

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN
Second Session — Sixteenth Legislature
18th Day

Thursday, February 27, 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'd like to introduce to you and through you to the other Members of the Chamber, two groups of students from Mayfair constituency. They both attend Mayfair public school in Mayfair constituency. The one group of students, 31 in number is accompanied by Mrs. Sutherland and Mr. Cowan, and in the other group I understand there are 28 students and their teacher, Mr. Schellenberg is with them. I'm sure that all Members here today wish the students an interesting and educational afternoon and we hope that they have a pleasant and safe journey back to Saskatoon Mayfair.

Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. E. Whelan (Regina North West): — Mr. Speaker, through you it is my pleasure to introduce to all Members of the Legislature, 46 grade eight students from Benson school in the constituency of Regina North West. They are seated in the Speaker's gallery with their vice-principal Orest Warnyca and another teacher, Garth Findahl. Members join me I'm sure in welcoming them here this afternoon and expressing the wish that their stay with us will be pleasant and educational.

Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. H.H.P. Baker (Regina North East): — Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to welcome a group of 92 in number, of grade eight students from St. Augustine school seated in the east gallery. They are here with their vice-principal, Mr. Frolick and two other teachers, Mr. Holash and Mr. Collins. Now, St. Augustine school is in the heart of my constituency, some two and one-half blocks from my home. This school has a great name for competition and sports and a good school for learning, a school with a fine reputation. I want to welcome them most sincerely this afternoon and hope that they will have a pleasant visit here and learn much with regard to our Legislative Assembly.

Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Speaker: — Gentlemen, I join the Member for Regina South East in

February 27, 1969

welcoming the children from St. Augustine school. St. Augustine being my patron saint.

Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

ADJOURNED DEBATES

Budget Debate

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

Mr. W.A. McIvor (Arm River): — Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to take part in this Budget Debate. I would like to compliment the Provincial Treasurer on bringing down a balanced Budget, the fifth in a row by our responsible Liberal Government.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. McIvor: — First, I would like to turn to my constituency for a few moments. Last February I made a request to the Hon. Mr. Barrie, Minister of Natural Resources, to have the park that is adjacent to the Gardiner Dam named after our former long-time Member from Arm River, namely, Mr. Herman Danielson. In due course my request was granted and was publicly announced June 27, two days after the Federal election, which indicates to the public that in no way was this done to promote political gains. I feel it was a very fitting way to honor a man who spent 30 years of his life working for the people of Arm River and the Province of Saskatchewan, especially so when the park is within the boundaries of the constituency he served. Last year, within my area, approximately 12,000 acres were irrigated and this Budget has allotted a considerable sum for a much larger program this year. With the commencement of irrigation one of the potentials of the dam is being developed and I look forward to a larger number of acres under irrigation and more and more diversification as this major project develops. Fodder, market gardening, sugar beets and other crops as well as wheat will be grown. People in this area will have a good standard of livelihood off much smaller acreage, thus a marked increase in population will become a very noticeable factor in the near future. On August 8th, arrangements were made by the Saskatchewan Power Corporation for a legislative tour of the hydro plant at Coteau Creek, also within the boundaries of Arm River. Here we saw the three generators in different stages of assembly. Since that time, these three generators are now producing power, and will generate 800 million kilowatt hours in an average year, making a second use of Gardiner Dam a reality.

Other developments in my seat are miles of new highway from south of Findlater to Chamberlain to replace the old No. 11 Highway, built by the former Government which was obsolete before

it was completed, as no recognition of safety features was built into it at the time of its construction. Our Highway Program for this year as announced by the Hon. Dave Boldt, Minister of Highways, includes the mileage from Chamberlain to Davidson, and the oiling from No. 2 into the village of Holdfast.

No. 11 is the main link between our two major cities, Regina and Saskatoon, also linking Regina with the Battlefords, Lloydminster, Edmonton and Prince Albert via Saskatoon. This highway has a very heavy daily traffic count and on the weekends there are times when it arrives at the state of congestion. I look forward to the day when this highway is completed as it will do much to alleviate the countless accidents and deaths which occur annually. The present condition of the highway has been a prominent factor in many of these tragedies.

Mr. Speaker, the Budget Speech in its reference to education stated that increased spending will take place at all levels of education. I am fully in agreement with this and would like to point to the very major advances that have been brought about by this Government at both the university, the technical and vocational training level. They are all very needy, also very costly, but at no time has this Government backed away from their responsibilities toward the education of our students and citizens.

I would also like to compliment the high percentage of university students for their very determined efforts in obtaining an education, in spite of the amount of unrest that exists at the University here in Regina. I do not hesitate now or at any time to advance a word of caution and advice that it is up to you, one and all, to take an active part in your student affairs, election of officers, campus functions and the editing of your paper. Stand on guard that these positions do not continue to fall into the control of a few radicals, students without any responsibility who damage the image they are creating of you. Once again, I say to you, you have the majority, the ability and only need to take the time to take part. This present condition will be looked upon as a period of adjustment when you, the good honest students temporarily dropped your guard. Good education is our modern way of life. Do not slight your responsibility while attaining it.

Mr. Speaker, this Budget has allowed for increased remuneration to urban councils. I am fully aware that this is necessary to get good active personnel to take part. But in dealing with urban councils I think a condition exists in this province that is not healthy — having politics mixed with local government — no person can ride two horses at one time and be successful. This is very glaring to us people from the rural areas. Being saddled with the cost of building the auditorium here in this city was nothing less than poor administration from the top and in the final analysis an attempt to make a political issue of it. In the light of this, I for one am going to strongly recommend to the Minister of Municipal Affairs that the Act be changed to state that once a person becomes a Member of the

February 27, 1969

Legislative Assembly, he or she no longer can hold a position on urban or rural councils.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. McIvor: — I do hope that the rest of the rural members will get behind this stand of mine and bring about a correction to this urgent matter before we get involved in taking over other buildings or projects that belong to the city fathers.

Mr. Speaker, being a farmer it would only be right to draw to your attention and others the drastic effect strikes are having on the farmers. Any strike that ends up crippling our economy for any period of time nearly always causes an increase in the price of some commodity or other that we must purchase. In the December issue of *The Leader Post*, strikes were considered one of the three highlights of the 1968 global events. Four of the major strikes being: General Motors of Canada and United Auto Workers — settled after a seven-week strike; St. Lawrence Seaway strike, lasting 24 days; the postal employees were out on strike for 22 days. On the same day the postal employees went out on strike, we had the start of the grain elevator workers at the Lakehead going out on strike for 59 days ending on September 14, this being the cruellest blow of all to the farmer. Many of the elevators were left congested with the 1967 crop, and we the farmers were just commencing to harvest our 1968 crop before this strike ended, which only added to the lack of space, no quotas and general disruption of our marketing facilities. I must say, while all this was taking place, the Members to your left certainly were a quiet lot, whether on their own or because of their union association, we'll never know but when we know that the bulk of their funds come from labor unions it is not too hard to understand why. The farmer today sees that under these ground rules, labor and farmer do not belong together as the NDP would like people to believe. The result of this last strike will never be able to be assessed in dollars and cents what it cost the economy of the Western farmer and other sectors of society in Canada. The statement by Charles W. Gibbings, president of the Saskatchewan Wheat Pool in September 19th issue of the *Western Producer* says and I quote:

The very substantial added costs associated with the settlement will, as is often the case, be borne by the farmer at a time when he is in a difficult financial position himself.

There is no doubt in my mind that the foregoing statement of Mr. Gibbings is factual. In the February 6, 1969, issue of the *Western Producer*, an item headed "Elevator system handles less grain," is quite lengthy but one paragraph states:

The car lot volume destined for the Lakehead terminals, 200,000 million bushels, accounted for a reduced proportion, 50.6 per cent, of the country elevator movement

reflecting the combination of sluggish exports, the St. Lawrence Seaway workers' strike and the strike of the Lakehead grain handlers.

An illustration of the cruel effect strikes can have on society, resulting in deaths and ill health was brought to our attention by an article in *The Leader Post*, December 27, 1968 issue, 10,000 ill due to lack of heat, three deaths directly attributable to lack of heat in the city of New York, all caused by a strike of drivers who handle 40 per cent of the city's fuel-oil deliveries. Mr. Speaker, I have pointed out some of the impact strikes have on us and feel that if labor and management are not prepared to work to gain solutions to their problems without the means of strikes, the time is fast coming when government will have no choice but to intervene.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to turn to the subject of agriculture and damp grain for a short time. Our Minister of Agriculture (Mr. McFarlane) quite ably laid before us the detailed program of what the Government of today has done to arrive at a solution of this problem, which is both feasible and workable. The Opposition have been both loud and long in their cries of what they have done and what should be done. Our Minister pointed out what they did — practically nothing. In outlining their efforts for the farmer in our years of need, he was most kind. He forgot to mention their nothing programs while we fought the grasshoppers on two different occasions and the rusted crop of 1954. Although these affected the southern half of the province mostly, I might say that, when we had to burn a lot of our crops in 1954, we were not advanced the price of the matches to light them by these would-be farmers' friends who sit to your left, Mr. Speaker.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. McIvor: — As to drying grain, my neighbors and I purchased one of these 65 dryers that were brought into Saskatchewan in 1951. We made our purchase on the 14th of March, 1952. We dried approximately 70,000 bushels of grain prior to seeding and considerable after the crop was sown. Mr. Speaker, I feel I can speak with some authority when I say it does not pay a farmer to dry his grain if he can sell it otherwise. At the present time I own this dryer and my son and I have approximately 15,000 bushels of damp and tough grain on our farms, combined after March 23, 1968. We are prepared to heed the warnings of the Minister of Agriculture that it will have to be dried on the farm, but from my experience I know it would be more costly, a much slower process and harder to handle in this weather. I would also like to tell you, Mr. Speaker, that while the Members opposite were on the tour to the States about dryers and were putting up their hue and cry that there were none available in the province, I could have rented six other dryers at that time within a 40 mile radius by placing a phone call.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. McIvor: — Mr. Speaker, much has been said by the Opposition to your left on the damp grain issue, mostly for political reasons, which have been very easy to detect when you consider their almost nothing programs on similar occasions when they were the Government.

Mr. Speaker, in my constituency many elevator companies have rented dryers from the farmers and have set them up in conjunction with their elevators and are operating at the present time. This Government has taken an active part in having the Federal Government of Canada bring in the necessary legislation to assist the farmers of Western Canada and here in Saskatchewan to overcome the shortage of ready cash. I am quite confident the farmers in my constituency will get the job done with no losses. Mr. Speaker, when our Premier (Mr. Thatcher) took over the reigns of Government in this Province in the year 1964, both he and his two different Ministers of Agriculture on numerous occasions stressed the need of diversification on the part of the farmers, especially the smaller farmer. Today when problems have arisen, markets tightened up with a slowing down of grain movement in general, the need is even greater and the wisdom of this advice is very evident. In my area it is most noticeable. The farmer who is in livestock appears to be less concerned and more often the one with the spare dollar to spend. This Liberal Government has increased community pastures from 33 in June 1964 to 52 in June 1968. Five sheep pastures have been established. In June 1969, two more cattle pastures are to be developed. Grants are available for the promotion of swine, seeding of land to fodder, for fodder hay shelters, irrigation of fodder crops. A fodder reserve has been set up and grants are available for clearing land for small farms. Since we have taken office record sales for livestock and livestock products have been established. I know from personal experience that livestock will add to the stability of a farm and urge more farmers to take advantage of the above mentioned programs and by so doing will become more secure.

Mr. Speaker, as I mentioned before this is a balanced Budget, one of the few in Canada today. I will vote for it and against the amendment.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. G.F. Loken (Rosetown): — Mr. Speaker, as I rise to take part in this debate, may I first congratulate the Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Steuart) for this presentation of a responsible Budget. May I also congratulate my colleagues who have spoken before me for a job well done. This debate has certainly reflected the general political attitude of the parties represented in this House. Comments made by Government Members have by and large been constructive and enlightening, while Opposition criticisms and charges have been characterized by the traditional negative attitude and doom and gloom philosophy of Socialism. I must

say that from a rural citizen's point of view I was amused, but not impressed by the loud vociferous comments made by the Opposition in the course of this debate. I was even less impressed by comments of some of the labor boys who sit opposite.

You know, Mr. Speaker, no one, but no one speaks about rights and privileges and freedom more than do our friends opposite. Again, Mr. Speaker, all they speak about and all they do is speak about it. But how do they act? What does the union-controlled NDP have to say about the type of freedom and rights unions give to the individual laborer. How many rights and how much freedom does the individual laborer have today? Can our Socialist friends tell us that, Mr. Speaker? What freedom is there for the laborer trying to obtain a job in a union shop? None, none, unless he joins the union, Mr. Speaker. Are these the rights and freedoms condoned by our friends opposite? It is argued by the NDP and union leaders that the majority rule should govern. In this they are right, but surely this should apply to the internal workings of the labor union also. How can the labor unions justify their interference with the rights and freedoms of workers outside their membership? Well, they attempt to justify it, Mr. Speaker, by saying that unionism would die unless workers were compelled to join unions. Is it because the NDP would find it difficult to finance its election campaigns if it could not depend on the services and monies extracted on the compulsory check-off basis? Perhaps 25 or 30 years ago it was necessary to build union strength when the worker was at the mercy of some unscrupulous employers. Now it appears that the worker is at the mercy of the union officials and the union gangsters. Either the employee agrees to support the union or he loses his job. Is this the kind of freedom and justice our Socialists talk so frequently about? In other words, they are saying, "You are free to join or not to join, free to work or starve." Mr. Speaker, we saw this type of Socialism at work in Saskatchewan for 20 long years and we have seen it at work in many other countries of late. I would refer to our Socialist friends and union bosses to Abraham Lincoln who said, "Those who deny freedom to others, deserve it not for themselves." Or to Sir Wilfred Laurier who said, "Freedom breeds loyalty. Coercion always was the Mother of rebellion." Compulsory unionism and the compulsory deduction of union fees from the worker's wages is an outright abridgement of the worker's rights, yet the NDP Socialists endorse it wholeheartedly. These sanctimonious champions of justice endorse one of the most undemocratic and unjust principles operating in Canada today. Not only do these NDP supporting unions coerce and rob their worker members, but they go further than that, Mr. Speaker. They have robbed and cheated our Western Canadian farmers out of millions of dollars through their delaying of grain shipments and sales.

When the Opposition rant and rave of their hypocritical concern for Western agriculture, did they once mention the Lakehead grain handlers strike? Did they once deplore the economic hardship brought to the Western farmer when the Eastern union gangsters and crooks were on strike at the Lakehead?

February 27, 1969

Not once, not once, Mr. Speaker. This has cost the farmers far more than the damp grain situation we face at the present time. I do not intend to discuss this issue in detail as this has been done quite adequately by previous speakers in this debate. I do feel obligated, however, to comment on a matter previously raised, but important enough, I think, to warrant further comment.

I refer, Mr. Speaker, to the demands of the youth arm of the New Democratic Party for socializing of all farm lands in Saskatchewan. I don't think that the basic motives of Socialism have ever appeared clearer than they do in this news article of January 20 from the Moose Jaw Times Herald. I quote, "Young NDP call for farm nationalization."

Saskatchewan Young Democrats Sunday voted to press for the nationalization of all farm lands in Canada to decrease investment currently required to operate an economical farm unit.

I don't think even the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Lloyd) is so utterly stupid as to think that the Saskatchewan farmer will recall the agriculture policies under the NDP or the lack of them, that he will recall the millions of dollars he has lost through labor tie-ups over the years, that he will consider the statements of the NDY in Moose Jaw at the recent convention. Surely the Leader of the Opposition does not think that, in spite of all this, the Saskatchewan farmer will fall for the desperate attempts they have made for farm support in this session. I would think the Hon. Leader of the Opposition must be treading on pretty thin ice right now. Surely his United States and Eastern labor bosses will not stand for the desperate attempts for agrarian support made in this debate. Surely the youth in his party will not accept anything short of the complete take-over and nationalization of farming in Saskatchewan.

We see here, Mr. Speaker, the Leader of the Opposition trying to ride two horses, the labor horse because he needs the money and the rural farm horse because he needs the votes.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. A.R. Guy (Minister of Public Works): — He can't ride either one.

Mr. Loken: — The only problem, Mr. Speaker, is that both horses are heading in opposite directions and I think he will soon find himself flat on his back between the two.

Not only is there a conflict in policy regarding farm lands between the Hon. Leader of the Opposition and the NDY, but the pseudo-national leader of the NDP, the Hon. Member from Regina South East, the Mayor of Regina (Mr. Baker) . . .

An Hon. Member: — Oh, Henry!

Mr. Loken: — . . . who announced last year that he would seek little Tommy's job as National Leader. The Hon. Member from Regina South East (Mr. Baker) should have been somewhat disturbed at the action recommended by the NDY in nationalizing all farm lands.

An Hon. Member: — Henry agreed.

Mr. Loken: — If the Member can recall his speech of March 6th, 1968, in this House, and I quote:

I would again urge this agricultural loan fund to purchase farm lands for resale, interest free for a 5-year period to enable young farmers to acquire the land and the machinery they need to cultivate it. This could be one method of preserving the family farm.

Adlai Stevenson once said, 'Farming is more than an essential industry. It is a way of life that must be preserved and encouraged in much of the free world.'

In much of the free world land reform and tenure by the many instead of the few is the major goal. Let us not go into the opposite direction and plough under the family farm.

And His Worship goes on to promise his usual "pie in the sky", "pay over the next 100 years" program. Well, what has the Hon. Member to say now? Does he support nationalization of farm lands or does he support his previous statement which I've just quoted? Or does he believe his proficiency in the wearing of two hats will also see him through the basic policy conflict between his views and the views of the NDY?

Mr. Speaker, the Budget Speech contains many sound proposals which will be met with enthusiasm by the people of Saskatchewan, farmer and laborer, rural residents and city dwellers alike. This Government's policy embodies the principles upon which our Government was elected to office. Sound, business-like Government with progressive social legislation where it is most needed and can be most effective, and where it is within the economic capacity of the Province and the taxpayer.

I know that the people in my constituency will be happy with a rebate of 75 per cent, being the Provincial Government's share of estate tax. They will also be happy with the increased money for paving and oiling our highways and more miles added to our farm access program, increased equalization grants to rural municipalities and further assistance to towns and villages for improving their streets, and no tax increases.

Mr. Speaker, I will vote in favor of the Budget.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

WELCOME TO STUDENTS

Mr. R. Heggie (Hanley): — Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of privilege. The Member for Humboldt (Mr. Breker) has very kindly granted me a moment or two to introduce a school which came in after the introduction of schools took place. I beg leave, Mr. Speaker, to introduce them now.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to introduce to you 56 pupils from the Vanscoy school from the Saskatoon West school unit, located approximately 18 miles south and west of Saskatoon. There are two grades here from Vanscoy school, grade five, accompanied by the teacher, Mr. John Moore and grade 6, accompanied by the teacher, Mrs. Marguerite Shovan. I hope the Members will welcome this school from Vanscoy. I might say that this little hamlet of Vanscoy was once a very quiet little place but with the advent of the potash mines, its population has mushroomed to about 500 to 600 people, and it has a very good school there now.

Mr. Speaker, these are words of welcome to the pupils and the teachers from Vanscoy school of the Saskatoon West school unit, and I hope that they have a pleasant time in the city of Regina today. Thank you for the privilege.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. T.M. Breker (Humboldt): — Mr. Speaker, I've heard much about riding two horses in both the preceding speeches of my colleagues, all I can say is that I was at the Calgary Stampede and I saw a fellow ride two horses and he was getting about \$500 a day for it.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Breker: — Maybe the trouble with those fellows on the opposite side of the House is riding too far back on the horse. It's kind of hard to tell.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Breker: — I'd like to take this time, Mr. Speaker, to deal with the problem that concerns my constituency. The most important and immediate problem of my constituency is damp grain. The greatest problem facing the agriculture community today in the vast part of Saskatchewan and especially in the North, is the huge quantity of damp and tough grain in storage on the farm. There is at least twice as much high moisture grain as in any previous year in the history of farming in this province.

A very substantial effort will be required by all concerned, from now till spring to dry that amount of grain which cannot possibly move through the regular commercial channels of drying.

In recent weeks, the real size of the problem has just come into focus. Farmers have become active in meeting the problem with characteristic ingenuity, some of them by independent action and others through co-operative action with groups and with their neighbors.

There has been an encouraging amount of the number of grain dryers in the province and if they operate at full capacity throughout the winter and the spring, there is a good possibility that major spoilage of grain can be avoided. Crucial factors in the situation from now to spring will be temperature levels, road conditions and spring breakups, and the apathy of some farmers, coupled with the ability of the propane companies to service the dryers.

Incidentally the people around Lloydminster are buying propane for 12 to 13 cents a gallon. We in the Humboldt area are paying 16½ to 17½ cents a gallon.

Efforts to convince the Federal Government that the damp grain is a crisis on the Prairies, and is a national disaster, have failed. Mr. Gibbings has said:

There were precedents such as the Winnipeg floods during the 1950s when the nation rallied to assist and public funds were spent on a floodway to keep a similar disaster from recurring.

He said further:

You had a right to expect some assistance in drying this grain and furthermore in preventing it from happening again.

Whether we get 10 cents a bushel for drying grain, Mr. Speaker, is not that significant. I do not expect the Federal Government or the Provincial Government to alter its position on grain drying assistance. The problem of farming is much more complicated, complex and older.

The real difficulty and an immediate problem is being only able to sell six bushels per acre. Costs of production in Saskatchewan range from \$17 to \$25 an acre, and on a six-bushel quota — and I expect this is all we're going to see this year — there is no way that a farmer can generate more than \$12 per acre.

We need not only a decent price per bushel but we need volume. The costs of goods and services used by farmers increased 76 per cent between 1949 and 1967. The price of wheat rose only 16 per cent or 29 cents in the same period. The price of wheat is clearly lagging far behind other Canadian price levels as reflected in the cost index.

Mr. G.R. Bowerman (Shellbrook): — You're on the wrong side of the House . . .

February 27, 1969

Mr. Breker: — The cost of production has been rising at an alarming rate. In the last two years, farmers, I think, have failed to notice, due to the high price, good yields, and good grades, the alarming increase in the cost of production over the last two years.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Breker: — This fall we are not only faced with the problem of cost-price, no-market squeeze, but with the added burden of drying vast quantities of low grade wheat.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Breker: — I believe those who produce have a responsibility to produce what the market wants and the amount that the market can stand. I believe that the policy of producing the best possible goods at the best possible prices will benefit the country as a whole, but this policy evidently is not applicable to all industries. The farmer is expected to produce and sell without any type of protection or subsidy. Subsidized domestic prices, Mr. Speaker, however, are a rule rather than an exception among importing nations. Three, at least, of the major exporters, United States, Australia and France, pursue policies resulting in a different price for wheat consumed at home than that sold in export markets. But the Star Phoenix says:

While the plight of the farmers is recognized, there is no place in the Canadian economy for a subsidy to any segment of it. Such an outright subsidy, without any strings attached, amounts to a direct tax on Canadian taxpayers who, whether farmers or others, already carry a heavy tax load in Federal, Provincial and municipal taxes.

If such a subsidy is made available to farmers, similar subsidies are clearly the right of Newfoundland fishermen and others whose business and industry are undergoing serious difficulties at present.

I'd just like to remind the Editor that, under our mineral resources incentive program, those who delve deep into the hidden treasures of the Saskatchewan North, are reimbursed 50 per cent up to a maximum of \$50,000 for any one year. Is this not a subsidy?

I would also like to say that anyone that wants to build a new building, buy new equipment to produce manufactured articles, to develop an industry in a designated area in this province or any other province in the Dominion of Canada, gets a 25 per cent rebate on all buildings and equipment. Is this not a subsidy?

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Breker: — I would also like to say that most of the manufacturers in this country receive a 25-35-45 per cent subsidy when they operate behind a tariff, behind a tariff wall that prevents goods from coming into this country from countries that want our wheat, from countries, which if they could trade with us without these excessive tariffs, could help to alleviate our situation. Do you not call this a subsidy?

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Breker: — We have heard, Mr. Speaker, statements made in and out of this House for the sole purpose of making political gain.

