

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN
Second Session — Sixteenth Legislature
19th Day

Friday, February 28, 1969.

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

WELCOME TO STUDENTS

Mr. E. Whelan (Regina North West): — Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure through you to introduce to all Members of this Legislature, 68 grade eight students from St. Peter school in the constituency of Regina North West. They are seated in the east gallery. Their principal, Harold Ferner and their vice-principal, Ray Petracek are with them. They are a special social studies group that are studying parliamentary procedures. All Members, I am sure, join me in congratulating them for their interest in parliamentary procedures, and I am sure that all Members would join me in expressing the wish that their stay here this afternoon with us will be pleasant and educational.

Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. P. Schmeiser (Watrous): — Mr. Speaker, I would like to introduce to you and through you to this Assembly a group of 50 students from grade eight of Cudworth public school. They are seated in the west gallery and with them are their teachers, Mrs. Diakiu and Mr. Herman, also their bus driver, Walter Diedrick. We wish them an educational and informative afternoon and a safe journey back to Cudworth.

Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. J.A. Pepper (Weyburn): — Mr. Speaker, I would like to introduce to you and through you to the other Members of the Assembly, a group of approximately 45 students from the adult upgrading class from the vocational centre in Weyburn. They are situated, I believe a portion of them, in the Speaker's gallery and the other portion in the east gallery. The grades are the nine and ten students and are accompanied by their teachers, Mrs. Jack Evans, Mr. McKay and Mr. Ed. Woodrow. The other portion of the grade 11 class which is accompanied by their teacher, Mr. Andrew Medwil and I know, Mr. Speaker, that I am speaking for all of you when I say that it is our wish that their visit here today will prove pleasant, educational and profitable. We realize that you, Mr. Speaker, as well as the Wascana girls have played a great part in making it so. I am sure that it is our wish that they have a very pleasant journey home.

Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. W.E. Smishek (Regina North East): — Mr. Speaker, I want to bring to the attention of the Hon. Members of the Legislature that seated also in the west gallery are a group of grade seven and eight students from St. Michael's school which is located in my constituency. They are a group of some 52 students and are accompanied by their

principal, Mr. Reyda and one of their teachers, Mr. Walmeir. Many of us will remember Mr. Walmeir when he played centre for the Saskatchewan Roughriders in the period 1957 to 1967. On behalf of the Members here I want to extend a warm welcome to the students and I trust that their visit here with us this afternoon will be educational and profitable and a pleasant one.

Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

WELCOME TO YELLOW CREEK SOCCER TEAM

Mr. A. Thibault (Kinistino): — Mr. Speaker, this afternoon I take great pleasure in welcoming a fine group of students from the Yellow Creek high school. They are led here by their teacher, Mr. Bennett who came from England a couple of years ago with his wife. His wife is also chaperoning the students today. I want to say that they left Yellow Creek about 5 o'clock this morning and they are right on schedule with their tour. I also want to bring to your attention that in the Speaker's gallery in the front row, we have the Provincial High School Soccer Champions. I want to tell you that Yellow Creek won the soccer championship in 1961 and again in 1968. I think that we have to give credit to the boys who worked so hard, also the principal who coming from England, knew quite a bit about soccer. I also want to read the names of the champions and please stand up as I call their name. First of all, Derwent Mazur, Edward Wojeiehowsky, Daniel Nameth, Larry Nameth, George Madraga, David Kowalchuck, John Gryba, Philip Mansiere, Gerald Swicheniuk, Walter Stefaniuk, Darwin Mazur, Gerald Buzikievich, and Morris Chytk.

Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Thibault: — They are accompanied here today by their bus driver, Andy Lipchuck and assisted by David Kowalchuck. I am sure that the House realizes that when a little village school can go out and capture the Provincial High School Soccer Championship that it takes a great deal of effort. They have a very limited number to draw on and I think that the House should give them a great round of applause for a job well done.

Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Thibault: — I am glad that the House is joining with me today in congratulating them and also that their trip here today will be very educational. They have covered the steel mill, the Museum of Natural History, the Legislative Buildings and they are going to see the RCMP barracks. And with this, I want to wish them also a safe journey home.

Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. D.T. McFarlane (Qu'Appelle-Wolseley): — Mr. Speaker, I want to draw your attention to a fine young group of students in the two top rows of the Speaker's gallery from the hustling hockey centre of Montmartre in the Qu'Appelle-Wolseley constituency. I want to join with other Members who have congratulated the soccer team from Yellow Creek, but suggest to them that if they want to have a real good hockey game to take on those high school boys in the top row. If they can't beat them then the high school girls will.

We wish them a very pleasant trip and a most enjoyable and interesting afternoon.

Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. D.V. Heald (Lumsden): — Mr. Speaker, further to what my colleague, the Minister of Agriculture has said, and further to what the Member for Kinistino has said, on behalf of us on this side of the Chamber, I would like to associate ourselves with everything that he has said in extending the congratulations of everybody in this Legislature and on behalf of the Government and the people of Saskatchewan, to this very fine group of athletes from the Yellow Creek high school who really have excelled themselves and really have performed a notable achievement. I have only been in the Yellow Creek area once before but when I go to a small school like this it takes me back to my own early beginnings of a school about the same size in one of the towns in the southern part of Saskatchewan. I think that one of the things that really makes Saskatchewan the kind of a place that it is, is the kind of people that we have in our rural areas who do excel themselves in all areas of activity, not only in athletics but in scholastics and so on. So I would like to associate the Government and those on this side with the very fitting and eloquent words expressed by the Member for Kinistino (Mr. Thibault).

Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. W.S. Lloyd (Leader of the Opposition): — Mr. Speaker, I want to take just a second to again associate all of us with the Attorney General (Mr. Heald) and the Member from Kinistino (Mr. Thibault) as they welcome and congratulate the soccer team. I am sure that, if this young group of athletes take a look at the Member from Kinistino and the Attorney General and myself, they will realize that we are advocates of physical fitness and are athletes ourselves. I don't know how well any of the Members in this part of the Assembly, Mr. Speaker, would do in booting the ball. If I made a slight slip of the tongue there, some of my colleagues might recognize themselves I think. I most sincerely congratulate our young friends and their teacher and coach who are here. As the Attorney General has said, activities of this kind do help to make Saskatchewan what it is. I know that these kind of activities are greatly valued by the individuals that take part. Certainly they are of great value to the communities from which they come, a source of pride and inspiration and entertainment. We congratulate them and thank them for their effort and wish them well as they continue.

Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

CONGRATULATIONS TO JOYCE MCKEE'S RINK — DOMINION CURLING CHAMPIONSHIP

Mr. R. Romanow (Saskatoon Riversdale): — Mr. Speaker, very briefly last night late in the evening during the course of the sitting of the House, my friend the Member from Saskatoon Nutana South (Mr. Forsyth) announced to the House that Miss Joyce McKee's rink from Saskatoon had won the Dominion Ladies Curling Championship. I think in the light of the fact that we are having congratulations

this afternoon and all Members are not present, I think that this is a singularly important honor. I am sure that all would like to congratulate the winning team this afternoon formally, because I am sure the reputation for the province has been one that will carry us a long, long way. I just want to tell the Premier that, if Saskatoon doesn't produce some of the best politicians, at least it produces all the best curlers.

Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

ADJOURNED DEBATES

Budget Debate

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

Mr. A. Matsalla (Canora): — Mr. Speaker, I would like to on the outset to congratulate the Members on both sides of the House for their contribution to the Budget and Throne Speech Debates.

Prior to adjourning the debate last night, Mr. Speaker, I said that the Budget was a shrinking document of a shrinking Liberal Government. I said that it contains old, shrivelled-up ideas based on the old-time philosophy that the rich come first and what is left is for the poor.

The New Democratic party, Mr. Speaker, believes in a social democracy for the benefit of society as a whole. This would mean that we, the members of the New Democratic party believe in the economic system based on public and private ownership, to provide the greatest production for use and benefit by society. We take the confident position that we can bring this about and maintain our policies in a peaceable way. This, Mr. Speaker, has been made evident through 20 years of CCF Government in the Province of Saskatchewan.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Matsalla: — Twenty years of the best democratic government that Saskatchewan ever had.

Mr. Speaker, the former CCF Social Democratic Government of Saskatchewan was a government that was in tune with the changing times and had the courage to act forthrightly, and a government that believed in what is just and right and in the best interest of humanity.

I cannot help at this time, Sir, but recall the 1962 medicare crisis when the Liberal party of Saskatchewan under the leadership of Mr. Ross Thatcher, now Premier, and the so-called KODs did all in their power — and I mean power — which they were prepared to use to start up a revolution and resort to violence in an attempt to overthrow the CCF Government. I recall that Mr. Thatcher attempted to take the law in his own hands. He kicked the doors of the Legislature displaying force and disrespect for Government authority.

During this crisis, Mr. Speaker, our illustrious Leader,

February 28, 1969

Mr. Woodrow Lloyd, then Premier of Saskatchewan, stood patiently, but firmly and undaunted. He had the sincerity and determination of a great leader. He had the heart-felt concern and tenderness of a great humanitarian.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Matsalla: — Truly, Mr. Speaker, a great man and a great Canadian. I am pleased and proud to be associated with Mr. Lloyd. MacLean's, Canada's national magazine, in its January 4, 1964 issue recognized Mr. Woodrow Lloyd as one of the outstanding Canadians of 1963, as one, quote:

Who helped to move Canada quietly forward in the midst of one of our most turbulent years.

Mr. Speaker, an economic system prevalent in Canada and now in Saskatchewan, under the Liberal Government, is that of capitalism, an economic system that is based on the philosophy of profit rather than service. The laws under a capitalistic system, Sir, are primarily designed to protect capital and those who control capital, but not society. The laws are designed to protect the rich and not the rank and file, the large business corporations and not the small private enterprisers.

When the Premier and the Liberal spokesmen speak of private enterprise, they do not mean the farmer and the small businessman. They mean the big companies, they mean the corporate enterprises. This is their sacred cow and they dare not offend it. They only speak in pretence and hypocrisy when they speak of private enterprise. It is really a smokescreen to cover their true philosophy of corporate enterprise.

Mr. Speaker, I said earlier that the Saskatchewan Liberal party is a capitalistic party, but I might say that by its actions it goes further than that. The medicare crisis of 1962, provoked by the Saskatchewan Liberal party, and Mr. Thatcher kicking the door of the Legislature, leads me to believe that this Liberal party and Government have leanings towards Facism. The indication of force, obvious preparation for violence, disrespect for government authority and an attempt to overthrow the Government of the day is every sign of Facism and dictatorship.

Let us go further than that, Mr. Speaker. Since this Liberal Government took office in 1964 there have been many cases of infringement on human rights and many instances of interference into local government decisions. There was fear cast upon Government employees. There was suppression of thought and speech. There was refusal to disclose government information to the public, and there was the creation of hatred and distrust between farmer-labor groups, between student-teacher university groups, and between teacher-trustee groups.

Once again, Sir, as in the past the Liberals are using the old trick of divide and conquer in order to destroy democratic processes. May I sound a word of caution to this House. The removal of authority from the local government level has tendencies towards strong government control and one-man rule. In my opinion this is dangerous, and if it should continue we can expect being led into a dictatorial Facist government in this province.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to now turn to agriculture, the neglected industry under the Liberal Government. The year 1968 was a bad year for agriculture and the farmers of Saskatchewan. The fact that agriculture is our primary industry, the 1968 crop failure is having far-reaching ill-effects on the small businessman, the worker and the professional man. The small businessman finds himself in a position of drastic reduced sales and in many cases greater extension of credit, both of which could be disastrous to his enterprise. As a matter of fact during the last few years of Liberal Administration, many small businesses had to close their doors due to the economic slowdown. And if the economy continues to sag, more people will be forced out of business. Because of the sagging economy the worker is faced with inadequate wages and in many cases, unemployment.

But in these cases of life, Mr. Speaker, the cost of living continues to rise. Reducing income and increasing costs are dangerous and could end up in calamity. In a dilemma such as this, it is of utmost importance that our greater institutions of government concern themselves with the dire situation and take a positive attitude toward finding answers to the problems.

The farmers of Saskatchewan find themselves today more than ever in the firm grip of the cost-price squeeze. Millions of bushels of damp grain are to be dried, prices are reduced due to poor grades and quotas are low due to lack of markets and inefficiency in Government administration. The New Democratic party called on the Provincial and Federal Governments to immediately bring in grain dryers, to speed up the movement of grain and to make direct cash payments to farmers of up to 10 cents per bushel for drying grain.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to briefly point out to this Legislature the predicament the Saskatchewan grain farmer is in with this year's damp grain harvest. According to Saskatchewan Farm Business Summary, 1967, Extension Report No. 16, July, 1968, the average production costs per grain acre for 1967 was \$21.49. Now if we take the 1968 average yield of wheat in the northeast central part of Saskatchewan at 15 bushels per acre and the price of \$1.01½ per bushel for No. 5 damp, we arrive at a net loss of 41¾ cents per bushel, or in other words the farmer's net loss was at the rate of \$6.26 per acre. With this loss in his farm operations, Mr. Speaker, the farmer is in no position to pay for drying grain. If he takes the emergency loan, I ask: how and when will he be in a position to repay it? Because of the loss in operations, it couldn't be paid out of the 1968 crop and perhaps not out of the next year's crop. It will be necessary for him to recover his losses of this year and other years and at the same time attend to debts he obligated himself for through the purchase of machinery and possibly expansion of his farm unit.

