

**LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN**  
**Second Session — Sixteenth Legislature**  
**20th Day**

**Monday, March 3, 1969**

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

**WELCOME TO STUDENTS**

**Mr. Whelan** (Regina North West): — Mr. Speaker, through you, Sir, it is my pleasure to introduce to all Members of this House 37 grade eight students from RJ Davidson school in Regina North West. These alert young people are the social studies class. Their teacher Gordon Glaicar is in the east gallery with them.

Also a second group of 20 students from the vocational training course at St. Pat's annex in Regina North West. Their teacher, Mrs. Muirhead is with them in the east gallery. This group is the senior preparatory class.

I am sure all Members join me in welcoming these two groups and expressing the wish that their stay with us this afternoon will be both pleasant and educational.

**Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Lloyd** (Biggar): — Mr. Speaker, I want to welcome through you and along with other Members of the House a group of students in the Speaker's gallery from the school at Delisle. They are accompanied by some of their teachers. Delisle is a name which has been well established in athletic circles in the province. One thinks of curling, of hockey and/or of baseball. It is also the seat of a very fine composite high school which serves the towns around and communities such as Vanscoy and some of the others. I am sure all of us wish them a fine stay here in the House, hope that they enjoy other parts of their visit and hope that they will indeed have a safe journey home.

**Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**ANNOUNCEMENT**

**LIEUTENANT GOVERNOR — EXTENSION OF TERM OF OFFICE**

**Hon. Mr. Thatcher** (Premier): — Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, I wish to advise the House that I have been informed that His Honour the Honourable Robert L. Hanbidge has been invited to remain in office as Lieutenant Governor of Saskatchewan until January 1, 1970.

**Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Hon. Mr. Thatcher:** — Hon. Members will recall that his Honour was appointed in February of 1963 and this will be his second extension in office.

I wish to express my personal pleasure at this announcement and the pleasure of my colleagues. I am certain that Members on both sides of the House as well as all the people of Saskatchewan will welcome the news that his Honour is to remain in office for a further period of time.

During his tenure as representative of Her Majesty in Saskatchewan he has been a most distinguished and popular Lieutenant Governor. Most of his life has been spent in the service to his province and to his country. There can be no doubt that Saskatchewan has seldom had a more widely respected public figure in its history. It goes without saying, Mr. Speaker, that we look forward with great pleasure to his Honour's continued service as Lieutenant Governor of Saskatchewan.

**Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Lloyd** (Leader of the Opposition): — Mr. Speaker, let me just concur with the Premier's remarks and let me too pass on how very pleased every Member in our group is that the Honourable Mr. Hanbidge will continue to be Saskatchewan's Lieutenant Governor.

He has certainly been a fine person and a fine representative of all that a Lieutenant Governor does represent. We are glad to have him with us and we wish him well as he continues in that service.

**Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

### SASKATCHEWAN CROP INSURANCE PROGRAM

**Hon. Mr. McFarlane** (Minister of Agriculture): — Mr. Speaker, I want to bring to the attention of the Members of the House, a matter that I think will be of interest to all Members here and certainly to the farmers of this province, the fact that in 1968 we had 12,400 farmers insured under the Saskatchewan Crop Insurance Program. This was an increase of 4,189 farmers over the previous year. The total insurance liability amounted to approximately \$27 million. To date 1,607 claims have been adjusted amounting to \$1,550,000. Thirty-two farmers have been given advances where threshing is not completed and claims are definite, but the full amount will not be determinable until spring. Amounts of advances paid here with an additional \$20,000, making a total of \$1,570,000. The estimated additional amounts to be paid to farmers where the claims cannot be determined until spring, are about \$75,000.

**March 3, 1969**

This would mean a total then of \$1,645,000 in cash put in the farmers' hands in this province. The total premium to the farmer plus the contribution to premiums by the Canadian Government amounts to \$2,350,000; total estimated claims, \$1,645,000 leaving a balance of \$705,000. As a matter of interest in regard to the claims adjusted, the amount varies from a high of \$13,000 to a low of a few dollars. The claims that exceeded \$200 averaged about \$1,150.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

## **ADJOURNED DEBATE**

### **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).

**Hon. Mr. MacDonald** (Minister of Welfare): — Mr. Speaker, I want to make a few comments this afternoon on a subject that has been brought up concerning my Department in the Budget Debate, and that is the new policy in relation to maintenance grants in Special Care Homes.

In 1964 when we became the Government of Saskatchewan, one of the major problems confronting our Province was accommodation of our senior citizens. A serious lack of special-care beds was apparent in nearly every region of the province. A study on the aged and long-term illness of 1963 recommended 5,000 special-care beds for Saskatchewan. We set our goal to achieve that objective at the earliest possible time. As a result, a major emphasis was directed to this field, with amazing co-operation from municipalities and volunteer agencies. Here are the results of that drive.

In 1964 in Saskatchewan there were 2,583 persons in special-care homes, 2,084 persons in self-contained housing units. Total construction grants over the history of the Province amounted to \$3,618,822. Today, just over four years later, the record of achievement is one that this Government is extremely proud of. The accommodation available on December 31, 1968, is as follows: in special-care homes, 4,871, under construction 353. A total of 5,244, in more than double the entire 20 years of Socialist reign; in self-contained housing units, 2,890, under construction, 122, for 3,012, almost a 50 per cent increase. This increase in beds has been due in a large part to payment of over \$4 million, \$4,269,232 of construction grants over the four-year period. This represents a greater contribution in this period than in the entire history of the program.