Mr. Speaker, the Members opposite have been clapping, from now on I don't think they'll clap.

Mr. A. Thibault (Kinistino): — Hear, hear!

Mr. Breker: — I never forget a face, Mr. Thibault, but in your case I'm going to make an exception.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Breker: — To make political gain at the expense of an already hard-pressed industry is cheap and deceitful. The Members from Touchwood (Mr. Meakes), from Wadena (Mr. Dewhurst), from Kelsey (Mr. Messer), and other Members from that side of the House have made major addresses regarding damp grain.

An Hon. Member: — They weren't major.

Mr. Breker: — They weren't major, no, but they took a long time. If half of the hot air that these Members opposite are spewing regarding the drying situation was in the dryers rather than in the House, I think our problem would probably be solved by now.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Breker: — They blame the Wheat Board, the Government, the railways and the elevators. They talk about demurrage on the West Coast running into the thousands. They talk about ships . . . just a minute, hold your applause. They talk about ships with orders for wheat cargoes that are being kept waiting at Vancouver terminals. Mr. Lloyd says, "It's the wrong grade because one hand of the Government moved without knowing what the other one needed."

February 27, 1969

I would like to read what C.W. Gibbings, G.L. Harrold and H.B. Sneath said in a joint statement speaking for the three Western Wheat Pools. This, of course, came out after they had made their major addresses. They said:

Action by the Canadian Wheat Board in the undertaking of additional export sales to the port of Vancouver, should be recognized as a benefit to Western farmers.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Breker: — They spoke of the congestion currently plaguing the Western port, and it states:

The situation has arisen, because the Board took extra orders of No. 2 Northern wheat required by Japan following that country's suspension of United States imports due to questionable quality.

Added to this was the commitment for No. 4 Northern and No. 5 wheat for China which had to be dried before export, as well as labor problems in the United States Gulf ports, which re-routed vessels that would not normally have come to Canadian West Coast ports.

This is the punch line:

There would have been justification for more criticism had the Canadian Wheat Board refused. The railways too must accept their share of the responsibility for inefficient movement of grain to date and must make the cars and power available to what has become an emergency situation. Terminal elevators must be kept working to capacity to obtain maximum efficiency.

A lack of sufficient cars in position to unload at West Coast terminals in recent weeks may have been due to inclement weather that has resulted in loss of operating time for terminal elevators.

Here they get on to demurrage payments:

Demurrage payments to boats waiting for grain borne by producers through the Canadian Wheat Board are a factor in some cases but have been highly exaggerated in many reports.

Then they go on to say:

Risks must be taken to make sales and these charges will be less of a burden to the farmer than the loss of sales.

I realize, Mr. Speaker, that, if any farmer should suffer the loss of his crop or even a portion of that crop, to that farmer that loss is serious. I am happy to report that at least in my

constituency the damp grain situation as presented to you by Members opposite is unrealistic and inaccurate.

I am happy to report that in Ag. Rep. District No. 21 there are approximately 150 dryers serving eight municipalities. This works out to one dryer per eighteen farmers. Mr. Speaker, five dryer meetings have been held in this area at which the attendance has been 1000. Farmers in my area have risen to the challenge and with their characteristic ingenuity are themselves solving the problem.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Breker: — I checked into some of the other constituencies. Ag. Rep. District No. 19, Canora, 66 dryers. Ag. Rep. 18, Kamsack, 20 dryers. The general opinion, and I checked many more, is that there is grain drying equipment ready and capable to do the job if the farmers make use of the facilities available.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Breker: — I've contacted Ag. Reps. in District No. 20 and I'm informed that there are 40 dryers in that area. This takes in Touchwood and Kelvington. In District No. 38, which takes in Turtleford, there are 25 dryers. From this we can see that the distribution of dryers, Mr. Speaker, is very sporadic, and should we experience an early warm spring and an early break up, certain areas could have serious problems.

I believe that the Provincial Government should make necessary arrangements whereby Ag. Reps. could enlist the help of dryers in other districts, should any area experience difficulties. I believe that the Ag. Reps. should have the power to pay dryer owners a cost-of-transportation and setting-up allowance. I believe the Ag. Reps. could render a very valuable service by becoming both watch-dog and guardian of what might become a disaster for local areas. I believe too, this way the Ag. Rep. service could make better use of all the resources here in Saskatchewan.

We have a Standing Committee on Agriculture. It hasn't convened, to the best of my knowledge, for the last 15 years. The CCF convened it in 1953. I believe that the damp grain situation is serious enough that it should be referred to the Standing Committee on Agriculture so that they can make inquiries for recommendations and acquaint themselves with the situation as it is here and now.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Breker: — Highways, Mr. Speaker, is not a problem unique to my constituency. The Opposition last year said that the Budget

February 27, 1969

for highways should be cut and in that way taxes would not have to be raised to the extent that they were. The Minister of Highways (Mr. Boldt) has had 459 delegations in to see him. Their requests range from wanting bridges, wanting oil, wanting pavement, new construction, gravel or taking grid roads into the highway system, and I know that the members of the delegations that I brought in weren't all Liberals. The Highway program has been a very popular program indeed, and I commend the Government for continuing to forge ahead with this extensive program.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Breker: — Mr. Boldt in his Highway Program said No. 20 from Humboldt to Fulda will be completed this year, and I am informed that this will be done as early as possible, probably in the end of May. I am also pleased to announce that the stretch from Fulda to Pilger will be rebuilt. A new tender will be let for that stretch of highway.

Mr. Speaker, I must say something about the Leroy hospital which is scheduled to close July 1st. The Leroy hospital board made the Minister of Health (Mr. Grant) a proposition whereby they would accept all the financial responsibility over a fixed amount. The Minister (Mr. Grant) has not accepted the offer. However, I am sure that the door to further negotiations is not closed. It is hoped that a value can be set on the care given in that hospital and that further negotiations will continue.

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

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. R. Romanow (Saskatoon Riversdale): — Mr. Speaker, we're now debating the 1969 Budget and may I say that there is nothing so lacking in daring and imagination as this Budget 1969.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Romanow: — I shouldn't say that exactly; that there is nothing. That's not totally correct. One must not overlook the contributions in this debate by the Members opposite thus far. Take for example the Member from Humboldt (Mr. Breker) who just took his seat, talked about the availability of dryers but completely overlooked to mention the fact that the problem for the farmer is a lack of cash directly to help them dry.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Romanow: — He overlooked the fact that this Government has purposely and wilfully omitted to look after and take care of the farmers and refuses to provide assistance for them in drying.

An Hon. Member: — Disgraceful.

Mr. Romanow: — Now, there have been other contributions to this debate, for example the resident Minister in charge of the Hanley liquor board (Mr. Heggie), talked of glib lawyers during his debate and after he finished the contribution, we all wondered if that rule was really universal. And the Member from Watrous (Mr. Schmeiser). Well, he wandered through history pages of the dirty 30s and the 40s and the 50s. And the Premier made a notable contribution on estate tax, but the Members noticed that he seemed to lack his usual type of buoyancy when he delivered his speech. We had to ask, on this side of the House, why didn't it have the same punch? We studied his lack of buoyancy. I think the answer is simply that the Premier and the Government and the Members opposite know that come next election they are out and that's the explanation for the lack of buoyancy.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Romanow: — I'm going to refer to the Premier's report to the Liberal convention, in a moment or two, to support that proposition, but I think that Saskatchewan, and the people in Saskatchewan, noted the sense of impending tragedy that permeated the Liberal convention in December in Regina here. Now don't forget, Mr. Speaker, this was the first convention since the election of 1967. It was the first convention after the deterrent taxes on the sick were imposed, sales tax increases were made, and the like. Now this same convention in December last barely defeated a resolution that condemned this Liberal Government sitting opposite for imposing the 2-cent per gallon tax on purple gas.

Mr. Speaker, the Leader Post reported that the resolution condemning this Liberal Government passed through a closed panel session, but it failed when it got to the convention as a whole. That prompts me to the observation that maybe things aren't all so bad behind those smoke-filled, back rooms of Liberal parties. But, however, this resolution did come to the floor of the House at the plenary session. It came and it failed to gain support by a very, very close majority. It was one of the hotly contested resolutions. In fact, the Leader Post reports that a standing vote was so close it had to be counted three times in order to enable the session chairman to be certain whether the Liberals stood with this Government or stood against the Government.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Romanow: — But I want Hon. Members to note this, the Leader Post states:

The count was later reported to be 78 to 58, meaning

that 136 out of more than 800 registered delegates voted on the question.

Mr. Speaker, 136 out of 800 delegates voted on the gas tax resolution. It leads me to the observation that either the Liberals can't count on their registration record or they show a marvellous devotion to their democratic duties. If this convention was truly democratic, if the people of the Liberal party had been truly allowed to express their true feelings, that resolution would have passed and they would have thrown out that tax on the gas, as they would have thrown taxes on the deterrents and sales increase taxes as well.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Romanow: — I think the Premier knows that he's facing a tough fight the next time round.

In the course of this Budget Debate, some Members opposite have referred to conventions of political parties and some reference has been made about the concern of political parties about images. Frankly, this is the first time that I've really bothered to peruse the Liberal convention proceedings that finished last December. I can tell Members that it's really no great shakes, but I want to bring this to the attention to the Members.

One, R.W.B. (Bob) Thompson of Saskatoon was elected the new President and Mr. R.W.B. (Bob) Thompson, I think, sensed this impending sense of tragedy and defeat that was permeating the Liberal party at their convention last, when it was reported he said:

Our public relations and public image need polishing.

An Hon. Member: — Sure does.

Mr. Romanow: — All I can tell Mr. Thompson is that judging by Tuesday's performance by the Minister of Highways, their public relations firm had better be fired. Mr. Thompson continues though, quote:

The party has just come through some difficult times, he states, and even some good Liberals have run for cover.

I want to tell Mr. Thompson and the Premier that not just a few good Liberals, but most good Liberals have gone to cover as a result of the Liberals actions last year . . .

An Hon. Member: — . . . coming over to this side?

Mr. Romanow: — Yes, it is only the battle-hardened die-hards that sit opposite, Mr. Speaker, who remain to pick the pieces of what's

left of the Liberal party in Saskatchewan.

Mr. J.J. Charlebois (Saskatoon City Park-University): — . . . Socialists!

Mr. Romanow: — But there they sit, the Premier unfortunately not in the House, but the Treasurer sits in splendid isolation, surrounded by his very loyal few, with a few exceptions here and there. Like Humpty Dumpty, the Premier sits on his wall, and like Humpty Dumpty, Mr. Speaker, he's going to take a great fall next election. All we can say is that the people of this province will never put them to power again.

Mr. Speaker, according to the Leader Post the Premier also - and this is the part that I want the Members opposite to particularly note about this sense of defeat that he knows is impending — he is quoted as saying in his report to the convention as follows:

A few of our Liberals have become timid and faint-hearted. An occasional one has lost courage the Premier says. A few Liberals have become critical.

Mr. Speaker, what is a few? If and when this Government calls a Kelvington by-election they'll show the Premier that it's a few thousand in each constituency of this province.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Romanow: — Then with a soldier's lament . . .

Hon. A.R. Guy (Minister of Public Works): — . . . Tell the truth!

Mr. Romanow: — . . . the Premier ruefully concluded, "How quickly even by some Liberals were our very substantial tax reductions of previous years forgotten."

Well, Mr. Speaker, with tax reductions like last year, I want to say, that they may have been forgotten, but not forgiven by the people of the Province of Saskatchewan.

Now one other small observation. Much ado about nothing has been made about youth participation in political parties. In fact the Member from Rosetown (Mr. Loken) made his little contribution today on that point. Frankly, I think youth should be encouraged by all parties to experiment and do things on their own and toss out ideas while we consider them or reject them.

But for honesty's sake and to keep the record straight, one cannot pass without some brief comment about the Liberal Youth party in Saskatchewan. After all, Mr. Speaker, don't

February 27, 1969

forget they have conventions from time to time as well and they had one in December. Someone has to notice the Liberal Youth, even if my friends opposite refuse to do so. The Leader Post reported that the Liberal Youth were complaining greatly at their December convention about the role of the Liberal Youth in the Senior Youth. Some wanted to disband. One unnamed delegate, according to the Leader Post, complained that the Youth were given only token treatment, like the women's organization says the report, consisting of, and get this quote, "stamp-licking and boot-licking."

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Romanow: — About 80 youth registered. But the newspaper reported that only 30 idealistic, aggressive and dynamic Liberal Youth remained when the resolutions were passed.

The organizers of this convention, according to the report, wanted to talk about organization, but one unnamed delegate summed up the feelings of the group when he said, "Let's get down to the nitty gritty." Mr. Speaker, that's just what they did, they got down to the "nitty gritty". Here were the resolutions that they passed, and the only ones according to the paper, with little discussion by this idealistic 30. 1. Lower drinking age to 18. 2. Longer hours for beer parlors and bars. 3. Serve draught beer in pitchers. Now that's a tough philosophical problem I can see. 4. More entertainment in pubs and bars. 5. Allow Sunday drinking, the Liberal Youth said. 6. Allow liquor advertising, and on and on they went about liquor. No mixture of resolutions to dilute this convention. They certainly were very spirited deliberations to say the least.

Well, I don't think, Mr. Speaker, that this really means that we can draw conclusions that all the Liberal Members on the opposite side are obsessed about alcohol because of what their youth section voted on, but nevertheless they were discussing these timely issues. But I just want to make one point clear. The youth weren't as totally divorced from their elders opposite as they might appear, as I may have told this House, because the newspaper later said, "Welfare Minister Cy MacDonald — I'm sorry he's not present — spent about half an hour at the meeting." Is this the Minister in charge of the Youth Agency for the Province of Saskatchewan? We agree with the Premier when he said in his same report to the convention December last, "The Young Liberal organization leaves much to be desired." Well, Mr. Speaker, I can see another instant band of Socialists in the making. However, I don't blame them. This entire Liberal party as evidenced by the Budget leaves very much to be desired. I don't blame the Liberal Members opposite and the Minister of Public Welfare for refusing to talk about this Budget. There is very little in it. Specifically, I want to refer to three areas of concern which affect constituents in Saskatoon Riverdale, but I think these concerns are mirrored

throughout the province everywhere that the Budget is deadly silent on.

Firstly, this Budget has failed education, and particularly as it relates to and is affected by automation. Secondly, this Budget has neglected the youth of Saskatchewan. Thirdly, the Budget has abandoned the aged and the afflicted. This Government's pay-as-you-go business philosophy is repugnant to its legal and moral responsibility to provide leadership in those three areas.

Now, Mr. Speaker, Saskatchewan will find in the future that it can't afford the price of this balanced Budget. Our young people are the innocent bystanders gunned down by a poor paltry and inadequate education budget. The refusal to invest in our young people in order to meet the challenge of the 1970s is an extravagance — and I'm sorry that the Minister of Welfare (Mr. MacDonald) isn't present — that my generation will be paying for in the years ahead. This Government has failed to provide leadership to rejuvenate our educational program. The educational program is far behind the needs of today's space-age world. The lack of funds for local school boards, as pointed out by my colleague from Regina Centre (Mr. Blakeney), is absolutely scandalous. Each and everyone of you and the Members opposite, if you take the time to check with your rural secretary, or the proper official at city hall wherever it happens to be, will know that the mill rate has been rising and is going to rise because of this penny-pinching attitude by the Members opposite. I submit that Wednesday's cavalier disregard by the Minister of Education (Mr. McIsaac) is shown by his plea to hold the line. I was present in the House when he said words to the effect that I suggest 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 did, or words to that effect. How can the Minister say that? Education, and he admits it, is changing rapidly almost daily due to technological growth and development. By necessity, the costs of education are going to have to rise. It must cost more if we are going to leave behind our horse-and-buggy educational system in Saskatchewan and institute a new one. When the Minister and this Government urge school boards to be responsible or to hold the line, what they are really saying is simply this: "Local school boards, sacrifice modern and good education for short-term political expediency." There is just simply no way that you can reduce effectively the cost of a comprehensive high school or modern laboratory or the type of modern facilities that we need, if we are going to keep pace with the 1970s.

I think this Budget has simply made a clear choice against modern education and the youth and for sheer, blatant, political expediency. I have personal regards for the Minister, but his speech yesterday proves it and in effect he admits it.

Now, Mr. Speaker, some Members may be a bit dubious about this word automation, but it affects everyone. Its impact is

February 27, 1969

very strong on education. Increasingly, automation shapes our social and economic lives. For example, the farmer, due to automation and other reasons, has to go to other fancier and more expensive farm machinery. It is estimated that a graduate engineer from our University of Saskatchewan in the future will likely have to be retrained as many as three to five times just to keep pace with the technological growth and advancement that goes around about him. In automation, industry is here. Now a good example is my constituency, Saskatoon Riversdale, where Gulf Oil has announced the closure of its oil refinery on 11th Street. It is estimated 100 men are directly affected. The closure is a blow to the families of these workers. It is an economic blow to the city of Saskatoon. The oil industry, everybody knows, is getting more sophisticated by automation. No one is going to blame Gulf Oil if it finds it can no longer do the job economically or can do the job with less refineries and less workers. But I want to say, by the same token, no one can blame the worker, if he then asks, after the plant has closed, "Where do I go?" Often, the person affected is unable to obtain training because there is simply, Mr. Minister of Education, not enough schools designed specifically for this type of crisis. The Minister of Education confirmed this yesterday when we had a bit of a conversation during the course of a speech. Now if there is a new position for this worker out of the city, he has to up-root his family, sever all social and economic conditions and start anew. Now, Mr. Speaker, can any Member in this House and the Government opposite tell me why it is in the 1970s that this Government has not been able to foresee and to plan for this closure and the others that are going to come in the future. At a time when we are sending men to the moon and back, why can't this Government provide for an orderly program of retraining for people hit by automation?

Now on a larger scale, I often ask what is wrong with our educational system in Saskatchewan, when it seemingly concerns itself only with training our young people to take up soon-to-be-automated jobs under an economic system. The educational system of Saskatchewan, I think, is basically designed to fill the economic needs only of our society. The student is a product of learning by rote. He learns only his field on his job. Then, when he goes on to his job and automation hits, he is stuck and affected because his learning experience has narrowed his vision and his ability to respond. He is denied his opportunity to learn by discovery, an opportunity that would give him a better chance to survive in the automated world.

Now, Mr. Speaker, what we on this side of the House want is a program to meet that challenge of the 1970s. The Minister of Education is not doing his job when he merely says the school board plans are "grandiose". Saskatchewan asks this question: has this Government analysed the cost in dollar and human terms to provide for the displaced worker or farmer or the alienated youth? And the answer, judging by Budget 1969, is no! We don't have planning for the future. What do we have, Mr. Speaker? Instead, we have a balanced Budget! At a time when

we should be revamping our entire educational system — and this costs money and much more in the future — what does this Government give us? A balanced Budget!

Now in the particular case of Gulf Oil Refinery, it is not too late for this Government to act yet. I call on the Government to call on the Company — I bet you they haven't done that yet — to find out its intentions, particularly as they affect those workers. I urge this Government to assess the social and economic impact of the closure of this plant on the families and for these workers at Gulf Oil and others affected in Saskatoon and should provide financial remuneration during the time these people are being retrained and re-located. The Department of Industry, the Minister, the Premier's Department, should be searching now for jobs for these people so that they won't have to leave Saskatoon and Moose Jaw, which is also affected.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Romanow: — Above all, Mr. Speaker, this isolated example shows the need for this Province to take immediate steps, both in the field of education and in economic planning. Educational goals, as I have stated already, have to be re-defined. Our education system is antiquated. Where was the Minister of Education's voice when the Budget showed inadequate spending on education in a balanced Budget?

On this special problem of automation, who in the Treasury benches opposite raised his voice to combat or to present a solution to combat this problem of technology? No, none I bet, Mr. Speaker. None judging by this Budget. They only brag for cheap political expediency about new industries and forget about the ones that leave the citizens holding the bag.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Romanow: — I want to emphasize that what is needed is an overall program in this area. It has got to be integrated with all departments of government, objectives and social goals must be re-defined to meet the needs of the 1970s. But there is one thing that the Government can do now as well. Specifically I urge the implementation of a special branch on the Problems of Automation. This branch could carry out research programs to determine those sectors of society and industries to be affected in the future. And mark my words, gentlemen opposite, this is going to be an increasingly important branch for the family farm and for the farm person, who has lost his farm because of the economic squeeze.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Romanow: — This branch could recommend and have the power to enforce

February 27, 1969

an orderly planned program of discontinuation of operations in any industry, farm or business. It would seek out new jobs for the displaced worker. It would provide social and special programs and opportunities for re-training at any age. If this Budget had this provision, Mr. Speaker, we on this side would applaud this Government for having shown leadership and imagination. But this Government has miserably failed. The voice of the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. McFarlane), in Budget deliberations, must have been silent as it is most times. Above all, this Government has miserably failed our youth, in balancing a budget at a time when more and better schools and a new approach to education are needed. A new modern curriculum is long overdue. It will have to be done, Mr. Speaker. It will have to be done. Oh, yes, sometime in the future, but at an enormous and terrific expense to the taxpayer of Saskatchewan. As I said, Saskatchewan education can ill afford the luxury of this balanced Budget.

Now, Mr. Speaker, may I turn briefly to a second area that I think indicates the paucity of ideas on the part of the Members opposite. Many young people are not able or willing to attend institutions of higher learning. Saskatoon Riversdale has many of these young people. I am sure they exist in each and every one of the Members' constituencies opposite. Although my remarks can be applied to the youth as a whole, I am particularly concerning myself now about those young people who are caught in between, as it were, in between high school and job, or in between high school and university, or bluntly speaking, in between grade and grade, the school dropouts. The problem is immense. I am not going to elaborate on the expense to society and to Saskatchewan, to maintain a person who purposefully or through circumstance chooses to discontinue further studies, or is unable to continue studies because of financial inability. Let it just be said that in today's world there is no such thing as enough education. But does this Budget provide our young men and women with a proper motivation and the proper opportunity to develop their abilities to the full? No. This Budget is silent. There is no money for this youth. It is of the most importance that every opportunity for character and intellectual development of this segment of youth be utilized. We all agree that our youth must be motivated to pursue activities that will make them physically fit, emotionally well-balanced, culturally enriched, intellectually alert. I can think of a number of projects that come to mind that could be integrated in a planned, Provincial program for the development of youth. I am not here to detail this program, but one important first step would be the establishment of community all-purpose, youth development centres. These centres could be the fountain-head for physical education, cultural and formal educational training of those youths that, I have mentioned, are sort of caught in between. Opportunities in the arts and sports should be available. Specialized facilities and instructors will have to be obtained.

Mr. Speaker, lest this Government brag about isolated

instances of financial support, let me say, though, that the job that this Government has done in support of the youth is totally ineffective. The Youth Development Program of the Liberal party opposite has been nearsighted to say the least. This Government fails to provide leadership in not building these types of facilities I have talked about, in instilling the motivation that I have referred to, and in training young men and women of Saskatchewan. Where are our community colleges I have to ask? What about these special intermediate schools? The Minister of Education said himself yesterday that there were just too many people waiting for not enough facilities. Where is this attention being given to this youth caught in between? Well, let the Government go out and tell the youth of the Province of Saskatchewan, about the balanced Budget. Yes, we have a balanced Budget. But that Budget reveals a lack of dynamism, a lack of vigor in the formulation of constructive programs for the youth of Riversdale and Saskatchewan. Can any Member in this House tell me what the price my generation is going to have to pay for this Government's pallid disregard for youth, for this Government's short-term expediency in balancing the Budget this year?

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Romanow: — The price is going to be huge. We the future and the taxpayers of the future are going to have to be paying terrifically for this Government's inactivities.

The Minister-in-Charge — and I am sorry he is not here today — has paid only lip-service to the interests of our youth. Where was the Minister of Welfare's voice when this Budget was brought before the Treasury, in order to ensure that the youth are going to be properly looked after? I bet you it was silent! I urge this Government to announce a Provincial program for development of youth, to meet these aspirations that they have for tomorrow. Municipal governments should be consulted immediately so that their youth programs can be dove-tailed into this integrated Provincial program to prosecute the problem on a province-wide basis.

