressure equalizer would solve this problem. It appears that manufacturers are showing little

concern. Most large modern tractors have a cramped space for only one person, no seat for a passenger, no hand grip. Those of you who have tried to hang on to a slippery tractor seat or a fender will understand what I mean. It is a fact of farm life that a passenger is occasionally carried on the tractor and that provisions could easily be made for his safety. Medical experts agree that prolonged exposure to noise levels of over 95 decibels can cause permanent hearing damage. Tractors such as the Massey-Ferguson 1100 have produced continual ratings of over 110 decibels and cabs often amplify the noise. Many farmers in Saskatchewan have suffered permanent hearing damage. Improved mufflers and cab insulation could bring the noise down to a safe level but it is not being done. Increased horsepower has caused traction problems in many tractors and manufacturers have attempted to cope with this problem in a very dangerous way. They have raised the hitch level to get weight transfer from the implement and from the tractor front end. This is good for traction but it is bad from a stability and a safety point of view. Clutch pedals on tractors are often very heavily sprung and for no good reason. Releasing a clutch pedal on a Case 930 is like pulling the trigger of a loaded gun and almost as dangerous. Younger persons or female field operators find it almost impossible to use the clutch in a safe manner. This accident hazard could be eliminated by the manufacturers with very little effort. I could mention many other safety hazards: the poor visibility which increases the possibility of running over small children or obstacles; the poor lights for driving on the road; the vibration that causes spinal ailments; the tool boxes which are inadequate or non-existent so the operator's platform becomes cluttered with chains, grease guns and tools. The lack of a parking lock or brake can lead to accidents when a tractor is left unattended. Many manufacturers are producing tractors much higher than necessary, presumably to give the buyer the feeling that he has a bigger tractor. This high centre of gravity leads to poor stability and makes it difficult and dangerous to mount the tractor. On many tractors, Mr. Speaker, the first step up on the tractor is over 30 inches high and the steps are small and dangerous. Mr. Speaker, I have had people say to me that we need not be concerned as the manufacturers are doing the research in this regard. Those who say this have not spent much time operating a tractor. It is obvious that the manufacturers are not doing their part in this regard. It is obvious that research and regulations are needed at the Provincial level and I would like to see a program initiated in this province. As a result of this research I would like to see regulations which would force manufacturers to eliminate these dangers to our farm tractor operators. At the Saskatoon campus of the University we have the best agriculture engineering college in Canada. They would be capable of carrying out such a research program. Funds could be solicited from manufacturers or supplied by the Province. A great service would be provided for the rural people of Canada at very little cost.

Mr. Speaker, I predict that the 75 per cent estate tax rebate as announced in the Budget will prove to be one of the most popular tax reduction measures in the history of Saskatchewan. Estate taxes generally are objectionable to many people for a variety of reasons. They destroy incentives which are a basic need in any free-enterprise society. They take money from the thrifty and give to those who are not, in a typical Socialist manner. It is like the basic Socialist theory that you should soak the rich. It may not be such a bad idea but they soon run out of rich and then have to soak the

ordinary citizen. The estate taxes tend to break up small farms and businesses which are the backbone of our economy. They cause the loss of estates and capital to our province and our country to areas where estate taxes are lower or non-existent and they provide great problems for inexperienced young people when the guidance of parents is missing. Mr. Speaker, many of our citizens would now be subject to estate taxes who would never have been eligible before. The increased value of farm land, pension plans, life insurance and other property has brought estate taxes into the realm of possibility for many, many people. For these and other reasons this Government is against the raising of money by estate taxes. A great deal of concern has been expressed to me about the new Federal estate taxes. Indeed, I have had more letters on this subject than on anything else since I have been a Member. For example a recent panel meeting which I attended at Grenfell in my constituency attracted about 175 people to discuss the estate taxes. I would like to assure my constituents that the new Federal Estate Bill is not all bad, it has many good features. For example the exemption for children are much larger and are even available for adult sons and daughters. The complete exemption for a wife allows the children to receive a share of the estate tax free when the father dies and again to receive a share tax free when the mother dies, or essentially double exemption for children from the same estate. So, Mr. Speaker, the good news is this, the new Federal proposal along with the 75 per cent rebate proposed by the Saskatchewan Liberal Government should almost eliminate the estate tax worry for citizens in Saskatchewan.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Gardner:** — Mr. Speaker, I will support the motion but not the amendment.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. E.I. Wood (Swift Current):** — Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, the Hon. Member who has just sat down (Mr. Gardner) said that I said that the Indians were becoming a continuing festering blight upon our society and economy. I have here the official transcript of the record and I did not say that the Indians were becoming a continuing festering blight but I said their “situation is becoming a continuing festering blight upon our society and our economy.”

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. J.E. Brockelbank (Saskatoon Mayfair):** — On a point of order, I think the Member (Mr. Gardner) should retract his statement because it is a personal statement.

**Mr. Gardner:** — I quoted it exactly the way he did.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Well, I have before me the speech as delivered by the Member from Moosomin and the quotation from that reads as follows:

Mr. Speaker, I was concerned last Friday when the NDP Member from Swift Current referred to our Indians and I

February 26, 1969

quote, "Their situation is becoming a continuing festering blight in our society and our economy."

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order, order! And I have here the official transcript of what the Member from Swift Current (Mr. Wood) said and I will read that to you:

Their situation . . .

He is referring to Indians

is becoming a continuing festering blight upon our society and upon our economy.

Now I trust that both those quotations will clear up any misconception that there may have been in the minds of the press and in the minds of the House. There may have been a misunderstanding in the words in connection with their relationship to the transcript as it will come out. I think the House will be prepared to accept the statement certainly of the Member from Swift Current (Mr. Wood). It's on the record.

**Mr. E. Kramer (The Battlefords):** — Mr. Speaker, and further on the point of order, it is all very well for him to read from his prepared text, but the transcript will say he went on to say afterwards that it was all very well for the Member to refer to the Indians as a festering blight. He said this and this is what we want him to withdraw.

**Mr. Speaker:** — If the Member for the Battlefords would only keep his seat, and the rest of the House, until such time that I was through with the argument, I would have gone on to say that I intend to look at the transcript tomorrow and settle the argument fully and completely, and in fact, tell those girls to get that transcript run off right away. That is the end of that argument for the time being until we see what takes place.

**Hon. A.C. Cameron (Minister of Mineral Resources):** — Mr. Speaker, I noticed that they just conveniently have taken up five minutes of my time. I was interested, as I was sitting here this afternoon, that this official Opposition that is so vitally concerned with the plight of the people of Saskatchewan, adorns this Chamber with less than eight Members.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Cameron:** — Where the rest are, I don't know. But I even notice that the financial critic (Mr. Blakeney) is not in his seat. I pertain to his speech of the other day. I listened to him with interest because the financial critic's speech in parliamentary procedures, as I understand it, sets a pattern for the attack of the Opposition. He set a pattern, he set a theme song. His theme song was I don't believe the Government figures. I don't trust this Budget. Budget figures cannot be trusted. "I do not believe," he said, "that this is a balanced Budget." "I do not



believe the economy is buoyant.” I have a credo, Mr. Speaker, I believe. His says, “I do not believe.” “I do not believe there is activity in Northern Saskatchewan.” said the official Opposition critic. And then he moved, Mr. Speaker, to agriculture.

I want to quote what he said on agriculture. He painted a picture of an agriculture economy in ruins, dropping cattle production, dropping hog production, dropping production in every phase of the livestock industry. While he was singing these blues in the Legislature here, the cattlemen were meeting in Saskatoon. What did the cattlemen in Saskatoon come out in the press and say? This is interesting. Cattlemen were being told that in the past three years Saskatchewan marketed more feeder cattle than any other province in Canada.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Cameron:** — They were told that Saskatchewan cattle producers provide 20 per cent of the total Canadian market. That out-of-province marketing of calves has been simply phenomenal. Here are the cattlemen creating a picture of optimism for the future of the cattle industry and the so-called financial critic is laying it in ruins before the people of Saskatchewan. Then he went from the cattle industry and agriculture to mineral resources. I was more than interested in what he had to say on mineral resources. He is reported in the Leader Post as having said:

Oil production reached 10 million barrels in 1964 but dropped to five million barrels in 1966.

Mr. Speaker, this is a gross exaggeration. The financial critic has before him the official report of the Department of Mineral Resources. He will find, if he takes the trouble to look, that oil production in 1966 was not five million barrels, it was 92 million barrels. The highest production ever recorded in the history of Saskatchewan.

**Mr. Blakeney:** — Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege. If the Hon. Member will take the trouble to read Hansard instead of the Leader Post he will get the figures and will find that my figures were correct.

**Mr. Cameron:** — Mr. Speaker, he has had over a week . . . Mr. Speaker, why didn't he offer a correction to the Leader Post? I have letters come in to me from the people of Saskatchewan questioning this article in the Leader Post. He made no effort to correct it. He wanted to leave that impression across the province. Mr. Speaker, I was one of the Saskatchewan delegates to the recent Constitutional Conference in Ottawa. One aspect of the conference was particularly heart-warming to us, the Saskatchewan delegates. This was the repeated reference by other Provincial Premiers to Saskatchewan's new position in Confederation. They spoke, Mr. Speaker, with warmth about Saskatchewan's achievement in leaving the have nots and taking her position as one of the richer industrialized provinces in Canada.