The significant factor, Mr. Speaker, is that we have now

surpassed the recommended number of beds in the study of 1963. I therefore asked my Department to undertake a complete review of our policy in relation to special-care homes. Several factors are immediately apparent. 1. Many areas of the province still have a shortage of special-care beds. I refer specifically to Northern Saskatchewan and our large urban areas. 2. Most regions of the province have an adequate number to meet the recommended requirements of the 1963 study. 3. What is now required in most areas of Saskatchewan is not more beds, but supplementary community services. Homemaker services will complement our existing programs and reinforce our special-care homes. I have, therefore, instructed my Department to proceed in the following manner: 1. Conduct a survey of all areas of the province to determine those areas where need still exists for additional beds. This survey is now almost complete. 2. Freeze all further applications for grants to construct special-care beds until January 1, 1970. Construction will continue during the 1969 period on present commitments and the additional 353 beds will be completed during the coming year. Construction grants will be paid to complete these commitments, totalling \$810,000. 3. Request that the Program Branch of my Department assess the need for community services to supplement special-care beds.

In addition to these steps, we have reviewed our policy of maintenance grants to special-care homes and self-contained housing units. The policy over the past four years has been to pay grants to all homes according to the following formula.

- (a) Special-care home that is duly licensed and operated on a non-profit basis is entitled to receive a maintenance grant of \$60 per annum per rated bed.
- (b) A housing project intended for the accommodation of the elderly that is duly licensed on a non-profit basis is entitled to receive a maintenance grant of \$40 per unit, for self-contained housing units.

During the 1969 year the policy will be changed to the following: 1. The maintenance grant in special-care homes will be reduced from \$60 to \$12 per annum per bed. The payment of maintenance grants in self-contained units will be discontinued. At the same time, Mr. Speaker, the maintenance rates paid to special-care homes in self-contained units through the Saskatchewan Assistance Plan will be raised to the following maximum level: limited personal care from \$180 to \$194; intensive personal care from \$260 to \$274; self-contained housing units increased \$3.50. These rates, Mr. Speaker, have been determined to provide for increased costs and to make up for any loss of revenue from the change in policy regarding maintenance rates.

This change in policy has been instituted for these reasons. 1. Payment of Provincial maintenance grants is not recognized as a cost-sharing program with the Federal Government and becomes a direct charge to the Provincial taxpayer. By attaching this amount to the maintenance rates, a large percentage of the

**March 3, 1969**

cost is recovered through the Canada Assistance Plan. 2. The payment of this grant provides a monthly subsidy to residents that are financially independent. We believe these tax dollars could well be utilized to provide other services to our needy citizens, such as homemaker services.

Mr. Speaker, I also want to comment on Wolseley's Geriatric Centre. Another implication of the expansion of special-care beds in Saskatchewan has been the continued operation of the Wolseley Geriatric Centre as Government-financed institution. Over the years, due to the shortage of nursing beds, the Centre at Wolseley has been used as a gathering institution for the entire province. With the expansion of the number of beds, this is now no longer the case. Up until one year ago, the institution at Wolseley had 128 patients. The building was over-crowded to the point where beds were located in the halls, sun-rooms and every conceivable corner of the centre. During the past six months, the capacity has been reduced to 70 patients. This number can now be adequately housed in the existing facilities. With the growth in the number of special-care beds in the province, it is now no longer being used as a gathering institution for provincial needs.

At the present time, the Centre at Wolseley is reserved for the people of that community who require level II and III care. It is now an institution that serves the people of Wolseley and district.

However, Mr. Speaker, the Department of Welfare has always considered level II and III care to be a community responsibility. We have therefore assisted municipalities and volunteer agencies to construct and operate these special-care facilities through construction grants. Therefore, as of April 1st, the Wolseley Centre will be operated under this policy. 1. It will be a special-care home with a bed capacity of 70 that will serve the district of Wolseley. 2. The 70 beds will be allocated to 40 beds providing level III care and 30 beds providing level II. 3. Patients, who are admitted to the Wolseley Centre or patients presently residing there, will be charged the same maintenance rates as other special-care homes in the province. 4. The Department of Welfare will continue to operate the Wolseley Centre as a part of its institutional program.

Mr. Speaker, I want to turn this afternoon for a few minutes to discuss the Budget presented by the Provincial Treasurer some ten days ago. The traditional Budget Debate has always been a vital and significant part of the business of this House. The form of the debate has usually followed the pattern of Members on both sides of the House evaluating the Budget presented on the first day by the Provincial Treasurer. The Opposition of course attempts to criticize those aspects that they consider vulnerable. The Government Members on the other hand promote those aspects that they consider attractive.