Voluntary agencies, who have up to date tried their best, should also be consulted. Yes, Mr. Speaker, I can say that youth can ill afford the price that we are going to have to pay for this balanced Budget.

Mr. Speaker, one other area is of vital importance. You know every time we have to go to see a doctor, the people of Saskatchewan are reminded of the Liberal Government's inept and bankrupt health services program. This Budget solidified and confirmed all of Saskatchewan's conviction that the Liberals have not yet determined for themselves that good health means good economics. Every dollar spent from the Treasury for promotion and expansion of health services will be repaid a thousand-fold to the future of Saskatchewan's economy. But

February 27, 1969

these Liberals can't see that. These wise all-knowing businessmen opposite cannot see the dollar-cents value of that approach to health.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Romanow: — No, Mr. Speaker, they can't! Instead the Liberals persist in raising bogey and false fears about imaginary spiralling costs for health services. The Premier wants to convince the people of this province that we can't afford medicare and hospitalization so that he can chop it off the market-place of the people of this province. Well, I say he is not going to succeed. Last year, deterrent fees on the sick struck a cruel body blow to medicare. This year, with a likely reduction in services for physiotherapy and laboratory, further curtailment of health programs is evidenced. In other areas, health care attention by the Liberals is frankly appalling. To balance the Budget, only one half million dollars is being spent to improve mental health, when at least \$2 million is called for, and that was a year ago. To balance the Budget, what provision is there for the mentally retarded, or crippled, or chronically ill people. These programs are equally inadequate and ineffective. Can any Member in this House tell me what price we will pay in the future for this purposeful stifling of good health services by the Liberals opposite in Saskatchewan.

In Saskatoon, the Minister of Health (Mr. Grant) knows that the University Hospital has been planning major additions, and the Minister of Health knows about it. The finest hospital in Saskatchewan. We need a new base hospital here in the southern part of the province. Can the Minister tell me why these facilities are being denied to the people of Saskatchewan now?

An Hon. Member: — Planning!

Mr. Romanow: — Planning! For the price of a balanced Budget "homecoming".

Can the Minister of Public Health tell me what price we are going to pay in the future for having been denied these much needed facilities right now? The burden is particularly heavy also, Mr. Speaker, on those who are on fixed incomes. These are the old people, the chronically ill. They must meet cost-of-living increases and deterrent fees. I want the Minister of Public Health to remember that. The senior citizen and the afflicted person to my mind are the forgotten man of this Government. The senior citizens, for example, do not have adequate funds with which to live decently. And you know it! When old people have to leave their homes, as sometimes is the case, with advancing age, where do they go?

Mr. Charlebois: — They are a lot better off . . .

Mr. Romanow: — The Member of Saskatoon City Park-University knows that there is a serious shortage of nursing homes right in Saskatoon. If he doesn't know, he had better start getting around his constituency to find out about it, or he is going to be defeated next time.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Romanow: — I would ask the Hon. Member from City Park-University to take a look at the grants that have been made, or the Budget estimates for grants, with respect to operating capital costs in this area. They have been either reduced or totally eliminated. It is shameful. He doesn't care. He doesn't know. All I can say to Members opposite is that where homes are available for these older people, they are too expensive for most to be able to afford them. When they have to go in them, savings are rapidly eaten up. Let the Minister of Welfare and the Premier tell these people, the old, the chronically sick about the advantages of a balanced Budget. Yes, this Government exhibits a throw-away mentality, that is the only way we can describe it, a throw-away mentality about senior citizens, about the chronically handicapped. This Government has given these people a measly living allowance, or pension, or supplement, locates them wherever possible and then forgets about them. I don't blame the psychology of the old age pensioners, and I think all Members will agree with me that it is sadly tragic. Most old age people fear the prospect of growing old because of financial uncertainty. It is little wonder. Having pioneered this province, they should be provided as a matter of right with sufficient funds and facilities in which to grow old with dignity. Mr. Speaker, when I and the people of Saskatchewan see a balanced Budget, what we see is this Government's inability to look after the aged and the afflicted, while somehow locating millions and millions of dollars for highways. Shameful!

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Romanow: — It is the type of cock-eyed priorities that went out with old-styled politics. As a direct consequence of this Government's neglect, old people have to live in run-down tenement blocks, apartments stacked upon apartments. Facilities are poor. Recreational activities just simply don't exist.

Now for the chronically handicapped, I refer the Minister of Public Health's (Mr. Grant) attention to the Geriatric Centre in Saskatoon. It is located in Riversdale and I visited there. I think the facilities are cramped. Working personnel are overworked because of the special type of attention needed for the person who is chronically ill, three or four people to lift and move a person who is unable and incapable of looking after himself. The building is old, outdated and inadequate. Now to hear the Premier (Mr. Thatcher) and the Government and those opposite who took part in this Debate, we would conclude

February 27, 1969

that this is the age of affluence and prosperity. Why then is this Budget silent on long-range objectives for the care and the training of the mentally retarded, the crippled and the older citizen of this province? Silent, Mr. Speaker.

Well, now, Mr. Speaker, something can be done in a short term if the Government wants to show good faith. I call on the Government to set up special community centres for the aged and the afflicted which are community-oriented, community-structured. This problem needs to be singled out by the Legislators of this province for special attention. This problem needs to be singled out because it is one of the most important ones in our province. Now part of the problem, I think, can be met by this type of a centre. These centres would provide living accommodation for the sick, facilities for the handicapped, recreational activities appropriate for both, referral and consultation centres, simply a place where the old person can go to directly when he needs some advice and needs some help. I know Members who have had some dealings with old-aged people who confirmed this. Most of them are confused and simply do not know where to turn for help. This type of a referral centre would be designed and would be one big step forward to erasing this social inequity. Mr. Speaker, the Department of Welfare and the Liberal party have simply not done the job. We don't want to hear about 1964 and before, because for most of the Members opposite who are in dreamland there is 1970 around the corner.

Mr. Speaker, this Budget is barren. It is hollow. It is empty of exciting programs for the new Saskatchewan. We are trying, all of Saskatchewan is trying, to drag the Liberals reluctantly into the new Saskatchewan. The problem is that this has been a figment of some public relations firm catch slogan that the Liberals didn't fully understand or appreciate when they talked about the new Saskatchewan. Saskatchewan remembers that this Budget comes to us only after the highest tax increases last year ever in the history of this province. This Budget comes to us after the imposition of a farm fuel tax. You rural Members opposite, defend that in your ridings next election. This Budget comes back to the people of Saskatchewan after the imposition of deterrent fees on the sick and the old. This Budget comes to us after staggering sales tax increases and other many, many tax increases. About \$40 million roughly has come as a result of this new taxation and what this Government has been able to do with \$40 million new dollars has been to balance the Budget. Fancy that for the big businessmen opposite. On top of this, in order to balance the \$40 million, the Treasurer had to admit to the people that the Government has had to dramatically reduce and slash existing programs, and has refused at the same time to present new ones which I have talked about, some areas in order to meet the challenges of tomorrow. As I have said the Liberals have raised a bogey man about balanced budgets as an excuse and as a reason to eliminate social welfare programs for the people of this province.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Romanow: — This balanced Budget is the Liberals' way of apologizing to the people of Saskatchewan for failing to inject new programs for Saskatchewan's tomorrow. Mr. Speaker, Saskatchewan is going to have to pay a very high price in the future for this Budget. As I have said we cannot afford the price this balanced Budget is going to cost. It shows the Liberals govern in a piecemeal and patchwork fashion. You know I honestly don't think the Premier (Mr. Thatcher) has sat down and ever assessed long-range goals and needs for 1970 Saskatchewan, and then said, "Look, we've got these goals. Let's go out and attain them, if it means perhaps a deficit from time to time, working on cyclical budgeting." It has no program. That's why he can't do that. The Government had no co-ordinated program of social action. It has failed to support clearly defined goals in public health. Mr. Speaker, Members opposite don't like to admit it, but the Liberals try to build a so-called new society solely in terms of their own political instincts. They govern one year to another year without any integrated or related program, like the drunken sailor wandering from goal post and lamp post to lamp post. This Government is a band-aid dispensary, covering up for its inability to come to grips with Saskatchewan's needs for the '70s.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Romanow: — You know, Mr. Speaker, knowing the Minister of Health (Mr. Grant), I don't even trust the band-aids to hold up. I admit in many ways the Liberals are victims of economic circumstances beyond their control. The Federal Liberals are unable to sell wheat. Inflation is present. But let's not forget that in many other ways the Liberals are the authors of Saskatchewan's misfortune, future and present by their adherence to old and outdated economic philosophies. It knows, you know, something is wrong. The Member from Humboldt (Mr. Breker), he isn't here, but when he talks about wet grain he knows something is wrong. The Member from Saskatoon City Park-University (Mr. Charlebois) went around his riding and talked with the businessmen and he knows that their retail sales are dropping. The economic pinch is being felt. They know this. They know something is wrong, Mr. Speaker, but they don't know how to come up with a solution to the problem. They know that there is a problem with damp wheat. They know there is a problem because they are trying to justify their inactivity on this question of damp wheat. They know there is something wrong but they are paralyzed with inactivity. Mr. Speaker, this Government strictly speaking is uptight. Figure that one out. Ian is uptight in the old, old sense you see. He is not in the 1970's uptightness.

Oh, yes, Mr. Speaker, we do have a balanced Budget, there is no question about that but I can say this. I, for one, do not want to be associated with a Budget that is balanced at the expense of our youth, the aged, the afflicted and our educational system. I don't want to be a part of a Budget that turns its

February 27, 1969

back on the sick, the farmer when he is in need with respect to the damp grain situation, the laborer and automation, after having extracted from these very same people, millions and millions of dollars in taxes to be squandered on highways. I can tell the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Guy) that a government devoid of ideas and programs is devoid of support in Saskatchewan. This Government is bankrupt morally and economically. This Budget comes from an old government that has lost touch with the Member from City Park-University and my generation.

This Government has presented a Budget that has lost touch with all of Saskatchewan. This Government has lost touch with my generation which seeks solutions to poverty, to injustice and inequity, three words the Liberals don't know the meaning of. This Budget has lost touch with modern Saskatchewan and those boys opposite know it and that is why they are howling loudly. This Government, Mr. Speaker, is too old, too tired. We'll prove it to them at the next election.

Mr. Speaker, I cannot support the motion but will support the amendment that reflects the spirit of the things I have been talking about.

Hon. G.B. Grant (Minister of Health): — Mr. Speaker, I don't think any Member opposite can accuse me of standing in this House and sounding off about the younger generation or the university student, because I have always had pretty good faith in our youth until the advent of the last few minutes and I questioned my faith in the last speaker's generation. I consider him the lost member of that generation that he refers to.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Grant: — It is refreshing though to have him reserve his remarks about the Health Department until he is off the radio. I think this indicates that it doesn't have very much importance as far as the general public are concerned, at least as far as his listeners are concerned. He stressed other things that I won't take the time to tell about. Well, there is evidence he chose himself to wait until after four o'clock to make any observation about the Health Department. I thank him very kindly for this because it indicates the priority that he has given, the tax on sick, as he calls it, the deterrent on sick. I think it bothers you people most of all. It is not bothering the general public.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Grant: — It's funny you know. You fellows all quote the number of letter you are getting, the number of phone calls. Henry Baker gets numerous calls about this, that and the other thing. If anybody should get letters and phone calls it should be myself.

When the Hon. Member from Riversdale (Mr. Romanow) describes us as too old and all that, I think he is too vocal, he is too whiney, he is a member of a lost generation, and if they haven't written him off I strongly recommend that his generation write him off.

An Hon. Member: — Come on, stay Roy!

Mr. Grant: — That's too bad because I had more to say but I'm not going to waste it on the rest of you, because I want him to hear it.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak in support of the proposed Budget confident it reflects the actions of a responsible Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Steuart) and a responsible Government. I wish to commend the Provincial Treasurer on his handling of the details of the Budget preparation. I seriously doubt if department programs were ever previously exposed to such close scrutiny, detailed review and examination, and overall assessment, as they have received in the last six months. I firmly believe that a realistic and worthwhile determination was made on program priorities. Admittedly I surrendered some priorities as did other Ministers. This must happen in a democratic system. However, in the process of assessment and conclusion, departmental personnel and Ministers were completely involved, so that all were aware of the reason for inclusion or exclusion of a particular item. I can say with confidence that I and my departmental people appreciated the degree of involvement made possible by the Provincial Treasurer. It appears quite apparent to me that his earlier experience as Minister of Health stood him well in his present onerous and at times thankless position. I never cease to be amazed by some of the outbursts from the Members opposite. Possibly it is because I have never been in their shoes that I find this amazement. I refer particularly to the early remarks of the financial critic, the Hon. Member from Regina Centre (Mr. Blakeney). I am sure that the people of this province will view with some concern his slighting reference to the Budget as an austerity Budget. I personally feel that the citizens of this province and other provinces as well are anxious to see a few hold-the-line budgets, a few more surplus budgets, a few more responsible budgets. It is my opinion that our Budget is going to shine like a bright light when viewed along side other provincial budgets in a few months. You just wait and mark my word. Yes, Mr. Speaker, the people are fed up with free-spending governments. One more reference to the Member from Regina Centre. He suggested that my remarks on health premiums were a possible indicator of government policy to be. Let me read the actual newspaper quote. The heading is "Premiums too low, says Grant."

Health Minister Grant said here he personally feels hospitalization and medicare premiums in Saskatchewan are too low.

I would emphasize the word “personally”.

The Health Minister told the annual meeting of S.E. Regional Hospital Council he feels this way because the premiums should have a relationship to the actual cost of providing service. Originally, the premiums provided 50 per cent of the actual cost, but now provide only 16 or 17 per cent. He said the rates should be adjusted periodically.

I don't have to apologize for this because I said it before and I am going to keep on saying it, because I believe in it personally. I might also say for the benefit of the Members opposite that I personally feel that the Government should not hold their breath until they do this, or that my opinion about medical care premiums becomes policy. Please note I was expressing a personal opinion. I've said it before and I repeat it now as a personal opinion only. Our health premium should represent a more realistic portion of the total cost and should be tied to a definite percentage of the cost. It should be adjusted at annual or biennial periods to maintain that percentage and not left to the vagaries of election years to be adjusted like a window shade, as was invariably done by the Members opposite when in power.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Grant: — I would suggest that the Hon. Member is a real gambler if he interprets my personal views as a barometer of Government policy.

I would like to ask your indulgence while I cite the facts about our Psychiatric Program in contrast to the flights of fantasy displayed by several Members opposite, when they make such remarks as the Hon. Member from Moose Jaw North (Mr. Snyder) when he says:

... Saskatchewan's mental health program is a shadow of the plan developed from 1944 to 1964. Other provinces have overtaken Saskatchewan in recent years and at the same time large numbers of our most capable, best trained and most dedicated people have left Saskatchewan for jobs elsewhere, which represents a new challenge and new opportunity.

The Hon. Member from Regina North East (Mr. Smishek) used the expression “Mental Health Program slashed.” The Hon. Member from Regina Centre (Mr. Blakeney): “Public Health Minister has failed to attract competent staff.” The Hon. Member from Weyburn (Mr. Pepper): “Orderly discharge of patients ceased in 1964.” Mr. Speaker, these sanctimonious types love to leave the impression that all was love and sunshine in the Mental Health Program prior to 1964 and that since then it is in a state of hate and cloudiness.

Let's look at this B.C. 1964 world of love. Well, first of all a good barometer is the number of patients per institution per 100,000 of population. This is a real eye-opener. Saskatchewan 455 — highest in Canada. In fact from 1944 to 1964 it was the highest. Most provinces were 100 to 200 per 100,000 population fewer. Just let me give you some of the figures, in 1942 Saskatchewan 477, the average for Canada 394. The high year was 1951, 522 people out of every 100,000 of our population were locked up in mental institutions. That year the average for Canada 395. I will just read the figures from then on: 552, 542, 541, 533, 529 and no other province had a figure above 470. A fine humanitarian Government we had. These sanctimonious types across the way said, "Lock them up. Keep them out of sight. Forget the odd one." Crowd 1,500 patients into quarters built for 750, feed them out of dietary facilities in North Battleford unfit for human use. In North Battleford in 1963, 1,500 patients were jammed into those quarters. We now have 800 patients and according to the Health and Welfare standards there should only be 671 in the area where they formerly crowded 1,500 patients in.

These gentlemen know as well as I do that the 1964 program was better than 1944 program or the 1954 program, I have admitted this in this House. They also know that our 1968 program is superior to the 1964 program. I say, Mr. Speaker, they are irresponsible in their statements and are knowingly misleading the public when they make statements such as I have quoted.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Grant: — Here are some other figures that I am sure this House would be interested in. I think it is a fair barometer to look at the number of people dying in mental institutions per 100,000 population. No, it is not the percentage of the people in the institution but the number per 100,000 of our population who die in mental institutions. Well let's look at 1962 - Saskatchewan 37.74; low, British Columbia 10.49; average for Canada 18.22. Saskatchewan was twice as high as the average for Canada. 3½ times the figure for British Columbia and so far ahead of all provinces there was none even close. In 1963 this great humanitarian previous Government that criticizes the program that we have now, Saskatchewan 43.3 per 100,000. They had gone up six out of every 100,000 in a period of one year; British Columbia still the low 9.2; the average for Canada 18.3. Now we go on to 1965. Saskatchewan is still high, we had inherited the blight, 28.29; British Columbia 7.1, Alberta 15, Manitoba 18. The average for Canada 15.84. Let's look at it today; these are deaths per 100,000 of the population occurring in mental institutions, Saskatchewan 14.93 in 1967 and in 1968, 13.65. I could give you more reasons why these statistics are very important but I do not intend to take the time today. The Mental Health Program has not been slashed. It has been expanded in quantity and quality and the Members opposite know that

just as well as I do. We have attracted competent staff.

Let's look at the staff picture. They painted a picture of gloom that we haven't been able to attract people, that we are cutting the budget, that we are niggardly. In 1962, 32 social workers; in 1969, 60. They have suggested that we should be working harder to get community psychiatric nurses; in 1962 nil, in 1969, 46. In 1963 the ratio of the doctors working in our mental institutions with specialized, specific psychiatric training, out of 50 doctors only 17 had it; what's the ratio today? 35 out of 59. How those Members opposite, Mr. Speaker can sit and give the appearance of sincerity when they criticize today's psychiatric program in relation to what we inherited is beyond me. Saskatchewan has not been passed by other provinces; we still lead Canada and most of the States.

I resent the Hon. Member from Moose Jaw North (Mr. Snyder) saying that most dedicated people have left the province for more challenging positions. I am glad some of them did leave. They were too politically motivated to be dedicated. The former Minister of Health knows as well as I do that others left because they were types who initiate programs such as the Saskatchewan Plan and are never satisfied with the hum-drum task of implementation or administration. Some of them are in New York State now. I predict they won't stay there very long either because they are just not that type of an individual to stay with the details of implementation. I am not discounting their ability, they are good people. We have many dedicated workers in the psychiatric services, every bit as good and better than some of their predecessors.

Let's look at the question raised by the Hon. Member from Weyburn (Mr. Pepper), the question of orderly discharge, supposedly only carried on prior to 1964. Now, Mr. Speaker, I am going to omit 1964 for good reason, since our Government and former Government shared that year. We had it for seven months and they had it for five months and I think it may be unfair to include those figures. But I could do it and it wouldn't make any difference. From 1960 to 1963, the three years prior to 1964 dismissals from Weyburn 2,710. The three years following 1964 the same institution 2,554, 150 or 160 fewer than were discharged under the orderly plan of the previous Government as cited by the Member from Weyburn. Now let's look at North Battleford. Apparently Weyburn wasn't so disorderly — North Battleford, the three years prior to 1964, 3,107 discharges; the three years subsequent 2,511 — 600 fewer than the previous Government discharged. I suggest that disorderly discharging has not occurred, that they were discharging more patients per year than we were for a three-year period. Now all the Hon. Member who is making a little noise over there has to do is check the answer to a question which I tabled in this House and he will get more detail than I have cited here, year by year, admissions, discharges etc.

Mr. Speaker, the Budget before us indicates a dedication on the part of this Government to continue our Psychiatric Program

as a top priority item and to see that we improve both the quantity of care and the quality of care. For anyone to say we intend to phase out Weyburn hospital without offering assurance of adequate accommodation for 400 or 500 patients is so irresponsible as to hardly warrant acknowledgment. Various statements and new releases by myself indicate that this is not true.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to make a few remarks now about Regina Base Hospital. This seems to be a subject of interest on the other side of the House. The Hon. Member for Regina Centre (Mr. Blakeney) made reference to the Base Hospital in his reply to the Budget Speech. I want to make sure I quote him right so that we won't have to run up to you, Sir, to make sure. I am quoting from Hansard. The Hon. Member said:

I have a son and he was born just about the time that the Minister was making his promise. He is five years old now and now this little son has a sister and she is four months old. All I want to say is this, that I had rather hoped that this daughter would be born in the new hospital.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I am afraid the Hon. Member had better give up that hope because there isn't going to be a maternity department in the Base Hospital. I recognize that he and some other Members on my side of the House have been more prolific than I have been. I was raising my family in the Dirty Thirties and things were pretty dry in those days and we only had three, but good luck. We will have maternity facilities in other hospitals but not in the Base Hospital . . .

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Grant: — . . . and I am casting no reflection on this at all, because I was not born in a hospital. I feel that Blakeney Junior has a great future in two areas. One in longevity. Who knows he may be a Member of this House some day as I have reached the ripe old age of 39, like our friend on television. My mother was not born in a hospital, she was born at home and she is working on her 101st year. I don't know whether I will ever make that or not, but don't be too disheartened anyone, just because you are born at home because there is a pretty bright future. I wouldn't recommend it but don't give up hope if you are.

Now the Hon. Member said that the atom bomb was developed in five years as was Expo. I think that was roughly what was said and that Mr. Drapeau had moved millions of yards of dirt and I hadn't moved a shovelful, or something like that. Mr. Speaker, let's all sincerely hope that the Base Hospital will do more for mankind than the atom bomb and be more lasting than Expo appears to be. Possibly the latest news is that it might struggle along for another year, but I predict that Expo sooner or later will be too expensive for this country to keep up.

Mr. Speaker, I do not apologize to this House for the time that it has taken to plan the hospital. This is not an ordinary service hospital, but a complicated teaching hospital with all the complexities involved in the affiliation with the University and the establishment of teaching criteria and standards. An added problem is to see that it qualifies fully for Health Resources Fund sharing. Such rapid change is occurring in the provision of health care that every precaution must be taken to assure that we produce a building which will not only meet today's needs but be flexible enough for adjustment, expansion and change for tomorrow's needs.

I was hopeful that the Hon. Member from Riversdale (Mr. Romanow) would be back in because he made reference to the University . . . Hospital and the need for expansion. Well, let's look back to 1944 when the previous Government decided to build the University Hospital in Saskatoon. When did it open? 1954 — 10 years later. While our Government took over almost five years ago, I introduced the South Saskatchewan Hospital Centre Act in 1967, and I am confident that I will be well ahead of the previous Government's 10-year record. Actually they should have taken longer than 10 years — and this is where I hope that the Hon. Member listens — because lack of long-term thinking on the University Hospital — I guess he is not interested, Mr. Speaker, in the question of the expansion of the University Hospital. He made quite an issue of it a minute ago and now he is not even listening. He says that it should be expanded. Well, if they had taken a little longer in planning it 15 years ago, we wouldn't have such a difficult task now because it is almost an impossible building to expand. It has little or no flexibility. I would also point out that it was only about two months ago that the University Hospital Board of Governors presented their master plan to the Government, so we are not in a position to be accused of delaying in this regard.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Grant: — There are some other fine examples of hasty planning by the Members opposite. What have they to say about building five psychiatric cottages in Yorkton when the most that we have ever used for that purpose is two? Apparently someone took an LSD trip to design the psychiatric centres up there. I am beginning to think that whoever did the planning over in the Health Department for them was on the same trip.