Mr. Speaker, I believe this is a tribute to the energy and

the stamina of Saskatchewan people. In 1964 when the Liberal party was seeking a mandate from the people we stated at that time it was our belief that, if Saskatchewan was to broaden her economic base, we must turn elsewhere than to the agriculture economy and the livestock industry, that we must turn to the only sector of the economy where any measure of growth could occur, that we must turn to the primary resource sector of our economy. It was our belief that Saskatchewan is blessed with tremendous mineral potential. It was also evident to us that rich, as this potential may be, it was of little use to the people of Saskatchewan until it has been searched out, extracted, and put to use for the benefit of the people of Saskatchewan.

One of the first acts of this Government was to meet with the mineral industry and devise a working arrangement between the Government and the industry, a working arrangement which would assure to those who would develop our resources a reasonable profit but which would at the same time safeguard the people's interest in these resources. It appeared to us that, if we were to find new oil reserves to meet an expanding market, the industry would have to be encouraged to go deeper into the bowels of the earth in search of this oil.

An incentive was offered to encourage the industry to enter a phase of deep drilling. To encourage a stepped-up search for natural gas, we removed the restriction which compelled all gas producers to sell only to the Power Corporation at prices dictated by the Power Corporation. In other words, Mr. Speaker, we freed the gas producers and gave them access to the competitive market.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Cameron:** — This sparked the tremendous upsurge in gas development in this province. In order that the people of Saskatchewan may assess our record in this regard, Mr. Speaker, I want to lay before the Members of this House the achievements of the oil industry to date since 1964. The oil industry during the past four years has poured \$600 million into Saskatchewan in oil exploration and development. During this period 323 wells have been drilled into the deep Devonian formation compared with 53 wells in the period 1961 to 1964.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Cameron:** — Today, Saskatchewan people I think, can be proud of the fact that Saskatchewan has joined Montana and Alberta as a producer of Devonian oil. Today, Saskatchewan wells are producing in excess of 90 million barrels of oil annually, some 20 million barrels more than we were producing in 1963.

I think, Mr. Speaker, it would be of interest to the people of Saskatchewan to know that of all the oil produced in Saskatchewan since oil was first discovered, 45 per cent of that total oil has been produced in the last five years.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Cameron:** — To those who would attempt to say that this Government has given away our mineral resources, let me give the House the

figures on the revenue received from the mineral resource sector.

In the past four years the oil industry has paid in taxes and royalties to the Provincial coffers an amount in excess of \$153 million. In addition to this it has paid another \$33 million for the privilege of securing land for exploration. Let me put it another way. Of the total amount of revenue received from the mineral sector since the Federal Government returned the resources to the province, 40 per cent of the total was received during the last four years.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Cameron:** — Mr. Speaker, this is the contribution the oil industry has made to this province since 1964. I would like here, Mr. Speaker, to pay public tribute to the oil industry for the contribution it has made and is continuing to make to the economic growth of the Province of Saskatchewan.

I want to turn now, Mr. Speaker, to the potash industry. The potash industry like the oil industry has shown its confidence in Saskatchewan. In the past five years, five new potash mines have come into production. Four other companies are presently sinking shafts in preparation for production. By the end of this year or shortly thereafter, Saskatchewan will have ten potash mines in production. I think that we should note, however, for the immediate future Saskatchewan potash will have to compete in an extremely competitive market. The world potash production has outstripped the growth in consumption. In an effort to ease the pressures on the companies in Saskatchewan to construct new plants, the Government amended the regulations that compelled the companies to spend a minimum of \$3 million during the first three years of the lease. New regulations permit the companies to hold a permit for development at a later date by paying a straight rental of \$90,000 per year on each permit. In addition to this, Mr. Speaker, we undertook a study to assess the world outlook for potash production and marketing.

Here again, I want to pay tribute to the members of that committee for the job that they did in this study. This report has received wide acceptance among the potash industry. I think, Mr. Speaker, that Mr. Nelson White, president of International Minerals and Chemicals, summed up the industry's reaction:

The report should be a tremendous aid toward crystallizing action to solve the Canadian potash industry's problems.

He said further:

The very fact that such a study has been made, and so thoroughly, suggests that one of the principal problems has already been solved.

In addition to Mr. White's comment, I would like to refer to Kalium's announcement that they plan an additional 50 per cent expansion to their plant in 1969. In announcing the expansion, Mr. Franklin Barber, the chairman of the Board of Pittsburgh Glass, commented:

The plant expansion is a measure of Kalium's confident in the future.

**February 26, 1969**

I think, Mr. Speaker, we can be confident of this that the potash people here in Saskatchewan, trying as the times may be are made of the stuff that will carry them through this difficult period.

May I say that it would aid their task immensely if the Opposition do-gooders and crepe hangers would get off the back of the potash industry.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Cameron:** — I wish, Mr. Speaker, now to turn to the third area of the mineral sector, namely, the hard-rock mining in Northern Saskatchewan. In this area I wish to quote again from the remarks of the financial critic and hope that Hon. Members will keep these remarks in mind. He asked a question: How many times has it been suggested that the North is experiencing a veritable resurgence after years of deadening stagnation? Then he goes on to quote some more figures. “Why,” he said, “hard-rock mineral production in 1968 was down 30 per cent from 1963.” That incidentally is correct, Mr. Speaker. But I noticed that he was very careful not to elaborate. Why didn’t he tell the full story of declining metal production? Since he didn’t tell the story of declining metal, Mr. Speaker, perhaps I should tell the story. Why didn’t the financial critic go back to 1957? Why did he begin in 1963? Metal production has been dropping at a drastic rate each and every year since 1957. Our only metal production was coming from a mine, not in Saskatchewan but in Flin Flon, Manitoba, which was mining under the earth and reaching into Saskatchewan. This reserve is being depleted and they were phasing-out the Saskatchewan operation. That is why revenue was dwindling.

Mr. Speaker, may I tell the House this afternoon that the Government immediately took some measures to correct this situation. As a result today we have Saskatchewan mines producing Saskatchewan ore for the benefit of Saskatchewan people.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Cameron:** — Last year after a decade of declining metal production this was halted. The Mineral Resources Report is in front of the financial critic. The Report from the Department of Mineral Resources shows that metal production now is on the upturn in every phase.

These people, Mr. Speaker, should be the last in this Chamber or elsewhere to criticize activity in Northern Saskatchewan. When we formed the Government in 1964 we found only one mine operating in Northern Saskatchewan and that was the Federal Government’s mine producing uranium. Activity in Northern Saskatchewan had ground to a virtual halt. Only a handful of companies were doing work in the North. The total expenditures for exploration for minerals in the North in 1963 were \$250,000! Less than 1 per cent of the Canadian mining exploration dollar was finding its way into Saskatchewan. In 1964, may I say again, when we were seeking a mandate from the people of Saskatchewan, we told them that it was our belief that, if Saskatchewan was to reach her full potential of growth, we must push back our northern frontiers. We believed that the mining industry must be in the vanguard of such a challenge. We realized

that it was extremely costly to take men and equipment into the remote areas of Northern Saskatchewan. We realize that in many respects it is very inaccessible. We offered the mining industry an incentive program which we thought was tailored to the needs of Northern Saskatchewan.

This program in essence provided that the Government would undertake to share the risk of finding metals. We believed it was good business to take some of the revenues accruing to the Province from minerals in the South and to plow them into the opening up of the North. In the fall of 1964 we announced our incentive program to the northern mining areas. I want to quote a few statements from the comments made by the Northern Miner which is a national magazine devoted to mining interests. Here is the quote from the article entitled, "Saskatchewan sees the light."

This week's announcement that the Saskatchewan Government is writing new legislation into the books to attract the prospector points up the forward thinking of the new Liberal Government of the mid-prairie province. She is looking northward to achieve the full measure of economic growth and development that is within her grasp.

So said the Northern Miner.

Mr. Speaker, I think today is a good time after four years to here again give the people of Saskatchewan an opportunity to assess the success or otherwise of this incentive program. Hon. Members will find on your desks a map showing the northern area, showing the red line at the bottom which indicates the boundaries where the Precambrian area begins and a circular area showing the area which we refer to as the Athabasca Sandstone area.

The Precambrian Shield of Northern Saskatchewan as you see from your map is a massive area. It contains approximately 60 million acres. Mr. Speaker, of this total area of Northern Saskatchewan of 60 million acres in 1963-64, 72,000 acres were being explored for minerals. 72,000 and I hope that the Hon. Members will keep that in mind. This was the extent of development in 1964. As at January 31, 1968, this 72,000 acres had mushroomed to 33 million acres. 33 million acres in Northern Saskatchewan are now under active exploration. I think that it is of interest to note that this summer we will see more acres in Northern Saskatchewan being combed for minerals than seeded to crop in Southern Saskatchewan.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Cameron:** — The map, you will notice, reveals this area stretching from La Ronge east and west both to the Manitoba and Alberta border and north right up to the Northwest Territories.

Mining companies will spend this year in the search for minerals, not \$250,000 as they did in 1963, they will spend combing the North for minerals this year in excess of \$10 million. Hon. Members will recall in the latter part of November we announced that Gulf Minerals had struck a rich uranium showing in Northern Saskatchewan. This discovery showed uranium oxide mineralization grading at what they term .60 per cent, which is the richest uranium ore ever discovered anywhere in the world. This ore is three times richer than the Elliott Lake

discovery in Ontario.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Cameron:** — Mr. Speaker, the announcement of this uranium discovery in Northern Saskatchewan, regardless of the downgrading of the Opposition triggered the greatest land rush Saskatchewan has ever experienced. The flood of applications coming into my Department has resulted in 160 permits being taken up in Wollaston Lake area alone covering over 30 million acres. Do you know, Mr. Speaker, how many permits were out in the North in 1964 when I took over the office?