Today, Mr. Speaker, I want to depart from this practice and

evaluate the Budget from another approach. The strength or weakness of a budget is often determined by the validity of the criticism offered by the Opposition. The confrontation of the Provincial Treasurer and the Budget critic is normally the highlight of the debate. Today, I suggest to this House and the people of Saskatchewan that the weakness of the rebuttal of the Member from Regina Centre (Mr. Blakeney) is the greatest compliment that could be handed to this year's Budget.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Hon. Mr. MacDonald:** — This is the fifth Budget that I have seen handed down by a Provincial Treasurer. Never in those five years have I witnessed such a weak, shallow, inconsistent presentation as the one presented by the Member for Regina Centre. His remarks were highlighted by misrepresentations, half-truths, distortions and deliberate juggling of figures in a vain attempt to substantiate his case. Not only, Mr. Speaker, were his arguments not valid, but they were a deliberate attempt on his part to perpetrate a farce, a hoax and a fraud on the people of Saskatchewan.

Let me review them for you. First, Mr. Speaker, he suggested that the Budget figures presented were not trustworthy. I quote:

Some of us are skeptical on other accounts particularly about the Government's so-called balanced Budget this year. I for one don't believe the Government's figures.

To substantiate these charges he used two arguments, one that the Government was losing millions of dollars on its pulp operations. He stated, and I quote:

They are losing money on this Crown corporation at a rate never before equalled by such business operations in Saskatchewan.

Mr. Speaker, how short is his memory, how careless his remarks, how stupid the analogy, and how ridiculous the charge.

This is the party that dissipated millions of dollars of the taxpayers' money on nine Crown corporations that went bankrupt and had to be discarded. All the people of Saskatchewan remember the box factory, the shoe factory, the tannery, the fish board, etc., the other Socialist nightmares that cost the people of Saskatchewan \$2 million. This was only part of the story. They paid no interest on capital from the Treasury, they concealed operating costs in other Government departments that cost millions of dollars. The most notorious case was that of the Guarantee and Fidelity Company that suffered huge losses year after year, but continued to report profits because of funds transferred to it from the general insurance fund merely to cover its losses. This company sustained losses at the

**March 3, 1969**

astronomical figure of \$3½ million of the taxpayers' money. Mr. Speaker, this was the most deceitful accounting procedure ever used by any government in Canada. Mr. Speaker, what did those companies contribute to the Province of Saskatchewan? Nothing, but deliberate theft of the taxpayers' money. The Socialist Crown corporations are now a ragged skeleton rattling like a scarecrow over the history of this province.

Compare this to the pulp mill, Mr. Speaker. First the Socialists said it wouldn't be built; second, they said it would never be opened; third, they said there was not enough lumber. Now, they are implying that it is not a feasible operation. They are attempting to destroy the greatest single economic achievement in Saskatchewan's history.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Hon. Mr. MacDonald:** — I suggest the Member for Regina Centre go to Prince Albert and see for himself, the most modern, efficient pulp mill on the North American continent. Of course, Mr. Speaker, the start of any pulp mill is the most critical and costly stage of its operation. I have been informed that this mill has so far encountered less start-up problems than any other Canadian mill. But, Mr. Speaker, everyone that has any knowledge of this operation knows that the economic success and economic benefits to Saskatchewan are beyond comprehension in the years ahead.

Let me review the latest estimates of this economic boom to Saskatchewan. 1. \$365,000 annually in stumpage fees will be paid directly to the Province of Saskatchewan. 2. Gross value of Saskatchewan's forest products will jump from \$10 million prior to the pulp mill to \$50 million when the mill is in full production. This includes the purchase of over \$10 million worth of Saskatchewan pulpwood. 3. Over 550 people employed directly in the mill and forest operations. In addition, conservative estimates of 1,300 jobs associated with the establishment of the mill. 4. A total capital investment of over \$80 million in the mill, roads and inventory. \$65 million in the mill itself. 5. An estimated \$750,000 investment in housing and over \$1 million in municipal services. 6. Increased retail sales in Prince Albert from \$45 million in 1965 to \$54 million in 1968. 7. \$35,000 revenue per month to SPC for power and \$90,000 per month in natural gas. 8. The purchase of over \$1.5 million gallons of petroleum products annually. 9. The purchase of 80,000 tons of chemicals annually with 60,000 tons bought from Interprovincial Co-operatives Ltd., which expanded its plant in Saskatoon to supply the pulp mill. 10. \$100,000 additional tax revenue to the city of Prince Albert. 11. Payroll of employees in operation of mill and associated jobs of over \$10 million; it is the largest industrial employer in the Province of Saskatchewan.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Hon. Mr. MacDonald:** — 12. Construction of over 200 miles of all-weather roads to open the North for vacationers and tourists.

I could go on, Mr. Speaker, but these are only a few of the economic benefits of Saskatchewan's greatest enterprise. The cost of establishing the mill, building the inventory, commencing the operation, will be repaid in the future, in stumpage fees, profits, and taxes. It will mean millions of dollars to the public of Saskatchewan and the Government in the years ahead.

Why, Mr. Speaker, do the Socialists hide these facts? Why do the Socialists refuse to admit these things? Why do the Socialists continue to lie about this great adventure in the growth and expansion of our province? Mr. Speaker, these charges of the Member from Regina Centre are a farce, a hoax and a fraud.