What do they say about overlooking the necessity of footings for the Moose Jaw Training School? As a result of their inadequate planning our Government has spent between \$750,000 and \$1 million on under-pinning these buildings. Mr. Speaker, health science buildings such as are being planned for Regina are being planned in several Canadian cities. A check across Canada indicates that they are taking from three to ten years for the first phase and nine years to 18 years for over-all plans. No, gentlemen, a health centre as proposed does warrant

responsible planning and Opposition remarks will not stampede us into any hasty mistake such as they were guilty of. The longer that I am in this House the more sympathy I feel for the Members opposite. The desperate lengths they go to, the depths they slip to, in an effort to ridicule this Government absolutely amazes me. I am sure that I will never be an Opposition Member. If such fate befalls me I can see only one area of enjoyment over there. It would enable me to make irresponsible statements, make irresponsible promises, with no responsibility to deliver.

The Hon. Member from Saskatoon referred to Mr. Benson's observations as to how the Provinces might treat Ottawa's share of medicare. He admitted there was no agreement between Ottawa and the Provinces. It was left to the Provinces to decide how they wished to handle it. In fact I don't recall the matter ever being mentioned by Mr. Benson, Mr. Munroe or their successors or predecessors. Mr. Benson doesn't pay much heed to my thoughts and I feel little need to heed his. If I recall rightly the same Member said that we were flying backwards on our Mental Health Programs. I think I have indicated that he is the mugwump. He is the one who is flying backwards. I sympathize with the Member from Weyburn (Mr. Pepper). He was on radio and he had to impress his constituents and I suppose that is part of the game. This is why I am not very enthused about radio broadcasts. Probably we would all be more realistic if we weren't playing for the audience. I recognize that the Hon. Member is a pretty steady, reliable fellow. He is not prone to outbursts. I also know that he knows, as does the Member from Regina Centre (Mr. Blakeney), that the Psychiatric Branch is not out of control. It is not being starved of dollars. The Weyburn Member says, "Small hospitals were closed last year. Others are waiting with baited breath for decision." The facts are, one was closed in 1968. I don't know which ones are holding their breaths these days because ten have received definite dates for this year. I have assured the public as recently as Monday this week that I do not have plans to close an additional 17 as suggested in the meeting last weekend in Davidson.

I never cease to observe how closely the Members opposite watch their words when referring to small hospitals. They try to give the public the impression that they are the protectors of small hospitals. At the same time they know, and the former Minister of Health knows best of all, that it is essential to reduce the number of hospitals in this province. It is essential to strive to develop larger economic units. Saskatchewan, I believe, is in the most critical position of any province in Canada as far as the number of small units are concerned. I know that we are being watched with interest across Canada. I also know that our neighboring States are watching us. I have been in touch with Montana and North Dakota. I would like to quote from the February 21st issue of Time Magazine, an article on medical and hospital problems.

Countless hospitals have been, and are still being, built on the wrong places for the wrong reasons.
Under

the Hill Burton Act of 1946 any hamlet could raise matching funds to get themselves a tiny hospital of 20 to 30 beds and too many did. These are not only uneconomic but bad for medicine, says New Orleans Surgeon Alton Ochsner. No hospital with fewer than 100 beds is medically viable and he suggests that none should have more than 600 beds.

Well, we never hope to get to the point where we have minimum 100-bed hospitals, but I would sure be happy if we would have a minimum of 25-bed hospitals.

I am sorry that the Hon. Member from Regina South East (Mr. Baker) is not here. I guess he is away working on his other job. We can always count on this Member to come up with a blue-plate special and this year was no exception. The Government Computer Centre comes under my jurisdiction, but in spite of this I was unable to keep a running total on his pet programs, all most costly. I ran behind him when he passed the \$10 million mark. I noted that without exception his planks or promises were directed to the ears of those he looked to for political support. He produces these blue-plate specials with the same speed and ingenuity that he produces city halls.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Grant: — Mr. Speaker, while I recognize the limitations of the Health Budget, I realize that our health costs cannot continue to take an ever increasing percentage of the Provincial Budget. This can only happen at the expense of other programs or at the cost of additional taxes. I will support the motion because it recognizes the importance of health services by a major increase, the largest of any department. At the same time it is a balanced Budget with no increase to the individuals.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. W.G. Davies (Moose Jaw South) — Mr. Speaker, in rising in this debate, I notice that this is the second time in the two debates in this session that I have followed the Minister of Health (Mr. Grant). I want to begin by assuring him that this is just a coincidence and nothing more. I don't want to spend too much of my time here this afternoon in trying to dissect what he has said. But I can't resist the temptation to say a few things about some of the lame, ineffectual, irrelevant and unrelated statements that he had made with respect to many of our health services.

First of all I am very interested, Mr. Speaker, to note that the Minister feels that we should have an increase in the premiums for medicare and hospitalization. I am sure that a great many people across this province will be interested to know as well, because this, lumped on top of deterrent fees, will undoubtedly make the lot of many poor people in this province

much worse than it is today. The Minister spoke about many things today. One was with respect to mistakes in planning. Well if we made, in the former Government, mistakes in planning, it was because we were eager to get on with the job that no other Liberal or Conservative Government in this country was doing anything about, especially with respect to health programs and particularly, of course, with respect to a mental health program.

Respecting the foster home program that the Minister was talking about, many figures were given to us. I am afraid that I was not able to get them all down. I don't think that we quarrel, on this side of the House, with a foster home program. Our main complaint is that this Government has acted with such haste and such rashness with respect to this program that the results for the general public and the patients are extremely grave. We have already been told this in the Frazier Report. I am surprised that the Minister hasn't recognized the sin of omission of his Government in this regard. He talks about the University Hospital not being built until 1954. I want to say, Mr. Speaker, that it took this Government at least 10 years to undo the mistakes and remedy the short-comings of the former 38 years of Liberal misrule and rule in this province. When you get down to some of the tables that the Minister has been quoting to us this afternoon, my charge that he has been most irrelevant in his examples is borne out. One of the tables that he referred to had to do with people dying in institutions, that is in mental institutions. It is no wonder, Mr. Speaker, that there were a large number of people dying in mental institutions in this province in the years that he has given us for reference, because for years many of the people who were admitted to mental institutions by the previous Liberal Government had no type of treatment that would enable them to leave those institutions. When the CCF Government took power in 1944 the situation was that, for thousands of the patients in these hospitals, there was no hope. There was no hope with respect to them rejoining society in a normal way because of the fact that they had not had this better treatment in the many, many years previous to that time. There is no wonder that in this period we found, in Saskatchewan, when we did achieve a mental health program, a certain percentage of people per 100,000 population dying in mental institutions. If the Minister wants to quote a figure for 1962 — 37.74 per 100,000 dying in mental hospitals in Saskatchewan as against a Canadian-wide figure of 18.2, let me tell him this: the reason was that the other mental health programs across Canada lagged so badly that they had no mental hospitals for people and did not have mental hospitals to accommodate them. That is well known. He has already, of course, admitted that by saying that our program is still a good mental health program. I think it is one that will be improved very much when this Government leaves office and the former Government again takes power.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Davies — Mr. Speaker, when I rose to speak in the Throne Speech,

February 27, 1969

I referred to a number of matters which I said could not be discussed until the delivery of the Treasurer's Budget Address. At that time, I expressed the hope that there would be a significant recognition by the Government of the plight of Moose Jaw City. I regret to say, Mr. Speaker, that an examination of the Budget Address and of the Estimates discloses very few crumbs of comfort for my city.

This was a time when the Budget should have been used to stimulate the economic factors that can assist an area like Moose Jaw. This was a time when the Government of Saskatchewan could have acted on the lines that have been urged on the Federal Government to assist communities like the Friendly City. The stimulus that I speak of could have been accomplished by announcing a Special Grants Program to assist industrial development in Moose Jaw. It could have been done by a location or re-location of Government facilities and functions. It could have been assisted by announcing the beginning of construction on the Provincial Office Building which would have begun five years ago, were it not for the discriminatory and partisan action of this Government.

The Budget Speech, Mr. Speaker, talks about increasing programs in the technical institutes and I think that this is to be welcomed. However, no construction vote to expand the Moose Jaw Technical Institute is shown in the Public Works Estimates. Now the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Guy) may indicate that this is to come from an item such as Miscellaneous Construction under capital expenditure in his Department, which is not a very large one. But there is nothing now ear-marked for the Moose Jaw Technical Institute.

Now surely, Mr. Speaker, if this Government were concerned with positive and practical action to help the third largest city in this Province, it should have included at least a modest building program in Moose Jaw. Extra space is very necessary for our provincial technical educational program. There is no reason, no reason at all, why the building program at Moose Jaw could not have been substantially enlarged.

Mr. Speaker, the Budget has been, I think, justly criticized by many Members of this House for shortcomings that affect every Saskatchewan citizen. For the city of Moose Jaw and for its citizens, this Budget is especially flat and disappointing. There was one ray of light in the darkness. That is the \$145,000 capital appropriation for the Saskatchewan Training School. While it is a relatively meagre amount so far as building estimates go these days, it is an item of some small consolation.

But, Mr. Speaker, there are other depressing effects of the Budget for my constituency. The Treasurer's address gives no cause for enthusiasm among local government, especially school trustee groups. There is, I think, it is fair to say, a feeling of genuine pessimism among local legislators. We do know what the local grants will amount to for education. I hope

that we will know soon. They definitely will not offset this year's increases for school boards.

Moose Jaw City Council people are talking about a mill increase this year in the order of about 9 mills. It is by no means decided. It may go much higher; but the bulk of this will go to education. This mill rate rise will mean an extra \$28 payment for each average Moose Jaw taxpayer. Last year's increase was about \$30 and the two amounts, of course, are well in excess of the homeowner grant about which the Members opposite like to say so much. But this is by no means the whole story. Even with a 9 mill rate increase, Moose Jaw citizens will be just barely maintaining a standard of services. There is no increase for example provided at all in these figures for teachers' salaries.

Most important of all, perhaps, is the Moose Jaw school building program. \$5 million is what the school trustees now estimate is required as a minimum. Half of this, of course, at least half, the city will have to bear. The 9 mill increase will make provision for capital in this undertaking, and the situation poses a stark and difficult question for trustees and councillors.

The Deputy Premier in his Budget Speech had a lot to say about extravagance in buildings; "palatial school buildings," I think was his actual comment. I want to say, Mr. Speaker, he certainly could level no such accusation against Moose Jaw school authorities. Most of our public schools were built many, many years ago. A good number of them were built around 1910 or a little later. Victoria public school was built in 1894 and was the first main building that was constructed in the first organized Protestant School District in the Saskatchewan Territories.

Moose Jaw's capital situation for school building is not an easy one. Like other communities, Moose Jaw will have to pay much more in taxes for the running cost of 1969 education. The building position, however, is one which imposes, as I have suggested, added financial responsibility and hardship. These things are not easy in a community which has endured so many shocks through advancing technology on the railroads, in the flour and meat packing plants and now, as my friend from Saskatoon Riversdale (Mr. Romanow) has commented, in the oil refineries.

The Budget, as I have said, Mr. Speaker, is a deep disappointment for Moose Jaw citizens. The Treasurer argues that he is holding the level of costs. But there is no reason whatsoever, within the bounds that he has set, why the city of Moose Jaw could not have received deserved consideration. There has been little or no attempt to do anything meaningful in this direction. Mr. Speaker, the Treasurer has repeated the Government boast about low unemployment levels in Saskatchewan. Now, Mr. Speaker, the Treasurer well knows that relative to the percentage of total population, the province has rarely had other than the lowest levels of unemployment during the past two decades or more.

February 27, 1969

I notice that the Minister of Labour (Mr. Coderre) has opened his mouth at long last. I listened to the Minister of Labour on the open line program on one of the local radio stations. He repeated this comment as well. I want to say that the real test is the proportion of wage and salary earners who are jobless. That's the real test! I marvel that the Treasurer and the Minister of Labour can be so oblivious to the fact that we have a serious unemployment problem in Saskatchewan. It is particularly noticeable among construction workers. Our total percentage of unemployed is about 4.5 of all wage and salary earners in the province. The Minister of Labour knows this. This is an unacceptable level in the way that the rules have been laid down by the Economic Council of Canada. Therefore, it should not be considered acceptable by this Government.

I don't want to hear the old, tired figures of the Minister about the proportion of unemployed of the general population. In a province that has the largest proportion of farmers of any province in Canada, what else can you expect? The fact of the matter is, however, that, if you are talking about the percentage as it relates to wage and salary earners it is 4½ per cent, 1½ per cent above the level that the Economic Council of Canada considers dangerous.

The Government's policy is not encouraging construction. This is one of the really big job-makers in society today. Forecasts for construction in many communities show a lower level than in 1968. Here is a place where the Budget could have given nourishment and could have given leadership. Before the end of 1969, Mr. Speaker, we are going to see even worse results because of this Government's narrow and limited economic policies.

When the Minister of Labour spoke in this Debate, I listened and I hoped that he would have something to tell us on how he expected to cope with the problem of unemployment. I expected he might inform us of a few employment-stimulating activities of his Department, about plans to take the minimum wage from the lowest comparative point it has been since a last Liberal Government held power, to a higher rate. But I regret, Mr. Speaker, that the Minister told us almost nothing about his Department. The whole of his meandering dissertation was occupied with Olympian comments about labor-management relations on which he has assumed the mantle of great expertise.

While I deplore the failure of the Minister to attempt to give us any real insight into activities or plan of his Department, his speech did in many ways constitute an admission of facts which expose the partisan path that his Government is taking in the field of management-labor relations. I do not take exception to what he said about the need for certain individuals to moderate and adjust themselves to reality and responsibility. Among labor and management as anywhere else you will find as many personalities as there are people. This is not strange. I do not dispute the Minister's right to speak out on this aspect. But, Mr. Speaker, the real message provided by the

Minister, unintentionally, I think, was sandwiched between somewhat contradictory statements of belief, expressing support for collective bargaining in the one breath and compulsory arbitration on the other.

Mr. Speaker, this Government has been berating and abusing union members ever since it came to office, as its Members did before this Government came to office. The record has been listed many, many times. At the head of the list are the damaging amendments to The Trade Union Act and The Emergency Services Act. If anyone doubts the policy of this conservative Liberal Government he is reminded forcibly by the bullying and the hostile utterances that are made regularly by its leaders. The Premier, for example, doesn't take a moderate and a temperate tone in dealing with labor questions. He places no blame on high prices or the lower living standards and associated issues for workers as causes of such troubles. His whole thesis is a contribution of the largest part of the population of this province, the wage and salary-earning section. When the Labor Minister (Mr. Coderre) spoke on Tuesday he gave out some absolutely damning pieces of information so far as the Government's general position on labor is concerned. He said that a total of 362 minutes for every wage and salary earner in Canada had been lost yearly because of strikes. But then he went on to say that the comparative figure for Saskatchewan was 29 minutes. This applied, he said, for a 4-year period, from 1963 to 1967. Mr. Speaker, in the face of these figures, who can accept the phoney rationale of the Government and the excessive, extreme, unfair and unjustified conduct of this Government in labor relations?

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Davies — These figures say that lost time in labor disputes in Saskatchewan is eight per cent of the national average. These figures say clearly that the trade union movement of this province has avoided work stoppages. They show beyond a shadow of a doubt that this Government's right-wing extreme legislation against labor has been taken for despicable and partisan motives and objectives.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Davies — Mr. Speaker, Saskatchewan Liberal policy on labor cynically calculates that by inflaming farmers against labor, two things are accomplished. First, farm people are diverted from their real problems and the real solutions to them. Second, the voting population is divided for Liberal political purposes. The Liberal party does not really think that they have a labor problem in Saskatchewan. The Liberal party, however, believes that labor is an invaluable whipping boy. The Minister of Labour (Mr. Coderre) lauded the voluntary conciliation program of the Department of Labour. Of every five serious disputes

between labor and management, only one, he said, ever came to the strike stage. This was because of the program that was conducted by the industrial conciliation officers of the Department. He told us that overall there are very few strikes annually. He told us that there were 500 collective agreements between employers and employees in Saskatchewan. I think he said that there had been something like 17 disputes in the recent period.

Mr. Speaker, what about the voluntary conciliation programs? Whence did it come? Well, not from this Government! The voluntary conciliation program was a feature of the CCF Government's approach to collective bargaining. The kind of record that the Minister reports on had been going on steadily since 1945, when the CCF Government introduced The Trade Union Act and the complementary conciliation apparatus. If you doubt this, Mr. Speaker, and Members and Minister of Labour, look at your annual Department of Labour reports. It's a revealing commentary on the legislation of Liberal and Conservative Provincial Governments that it was their badly conceived and their cumbersome labor laws that de-emphasized voluntary conciliation processes, which has led to the sort of situation which the Minister has disclosed in his speech on the national figures with respect to lost time due to labor disputes.

Mr. Speaker, if this Government pursues its unwholesome and injurious course, the situation that was brought about by wise and thoughtful CCF labor policies in this province will undoubtedly change. Now, this is the lesson that the Government can learn if it weren't so wilful and arrogant. It can learn a lesson from, say, Federal Labour Minister Brice Mackasey, who is avowedly completely opposed to the sort of repressive legislation and position that this Government takes on labor.

Mr. Speaker, this House has listened also to sly and mean little insinuations and innuendoes suggesting that labor unions which support political parties in Saskatchewan are the ones who engage in all or most of the strikes. This is just another example of the falsification of labor issues by Saskatchewan Liberals in this House and this province. And I heard it again, Mr. Speaker, on the open-line program when the Minister of Labour (Mr. Coderre) spoke this morning. On no less than three occasions did he make reference to this particular question. Let's look at the facts, Mr. Speaker. And these facts come from the Minister's own Department Report; the last report of the Department of Labour. Of 23 strikes which took place in the province in the most recent year that is reviewed, 19 of the strikes concerned unions which have no political action program whatsoever. I say, look at the Report. It's all there. The Minister when he was speaking the other day tried to link up unions conducting active political programs with strikes. I say he stands exposed and condemned in the face of his own facts. The Minister has an obligation to speak the truth to the public. His actions have been irresponsible and partisan in the extreme.

I said, Mr. Speaker, that the Minister, in his talk, vacillated backward and forward in his feelings and opinions. At one point, he said that, in spite of Saskatchewan's unsurpassed record of good labor relations, it might be necessary to implement general compulsory arbitration in this province. This was because of an alleged tremendous loss of productivity involved in Saskatchewan strikes and the need for an orderly development of the Province's economy, which he suggested is suffering very badly because of strikes. Well, Mr. Speaker, with Saskatchewan losing about eight days in strikes for every 100 days that are lost in the national average, we are a long, long way ahead of the rest of Canada.

Mr. Coderre: — But you still agree.

Mr. Davies — I do agree, Mr. Speaker. What I disagree with is the Minister's intemperate distortion of the figures, as he well knows. But it is always puzzling to me, Mr. Speaker, why the Minister doesn't worry and why he isn't active about the main causes of economic losses due to the lost time of workers in production. Again, I invite the Minister to look to a table in his own Annual Report that indicates a concern that he wholly ignores. Now that table shows that last year the average wage earner in Saskatchewan lost about 20 days yearly because of unemployment, because of accidents, because of sickness and because of strikes. Now, since the Minister has already told us that the lost time for strikes in Saskatchewan per worker is only 29 minutes a year, this means that 19 days, 7½ hours of the whole time that was lost is due to accident, sickness and unemployment.

Mr. Speaker, these figures illustrate better than any argument that I can suggest, the fallacy and the folly and, I think, the unashamed duplicity of the Government's malicious and one-sided pursuit of organized labor. But the figures do more than that. They show the appalling amount of neglect which this conservative Liberal Government gives to constructive ways of not only making more time available for production in industry, but in saving the workers from the terrors and the anxiety and the pain of unemployment and accidents and sickness. When I have tried to get the Minister to give from the Compensation Board some facts on accidents in industry, in this House before this time, he claimed this couldn't be done because this was a privileged matter in the hands of the Compensation Board. This House has therefore been denied information on a crucial question affecting employees of the province. I want to say, Mr. Speaker, that the Accident Prevention Program in this province is ill-planned, insufficiently staffed and inadequate.

Mr. Coderre: — Mr. Speaker, may I ask the Hon. Member a question. When were you denied that? Were you denied that this year?

Mr. Davies — Mr. Speaker, I'm referring to the fact that a question

in this House, as you are well aware, was put on compensation information and this information was denied in the House and it has never been provided.

Mr. Coderre: — Has it been denied in this session of this Legislature?

Mr. Davies — Mr. Speaker, it is quite evident that information that has been denied to me previously by the Minister is rather hopeless to secure at this time this year. But I want to say further that the Minister does not have . . .

Mr. Coderre: — Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Member has not replied to my question. Has it been denied this year?

Mr. Davies — I'm not answering another of your questions at this time, Mr. Minister. You've had your opportunity in this debate and I think you could have made clear some of this information at that time. I want to say this to the Minister that one of the sections of the Compensation Act provides that the Government can at any time ask the Compensation Board to provide any information or do anything that has to do with respect to accidents and with respect to accident prevention. You, Mr. Minister, have not done this on any occasion so far as I know nor have you advised this House on the information that we tried to get previously. I say again that the Accident Prevention program in this Province is ill-planned, it is insufficiently staffed, and it is wholly inadequate. This Province of Saskatchewan of ours could save 10 times that time which is lost because of strikes in bringing down, even fractionally, the time lost in industrial accidents each year. It is a sad commentary but it is known that the Workmen's Compensation Board cannot itself supply the figures showing the percentage of time lost due to accidents in industry. Shockingly the Compensation Board does not even know how many workers are covered by the Workmen's Compensation Board in this province. That's a fact; the Board admits it is a fact. The Board has the information in the forms that are provided employers to remedy this omission but does nothing about it.

And what about unemployment, Mr. Speaker? The Minister could have prevailed upon his colleagues to have diverted some additional expenditures to public housing, really an investment because for every Provincial dollar you get an investment of three more Federal dollars. It is not spending, it is an investment, and employment created could have reduced the serious amount of time that is lost due to unemployment in this province. Last year, I understand, that there was a Saskatchewan average for every day of the year of 8,000 workers unemployed for every day of that year. 8,000 people unemployed for every day of that year! That's only, of course, the Federal figures that register those that apply for work. It doesn't apply to those people who do not register because they feel that their chances of

employment are hopeless. Now, if the Government had acted in other ways to generate construction employment, most of the present estimated 2 million man-days that were lost in Saskatchewan in 1968 because of unemployment could have been completely eliminated. I point out to the Minister, 2 million man-days were lost last year in Saskatchewan because of unemployment, to 45,000 man-days lost because of strikes. I am deeply disturbed and concerned about this Government's actions and attitude on labor, Mr. Speaker. It must know where it needs to act. There can't be any excuse for not acting. When will it cease, I say, the misuse of its powers in government and get down to positive ways of dealing honourably with and helping labor?

The other day the Minister attempted to suggest that the Government's labor posture couldn't be so bad because there had been an increase in the number of people in the province's trade unions. Well as a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, there is an increase of about 4,000 shown in the last annual report of the Department. But any increase doesn't arise from the benignant and sympathetic hand of the Government.

First, there are natural increases, due to the added numbers of employees in areas like public employment. Also the new collective bargaining legislation of the Federal Government has brought new unions into existence. The point is that, overall, the Province's large unorganized labor section has not benefited by the amended Trade Union Act of this Government or its administration, or under its new Labor Relations Board. Mr. Minister, you ask anyone who has been helping workers to organize in the past year. The feeling of leaders in the trade union movement is practically unanimous that the job of getting new union organization is increasingly tough under this Liberal Government. The growth rate of employees in the unions in Saskatchewan is lower also than the Canada-wide rate.

Mr. Speaker, while I have been very critical of the Minister of Labour, it has been apparent I see, Mr. Speaker, that all my words on the Minister have been lost. He has repeated now, as an aside what he has said this morning on a radio program and what he said on Tuesday, that strikes in this province, the main strikes and most strikes, are caused because of political interference. I say that is false. I say that the figures of his own Department show that those figures are absolutely false, and I ask the Minister again to tell the truth to the public or Saskatchewan.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Davies — Now I started to say, Mr. Speaker, that I've been, I think, justly critical, positively critical of the Minister of Labour and this has been on the basis of his own statements and the stand of his party. But I don't dismiss everything that he says as insincere or wrong. I agree that we need much more management-labor consultation and less bitterness. I agree we need to devise broader forms of collective bargaining. I believe

February 27, 1969

that national and regional bargaining is becoming increasingly necessary. I have spoken previously on this and comparable subjects.