**An Hon. Member:** — Two.

**Mr. Cameron:** — Seven! Today there are 160 permits in the North covering over 30 million acres.

Now what does this mean to the provincial economy and what does it mean to the Government? Permits issued to date in the Wollaston Lake area commit these companies to spend a minimum of \$22 million during the next three years in the search for minerals. As a guarantee that this amount of money will be spent, the companies have deposited with my Department of Mineral Resources a deposit of \$4 million. If they default in the work commitments it will entail the forfeiture of that \$4 million to the Provincial Government.

The Government will receive in rentals alone on this area during the next three years in excess of \$2 million. When the uranium discovery was announced resulting in the above committed expenditures we announced to the people of Saskatchewan that the incentive program for Northern Saskatchewan is being stopped. It will end and be cleaned up at the end of March, when all the accounts are in. I think I can inform the Hon. Members that to date this program has cost the Province in the neighborhood of \$3 million. When the final payments are made on the work commitments that are out and are being processed now to the end of March, we estimate that the total cost of the program will be \$5.4 million. I would point out, Mr. Speaker, that in excess of \$2 million of this will be refunded in rentals within three years.

Of course under that incentive program any mine that comes into production must return to the Government the assistance that it received from the Government. It is evident, I am sure, to all fair-minded people of Saskatchewan that this incentive program has played a very important role, first in attracting the attention of the world-wide mining industry to the possibilities in Northern Saskatchewan, and secondly to ask them to bring in their mining and to assist us in pushing back the frontiers of the North. I am confident that this program will repay dividends to the Province many, many fold.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Cameron:** — In Northern Saskatchewan, at the present time tractor trains are now wending their way over the frozen terrain of the North taking in mining equipment and rushing it in before the spring break-up. The programs planned by the companies are too numerous to mention here, but I want to mention just one or two

that I think are of a nature that you would be interested in.

Gulf Minerals will be doing extensive diamond drilling work to determine the size of the uranium ore body they discovered last fall. In addition, the company will be drilling a four-inch hole, 5,000 feet deep into the Athabasca Basin to assess the possibilities of uranium there. A second company, Dejour Mines Limited, have just informed us the other day that they likewise will be drilling a hole in the Athabasca Sandstone down to the basement to test the Athabasca Sandstone.

We are presently, in the Department, working with a host of companies which are setting out an agreement for pooling their resources to undertake a massive flying program in the North. This year the North will see put to use in this mapping program not only the fixed wing and the helicopters in Saskatchewan, but companies will be sending in fixed wing and helicopters from British Columbia and from Manitoba.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Cameron:** — The financial critic asked, “How many times has it been suggested that the North is experiencing a veritable resurgence after years of deadening stagnation?” I have given him the answer to his question. Yes, Mr. Speaker, the North is experiencing a veritable resurrection after years of deadening stagnation.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Cameron:** — This is the reason, Mr. Speaker, that Saskatchewan looks to 1969 with confidence. Before the curtain of 1969 is lowered, we should have a fair assessment of what the North holds for our people. I think we can look to the future of Northern Saskatchewan with optimism. A development in the Wollaston Lake area based on a mine and mill the size of Eldorado could mean employment for 250 men in a townsite of 1,300 people, supported by an annual payroll of \$3 million. A road to the mine could open up a fabulous new northern playground. These are some of the bounties for the people of Saskatchewan we had in mind when we devised the incentive program which has breathed new life into Northern Saskatchewan. I am sure, Mr. Speaker, that Saskatchewan people will join with me in wishing these stout-hearted men of the North success in this fascinating venture they have undertaken.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Cameron:** — If we can continue blazing these new trails, opening new frontiers, Saskatchewan, as the Northern Miner stated, will achieve the full measure of economic growth and development that is within her grasp.

Mr. Speaker, I support the motion.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. H.H.P. Baker (Regina South East):** — Mr. Speaker, I thought perhaps the Minister might give me a little air time for free, but I want to say that

**February 26, 1969**

whenever he gets up to speak I seem to get a bleeding heart. The shovel that was presented to me today, I was going to re-present to the Minister of Highways (Mr. Boldt) but after listening to the Minister of Mineral Resources I am not sure.

Mr. Speaker, in rising to debate the Budget let me first of all make some general comments about it and its authors. Not surprisingly, I am deeply shocked and very disturbed at the double-talk contained in the Budget speech. However, I support there is some good in everything, even in a Budget speech like that of the Deputy Premier (Mr. Steuart). It does show that the Member from Prince Albert has a sense of humor. It is strange that his humor is at the expense of the municipalities of this province, whether they be cities, towns, villages or rural areas.

I hope the Minister of Highways (Mr. Boldt) will remain here because I have a few remarks for him later on, particularly as the Hon. Member is Mayor of one of our urban centres. It is so out of context to hear the Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Steuart) make statements such as:

I challenge those to remember that the taxpayer could do with more consideration than he has had in the past.

Obviously he wasn't thinking of the municipal property taxpayer. Another quote:

The present imbalances between our fiscal resources and responsibilities are corrected. We will accept the principle that the Government which spends the money should raise the money, and then we will be in a position to establish our own priorities.

There is certainly nothing in this Budget to indicate that the Government intends to grant similar powers to local governments. In fact, it is obvious that the brief on broadening of the tax base presented by the city of Regina to the Cabinet fell on deaf ears.

Another interesting quote:

Because provinces do not have adequate tax resources, it makes it extremely difficult for them to fully meet the needs of their municipalities.

This acknowledges a situation which to some extent exists, but it certainly does not account for the fact that Saskatchewan is the only province which does not make unconditional grants to municipalities. Nor does it account for the fact that in every other province some attempt is being made to lessen the burden of education costs upon the property taxpayer. The Treasurer states that the Government has displayed leadership in controlling its rates of spending and asks all local governments, including school boards and hospital boards, to display the same restraint even when this means making difficult decisions.

Mr. Speaker, we have been listening to that same dogma ever since this Government took office.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Baker:** — The Province will continue to grab all the taxes and



spend it where its whims dictate. Certainly, Mr. Speaker, the cities of Regina and Saskatoon are to be granted a few dollars to assist in the maintenance of the former health grant. This 25-cent increase given to us is a help, but the city of Regina will have to find another \$10,000 this year to cover grants that were cut, and around \$30,000 next year. But equally certain is the fact that the property taxpayer in Regina must dig a little deeper if we are to continue these desirable programs, programs which in all health regions are being borne in full by Provincial taxes. I don't know, Mr. Speaker, whether my sense of humor is lacking, but I can assure you that I never could stand sick comedy, particularly when the comedian's sense of timing is so sadly lacking.

Last year I paid tribute to the musical ability of this Government under the leadership of the Premier. I've grown accustomed to those staccato, discordant dirges which emanated from the Cabinet chambers. Chamber music — it was not.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Baker:** — This year it appears we must listen to the same orchestra but with a new conductor. The discord remains, but in the place of the staccato dirge, we are to be surrounded by the slow, syrupy tunes of the deceptively muted wind section.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Baker:** — Perhaps all we can really hear is the wind. You know the one who blows no one any good. However, I assume that the heir-apparent needs some time before the orchestra can become accustomed to his own particular blend of vagueness and confusion.

I think that if this Budget document were to be given a title, the most appropriate one would be "The things I didn't do," or "How to talk a lot and say nothing."

The Government makes a great effort and goes to many pains to call it a balanced Budget. How balanced is it when monies are borrowed from the Saskatchewan Power Corporation fund of profits, from the Telephone profits and others. \$3.5 million from the Saskatchewan Power Corporation, \$4,300,000 from Telephones and \$3 million from finance office corporations. What is it called in the Estimates, Mr. Speaker. It is called a dividend, a dividend or profit made from Socialist enterprises. If you hadn't used these dividends, you would have a \$10 million deficit. A \$10 million deficit, and of the \$4 million you took in from the Saskatchewan Power Corporation, \$2 million of it is another outright gift from the city of Regina through its city light and power system you got for practically nothing, as a gift from your Civic Voters' Association friends at City Hall.

Last year you got over \$1½ million of the \$3 million taken in as a dividend from the city. Dividend is a cute word. A Socialist or co-operative word, as I understand it. I'm amazed you use it. The monies contributed, as I said, by the Socialist enterprises amount to over \$10 million so you took this into your Budget as revenues to balance it. Instead of using this money to expand the utilities or to give the dividend back to the people as a dividend, instead you borrow money for expansion of these utilities and so in essence you're borrowing money to balance the Budget.

**February 26, 1969**

The Government says we need more restraint again. Capital projects are piling up year after year and interest rates going higher and higher. I say we don't need an austerity budget now, we need to provide more funds to keep our economy affluent and buoyant.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Baker:** — We need more money to spend on buildings for our University to cope with our student population. We need a technical institute now in Regina and other cities too. This Budget is creating such a backlog. I know the Treasurer can't take it, he's got to go now.

Heaven alone knows we'll never catch up in 20 years. It can also be called a stagnation Budget with no new programs to promote industrial growth, with no new programs for parks and recreation. In fact a \$600,000 cut. It cannot be called a status quo Budget, because many programs are actually reduced. Others may be given a similar service as last year. But to me, it is a plain "Nothing Budget." A plain "Nothing Budget." I notice I scare them all out when I tell them the truth. Nothing for cities, towns, villages or rural municipalities. Nothing for extending the medicare and hospitalization plan, actually cutting back on physiotherapy and radiology. Nothing for chiropractors. Nothing for dental care programs. Nothing for a drug plan. It's a real nothing Budget, I'm telling you. Nothing to increase the benefit to our welfare recipients to whom I suggested \$25 to \$30 per month be given. Nothing for our pensioners. Nothing for student work program. Nothing added to the homeowner grant. Nothing for the farmer in paying back the \$400 installation electrical charge, this is his dividend. Nothing to reduce university tuition fees. Nothing of any consequence for education or the foundation plan. Nothing for a new technical institute. Nothing for university expansion and construction. Nothing to relieve the taxpayer of the burdensome \$35 million taxes you imposed on the good people of Saskatchewan last year. And yet you got millions extra for a medicare plan. Yes, you are not only broke but long gone.