The second argument to challenge the trustworthiness of the Budget was his demonstration that some items of actual expenditures made last year were less than amounts estimated in the Budget. He stated that the technique of subterfuge is pretty well developed. No point in his speech was as cheap, pointless and without validity.

The practice of not spending all of each appropriation on each amount included in the Budget is a feature of each year's financial transactions. It is reported in each year in the Public Accounts. The resignation of one employee, a cold winter, a late harvest, a strike, or a hundred other factors contribute to this fact. I challenge him to demonstrate one year in the 20 years of Socialist Government that millions of dollars were not under-expended. That is why they are referred to as Budget Estimates.

Let me take the year 1961-62, the year he was the Provincial Treasurer. On the table from 652 to 667, a total of 25 pages, it shows the amounts in the Budget expended, under-expended and over-expended. Let me point to a few of his under-expenditures. Agriculture \$291,018; Attorney General \$80,779; Education \$77,265; Maintenance of Highways \$448,711; Municipal Road Assistance \$431,545; this was the interesting one, Mr. Speaker, Health \$868,638.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Hon. Mr. MacDonald:** — Mr. Speaker, when you compare this with a Budget of just a little over one-third of this year's Budget, this would have been a total of over \$2 million, and he complained about \$700,000 last year.

Mr. Speaker, I counted a total of 206 items that were under-expended in that year. Was the Member dishonest, was this subterfuge, was this deliberately falsifying the Budget



**March 3, 1969**

Estimates? Mr. Speaker, another argument that was a farce, a hoax and a fraud!

Next, Mr. Speaker, we had the argument that the Saskatchewan economy is faltering and in the words of the Member for Regina Centre, "faltering badly." And how, Mr. Speaker, did he demonstrate this? By referring to the economic indicators that normally determine the growth of a province or a region. But oh, what a feat of juggling, conniving, duplicity resulted. He waded through quantities of statistical material to find some data to hang his case. Why did he not compare all the economic indicators that are normally used? Why did he not compare 1963 with 1968? Because this comparison would have demonstrated that Saskatchewan in the last five years has hurdled ahead in every area of economic growth.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Hon. Mr. MacDonald:** — Here are some of the main indicators in the year 1963 compared to 1968. Public and private investment - \$789 million to \$1,228 million; net value of commodity production, that's non-agriculture - \$642 million to \$931 million; oil production - \$71 million to \$92 million; natural gas sold MCF - \$39 million to \$84.5 million; forest production — 21.4 million cubic feet to 50.3 million cubic feet; electric power generated — 2,991 k.w.h. as compared to 4,830 k.w.h.; construction value of work performed - \$445 million to \$687 million; retail sales - \$837 million to \$1,072 million; personal income, Government revenues. Mr. Speaker, I could go on and on and on and point to almost every single economic indicator that shows exactly the same unbelievable growth. The Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Lloyd) will be following me in a very few minutes. I challenge him to get up and deny those comparisons, or get up and repeat them. Another argument of the Member for Regina Centre that is a hoax, a farce and a fraud.

Now let me take two examples that he did use to demonstrate this, and show how he juggled the facts to demonstrate his case. First, oil production. In the field of mineral production he compared 1963 with 1968, but in oil production he used the fluctuations in the Liberal years. Why, Mr. Speaker? Because in oil production the record of expansion and growth has been exciting and challenging. Here is why he refused to compare '63 to '68. He would have been forced to tell the people of Saskatchewan this story. Oil production has jumped from 70 million barrels to over 90 million barrels.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Hon. Mr. MacDonald:** — Over the past four years the oil industry has poured over \$600 million into exploration and development. There have been 323 deep wells drilled into the Devonian compared to 53 from 1961 to 1964. Forty-five per cent of the total oil

produced in Saskatchewan has been produced in the last five years. \$153 million in taxes and revenues have been paid to the Government of Saskatchewan and \$33 million for securing land for exploration. Forty per cent of all revenues paid to the Province of Saskatchewan, since this resource was turned over to the Province, have come in the last four years.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Hon. Mr. MacDonald:** — Why did the Member for Regina Centre not tell the people of Saskatchewan these facts? Another argument that was a hoax, a farce and a fraud.

But the best is yet to come. Hardrock mineral production? Yes, he changed his course and he compared the production in 1962-63. But once again, Mr. Speaker, he distorted the facts. The story of hardrock mineral production in 1962-63 is quite a story. First, Mr. Speaker, it all came from one mine. The Hudson Bay Mining Company of Flin Flon. The main offices and all the major works are located in the Province of Manitoba, that's where they paid the majority of the taxes. But one shaft was located in Saskatchewan at the town of Creighton. Mr. Speaker, you would think to listen to the Member from Regina Centre that he and his colleagues went north and with their own two hands dug all the gold and copper and zinc right out of the Precambrian Shield. The truth, Mr. Speaker, is that Socialists had no more to do with establishing that mine than fly a kite. The mine was there before anyone heard of the Socialists.