Yes, Mr. Speaker, the Saskatchewan farmer today is in a precarious position. If he is to survive, he must have outside help particularly during this time of distress. It is time that the Liberal Governments at Ottawa and Regina got off their high horse of industrial corporations and get down to more attention in agriculture.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Matsalla: — The Ottawa Liberals say the farmer should look after

himself and sell his own wheat. The Regina Liberals say that farmers don't want and don't need help and that there will be no handouts. When the Governments speak about the farmers in this manner, Mr. Speaker, it is no wonder that Eastern Canada get the wrong impression about the conditions of the agriculture industry here. Thanks to the people of Saskatchewan, who in their wisdom elected six New Democratic Members to Ottawa, the Members repeatedly and untiringly speak loud and in no uncertain terms about the problems of the farmer.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Matsalla: — They, and now along with the great Tommy Douglas, will make it known that the call of the Western farmer is realistic and cannot be passed unnoticed.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to at this point draw the attention of the Legislature to an area of concern in property taxation. It is a recognized fact today that property taxation has reached unbearable proportions. There is an urgent need for a review of property taxation in terms of establishing maximum tax loads property can bear. There is a need that property taxation be more closely related to direct services received.

As time goes on, Sir, it becomes convincingly rational that the education costs should not be paid out of taxes levied on property. Generally speaking, education, although provided at local levels, cannot be construed any longer as a local service of direct local benefit. Today, education benefits reach out far and wide from one area to another, from one province to another, and from one end of the country to another, and even internationally. Education costs should be placed on a broader tax base and become removed from local property taxation. The Provincial and Federal Governments should prepare themselves now to gradually assume a greater financial responsibility in the field of education.

Mr. Speaker, education costs have been rising steadily. I want to remind this House that since 1963 to 1967, local (rural and urban) costs of education through taxation increased by nearly \$20 million. The 1967 local school taxes amounted to over \$66 million. This is a tremendous tax load on property. School taxes in most municipalities have skyrocketed ahead of municipal and other direct service taxes.

Let us examine, Mr. Speaker, the local taxes in a couple of the school units. I would like first of all to take a local school unit in my constituency of Canora. In the Canora school unit, in 1953 when the unit was first organized, the rural mill rate was set at 29 mills. Take note, Mr. Speaker, the mill rate remained at 29 mills until 1964, the year that this Liberal Government took office. The mill rate for 1965 was 32 mills; in 1966, 34 mills; in 1967, 38 mills; and in 1968, 48 mills. No increases during 10 years under the CCF Government, but a total of 17 mills increased during the four years of Liberal Administration.

Let us take a look at the tax mill rates of the Kamsack school unit. For a period of 12 years from 1953 to 1964 during the CCF Government, an overall increase of 4 mills. For a period of four years from 1965 to 1968 under the present Liberal Administration, an overall increase of 10 mills or a rate of 7½ times

greater. It is significant, Sir, that tax increases were made necessary from the year 1964, the year when this spendthrift Liberal Government took office. This Government chose to give less priority towards education and shift the education cost-load into local property owners. In spite of increased Provincial revenues, Government grants towards education have not kept pace with rising education costs. So who takes the brunt, Mr. Speaker? The local taxpayer.

My sympathy, Sir, is with the local taxpayer who really finds himself in a bind trying to meet today's high cost of living. With respect to school taxes I would like to put forward to the Government a consideration whereby local boards could be assisted in their school finances and provide relief to the local taxpayer. The two school units in my constituency of Canora, Canora school unit and the Sturgis school unit, in 1968 spent \$16,000 and \$47,000 respectively on gas purchases for operating their school buses. This would mean consumption of about 40,000 gallons and 120,000 gallons of gasoline for each of the respective units in 1968. The Provincial Government collects 17 cents per gallon tax.

Mr. Speaker, the removal of the 17 cent per gallon tax on gasoline used in school buses could save school boards in these cases from \$6,000 to \$12,000. It would at the same time be a means of lightening the local tax load. Since the operation of school buses is an essential public service, I believe the move to be justifiable.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Matsalla: — I request the Government to entirely remove the Provincial tax on gasoline used in school buses. I want to make it abundantly clear that this proposal is in addition to and not an alternative to increased school grants. I might say that to add to the serious local financial needs, the Government about two weeks ago quietly announced that the 25 per cent grants for the purchase of school buses will be discontinued.

Speaking further on property taxation, Mr. Speaker, I would now like to deal with rural land assessment, with particular reference to areas in the province where land development is taking place. I believe that consideration should be given to deleting or exempting from assessment land that has been cleared and newly broken, and land areas that have been reclaimed through drainage. I would suggest that improvements of these lands be deleted from assessment for a period of three years. If we examine the investment and capital costs involved in these projects, we would find that land clearing, breaking and preparation of new land for the first crop could run into \$40 to \$50 per acre, and that construction of drainage works could run into \$25 to \$50 per acre. Mr. Speaker, anyone having knowledge of and experience in farming practices will agree that, following development of new land through clearing and drainage, there is the risk of no return from investment for at least three years. Crops on newly-broken land require ideal growing conditions and a long season. Because of this, the crops are more subject to drought, rust, excess moisture, and frost. Lands reclaimed through drainage are generally unproductive for several years due to salinity. It would seem fair, Sir, that newly developed farm land should not be subject to increased assessment and taxation during the normal period of non-productivity.

February 28, 1969

Permit me, Mr. Speaker, to examine concessions and incentives the Government of Saskatchewan has been granting and will continue to grant to mining and manufacturing industries. Let us take a look at hardrock mining, a three-year royalty-free period and after three years, royalties to be paid on a sliding scale. There is no maximum on profits.

Now regarding potash mining, the Liberal Government advanced the original guaranteed freeze on rentals per acre from January 1, 1974 until November 1, 1981 to all companies, despite the fact the only two companies had to spend extra millions of dollars researching a method to keep out the Blairmore formation. This act has not resulted in one new mine, or one more ton of potash, or one more job. It has, however, lost \$50 million to the Province's Treasury and the people of Saskatchewan.

Let us examine the sodium sulphate deal. In 1965 the Liberal Government sold sodium sulphate deposits to Alsask for \$22,000. The estimated recoverable deposit is 2,200,000 tons. Hence, the cost of this mineral to the private developer was only one cent a ton. Now what was this industry worth to the Saskatchewan people, Mr. Speaker? With profits running around \$3 a ton, the net take, after royalties, for the private corporation would be \$6,600,000. The \$22,000 paid to the Government by the corporation is .3 per cent, that is, less than one-half per cent of the profit that would have accrued to the Province, if the Alsask development had been done by the Government. Now, Mr. Speaker, is this what the Liberal Government calls a businesslike approach to sound administration, a loss of over \$6½ million. What a deal! It smells!

These, Mr. Speaker, are only some of the generous tax concessions granted to industries. The Budget indicated that the Liberal Government intends to make further concessions and incentives to industries, this time in the form of cash grants. Everything and anything to their big corporate friends, but what about the primary industry in Saskatchewan, what about the farmer? Couldn't the concessions to the development of mining industries be paralleled to the development of new farm land? Surely, Mr. Speaker, in this crucial depressed state, the farming industry should have a break. Surely, the farmer, in making an honest effort to survive the economic pressures by developing new farm land, should be entitled to a bit of a tax concession. I urge the Government to favorably consider changing assessment regulations and procedures to provide for exemption from increased taxation on newly developed farm land for a period of three years. I am convinced that this will create greater fairness in taxation of farm land.

Mr. Speaker, in my remarks this afternoon, I pointed out to this House and the people of Saskatchewan that this Government is out of touch with the people, that it has a wrong conception of priorities, and that the Budget fails to grapple with the problems of the day.

I will not support the main motion, but I will support the amendment.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. D.V. Heald (Attorney General): — Mr. Speaker, I welcome the opportunity to take part in this debate. My first words must be words of congratulation to

my colleague, the Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Steuart), not only for the dynamic delivery of his speech but for the dynamic content of this year's Budget. Budget preparation for 1969 was more detailed and more painstaking than in any year since I have been a Member of the Government. In fact, civil servants who have been with the Government for 25 years or more have told me that this year's Budget preparations were the most penetrating and the most effective in their long experience with the Government. While I am congratulating my colleague, the Provincial Treasurer, Mr. Speaker, I would also like to take a moment to congratulate my colleague, the Minister of Highways (Mr. Boldt) for his very fine 1969 Highways budget.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Heald: — My constituents in the Lumsden constituency are delighted to learn that included in this year's budget is the oiling of No. 35 Highway from Francis to Qu'Appelle, the construction of new No. 54 Highway from No. 11 to Regina Beach, the oiling of the highway from No. 1 junction to Pilot Butte, and the making dust free of the cement plant road northeast of the city of Regina. These and many other things have been needed for some time. As a matter of fact they were needed when the gentlemen who now sit to your left sat on this side of the House, and it is with a great sense of satisfaction and gratitude to my colleague, the Minister of Highways (Mr. Boldt), that I can announce that these programs are going to be carried on this year.

Sir, I have listened with a great deal of interest for the last week or so to the participants in this debate. I have listened with particular interest to the Opposition speakers. After listening to them, after sifting the great quantity of chaff from surprisingly few kernels of truth, after casting aside the clumsy sarcasm, the petty politicking, the picayune nit-picking, yes, the pitiful poetry, if I may say so, one solid fact shines through the fog of subterfuge and evasion and half-truths like a beacon in the night.

Mr. Speaker, what is that fact? It is that the Opposition has been forced to grudgingly concede that this is a good Budget, a performance-of-promises Budget, a Budget that is fitting in size and priorities for Saskatchewan 1969.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Heald: — And because they really believe this, because the last thing they really want to do is talk and vote against this Budget, they have decided to talk about everything but the Budget. And I'm not alone in my opinion in this regard, Mr. Speaker. I would refer Hon. Members to the Moose Jaw Times Herald of Tuesday of this week:

The status quo was appreciated.

And I will only read the first and the last paragraphs. The first paragraph:

If one makes a close and impartial study of Opposition financial critic, Allan Blakeney's main attack on the Budget, the conclusion arrived at is that Mr. Blakeney

actually spent little time on the Budget as such.

An Hon. Member: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Heald: — And then at the end,

There's no question whatever that, despite Mr. Blakeney's criticism in some areas, the Government showed a responsible approach to financing at a time when taxpayers feel relief at nothing more exciting than the status quo.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Heald: — Well, what have the Hon. Members been talking about, Mr. Speaker? They haven't been talking about the Budget, so what have they been talking about? Well, they've talked about damp grain. Now, Mr. Speaker, no one minimizes the very serious position that our farmers are in because of the difficult 1968 crop year, but any objective and fair-minded person will concede that there is a limit to the financial assistance that any Provincial Government can provide in a situation of this kind.

My colleague, the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. McFarlane), has described the programs and activities of his Department to assist our farmers within the capabilities of that Department. Other Ministers of this Government have from time to time announced complementary programs.

Mr. Speaker, I say that this Government has done everything that a Provincial Government could reasonably be expected to do to assist our farmers in coping with a most difficult and costly problem.

Then, the Opposition has again talked about utilization fees. Yes, they've talked about them, ad infinitum, ad nauseam. They don't tell you that the total family cost in Ontario for every family, for every family is over \$300, that the total family cost in Manitoba, for every family, is over \$200, that the most it can cost the most unfortunate family in Saskatchewan is \$252, and that the average for most families in Saskatchewan will be far less than this maximum. They don't tell you the plain, unvarnished truth, Mr. Speaker, that the Saskatchewan plan, with its control of cost-crippling abuses, is the best plan in Canada.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Heald: — Mr. Speaker, politicians are always reminding one another of the grass roots. What are the people at home thinking and saying? And, of course, this is as it should be. The very essence of a vibrant and effective parliamentary democracy is an interested, informed and articulate electorate. And so I thought this afternoon that Hon. Members might be interested in a letter that I received January 27 of this year from a resident of this province. I know this gentleman and I accept full responsibility for the letter, and I would like to quote his views on one or two subjects, and I'm going to quote you on the subject of damp wheat:

Also, about this damp grain, I have never heard one farmer around here say one word about damp grain. That

is all the CCF and Conservatives have to talk about. Why should taxpayers pay out money on an acreage bonus to someone who had no wet or damp grain? I never saw better times than there is now. The farmer's wife drives into town in a new car, husband comes after her with a new truck, and a snowmobile in it. Now in the time when the Conservatives were in, when Bennett was there, we got as low as 14 cents for good wheat. He gave five cents a bushel bonus and there was not enough wheat to feed one hen on 500 acres. I cannot understand why the Liberals do not tell them that eggs were six cents a dozen, butter was cheaper than axel grease. About this drying of wheat, the farmers here went and found the test. The elevator records should show when the wheat was delivered, if it was wet or damp. One farmer bought a dryer here. He would not make enough in the difference in the price if he dried his crop for years.

Now listen to this, this particularly, Mr. Speaker, should be read and re-read and inwardly digested by the Hon. Members opposite:

In 1942, the farmers and the elevator agents looked after it. You know all things cannot be done in a day. The average farmer knows you cannot take a cow to the bull and bring back the calf in your arms. The average farmer has his bins full of wheat, his barns and corrals full of cattle and feed, and most wives are full of babies for the bonus.

An Hon. Member: — That's a lot of bull.

Mr. Heald: —

Just how could times be better. I hope you tell them good when the House opens.

Mr. Speaker, this pioneer citizen of Saskatchewan with the good common sense that is characteristic of our people, I think, should cause us all to count our blessings and to take our woes and misfortunes in our stride and to remind us that after all this is a pretty good place to live, to work, to raise families and to prosper according to the talents given to us by Divine Providence.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Heald: — Mr. Speaker, the gentlemen who sit to your left look out at the world around them through glasses without lens, from a room with windows, surrounded by the prophets of doom and gloom in their midst.

Mr. Speaker, this is a depressing crowd. A bitter crowd. The Member from Cutknife (Mr. Kwasnica), what a bitter young man, the other day. So sad to see a man so young, so bitter. Mr. Speaker, the main purpose in life of the people who sit to your left seems to be to preach calamity and catastrophe, to spread fear and hysteria, to agitate and to foment strife and discord in our society. And why do they do these things? Why do they act in this manner? Well, to me, the answer is, Mr. Speaker, crystal clear. They do these things because they realize that only in this fashion, only if they can make us

February 28, 1969

forget to count our blessings, only if they can shift our focus from the realization that responsible private enterprise, and please note I said, responsible private enterprise, as practised on this continent, has given our people the highest standards of living in the world.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Heald: — Only then will my friends to your left, Sir, have any chance whatsoever of realizing their fondest ambition, their fondest hope. Of course, what is their fondest ambition, what is their fondest hope? Their fondest hope is the Socialist Utopia where the State owns everything, where the Socialist bureaucrat reigns supreme, and in his benevolent wisdom returns to the citizen a small portion of that which he formerly owned.