Mr. Speaker, many municipalities and organizations have made representations to this Government for assistance in one form or another. Obviously the Cabinet intends to do very little to rectify matters. Equally obvious, the Cabinet is not advising the Members of the Government or the Opposition what the problems are. I must, therefore, take a few minutes to point out just a few of them. I do this so that all Members of this Legislature may know the extremely perilous position of the local government authorities of this province.

Mr. Speaker, the plight of all municipalities is desperate. Today the cost of providing municipal services exceeds the limit of monies obtainable from property taxation. In short, the revenue system to the municipality is inadequate. Ontario, New Brunswick and even the neighboring province of Manitoba have had commissions to study this matter. All have taken action to improve the situation.

I did, with the support of the city council, arrange for the submission of a brief to this Government entitled, "Broadening of the Urban Tax Base." It was submitted in July, 1968 and gave them an insight into some aspects of the financial situation

of the major cities of this province, and our city as well. The area of most concern was the rapid growth of education costs, and its impact on property. Research indicated the following: In 1967 and 1968 we were receiving something like 29 per cent toward education costs from the Government. 1968 and 1969 it appears will be around the figure again. However, during the same years the national average rose from 26 to 33 per cent. In 1968 and 1969 Ontario now gives toward education 37.4 or anywhere to 39 per cent.

Of the four Western Provinces, property in Saskatchewan bears the largest share of education costs. The conclusion is that this Government has fallen behind in its contribution to education and it is the property owner who has been forced to assume the increasing tax load. The seriousness of the situation in Regina is illustrated in the following further points:

In 1963, it was mentioned yesterday, the gap between operation costs and grants was \$6,700,000. In 1967, \$11,200,000 which shows definitely that increased grants are far from adequate as far as the property tax is concerned. In 1960, education took 42 per cent of the property tax. You know what it takes in 1967 in Regina, over 56 per cent. Over 56 per cent. While the municipality levy has risen parallel to the monthly wage, it is obvious that the education levy on property has risen at a far faster rate.

In this respect, I must point out that the competition for the tax dollar is painfully apparent and current competition between schools and municipal governments is critical. All forecasts predict a substantial increase in the cost of education throughout Saskatchewan for 1969. Action must be taken to alter the tax structure.

Dealing somewhat with assessment, which was touched on yesterday, I think all of us accept the fact that all taxes should be imposed as equitably as possible. They are a necessary evil which generally are related to the ability to pay. It follows that the assessment of property throughout the province should be on a uniform basis by re-assessment at frequent intervals. It should remain so.

The policy of the Government is to undertake the assessment for all rural areas and all urban centres with a population of less than 15,000. This is at the total cost to the Province. In Regina and three other major centres, the Government is prepared to pay only 35 cents per capita toward the cost of re-assessment. This would only mean \$49,000 for Regina, whereas the total assessment of this city would cost something like \$300,000. Our citizens are not asking for preferential treatment. They merely ask for the same treatment as that afforded other areas of the province. I think they are entitled to the same consideration.

It is noted that the expenditures for the Attorney General's (Mr. Heald) Department are mounting steadily while revenues remain somewhat static. It is also noted that the major cause for increased expenditures in this Department is the cost of contractual services with the Royal Canadian Mounted Police. This is yet another example of the inequities created by this Government between the larger urban and smaller local governments. The Government is quite prepared to subsidize the less densely populated areas of our province, but the large urban centres must support

**February 26, 1969**

not only their own force and police magistrates as well. We must also provide revenue with which this Province can aid the smaller centres. I'm not against this policy but larger centres deserve their share too.

Further, our police force is compelled by law to carry out duties which not only aid the Province and its Crown corporations but actually relieve them of substantial costs. These costs are being borne by the property taxpayer in urban centres and are an imposition which should be recognized by the Government. Every royal commission across Canada has recognized that the administration of justice is a Provincial matter. We're even prepared to go along and do this on the basis of a two-way street in order to help solve this situation. Other provinces have taken action to rectify it. I suggest it is time this Province took the appropriate action as well.

Mr. Speaker, for some strange and inexplicable reason, this Government shies away from even the mention of unconditional grants. There is nothing underhanded, nothing devious in my constant requests for unconditional grants. Indeed, I am sure I am voicing the opinion of all our municipalities, both large and small, when I say unconditional grants are absolutely essential if local governments are to fulfil their roles.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Baker:** — The payment of unconditional grants by other provinces to the municipalities has been in existence for many years. Unconditional grants are given so that all property owners have the same relief from taxation. In every other province, unconditional grants are a matter of record. But in Saskatchewan, the equalization grant is given only to rural municipalities and the urban centres are left to secure their revenue, chiefly from property taxation.

I do acknowledge the existence in Saskatchewan of the homeowner grant which should have been raised to at least \$100 this year.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Baker:** — British Columbia pays the unconditional per capita grant plus the homeowner grant. The same situation prevails in Alberta. Provincial governments recognize that municipalities cannot meet their financial obligations unaided, but not this Government. There is also general recognition that local governments know best where funds are required. Mr. Speaker, in Alberta municipalities receive unconditional grants on a formula basis. Using the same basis, Regina would have received \$2,430,000 in 1968.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Baker:** — Or \$17.36 per capita. In Ontario, formula unconditional grants are made to municipalities. A similar formula in Saskatchewan would yield to Regina \$875,000 or \$6.25 per capita.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Baker:** — British Columbia is extremely conscious of the problems of the municipalities and makes unconditional grants of \$25 per capita. A grant of this nature would yield Regina \$3½ million per annum.

I have illustrated how other provincial governments have recognized the utter necessity for government aid to municipalities and how they have endeavored to meet it by the payment of these grants. No doubt whatever can remain in the minds of anyone in this House that urban centres in Saskatchewan are being treated unfairly and inequitably. This Government must recognize the paralyzing weight of taxation placed on property owners in urban centres, a crushing burden.

In all fairness to the fine people of Saskatchewan, I must insist that this Government make unconditional grants to all cities, towns, villages, hamlets and rural municipalities of not less than \$10 per capita.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Baker:** — In summing up, the tax base should be utilized to provide local services such as streets, water, sewer and other services to residences and businesses. This situation no longer exists. Today the property tax in the province is being used to pay services to people as well, health, education, welfare, and justice. I have pointed out continually that this Government must commence to assume its responsibilities. It cannot continue to increase the load on the municipal mill rate.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Baker:** — Therefore, in summing up, immediate action is required in these two fields: the cost of education should be limited as to the amount that can be obtained from property tax, some form of the foundation system must be instituted now; secondly the payment by this Government, as I've stated, of an unconditional grant to all municipalities of \$10 per capita per annum. I shall continue to press this Government at every opportunity for the implementation of these two most just requests.

I now turn to highways. I'm very sorry that the Minister (Mr. Boldt) is not here. I gave him the courtesy yesterday, Mr. Speaker, of remaining and listening to his diatribe for an hour and a half. I'm very sorry that he doesn't accord me the same privilege.

Practically \$62 million is to be spent on highways and of that \$61 or \$62 million, Mr. Speaker, we are only going to get \$45 million in value. Where, Mr. Speaker — I wish the Minister was here — is the other \$16 or \$17 million? Where is it? Who gets it? It is difficult to compare highway contract prices with city contracts because of the difference in working space. However, it is possible to compare — and I want to do this — the efficiency of city crews and city contracts over the years with the work carried out by the highway crews and highway contracts. During 1956-1957, now listen to this, following the recommendations of the Woods, Gordon Report submitted to the city of Regina, we purchased an asphalt plant and road building equipment. That's the first year I was elected an alderman, in 1956.

**February 26, 1969**

Prior to 1956 the city of Regina paid an average — I want you to mark this down — paid an average of \$10.50 per ton for asphalt. During the first year of operation the city plant produced asphalt at \$6 per ton. In 1965 the city was able to reduce the price to \$4.85 per ton.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Baker:** — The tonnage produced by the city plant was 712,000 tons, resulting in a saving of \$1,885,000 during the period from 1956 to 1965.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Baker:** — The same reductions in cost can be shown by using city-owned gravel. The average cost — I wish he was here, I've got a few more things to say to him — of stabilized base, delivered and placed by private contractors averaged between \$2.25 to \$2.55 per ton. But for the city, utilizing their own gravel and placing it with their own equipment, the costs varied between \$1.55 and \$1.75 per ton. By the city doing a substantial amount of work with its own crews, the overall cost of paving has been reduced by 30 per cent. The city has carried out approximately \$20 million of paving over the past 15 years, resulting in a saving to the Regina taxpayers of \$6 million.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Baker:** — But what do we see in the Provincial Department of Highways contracting policy? It would appear the reverse is taking place. To 1964 the Government still carried out construction work with its own crews with an average cost for earthwork of 16 to 19 cents per cubic yard. By phasing out the highway construction crews, contract prices immediately rose to 22 to 26 cents per cubic yard. From 1964 to 1969 there has been an increase in earth-moving costs of 27 per cent in the Highways Department. The same is true for asphalt. For the years 1962 to 1964 the average costs of highway contracts for mixing and placing only, the gravels and bitumen being supplied by the Government, was \$1.88. But since this Government changed to contracting, the price immediately rose by \$1.25 to \$1.45 per ton, an increase of 29 per cent, to \$3.13 or \$3.33.