But I have to point out to the Minister that in none of these areas is the Liberal Government in Saskatchewan playing a meaningful or constructive role. For example, it is proceeding to new changes at this session before the Labour Management Committee on the Construction Industry has even reported to the Government. What is the use of talking about consultation when this Government hasn't even consulted its own Committee? Much of what the Labour Minister has told the House he needs to repeat to his colleagues. They are the ones that need convincing. It is they who are hampering and holding back true progress in industrial harmony in Saskatchewan.

Mr. Speaker, in this Budget we have no answers to the deep problems of my constituency. There are no effective programs to lift Saskatchewan's sagging economy and enable it to forge ahead. There is no recognition of unemployment or active solutions provided to offset unemployment. The only message in the Budget for the working man is a continuation of the negative message contained in the Throne Speech. Basically it is threats to the rights of the employees or no action whatsoever to help labor.

The Budget finally is not part of a far-sighted Provincial program. It complains of high costs of government but does not give leadership on where high costs and high taxes can be relieved. For all these reasons, Mr. Speaker, I will vote for the amendment and reject the motion.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. A.R. Guy (Minister of Public Works): — Mr. Speaker, as I rise to take part in this Budget Debate, I want first of all to put on the records of this House the fact that last night I had the honor to attend the testimonial dinner in Prince Albert for the Hon. Dave Steuart, Deputy Provincial Treasurer, that was hosted in his honor by the Prince Albert Chamber of Commerce. People from all walks of life and all political and religious faiths came together to honor the Provincial Treasurer for 18 years of service to his community, his province and his country. I know that all Members on both sides of the House would join with the people of Prince Albert in wishing Dave and his family good health and many more years in public service.

Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Guy: — However, the highlight of the evening, although the Minister from Prince Albert was the honored guest, I think, belongs to my friend from Prince Albert East-Cumberland (Mr. Berezowsky), who was also in attendance. I'm sorry that

he is not here in his seat. However, when we were sitting down for supper and were just about ready to start the proceedings, two of the nicest-looking young ladies in the banquet hall came through the door, went up to Bill, gave him a good sound smack on the cheek and went on their way. I'm sure, as long as these things are occurring up there in that constituency, that Bill will probably be around for a long, long time.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Guy: — What was particularly disconcerting was that I was sitting two feet to the left of Bill and they went right by me.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Guy: — Oh, I'm very happy, Mr. Speaker, to see my friend from Melfort-Tisdale (Mr. Willis) back with us today. I hope he hasn't been ill. He looks reasonably well and I welcome him back and I'm sure all Members on this side will.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Guy: — I had the privilege of being in Melfort-Tisdale a little earlier in the year when the Member for Melfort was at a public function. In that case I must admit they went by him and kissed me.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Guy: — I guess the fact that one of them was my cousin had maybe a little bit to do with it. However, I understand that even she is somewhat misguided by the fact that on occasions she has been known to support the gentleman that sits across the way. However, there have to be a few weaknesses I guess in every family.

Mr. J.E. Brockelbank (Saskatoon Mayfair): — There are some weaknesses . . .

Mr. Guy: — Yes, yes, there's an example where the son doesn't follow after his father's footsteps, as was pointed out yesterday.

You know, I'm amazed, Mr. Speaker, by the confusion of people opposite. Some of the Members have risen on the floor of this House during this debate and they have violently opposed the idea of grants to attract industry. The Member for Riversdale (Mr. Romanow) said we have to have more grants for education. The Member that just took his seat wants it both ways. He wants grants for industry and grants for education, providing of course that the grants for industry are for his own city, which is a rather selfish attitude. But Members opposite get up and demand grants for this, grants for that and not one of

them has told us yet where the money is going to come from to provide these grants. The financial critic (Mr. Blakeney) and others spent time trying to prove this was not a balanced Budget. Then the Member for Riversdale (Mr. Romanow) got up earlier this afternoon and says it is a balanced Budget, but it shouldn't be balanced. We don't want a balanced Budget at this time. I just wonder whether he talks for himself as he usually does or whether he is talking policy of the NDPs. I noticed the Member that took his seat didn't say that there shouldn't be a balanced Budget. The financial critic who should be speaking for them didn't say that they didn't want a balanced Budget. But the young chap in tune with the 70s, I think he called it, says that he wants a Budget that is not balanced.

Mr. Speaker, every other Province and the Federal Government have finally decided that they should have had balanced budgets five years ago. And, here's a man today who says he is in tune with the 70s, who goes against every Provincial Treasurer, the Financial Minister in Ottawa and the best known investment and industrial people in this country who say we need a balanced budget. But the young fellow from Saskatoon Riversdale with all his experience, gets up and taunts these people who want a balanced budget and says, "No, we don't need balanced budgets in this time of inflation." It is no wonder, Mr. Speaker, that the NDP are committed to that side of the House, they haven't formed the Government, and they never will in any other province in Canada.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Guy: — Mr. Speaker, I have several other comments that I would like to make but before I proceed I would like to call it 5:30.

The Assembly recessed at 5:30 until 7:30 p.m.

Mr. Guy: — Mr. Speaker, when I called it 5:30, I had mentioned the high esteem in which the people of Prince Albert West hold their Member, the Hon. Provincial Treasurer. I had pointed out that, if the MLA from Prince Albert East-Cumberland (Mr. Berezowsky) continues to receive the affection that he did last night, he will probably be with us for quite sometime and in fact I don't think he can afford to quit under those circumstances. I showed the confusion that existed on the other side of the House with the financial critic trying for two hours to prove that the Budget wasn't balanced, and the Member for Saskatoon Riversdale stating at least three times this afternoon that it was balanced, members opposite opposing the grants for industry, and the Member for Moose Jaw South (Mr. Davies) standing up this afternoon and supporting grants to industry. Finally I pointed out that while every Provincial Treasurer in Canada was trying to come through with a balanced budget this year and every financial expert in North America has been recommending such an approach for the last three years, we have the Member for Saskatoon

Riversdale calling for deficit financing on a large scale — and he says that he is in tune with the times.

No, Mr. Speaker, I would like first of all to commend the Provincial Treasurer for bringing in his fifth balanced Budget with no tax increases. Once again it was geared to the economy and the needs of the people of this province. I'm sure as was mentioned earlier on this side of the House that, as we see the budgets for other provinces, we will be thankful in Saskatchewan that our fiscal matters have been handled so capably since the Liberals became the Government in 1964.

I would also like to congratulate the financial critic for the Opposition, in his attempt to criticize the Budget, and I am sorry he is not with us this evening. I knew from the first moment that he jumped to the attack after the Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Steuart) sat down, that he was going to be in trouble. His first words were, as I recall, "This is a hold-the-line or panic Budget". Yes, I think, that all of us, with perhaps the exception of the Leader of the Opposition, are well aware of the meaning of the two terms, "hold-the-line" and "panic", and I think that all reasonable Members will agree with me that you can't have both at the same time. If you are holding the line you are not panicking, and if you are panicking, you are certainly not holding the line.

So with that rather poor start, is it any wonder that the rest of his remarks, the financial critic's, fell into that mixed up or confused category? As usual the financial critic had put a lot of effort into his remarks. He had searched the records in the hope that he could find statistics that would prove Saskatchewan was not progressing under the Liberal Government. But he failed to find what he wanted in the Saskatchewan records, so he had to settle on figures gleaned from Canada, Ontario, British Columbia and the other provinces in the hope that he could confuse us by his juggling act.

But unfortunately for him the case he tried to make does not stand up, if properly scrutinized. The people of Saskatchewan will not be confused by the financial critic no matter how hard he tries. He can fool himself and his colleagues opposite, which is pretty easy, but not the Saskatchewan citizens. One might ask why didn't he use the figures and facts that were right at his fingertips, in the little blue book that the Provincial Treasurer was kind enough to give him. The answer is he couldn't and he wouldn't use the figures provided there because they were too favorable to the Liberal Government. Mr. Speaker, this is a book that should be in every household in Saskatchewan, in fact in every household in Canada, to be read morning, noon and night, to remind us of the failures of Socialism.

There is no document that has been printed that as clearly shows the failure of Socialism as does this little blue book with its tables at the back which compare the last five years of a Socialist Government and first five years of a Liberal free enterprise Government.

February 27, 1969

You know, I was waiting with great anticipation for the financial critic to come to the figures whereby he would compare our record in the past five years with the last five years of his Government, part of which took place when he was Provincial Treasurer. But I had a long wait. In fact the time never did come when he compared figures of our Government with his. He was content to compare Saskatchewan to Canada, in the case of construction, retail trade, merchandizing, population increase and so on. But he carefully neglected to make the only valid and true comparison of his record against ours. He was content to compare Saskatchewan to Ontario, to British Columbia, to Alberta and all the Provinces which did not have the 20 years of Socialist stagnation that we had here in Saskatchewan.

We do not for one moment pretend that our economic development has caught up to Ontario's or British Columbia's, but we do say and can prove through the figures in this little book that the gap is narrowing. After all one does not reach economic greatness overnight. It is a slow process that has to develop over the years. I am sure that the financial critic will agree that industrial development came slowly to all provinces in Canada. They had to build up a transportation system. They had to find and develop raw material and resources and they had to create an investment climate that would bring money for establishing industries. It is only after you have founded one industry that you found subsequent industries. Ontario had been developing hers for many years before Confederation, Manitoba and British Columbia since 1870, Alberta and Saskatchewan only since 1905.

For Saskatchewan this was disrupted for a 20-year stretch when we had a Socialist Government dedicated to the eradication of free enterprise and capitalism, the only principles that can adequately serve our industrial economy.

When we became the Government in 1964, industrial growth was stagnant. There was a second-class highways system, the investment climate was practically nil, no one could be encouraged to invest their money in Saskatchewan as long as there was the threat that the Socialists would confiscate their funds at every opportunity. However, in five short years the Liberal Government has created an atmosphere favorable to industrial expansion, and we are well on the way to developing an industrial economy that will catch up to Alberta's, Manitoba's, British Columbia's and Ontario's.

If the financial critic had been fair he would have used figures that compare Saskatchewan today with Saskatchewan as it was when he was the Provincial Treasurer. He can't say that the figures weren't available, because they practically scream from the pages of the little blue Budget book in their condemnation of his Socialist Government. On page 58 — and I hope the Members still have their little blue books here with them tonight — one finds a comparison of the net value of commodity production in Saskatchewan, which certainly must be considered a true growth factor of our economy. In their last three years

of office, the NDP net value of commodity production averaged one billion, one hundred and seventy million dollars per year. During the last three years of the Liberal Government it averaged one billion six hundred and thirty three million dollars, an increase of 40 per cent in commodity production. Why didn't the financial critic quote these figures?

The financial critic then turned to mineral production and tried to show that our production has declined under a Liberal Government. But again the facts are right there in this little book for those who want to see. During the last five years of the NDP Government, the value of mineral production increased \$62 million, an average of \$12.2 million per year. The five years of the Liberal Administration has seen an increase of \$99 million, or an average of \$19.8 million per year. 1968 production exceeded 1963 production by 44 per cent, an impressive record that the financial critic tried to hide from the people of Saskatchewan.

Then one goes on to the next page and we find the record regarding private and public investment in Saskatchewan. Again we're comparing the record of the NDP with that of the Liberal Government. I submit, Mr. Speaker, that there is no statistic that shows as clearly what the rest of Canada and the world think about the return of a free-enterprise Liberal Government to Saskatchewan. In the last five years of the NDP Government the increase in private and public investment was \$155 million, an average of \$31 million per year. In the five years of the Liberal Government, the increase was \$439 million, an increase of \$90 million a year or an increase of 180 per cent. Surely this proves we are creating an investment climate where industry will come into the province under a free-enterprise Government. But I ask why didn't the financial critic bring these figures into the House.

Now, we can look at personal income in Saskatchewan. Surely this record reflects the ability of a Government to diversify its economy and to improve the living standards of its people. In the last three years of the NDP Government, the average of personal income in Saskatchewan was one billion four hundred and eighty-three million dollars. The last three-year Liberal average was two billion one hundred and thirty-three million dollars. 1968's personal income is up 30 per cent over the last year of the NDP Government. Why didn't the financial critic put these figures in the records of the House?

The same pattern is evident in farm income, in spite of the figures related to chickens, eggs, sheep and turkeys, that the financial critic mentioned the other day. We all recognize that farm income is a cyclical figure where there are considerable ups and downs. However, I think it fair, and I think the financial critic would agreed, to compare the last five-year average of the NDP against the five-year average of the Liberal Government. These are the figures that we find and I wonder why the financial critic didn't put these figures in the records of the House. They are right there in this little blue book.

February 27, 1969

All he had to do was look at page 61. For the NDP Government it was \$331 million a year average. For the Liberal Government it has been \$430 million average, almost \$100 million a year extra under a Liberal Government and its diversification of farm operations. Yet, the financial critic did not have the courage to mention these figures, when he was comparing the Liberal Government with the other governments of Canada.

The financial critic and the Member for Regina North West (Mr. Whelan) — and he's not here this evening either — had some pretty harsh words to say about . . .

Mr. A.E. Blakeney (Regina Centre): — Sure I'm here!

Mr. Guy: — . . . Oh, there he is, pardon me, Mr. Member from Regina Centre, . . . I lost you for a few minutes . . . You know, I must tell the House, that the financial critic is a good swimmer, I saw him down at the 'Y' today and while I can swim the width of the pool, I have to be honest, the financial critic can swim both ways. There is no danger that he is going to be carried under by the current of the 'Y', but he may be carried under by the current of the Socialist philosophy.

However, I was going to refer to the construction industry in Saskatchewan. Again we all recognize that high interest rates and shortage of money have made the construction industry depressed in the last year or so. But again it is a cyclical industry which has had its up and downs, so a five-year average would appear to be a realistic method of comparing the two Government accomplishments. If there was one set of figures the financial critic would have been wise to stay away from, it is those related to the construction industry. For the last five years of the NDP Government, the value of work performed in the province averaged \$17,381,000. The five years of the Liberal Government, the average of work performed was \$48,520,000, an increase of 180 per cent. Why didn't the financial critic tell us these figures? The NDP averaged 29,605 employees per year, the Liberal average has been 33,640.

In 1963, the construction budget was \$5.7 million. The University construction, and I want you to get this, Mr. Speaker, was \$1.5 million. A total of \$7.2 million, compared to \$21.3 million this year. A budget that is three times that in the last NDP budget. The Department of Public Works budget, plus the University of Saskatchewan construction totals \$21.3 million compared to \$20.4 million, last year. An increase of 5 per cent. Yet Members opposite — the Member from Regina Centre was one of them — deliberately tried to mislead this House by saying that our construction budget was down this year. Even when the figures are right at hand, Mr. Speaker, Members opposite would rather tell a lie than tell the truth. The financial critic, then cited figures . . . Well, Mr. Speaker, I don't know what else you would call it when it is right there in the little blue book, and he refuses to use those figures. I hate to use that expression in this Legislature, but when it is the truth, it is the truth.

The financial critic then cited figures dealing with retail trade and manufacturing. We are the first to agree on this side of the House that these two figures are important in determining the economic development that has taken place. That is why we are prepared to compare the figures for 1968 and 1963. The 1968 figures show an increase over 1963 of 35 per cent for manufacturing, and 28 per cent for retail trade, certainly an impressive record for five years of administration.

So you see, Mr. Speaker, when the financial critic compared our record with the record of provinces like Ontario and British Columbia, he was not being fair, he was not being honest and he was not being realistic. The true comparison of the growth of Saskatchewan economy is here in this little blue book where you have the record of the Liberal Government, as compared to the record of the NDP Government over a similar period of time. Because the financial critic refused to use these figures, I say that every household in Canada should have a copy of this little blue book. From the true figures that this book provides, it is evident that Saskatchewan is on the move and that this is really a new Saskatchewan. Once the people in industry in the rest of Canada are convinced that there will never be Socialism again in this Province, our growth will continue at an even greater pace than it has at the present time.

So, Mr. Speaker, this “panic Budget” as it was referred to by the financial critic opposite, shows that the only panic is in the minds of the Members opposite as they realize that, if the Liberal Government continues to bring down responsible budgets, they will be relegated to the role of Opposition for many years to come. No amount of cooked-up figures and speeches from their financial critic, their Leader or their MLAs will disperse this panic. I would commend to the financial critic opposite the Budget Speech of the Hon. D.G. Steuart with particular reference to those pages that I referred to the House this evening, because they are there in black and white. They can't be disputed and they are the only true facts that the people of Saskatchewan wish to compare, the NDP record for their last five years, compared to our record today.

No, Mr. Speaker, as is customary in the Budget Debate and as I promised in reply to a question from the Member from Melfort-Tisdale (Mr. Willis) — who was here for five minutes this afternoon, but is now absent again this evening — I would now like to touch on some of the highlights for the past year and plans for the coming year of the Saskatchewan Water Resources Commission and the Department of Public Works.

Perhaps the most import aspect of the Saskatchewan Water Commission's program during the past year, was in the field of water pollution control. If you will recall, in 1968 the Government transferred the water pollution control aspects of the Division of Sanitation of the Department of Health, to the Water Resources Commission. This action was taken in recognition of the modern water management concept that water has little value unless it can serve a multiplicity of uses. By moving the

February 27, 1969

pollution control function in this manner, the Government was able to shift the emphasis in control policy from the mere abatement of pollution, to one of pollution prevention. If ever the statement, "an ounce of prevention is worth a pound of cure" was applicable, it has become obvious that it is true in the prevention of water pollution. One has only to look at the expenditures in Eastern Canada and the United States to see the terrific cost of trying to clean up pollution once it is well underway.

Last November, Members will probably remember that some of the largest bond issues voted on during the United States Presidential Election dealt with water pollution control. The State of Illinois for example voted on a bond issue of one billion dollars for pollution control. The city of Cleveland had a \$300 million bond issue, and there were several other issues of the magnitude of \$125 million to \$200 million.

It is our intention by careful management to ensure that the water streams in Saskatchewan do not become polluted to the extent where large sums of money are necessary to correct them. To ensure that Government policy was understood by communities, industry and their consultants, the Water Resources Commission prepared and distributed a comprehensive information manual that contained a summary of pertinent legislation, policy statements and brochures on Sewer Works Design, Waterworks Design and Water Quality Criteria. This manual was well received, and in fact we received many requests from agencies outside of this province. At the inception of the Water Pollution Control Program, there were five communities in Saskatchewan which did not provide the minimum of primary treatment of their effluent. They were Saskatoon, Prince Albert, Nipawin, Outlook and Uranium City. During 1968, Water Resources Commission officials met with representatives of these communities and informed them of our government policy. Commitments have now been received from Saskatoon, Prince Albert and Uranium City that a minimum of primary treatment will be provided between 1969 and 1972. The towns of Nipawin and Outlook have retained consultants to prepare reports on their problem and it is expected that commitments will be received from them in the next few months.

I wish at this time to say publicly that we appreciate the co-operation we are receiving from these five communities that themselves recognized the need for improved treatment facilities, if they were going to do their part in preventing pollution of our provincial water bodies.

During the year also the Commission initiated a program for sharing water quality data, thus eliminating much of the over-lapping work that has been carried out by various departments.

On April 1st, 1968, the Saskatchewan Water Resources Commission implemented a system of charges for the use of water. These charges were levied against all industrial users of water except those supplied by municipal water systems. The Government recognizes that water has a value in use, that it is not

available in unlimited quantities and that large sums of money must be expended to manage and develop this resource. We hope that the effect of implementing a system of water charges will be to promote wise use of a limited resource, provide revenue to offset the high cost of carrying out a water management program and to help offset the heavy expenditures required to develop provincial water resources and place part of this burden directly upon the beneficiaries of this investment and to assist in compilation of an up-to-date inventory of water use in the province.

As well may be appreciated, this was not a popular program to implement. However, again the Government took the responsible attitude that, being a limited resource, those gaining the most benefit must be prepared to pay a portion of the cost of managing and controlling this resource. However, implementation was carried out with a minimum of stress, and again I wish to commend the industries for their co-operation in this regard. The Government is now in the process of collecting the charges applicable to the 1968 calendar year. Approximately 80 companies were affected with annual revenues of approximately \$175,000.

Because the major streams upon which our water management program must rely are interprovincial in nature, the Commission has initiated negotiations with the provinces of Manitoba and Alberta to reach an agreement as to how the water flowing in interprovincial streams shall be shared. This type of understanding is necessary to enable all parties to make long-term plans for development. The Saskatchewan river system is of prime importance to this province, as well as to the provinces of Alberta and Manitoba. There is a limit to the water flowing in this system and there is a need to prepare for the day when all the available water is allocated. Rational planning requires a knowledge of resources and alternate schemes to supplement the shortages. It is possible to say at this time that a final agreement on how these interprovincial waters will be shared in the interest of all residents in Western Canada will soon be reached.

During 1968, significant improvements were made in the quality of water available from Buffalo Pound Lake, which is a major source of water for the cities of Moose Jaw and Regina. By maintaining a constant flow of water through the lake — you know I could say, Mr. Speaker, that the only dead fish that I've seen for some time are on the opposite side of the House, but I know this is unparliamentary, and I withdraw the remark before I say it -

An Hon. Member: — . . . Go ahead!

Mr. Guy: — . . . By maintaining a constant flow of water through the lake, it was possible to maintain the oxygen at a certain level during 1968 and recent test results show that the oxygen levels range upward to the saturation point. Not only was the quality of water much improved during 1968, but the ability to deliver

water was improved by a channel-dredging program carried out on a 17-mile section between Buffalo Pound and Lake Diefenbaker by the Department of Agriculture.

In June 1967, the Qu'Appelle River was designated as a multi-purpose project. This provided the Commission with authority to co-ordinate and approve research, investigation and planning for the development and operation of the Qu'Appelle River and Lake system. The following work items were completed during 1968: erosion and safe-building set-back studies were carried out on Last Mountain and Buffalo Pound Lakes; shoreline evaluation was carried out on Last Mountain Lake; air photographs necessary for the study were taken; compilation of basic data on the Valley presently available from all sources; a start made on the compilation of current water requirements; municipal demand forecasts and industrial demand forecasts carried out.

Concurrent to this work, Saskatchewan has undertaken to carry out, as part of the Saskatchewan-Nelson Study, a detailed study of the Qu'Appelle River as a conveyance channel. This study, as you are aware, is carried out through the participation of Alberta, Saskatchewan, Manitoba and the Federal Government. This is a five-year program, expected to be completed in 1972 and to date no interim report has been released.

In August, 1968, the Saskatoon South East Water Supply System was officially opened by the Premier. This multi-purpose system provides water for industrial, agricultural, recreational, municipal and wild life needs. Water for the system originates at the South Saskatchewan River Reservoir and is moved through a network of canals, holding reservoirs, and pipelines to various users. The largest reservoir is at Blackstrap, where recreation and private cottage developments were begun during the past year.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I would like to turn to the Department of Public Works. The Department of Public Works was successful in carrying out during the 1968-69 fiscal year one of the largest capital construction programs ever assigned to the Department. Although the year is still not complete, our present estimate of total capital construction will be approximately \$9.6 million. This was a complex program ranging from small renovations from \$15 to \$20,000 to large multi-million dollar buildings. A total of some 80 projects were involved in the capital program, giving some indication of the problems associated with bringing together the necessary planning, design and construction services.

Tenders called throughout 1968 and early 1969 have, with few exceptions, been consistently below departmental project estimates. Although the primary reason must be attributed to the higher competitive atmosphere in the construction industry, the Department's expansion of its planning services, combined with more sophisticated cost control systems, has also contributed to the arrest of spiralling increases in construction costs. Standardization of contractual documents and a high level of

scrutiny of proposed designs to ensure good value for money spent have also been a contributing factor.

The construction of the Veterinary Diagnostic Laboratory in Regina was completed on schedule in 1968 and is fully operational at this time. This \$675,000 facility provides a complete veterinary diagnostic facility for the use of stock growers in the southern half of the province. \$350,000 of the capital investment was provided by the Provincial Horned Cattle Fund. During the coming year the site completion will be finished around the Veterinary Laboratory.