An Hon. Member: — You don't believe that, Darrel.

Mr. Heald: — Mr. Speaker, I have waited about three months now, all through this sitting of the Legislature and before, for the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Lloyd) or for one single Member of the Opposition, to denounce the resolution passed at the Young New Democrats Convention in Moose Jaw calling for the nationalization of all land in Saskatchewan.

Mr. Speaker, this silent acquiescence, this consent through silence will not be lost on the farmers of Saskatchewan.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Heald: — I challenge you to tell the farmers of Kelvington that you agree with the young section of your party and that you advocate the nationalization of all land in the Province of Saskatchewan.

Mr. A.E. Blakeney (Regina Centre): — I accept the challenge. What's the date?

Mr. Heald: — I am confident the by-election in Kelvington and the next Provincial election will be sooner than you think.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Heald: — You know, Mr. Speaker, for a party that has such a terrible batting average in by-elections, loss of six out of seven, I wouldn't talk too much about by-elections, if I were them.

Mr. Blakeney: — You've never gone down and you've never gone up.

Mr. Heald: — Mr. Speaker, I am confident that the by-election and the next Provincial election will give you your answer loud and clear on this score of nationalization of land.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Heald: — Mr. Speaker, am I being fair to them when I say that they agitate, that they spread fear and hysteria, that they foment strife and discord in our society? Well, let's look at the facts.

I have in my hand a newspaper, not The Carillon — hope you aren't disappointed — but it's called "Confrontations," and it's published apparently by the New Democratic Youth for an Independent Socialist Canada — whatever 'independent Socialist' means. The Member for Touchwood (Mr. Meakes) said he was a Democratic Socialist and he talked about political Socialists but here is a paper put out by the NDY, the youth section of the NDP, for an Independent Socialist Canada. Its date is October/November 1968. It was handed out to the high school students in every high school in Regina a few months ago. It states that over 50,000 copies of the last issue were distributed in unions, at factories, high schools and universities. And then it goes on:

We expect that within two more editions we will be distributing over 100,000 copies.

And what message, Mr. Speaker, does this fine upstanding newspaper have for our grade nine students in Saskatchewan? Well, I'd like to quote from page 6:

The movement,

that's the movement for an Independent Socialist Canada

builds,

it says,

through organization and through education.

And I was very interested to learn what kind of education the NDP advocates for our grade nine students. Well, let's take a look under the heading, 'and through education.'

The following articles are now available at cost from Confrontations publications in Edmonton. They are all short, concise and written in clear English. To obtain them send 20 cents for each title to Confrontations Publication, Box 1044, Edmonton, Alberta.

And what are these subjects that our friends opposite are advocating the grade nine students of the Province of Saskatchewan should be reading: 1. Karl Marx, 2. Ideologies, 3. Social Scientist.

Mr. Guy: — Good old Karl.

Mr. Heald: — 5. African Socialism. African Socialism, the road of development. 6. Student political activism — heard that before, here to stay. 7. Why Vietnam? 8. This is a dandy, civil disobedience, pre-requisite to democracy in a mass society. 9. This is a good one too, a revolutionary strategy for South Africa. Now why in the world would the grade nine students in the school in Regina and in Saskatchewan be interested in the

February 28, 1969

revolutionary strategy for South Africa? What are you doing? Are you organizing a little cell over here that you want people to learn how to revolutionize and organize? 13. Why Socialism? 14. Radical youth and alternatives for action.

An Hon. Member: — How about draught beer?

Mr. Heald: — Well, there it is, Mr. Speaker. What a scintillating portfolio, Mr. Speaker, for our grade nine students extra-curricular reading. Karl Marx, African socialism, civil disobedience, and so on. Is it little wonder, Mr. Speaker, that our people in this province are concerned about the sharp left turn the Members opposite have been making in recent days?

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Heald: — I challenge you to distribute these little 20-cent gems along with your campaign literature in the Kelvington by-election, and I challenge you to distribute them in the next Provincial general election.

An Hon. Member: — You do that. . .

Mr. Heald: — Mr. Speaker, I challenge the Members opposite to vote against this Budget. If they accept my challenge, and I'm sure they will, let us consider for a moment what they will be voting against. 1. They will vote against the rebate of 75 per cent of all estate taxes payable by Saskatchewan residents. Try to explain that to a farmer who owns a section of land and a full line of farm machinery, and maybe some stock, whose estate at today's inflated prices might be valued at \$100, \$150, or \$200 thousand. Try to explain it to his sons and daughters who will be left to wrestle with the problem of where to find the money to save the family farm unit that his parents worked all their life to create. Tell it to the small and medium-sized businessman caught in the same squeeze.

Second, they will be voting against the Municipal Revolving Loan Fund for local governments. Tell that to your reeves and councillors, your school boards, your village, town and city councils.

Third, they will be voting against a separate and new Department of Indian and Metis Affairs with a budget that is large enough to effectively tackle and hopefully solve many of our native problems. Tell that to your Indian citizens on reserves and the Metis citizens all over our province.

These and many more exciting new programs, Mr. Speaker, will be soiled and sullied by your 'nay' vote when the division bells ring.

Mr. Speaker, it is now my privilege and pleasure to report to the Legislature and the people of Saskatchewan on some of the exciting new programs and policies in my Department which, of course, do form an important part of this Budget.

I would like to deal first with the policy changes made last fall in respect to drinking drivers. In common with other provinces, the USA and most other countries, we have for

many years been experiencing substantial increases in motor accidents, and, in particular, traffic fatalities. Everyone involved in government has been much concerned with the slaughter on our highways and all jurisdictions are doing everything in their power to develop new policies and new legislation to meet this challenge.

We, in Saskatchewan, became convinced that the proven relationship between drinking drivers and traffic fatalities required drastic and decisive action. So we acted in two ways. First, effective August 26, 1968, the Highway Traffic Board instituted a policy of imposing minimum licence suspensions of six months for a first offence for impaired driving, and a minimum of 12 months for a first offence for drunken driving, each of these penalties to be doubled for second or subsequent convictions.

And then we did another thing, effective October 1, 1968, the 24-hour suspension law passed at the last session was put into force. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to tell you today, that traffic deaths in Saskatchewan have been reduced by 45 per cent, almost half, since the implementation of these programs. In this regard, I would like to read into the records of this House, a letter I received from Mr. Leonard Bowman, the general manager of the Saskatchewan Safety Council, who clearly evaluates the success of this program. And I quote. This letter is dated January 6, 1969:

With regard to our conversation this date concerning the drop in fatal traffic accidents and traffic fatalities, attached is an extract from our records which I trust will serve your purpose. In keeping our figures we take into consideration those deaths that occur attributable to traffic after a person has lingered for a period of time after the event. In this way we can assess accurately the totals each month, whereas other recordings do not for all the deaths that occur in the actual month. The final highway fatality figure for 1968 shows a substantial 9.2 per cent reduction. From a high of 292 in 1967, deaths attributable to motor vehicles dropped 265, the lowest figure since 1965. This reversal of previous trends is even more significant when it is compared to the average annual increase of 8.66 per cent over the last six years. The net improvement therefore is the combined total of 27 fewer deaths plus the projected increase of 8.66 per cent, if the trend had followed an established pattern, giving a new improvement of 52 less fatalities or a 17.5 per cent improvement over projected figures.

And this last paragraph, Mr. Speaker, I suggest is the most significant, and I quote again:

A significant trend is evident in the fatality figures from August 15, 1968 when the Provincial Government legislation on drinking and driving came into effect. In 1967, 156 people died on our highways between August 15 and the end of the year. This year the number dropped to 86, that is from 156 to 86 for a reduction of almost 45 per cent. This is comparable to the experience in Great Britain and shows the benefits of enlightened legislation in this area.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that our program has been effective because it has combined two measures. One complements the other. The first imposes sanctions on the most seriously impaired drivers, the second imposes less serious sanctions on a larger group of drivers, those drivers who are not impaired enough to be charged with impaired or drunken driving, but who are, nevertheless, still a hazard to other highway users. Mr. Speaker, since October 1, 1968, about 1,400 drivers have had their licences suspended under the 24-hour suspension law. I say that these are 1,400 potential accident causers that have been removed from our roads.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Heald: — And I was a bit distressed to listen one day not long after this program came into effect, I was a bit distressed to hear the Member for Regina North West (Mr. Whelan) rushing onto the radio on a hot-line program and proceeding to condemn the 24-hour suspension law before it had even had a chance to be tried. Well, if he doesn't think it is effective, he's about the only person in the Province of Saskatchewan who doesn't think it's effective. I have a report from the RCMP who credit in very large measure the 24-hour suspension law as being one of the main reasons why we have been able to effectively reduce traffic fatalities in the Province of Saskatchewan. At this time, Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the driving public of Saskatchewan for the wonderful support that they have given to these policies. I would also like to thank the many hundreds of our citizens who have taken the time to write to me personally and to give us their support and encouragement. Mr. Speaker, this improved picture leaves no room for complacency. The death toll for 1968 is still a frightful figure. We will continue this get-tough policy. If new measures are needed to continue the downward trend, the Government is determined to take them. Let me hasten to add that drinking drivers are not the whole picture. Many other programs aimed towards the driver, his vehicle and our highways will be introduced by this Government as we continue to fight the battle against slaughter on our highways.

May I turn now, Mr. Speaker, to another change of policy in my Department that has been inaugurated since the Legislature last met. For some time I have wondered about the wisdom of putting people in jail for common drunkenness. We have always had in our Liquor Act a prohibition against drunkenness. The penalty is usually a fine, and when the fine is not paid, there is a jail alternative. I was surprised to find that in some parts of our province perhaps half or more of those fined went to jail, instead of paying the fine, and when the fine is not paid, there is a jail alternative. I was surprised to find that in some parts of our province perhaps half or more of those fined went to jail, instead of paying the fine and of course they usually went for a period of at least 30 days. I was surprised also at the total number of drunkenness charges in the province. In some of our Provincial jails, Mr. Speaker, over half of the inmates at any given point in time were there for drunkenness only. Think what this was costing the taxpayer of Saskatchewan. Was this policy of locking up drunks doing anybody any good? Surely, Mr. Speaker, a person who is guilty of no offence other than excessive use of alcohol, should not be treated as a criminal. Instead, in the case of chronic drinkers, surely we have to provide treatment and therapy. And so on August 15, 1968, I issued a directive to all law enforcement agencies in the province to refrain from laying charges against persons picked up for common drunkenness. Instead, the police were

instructed to hold these persons until sober and then release them. They were further instructed that, if circumstances indicated a more serious offence such as assault for example, he is to be dealt with for that offence the same as before. At the time of my announcement I indicated this policy would continue for a trial period of several months and would then be evaluated. I now have this evaluation on a three-month basis from the law enforcement agencies of our Province. Without exception the chiefs of police and the RCMP have described the program as being successful and worthy of continuance. On the basis of the figures available to me, I estimate that at least 1,000 persons over a three-month period have been dealt with under this new policy.

What conclusions do the police draw from this program? May I list their conclusions: first of all, we are spared the necessity of drawing up and laying charges; 2. we are spared the bookkeeping entries of convictions; 3. 23 are spared the need to issue warrants of committal when they don't pay the fine; 4. prosecutor's time as a consequence is saved; 5. we are spared the need to call and pay overtime for police witnesses who had to come and give evidence; 6. the problem of handling such prisoners, their feeding and care is drastically reduced; 7. the problem of fine collection where time to pay has been granted by the court has been eliminated; 8. there is a saving in escort's time and expenses incurred for transporting prisoners to the jails in Prince Albert and Regina; lastly of course, there is a marked saving in the cost of keeping persons serving the jail sentences.

It is also clear, Mr. Speaker, that the new policy has not resulted in any significant increase in the number of persons picked up for drunkenness. As a result, I am now prepared to recommend to the Legislature that this policy be continued and accordingly legislation will shortly be placed before you to accomplish this. Furthermore, my officials have initiated discussions with the newly constituted Alcoholism Commission, so that there will be close liaison between the Courts and the Commission to the end that rehabilitative programs in this field can be made more effective.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to say a word about the new Orderly Payment of Debts Program which I announced will become effective on April 1 this year. We have had in this province for many years the Provincial Mediation Board and this Board has done a good job of settling debt payments for debtors and creditors on a voluntary basis. However, there are some cases where the creditor has refused to agree to the settlement proposed by the Mediation Board. The result sometimes is that the debtor loses his job because the creditor garnishees his wages. In some cases this has resulted in undue hardship to the employee and his family. Now this doesn't apply to most creditors but it does apply to some. There are cases where modern high pressure merchandising methods have resulted in people buying beyond their means and then becoming hopelessly and helplessly involved in debt obligations far beyond their ability to pay. In those cases, under the new Act, our Court officials will be instructed to provide a debt counselling service to decide how much per month the debtor can pay as a lump sum for all his debts. So long as he makes this lump sum payment, he will be protected from legal action by his creditors. I confidently expect, Mr. Speaker, that this new program will be successful and popular with our people. It is designed to help

those of our citizens who are over-extended debt-wise to help them pay their debts on an orderly and consistent basis without undue harassment by overly aggressive creditors.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I would like to give you a progress report on the operations of The Criminal Injuries Compensation Act. As you know, this Act was passed at the 1967 session of the Legislature and was brought into force by proclamation on September 1, 1967. It was at that time and still is the only comprehensive plan in operation in Canada. I would like to just quote from the Leader Post of December 5, 1968, an article from Los Angeles where they were having a seminar on criminal compensation and they had there a professor from York University, Toronto, and he said:

Criminal compensation to the innocent victims of crime is provided only in Saskatchewan, which as always is leading the rest of the country in matters of social welfare.