**Mr. Blakeney** (Regina Centre): — We didn't have a one-man Government!

**Hon. Mr. MacDonald:** — But the sad part, Mr. Speaker . . .

**Hon. Mr. Stuart** (Provincial Treasurer): — You didn't even have a Government!

**Hon. Mr. MacDonald:** — You didn't even have a Government! In 1944 when they took office, Saskatchewan was producing 2,726,000 ounces of base metals. By 1963 it was reduced to 729,000 ounces and going down every year. In addition, Mr. Speaker, they sat on their haunches and did nothing to stop this steady decline. The rich Precambrian Shield in Northern Saskatchewan was as dead as King Tut's Tomb. No investment, no exploration, no development was taking place to stop this steady decline.

Then, Mr. Speaker, in 1964 new life, new interest, new spark in the entire mining industry.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**March 3, 1969**

**Hon. Mr. MacDonald:** — In 1963, just over 72,000 acres of our North was under exploration with \$250,000 being spent. Look at today, four years later, the downward trend in hardrock mining has stopped and we are now on the ascent. This has been caused by the establishment of four new base metal mines. Today, the northern part of Saskatchewan is a beehive of activity in the field of exploration. Over 33 million acres are under disposition and exploration with an expected expenditure of \$8 to \$10 million.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that the Members opposite will look at the map. Nothing like this has ever happened in the history of Saskatchewan and the history of Canada in the Precambrian Shield. Mr. Speaker, no argument was more ridiculous or misrepresented, more false than his statements on hardrock mining. Another argument that was a hoax, a farce and a fraud.

Then, Mr. Speaker, he turned to local politics and tried to gather a few votes in Regina. He used two subjects relating to my Department that I must challenge. First, Mr. Speaker, he called for more special-care beds in Regina. I understand that the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Lloyd) and the Budget critic (Mr. Blakeney) were on television last night talking about special-care beds. Of all the subjects that they should have refrained from commenting on, nursing home construction was one. The record of 20 years of Socialism in Regina is one of the most pathetic on record.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Hon. Mr. MacDonald:** — In 1964 in the city of Regina, after 20 years of Socialism, the number of special-care beds, excluding the commercial enterprises, was a total of 156. I repeat, 156 beds for a city with a population of over 100,000.

Mr. Speaker, I don't think in one year that the Member for Regina Centre was a Member of his Cabinet and his Government that there was one special-care bed constructed in the city of Regina. Today, after four years of Liberal Government, there are a total of 763. There have been 468 new beds constructed in this city in the last four years. I invite him to stop and visit the Santa Maria Home, the Regina Lutheran Home, Pioneer Village, Qu'Appelle Housing Corporation, the new Salvation Army Eventide Home and see the accomplishments of four years of Liberal Government in the field of special-care homes.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Hon. Mr. MacDonald:** — Another argument that is a farce, a hoax and a fraud. Then he called for an increase in welfare allowances. Well, Mr. Speaker, this one touched my heart. All of us know that these must be reviewed periodically and adjusted to keep pace with the rising cost of living. But, Mr. Speaker, isn't it a shame

that he didn't feel this touch of sympathy when he was a Cabinet Minister and when he was the Provincial Treasurer. Not once from 1958 to 1964 did he give the poor, the needy, the old, or the handicapped a five cent piece increase in welfare allowances. Mr. Speaker, not a five cent piece from 1948 to 1964. In addition to that, Mr. Speaker, they put the welfare clients, the poor, the needy and the handicapped in Saskatchewan so far behind it will take us ten years to catch up to the rest of them. Mr. Speaker, isn't it too bad that he didn't mention the increase in foster homes of \$7 per family this year, the third increase since we have been the Government. Another one, Mr. Speaker, that they ignored for seven years.

Yes, Mr. Speaker, the record of the Member for Regina Centre (Mr. Blakeney) in this debate is questionable. He challenged the concept of a balanced Budget, he questioned the validity of the Treasurer's figures. He questioned every aspect of the Budget, - I want to tell the bull moose from The Battlefords (Mr. Kramer) that I am coming to you in a few minutes — arguments that when examined were shallow, weak and without substance. Is it any wonder, Mr. Speaker, when you look at his seatmate and his Leader who, when he was Provincial Treasurer, did not believe in a balanced Budget. He had a deficit of over \$4 million, the largest deficit in 20 years of a Socialist Government. No wonder that after a year as Provincial Treasurer he moved on.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to take a few minutes to discuss the remarks on highway construction made by the Member for Shellbrook (Mr. Bowerman). No speech in this Assembly in this debate was more repugnant to me, to the construction industry and to the people of Saskatchewan. It contained innuendoes and falsehoods that demand a reply. Let me quote his report or his statement as reported in the Leader Post, February 25, 1969. Look at him laugh. Well, Mr. Speaker, he was a disgrace to his constituency and to the people of this province.

**Mr. Bowerman** (Shellbrook): — That isn't what they said.

**Hon. Mr. MacDonald:** — “One of the greatest pork barrels in the history of this province operated under the pious disguise of this Saskatchewan Highway Department.” And again, “Mr. Bowerman told the Legislature that highway construction costs exceeded by 29.7 per cent, the next highest construction costs in Canada.”

Mr. Speaker, these statements are deliberate falsehoods. These statements are an attempt by the Members opposite to deliberately discredit the greatest highway program in the history of our Province. Mr. Speaker, I agree that the tactics of the Member from Shellbrook are a disgrace to this Assembly and a disgrace to his constituency. They are an insult to the entire construction industry and all those who work in it.