At the Institute of Applied Arts and Science, Saskatoon, construction continued on phase II of the building which includes classrooms, shops and laboratories. Major portions of the extension have now been completed and furnished and are presently used by the Institute. As work progresses, further sections are being made operational. The total project is expected to be completed in late July or August of this year. During the 1968 construction season, construction was delayed for a total of 88 days due to trade strikes. This has seriously delayed the completion of this project with the resulting disruption of the educational system.

Additional classroom facilities were completed at Ile-a-La-Crosse, La Loche, Turner Lake during the year and an auditorium-gymnasium is presently under construction at LaRonge and will be completed in early spring, 1969. During the coming year facilities will be provided at Stanley Mission, Patuanak, Stony Rapids, LaRonge, Wollaston Lake, Fond du Lac, Camsell Portage, Cumberland House, Buffalo Narrows and Ile-a-La-Crosse. With the completion of this program, Mr. Speaker, I believe without exception that every community in Northern Saskatchewan has been provided with additional up-to-date modern classroom space, since we became the Government in 1964. Certainly a far cry from some of the facilities that were used when the NDP were the Government.

Major renovations were carried out on the old nurses' residence at the site of the Saskatchewan Hospital in North Battleford, to accommodate Diploma Nursing Training at that location. The facility is presently being used though some renovation work is still underway.

During the coming year additional renovations will be carried out at the Weyburn Vocational Centre and a new addition to the School for the Deaf in Saskatoon will be started. This is something that has been on the books for several years, and we're pleased that we can provide this much needed addition at this time.

Hon. J.C. McIsaac (Minister of Education): — . . . 10 years ago!

Mr. Guy: — Well, they probably will say they promised it 10 years

ago but then what haven't they promised since they were there in 1944.

The \$¾ million North Battleford office and shop depot for the Department of Highways was completed and officially opened during the year, providing new and modern facilities for the Department of Highways in that area of the province. This building was the first of a series of office and depot complexes planned for construction in major locations throughout the province in keeping with the Government's expanded Highway Program. This coming year, work will proceed on the shop and repair depot for the city of Saskatoon, and planning will start for the Regina depot.

A total of five new two and three-bay storage buildings were designed and constructed throughout the province at Esterhazy, Kindersley, Lloydminster, Mile No. 97 on Highway 106, and Whitewood, during the past year. During the coming year storage buildings will be provided, or added to, at Preeceville, Watson, Meadow Lake and Swift Current. Site work will also be completed at the North Battleford depot and some renovations will be done to the materials lab in Regina.

A \$¼ million program was carried out in the 1968-69 season which provided for an expansion of tourist and recreation facilities at our Provincial parks. Some of the programs completed in the past year included a service centre provided at Echo Lake campground, a service centre at Green Water Lake campground, park entry and administration building at Green Water Lake, store and cafe equipment at Green Water Lake, a change house at Loon Lake, maintenance buildings at Moose Mountain, and storage building and staff headquarters at St. Walburg.

In addition to this work, a storage building and office facility at the Big River Nursery Station was constructed in the interest of expanding the production of the Forest Nursery Station at that location.

During the coming fiscal year a service building will be provided at Blackstrap, a storage and maintenance building at Meadow Lake, a service building at Good Spirit Lake, a service centre at Battleford Park, a canteen building at Blackstrap and a recreational hall at Duck Mountain.

In 1968 at the Saskatchewan Hospital in North Battleford, a project was carried out in reconstructing and relocating the sewage lagoon. A project has been undertaken to increase the capacity of the power house and this will continue during the present year.

A \$200,000 Ward Renovation Project is presently underway which is part of a continuing renovation program that has been carried out for the past three years in the interest of upgrading the facility.

A \$¾ million project involving renovation and new construction, associated with the dietary facilities at the hospital, is expected to be called shortly, and this work will continue during the 1969-70 fiscal year.

At the Saskatchewan Training School in Moose Jaw, three projects were carried out during the year primarily work associated with the foundation repair work on the various buildings, and it is hoped that this work will be completed in the coming year. Members opposite are continually criticizing the amount of work that is being done at the Training School in Moose Jaw. I want to tell you that the only reason that there is not more work being done is the fact that because of their inefficiencies, when they were the Government, we are now spending more than \$1 million in rectifying the mistakes that they made when these buildings were first put up.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Guy: — They talk about planning. If there was ever a shortage of planning under the former Administration — and the young Member from Riversdale (Mr. Romanow) had better listen to this — it was in regard to the Training School in Moose Jaw. To date, expenditures on this repair have amounted to more than \$1 million. Renovations were also carried out in the Saskatchewan Training School in Prince Albert and these will continue in the coming year.

For the Department of Welfare, site improvement work was undertaken at the Pine Grove Correctional Centre, the Regina Correctional Centre and Dales House, during the current year. The Roy Wilson Centre at Sedley was purchased, renovated and put into use. Renovations on this building will continue. During the coming year, the dietary area of the Prince Albert Men's Correctional Centre will be renovated and Dales House will be ventilated.

The \$3.8 million Phase III contract on the Saskatchewan Centennial Auditorium has progressed favorably during the fiscal year and it is expected that this main portion of the construction will be completed by December, 1969. Present construction is significantly ahead of schedule and no difficulties are anticipated at this time.

Phase IV, which includes primarily the convention facilities, will be proceeded with in the coming year and the work will progress coincidentally with Phase III, allowing for completion of the entire project by April, 1970.

A \$.5 million public office building was completed at Melville during the year. It provides space for Government offices, court facilities, the Saskatchewan Power Corporation, and the Saskatchewan Liquor Board store.

February 27, 1969

The renovation work in the Legislative Buildings continued during the year and saw the completion of the main corridor areas of all three floors. This work also included the installation of new electrical and mechanical fixtures, most of which were considerably under capacity and represented a significant hazard to the building and the public.

Work on the west wing basement level began in late fall of '68 and is progressing well with an expected completion time of May, 1969. This work will make available an additional 12,000 square feet of first-class office space which has previously been in the class of poor storage area.

This work also saw the installation of new drainage lines and transformer vault electrical service to the main building. A renovation program was also carried out on the Legislative annex which brings the facility up to fully modern office requirements and houses the central services of the Government, including photo-copying, duplicating and addressograph equipment in operation.

New ground level entrances were constructed at the east and west terminals of the Legislative Buildings. These new entrances were required to meet today's fire regulations and have been designed in keeping with the classic architecture of the structure.

I must say again, Mr. Speaker, that the renovation program, that the Government has embarked upon, is long overdue for the 56-year old Legislative Building. It is obvious that for years maintenance of this dignified structure was minimal and has resulted in the building becoming very much run down, to the extent of presenting some significant structural failure hazards in certain areas. Fire control and electrical system in the building were critically inadequate in terms of the present-day load and safety requirements. Increase in tourist traffic through the building during the summer months dictated the need for the installation of public washrooms which were not considered when the building was first constructed.

The overall plan for renovation, though dictated primarily by the urgent need for major maintenance, involves the re-establishment of the building as a centre of the legislative function of Government and the restoration of the original architectural features. The renovations spread over a number of years will result in a complete relifting of the Legislative Building which should circumvent major expenditures for the next 30 to 50 years.

Public display galleries were created by using existing wasted space in the centre block of the building, resulting in much improved utilization as well as a facility for the displaying of historical artefacts associated with the development of the Province of Saskatchewan. I must say here that these galleries receive nothing but the very highest commendation and

admiration from tourists who spend considerable time wandering throughout these galleries.

During the past year, renovation was carried out as usual in many of our Provincial office buildings, court houses and land title offices. These will be continued in the current year as required.

A new dietary addition for Camp Easter Seal at Watrous will be provided this year.

Two other programs that I might refer to prior to concluding my remarks deal with the Assisted Passage Program and the air-strip improvement program.

In 1965 the Government initiated an Assisted Passage Program in the interest of meeting the remarkable increase in teacher and other professional people requirements in the Province. To date, a total of 650 teachers, 18 engineers, 13 physicians, 10 psychiatrists, 5 geologists, 2 nurses, 2 librarians, 1 physicist, 1 psychologist, 1 architect, 1 administrator, 1 economist, 1 geophysicist, and 1 medical health officer have been assisted by this program with an expenditure by the Province of approximately \$220,000.

Mr. W.G. Davies (Moose Jaw South) — . . . no kooks.

Mr. Guy: — I don't know. I haven't met them all. The only kooks that I recall meeting recently are those on the other side of the House.

The program provides for the payment of transportation costs for teachers and other specific professional personnel from the United Kingdom to Saskatchewan, based on their agreement to work with the province for a minimum two-year period.

In 1967, the Department of Public Works initiated a municipal airstrip improvement program which provides financial assistance to municipal governments for the improvement of local airstrips. The objective is to assist in the provision of better facilities for air transportation in keeping with the industrial expansion within the province and the remarkable increase in the utilization of private aircraft by all industries including agriculture.

To date, well over \$100,000 has been approved in grants to over 50 urban centres in the province.

The Central Vehicle Agency also comes under the Department of Public Works and was established in 1966 for the purpose of centralizing the management of the entire Government automobile fleet. Through the use of a completely computerized cost control system and a relatively small administrative unit, the Central Vehicle Agency affected a saving in the first year of operations of \$600,000 and a continual annual savings of approximately \$350,000.

February 27, 1969

Mr. Speaker, before concluding, I would like to make several comments regarding the attitudes of Members opposite. One cannot but be dismayed at the delight they take in attacking the Prince Albert Pulp Mill. This is particularly true of the two Members who have received the most benefit from this welcome addition to our economy, the Member from Shellbrook (Mr. Bowerman) and the Member from Prince Albert East-Cumberland (Mr. Berezowsky).

Both of these Members take every opportunity, both in and outside of this Legislature, to attack and destroy confidence in this project. It's hard to believe that these two Members would let jealousy blind their eyes to the great contribution the mill is making to that area. One only needed to be at the testimonial dinner last night in Prince Albert when Carl Landiger from Parsons and Whittimore was introduced to the gathering, to see the reaction of the people of Prince Albert to the Prince Albert Pulp Mill.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Guy: — And it's too bad the Member from Shellbrook was not there because I'm sure that he would change his philosophy because I would imagine, like every other Member in this House, he wants to get elected next time. But I can tell him here this evening that, if he continues to condemn the Prince Albert Pulp Mill in the manner that he has in the past, that seat over there will be vacant after the next election.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Guy: — As far as the Member for Prince Albert East-Cumberland (Mr. Berezowsky), this is probably true there but again we have to kind of weigh this other attraction that he has in Prince Albert to determine whether he's going to lose his seat in the next election or not. I wouldn't bet on Bill the way that I would on the Member from Shellbrook (Mr. Bowerman) losing his seat in the next election.

Mr. G.R. Bowerman (Shellbrook): — . . . How much?

Mr. Guy: — You know it's really a shame.

An Hon. Member: — . . . Hot air!

Mr. Guy: — Hot air is better than a cold heart, my boy, when you consider the Prince Albert Pulp Mill.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Guy: — I know the Member from Touchwood (Mr. Meakes) would give his last pair of drawers if he could get a pulp mill in his constituency.

Mr. F. Meakes (Touchwood): — I have only one set . . .

Mr. Guy: — Oh, I think we'd better not. You know, Mr. Speaker, as these so-called middle-Saskatchewan or northern Members, one would have thought that these two would have been delighted with the development taking place in the north country. The Member from Prince Albert East-Cumberland (Mr. Berezowsky), I want to remind him, is the same Member that attacked the Anglo-Rouyn Mine when it was first announced. Today that mine is in production. The reserve tonnage is greater than ever before and the company is doing well, with no thanks, however, to the Members opposite who belittled and tried to undermine this project from its very start.

One wonders why Members like that continually opposed the development of our natural resources for the benefit of our people. However, it must be Socialist philosophy because for 20 years the timber rotted in the forest, the pulpwood remained unharvested and the minerals remained far beneath the surface during the time they were the Government. Members opposite should be proud of the new Saskatchewan that is unfolding before their eyes under a Liberal Government.

When one sees the roads and the airstrips that are being constructed, the schools that have been built, the houses that have been provided, the formation of the Northern Power Company, the mining and exploration development program that the Minister of Mineral Resources (Mr. Cameron) outlined the other day, and the increased job opportunities, the education and training program that are provided for people of Indian ancestry, all within a period of a few short years, no one can deny that the North started to come into its own with the election of a Liberal Government in 1964.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Guy: — Mr. Speaker, the second major debate of this session is drawing to a close and the people of Saskatchewan are still waiting for an answer to the questions that have been raised on this side of the House.

Almost without exception each Member on this side of the House has asked a pertinent question, which the people of Saskatchewan are waiting to hear a reply to, but to date it appears that Members opposite have no answers to these questions. However, I am convinced that before the people of Saskatchewan will consider the NDP as an alternative to the present Government, they will demand an answer to the following questions:

1. Will the NDP abolish school boards as the MLA for Saskatoon Riversdale (Mr. Romanow) told a teachers' meeting at Tisdale?

I would remind you, Mr. Speaker, that the Member from

February 27, 1969

Saskatoon Riversdale has spoken twice in this Assembly since this question was asked. Did he ever refer to what would happen to the local school boards? No, he got into the upper limits of the 1970s but not once did he answer the question that I raised in the Throne Speech Debate. Did he mean what he said when he said that an NDP Government would abolish school boards, or was he only talking for the benefit of the teachers trying to enrage them against the Liberal Government? He's had two opportunities. Why didn't he tell us instead of some of these other things that he referred to? Surely to goodness this Member from Saskatoon Riversdale doesn't lack courage. He's already ready to tell us that he's ready to speak his mind and that he'll tell what he believes regardless of whether it fits in with their policy or not, but in this particular regard he's silent. In fact, I would sit down right now, Mr. Speaker, if he would get on his feet as a question of privilege, and answer this question.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Guy: — The second question, Mr. Speaker, that has to be answered before the next election is: will the NDP nationalize the land, as their policy statement now stands?

Again we have had many of the farm Members stand up in this Legislature but not one of them has answered this question although it's been asked many times by Members over here. We have challenged them to say whether they really believe in this policy, but to date there's been dead silence.

The Member from Shellbrook (Mr. Bowerman) pretends that he's a great speaker for the farmers over there. Did he mention nationalization of land? He'll go back to his constituency and when he's asked about that question, he will deliberately lie to his constituents that they don't believe in this.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Guy: — I'm sorry, Mr. Speaker, I withdraw that remark. I would say that he will go back and he will deliberately mislead them into believing that they do not believe in the nationalization of land. But why does he not stand up in the Legislature where the record will be written and say, "The NDP do not believe in the nationalization of land?" Not one Member, not even the Member from Turtleford (Mr. Wooff) had the courage and he's been here a long time. However, I think that question may be answered later this evening as I understand the Member for Kinistino (Mr. Thibault) is going to speak.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Guy: — I hope that he will make a major statement on the nationalization of land. I challenge him to make a statement here tonight on whether they believe in nationalization of land.

But unless I miss my guess, he will stand up here like the gentleman that he is and he won't even mention nationalization of land, let alone condone it, condemn it or anything else.

An Hon. Member: — He will.

Mr. Guy: — Will he? Well, I hope so, and hope that while he's on his feet that he will also comment on another question that has been raised on this side of the House, and that is: why do Members opposite call for the support of Quebec Separatism which would destroy Confederation? I would hope that the Member from Kinistino (Mr. Thibault), who is rather closely linked to that particular part of the country, might have some comments in this regard.

Mr. R. Romanow (Saskatoon Riverdale): — How about Fern Larochelle or Coderre?

Mr. Guy: — Yes, Sir, I will tell you that Lionel Coderre and Fern Larochelle have opposed Separatism in Canada, but when has one speaker across the way got up and opposed Quebec Separatism? Not one of them. Not one of them. They pass it at their conventions and then they come into the House like little puppy-dogs with their tails between their legs; for not one of them will mention it. However, I understand that the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Lloyd) is going to speak in this debate. He was down to the confederation Conference in Ottawa. Surely to goodness he will get on his feet and condemn the Young Democrats for their resolution calling for Quebec Separatism. We will wait and see if he will accept that challenge. You know, Mr. Speaker, I was expecting the Member from Saskatoon Riversdale (Mr. Romanow) when he was on his feet today, to say, "I do not agree with the Young Democrat resolution that we should have the establishment of a Viet Cong Government in Vietnam." But have you heard one word from him about this vital question?

Mr. R.H. Wooff (Turtleford): — Now you're running scared.

Mr. Guy: — He never says anything when he's speaking in the debate.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Guy: — I ask you, Mr. Speaker, why have not these Members stood on their feet and said, "We do not believe in the establishment of a Viet Cong Government in Vietnam." Until they do, what can we do but believe that they do support the resolution passed by the Young NDP. I would have thought the gentleman that can't take any more and is leaving would have stood up in his seat. After all he's pretty closely related to that type of philosophy.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Guy: — The Senior Member from Moose Jaw (Mr. Davies) has had a lot of opportunity to speak to fairly leftist groups in his time. I recall the time he was down in the United States making a little speech. Today he did not say that he opposed the establishment of a Viet Cong Government in Vietnam. In fact, the Member today never said a word about the condemning of the American training flights over Canada and the condoning of Russian action in Czechoslovakia. We raised those questions on this side the House. But have they replied to them? They have not. Not one Member opposite has stood up in this Legislature, although many of them have had two opportunities, and said that they condemn the action of Russia in Czechoslovakia. But, oh, they were quick at their convention to send a telegram to the Prime Minister condemning American flights over Canada and Saskatchewan where they had the complete permission, and understanding of Canada. But when it comes to Czechoslovakia and Russia, that's an entirely different story.

But why don't they stand up and tell us whether they support Russia or whether they don't? Why do they try and sweep it under the rug? Why do they sit there tonight with their heads in their hands, ashamed to say one thing or the other? They've had their opportunities. Again, I would hope the Leader of the Opposition, (Mr. Lloyd) before this debate is over will make the position of that party very clear in this regard.

An Hon. Member: — How can he?

Mr. Guy: — And finally, you know I was amazed today, Mr. Speaker, when the Member from Riversdale was speaking. He talked about the actions of the Young Democratic party, how they're planning for the future. Well, we saw how they planned this year. They planned to go up to Naicam with the support of NDP money and organization, and they burned the American flag. That's the planning that that fellow over there was talking about today.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Guy: — And this is a question that we want answered before this Legislature ends this year too. Why did the Saskatchewan NDP finance and organize the burning of the American flag in Naicam last summer?

An Hon. Member: — Why?

Mr. Guy: — And again he laughs, he laughs. One of his own Members. I think it was a fellow by the name of Monkhouse who said, "The NDP supported and financed it and I clapped and only wished that they had burned some generals at the same time." Why don't you stand up there and say that you don't approve of this? You haven't got the guts . . .

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Guy: — Either that or else you condone it. If it's one or the other, Mr. Speaker, I'm convinced that they condone these actions.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Guy: — No, these are questions . . . and I'll say this to the Member from Riversdale (Mr. Romanow), I am happy that the Young Liberals are spending their time in the pursuit of determining whether licensed rooms should be available to them at 18, 19, 20 or 21, as I tell you that's far less harmful activity than burning American flags.

Now these are questions Saskatchewan people are asking. These are policies and philosophies that are the absolute opposite of what the Liberal party believes in.

The people of Saskatchewan today must realize that they can't support the establishment of a Viet Cong Government in Vietnam and subscribe to democracy at the same time. They can't support the NDP and continue to hope to own their own lands. They can't believe in the role of the local government and support the NDP policy of eliminating local school boards. They can't have pride in being a Canadian and in our Canadian flag, which we adopted a few years ago, and at the same time support a party that would deliberately burn and destroy the flag of a friendly neighbor, and bring shame on the whole of Canada.

Yes, Mr. Speaker, it was sickening alright when we read in the paper where members of the NDP participated in this disgraceful episode. The Province of Saskatchewan will take a long time to live it down. You should be ashamed of yourselves sitting across the floor there. You can't stand up and say that it was the Young NDP that did it, and that you had no part of it, when it was printed right in the press that you had supported it financially. You can shake your heads all you like. It's not going to get you off the hook unless you get up on the floor of this House and put it in the record books that you opposed it.

An Hon. Member: — There's the point.

Mr. Guy: — You sit there pretty quiet all of a sudden. Well, Mr. Speaker, the people of Saskatchewan are still waiting to hear the comments of the Members opposite regarding these questions and these positions, and until such time as we, on this side of the House, are given the answers, I am afraid that I cannot support the amendment of the Opposition but I will support the position and the Budget of the Government.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

February 27, 1969

Mr. J.E. Brockelbank (Saskatoon Mayfair): — Will the Hon. Member permit one question before he takes his seat. These are very important issues that he has brought forward in the last few minutes. I wonder if the Hon. Member would attempt to convince his colleagues that we should have a by-election in Kelvington and get them out in the open.

Mr. Guy: — Mr. Speaker, I've got another half an hour now I guess on this one. We are prepared and we will call a by-election when the weather and other conditions warrant. And I will tell you now that we will win that by-election.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Guy: — And I will tell you this also, that when we do win this election, there will be a shakeup on that side of the House that you have never seen before in the history of the NDP. There will be a new leader, there will be a new financial critic, there will be a new Member from Saskatoon probably too. This is going to be a vital by-election and when we win it the end of their party will be complete. Any more questions, Mr. Speaker?

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. A. Thibault (Kinistino): — Mr. Speaker, I didn't know that they would be so interested in what I was going to say. First of all I want to congratulate our Leader (Mr. Lloyd). They are worried about leaders. They sort of point to this fellow and that fellow. I want to tell the fellows across the way they are stuck with little Davey. At times I think they are shooting dice to decide who they could really put in. But I say that we are proud of our Leader and we are going to stand behind him and we will trim you when the time comes.

Mr. Thibault: — I want to congratulate the financial critic (Mr. Blakeney) for the wonderful job that he did. I think that we have every reason to be proud of his leadership ability as well.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Thibault: — I also want to congratulate the Mayor of the city of Regina. You know in the last few months I made a few trips to the city and you would be surprised how short a time it would take to clear the streets when a snow storm came along. But the Department of Highways had icy roads for over a month and there was a price on safety. You could not sand these highways. They talk about safety!

Now I am going to tell you that I am one of these boys that voted against purple gas. You know, my people did not get hoodwinked into that one that easy. I told them that it was opening the door to taxation. But what amuses me — and perhaps I am just a little older than some of them were back in 1944 — is how the Member for Watrous (Mr. Schmeiser) can get somebody to write a 1944 speech for him to read . . .

Mr. D.G. MacLennan (Last Mountain): — You can't write one . . .

Mr. Thibault: — . . . I am not reading my speech. I am speaking off the cuff. Prior to 1944, the farms were going to be taken away. For a while they had my parents scared that they were going to take the farms away, but when they saw a man like Jim Boyle run for the CCF, they said, "If he is not scared of his five quarters I am not scared of my four, so I am in with them." There are the 1944 speeches coming out now, they are desperate. They are desperate, I am telling you. I have been in this House for 10 years. This is the first time that I have seen a vacancy that they have taken the seat out of the Chamber and put it in the washroom. The place for the Member for Kelvington is in this House. The place for this seat is in this House.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Thibault: — I tell you when they haul that seat back in, I know where it is going to go. Right here! You haven't any courage. There are so many questions the Member for Athabasca (Mr. Guy) said that can be answered in Kelvington. Call it! Last year I challenged the Member for Prince Albert West (Mr. Steuart) to resign his seat and I would resign mine and we would have two by-elections to get an expression of opinion. He said, "Boy, I never saw so many brave men." You don't need to resign this year. The Minister of Education (Mr. McIsaac) challenged a Member to resign his seat. He doesn't need to resign. They have an empty one! Let's have it out there and we will answer all the questions you want in that by-election.