He goes on to say:

Saskatchewan's Criminal Injuries Compensation Act is a real plan.

From this report you will see that Saskatchewan has attracted international as well as Canadian attention with this enlightened piece of Social legislation. Mr. Speaker, in January of this year, I was privileged to accept the invitation of the Faculty of Law, Dalhousie University, Halifax to address their law students on this plan. While I was at Dalhousie, I also participated in a seminar at which I was asked to describe our Legal Aid Plan. I also participated in a one-hour television program over Halifax TV dealing with these two programs of this Government. Without exception, the telephone calls I received on this program were in praise of our programs and the effective way in which we are providing citizen's and consumer protection for the people of Saskatchewan. And incidentally I heard a great deal about the Member from Regina Centre (Mr. Blakeney) when I was at Dalhousie University in Halifax. He is a graduate of that University. They are very concerned about the sharp left turn that he has taken in his ideology since he left there. I indicated to them that his physical health is good, but I wasn't so sure about his ideological health. So, Mr. Speaker, perhaps I may be forgiven if I become a bit weary and a bit incensed about the pious drivel which emanates from those who sit to your left, about consumer protection legislation. . .

An Hon. Member: — You're counting them!

Mr. Heald: — All of them. Mr. Speaker, they sat to your right for 20 years, over here, they sat here for 20 years, and when they were defeated in 1964, they had the poorest record of consumer protection legislation of any province west of the Maritimes.

An Hon. Member: — Who was the Provincial Secretary?

Mr. Heald: — The Criminal Injuries Compensation Board consists of Mr. James Eremko, Q.C. of Nipawin as Chairman, Mrs. Joyce Moxley of Regina, and Mr. Harold Gronerud of Lewvan. The Board,

as of January 31, 1969, had received 37 applications. 18 cases have been heard, 5 awards have been made, and awards in respect of the remaining applications heard are expected shortly.

Of the remaining cases that haven't been heard, many were received late in 1968 and are now in the process of being readied for hearing. The geographical distribution of the applicants might be of interest to Hon. Members. Of the 37 applications, Regina District 7, Saskatoon 10, Moose Jaw-Swift Current 8, Prince Albert 5, Melfort-Nipawin 2, Weyburn-Estevan 3, Yorkton 1, out of province 1, for a total of 37.

You will note the distribution of cases as between Northern and Southern Saskatchewan is about equal. The board has held hearings in Moose Jaw, Saskatoon and Regina. They propose shortly to hold hearings at Yorkton, Prince Albert and Melfort, and they will sit at any other convenient place to accommodate the applicant and his witnesses. I am advised that the first awards are expected to appear, that is they are going to be printed and published in the Saskatchewan Law Review. Some Members may feel that the awards made thus far are in small amounts. I would remind you, however, that the awards have to be related to the facts and circumstances of each case and that it is dangerous to generalize without looking at the facts in each case.

I would here like to publicly pay a most sincere tribute to the members of this Board for the outstanding service that they are providing to their fellow citizens in serving on the Board. Their material rewards of course are very meagre indeed, but may they gain much inner satisfaction from the knowledge that they are the distinguished pioneers in a relatively new and promising area. May I thank them for their service on behalf of all Members of the Legislature and on behalf of the Government and the people of Saskatchewan.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Heald: — Mr. Speaker, time has allowed me to deal with only four of the many on-going programs in the Department for which I have responsibility. I would like to tell you of the outstanding success of many of our other consumer programs; I would like to tell you of new proposals and plans for streamlining and improving the administration of justice in Saskatchewan, but this will have to wait for another day.

Before I close, I would like to pay a most sincere tribute to the officials and staff in the Department of the Provincial Secretary, the Department of the Attorney General and the Highway Traffic Board. Mr. Speaker, we are ploughing new ground, and we are making hard and difficult decisions in each of these Departments as we march along the road to social justice for all our people. I have had at all times the wholehearted co-operation and tireless dedication of everyone who works in these departments, and they have my heartfelt appreciation and gratitude.

Mr. Speaker, because this is a balanced Budget, because its priorities are realistic and reasonable, because it is attuned to the needs and desires of our people, because its passage will make possible exciting new programs, because it will provide roads and other needed facilities for my Lumsden

February 28, 1969

constituents, because it will ensure the preservation of the family farm unit in my constituency, for these and many other reasons, it gives me great pleasure to record my decision to vote for the Budget and against the amendment.

Mr. D.M. McPherson (Regina South West): — Mr. Speaker, there are several things I would like to say before I take part in this debate. First, I would like to welcome to my constituency, the constituency of Regina South West, the Member for Prince Albert Cumberland (Mr. Berezowsky) and also the Member from Shellbrook (Mr. Bowerman). You've chosen a great constituency to live in. You are joining three other gentlemen from that side of the House, the financial critic, the Member for Regina Centre (Mr. Blakeney), the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Lloyd), and the Member from Moose Jaw South (Mr. Davies). Now these are quite the group that you've joined. They all like to live in a great and good progressive constituency and you'll be happy in this constituency.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. McPherson: — I'd just like to say, Mr. Speaker, that in the poll taken prior to the election in 1967, it showed that, if I did run I could get 51 per cent of the vote. When the election came about in 1967, I received 52.4 per cent and the NDP received 36. Now there has been a lot of gloom and doom over this House in the past week or so about how the Liberals were going down and that, if we called an election, it would be really bad. So I called in the Independent Survey again, Mr. Blakeney, and we got a very good result — I paid for it myself I might add, and I'll take full responsibility for it. The increased percentage to myself is two points. It has now gone up to 54 per cent and the NDP has gone down to 34. Now I'd like you to take a look at this. If things are so bad in the Liberal party and in Saskatchewan, I would like to welcome Mr. Blakeney from Regina Centre, the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Lloyd) and the Member for Moose Jaw South (Mr. Davies) to come over and run in the next election and I'll give them a homecoming in 1971. They'll get one. I'll give them one.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. McPherson: — I'd like to say a few words about Moose Jaw. The Premier wasn't in the House the other day to defend himself but the Member for Regina North took off in his usual tirade about the Premier who wasn't doing anything. But I will say this in defence of the Premier — and he doesn't need anyone to defend him — that he is doing more for the city of Moose Jaw than any man could do and we are all sorry that industry is leaving Moose Jaw, every Member in this House. There are good people in Moose Jaw, well respected people, and it is hard to see refineries leave Moose Jaw and people not in work. What are we going to do about it? I think our Premier has done more, he's traipsed across Canada, tired himself out — this is why he is a sick man — for the people of Moose Jaw and he deserves a lot of credit.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. McPherson: — I would suggest

that if Mayor Lewry and the Member from Moose Jaw North (Mr. Snyder) got busy and quit running down the Premier and what he is trying to do, they'd get a little more industry in the city of Moose Jaw.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Baker: — Two new Members?

Mr. McPherson: — And I want to say a little bit about Regina, Henry, and I have a lot of arguments but there is always one or two things. We've got the games coming up in 1971, and I want all the Members, the Minister of Public Health (Mr. Grant) and the Members from Regina to pull together for we want the games here in Regina. Henry mentioned the other day that Saskatoon is getting a little too much. I sort of feel this way too and I want to see the 7,000 athletes come to the city of Regina in 1971. I'm with you one hundred per cent, those that will support it. So we are going to have the games here. I want the Minister of Social Welfare (Mr. MacDonald) to know this: Cy, we want them here and we are going to have them in 1971. Regina is a good city, a city that's growing, not as fast as Saskatoon percentage-wise, but it is growing and we want this great group here and Regina will entertain them properly.

Now a few words about the city that I live in. I just want to take a few words to say a word about the auditorium, because Henry dealt with this at some length the other day. I have a little clipping and a couple of letters here — it's ready to be placed on the table. But the city of Regina asked the Provincial Government to take over the auditorium. Now there's no doubt about this. In May of 1967 there was a letter written by the City Clerk and also it appeared in the Leader Post that the Council Auditorium Committee had recommended that the request be made, the Committee reported. The report was presented to Aldermen George Bothwell and Vince Mathews. Then it all goes down on the recorded vote and guess who votes for it that the Government take it over, the Liberal Government. First on the list, who would you say? Mayor Henry Baker and Alderman Bothwell, the first on the list.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. McPherson: — You see, Henry, you get mixed up a little. Now you got a little mixed up also when you were talking about the financial critic on your side of the House where the money went to. If you recall the NDP were in power at that time, Henry, and little Allan decided to split the money with Saskatoon and your Leader went along with it, so Regina lost the money. So there was a little surplus in 1963 if you will examine the financial statement and that's where your money went. So, the Liberal party doesn't owe you a thing, but you'll have to go back to your good friends on that side of the House.

Now in regard to the SPC I checked the memberships all over the years, and I can't spot one place where Russ Brown or Cass Beggs ever held a Liberal membership. You said the other day that they were the people who were responsible for the Power House being sold. These are the two people that sold the Power House, Henry, and it was at a time when the NDP Government was in. So, Henry, you see there were a lot of things you went

February 28, 1969

on to explain that are just not right. Now, Henry, you can see that you lost the auditorium vote first. You lost the night shopping vote, that was second, and then Henry you lost the moving of the city hall. You know it only takes three strikes and a man is out and there you got your three.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. McPherson: — You know, I want to say about the Member for Regina Centre (Mr. Blakeney) and the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Lloyd) and also the Member for Moose Jaw South (Mr. Davies), they all had big majorities when they did win and I'll give them full credit. But, Henry's majority was only 432 votes and this isn't enough to come over and join Regina South West. So, Henry, you can't come over with the select group. We wouldn't entertain you at all.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. McPherson: — I did mention that more industry had gone to Saskatoon over the year and there is a reason for this. They are selling their land at \$5,700 and we are selling ours at \$9,700, but they did have the advantage of the potash up there and I can't blame it all on the city of Regina. But we do want the gains, I repeat it again and just as a final closing, just so that the Member for Melville (Mr. Kowalchuk) wouldn't think I'd forgotten him, I would just like to say to you — he is not in his seat as usual — he mentioned the land barons, the trust companies and the banks and all the people who were taking over the land, so I took the trouble to check since 1964. The only land that has changed hands in the constituency that he represents has gone from father to son or they have formed into companies. Now this is the only thing that has happened up there. I also found out that the only foreclosure was by a great organization that he speaks so well of, the credit unions up there foreclosing about four farms. Isn't this a great thing. Not one trust company, not one bank, but the credit union went ahead and did it. That's what happened, Mr. Speaker.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to say a few words about industry, something I'm very enthusiastic about and like and as I mentioned before I'd like to see a lot more of it in the city of Regina, a lot more in the Province of Saskatchewan. I believe this is a subject that every Member in this House is interested in. We are all interested in the widening of the tax base in order to reduce taxes. This doesn't matter whether you come from a small municipality or a large municipality. This is so true, Mr. Speaker, and this influx of industry to our province is what will eventually lower the taxes. This afternoon, Mr. Speaker, I would like to outline what is going on in industry today, what has gone on over the past seven years, where I see we are going in the years to come and my own personal recommendation for the coming year. Across Canada as everyone knows there is a virtual industrial explosion. Every city in Canada along with the ten provinces is all out to bring new industries to their particular areas. This is why, Mr. Speaker, every one of us, every one of us in all the departments must be ever alert as we are in a very competitive field. I would like to point out to this Assembly, Mr. Speaker, after studying all the Provincial industrial departments, there is taking place in Canada today a greater romancing of industry than ever happened before.

Firstly, municipal tax concessions up to 10 years are being given to big companies and these are very important, gentlemen. Secondly, outright grants by Provincial governments are being given subject to the size of the industry. Thirdly, roads to plants are being built and paid for by both the Provincial and municipal government. Fourthly, free water and sewer connections plus a supply of water for up to 10 years. Fifth, utility concessions for a number of years tied in with the types of manufacturing that the particular firm is embarking upon. This means the electricity and the gas. Sixth, building and machinery, outright grants. As you can see, Mr. Speaker, Saskatchewan must be ever ready to meet the competition from other governments. We cannot be put at any disadvantage.

This Government since taking office in 1964 has vigorously encouraged private enterprise to invest and establish in the Province of Saskatchewan. This task has been the responsibility of the Department of Trade and Commerce. The records show that this program of researching employment opportunities and promoting the establishment of primary and secondary industry and the expansion of existing industry has been very successful. This business of attracting new industry and new capital to our province is highly competitive and it is necessary that the opportunity for investment in our province is equal to or better than those of our competitors. All of Canada is faced with spiralling inflation, high interest rates and shortage of capital. This makes the job even more difficult. Despite these difficulties, our Government has maintained a steady growth rate in the primary and secondary industry development. Industrialization, Mr. Speaker, and diversification of our basic industry is a must to ensure that this development trend continues.

Our Government proposes to present to the Assembly an Act to encourage the establishment of certain manufacturing industries which could be lost to the province because of incentive grants to industry now offered by other regions in Canada. This Act will be called The Manufacturing Industry Incentive Act. The government has been aware of the disadvantages of the Saskatchewan Government with regard to the education and health tax when compared to its neighboring provinces. Alberta has no sales tax while Manitoba does not levy a sales tax on equipment or machinery used in manufacturing. While the Government is unable to exempt all manufacturing operations from the education and health tax at this time, it does believe that The Manufacturing Industry Incentives Act will be of assistance to those companies considering a Western Canada location and to those industries in Saskatchewan considering significant expansion. That is very important. The Act is intended to apply to new industries and expansions having significant impact on the economy and the development of Saskatchewan as a whole. A large number of employees are requiring a high capital expenditure for assets. The Act is applicable to those industries which meet the above criteria whose operations fit the definition of the manufacturing industries outlined under the Federal Area Development Incentives Act.