On the three contracts on which tenders have been called for so far this year by Highways to \$898,000, the price could be \$250,000 less if the contractors had to compete with the Highway Department crews. If this same percentage is applied to the \$60 million Highway budget, the Province could realize \$17 million saving, which could be used for the betterment of the people of Saskatchewan.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Baker:** — Yes, Mr. Speaker, I was going to ask Mr. Minister or Mr. Invisible Minister (Mr. Boldt): who is getting that \$17 million when you have a budget of nearly \$62 million or thereabouts? And yet the people of Saskatchewan get only \$45 million worth of services. I ask the Minister: to whom are you giving these lucrative donations? Last year contracts were let

out of the province, in the main. All servicing of their equipment was done, I understand, in Edmonton and Winnipeg, thus creating lay-offs in our large industrial centres and by contractors in Saskatchewan. I believe we must look after our own people first if we are to keep our economy going.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Baker:** — Yes, we need competitive bidding, but a percentage should be used as a certain basis for awarding contracts so that we are not short-changed here in our province.

I was going to say that my message no doubt would have fallen on deaf ears as far as the Minister (Mr. Boldt) is concerned. We all know he is considered No. 13 on the totem pole in the Cabinet. I always like to refer to him, Mr. Speaker, as Apostle No. 13, the apostle of hate, the man who said we need a depression, we need unemployment, we need soup kitchens again to have a good economy, while he can continue to live with a silver spoon in his mouth, which he inherited.

A very perturbing thing which is happening in this Budget, Mr. Speaker, is the cutting off of the maintenance grants.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Baker:** — With regard to the Department of Welfare, in cutting off the maintenance grants for those in the homes for the aged, some will be receiving nothing at all, as far as I can determine. I don't know the details of what he's to bring out yet, but I'm mentioning what's coming to me now. Some homes might get 10 per cent. I don't know. Those aged on assistance are to lose their clothing allowance, I understand. How cruel can this Government get? It tries to talk about a balanced Budget by taking the clothes away from old-age people on assistance. By taking off these maintenance grants, it means it will increase the cost to guests living in homes. What a shameful, inhumane stroke of business against helpless people! I am sure that we'll say more about this as we get along in the session.

Well, you know, Mr. Speaker, I always have a lot of joy in talking about the auditorium. I don't see the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Guy). The Member from Yorkton (Mr. Gallagher) has disappeared too, but I always come here to tell the true story and to give you the real facts.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Baker:** — The auditorium always seems to create great headlines in the press. I've got a real story for you this year and the true one in complete context.

The Budget in 1968 put in, I think, \$2,489,000. In 1969 I believe it contains a little better than \$2½ million.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Baker:** — Somebody said . . . oh, there he is, the man from Yorkton! Well, well, the man that predicted to me in the last Federal

**February 26, 1969**

election in his constituency of Yorkton that the NDP candidate would lose his deposit and the Liberals would win . . .

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. B.D. Gallagher (Yorkton):** — What about the suggestion to run in Regina East, Henry?

**Mr. Baker:** — That's about as much stalk as you can put in his words or his thoughts . . .

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Baker:** — . . . I always knew he was far off base, but my God he is way out in left field.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Hon. L.P. Coderre (Minister of Labour):** — Henry, you can't make it!

**Mr. Baker:** — So far a few snide remarks . . . If you invite me out to your constituency, I'll come out and run.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Baker:** — So far a few snide remarks have been made in this House regarding the Auditorium, mostly of course, from the Member from Saskatoon City Park-University (Mr. Charlebois), the Junior Member as he's been called. Their time would be much better employed in pressing the local government there to see that the stench and smell that Saskatoon residents have been putting up with for years would have been looked after in getting a sewage setup there.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Baker:** — They should have made their city habitable for the good people of Saskatoon to live in. Not only that, you have polluted a good river from which hundreds of thousands of people draw their drinking water. I said earlier that we have spent \$16 to \$18 million these past 10 years since I have been Mayor, to protect the good citizens of Regina from sewage odors and the pollution and supply of water used for drinking.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Baker:** — You would do well if you'd get to work on that, gentlemen, because I'm getting plenty of letters from the Saskatoon people to come there and build a sewage system for them.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Baker:** — Come to think of it, I believe the Saskatoon Member (Mr. Charlebois) needs that shovel most of all.



**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Baker:** — Well, you know the Regina local government is concerned with the health and welfare of its people. When Saskatoon is finally forced to put in the sewage treatment facilities, this Government runs to their side but not for Regina, not for Moose Jaw, not for Weyburn or Estevan — how about that Mr. MacDougall? Not for Melville, not for Yorkton — where's Mr. Gallagher? Not for Swift Current, yes, not for North Battleford, for Melfort-Tisdale, and I could go on and on. But when Saskatoon or Prince Albert needs it, legislation comes in here real fast.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Baker:** — So we all have to contribute to help poor old Saskatoon and Prince Albert again.

**Hon. C.L.B. Estey (Minister of Municipal Affairs):** — The growing city of Saskatoon!

**Mr. Baker:** — Most of us have completed proper facilities. Well, I come back to the auditorium. It is something that I've said that must be told at each session. The truth is always told by myself.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Baker:** — Here is what happened, I can see Mel Hinds up there in the press gallery getting ready for the glowing headlines. I hope you get up and say something on this, Mr. Minister of Public Works (Mr. Guy). Yes, what happened? Now get this, I'll put it very simply, I'll put it in simple arithmetic, I know it is hard for you to understand over there, but I'll put it very simply.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Baker:** — What happened when we planned a \$4½ million auditorium? Regina voters voted by a good majority to put in \$1 million, \$2½ million was given to us by Ottawa under the Diefenbaker Government. The Provincial Government was to give us \$1 million or \$2 million if it divided the Federal grant. So that made the total \$4½ million. Had we received our rightful monies, the auditorium would have been completed over two years ago. What happened when the Thatcher Government got in? What happened? Look at the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Estey) acting up. Wait until I give him the next point. It took \$1¼ million of our money from Ottawa, that Ottawa gave us, and gave it to Saskatoon. Our voters then said "No" to another \$1 million bylaw because this Government gave away \$1¼ million of our money. How much have we got, Mr. Speaker, in this auditorium? This takes the cake! Take the \$1 million the people of Regina contributed, take the \$2½ million that had been invested for the past three or four years, that gives us an interest amount of \$500,000. What is our equity in the auditorium in Regina today? We've got \$4 million in that auditorium, \$4 million . . .

**February 26, 1969**

**Mr. D.M. McPherson (Regina South West):** — . . . Henry, Henry, blame the Member for Regina Centre (Mr. Blakeney).

**Mr. Baker:** — Well, look at the boy back there, he eventually woke up the first time during this session. This is the man that says, "Get things done with Don in Regina, get things done with Don." The only thing he gets done is when he extracts the money from the pockets of the people and the people contribute to build the various projects that he takes the credit for.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Baker:** — And when it comes to getting money for the hospitals in Regina, who has to find it? I've got to find it for them.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Baker:** — So he stands up here and talks big. Big Don talks big but what has he done for Regina? He hasn't even got the sod turned for the base hospital which should have been done two years ago.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Baker:** — I can assure you that Big Don isn't going to be back after next election.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Baker:** — Well now, as for the city's contribution to that auditorium, in fact, Mr. Speaker, we've got more money in that auditorium than the Government has.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Baker:** — The Minister of Labour (Mr. Coderre) is sitting there and he believes me now, Mr. Speaker, furthermore, we've got more money in the auditorium than the city of Saskatoon has in theirs.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Baker:** — Put that in your pipe and smoke it! Yes, and these are the facts.

**Mr. J.J. Charlebois (Saskatoon City Park-University):** — Henry, you are off base.

**Mr. Baker:** — And because of this situation, Mr. Speaker, this is what I will urge the New Democratic Government to approve when it takes over in 1971.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Baker:** — These are the recommendations when we are elected that I will ask to be implemented, first — I want you to get this — that the auditorium in Regina and Saskatoon be operated by the Provincial Government, assuming full costs of operation for both cities, as it is done in Alberta for Calgary and Edmonton; secondly, that the property title of the auditorium here and the 31 acres of land we had, be put back in the name of the city of Regina. That is number two I am going to demand; thirdly . . .

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Baker:** — It will be done, you won't be here, though.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Baker:** — Thirdly, this is the last one and this is a good one too, that the city of Regina will be given back the \$1¼ million you stole from our coffers and gave to Saskatoon, to be paid back with interest.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Baker:** — This will be in my platform in 1971. Now, Mr. Speaker, that is the true auditorium story and I will tell it over and over again, session after session. I know this Government will do nothing about it. By your delays and procrastination, it is costing the people of Saskatchewan more money in getting the auditorium completed three years too late.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Baker:** — Now, Mr. Speaker, we hear — oh, the Premier has gone too — we read of Premier Thatcher's many travels. You know I haven't said anything to him during this session but I thought it would be unfair if I didn't make a few remarks about him. He might feel offended.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Baker:** — Yes, we read and hear of his travels all over the country to other parts of Canada, the United States, Japan, to name a few of his many sojourns abroad. My first thoughts centre on the selling job that could be done for Saskatchewan's products, tourism, new industries, and so forth. I know the opportunities do exist during such trips. It is just a case of utilizing the chance to sell Saskatchewan and tell them about Saskatchewan. Do you realize, Mr. Speaker, the feedbacks from these sojourns of the Premier are exceedingly disturbing. Instead of expounding the theme of Saskatchewan's forward thrust and commending Saskatchewan to all our friends, we hear reports that deflate our province. The Premier often refers to the depression of the 30s, but he doesn't tell them who the Governments were in the 30s . . .