You know I get annoyed sometimes at name-calling and I made a list of all the ones that I could hear: Russia, Castro, Communist and . . . and most of them come from the Member for Athabasca. I thought tonight that he was reformed but he slipped. He couldn't stand it.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Thibault: — Once in a while we hear the Member for Gravelbourg (Mr. Coderre) say, Moscow. I want to say that in my constituency I have people of every denomination. I have told them that when I came to this Legislature I came here to represent all of them. I take no blood tests. My doors are open at any time to all the people of my constituency. Any time the Member for Athabasca

February 27, 1969

wants to run in Kinistino — and I have taken some big ones out — he can come. I will challenge anyone across the way to come in and try Kinistino. The sooner that we have Members in this House that represent all the people, the better Government we are going to have.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Thibault: — I am not going to say too much about names, but you know what amazes me is that, if we talk about selling grain to China, we are a bunch of Communists. Diefenbaker and Alvin Hamilton — we've got to give the devil his dues you know — came along and opened the door. They started selling to China, started selling to Russia. They didn't call them Communist. But when we suggest it — Communists! I am merely reviewing this little outfit you know. If somebody makes a trip to Cuba, oh, that makes him a Communist. I wonder when Tim Buck shared the platform with Mackenzie King, did that make Mackenzie King a Communist? I won't accuse him. And you know about the Dorian Inquiry when there was a bunch of flirting around for campaign funds. You know all about it. Did that make you all a bunch of — well, you know what? I won't tell you!

Then when Hal Banks skipped off — do you know about him? Did that make you any different? You had a youth convention that was apparently loaded with booze. From something that was said a while ago, I think they are all in favor of booze. It disturbs me when a convention can have all these resolutions. What the heck are they thinking about? The Member for Athabasca (Mr. Guy) when he wound up his speech sounded as if he was coming from the youth convention.

I would like to say this. They like to condemn a person by association. If the Member from Athabasca went to the Virgin Islands, I wonder what they would call the island then?

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Thibault: — Now so much for that. I don't intend to dwell any more on that. I don't like name calling. We had kooks, punks, and finally we had pip-squeak running in the Chamber here for awhile. Let's not have that kind of stuff from the Minister of Education, I was disappointed when he came out with that. I always held him in pretty high esteem. I'll get back to my speech.

I want to say a few things about my own constituency. Tomorrow the high school soccer champions will be in this Chamber. The Speaker has agreed to sit them in the front row and I want to thank him for it. I hope that they will be welcomed and I will be happy to be able to introduce them. I would like a few comments, perhaps, from the House Leader as well as the Leader of the Opposition, because our young people are going to decide what kind of society we are going to have. Let's treat them

with respect. Let us show them that the Chamber is a place that is respected and let's cut the name-calling and get down to business. If there is a serious problem, I say, let us set up committees, like we did on the highway safety and let's get something done about it.

We will talk a little bit about agriculture. I guess everyone will agree that when damp grain hit Saskatchewan and the Western farmers, the left hand didn't know what the right hand was doing. They were mixed up. Ottawa, Regina, you couldn't get any information. It showed right up that there was a need to protect this very important industry, to have a great deal more of reorganization in it. There was lack of information on drying grain. Farmers could have saved a lot of money by installing ventilation in their granaries. Aeration would have saved a lot of it. Information was not available that is available now. Lack of guidance. How much do we spend in agriculture in this province for the biggest industry that we have? Let's face it, the agricultural industry is in trouble. It is going to take more than name-calling from the other side to do something about it. I think when we get the Estimates on agriculture we need a great deal more research, a lot more guidance and a lot more of telling the people what crops would likely be needed. In 1968 only 49 per cent of the '67 rape acreage was sown. A great deal more could have been sown. The price is good. Perhaps there are many crops that we could raise here in Saskatchewan and with research we can find out. We should explore all the possibilities of markets all over the world. I am going to tell you about these Communists, Facists and so on that we are all a part of the world. If they are Fascists they are part of the world. If they are Indians or negroes it doesn't matter a heck who they are, they are God's children. If we learn to share the fruits of the earth we are going to have peace on the earth.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Thibault: — Let us do it with bread and not lead, that is my motto. That should answer part of Mr. Athabasca's question.

Let's look at what is going to happen next spring. The farmers will have to start borrowing money at 8 per cent interest. I want to congratulate the Member for Humboldt (Mr. Breker) for the wonderful speech he delivered this afternoon. When I told him that he was talking sense I really meant that he was talking sense and I didn't appreciate the remark that he threw back. I want to compliment some of the speech of the Member from Elrose (Mr. Leith) when he spoke about retarded children. I think that we should do something for them but I will speak about that later.

Getting back to the 8 per cent on money, they will have to pay 8 per cent for fertilizer and they will have to borrow money for that. They will have to borrow money for gasoline, fuel, their seed, and believe me some have not yet paid their loans for last year. I want to draw to the attention of this House

February 27, 1969

that as of February 21st, 74 points in Saskatchewan were still on the unit. I urge the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. McFarlane) to really get on this and really hound the railroad companies to get this grain moving. I want to read the report from the Saskatchewan Wheat Pool to the country elevators. It says this:

The terminal report Lakehead unloading of 412 cars at our terminal showed an increase of 48 cars in the wheat under review, compared with the previous week of a total of 364. However, unless there is a definite increase in car arrivals, this cannot continue as only 44 cars, 18 CP, 26 CN, are on hand marked for unloading at the terminal at the time of the report.

Mr. Speaker, I hope instead of toying around with what is being said here this evening by some of the Members opposite a little time would be better spent in seeing what we can do for our Western farmers, because they are in trouble. They are trying to take our attention away.

I also want to remind them along with what the Member for Humboldt said that the estimated cost per acre is \$23 per acre. He gave a low and high figure but I have an average here of \$23 and that is not very far out. Unless something is done there are going to be a lot more farmers that are going to try to sell out, but I am afraid that right now there are no buyers. A few years ago they could sell, but now they are stuck. They will have to sacrifice.

I will go on to talking about the two-price system that we have heard so much about. It has been promised. Let the Liberals go after the Federal Government and say, "Get the two-price system. Why should we sell cheap wheat to make Canadian bread. Let the rest of Canada help us in that regard." Instead we hear all the other things in the House. They don't even want to spend 40 seconds to introduce students and with the amount of trash and straw that goes through here it is shameful to suggest such a thing.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Thibault: — Where would western agriculture be if we hadn't dealt with the countries not of the same color and belief? I also want to remind them of the resolution passed by the Saskatchewan Wheat Pool. I am a wheat pool member. I hope they pay close attention to it, because there is a real area of communication. This is a big farm organization. Resolution 54, that the Saskatchewan Wheat Pool request the Provincial Government to consider the removal of additional 2-cent tax on farm fuel. Are you going to do it in this Budget? Another one No. 55, that the Provincial Government institute a system of machinery testing. Are you going to do something about it? Last fall it would have been nice to test some of these dryers and give guidance to our people. But AMA was wiped out. Look at the millions of dollars we could have saved on that item alone if we

had had guidance and planning. Resolution 56, that we request the Provincial Government that the rural municipalities arrange a program of roadside spraying and control of weeds. Good! How much maintenance is the Provincial Government giving the municipalities after taxing the farm fuel? They took a lot and returned very little. Now we have another resolution No. 60, that the Saskatchewan Wheat Pool request the Provincial Government to repeal the legislation imposing hospital and medical deterrent fees.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Thibault: — I want to tell you something about deterrent fees. I was very upset last year about the whole question. We had gone for 20 years in this province without deterrent fees at the door of our hospitals. We gave these boys across the way a surplus of \$9 million in the Medicare Hospitalization Fund. They went at it like a bunch of drunken sailors. The doctors had to have a raise in pay — now I am not attacking the doctors that bad, as some needed it. But instead of doing research and finding out where the trouble was, deterrent fees, and the only ones that they hurt is the poor. I hated to see a record of 20 years ruined. Now had the Government put deterrent fees on the doctors there could have been an argument there. But on the hospital it is nothing but a dirty shame.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Thibault: — And you are going to pay for it in Kelvington when you have the courage to go to the people.

I want to say a few words about things that happened closer to home. The village of St. Louis last summer was swimming in the stuff that was coming down from Saskatoon along the river. It was running so low that it ruined many things. Their wells could not draw water. The village ran into quite an expense of over \$5,000 to rectify this situation. I hope that the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Estey) will make good to the village of St. Louis this extra expense that was made unnecessarily. If the Member for Athabasca (Mr. Guy) had thought of looking after his business, as far as the water was concerned, we would not have had the situation in Saskatoon and St. Louis, and perhaps a few other places.

They went into a lot of money and if he has a conscience he will say, “Okay we made a mistake, we will reimburse you. We will pay for your troubles.” I think that is what he should do. As far as the Minister in charge of the Power Corporation (Mr. Grant) we haven’t had another gas connection, and I am now talking in the terms of outlets to villages or towns, since the CCF has left office. The hamlet of Hagen needs natural gas. It can be connected without too much trouble and I hope that they will consider Hagen in the Budget.

February 27, 1969

As far as the Indians are concerned, we have a Bill coming before us in this House and I will say very little about that. But I hope that in the Department there will be Indian representation. I am all in favor of making the Indians part of the scheme of things, part of this world. I don't think that it should be done without consulting them. A few years ago, I was one that voted in favor of giving the Indians the right to vote. The Conservative Government at Ottawa did that also. I maintain that, until we gave these people the right to vote and they could come to the Government and express themselves, the situation on the Indian reserves would never improve. I hope that they will use their right to vote wisely. Just as I tell my students when they ask me, "How should we vote?" I never tell them to vote CCF. That is as true as I am standing here. I tell them to study their political philosophy. Study your Member, study what they stand for, study their programs and then go out and make up your own mind.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Thibault: — I have no doubt in my mind how they are going to vote.

Now, coming back to the Member from Elrose (Mr. Leith) and the question of retarded children, I want to say that I am happy to see one Member on the other side of the House who is interested in this regard. We have a home in my constituency, Mr. and Mrs. Powalinsky who have a retarded child of their own, have built the home. They have spent a lot of their own money and the community has also helped. The school has helped also. Any help in that regard will certainly be appreciated by the community as a whole.

I don't want to take too much time. How long have I got, Mr. Whip? You know I break the rules of the House. I don't write a speech. I go by notes. I would also like to mention a few words about the Port of Churchill. There is one area that I hope the Government will put a little more effort into. When you look at the budget of the Hudson Bay Route Association, it is a budget of \$14,000. It is a very small amount to promote a port like Port Churchill. It is open three months a year and it could be open the year round with the new ice breakers that are available, with the Scott Alexander ice breaker. I was told by the president of the association that the port could be kept open the year round. In 1965 we shipped 24,700,000 bushels of grain through that Port. In 1966, it dropped to 21,817,000. In 1967 it dropped again to 20,639,000. In 1968 it went up to 23 million. But at a time when Port Arthur and Fort William were tied up with strikes, I think that the Port of Churchill could have been pushed a little more. I think, when you can save 10 cents per bushel for every bushel that goes through the Port of Churchill, that a greater effort should be made than just contributing \$750 to the Association. \$14,000 is less than some of these Members have spent in this House to get elected in one constituency. I don't spend very much, I don't have to work very hard as I have a lot of people working for me.

I think this is one area where we should work together with Alberta, which doesn't contribute very much and Manitoba which contributes a little more. The municipalities contribute their memberships and there are a lot of individuals who pay in. But all this money amounts to \$14,000 and a few dollars, to give you the exact figure, \$14,188.08.

There is another thing that can be investigated and that is the freight rates. We have here on the CPR line between Hagen, St. Benedict and Crystal Springs, three stations. For rape seed shipped from Hagen, the freight rate to Vancouver is 27½ cents a hundred weight. At Crystal Springs it is 32½ cents a hundred weight. St. Benedict it is 27½ cents a hundred weight. Why should there be a 5 cent difference in a station that is in between? The result is that Crystal Springs handles no rape at all. It doesn't make sense. The Department of Agriculture could look into this.

You have the same thing on the CNR with the freight rate from Birch Hills, Brancepeth, Kinistino, Melfort and Weldon. They are on 22-cents freight rate except Brancepeth who has 23 cents. The grain is loaded at Birch Hills and goes past Brancepeth. It pays 22 cents and Brancepeth pays 23 cents. There are a lot of discrepancies and here is a place for study. This is what I mean when I say, research.

Let's look into every aspect of agriculture. We hear the Members opposite blaming labor for the high cost of machinery. We've got DBS figures here. I want to tell you I've got five children. Some are going to be in the labor force and some are in the labor force. Some are going to be farmers. By golly I'm not going to teach them to hate one another like some of the boys across the way would like to do.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Thibault: — Then back to the wages that are paid on farm machinery. These are DBS figures, 1966. The cost of labor on farm machinery in wages, 17.2 per cent. And a reduction in the cost of wages from '62 to '65 was minus 18 per cent. It came down instead of going up because the workers are more productive. Yet we would like to create the impression that all the cost of farm machinery is labor, when it is 17 per cent. Let's tell the farmers it is 17 per cent.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Thibault: — As far as taxes are concerned, I want to say a very few words about them. I'm going to tell you that this Government is just simply starving our local governments into forcing the mill rate to go up because it did not keep pace with increased costs. I want to point out that from 1955 to 1964 the mill rate in the Kinistino school unit remained at 29 and 32, 29 rural and 32 urban from 1955 to 1964. In 1964 it went up to 31 and 34;

February 27, 1969

in 1965, 31 and 34; in 1966, 33 rural, 37 urban; in 1967, 38 rural, 35 urban. They had a reassessment and there was an adjustment then. In 1968, 40 mills and 37. Now are you going to tell me that you're not starving these local governments? They have to raise the mill rates. I'm sure the Government welcomes the noise that the school bus grants are going to be taken out. That's another tax cut. Now this is the picture in my constituency. There are a few more but we'll leave them out.

In 1964 we spent \$24 million using round figures on highways; in 1968, \$52 million. If you pay attention you will see that figure more than doubled for highways. Then you take education, \$55,642,000, the increase there went to \$89,734,000. If you were to double the figure like you did in highways, it would have been over \$100 million. And this the local governments would have felt. The same thing applies to municipal affairs, from almost \$7 million up to \$11 million. Had the Government doubled it the municipalities would have got \$14 million. I'm not quarrelling too much with monies spent on highways but when we ask questions on how the money was spent and we've got to spend two hours debating it before the Minister can even give us a half an answer, then I'm beginning to question the Department of Highways.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Thibault: — On one occasion, if you look at Return March 14, 1967, the contract was let out for \$339,014 the final payoff was \$509,358 an increase of \$170,000 that was done outside the contract. This is hard to understand and we will certainly be giving the Department of Highways a pretty close look when it comes up. He'd better be prepared.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Thibault: — Now when we talk about the farmers and the teachers, if you look at the Saskatchewan Economic Review on page 18 — in this one the pages are numbered — if we look at the teachers . . .

An Hon. Member: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Thibault: — That's table 53, the teachers average in Saskatchewan is \$5,413 and the Canadian average is \$5,401. The Saskatchewan teachers have a difference of \$12 amounting to \$1 per month. And what a hullabaloo that's been put on today to try and say "It's the teachers, don't blame us, we are helping the school units." Why don't you be frank about it and tell us you've cut the units so badly that they've got to raise their mill rate.

Then we look at this table, we have the doctors here. We've got a question on the Order Paper. The average doctor in this province is in the highest paid occupation in Canada. So for the doctors in 1965, the average salary was \$25,534; the Canadian

average, \$23,229. I want to say they needed an increase just like I need a sliver in my foot. But they are the buddy-buddies, so what you do?

Well, I think I'm going to wind it up. I could talk about population. If you want me to I could remind you how you provided jobs for our people. I'm going to make it short. I got this information from the Family Allowance accounts. In 1968 — we haven't got December yet — the net loss of families who left Saskatchewan, those who are on the Family Allowance account — that's the working group, not the old people who are retired and haven't got families — was that more than 1,160 families left Saskatchewan than came in. Where are those jobs that you promised the people when you went to them? 80,000 jobs and these are the people that are leaving this province, the cream of the crop is leaving the province. And then when you look at the months, there's only one month that shows an increase in 1968. It is a plus six for that month, you've gained six. The highest loss was in October with a loss of 364 families more that left Saskatchewan than came in. There is a whole table here back to 1961. You can read it anytime you want to. Where are the jobs? Well, I don't expect it to mean anything to you fellows.

I want to say in closing — I'm glad that some of you stayed here and listened to me — I've been in this House for 10 years. I hope I haven't been too rough on the Speaker. He hasn't made me take anything back yet, but maybe before the session is out — I want to thank him for the kindness, he has tolerated me a great deal. I want to remind these boys across the way that last summer you had a Federal election. You know the answer. We had two Liberals that won their seats. One that amused me very much, is Dean Otto Lang, the MP for Saskatoon-Humboldt. He was a good campaigner, he knew how to do it. He would go around shaking hands and somebody would say, "You know this outfit in Regina, boy, that Ross Thatcher . . . put her here boy, I'm right with you."

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Thibault: — I want to tell the Member for Humboldt that he's going to have to 'put her here' if he wants to come back.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Thibault: — None of this sort of half horse and half rabbit . . .

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Thibault: — I'm not going to issue any challenges tonight because we've got an empty seat for a by-election, I'm just ready to go. I want to remind the Government that when it took this office there was money in the funds. I said it spent it like a bunch of . . . All right I won't repeat it, I don't like to indulge

February 27, 1969

in this kind of reproach. But we have had higher municipal taxes, higher school taxes, 10 per cent on farm fuel, plus deterrent fees to kick the poor out of our hospitals and the Government is broke. Mr. Speaker, I cannot support this outfit.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. J. Kowalchuk (Melville): — Mr. Speaker, in rising to speak to this Assembly in the Budget Debate, I wish to first congratulate you on your election to the position of Speaker and on the impartial manner in which you conduct the proceedings in this Chamber. I also want to congratulate Mr. Barnhart on his appointment as Assistant Clerk. I'm sure that he will be a real asset to this Legislature. I also want to congratulate our Leader, Mr. Lloyd, on his very able delivery in this House . . .

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Kowalchuk: — . . . And also the fine job done on this austerity Budget by our financial critic, Allan Blakeney.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Kowalchuk: — Mr. Speaker, when my hon. friend from Kinistino (Mr. Thibault) got up to speak, he informed the House that he was going to break the rules of the House; that he wasn't going to read his speech as other Members do but was going to speak so to speak, from the hip. Mr. Speaker, with notes or without notes, I know that we all are pleasantly pleased to hear our New Democratic Member from Kinistino.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Kowalchuk: — His simple language has a great deal of wisdom. I was interested in the remark that came floating across the Chamber, Mr. Speaker, from an Hon. Member in reply to the Member's statement that he wasn't going to read his speech. This is what I heard, "Because you can't write." Well, Mr. Speaker, I believe that the Hon. Member for Kinistino can write.

Mr. P. Schmeiser (Watrous): — Mr. Speaker, on a point of order regarding that statement . . .

Mr. Kowalchuk: — Whoever it was, Mr. MacLennan from Last Mountain? Fine! He was the man who said, "Because he can't write." But, Mr. Speaker, some of the speeches we heard from the other side of the House suspiciously point out that some of the Members from the other side of the House not only can't write, but they can't read either.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Charlebois: — You're not doing a very good job . . .

Mr. Kowalchuk: — I'll get around to it, Mr. Speaker. This is my first opportunity to speak in the House and I'm very pleased to speak here. I wanted to say something in regard to the remarks made by the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Guy) and I'm sorry he is not in his seat. I may have missed the fact that he may have said that in Melville we are getting the public building. I want to say in regard to the Melville public building what I said last year was this, that the public building would be very welcome in Melville and that the people of Melville would appreciate it very much. I also said that it would be welcome because it centralizes the public work services in the Melville area. That is what I said, Mr. Speaker. I wanted to say this in this House today because last year when I was out of the House one day, the Minister of Public Works stated that the Melville Member of this Legislature didn't really want the public building and didn't really care if it was built or not. Along with the people of Melville, I don't deal in subterfuge, Mr. Speaker, and innuendoes and outright deceit. I want to repeat that we needed the public building, we appreciate it, it is necessary and for the benefit of the Hon. Member for Athabasca (Mr. Guy) I want to set the record straight as to what I had said in this House last year. It certainly wasn't the distorted and untruthful story he related in this House.

Mr. Speaker, last week the Budget was brought down, a \$365 million Budget, the largest ever in this Province's history. The Liberals would have us believe, Mr. Speaker, that this is a responsible Budget. They would have us believe that by imposing the mineral tax on a few companies like the Hudson Bay that they have dealt the rich a mortal blow and have taken up the cudgel for the poor. Mr. Speaker, they are deluding themselves and not the people of Saskatchewan. I want to assure the Provincial Treasurer that the people of Saskatchewan are not that naïve. They readily see through the sham and the subterfuge.

Mr. Speaker, last year's Budget has not been forgotten and won't be forgotten by the people of Saskatchewan. On that Black Friday of March 1, \$35 million of new taxes were imposed upon the people of Saskatchewan when nearly every item one could think of, large and small, was heavily taxed. Mr. Speaker, the important thing to remember is that not one iota of these taxes was removed this year. Mr. Speaker, not only did they tax the people to the tune of \$35 million last year, not only that, but right after these increases they continued to furtively drag in new forms of taxation through the back door by Orders-in-Council. Mr. Speaker, here are some of them: land title fee increases; camping fee increases; farm management, auditors charge \$25; and dozens of other taxes, seemingly unimportant items, Mr. Speaker, but nevertheless they amount to hundreds of thousands of dollars of extra taxation. The last and latest is the discontinuation of the 25 per cent towards the purchase of school

February 27, 1969

buses. Mr. Speaker, this may seem trivial but it means another \$.5 million lost to the school units in the purchase of buses. As to the Minister's remark the other day that this amount will be incorporated in the more equitable grant formula on conveyance, I certainly will be looking to see if the grant for the Melville school unit shall be greater to that extent, if that is at all possible, because, Mr. Speaker, I have to see it to believe it. Adding figures simply means nothing if the total end result is less increases to the school boards and more local tax levies.

Along with the above-mentioned increases, Mr. Speaker, when one considers the \$4 million and some taken out of the Power Corporation dividends instead of some form of power rate reduction to homeowners, when one considers another \$4 and some million taken out of the telephone revenues to bolster the Provincial Treasury to balance a Budget, when one considers the ever-rising costs of the local tax burden — municipal and particularly the school tax levy, when one considers all of these things, you can easily see how the Budget will be balanced in 1969. First, by shifting the tax load total from one poor shoulder to another; secondly, depletion of millions of dollars of reserve funds from every source possible, and third, in cutting out essential services and loading the local taxpayer with the greatest local tax burden ever.

Mr. Speaker, last year when area bargaining legislation for teachers' salaries was being introduced, I repeatedly warned this Government to your right and the people of Saskatchewan that area bargaining wouldn't save us one red penny; that in fact, area bargaining would mean one thing and one thing only — a greater local tax burden, because, Mr. Speaker — and I want to repeat this — because this Liberal Government was not allotting sufficient money for grants to cover the yearly cost increase for education, this including teachers' salaries and the total operation of our schools. Let me read some of the quotations from the remarks I made last year, Mr. Speaker. And I'm quoting:

I only want it known throughout Saskatchewan, to all people, trustees of school boards and ratepayers, that these citizens of Saskatchewan be forewarned that area bargaining is not going to save the ratepayer any money, I would like to repeat this, Mr. Speaker, that bringing in area bargaining is not going to save the ratepayer any money.

Further down I go on to say, Mr. Speaker,

These school boards believe area bargaining is somehow going to make education costs cheaper, that somehow these cost problems are going to diminish with this Bill. I want the people of Saskatchewan to know that this alone, area bargaining, is not going to make education cost less. In fact I predict that it will cost a lot more. The Government to your right, Mr. Speaker, isn't saying a word about this. Why? Because they know this is going to

happen, that in fact this Government if it isn't going to pick up a much bigger tab for education costs, the local people will be asked to raise their local tax level to unprecedented heights. If this Government will not find more money to put into education than it has for the last four years, then local tax levies will continue to skyrocket.

That is what I said, Mr. Speaker, last year in the Budget Debate. And skyrocket they did, Mr. Speaker. In the Melville school unit, the 1969 school tax increase went up by 5 mills; in Canora, 8 mills; and in Meadow Lake, 6 mills. And the picture wasn't much brighter than anywhere else in Saskatchewan. That was last year, Mr. Speaker. From all indications and information that we have received this year, it cannot be much better and in fact I predict that after the teachers' salaries are settled and the sound of strife and fury in teachers' negotiations done and expenditures for next year calculated, the burden of the local taxpayer will in most cases be far greater than 1968. Mr. Speaker, I am going to repeat what I did say last year: that prior to this Liberal Government taking office, the CCF Government of that day provided sufficient grants to cover the yearly school operational cost increases, in many cases the full 100 per cent. I know, Mr. Speaker, that the Members to your right don't like hearing this, but it's the truth and needs to be heard and needs to be repeated.