Mr. Speaker, the types of industry I would like to point out that could take part of this, first, would be the large multi-million dollar projects such as the forest project plant, a chemical plant or refineries; second, it would be small plants making new products, but employing few people, example, the synthetic industry, potash and chemicals; third, plants with high employment and low capital investments, cut-and-sew

industries are an example of this. The rebate and rule of the education and health tax will be made to those industries which qualify under the regulations. This Act will be administered by the Department of Industry and Commerce. Saskatchewan needs more industry, as I said before, Mr. Speaker. We need more secondary industry in the whole province. I like to look at the steel mill and see the eight secondary industries that have come to supply the steel mill. I like to look at the cement plant and see the six plants that have come to Regina to support Inland Cement. I like to see what is happening in Prince Albert with the pulp mill and also the many secondary industries. I could go on and mention many other industries that are flourishing, but I say that we need the secondary industries. I would sooner see the 10 or 15 moderate secondary plants in operation with 20 or 30 employees than one big one that is seasonal and does not go the year round for the employees. I have just read about the industrial growth of the city of London, Ontario. There are today in the city of London and the surrounding area over 300 plants that have sprung up over the past few years. I believe every Member of this Legislature would like to see even 200 plants in Regina, Saskatoon, Moose Jaw or Prince Albert. In December of 1967, the population of London, Ontario was 191,000 people; the population of Regina at the same stage was 133,000. The net debt at London in December, 1967 was \$204 per capita, the net debt in the city of Regina is \$272. The net debt in London had gone down over the 10 years. This was entirely due to the spreading of the tax base, and this is what I'm recommending and what everyone here, I believe, would like to see.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. McPherson: — The Economic Development of Saskatchewan's natural resources and the progressive buildup of our existing industry to serve industries based on the resources is a continuing task of the Department. This Government since 1964 has carried out an aggressive program of research, study and promotion. In this highly competitive area of industry development, this Government through the Industry Department has been very successful in its prime concern of creating employment opportunities and a good atmosphere that is conducive to the influx of out-of-the-province capital investment. There are few regions in the world that can compare to the Saskatchewan's, so highly endowed with mineral wealth, forest resources, sources of energy, agricultural potential and a promising industrial base. Saskatchewan is a young industrial giant just beginning to stir. We have been striving for a long time to break the bonds of the pessimists and non-believers. Saskatchewan people should be proud of their province. We will never see the dirty 30s here again. There is no place for backward thinking in the new Saskatchewan. Saskatchewan people have the opportunity and the resources to make this province one of the richest in Canada.

In order to understand the industrial developments of Saskatchewan, I believe one must look at the transformation of Saskatchewan's economy over the years with the framework of natural resources, and how it has contributed to the increasing diversification and urbanization of the Province's economy. In Saskatchewan from the turn of the century the economy expanded consistently through colonization and establishment of farming over vast areas, with wheat production being its mainstay. Near total economic dependence on agriculture prevailed in

Saskatchewan up to and during the years of World War II. As late as 1945, agricultural economy accounted for over 75 per cent of the gross value of production. The remainder represented the production of the non-agricultural industries, such as the mining, forestry, manufacturing, construction, all of which representing approximately 25 per cent of Saskatchewan's gross value of production. The manufacturing sector, Mr. Speaker, small as it was, was basically dependent on agriculture. The three leading components of this sector were industries establishing a process, agricultural products, flour milling, meat packing, and dairy products. Other industries were concerned mainly with producing articles of use either directly or indirectly for agriculture. Other developments in the economic field prior to World War II took place in the lignite coal fields of Southern Saskatchewan, base metal mining in the Flin Flon area, brick making and some sodium sulphate production. During the 30s the economy was marked by depression, drought and pestilence, but in the 40s, wheat fields and prices improved to reinstate the prosperity of the province. The postwar period began to see the disportation of agriculture to non-agriculture pursuits to change to its present position of approximately 44 per cent of the economy's gross value of production. Now, Mr. Speaker, I could go on but I would just like to say to sum up that I think we have a great province and I think if we all work together we can get areas like Moose Jaw on the move and I talked about secondary industry; I'm sold on these. I think this is a great thing and one we must all work for. The way that Saskatchewan is growing, I think we are all happy about it. It has grown over the years, it hasn't all been done in one year. It's been done over many years. I'm pleased to see this. I have no hesitation, Mr. Speaker, in supporting this debate and voting against the amendment.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. W.J. Berezowsky (Prince Albert East-Cumberland): — This past week I visited my constituency twice, and during my visit I enjoyed the Annual Prince Albert Winter Festival. I think this has brought fame to my city, as well, the city of the Member for Prince Albert West (Mr. Steuart).

I would like particularly to go on record to thank the people of my constituency for making this festival a success, and more particularly the people of Cumberland House. I think without them we would not have been able to boast about the tremendous affair that was held just recently.

On my second visit which was made possible by the Prince Albert Chamber of Commerce, and I think NorCanAir — and I wish to thank them for that — I joined the citizens of Prince Albert, my constituency and that of the Hon. Provincial Treasurer, in honoring Mr. and Mrs. Steuart, our Provincial Treasurer and his wife, Eunice. I consider that this testimonial to the family is a credit to the sponsors. I would like to tell the people of Saskatchewan that I do hope that we have more functions of this nature. Too often, men and women dedicate themselves to public duty and too often they are forgotten. We don't always agree on matter of politics, but I want to say that I was very happy to be in Prince Albert, to see the people there, to find some very nice people whom I don't see at New Democratic party meetings. As a matter of fact I even enjoyed the kissing that came my way.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Berezowsky: — In my visit to Prince Albert I also heard a great number of complaints about hardships, I heard some on every side, Mr. Premier, from farmers, from businessmen and professional people. I would like to say at this time that my constituents have been very hard hit. We had frost, we have damp grain; in some cases no grain was taken off at all. I find that we have people such as these who phone me and write to me. There is one family and all they have had since harvest to live on is less than \$200. They have been refused help by the office of Social Welfare; they have been refused assistance. They tell me that they have been told that the only way they can get assistance is to begin selling their land. Now I do hope, Mr. Speaker, that this is not a new policy of the Liberal Government to try and get rid of the one-family farms across the northern part of Saskatchewan.

I also heard that the Provincial Treasurer and the Premier have been negotiating for the past two or three days for a sawmill for the North. There is much timber that I know of that has been hauled to the pulp mill, which is too large for the chipping machine and should be utilized in a sawmill. I say a sawmill is desirable, we want it, I hope he succeeds in negotiations. It is badly needed for job opportunities for some of the farmers and their sons, and for other people that live in my city.

But I do hope that the Minister has become aware that he is custodian of the public resources and any deal that he makes must be in the interests not only of the company, but in the interests of the people of Saskatchewan, because, if it is otherwise, then I can only say now, and I'll say it again, that this will be one more nefarious agreement which will be a black blot on the Liberal party that is governing the Province of Saskatchewan.

Mr. Speaker, as we approach the end of this debate, there is little left for any Member to say, that has not been previously said by someone else. However, there are different approaches to a subject, and after I read the Provincial Treasurer's Budget Speech over and over again, I find it difficult for me to congratulate him on that little 'blue book' and the contents thereof. The Provincial Treasurer has boasted of one great achievement — we have heard it a number of times from Members opposite — that is that he has balanced the Budget for the fifth time. I will say this to the Government and to the Provincial Treasurer — yes, you can clap — I can say this, that any public school child with less than grade eight can balance a budget by trimming down the services to the point of anticipated revenues and so balance anticipated revenues. I can only say that this Budget is as unpalatable to the people of Saskatchewan as the flesh of a loon. I hope you know what a loon is.

I suggest to this Government therefore that it is imperative to balance, not so much our Budget, but our failing economy rather than offset a few figures on a sheet of paper, which the Provincial Treasurer calls a Budget for the Province of Saskatchewan, 1969. There is nothing realistic in estimating revenues and then reducing the essential services to agree with each estimated revenue. This is just another attempt, I submit, Mr. Speaker, by this Liberal Government, it is an expert attempt to make a great show of nothing. Why didn't the Provincial Treasurer

confer first of all with the people who know, with the various organizations in the Province of Saskatchewan, his own executives, those who would know the facts, and find out what amounts were really required to meet the Province's needs in health, education and welfare, natural resources, mineral resources, all the departments of Government. No, he didn't do this. It was so much easier to ignore the needs of our people and to come into this House and say, "I have once again balanced the Budget for the fifth time."

This Budget, Mr. Speaker, has nothing for the distressed farm economy and particularly for that part which I represent. It ignores agriculture. Educational costs have been increased, yet this Budget does nothing to bring these costs into perspective. It is not viable. Does not the Minister know that mill rates will have to be increased by an unbearable amount, ranging some places I am sure up to 10 mills? I checked with my Prince Albert school unit when I was back there the other day, and asked them what was the effect of this Budget on the people and the unit in my constituency, Unit No. 56. I have been told by the Secretary the least that they could get by with is an increase of six mills. Then he added, because the Government has discontinued providing grants towards the purchase of buses, this will cost them another ½ to 1 mill so they expect at least seven mills is required.

I am much more than concerned, because our people reached the ultimate of taxation last year when this Government imposed \$40 million of extra taxes on everything. Our people just can't pay any more taxes. I tell you that, and it is true. It is evident that the Premier and this Government are not listening to our warnings or the people's. They just don't believe the facts, no matter how true they are. We get nothing in this House in the debates, but attacks against the Opposition. I believe we spent probably 10 per cent or more of our time hearing from this Government such terms as Communist, Separatists, and whatever it may be, instead of talking about things that are more important. Yes, we have had innuendoes, smears, insults, and the kind of attacks that will not remove the deep and painful problem of impossible taxes imposed on the public since this Government took over.

Ironically the Provincial Treasurer boasts. The other day he boasted, "Oh, we only increased the taxes by \$37 million," as if that was nothing. This \$37 million hurt the people of Saskatchewan, Mr. Speaker, and this year it is \$40 million, not \$37 million, and that is due to inflationary trends as we know. He prides himself on achieving such a goal after having promised substantial reductions to the people of Saskatchewan. I say, Mr. Speaker, that he should hide his face in shame for such a betrayal of public responsibility, public commitment and such a failure in promises, as this Government has made. He and his party pledged himself to reduce taxes. The Premier and his Government should hang their heads in shame as well in committing the Government in further assisting hesitant hothouse industries that we heard about from the Member from Regina South West (Mr. McPherson). They want them to come to Saskatchewan. Apparently they haven't come in the past five years, I don't know why. This Government is prepared to take money that isn't there, or borrow money I presume to try and bring industry to this province. I am not against incentives. The Minister of Mineral Resources (Mr. Cameron) knows that I have said so on different occasions, I believe in incentives at the

proper time, and the proper place. I don't believe in giving incentives to corporations that don't need incentives, such as Gulf Minerals, for example, a subsidiary of Gulf Oil, a billionaire oil corporation. Do such need incentives or do our farmers need incentives or our working people, and our business people?

So I say the Premier — he is not in the House right now — should hang his head in shame too, for suggesting a rebate in estate taxes, mentioned by the Hon. Attorney General (Mr. Heald) just a few minutes ago, suggesting that it was the farmer with \$150,000 that was going to save a great deal. My son doesn't care if I leave him \$150,000, which I shall never leave. He doesn't mind paying \$15, \$16 or \$17 thousand in taxes, he'll still have away over \$100 thousand left. But to give away \$4 million of wealth that belongs to the people of Saskatchewan after it was approved by the Federal Government, I think, is a betrayal of responsibility in this Legislature. Yet, they call this justice. As the Hon. Attorney General said, "We believe in the principles of social justice." I will ask the people of Saskatchewan to tell him and tell the Liberals, whether this is the kind of social justice they believe in. Mr. Speaker, the premier rationalized the other day, admitting that his tax concessions and his incentives have not brought industry in Saskatchewan. I was surprised. He now blames, as he blamed the other day, the estates tax for this failure. He now sheds crocodile tears about high taxes for industry to the point of confiscation by Liberals in Ottawa. Well, they are his own kind. He has no kind words of sympathy for ordinary citizens who are taxed for the profits that industry extracts from them. He forgets how he imposed and confiscated the estates of the widows and children of parents who are mentally ill.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Berezowsky: — The cost of mental care which was provided under the CCF Government, by the public purse, is not being rebated by this Government. It is ready to rebate to the millionaires of this province. What a double-faced argument, Mr. Speaker! If the Provincial Treasurer had included these \$4 millions, mentioned by the Premier, in his Budget, let us see what would have happened. He need not have wiped out certain essential programs and services as he did under this so-called balanced Budget. He would have had an extra \$4 million to work with, and provide, even if it's only \$4 million, to the depressed industry, farming. I can say this to the Government opposite that a backwood marginal farmer in my constituency on a quarter section of land can budget better than this Government is doing. This year we had a loss of crops. I hear farmers telling me that they are not going to buy fertilizer and they are not going to buy sprays, and are not going to buy anything. But knowing farmers as I do — and I am one of them — I know we are going to try and grow crops. We're not going to say to ourselves, just because we haven't got the income, just because it is only \$200 for the year, that we are going to quit farming, because of the size of the Budget. We will use whatever efforts are available to us to see that we can budget enough to produce another crop. We will then hope that something will happen to save us, the farmer. We will continue to farm in a husband-like manner which this Government has refused to do. Similarly may I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that any ordinary businessman — and the

Premier is a businessman, and he could disagree with me, I don't think he would disagree — would use up his surpluses, if he had any or his reserves, or if he didn't have these, he would go to the bank, to the financial institutions and borrow money, but he would not cut down the services in his business to balance a budget of that kind. Yet that's the kind of do-nothing Budget we are supposed to support.