What are the facts, Mr. Speaker? Perhaps the best answer

**March 3, 1969**

is to read the reply written to the Member from Shellbrook by J.E. Chase, Secretary-Manager of the Road Builders and Heavy Construction Industry of Saskatchewan, and I quote:

The association takes strong exception to the remarks which were reported made in the Legislature yesterday and attributed to you. According to the news media you stated that highway construction costs in Saskatchewan exceeded by 29.7 per cent the next highest construction costs in Canada and that from 1963 to 1966, this amounted to \$18 million.

And later:

We are unable to see where in any of the years 1963 to 1966, Saskatchewan highway construction costs exceeded by 29.7 per cent those of the next highest in Canada. With the exception of 1958 and 1966, Ontario's price index was higher than Saskatchewan's during the 10-year period. You will also note that in 1967 Saskatchewan's index dropped sharply, while Manitoba's and Ontario's prices held near the 1966 level.

He enclosed also, Mr. Speaker, for the edification of the Member from Shellbrook, the DBS price indexes for highway construction costs in Saskatchewan, Ontario and Manitoba. The price index in the Dominion Bureau of Statistics indicates that Saskatchewan in 1967 had a drastic reduction in costs compared to Manitoba and Ontario for all items and major components.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Hon. Mr. MacDonald:** — The price index for Saskatchewan was 137.6 compared to 153.8 for Manitoba and 156.3 for Ontario. There has been a further almost unbelievable reduction in 1968. This could lead to the cheapest highway construction costs of any Province west of the St. Lawrence when comparisons are available.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Hon. Mr. MacDonald:** — Mr. Speaker, the truth of the matter is that in 1968 construction costs per cubic yard are 18.7 cents, less than they were in 1963 and 1964 when the Socialists gave out contracts. In those years they were over 19 and 22.5 respectively. The 18.7 cents per cubic yard in 1968 is a fantastic reduction from 27.3 in 1967. But, Mr. Speaker, the interesting thing is why did he use the years 1958 to 1968. Why didn't he go back to 1957? Because, Mr. Speaker, I have in DBS here the indication that in 1956 and 1957 highway construction costs were higher than in 1968 in the Province of Saskatchewan.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Hon. Mr. MacDonald:** — The most amazing fact is that they are far lower than they were in 1957, almost 12 years ago according to the Dominion Bureau of Statistics. In this 12-year period, the costs of labor, machinery and every aspect of road building have skyrocketed, and yet Saskatchewan contractors have built highways in Saskatchewan cheaper than in 1957. The only waste, Mr. Speaker, that really stands out is the \$500,000 that the Province spent on the ring road in Regina. Then the mayor decided to abandon it. Now we have one-half million sitting out on the outskirts of Regina. Was this a pork barrel in 1957, Mr. Speaker? Was this graft, dishonest, crooked? Do these tremendous costs in 1957 indicate that 12 years ago these Socialists paid off highway contractors to the tune of \$18 million?

No, Mr. Speaker, I wouldn't be so rash. I know and all Members know the fluctuations in contract prices are based on competition, supply and demand. All of us recall the tremendous increased costs in all construction, housing and so forth during this Centennial Year. We can all be proud of the job that our contractors are doing and the efficiency and the economy of their operation. We also know, Mr. Speaker, that thousands of our people are still in mud and gravel, and that their only hope of getting out of it is a continued Liberal Government in Saskatchewan.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Hon. Mr. MacDonald:** — But it does indicate, Mr. Speaker, the hypocrisy of the Socialists, the cheap allegations, the distortion of facts for partisan political gain.

I hope, Mr. Speaker, that the Leader of the Opposition, when he stands on his feet, will deny the allegations by the Member from Shellbrook.

I want to comment on the remarks made by the Member for Melville (Mr. Kowalchuk) concerning Pere Murray of Notre Dame College at Wilcox. I am sure Pere Murray does not need me to defend him or speak on his behalf. However, the principle of a Member launching a vicious personal attack on a distinguished citizen of our province under the protection of this House is a practice that is a blight on every Member of this Assembly. The unwarranted, the uncalled-for, the viciousness, the foulness of this attack forces me to protest with all the strength at my disposal. Let me quote:

Monsignor Father Athol Murray who advocated violence and bloodshed on radio and in the street throughout the whole of Saskatchewan. A mature man, Mr. Speaker, a man who thought to carry the word of God to the people, to love and honor their fellowman and to forgive your enemies.

Mr. Speaker, his achievements in sport, education and youth

**March 3, 1969**

development do not need repeating in this House. The thousands of lawyers, doctors, teachers, engineers, farmers, nurses, are a living testament to his life and his work. The Member for Melville in comparing this distinguished man to punks, hoods and gooks has only damaged himself. I want to tell the Member for Melville that Pere Murray's only fault in the eyes of the NDP is that he abhors Socialism.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Hon. Mr. MacDonald:** — I also want to tell him that this summer he received the Order of Canada, the highest award that can be awarded to any citizen of Canada. He was the first man in Saskatchewan to ever receive that honor. It was given to him for distinguished and honorable service to Saskatchewan and Canada, because of his great contribution to education and youth. To those people who have visited his college and witnessed his love for boys, his tower of God, his college facilities, or have met the young men who are his graduates working in every corner of Canada, Pere Murray needs no defence. I know that people of every religion and every political faith will resent violently this personal attack. I also know that the people of Melville will resent violently this personal attack. It is beneath the dignity of this House.