Mr. T.M. Weatherald (Cannington): — Nonsense!

Mr. Kowalchuk: — Some Hon. Member from the other side says, "Nonsense." This isn't nonsense. These are figures taken out of records and they can be verified anytime, Mr. Speaker. From 1954 to 1964, Mr. Speaker, the Canora school unit had no local tax increase and you've already heard about Kinistino. Not one mill. For the same period the Melville school unit had a one mill increase in 1958, and it was in the latter part of that 10-year period that the Melville unit managed to put away over \$100,000 for expansion building funds that we knew was going to be needed and were planning for it. This situation — predominantly similar to Canora's and Melville's — was right across Saskatchewan. Little or no increases for the 10 years prior to 1964 and then, Mr. Speaker, from 1964 on under the Liberal private enterprise business-like administration, the roof fell in on the local taxpayer.

I realize that the situation is different today, that education costs have been skyrocketing, but the very fact that they were skyrocketing, the fact that for years educationalists and economists had been warning governments of this trend, the storm warnings went unheeded. It's typical, Mr. Speaker, of Liberal strategy. Do nothing until you have to and then do only what you have to. It's the basis of Liberal philosophy to procrastinate, to have commissions, and commissions to study commissions, inquiries to study inquiries, hoping to delay things as much as possible. You want to hear about some of the

February 27, 1969

commissions that we've had lately. They are plentiful and they are costly: B & B Commission, Carter Commission, The Watkins Report, The Batten Commission, The Frazier Report, The Moore Commission. You know, Mr. Speaker, one could go on till midnight listing reports and commissions that were put up in the last number of year. Millions of dollars on commission, Mr. Speaker, mostly a ruse to stall, a ruse to stall and hope that the clamor dies down and so Liberals can continue on their merry way without having done very much.

Mr. Speaker, this Government must face up to its responsibilities in the field of education. They must find ways to alleviate the burden on the local taxpayer. Certain public forms of expenditures can be temporarily halted, but, Mr. Speaker, not education. Education of our youth cannot and must not be curbed or halted. In this second poorer than average year for most of the farmers of Saskatchewan, the operating grant of \$2 million is, Mr. Speaker, I consider, a disgrace. These small farmers and homeowners in my constituency won't forget this, not this year, not next year, and not in Homecoming '71 either, Mr. Speaker. They will not forget it, I assure you. Why should they forget, Mr. Speaker? There are millions of dollars for the pulp mill gambles, millions of dollars for wastage on highways, about \$17 million yearly, including the million or so on the Primrose Path into the Meadow Lake bushland. A contractors' haven, Mr. Speaker. Millions for industrial development incentives, but for the poor farmer and the homeowner, nothing but more taxes. Mr. Speaker, all these subsidies and grants I just mentioned is what we call Socialism for the rich. But free enterprise, hold-the-line grants for the poor, local tax levying skyrocketing to the point of no return for the poor, deterrent fees to heal the sick for the poor, not one cent for scholarships from the Saskatchewan Government for the poor. Yes, Mr. Speaker, free enterprise is very important and necessary to the poor, for they must be free to pay those skyrocketing taxes, they must be free to pay the deterrent fees when they are sick, and they must be free to send their children to school, never mind the scholarships. What irony and how sad, Mr. Speaker.

These Liberals to your right, Mr. Speaker, are so anxious to give away money that they have already distributed some \$1,050,000 to 56 companies for their industrial incentives even prior to the Throne Speech presentation and the Budget. Mr. Speaker, I want to once again sound a note of warning to the Speaker, I want to once again sound a note of warning to the people of Saskatchewan. All school boards prepare yourself for the greatest shock ever. It's quite evident, even though negotiations with teachers are far from over, that the initial offers by these bargaining area specialists, if accepted, are going to increase the local levy by many mills.

I say to this Government and the Minister of Education (Mr. McIsaac) that they must accept full responsibility for this increase. You are the ones who played the tune, you are the ones responsible for paying the piper. I fully expected that this Government would accept this responsibility for offering substantial grant increases. The amount of \$2 million is

absolutely unacceptable, Mr. Speaker. This Government will have to do better.

Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Minister of Education implied in his speech the other day that school boards have been in the habit of being extravagant and wasteful and that they must show more responsibility. And I agree that the greatest care in the spending of the tax dollar should be applied, but, Mr. Speaker, I have been involved in education for many years as a teacher and as a trustee. It would be dishonest for me to say that school boards aren't guilty of some malpractice at one time or another, but very often, Mr. Speaker, through no fault of their own, but often upon the advice of the Department and its officials. In sincerest honesty I really don't believe that boards are deliberately wasteful. In fact, from my experience as a board member of the Melville Unit Board, I want to say that often board members are too tight-fisted and penny-pinching if anything. I think that the Hon. Minister of Education (Mr. McIsaac) would have to agree that the Melville Unit Board is running an efficient and business-like organization. I feel that others in the province are doing just as good a job, if not better.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Kowalchuk: — The Hon. Minister of Education also spoke of comprehensive schools. We, in the Melville area, have worked towards a comprehensive school for over four years and I am sure the Minister would agree that we had done our homework. Nothing was left to chance from student surveys to many of the smallest details. Granted the Department scrutinized the details very carefully and I agree that this is part of the duty of the Department and the Minister. However, Mr. Speaker, I can't help but suggest that a much quicker appraisal should have been made so that the school could have proceeded in its construction sooner. This would certainly have paid dividends in cost reduction of finance and construction.

This of course leads into an area of debentures and sales of debentures. Mr. Speaker, when I asked the Minister a week ago whether this Government was contemplating amendments to The School Act, lifting the eight per cent ceiling on interest rates on sale of school debentures, I wasn't being facetious nor was I trying to be smart. I was deadly serious. The Minister (Mr. McIsaac) and our Board have had discussions on this matter and I am sure much deliberation has taken place since. It is common knowledge, Mr. Speaker, that the interest rates have rocketed upwards instead of the wished-for downward trend.

Well, Mr. Speaker, if the school boards are to get the necessary money to proceed with their building programs, the sale of debentures must be made. It is highly improbable, as we are finding out, nearly impossible to sell these debentures at interest rates of eight per cent or lower. The Local Government Board does not allow the sale of these at a discount, so, Mr. Speaker, the school boards are in a real dilemma. The

February 27, 1969

Melville Boards, who make up the Comprehensive Board have had some success with the sale of the first 10 years of the debentures, but there are simply no buyers for the remaining 10 years at eight per cent. Mr. Speaker, Melville's Comprehensive School isn't the only school affected by this. I know of other school boards in Saskatchewan who are in the same position, and as this year progresses, it does not seem that the situation will improve. Mr. Speaker, the Local Government board still has the final say in interest rates even if the ceiling is removed. Something must be done in a hurry, and I am asking the Minister (Mr. McIsaac) to bend all his energies towards a solution to this problem.

Mr. Speaker, I have only today perused the Education Bill and find that the ceiling of eight per cent is being lifted and I want to say that this is a step in the right direction.

Mr. Speaker, since the majority of the people in the Melville constituency are small farmers and small businessmen, I want to bring to the attention of this Legislature the difficulties these people are in. I want to re-emphasize what I said last year as well:

Neither this Liberal Government in Saskatchewan nor the Liberal Government in Ottawa is really interested in the livelihood and the welfare of these small people.

Has this Government really done anything to help save the small farmer? Has a small farmer really much of a chance to improve his lot through farm loans and others to the point where he has a well-balanced economical unit? Has a laborer earning a fairly decent wage any hope of buying his own home with the National Housing requirement of a yearly income of \$8,000? Has a young man wanting to start farming got any chance through the financial institutions such as the Farm Credit Corporation to start a farming unit of his own? Has a young farmer a chance today to enter the milk business, the dairying business, poultry or hog business under our Federal or Provincial set-up of assistance if he has no cash or possibly he may have some? Mr. Speaker, in any of these cases, the chances are about one in a thousand.

In the Melville constituency out of the 3,000 or so farmers, just a few, the specified few have qualified for this assistance. Mr. Speaker, it's another example of Socialism for the rich and free enterprise for the poor. Mr. Speaker, I maintain that this Liberal Government and the Federal Liberal Government at Ottawa have already passed judgment on the small farmers of Saskatchewan. They have already committed them to the burial grounds of the capitalist corporate philosophy. They are just marking time so that their corporate friends can proceed to take over these small farm holdings, these broken and cleared homesteads made possible by the back-breaking work of those hardy pioneers: many Europeans, the Pole, the Ukrainian, the German in the parkland area, and the Anglo-Saxon on the open prairie of Saskatchewan, all these lands so carefully broken and nurtured by the men who tilled and loved the soil. All this will be handed down to the

land barons, Mr. Speaker, many of them living in foreign lands whose characteristic philosophy is that it is a financial investment and must provide a profit.

Don't scoff, my hon. friends, for that is exactly what is being planned by these Thatcherite free-enterprise Liberals. These independent sector business men that's what they are planning. This, Mr. Speaker, is what is going to kill the smaller communities in Saskatchewan. In the Melville constituency where we still have mostly half section and three-quarter section and some one section farmers, and these are the people who make up the rural community, but, Mr. Speaker, these are also the people responsible for the existence of villages, and towns and even small cities like Melville. You would think, Mr. Speaker, that a section farmer would be encouraged to stay farming. You would think that he would and should be in a position to make a decent living for himself and his family. You would think, Mr. Speaker, that the ultimate goal for this Liberal Government and the Liberal Government at Ottawa would be the preservation of the small family farm. But, Mr. Speaker, from their actions, and better described, from their inactions of their immovable inertia, they have really done nothing. In fact, Mr. Speaker, they have just turned thumbs down on the small farmer. By their silence they are saying, "Get rid of him."

Mr. Speaker, name me just one significant action taken by this Government that really will help to save the small section farmer or half section farmer. Has it introduced the two-price system for wheat, Sir, as it promised? Has it maybe made cash grants to farmers for drying their wheat? Has it said, "We've created cash industrial incentives in Saskatchewan for industry and we'll do the same for you in one form or another." Mr. Speaker, none of these things have been done, and I insist won't be done because it wants the small farmer to disappear. Mr. Speaker, why haven't these Governments come out like the former CCF Government of Saskatchewan to the assistance of the farmer, to make life easier, better and more enjoyable, a farm a better place to build a home and raise a family.

Mr. Speaker, no Government has done more in Saskatchewan to keep the small family farm in operation than the CCF. I want to list these things, Mr. Speaker, accomplishments I call them. The Liberals of that day chuckled in glee when the CCF took on the job of really doing some things for the farm people. Yes, they did. Let me list some of those accomplishments, Mr. Speaker: The power grid in Saskatchewan extending to nearly all farms. Tommy Douglas lit a candle in Saskatchewan that will never be extinguished. They began the grid road system creating roads and arteries to every nook and corner of the province. They began the creation of school units and centralization of our schools, with no need for iron-fisted tactics of the present Liberals. They began the water and sewage programs to make life easier on the farms. They built community hospitals so that a hospital and a doctor were close at hand. Mr. Speaker, what a wonderful array of firsts, what great achievements in helping communities exist and prosper.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Kowalchuk: — The present Government seems bent on destroying rather than building. Mr. Speaker, in answer to the drivel that spewed out of the mouth of the Member for Watrous (Mr. Schmeiser) last week, I say, Sir, it was unbelievable. I couldn't believe that a young man, a modern farmer, could be so far out of step and so far out of tune with the young generation of today. Mr. Speaker, my hon. friend for Turtleford (Mr. Wooff), though in his 70s is at least 50 years ahead of the young Member for Watrous, far ahead in his ideas and in his ideals. I'm sure that, if an eligible young Twiggy had a choice of choosing between these two, she would choose our Bob Wooff for his youthful thinking, if not for his good looks, and I wouldn't be too surprised if comparatively speaking for his virility as well.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Kowalchuk: — This young man from Watrous turned back the clock 30 years and proceeded to say how those evil CCFers were going to take the land away. Mr. Speaker, I want to remind you that events have proved this to be false, that not only was that false, but it was the CCF who guaranteed the individual farmers that no matter how far behind he was in tax arrears he would not lose his homestead. And, Mr. Speaker, in my area where many farmers at that time only owned a quarter of land and couldn't pay their taxes, who hardly made enough to keep body and soul together, this was a God-send.

Yes, Mr. Speaker, that same story of land being taken away by the CCF was very effectively practised by the Liberal politicians of that day. Very effective. Let me just show you an article printed by the Redemmer's Voice of Yorkton and authorized by the Liberal party of that day where in it says, "You will lose your farm, if you will vote CCF." This was printed in Ukrainian. This reminds me of a story back some 20 years ago when I was teaching at a little place called Willowbrook, when a poor little old farmer came into the beer parlor one day to a good friend of mine and said, "You know, I am scared of these CCFers. They will take my farm away." He in turn asked, "What are you scared about? I've got seven quarters and I am not scared." Tell me, Mr. Speaker, in the 20 years of CCF administration, how many farms did the CCF take away? Not only were these farms not taken away, but, as I said before, some protection was legally provided to help save the family farm. But, Mr. Speaker, at that time Liberal propaganda, outright lies, like that quoted above were quite effective in scaring a lot of European voters, the Polish and the Ukrainian, and other people of European peasant stock who had worked their fingers to the bone to get that one quarter of land. They were easily scared, Mr. Speaker, but times have changed I would like to inform you and the Members on the other side of the House. Times have changed, Mr. Speaker. Look at this side of the House and you will see the evidence. No more will those Liberals be able to prod these

pioneering farm people with tales of fear of the CCF or the NDP. No, Mr. Speaker, even their latest union wolf cry isn't going to do it. I will tell you why, Mr. Speaker, because the people of today read, and see and travel and ask questions. They have sons and daughters working all over this country, Mr. Speaker, in the trade unions, in the teaching profession, and above all they don't trust the Liberals. They doubt this Government as they have never doubted anyone before.

I want to say to you, Mr. Speaker, that I agree with the Hon. Member for Watrous (Mr. Schmeiser) that we, the small landowners, are afraid of the takeover of the small family farm, but there we have the parting of the ways. Who we have to fear is not the CCF, nor the NDP, not the New Democratic Youth Movement of Saskatchewan, not these people, Mr. Speaker. But who we have to fear is the Liberal Government and its corporate friends of the private sector. These are the people we should be afraid of. The writing is on the wall plainly for all to see that it's the mortgage companies, the lending institutions, the finance companies whom we have to fear. They are the ones including the Government Farm Credit Corporation who have the stranglehold on the lands of the Saskatchewan farmer, Mr. Speaker. It is these people in far-off plush offices who are going to wind up holding most the lands of our fathers, so that it could be added to the large land barons' holdings. Mr. Speaker, this is going on today and at an accelerating speed, aided and abetted by this Liberal Government in Regina and the Ottawa Government as well.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Kowalchuk: — This Liberal Government that is simply doing nothing to help retain the small family farm, is sitting back and gleefully awaiting the dismemberment and distribution of these pioneer lands to the corporate elite, Mr. Speaker. This steady erosion and exodus of the small farmers must be halted. You've had hundreds of commissions and task forces, spending millions of dollars, as I have stated before, to research other fields of work and industry, but, Mr. Speaker, never has there been set up a task force to study the declining small farm industry on the Prairies. Everybody is aware of it, and everybody fears the steady erosion of small farms and small communities. Everybody senses it and sees the steadily creeping corporate enterprise claws grabbing all the best farming lands in Saskatchewan, shunting the farm population in a steady stream to the cities, often to live in and perpetuate the worst sections of these cities. Most of these people are farmers at heart, with little or no skills or technical knowledge to fit into an economic position so necessary in this high-cost-of-living world of the city. Yes, this Government and the Federal Government do nothing. The small communities are dying off quickly, Mr. Speaker, but that is not the end. The larger towns and even the smaller cities are beginning to deteriorate as well. Someone mentioned the other day that some 20 businesses went out of existence in Meadow Lake in the last five years. The situation in Melville is even worse. The consequences are going to be tragic, nothing

February 27, 1969

can save these, even in a city like Melville except the preservation of the small family farm.

Mr. Speaker, it was reported in the Leader Post that Mr. MacDonald, Minister of Welfare, at a meeting in Elrose pointed to the 1969 Budget as a source of pride of being able to present a balanced Budget. In the next breath, Mr. Speaker, he spouted forth this Government's championship of small farmers, small businessmen and senior citizens by rebate of the estate tax. How inconsistent can he be, Mr. Speaker? The small farmer, the small businessman in my constituency, and particularly the senior citizens have very little to fear from the estate tax. They haven't got that much to fear, Mr. Speaker. The tax load of 1969, this is what they have to fear, the tax load of 1968-69, this Provincial tax load that is being shifted onto their shoulders to balance a Budget, that is really going to hurt them, Mr. Speaker. They want a living for today. That is all they can afford. Through increases in local taxes, cut-backs in services and raiding all surplus funds possible which will have to be replaced when needed — and, Mr. Speaker, needed these funds will be — this Government is operating on a make-shift basis in many fields of utilities and services.

Mr. Speaker, I've listened with a great deal of interest to the speakers from the Government side condemning these university students at the Regina campus, naming them Communists and kooks and everything of that sort. These Liberal speakers have deliberately done this to alienate these young people for political expediency and political expediency only. I don't condone violence and destruction, but I value highly everybody's democratic right to speak and be heard. These young people of this Regina and Saskatoon campus may be kooks but they are part of our society and have a right to be heard. And we as democratic legislators have an obligation to listen. In my estimation, these young people of Saskatchewan have behaved exceedingly well when compared to the turmoil across the whole of this country and the world.

It was ironic, Mr. Speaker, to sit back the other day and listen to virtuous Minister of Welfare (Mr. MacDonald) heap abuse and scorn on these young people, condemning them no end for violence and rightly so if there had been violence. But well do I recall the situation in 1962 when violence reigned and there was not a sound of anger from the Liberal ranks, Mr. Speaker. This violence was conducted not by energetic radical young men and women, but by mature educated men and women. Mr. MacDonald must have been a very poor student in the school of his protege, Msg. Father Athol Murray, who advocated violence and bloodshed on radio and in the street throughout the whole of Saskatchewan, a mature man, Mr. Speaker, a man who is thought to carry the word of God to the people.

Mr. C.P. MacDonald (Minister of Welfare): — On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. I don't mind . . .

An Hon. Member: — Sit down!

Mr. Speaker: — Order, order! Now we are not going to have people telling each other to sit down. It is a well known fact that when a Member rises on a point of order he has to be heard whatever the point is.

Mr. MacDonald: — Mr. Speaker, I certainly do not mind the Member from Melville referring to me or anything that I have said, but to viciously attack an individual who is not in this House and does not have the opportunity to stand on his feet and defend himself, a distinguished member of this province
...

Mr. Speaker: — Order, order! That's not a point of order, that's just a debate.

Mr. Kowalchuk: — May I proceed, Mr. Speaker. To love and honor thy fellowmen and to forgive your enemies, Mr. Speaker.

I recall other people, so-called responsible people, leaders in the community, mayors and alderman who came to this city, and with their leader, the man leading the Saskatchewan Liberals of today, kicked at the door of the Legislature. Violence, Mr. Speaker, kook, punks! Not at all, Mr. Speaker, I am not going to say anymore, but very respectable citizens in this province. Let us not knock the youth of our province too hard, Mr. Speaker. I say, let us sit and listen to them before it is too late.

Another reference to my hon. friend from Milestone in referring to the irresponsible press the other day and sensation-seeking press, and also that hon. gentleman from Rosthern, the Minister of Highways, (Mr. Boldt) who last year was the architectural critic on the construction of comprehensive schools and this year, took on the self-appointed job of being the Liberal press critic. This press critic had the audacity to call these hard-working press people kooks and punks. Mr. Speaker, what about a change for the Government Members opposite.

We recall so vividly, Mr. Speaker, how gleefully the Liberals lapped it up when the situation occurred in 1962, and headlines were carried clear across Canada! How gleefully, how proud of the fact that this news was carried. How commendable they thought the press and the radio and TV were, when word was flashed across the country that "Caesar Thatcher" was kicking in the Saskatchewan Legislature doors and pictures of his doing this was in every paper in the country. That was commendable to the Liberals, they like that kind of propaganda, they like that kind of publicity. Oh, yes, Mr. Speaker, what a divine press and radio and TV it was then. The question is of course whose ox is being gored isn't it? We, on this side of the House, also being human beings, express dissatisfaction with the news media at times, but never, Mr. Speaker, never has the NDP ever made

remarks of the calibre we heard in this session regarding the press and radio coverage. I must commend these people for the impartial news releases that are given most of the time. I do this because I realize the pressure that must be exerted on them at all times, and even a good press release is often criticized, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I agree with our financial critic, Allan Blakeney, that this Government is an old, tired and failing Government. According to the question on the order paper, once again the same ten hospitals are slated for closing. At least the best I can say for the Minister of Health (Mr. Grant) is that the people concerned back home didn't get the bad news via TV and radio. He did inform them and I think he should be congratulated on that one. Mr. Speaker, I still maintain that some of these hospitals like Neudorf have a place in the community, and that for the money spent, it conducts a good service for the people. In my last meeting with the Neudorf Hospital Board, they pointed out that the Minister wasn't at all worried as to what they did with the fairly new building when the hospital closed. He made no suggestions that it be converted to a nursing home as was done in Canora. It's a one story building, in excellent condition and I know that it would provide the necessary accommodation for the many people around Neudorf. No, Mr. Speaker, the only worry this Minister had was where alternative hospital services can be found. Even though Neudorf was quite far from any hospital, including Balcarres and Melville, the decision to close it still stands. As I said before, this hospital closing is just another nail in the coffin of the small dying communities.

Mr. Speaker, I have a number of other things to say, but I think I am going to close by saying that because this Budget has failed the farmer and because it has failed the worker in a crushing burden of taxation, has failed the sick and the poor in the continuation of those vicious deterrent fees, and has failed to lead in the many fields Saskatchewan has led in for so many years, I cannot support this motion but I will support the amendment.

Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

ANNOUNCEMENT

Saskatoon Curling Champions

Mr. W.A. Forsyth (Saskatoon Nutana South): — Mr. Speaker, may I have the indulgence of the House to make what I think is a very important announcement. The Joyce McKee rink of Saskatoon has won the Dominion Curling Championship with a score of 6 to 5. I think we are all very proud of our Saskatchewan representation.

Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. A. Matsalla (Canora): — Mr. Speaker, as my time this evening is limited, I will therefore be short. The 1969 Budget, Sir, is a let-down to the people of Saskatchewan. The Budget is a shrinking document of a shrinking Liberal Government. It contains shrivelled-up ideas drawn up by a Government with an old-time philosophy, the rich come first and what is left goes to the poor, and if there is not enough for the rich, rob the poor.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Matsalla: — The old time philosophy, Sir, revealed its ugly, inhuman head when this Liberal Government took office in 1964. The people of Saskatchewan are realizing very definitely that this Liberal Government is of the same philosophy as that of the old-time Liberals, the old-time Liberals who led our country to severe depressions. The people realize that this Government is not for the good of the common society. Mr. Speaker, the 1968 Budget imposed \$35 million of new and additional taxes, a record year for the highest taxes in the history of this province, this, by a Government that pledged to reduce taxes, and this at a time of great industrial boom as claimed by the disturbed Liberal party. I ask: where are the reduced taxes and what happened to the industrial boom? May I answer. The reduced taxes never came and the industrial boom hallucination suddenly disappeared. Quite typical of Liberal promises. Mr. Speaker, the 1969 Budget will continue collecting the record-breaking increased taxes. The fact that only one tax increase was announced in the Budget doesn't mean that there will not be further tax increases in 1969.

Mr. Speaker, it is my intention to continue my remarks on the subject of local taxation and to deal with other subjects at the next sitting. I therefore beg leave to adjourn this debate.

Debate adjourned.

The Assembly adjourned at 9:58 o'clock p.m.