Now the former CCF Government it must be remembered built up substantial surpluses which are still in the little 'blue book.' Some of them the Government has dissipated in the good years for political and wasteful purposes. Now they are as clean as a whistle they tell us. I don't think they are quite that clean. They say that some sound remains. I think there is still some sound there, but even if there isn't, surely the Province of Saskatchewan with all the industry that we have, farming and manufacturing and everything else, should be able to go and borrow \$50 or \$60 million to help our failing economy the same as they borrowed for the pulp mill. Why can't they borrow for the people? Therefore, I take this Government to task for the sins that they have committed. Sins of commission and omission. In an attempt to save its political hide, this Government now plans and proposes, what? Closing hospitals, removing certain essential services and clinics and medical offices. The Departments of Natural Resources and Mineral Resources are being trimmed down. Instead of expanding conservation policies and programs, it is reducing services in parks and elsewhere. This Government has tightened its belt in all branches and departments which affect people. Now, if this was just for economy that would be good, but it is doing it at times that it should not be doing the reverse. The Provincial Treasurer tries to fool the people and he only fools himself, by offering hopes to industry which he hopes may come to this province saying "We will find the money to give you," as the Hon. Member for Regina South West (Mr. McPherson) said, "we'll give you 10 per cent grants if you establish here."

I will say this. I am satisfied from listening to these debates that the Government is broke and the promises and incentives that have been promised are unrealizable. It is only a dream of the Liberal party opposite. That's the only thing left they have to offer the people of Saskatchewan. That's all that's left. Mr. Speaker, I have to say that this is a very bad Budget. From a word here and a phrase there, it is evident that it is also punitive and vengeful. The Minister need not turn red. The Budget Speech was lacking in optimism, we've all said that, and I can say this, that it is the dullest and saddest Budget that I have ever experienced in this House apart, dissected, just ragged hair and bones which the Provincial Treasurer calls a Budget. The body is gone and only the bones and the hair remain. This speech makes it clear, as I said, that it is vengeful. The speech made by the Provincial Treasurer is a vengeful speech, it is a vendetta against individuals, groups and thousands of Saskatchewan people. It indicates that many services will be removed from co-operative clinics in particular. I don't know why they put the word co-operative clinics in there, except it be for that purpose, to single them out in the field of physiotherapy, radiology and laboratory services.

Mr. Speaker, medical clinics have saved the medical insurance plan many tens of thousands of dollars, the Minister knows

it. He knows I speak the truth, because if it were not true I would not argue the point. I find no rational reason for the removal of these services except that it is to punish the community clinics and the people who established those community clinics.

Let me tell the Minister of Public Health (Mr. Grant) that I am a Member of the Prince Albert Community Clinic. I have not seen waste in our clinic. I have seen dedication. As a matter of fact I was one of those who asked our medical director to make a survey of costs and comparisons with other parts of Saskatchewan. If the Minister of Public Health gets these results of this survey — and he can get them, they are not secret — he will find that the clinic is saving the Government substantial amounts of money. He should have given the community clinics a bonus rather than punish them. Yes, why else would I charge this Government with prejudice against community clinics? Let the Minister bring forth any facts that would prove other than what I am saying, let him come out! Let the Minister compare the Annual Report I am talking about, with any clinic or any medical experience in the Province of Saskatchewan. Take the cost per patient, or any other comparison you like. I know that he will arrive at the same conclusions that have been arrived at in different places when you make those kind of comparisons. He will find that the number of patients referred to hospitals is little better than half the Provincial figure. A little better than 50 per cent. The combination of general practitioners and specialists in clinics gives the same results of comparison. Instead of hospitalizing patients, many can obtain therapeutic attention conveniently and expediently at our clinics, thus saving huge hospitalization costs.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Berezowsky: — When I asked our director, Dr. Hjertaas, for comparisons of average patient costs as to Provincial costs, he showed us records in Prince Albert which indicate much lower costs. I am only telling the Minister facts that he should know and which I believe he does know. Why then is he trying to destroy our community clinics and other clinics, as specified in the speech of the Provincial Treasurer? Mr. Speaker, the Government should be encouraging these services, but it has been trying to destroy them as I said, because it is jealous of the community clinic doctors. Or is it because the doctors opposed the Provincial Treasurer in the last Provincial election? It must be so! The Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Steuart) wants to get rid of a worthy opponent before the next election. The last time, Mr. Steuart barely got elected by the seat of his pants. I can tell you at this time, that the next time there will be no pants left. . .

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Berezowsky: — Maybe the Minister's or the Government's vanity produced this edict, and the director and all those who supported the community clinic must be punished by them. Yes, it doesn't matter that the membership is comprised of thousands of Liberals, Conservatives and, New Democratic party members. You have got to punish them all. This is a vendetta.

Now, I can really see how small this Government can be. I can't help but remember how Mrs. Bishop was fired from the

Department, because she dared to stand up against the Liberal candidate in Meadow Lake constituency. Therefore, they had to get rid of her, a woman who dared to stand up against this Government. I want this Government to know that this isn't Soviet Russia, nor is it Hitler's Reichstag. Our clinics were established here democratically and maintained by the dollars and cents of many thousands of people of all political parties. Our people in the community clinics and in private clinics as well have been the recipients of sympathetic and good medical attention. These people know that community clinics are saving millions of dollars for the Saskatchewan Health and Hospital Services. You can't fool them. Our people will not stand idly by and allow this Government or any other Government to destroy these community clinics. Our people won't allow any Government to destroy the Medical Health Services of Saskatchewan, Mr. Speaker. Why? Because the goal of Saskatchewan people is preventive medicine. This is the ultimate goal of community clinics, and should be the ultimate goal of this Government. As I read history, political history I admit, this also has been the goal of some very fine Liberals, such as Dr. Urich, Dr. Dragan, who sat in this House. Let me give you some specific figures why people believe in preventive medicine, particularly in the field of tuberculosis and in the control of diphtheria. In 1924 there were 9,506 cases of diphtheria in Canada and 1,281 deaths from this terrible surge in Canada. By educational campaigns and knowledge and public confrontation, our people were roused and acted wisely by establishing health leagues and immunization programs. We all know this. In 1966, when you look at the Federal statistics, (the Minister can see for himself) we find only 37 cases of diphtheria in Canada and no deaths. No deaths! There is the ultimate success of preventive medicine. A proud record for the Province of Saskatchewan and for the people of Saskatchewan.

Now the story of tuberculosis is equally true. Saskatchewan led Canada in TB prevention and care, and so if I take the figures for 1953, Mr. Speaker, I find for Canada, 1,810 people died of tuberculosis and in Saskatchewan only 87. Well that's not too bad you would say, but because of our program of preventive medicine by 1966, 13 years later, only 669 people died in Canada from tuberculosis and in Saskatchewan only 10. And there again it is a proud record.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Berezowsky: — Now our Prince Albert Community Clinic — I'm a member so I know some of these things — tried to find some effective means of discovering malignant neoplasm or cancer, because we knew that cancer was rampant. Our Board was concerned. Too many people died because diagnosis came too late, Mr. Minister. Members of my own family and personal friends of mine lost the battle of cancer because of late diagnosis. This Government frowns on a program of general diagnosis for cancer, and maybe even for other ailments. At least it so appears to me. I hope not. But the Government knows it can be carried out the same as TB tests or other public diagnosis tests and will be done as soon as you give the signal, Mr. Minister. These clinics would be able to undertake a considerable number of testing of women in particular. I hope you will do something about it to open up the doors a little bit, to prevent this tragic story that I am going to give you. In 1953 the deaths in Canada from cancer

were 19,129, in Saskatchewan 1,031. Compare this later year, 1966, the deaths had increased to 26,848 for Canada and 1,238 in Saskatchewan, Mr. Speaker, nearly a 20 per cent increase. I submit to this House that had this Government acted properly by trying to prevent deaths in this terrible disease area, instead of 20 per cent increase, we could have had some kind of a decrease. It is a sad record indeed when you compare it with these other experiences. So I have to appeal in the strongest language I can use, Mr. Speaker, and I am very serious when I appeal to this Government, for God's sake stop killing or destroying our health facilities for the Saskatchewan people. Make health a priority over deterrents and over highways, open up clinic facilities for diagnostic and other services to the full. Fulfil the dream of a former Minister of Health, whom I mentioned, Dr. Urich. Make the goal of our health program preventive medicine. Let us not forget the people of this province though the Governments have planned reasonably well. They have done well, and I say to you encourage not only community clinics but private clinics, to use facilities, use laboratory facilities, use the equipment that they have installed with the approval of the Government instead of doing what you are doing and removing them from our people. Let not this Government for any reason whatsoever act in a punitive or vengeful manner, but let the Crown co-operate with our people and our medical profession, Mr. Speaker. I am sure that by adopting such methods and such attitudes you will find health costs reduced and available for all members of our society in Saskatchewan, whether they are rich or whether they are poor. Let not the Minister (Mr. Grant) say the cost should go up to everyone because the overall costs have gone up. There are people that are not able to pay these costs, people who may only have made \$200 out of their current farm operations.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Berezowsky: — Now on a less serious matter, the Budget Speech, Mr. Speaker, says nothing about interest rates on loans required by farmers, homebuilders or business people. This is another sore sport. This is one area of dissatisfaction and of much concern at this time, not last year, not the year before but this year. This is an area where private enterprise, as you know, taxes profits, taxes dollars, takes it from hard-working people of our province who want homes and farms. One would think that representations would be made by this Government to the Federal Government for some kind of relief from excessive interest rates. As a matter of fact I would suggest that this Government should ask the Federal Government or do it alone and declare a moratorium to the farmers of the Province of Saskatchewan who instead of paying interest rates out of the cash advances that they use such money for food and clothing for themselves and their children. The Attorney General (Mr. Heald) spoke some time ago about debts and consolidation of debts. He is concerned about debts, I am sure he is concerned because we all should be concerned. But what has this Government done to safe guard the people of this province against high interest and the debts that they owe? Nothing. I again say that I suggest this Government should declare a moratorium.

Out at Tisdale, I have a nephew that works there in the hospital. He told me — and I have every reason to believe that he told the truth — in the last three weeks four businesses have closed down. Four important businesses have closed down,

walked out of Tisdale, one of the best communities in the north. Businessmen in my constituency and those I met the other day in Prince Albert and on other occasions are concerned and worried. Prince Albert is one of the better communities right now because there are some jobs in the pulp mill. Yet machine agents can't collect for farm machinery, merchants can't collect for furniture or whatever else it may be. Farmers can't pay for harvesting and other current expenses. I tell you, Mr. Speaker, that the economy is not only sagging but this Saskatchewan economy is going to hell.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Berezowsky: — Mr. Speaker, let me point out what needs to be done for some of the problems I've mentioned. In addition to jobs right now, our people need other assistance and financial assistance. Our people must have reduced property taxes, and this Government must act in every direction, not tomorrow but now, today!

Now you will recall, Mr. Speaker, that I have every right to ask about these matters because only a few years ago the Premier and his party promised 20,000 jobs for the people of Saskatchewan. Then the Provincial Treasurer went one better and he said, "This will mean an additional 60,000 jobs as a result of encouraging industry, which would create these new jobs." I am quoting him, he said it in this House on February 19, 1964. This Government, Mr. Speaker, has had five years to carry out this promise, but all it has produced is an abundance of high taxes, hard times and an empty Budget for 1969.

It has soaked the taxpayer, it has subsidized and it is going to continue to subsidize, as my good friend from South West Regina (Mr. McPherson) said, their friends from New York and Vancouver. This is a sad record, Mr. Speaker. That is why our people have been leaving the Province of Saskatchewan in large numbers, like the United Empire Loyalists left New England, Mr. Speaker.

We have trained some 500 doctors or more (I haven't got the exact figures so I can stand corrected) in our University. How many have we left in Saskatchewan? I doubt if we have 50 in Saskatchewan. They have gone from this great industrial booming province under the Thatcher Government. Druggists, lawyers, farmers, workers, all are leaving for other parts as the records show. Soon only a few rich industrialists will remain and a few Liberals in this Legislature. And a few imported workers from Quebec or Czechoslovakia. This is under a Government that criticized the CCF for loss of population. I say compare the record of the CCF and you will find that this was not the trend in our days. Today there is a great exodus out of Saskatchewan and let me remind you, Sir, that more teachers have left this province than ever before, actually last year, over 500. This is creating a teacher shortage and a major problem. Why this exodus, Sir? Why are the people leaving Saskatchewan? They shouldn't be leaving, under a Government that has made the kind of promises this Government has made and the kind of things it promised to do. Certainly it must not be keeping its promises or it is not doing the things that it promised to do. What were the promises it made? Here they are — lower taxes. It was to get rid of compulsion and it would have a great industrial expansion in order to get rid of stagnation, according to the

February 28, 1969

Provincial Treasurer some years ago. A Liberal dreamland, everyone would become rich. Yet this, Mr. Speaker, was just an empty promise, and like a soap bubble, empty inside, it burst and the truth came forth. It was seen to be soft-soap propaganda with nothing in it. Too late our citizens realized that our resources were being given away to Liberal friends. Too late they saw their taxes used to subsidize rich corporations. They are doing that now, so our citizens began leaving in great numbers for other climes, unhappy and disillusioned, Mr. Speaker. These are the facts.

I don't want to be unfair to the Government opposite and to say it didn't keep any of its promises. It did. As a matter of fact it kept 50 per cent of its promises. The Members on my side of the House will be surprised to hear this. I recall the Premier (Mr. Thatcher) and the Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Steuart) making promises to industry and these were promises that were kept. Their batting average was 50 per cent. They broke faith with the taxpayers 50 per cent, but they kept faith with business and industry 50 per cent. Let me remind this House, Mr. Speaker, of these other promises and I quote Mr. Steuart again:

We'll grant tax concessions to new industry and mines located in the province and if necessary will give major tax holidays. We'll reduce power and gas rates to levels at least comparable to other provinces. We'll reduce royalties on the natural resources to levels comparable with or if possible lower than other provinces.