Now, Mr. Speaker, let me turn for a few moments to my friend, the Member from Riversdale (Mr. Romanow). Once again in this debate he provided the comic relief. His speech on the problems of the Young Liberals, myself and youth in general, was so close to the ridiculous it must be considered humorous. The NDP Youth club and their policies, resolutions and programs have been a source of great embarrassment to the Socialists in this House. They have caused genuine concern to the general public and this has also bothered the Socialists. The fact that they have been unable to deny them, refute them or even explain them, has made it even more embarrassing.

The reason they have not denied or repudiated these charges about the future leaders of the NDP is because they support the same principles and therefore cannot negate them. Therefore, once again they called on the young Member for Riversdale to stand up and try and absolve them by attacking the Young Liberals and their convention. What a weak and nonsensical defence was put forth by the generation kid from Saskatoon. First he pointed to the resolution passed at the Young Liberal Convention asking that the liquor laws be reviewed to permit young people privileges at the age of 18.

Well, I want to tell the Member for Riversdale that we are not the least bit embarrassed by that resolution. Young people right across Canada from every political party including the young Socialists have been calling for this for years. Not only that, but as far as I am concerned there is some validity to this request. Second, he tried to tell us about his pipeline

to the young Liberals themselves and how much time the Members spent at the convention. Well I don't like to offer advice to any Member on that side of the House, Mr. Speaker, but I might make this suggestion. Don't worry about the Young Liberals, they can look after themselves, you look after the Young Socialists.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Hon. Mr. MacDonald:** — They have a pretty ambitious program outlined for themselves this coming summer. If you are going to assist them in bringing it to a successful conclusion, you will need all the spare time you can muster. If they are going to help the Viet Cong Communists take over South East Asia, if they are going to help the Quebec Separatists destroy Confederation, if they are going to seize all the private farm land in Canada, if they are going to burn any more American flags, you won't have any spare time to worry about the Young Liberals.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Hon. Mr. MacDonald:** — Next, Mr. Speaker, he presented us with his youth program, this from a party that deliberately destroyed the only branch in government that catered to their needs and the needs of the young people in Saskatchewan. In 1963 they took the Fitness and Recreation Branch combined it with adult education and called it the Continuing Education Branch. From the youth instead of expanding it according to the needs of the young people, they combined it and used the same staff to look after both the young and the old. They spent a total of \$128,969 the last year they were the Government, on the young people of this Province. It is unfortunate that you don't learn a little about the Saskatchewan Youth Agency and its programs. It is unfortunate that you haven't talked to the many volunteer agencies and youth organizations that have received help from the Youth Agency. It is unfortunate that you haven't talked to the thousands of young people participating in the Lighted Schoolhouse Program, Teen Power, Opportunity Caravan and the Saskatchewan Summer Games and all the other youth programs initiated and assisted by the Saskatchewan Youth Agency. I am not sure whether he knows a baseball from a football, a cadet uniform from a rock-and-roll outfit. I have never seen him at one youth function, not even in his own city in the last two years. However, Mr. Speaker, the next time I go to Saskatoon, I will forward him an invitation. I want him to see first hand how his generation functions.

Now, Mr. Speaker, let me comment very briefly on the bull moose from The Battlefords (Mr. Kramer). Yes, he is here today. Mr. Speaker . . .

**Mr. Willis (Melfort-Tisdale):** — Mr. Speaker, this is unparliamentary language and I object.



**March 3, 1969**

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order, order!

**Mr. Willis:** — He is still standing, Mr. Speaker. I object to one Member calling another, bull moose. I think he should withdraw it, Mr. Speaker.

**Mr. Speaker:** — This all depends upon your attitude toward bull moose. Under some circumstances it might be considered a compliment.

**Hon. Mr. MacDonald:** — Not only that, Mr. Speaker, but I consider the moose one of the most important animals in Northern Saskatchewan. It provides a great deal to our . . .

**Mr. Kramer** (The Battlefords): — Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege. When I listened to what my constituents call certain Members on that side of the House I consider the compliment.

**Hon. Mr. MacDonald:** — Mr. Speaker, the Member for The Battlefords went on to complain about the staff increase and the Department of Welfare in the Meadow Lake region. I want to tell him that there are two reasons. First of all when they were the Government they didn't provide any service to Northern Saskatchewan. They had the Department of Natural Resources' employees handle a check dispensing agency in LaLoche, Buffalo Narrows and Ile-a-La-Crosse. Mr. Speaker, today there is an office located in Buffalo Narrows which is providing service to the most important segment of our population in the most important region, instead of the Department of Natural Resources passing a check dispensing agency. On top of that, Mr. Speaker, he forgot to mention that in 1966 the Department of Welfare took over the responsibilities of administration from all the municipalities in Saskatchewan and the LIDs. This is the only reason there are less people and more service provided in Northern Saskatchewan than when they were the Government, and, Mr. Speaker, he is aware of it. We are proud of the job that we are doing up in Northern Saskatchewan.