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Baker:** — . . . the result of the CCF's

**February 26, 1969**

development of the province. The Premier endeavors to downgrade medicare, known to be one of the finest plans in the world,

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Baker:** — of course prior to the imposition of utilization fees by this Government. Yes, Mr. Speaker, the words of a man indicate his feelings. The words of the Premier indicate his lack of faith in Saskatchewan. It is time for change and the people of Saskatchewan now realize this status. I must suggest, Mr. Speaker, that if the Premier cannot feel the forward thrust concept that is accepted and believed in by the citizens of our great province, then he should blame well stay at home.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Baker:** — And so, Mr. Speaker, there are a few other things I could touch on, I believe I have gone over the period that was allotted to me and I will — I know the Member for Estevan (Mr. MacDougall), he's a little inflated today. Yes, has he got that water plant yet? In conclusion, I want to say that the Government has only three choices left for the future as sources of help. The first is, it is hoping that Ottawa will give it, over the next two years, a few millions as a windfall. It will probably sell our heritage in the making. Secondly, its other course is to raise taxes. Third, if these two sources don't come about, then it will have to resort to extensive borrowing and put us further into debt. Those are the three courses left for you as a Government of this Province, because of mismanagement over these past five years.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Baker:** — So, Mr. Speaker, as I have stated, I refer to it as a "Nothing Budget" for 1968-69. It is so obvious it cannot be supported. I support the amendment.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Hon. J.C. McIsaac (Minister of Education):** — Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to have this opportunity to participate in the Budget Debate. The Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Steuart) has again brought down a balanced Budget for the Province this year and he has again brought down a Budget that gives the whole overall educational picture by far the largest single slice of the Provincial tax dollar. This year, over \$121 million will be devoted to education which is very close to one-third of the total Provincial Budget. And I propose to deal more specifically later on in my remarks with a breakdown of some of the figures in that total Budget. But before dealing with some of the highlights of the departmental budget — and there are many — I would like to make some general comments.

This Government has developed and maintained an approach to fiscal responsibility that no other province has yet succeeded in doing. We certainly won't even mention Ottawa. Surely governments everywhere, federal, provincial, and municipal have the responsibility of ensuring that their spending stays

in line with our capacity to pay. There are two major areas of expenditures where cost escalations are of vital concern to every taxpayer in this province and across the country, namely, the fields of health and education. And as the Treasurer pointed out himself in his remarks when he launched this Debate, these are also the areas where the patterns, the programs or the promotions, if you will, come to a large extent from the professionals in those fields. Nobody will question the value of education and investment in education in terms of increased productivity resulting from increased investment in education, but surely again this does not mean that we should not take a real close look at the \$230 odd million that is now being spent on education in Saskatchewan. And surely it doesn't mean that pouring additional millions each year is simply the answer either, because our ability to pay has to be considered at all times. Our friends opposite in their criticism as usual, and the Member who just took his seat from Regina is a classic case in point, of course, show little concern over our ability to pay and to provide for the many grandiose programs that they are offering.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. McIsaac:** — On the one hand, Mr. Speaker, they have cried in this House about the economic situation faced by our farmers and rural Saskatchewan, the damp grain, the problems in movement and in marketing. And on the other hand they criticize us for not spending more money, a hold-the-line Budget, and they are complaining about it. Mr. Speaker, I suggest why not at this point in our time a hold-the-line Budget. Why not a hold-the-line budget for our local governments as well? School boards and hospital boards particularly. This year the Provincial Treasurer indicated in the course of his remarks that we have looked at every department and every program as closely as possible. And we have done this in the Department of Education and we are continuing to do so. I think that the assistance on the purchase of school buses by rural units has to be a good example of a program that we looked at and discarded, because that is being used by only about one-third of the school boards in total in the province. Those boards which choose to contract their school bus operations receive no grant with regard to capital costs, whereas those boards operating their own buses do. We feel it is much more sensible to support the operating costs of school buses which includes of course capital costs in the form of depreciation. In this way, the grant system does not encourage boards one way or the other. They can contract or they can operate themselves. Boards are free to make the decision as to which system suits their needs and is most acceptable to them. Also, under the old system of assistance in this regard, every board got 25 per cent of the cost of school bus purchases regardless of their ability to pay, whether they were wealthy or poor. Certainly the assistance on operating grants will be on an equalized basis. And I suggest it is a good deal more on an equalized basis. And I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that our school boards can well afford to have a good soul-searching look at some of their policies and some of their programs and all of their expenditures in the same manner that we have been doing at the Provincial level, not only in education, but in other areas as well.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I've been rather surprised that we haven't

**February 26, 1969**

had more factual criticism on education from Members opposite. Yesterday we heard the pipsqueak Member from Cutknife (Mr. Kwasnica), the so-called Shadow Minister of Education, and I use the word “shadow” because even his shadow is a little bit warped. He is the Member for Cutknife, Mr. Speaker, I think it is worth pointing out that on his election last time he was returned with about half of the majority long enjoyed by the former Member for Cutknife.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. McIsaac:** — We also heard him demonstrate why he will have no majority next time — 50 per cent down last time, it will be 50 per cent next time.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. McIsaac:** — Mind you, I suggest that he’ll have real difficulty in securing the nomination in the Cutknife constituency next time. If he does get by his own convention of course he’ll be defeated. But if he doesn’t get by his own convention, I’ll be very happy to invite him down to run against me in the Wilkie constituency.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. McIsaac:** — He’ll have no trouble getting the nomination down there, Mr. Speaker, because they have had difficulty the past couple of elections in trying to get a candidate from the home area. So they would be glad to take another import from north of the present constituency.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. McIsaac:** — Yes, that’s fine and I know the Cutknife seat a good deal better than my hon. friend.

**An Hon. Member:** — Will you go to Cutknife?

**Mr. McIsaac:** — Absolutely I’ll go to Cutknife. I’ll go to Cutknife any day to run against the present Member who represents Cutknife, any day at all.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. McIsaac:** — I was rather impressed with his remarks just the same, Mr. Speaker, because, other than his remarks directed to me personally, he never did get around to discussing education as such. He didn’t have one suggestion to offer either constructive, destructive, or otherwise. I could only take it from that, Mr. Speaker, that obviously he is satisfied with the education budget as presented, or that his narrow perspective and his inability to think that far for himself prevented him from making any meaningful contribution to this debate.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. McIsaac:** — Now he said, for example, 500 teachers left the province last year. He didn't point out that 400 came to the province last year and they weren't all coming from Britain either. He typifies, I suggest, Mr. Speaker, the very real problem of Teachers' Federation and the teaching profession in this province when they are trying to uplift the overall image of the profession. At the same time they have to drag a lot of Members like this with them. It does present a real problem. He talked salary comparisons in class I. He knows such comparisons are completely meaningless. He didn't talk about comparisons in class IV, class V, and class VI in this province with those in other jurisdictions. I do believe that the class II salary levels in this province are too low today, no question about it. And I do think also that some of the reasons perhaps for this has been that there have been too many class IV and class V negotiators on the negotiating that has gone on in the past in this regard,

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. McIsaac:** — because at the professional level of teachers' salaries, the class IV, V, and VI of Yorkton and the other boards, the major collegiate boards of the province, compare very favorably with the cities of Alberta, British Columbia and elsewhere.

Now in the last few years, Mr. Speaker, this Government has been giving increased emphasis to the technical-vocational aspect of education. Obviously this is an area that's very much interwoven into the economic development of the province at the same time. We have not only established a good number of new programs but we have expanded almost all of the existing programs. The overall program includes a multiplicity of training courses in a wide variety of occupational fields. It provides for training at different levels and for a wide range of training periods as such. We have for example the two-year post-secondary diploma courses in the technologies. We have one-year certificate courses in trades, and we have eight-week courses for apprentices, not to mention a wide variety of short courses. I suggest that this flexibility ensures that the programs measure up to employment standards and, at the same time, are arranged to accommodate the various groups to be served.

Technical and vocational programs are currently being offered in five major cities in this province. There are 52 courses offered in 33 different trades and 17 technologies. In addition, as I mentioned, there are numerous other short courses offered, upgrading and other types in approximately 40 communities throughout the province. In this province in 1964-65 there were approximately 460 adults enrolled in the technologies at the two major institutes. This year there were 1,242 enrolled, an increase here of about three times in a short period of four years.

**Mr. R. Romanow (Saskatoon Riversdale):** — How many?

**Mr. McIsaac:** — We will come to that in a minute, Roy. In 1964-65, there were 1,700 and some enrolled in trades courses, including pre-employment and apprentice classification. Today there are 3,600. Enrolments in our upgrading programs have increased more than five times in the last four years. And may I point out,

**February 26, 1969**

Mr. Speaker, again that our adult education upgrading programs consist of courses from basic literacy to vocational grade 12 and they are offered at various centres throughout the province, including some of our Indian reserves.

In 1965-66 was the first year of our training-in-industry program. 338 trainees participated. Three years later we had 1,200 participating in this program. Again, a four-fold increase in about three years. In total this year, Mr. Speaker, about 12,000 adults are enrolled in various technical and vocational programs as compared to 4,700 in 1964-65, the first year we were in office.

The Saskatchewan Technical Institute at Moose Jaw is presently operating to almost complete capacity. It is expected, according to the school's administrative staff, that about 2,800 trainees will have attended the school this year for varying lengths of time during the current academic year. In the previous year, about 2,600 was the total figure in this regard.

In the estimates that are before us, Mr. Speaker, an estimated \$1.9 million was budgeted for operating expenses for this institute, 1968-69 last year. This current year's budget shows an estimated \$2.5 million, which is an increase of about \$.5 million, close to 25 per cent of an increase. I could go into details of the various programs that are being offered, but I think we can leave them for discussion perhaps in Estimates.