This is what was said and it has done it. It has kept that promise, Mr. Speaker, it has done it and it is doing it now at the expense of the taxpayers of the Province of Saskatchewan. Promises it kept to the millionaires, to the value of many millions of dollars. It has given tax holidays to the cement company in Cory municipality and to the pulp mill at Prince Albert. It has reduced royalties by \$50 million to mining companies and given special power and gas rates to industrial plants and the mill by subsidizing the pulp mill. This Government has taken resources that belong to the Saskatchewan people and other Saskatchewan prerogatives of our people and auctioned them off to the first bidder at sacrifice prices. All in the name of industrial development, all in the name of private enterprise. Yes, just like it did with the Wizewood Plant that it stole from the people of Saskatchewan and gave to MacMillan Bloedel at 53 cents on the dollar. And after committing this terrible sin, this same Government is yet denying that there have been giveaways. It will deny that these have been nefarious acts, collusion and secret deals behind closed doors. There is another deal going on to-day for a sawmill. Well, I can tell you this, Mr. Speaker, it is not fooling either the Members on this side of the House or the people of the Province of Saskatchewan. It is fooling itself and it will not be sitting in this House after the next election, believe me, because, and I charge this Government right now, this Premier (Mr. Thatcher), this Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Steuart) and this Liberal party sitting opposite never did intend to honor their election promises. I charge that they did intend to give away the wealth and the resources that belong to the people of this province and the record shows that what I say is true. Take the nefarious deal with a group of business friends of the Provincial Treasurer, who call themselves NorCanAir. Yes, they were kind to me, they flew me up and I appreciate that but one of the gentlemen said, "You are the man that raised all the hell in the Legislature

about NorCanAir.” I said that I wasn’t blaming him, that I was blaming the Government that stooped so low as to take wealth that belonged to the people and gave it away plus millions of cash in addition. It gives them \$250,000 a year minimum, and it won’t even answer our questions when we ask to find out exactly how much it has given. It’s nothing but a retainer, Sir, this money that belongs to the taxpayers and was turned over to the company and which is used to pay for the assets that formerly belonged to the people of Saskatchewan. NorCanAir, as I said, and I say it again, and I stand to be challenged, got the plant and the assets for nothing and we are subsidizing them on top of that. This is what I mean, when I say it has kept promises to the rich at the expense of the people of this province. This Government has distorted right in this Legislature, the facts, it has hidden its secrets, it has falsified intentions, it has taxed the public, it has robbed the Power Corporation Treasury and every other corporation that we have. In every conceivable way it has broken faith with Government responsibility and duty to the Crown, Mr. Speaker.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Berezowsky: — Mr. Speaker, this Provincial Government has been like a porcupine who ravages a living tree by removing the life-giving bark. Such a tree dies and so will the Saskatchewan economy begin to die for want of a nourishing idea or nourishing media. This Government has been fishing for tax money, but it has allowed the big fish to get off the hook. The public pool is dry and no amount of angling will produce the taxes this Government must have, because it opened the dam for the tax-paying fish to flow downstream to New York and other places. Take the case of Canada Cement and I repeat, 10 years at 50 per cent tax free incentive, \$50,000 worth, this is a small fish. The people in and around Saskatoon must pay this \$50,000 for services required by this industry and its employees. And I ask as well did this incentive bring in any other cement plants or other industry? I must remind the Government opposite that this cement company made it very clear — and I said so in the House — that they were coming into Saskatchewan nevertheless because they had good business possibilities here under the CCF. They committed themselves to come here so why the giveaway, just to be friends with the big industrialists, Liberal friends. The Premier (Mr. Thatcher) the other day sadly admitted that for some reason industry had not come to Saskatchewan as the Liberals had hoped. This goes to prove that we were right and he was wrong.

He is also wrong with the pulp mill tax incentives as I will shortly prove to this House. But first I want to tell you the disgraceful story, seeing that I have been talking about these matters, concerning the Prince Albert pulp mill. This dishonorable and disappointing story of tax concession. It is over two years now when an agreement with Parsons and Whittemore was consummated. We all remember that. Members know the terms of this one-sided agreement. This agreement is another matter except that in the negotiations with the company, the Premier and Provincial Treasurer promised, as their party suggested, tax concessions. But because they couldn’t give the tax concessions and fearing to bring the appropriate Bill before this House, as they should have done, they got in touch with the then Mayor of Prince Albert City, Mr. Barsky. In spite of the fact that the pulp mill was located in the RM of Buckland

490, some 12 miles out of the city limits, the city fathers sat down in January two years ago and introduced a bylaw to remove taxes for the pulp mill. This, Mr. Speaker, was an illegal Act and not provided for under any statute of the Province of Saskatchewan. It would be just the same as if Mayor Henry and his council passed a bylaw to relieve the Besborough Hotel from paying taxes to the CPR. No jurisdiction, illegal in every way, yet that's what the Prince Albert city council was doing. On third reading, in February, they discovered their booboo and so phones began ringing between the Mayor's and the Premier's offices and the Provincial Treasurer's office. The bylaw by the Prince Albert city council had been passed. It was ultra vires, it was out of jurisdiction. So Mr. Steuart was disturbed. The Premier was mad, Mr. Barsky was ashamed. Something had to be done. Why not pass an Order-in-Council? After all we have a good Attorney General (Mr. Heald) who knows the law. Why not take what is black and make it look white? So the Government passed an Order-in-Council. It said that the bylaw was legal and added 12 miles of bushland in my constituency just to the outer edge of the pulp mill to the city of Prince Albert. They made everything legal. Yes, Buckland and Prince Albert school unit No. 56 lost millions of dollars of potential taxes. The city of Prince Albert lost because they conceded taxes. Parsons and Whittemore were the winners and then the Provincial Treasurer and the Premier jumped in glee at this smart trick. Ignominiously conceived as it was, I am wondering if some city burgess — and I could ask the Attorney General (Mr. Heald) — could not take this matter to court even now, or conversely if the city decided to tax the pulp mill at this time whether that bylaw would stand up.

Mr. Heald (Attorney General): — See me, we'll talk about it.

Mr. Berezowsky: — Yes, I may do that. But that legality is not for me, I am not a taxpayer of the city, I am just a Member there. I am throwing it open for the people and maybe someone in the city of Prince Albert will go to the trouble of investigating. It may be a very good idea.

Now since the Hon. Member from Regina South West (Mr. McPherson) knows about all the money this Government is going to give away to industry, Mr. Speaker, I want to suggest something that is fair and decent for this Government to do. Let us start returning some of this money that it has hidden in its cupboards to the city of Prince Albert, which is a depressed city as you know. The Dominion Government admitted that it had given the pulp mill \$10 million in grants, not to the city, but it gave it to the pulp mill. Why? Because it is a depressed area, right? And you have given \$1.5 million, all right. The city of Prince Albert requires at least \$2 million for public works to meet current needs for sidewalks and streets. The Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Steuart) said we have mud and huts in the city of Prince Albert and in other parts of Saskatchewan, Prince Albert needs \$2 million to bring its public works to a point of some decency. We also need a vocational school there which is to be built. I have all the facts here. I could talk for two or three hours, if you like, reading you what has been said in the past by the various Ministers about building a school at Prince Albert. It was two years ago, wasn't it, to cost \$8 million. The Government at Ottawa and the Province would pay a total of 75 per cent. So the city needs \$2 million for that school, they haven't got the money and the Local Government Board won't approve a

loan for \$2 million because this city hasn't got that kind of economic background. If the taxes for the pulp mill had not been conceded, as they were by you people, they would have been able to build either the school or the public works. Obviously it is because of the policies of this Government, Mr. Speaker, that this community of Prince Albert is in no shape to undertake these projects in spite of the fact they have a very fine Liberal mayor and a lot of Liberals on the council. They just can't do it, they haven't got the resources. You've stolen the tax resources from them. Yes, I know there has been much waste in Prince Albert in some of the public projects. I don't need to talk about that. I know real estate people are making a pretty good business out of some things that go on there. But let's remember this, Mr. Premier — though you are not in the House, you can read my speech when you get back — that the city is in a depressed area. There is no doubt about that. And if the Minister says that we have shacks and muddy streets, let us note they are all in Prince Albert, in the Minister's constituency. Does he begrudge these people good schools, hospitals and streets? He said he does. I suggest that because we have good hospitals and good schools, let's have some good streets as well and let's have a vocational school that will serve all the northern area. You gave \$1.5 million to the pulp mill so how about providing in your Budget some special assistance to pay for the cost of either one of those projects, \$2 million to the vocational school in addition to the grant and have it built, or give the city \$2 million for public works. We can't go into debt — no money, he says.

An Hon. Member: — A balanced Budget looks good.

Mr. Berezowsky: — I know you can't do it on a balanced Budget and as a result of Government policy, areas were opened up for housing in the city to staff the employees of the mill. It is a result of Government policy that the city had to grow, but the money wasn't there to provide the services. I think it is your duty as a Government to see that these cities do obtain these services. Let me tell you this that, when the pulp mill needed a highway from the bridge, a distance of 12 miles, you, the Government paid 100 per cent for that highway. Why can't you do as much for the streets for the same people? Lame excuses, you spent your money not the city's money. I don't like to say that the Provincial Treasurer — he's a fine gentleman, and tells very good jokes and I enjoyed him the other day — but I say this, that, if he doesn't do something, then he has failed to serve his city in spite of the testimonial. Somebody must speak up for Prince Albert and I am doing it now.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Berezowsky: — There he comes, my good friend from Prince Albert West (Mr. Steuart), I'm sure he doesn't mind what I said. He's going to find the money somehow.

Mr. Steuart: — But I've learned a lot.

Mr. Berezowsky: — About subsidies and assistance for community projects. It's not new, Mr. Provincial Treasurer, and you can tell that to the Premier. Our CCF Government when it saw the need built

dozens of schools in Northern Saskatchewan because of a depressed economy and where it was necessary. Even in Athabasca, in La Ronge, structures were built by the Government, and other schools as well, and hospitals by the people of Saskatchewan because these were depressed areas. The CCF built schools at Meath Park, Weirdale and at McDowell, at Hudson Bay and other points where such action was essential for the purposes of education and health, even at Meadow Lake. We the CCF pointed out the way for you and I urge this Liberal Government to build that vocational \$8 million school in Prince Albert. I don't care if it is in West Prince Albert, East Prince Albert. It should be at Government cost and thus relieve the city fathers from tremendous worry and the city people from fleeing that community. It will be burden enough believe me to maintain such an establishment, but somehow the people in the city and we in the country will join together to see that it is properly maintained. You do what I told you to do and we will co-operate. I say this because I have talked to other people in my constituency outside of the city and they feel the same way about this matter as I do. The Department of Indian Affairs — I think the Government knows this — will also assist. If it will help, I will say that the proposed school is in the same category as the base hospital in Saskatoon and the one that some day the CCF will build in Regina. Such a vocational school will serve a large part of the Northern area of Saskatchewan. If we don't get it built now we may lose the Federal grant and there will be no school at all. Mr. Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Steuart), I think the people who honored you would like you to do something about this particular matter. I am glad you are nodding your head and agree. I repeat, which will it be, Mr. Provincial Treasurer, \$2 million for public works, or \$2 million for a school? Either one doesn't matter, it's up to you to decide.

Now this will mean deficit financing. I don't know why my Hon. Members opposite are so scared of deficit financing. As a farmer I am not afraid of deficit financing. Some day after I die the Government will probably take my land or the mortgage company will take my land, but I'm not worried about that. There has to be farm production, so they'll keep me on the land even if they do soak me interest every year. Prime Minister Diefenbaker wasn't scared. He had some deficit financing in Ottawa and he has gone into history as a great Canadian. Even the Premier honored him in this House as a great Canadian because of his deficit financing policy. What about the Premier of this House and the Provincial Treasurer? Would they dare to take up this challenge and get into the history books of this Province of Saskatchewan. There are many things the Government can do, they can provide contracts, they can provide jobs, they can provide real incentives for people to undertake various capital works. For example, let us build the overdue powerline to Candle Lake. I understand from a friend that works for the Power Corporation that you have shifted that once more. It is supposed to be built this year and now you have decided to make it next year. It's always next year with the Liberals. You had five years to bring power there. We should have had it the next year after the election had we stayed as a Government, but we lost out and you cut out the project. We need a high school at Cumberland House, we need another high school in Creighton, the school that was stolen from us by the Premier of this Province. Remember when he had the delegation of children there. I don't want to go into that because I'll be taking up too much time. The Premier knows the story. Let us get moving on the project at Jan Lake, Mr. Speaker. As I have said our

people need jobs, they need money for food, clothing and rent. It doesn't matter if they are farmers, trappers, businessmen or teachers. They all want our economy to move ahead and we want the economy to move forward. If you budget for a deficit budget, we will be with you for the sake of the people of Saskatchewan.

You can see, Mr. Speaker, that I am trying very hard to get this Government to move in the right direction, but then I really don't expect to be too successful because they like to stay put, being Liberals, and to keep on repeating their principles of do-nothing Liberal enterprise, unless it is politically expedient. I hope then that the Prince Albert deal is politically expedient, maybe they will make a slight move in the direction of progress and maybe in that way we will get a school. The Premier has told us that he doesn't believe in Santa Claus, he has told other people that he doesn't believe in Santa Claus or in Socialist programs or policies. He opposes subsidies, assistance grants and such for the little guy but for the millionaires that is different. He can find \$4 million for the Kramers and the Berrys, and he can be Santa Claus to McMillan-Bloedell, a Santa Claus for potash and mining companies — \$5 million, \$10 million or \$100 million, so what? — to be the kind of Santa Claus that he likes to be that opens the doors for the Premier and his associates. So you see I hardly can expect my suggestions will be even considered, Mr. Speaker.

Now in spite of the farm distress and the lack of money for teachers and education generally, in spite of the fact that hard lines have been laid out for health and welfare expenditures by this Government, it still tries to be a Santa Clause as the Member who spoke from South West Regina (Mr. McPherson) told us. I am reminding you, Sir, because I think that you are wrong. The Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Steuart) or the Minister of Mineral Resources (Mr. Cameron) stated that the Government will appropriate funds to help Gulf Minerals to drill another hole. \$25,000 will be contributed. I have already mentioned who this company is. They will get some information of the Sandstone Basement as if the company couldn't drill their own hole to find out what lies there. Why give them \$25,000? They need it as much as any one needs a hole in his head.