**Mr. W.G. Davies (Moose Jaw South):** — What about the capital budget?

**Mr. McIsaac:** — The capital budget in Moose Jaw is down this year. The capital budget in Moose Jaw is down this year because the building is already there. Could we deal with this in the Estimates in detail, I don't have the details in front of me.

The capital budget in the Public Works' estimates, Mr. Speaker, does provide for an amount of \$100,000 for the study and development of plans and a comprehensive survey of the need to accommodate nursing and other programs to be offered in the post-secondary field in the city of Regina. In the interval I should point out that vocational training in Regina is expanding. The Regina Vocational Centre was established this year, operating out of Saskatchewan House and other rented facilities throughout the city.

In Saskatoon, the Saskatchewan Institute of Applied Arts and Science has completed phase I of the building program and is now able to offer new training programs in heavy duty repair, machine shop practice, industrial mechanics, plumbing, heating and gasfitting. The extension also provides facilities to enable the school to handle expanded enrolments in a number of other trades programs.

Phase II of the Institute expansion program is presently nearing completion. In fact, some areas of the building are already being used for training purposes. The extension will provide slightly over 26,000 square feet of additional floor space. In this regard, Mr. Speaker, I might comment on the question raised by the Opposition financial critic (Mr. Blakeney) in the course of his remarks as to why \$6 million was not spent last year instead of only \$5 million. The reason I'm



sure he is aware and all hon. friends opposite are aware was because of the holdup and the delays due to strikes on this project. This extension makes it possible to offer several new programs, eight to be exact in the two-year technology offerings, and the expansion of the many existing ones. Here again I believe possibly we can deal better with the details of this in the Estimates.

In addition to these new programs at the Saskatoon Institute, Mr. Speaker, some 150 adult business and industrial workers are presently enrolled there in special night school programs, designed to enable them to keep abreast of modern technological changes. It is entirely possible, I would suggest, judging from the experiences in some of the comprehensive high schools in the province that this program could triple or even move further than that in the very near future. In anticipation of the demand on the facilities up there in the increased programs, the libraries and the resource centre areas have been increased by almost eight times. Six new lecture theatres have been provided to facilitate large group instruction. The Institute in Saskatoon also continues to offer pre-employment apprenticeship, rural courses, and miscellaneous short courses in response to the varying demands from business and industry.

It is interesting to note, Mr. Speaker, that in the 1963-64 year a grand total of 1,800 students took training of some description in this Institute. And with the completion of phase II of the building program presently under way, we would suggest that upwards of 3,500 trainees can be accommodated over a one-year period in Saskatoon. As of February 24th of this week, the actual enrolment of the school was just over 1,500 students. In spite of an expansive building program, budgeted operating costs of the Saskatoon Institute are up considerably this year, up close to \$.5 million.

In an attempt as well, Mr. Speaker, to develop a more coherent structure in the organization of vocational programs in the province, this Government has set up three vocational centres since 1966. Through the Department of Public Health, the Weyburn Vocational Centre is presently operating, utilizing some of the space from the present Weyburn Mental Hospital. A responsibility for the supervision of the Training Centre itself was transferred to the Saskatchewan Technical Institute in Moose Jaw. While the number of manpower trainees did not increase particularly this year over the past year, the schedule negotiated for 1968-69 will provide for fuller utilization of these facilities. There was a total enrolment in 1967-68 of about 331 students in Weyburn. This year's budget shows an increase for the operating cost for this centre, Mr. Speaker, of about 50 per cent higher than the preceding year.

In the new programs in Weyburn this year, for example, plumbing, heating and gasfitting is a new course, so is the commercial course. A commercial preparatory course — adult upgrading — has been added. The plans are now being made to accommodate 24 trainees instead of 12 last year in stationary steam engineering. Pre-employment enrolments, trades training, have increased from 160 to 230 during the past year.

The 1969-70 estimates before us, Mr. Speaker, also provide for an increase in Government expenditures for the Prince Albert Vocational Centre where the courses are conducted in the Prince Albert Technical high school. The Regina Vocational

**February 26, 1969**

Centre, as I mentioned, is being developed here to accommodate students with every type of background and to allow them to follow a course of study beginning with basic literacy and extending to a complete high school standing. The present estimates allow for close to one quarter million dollars for operating expenses for this particular centre.

Generally speaking, Mr. Speaker, the 1969-70 estimates in the Budget provide for an increase in the operating expenses for the institutes and the vocational centres of something in the neighborhood of 20 per cent up from the previous year.

Somebody mentioned: what about the students that are not getting in, Mr. Speaker? I would like to say a word on that because let me say, here and now, that there isn't a province in Canada today that is meeting the mushrooming demand for adult education, for retraining this whole field. I don't deny that we are not meeting the full demand in this area in this province. However, I would point out that when you look at the figures of students who are not able to enroll in the course of their choice, they are truly not indicative of the total picture. I will give an example to support that. For example, this year in Renewable Resources Technology Program in Saskatchewan, we received 206 applications for a total of 50 student places that were available.

Now perhaps someone wants to take exception to our advisors in this regard. But if it can be shown that this province needs more than 50 new conservation officers in a year, then surely we are open to criticism. Surely the actual demand for training as such must be related to the needs of the economy and to the opportunities that are available to the trainees once they are graduated. We had another new course offered last fall for the first time with a beginning intake of only 15 students, dental assistants, and we attracted 150 applications here. Now perhaps it was the low academic requirement or perhaps it was the desire of a lot of girls to get into a white uniform, I don't know. But I suggest that we will have to begin this program and see how well it is received by the dental profession in the province. Many of the people applying would have to use their training in the province. I think that these are two examples, and these two examples account for about 40 per cent of the applicants this year that had to consider other courses or other alternatives. The point that I am trying to make, Mr. Speaker is that those who apply to enter various courses and the totals in this regard do not necessarily reflect the total need and the total demand as such. We have provided for further expansion. Many new courses both at Saskatoon and at Moose Jaw are provided for in this budget that is before us now and more expansion and more planning, of course, will continue for the future.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I would like to turn for a few moments to comprehensive high schools. When this Government took office in 1964, we did inherit a scheme of vocational high schools to be developed and presumably to be operated by the Province. The problem was, of course, that we didn't inherit any schools, just the schemes. The whole scheme was somewhat ill-conceived from an education viewpoint from the beginning. School boards, teachers and other educators in the province left no doubt of their reaction to this.

Within less than a year after we came into office we

developed, after very wide consultation with the educational people in the province, a new concept, namely, the comprehensive high school for grades 10, 11 and 12. This school opened the doors to forward-looking developments in adult education as well as for high school students. The accent generally was very enthusiastically accepted by school boards, educators and the public at large.

So today instead of an uncertain plan with no schools to show as a result, we can point to a meaningful plan and six schools now in operation with five schools under construction, Swift Current, Estevan, Regina, North Battleford and Nipawin. In addition there are plans for five other schools at this point of time. I suggest that this is a performance and a record, Mr. Speaker, of the past four years that needs no apology.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. McIsaac:** — The Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Steuart) in his address, pointed out that there will be some reduction in expenditures on the construction of comprehensives in the current year. I suggest here that we are merely being realistic. In the present year there have been serious difficulties with debenture borrowing — our friend from Melville can tell us about that when he joins this Debate — both as to the availability of funds and the high interest rates. We also believe that the mere fact that Federal-Provincial dollars are available to local boards for 25 cents, should not be allowed to encourage grandiose planning and spending. We have, therefore, very closely looked at all the programs as to their needs, as to the feasibility of the programs offered and the long-term operating costs of these projects. I can tell the House, Mr. Speaker, that substantial savings to local governments and the Provincial and Federal Governments have been brought about as a result. At the same time there has been no reduction in program plans and objectives, because we have found that time and energy spent on careful planning have certainly paid good dividends from everyone's point of view. We intend to continue in this pattern and indeed to strengthen it in the forthcoming year.

I can give you some examples of how a tripartite program, such as the comprehensive schools, Mr. Speaker, is another classic example of one government setting priorities for another. And the areas of shop space called for, I think, have to be a good case in point.

We have a construction shop in the new school just completed in Lloydminster where my hon. friend from Cutknife (Mr. Kwasnica) is teaching. That shop is as large as the assembly area in the Nelson Homes Factory just down the street in Lloydminster. Nelson Homes employs hundreds of men and turns out an average of close to one new home a day. We have another school being planned — and the plans are being revised I can tell you — where the auto mechanics shop space provided was larger in area than the biggest auto repair shop anywhere in this province.

I think surely all these facts point out that there is an absolute necessity for a good critical review of all of these building programs. There is no doubt, Mr. Speaker, I suggest, that greater utilization can be achieved in the present comprehensive school facilities that are now in operation as well as

those that are being planned and will be built in the next year or two.

I think we have another good example when we look at this comprehensive school program of the change in thinking in the past few years as the pattern has developed. I refer to the city of Saskatoon. School officials there initially felt that five comprehensive schools would be needed to serve that city. Today, they tell us that two such major schools of this kind, the two that are now in operation, should adequately handle the needs of the public and separate boards as well as some of the surrounding rural boards in this regard.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we are presently involved in reorganizing the structure of the Department of Education itself. As one aspect of this, at this point in time I should mention that within a few months we will have more specialized staff and space in the Department, and more complete information available to boards in the entire field of school construction. This, I suggest, will result in more positive guidance and direction to school boards planning, whether it is new construction, whether it is renovation or replacement or extensions of present facilities. This service, of course, will apply not only to comprehensives, but also to all school construction. The basic approach taken will be to try and relate enrolments to program requirements to square foot requirements for those programs. Such a move has been suggested and supported by teachers and trustee groups and other people.