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

Mr. Berezowsky: — My two holes are better than your fool blockhead. One would think that with a high grade discovery of .60 per cent of uranium over a length of 190 feet, that Gulf Minerals would be in the making. Of course, as a subsidiary of Gulf Oil, it is a multi-millionaire corporation and hardly needs \$25,000 for further exploration. In particular in spite of our economy, the Government didn't have to show Gulf Minerals that particular kind of friendship. Who knows but the boys opposite might even become directors of the company some day when they are chased out of this Legislature.

Let's take a look at this Gulf Minerals and see what happened. The find was announced where? At a Liberal convention. I am told that my Liberal friends opposite left the convention — that's why so few of them voted — and they all ran down to the stock exchange to buy stock, about all the shares that they could get with the money they had. Obviously the venture paid off.

Hon. D.V. Heald (Attorney General): — I didn't. . .

Mr. Berezowsky: — I don't think you did it. You are too fine a gentleman. You didn't need it but some of the boys did, so I was told, anyway. Obviously the venture must have paid off handsomely because the shares rose substantially after the Premier's promotion speech got into the press. Now I don't mind what the Premier says, but I don't like this kind of promotion. It is the same kind of promotion that we had when Mr. Winters came into this province and the Premier went out to Prince Albert and announced the first base metal mine. My hon. friend from Athabasca (Mr. Guy) said in the House, "Well you would have liked to have bought some at 11 cents too." I haven't bought any to date. You can buy them at 11 cents or you can buy them at \$3, but I don't give a darn. But this is not the way to look after the public business, to go out to a party convention and announce something that maybe isn't there. Our people will take their last dollar that should be used paying for something else and, trusting the Premier's words that he has some goodies, they may spend this money on stocks and shares. I am not against buying stocks and shares.

Mr. Guy: — You are hoping it isn't there.

Mr. Berezowsky: — That's nonsense.

Mr. Guy: — You always do. . .

Mr. Berezowsky: — I am sure that the Hon. Member for Athabasca did quite well when he bought shares at 11 cents and he admitted that he bought them. I could have bought them too, but I didn't for the sake of my people.

Mr. Guy: — Why didn't you?

Mr. Berezowsky: — When my people asked me if I had shares I said, "No. I don't speculate." I am all for the success of mining companies and I think I have proven that. I haven't talked like the Athabasca Member who just talks and talks and opens his mouth. I have gone into the North and tried to find a mine for Saskatchewan, which he hasn't done. I know more about mining than you do, Sir, from Athabasca. I can tell you about Garry Lake at Athabasca. I know they have silver and silver ore and I hope that they have success. I can tell you about the province because I have been around and you haven't. All you do is sit in Regina and you don't care for your people. I don't believe that any Premier or any Cabinet Minister should get up in any place before it is a proven fact and promote stock. If you don't agree with me, fine, you don't have to. These are my principles. If you don't agree, fine, Mr. Member from Athabasca.

I want to ask the Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Steuart) a few things about his Budget. He says that a balanced Budget is so important. Is that a Government's final and ultimate responsibility, I ask you, Sir? Is it not necessary at times to budget for a deficit to counteract a recession or lost income? If the private sector cannot provide the capital to correct our agricultural situation today, or any other bad situation, is it not up to the Government to provide the necessary flow of capital,

even if it has to borrow the money to get the economy moving ahead? I would like, when you conclude this debate, to answer some of these questions that I have asked and to let the people of Saskatchewan know just where you stand on these matters.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Berezowsky: — The Minister of Labour (Mr. Coderre) said the other day that we should co-operate with the Government and Cabinet. I think we do. Liberals say they subscribe to higher wages. We do too. This should not be at the expense of farmers and other underprivileged citizens who can no longer pay the shot. I think, as we proceed through a transition from a Liberal capitalistic society to an automated and interdependent society, that governments must protect and secure these first producers of wealth as well as take some responsibility to hold the line when the economy totters. It has a duty, this Government, to control our economic life without interfering unduly with human initiative and ambition when standards of life are endangered. I can tell you gentlemen that my taxpayers are asking for a halt to salary increases for highly paid executives and company agents. Also, I can add that the taxpayer is ready to blow his top — and I have said it in my own caucus — and strike against further exorbitant increases whether it is in taxes locally or by this Government. And taxes locally have to go up with this kind of a Budget.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Berezowsky: — It is so tragic and sad, Mr. Premier — I am glad that you are back — that there are Members sitting with you who don't comprehend the causes of poverty, distress and hardship in our society. You and your friends continually devalue our Canadian dollar at the expense of the majority of the working class. Think of the many who get \$50 a day or \$50 an hour, where at the same time I have people who have not had \$50 in the last two months. Think of that when you devalue, think of the economic situation! Think of people who are stuck with unsaleable wheat, who have damp grain and who haven't sold a bushel of grain because there is no room. Think of these people, not of me, but of people like myself who farm and can't find a penny. They can't borrow, they can't get any money and they can't get any subsidies. Think of the pensioners who have been robbed of their savings and think of the others who have very minimum incomes to live on.

And I point to the Minister who is going to follow me. I hope to goodness that you are going to change some of your policies and see to it that these people are not just shoved off their land, but assistance is given to them to stay on.

This is not 1949, 1959 or 1889, this is 1969. For a moment let's use some good common sense and some economic wisdom. The Premier studied in a university and he was an honor student in economic matters. I am just a farmer and I don't know economics, but I know when it hurts. I say that you should safeguard the gains that were made over the years in our country and in our province. If you do this, Mr. Speaker, and if governments turn to a little bit of planning and adopt some wise economic controls, then we can achieve goals we can be proud of. With automation all around us we can triumph over poverty, over

February 28, 1969

taxation and all the ills that presently beset us.

I am telling you, Sir, that last century's methods are not going to bring prosperity to Saskatchewan.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Berezowsky: — Mr. Provincial Treasurer. . .

Hon. W.R. Thatcher (Premier): — . . . The least unemployment in Canada.

Mr. Berezowsky: — . . . that's all you know. I thought that you had learned something but apparently you didn't. It's no use going to university for that so I don't think that I will go.

Mr. Steuart: — You would have trouble getting into a training school, Bill, but I don't want to say that.

Mr. Berezowsky: — I know, I know. But I would be a good man to teach you there anyways. Mr. Provincial Treasurer, now to reach such goals it cannot be done by boasting about balancing budgets. If there is unemployment as the Premier has said or inadequate pay to those who produce or provide services, then it must be up to the governments, who have and must use their financial prerogatives to supply the medium of exchange. If our private sector slackens, then it must be up to government treasuries to pick up the slack. I think I am right! For example, we have a Federal Bank of Canada. I want to get away from local problems for a moment and point out something because as I said I am not an economist and it is hard for me to understand. Why is it that we have a Federal Bank of Canada and yet we do such stupid things? We must go to private banks in times of stress, borrow money required for national purposes — which is after all just funny money in any event, it isn't wealth it is just paper, a book credit if you like — and in doing so tax the public and penalize them with abnormal and exorbitant interest rates. For example, under the BNA Act as you know, Mr. Premier, the Federal Government controls the monetary system and policy of this country. They can have a Bank of Canada just like your friend Bennett has a bank of British Columbia. You don't have to always run to your millionaire friends to borrow money and pay 6 or 7 or more per cent to obtain money for public works or other purposes. Why can't you get the loans at cost? I don't care if it is Social Credit or Liberalism or Socialism. The fact is, that is what you should be doing. As a Government we have the prerogative over the monetary system and the policies which give the Federal Government exclusive legislative authority over currency. This is where we are. I and my fellow Canadians thought, when we established a Central Bank in 1934 — and I well remember — that this would be an evolution in the exercise of federal power in the field of finance, but I was mistaken. They set up a bank for the banks, and now when the Industrial Development Bank needs money, what do they do? Do they go to the Bank of Canada to get the money so they could mortgage the bridge that they are going to build? Then when the taxes are paid off, you have the bridge. Instead they go to a private institution, a private bank, and they pay them 6 per cent and they charge us another 3 per cent for administration. So the poor fellow who wants a house or the government that wants

to build a bridge has to pay 9 per cent. Now you explain it to me.

Mr. Thatcher: — What would you do, Bill?

Mr. Berezowsky: — I have told you what you should do. I am saying in simple language that what is happening is that the deposit system of the banks and the policies of the Federal and Provincial Governments have sold out the people of our country. We have inflation, so we have financial straits. The Federal Government increases interest rates for housing, which it shouldn't have to do. People need houses. Why do they have to pay 9 per cent? I am asking you why? No wonder that this age is still called a backward age and we have backward Governments who can't see the future or the present.

Mr. Thatcher: — Do a good job now and end up on a nice tone.

Mr. Berezowsky: — If you don't be quiet I'll go on after five. I have a meeting in the country, but I'll try and wind this up.

Mr. Thatcher: — Fine Budget! Say that, Bill.

Mr. Berezowsky: — I think that I have said enough so that you should understand what I am trying to get at. Maybe you have learned something. I am trying to save a little bit of time for the Hon. Minister who is supposed to follow me. Now, the Government, as I have said, promised to lower taxes but this was only an election promise which it did not intend to keep. I would say that, if society asks for more educational and better education institutions to keep up with other parts of the earth, if teachers are to get higher pay — I know some who should and it is not the Member from Athabasca — if we are to provide free tuition and all the textbooks — and the Premier doesn't agree with that — we should be providing these things. If we decide on minimum guaranteed incomes which our people should have, then there must be a change in how all these goodies are to be paid for. I have said for some years now and I have argued from time to time — and I agree with the Hon. Member from Canora (Mr. Matsalla) — that school taxes should be removed from the assessment roles of this province as property taxes.

Mr. Thatcher: — Where would you get the money?

Mr. Berezowsky: — Set up a tax according to ability to pay. That is all that you have to do instead of imposing school taxes on property. There are some excellent logical arguments in this policy, Mr. Premier. If school taxes are paid according to ability to pay, then those in the high-income brackets, like yourself, would pay your percentage of taxes.

Mr. Thatcher: — I pay it now.

Mr. Berezowsky: — You would pay more. And those who are not able to pay will pay only their percentage of taxes. We would all be paying, but we would be paying according to ability. I think

February 28, 1969

that this is a fair and logical conclusion. I commend this policy as timely legislation for this Government to mean something. This is not just a Socialistic idea, but it is also socially sound and could be incorporated into our laws of Saskatchewan.

I wanted to talk about the young people, but I will forego that today. But I would like to say one more thing in conclusion. I am of Ukrainian stock and my folks came from close to Kiev. . . If you would just bear with me for a few minutes, I think what I have to say is very serious. It has to do with the conferences that the Provincial Treasurer will attend.

I want to refer to the recent conference on the question of the Canadian Constitution, federalism and official languages. I will be very brief.

I have some personal opinions which are based on some experience. These are my personal opinions. I say that a constitution means nothing if it is not adhered to. Political scientists say for example — and I am not saying this, I read this in the Library here — that the Soviet Union has an elaborate constitution but not a constitutional government. People say that its constitution guarantees to the citizen of that federal union a greater range of rights than does our own BNA Act. But the power of the dictators more than often restricts the rights of Soviet citizens. Let us recognize that. Let me illustrate: Mr. Speaker, this is now the twentieth century of the adoption of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. In the United Nations great speeches have been made. One was from the Ukrainian SSR by Petro Emelyanovich Nedbailo and he said this, and I quote:

One task of the United Nations was the fight against violations of human rights. Throughout the Socialist system conditions have been created for the enlargement of the dignity and value of the human personality and for greater happiness in life.

Now, Mr. Speaker, this is double talk, the same kind of double talk we hear from the Premier who is a capitalist. These are just words, Mr. Speaker, because in the USSR this noble cause is not promoted. Imperialism is rampant as it is rampant in Saskatchewan. Human freedoms are restricted as they are restricted here in Saskatchewan. The best examples are recent events in Czechoslovakia and in the Ukraine, the land of my fathers. Let me illustrate on the matter of language. I can produce the documents. Fifty million Ukrainians of the USSR are being discriminated against today. Today their language is being deliberately degraded and Russification of the people deliberately promoted by the powerful ruling group of technocrats that you have there.

Mr. Thatcher: — That is a Socialist government doing that, Bill.

Mr. Berezowsky: — That's stupid! History tells us that in 1654 there was an agreement at Pereyaslav which was negotiated by the Ukrainian leader, Hetman Khmelnitzky. This provided for the culturally advanced Ukraine, the national and political rights of a sister state, a joint union of that time with Muscovy which you now call Russia — I don't, I call it Muscovy. From the beginning

friction developed with numerous Ukrainian revolts by Cossacks, peasants and by the middle class. From Hetman Vyhovsky to Mazeppa at Poltava, finally in 1917 a social-national revolution brought an end to 300 years of prejudice. But I have pointed out, Mr. Speaker, and friends in this Legislature, that Ukrainian life and freedom were subdued in the Ukraine by the technocracy of the Bolsheviks.

Mr. Thatcher: — Socialists!

Mr. Berezowsky: — Nonsense! You are Socialists too. If you want to get into that debate I will take you on any time. Let's get to the conclusion because you want ten minutes at least. The Ukraine was betrayed but let us not betray the people of Canada. I don't care whether they are French, they are Canadians. Their language is not a foreign language. Let us tell the people of Canada and Saskatchewan, whether German or Ukrainian or Polish or any other language, that their languages are not foreign languages. They are Canadian languages because these people are Canadian.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Berezowsky: — When you go back to a conference keep that in mind. Let us not get into the kind of a jam that the Communists have gotten into in the Soviet Ukraine. People all over the world have dignity and respect. They want freedom. Let us give the French and the other people of Canada freedom. Now I have finished. I can't possibly support the motion and you know why, but I will support the amendment.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. C.P. MacDonald (Minister of Welfare): — Mr. Speaker, the hour is getting late. I want to thank the Member for the courtesy that he has afforded me. We, on this side of the House, made a deliberate effort to permit him to speak this afternoon. He was originally scuttled by negotiation. I hope that perhaps on Monday we might have the opportunity to repay the courtesy to some other Member on his side of the House.

With that I beg leave to adjourn the debate.

Debate adjourned.

The Assembly adjourned at 5:22 o'clock p.m.