Construction grants on regular building projects this year, Mr. Speaker, are reduced in this year's Budget. From 1960 to 1966, enrolments in our school system increased an average of roughly 7,000 students per year. In the last couple of years this has dropped off to about 3,000 students per year. Some projections indicate that by 1971 or 1972 or somewhere in that area that there may be an actual decline in enrolments (despite the papal edict of some weeks ago). Now with this prospect surely a critical review and a holding of the line in the building areas is only logical. At the same time I want to make it quite clear to all Members of the House, Mr. Speaker, that building projects are being approved. They will be approved and they will continue to be approved where the need has been demonstrated,

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Hon. Mr. McIsaac:** — because we recognize that renewal and replacement of facilities are necessary in some places everywhere throughout the province. The continuing program of upgrading facilities in our northern areas has to be an example in this regard. The record of the Government in regard to northern schools, I suggest, is an excellent one. I will leave the details of this for my hon. friend, the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Guy) when he deals with it in his Budget remarks.

Now a moment ago I mentioned that we were looking at a reorganization of the Department of Education. The Department of Education, Mr. Speaker, is responsible for the administration of programs running into many millions of dollars. The primary business of the Department, of course, is administering education. There is a rather unfortunate tendency, I suggest, for people to think that the only people who can make a contribution to the administration of either the Department or other affairs

educational are people who have trained as teachers or trained as educators entirely. I suggest that it is high time that this concept is rejected as the pure nonsense that it is.

Surely with the millions of dollars being spent in the whole field of education there is an absolute necessity for people with training or experience in economics, business administration and finance, to be integrated into the operation of the Department of Education or for people with common sense, if you will. Surely, I think, that this kind of an approach is a logical one.

Now basically under the reorganization, the Department will be divided into two main divisions, a division incorporating program development and supervision as such and a division responsible for the financial, economic and administrative aspects of education not only within the Department but in relation to the boards of the province. And a division, I suggest, such as this filled with people of the right kind of experience and background and training is certainly needed. Mr. Speaker, I suggest again that we need make no apology for the fact that not everyone associated with the Department of Education is not a former school teacher.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. McIsaac:** — I would like to deal for a few moments, Mr. Speaker, with the question of the grants in this year's Budget. A good deal has been said by the official critic of the Opposition and others and I would like to answer some of those remarks.

Now in looking at the 1969-70 structure of grants, I did point out that the Department went through the existing structure and the allocations very carefully, because we are well aware that in the light of the economic conditions in the province that every dollar has to be placed and directed where it would do the most good. As a result every grant program was analyzed from the standpoint of its initial purpose, how well that purpose had been fulfilled, and whether or not the money could be better spent if it were diverted elsewhere. In general, our analysis indicated that the primary emphasis was required in the general formula and operating grant aspect of school costs. In the light, as I mentioned earlier, of the levelling off in enrolments, the corresponding reduction in the overall new space requirements, more monies could be diverted from the building program to the operating grants. Similarly other grant programs for conveyance equipment, which I have mentioned, which have served their purpose and have outlived their usefulness, have been put into operating grants.

We have re-aligned the priorities within the total subvote, with the result that the most meaningful grants, the general formula and operating grants, will be increased by about \$4½ million over the amount budgeted last year. Now this, Mr. Speaker, is an increase of 8 or 8½ per cent. I should point out too to our school boards at this time that by no means can they all expect a uniform increase necessarily of 8 per cent. Some districts with increased assessments and stable or dropping enrolments may actually receive less grants than last year. Other districts will receive roughly the same. The bulk of the increase will go, of course, to the districts which need the additional support because of the added expenses of a rising school population.

**February 26, 1969**

Mr. Speaker, I suggest that these figures clearly indicate the high priority that this Government has given to education in this year of economic restraint at that. Not only have we given it priority in terms of additional dollars, but we have tried to re-align our internal priorities with the maximum dollars going to the area where the maximum need was. We have suggested, and I suggest it again today, to school boards that they do the same thing in relation to their total overall expenditures and policies.

Mr. Speaker, this Government is proud of the quality of education that is available to the citizens of this province today. We are proud of the quality and efforts of our teaching force, our trustees and other educators that are working in this field. The financial critic the other day used isolated figures to try and show where we stand in relation to other governments. I suggest that such comparisons and such figures in themselves are meaningless unless you look at the entire governmental spending program. I have a word or two to say about the Dominion Bureau of Statistics' figures with respect to education. Just a year or so ago Dominion Bureau of Statistics' people approached the Council of Ministers of Education in an effort to try and improve the methods of collecting accurate data, uniform data and up-to-date information. Dominion Bureau of Statistics itself recognizes that their statistics in the field of education do not represent the total picture or necessarily the true picture in province-to-province comparisons for various good reasons.

I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that Members on both sides of this House are very well aware of the tremendous highway mileage that we have in the Province of Saskatchewan, by far the largest per capita in any province in the nation, in fact above any two provinces you want to add. So is it any wonder that we are spending somewhat more per capita on highways than some other province with less highway needed to look after.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. McIsaac:** — The Saskatchewan Provincial tax dollar that is devoted to health and hospitalization and medicare is also number one in Canada, Mr. Speaker. When you look on the other hand at the direct individual contributions of Saskatchewan people to overall health programs, I suggest to you they are probably the lowest if not right among the lowest. When you look at the \$72 per family premium in medicare and hospitalization as against \$204 for our neighboring Province of Manitoba and as against \$300 for Ontario, certainly we are far below Alberta, British Columbia or Manitoba or Ontario in this regard. Yet our two more wealthy provinces, Ontario and Alberta, say they cannot afford to become involved in a tax-supporting medicare scheme at the provincial level.

Mr. Speaker, another point that has been mentioned by the financial critic is teacher-pupil ratios. This province has the lowest such ratio of any province in Canada. The Province of British Columbia, referred to yesterday by my hon. friend from Cutknife (Mr. Kwasnica), aims for 35 students per classroom and it achieves, or so I am informed, about 31 per classroom. So if he wants to go to British Columbia he will likely be called upon to make a little greater effort than he does here.

Metro Toronto, certainly one of the wealthiest boards in

the country, Mr. Speaker, aims for a teacher-pupil ratio of approximately 35 to 1. It achieves about 33½ to 1 in the classrooms. Now no one is going to tell us, Mr. Speaker, I hope in the Opposition or anywhere else, that the quality of education in Toronto or in British Columbia is that inferior to here. In Saskatchewan our teacher-pupil ratio is about 21.5 to 1. We have several rural systems that are considerably below that. We have one, as an example, of 16.3 to 1.

Mr. Speaker, I suggest that in no way will the quality of education be affected by an upward revision of this ratio by many school boards in the province. In no way would an improvement of this ratio cause any hardship particularly either when you look at the greatly reduced numbers of schools that are operating in the province today as compared to a few years ago. I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that there is very little point in debating some of the figures that were put forth by the Official Opposition critic in his opening remarks in this debate. I think the Member for Maple Creek, the Minister of Mineral Resources (Mr. Cameron), pretty clearly showed in his remarks today how not so much inaccurate, but the partial story and the incomplete story told by some of the figures. I can certainly say that the same is true in respect of the figures he used dealing with education. I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that this Budget once again demonstrates the genuine concern of this Government that our people be given the very best we can afford in the light of the other services we are called upon to provide.

Obviously, Mr. Speaker, I will be supporting the motion.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

#### STATEMENT BY MR. SPEAKER

**Mr. Speaker:** — During the Budget Speech Debate today the Member from Swift Current (Mr. Wood) said that he was being misquoted by the Member from Moosomin (Mr. Gardner). The Chair has taken a more serious view than usual of this matter because of the nature of the subject under discussion; namely, our Indian people. The transcript of the speech given by the Member from Swift Current (Mr. Wood) in the Budget Debate on February 21st, 1969, as recorded on page 40 of the debates shows his words to be as follows, and I quote:

Their situation is becoming a continuing festering blight upon our society and our economy.

The record shows that the Member from Moosomin (Mr. Gardner) quoted the Member from Swift Current (Mr. Wood) today as follows:

Their situation is becoming a continuing festering blight upon our society and our economy.

The record shows the Member from Moosomin quoted the Member from Swift Current correctly.

May I add that, while the Chair under some circumstances may be expected to consider the correctness of a quotation, it cannot be expected to comment upon or adjudicate the construction placed by one Member upon the words of another.

**Mr. Wood:** — Please, Mr. Speaker, on a

**February 26, 1969**

point of order, I do believe, I recognize that the Hon. Member from Moosomin (Mr. Gardner) did quote me correctly, but he proceeded to represent that I had said that the Indians themselves were a blight and not their situation was a blight.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. W.A. McIvor (Arm River):** — Mr. Speaker, this is the first time I rise in this House to take part in the Budget Debate and as I have much comment to say, I beg leave to adjourn the debate for today.

Adjourned Debate.

#### **ANNOUNCEMENT RE DISTRIBUTION OF BILLS**

**Mr. Speaker:** — Before we proceed any further, I wish to draw the attention of all Member of the House to the fact that I did at 2:35 this afternoon receive on my desk Bill No. 51, and that I did at 2:40 this afternoon receive on my desk Bill Nos. 52, 53, 54, 55, and 56, they being all the Bills for which introduction was given this day. I draw the attention of all Members to the fact that these Bills were all tabled on my desk and I trust Members will also check their own files as they were also delivered to the Members at the same time. Let all Members govern themselves accordingly and inform the Chair forthwith if they do not have them.

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