Mr. Speaker, you can certainly see from my remarks this afternoon that I will not support the amendment and I certainly wholeheartedly support the motion.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Leith** (Elrose): — Mr. Speaker, I rise to support the Budget brought into the Assembly by the Member from Prince Albert West, the Hon. Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Steuart). I am not here to defend it because it doesn't need any defence especially against the kind of attack that has been launched from the other side.

You know when I listened to the Hon. Minister of Welfare I wondered, if perhaps we ought not to call the Member from Regina Centre, the Opposition financial critic, the Artful Dodger. He was able to jump from one side of the question with great ease. He was able to say one thing in one minute and deny it in the next. His argument went up like a puff of smoke. He also reminded me of the man who said that he could move the whole world if he only had a crowbar long enough and something to stand on. His argument might have been long enough but he had, as far as I am concerned, nothing firm to stand on. His argument was without substance.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Leith:** — I want to mention to the Members of the House something that pleased me very much in this Budget and that is the allocation of \$300,000 to the School for the Deaf. This \$300,000 is to add more space and facilities for the School for the Deaf in Saskatoon. I think that all Members know that it serves all deaf children in Saskatchewan. It was opened in 1932 and it was a particular pet of the once Premier of the Province, The Hon. J.T.M. Anderson, who became acting director of the institution for a short time. According to the standards of that day, the school was built to accommodate 130 students but according to modern day standards it should only have 80 in there. But for the last many, many years it has had 135, and for the last 10 years there have been from 160 to 165 pupils in there. The \$300,000 that is to be spent during this year is to provide six additional classrooms and auxiliary services. The extra rooms are going to allow the children to be taken out of the basement classrooms and will allow the staff room enough so that the children won't have to go through the hospital anymore to get to the library.

Mr. Speaker, since this Government was first elected in 1964, one classroom, a portable classroom and a science laboratory, have been added up there. The new addition is going to be started this year and we hope that the people will be in it by Christmas of this year.

I wonder, Mr. Speaker, if Members know that deaf children are enrolled from all over the province. I wonder if they know that the younger they come to the school the more advantage they get from it. There has been a special class for very young pre-school deaf children ranging in age from three and a half to five and a half years. This program has been restricted to children living in Saskatoon, but future plans include all deaf children in the province over four years of age. I could say a very great deal more about this school, Mr. Speaker, but time is short and I refer the Members to the Annual Report of the Department of Education. However no annual report can reveal or describe the courage of the young children and the fidelity and the hard work of the staff of the Department of Education.

**March 3, 1969**

No report can reveal or describe the sense of satisfaction that the families have when they see their children coming from a state where it is impossible to communicate with them to a point where they are able to read and write. Some of them even go on to university. Three of them this year were progressed far enough so that they went down to Gaulladet College in Washington D.C. I am extremely pleased that this Government has recognized the need for expansion. I am extremely proud that this Budget is supplying the \$300,000.

I wonder what the Members Opposite think about this, Mr. Speaker. I wonder what these Members who criticize the Government one day for spending too much money and then the next day for not spending enough money, think about it. I wonder if some of the new Opposition Members, perhaps the Member from Riversdale (Mr. Romanow) or the Member for Canora (Mr. Matsalla) know that, while the CCF was in power, the only capital expansion that that school had was a few light bulbs and a few coats of paint, except — and I must be fair — that they added a three-car garage during that period. I wonder if the Members Opposite know that there was some money planned for expansion up there in 1963 but the former Minister of Welfare, the former Member from Saskatoon, saw that he could use the money to better political advantage, and it was taken out of that budget. I would like to hear what the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Lloyd) might have to say about the School for the Deaf. I don't intend or want to make it a political football, but I do want to tell the Members of the House how pleased and how proud I am that finally the expansion that is needed is coming about.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Leith:** — I want to turn to another matter very briefly, and that is the problem that we have been discussing — all of us I think have been discussing — in connection with our young people. Nobody can deny that there are problems and difficulties associated with the changing of our times.

I want to say to the Members, Mr. Speaker, that I believe that some of these problems generated in connection with our young people are caused by the frustrations of their peculiar position. They are not children and neither are they treated as adults. The members of our population who are over 18 but who are not yet 21 are discriminated against in many ways. They are old enough to marry and to make decisions about bringing other human beings into this world. They are old enough to rent houses, but they are not old enough to sign a lease. They are old enough to enlist, they are old enough to be drafted, they are old enough to be commissioned to lead other men into battle, to be wounded or to die, but they are not old enough to legally drink a glass of beer in public. They are old enough to vote for Members of this Assembly, but they are not old enough to buy or own or inherit or lease property. People who are 16 years of age or over are treated as adults before the criminal

courts. They are liable for their actions.

Several Bills have already been brought into this Legislature which will make possible the election to the boards of directors of co-operative associations, people who are 18 years of age or over. I approve of this, but to me it points up the necessity for doing something more about lowering the age of majority as a general rule, instead of doing it in a piecemeal fashion. Nobody denies, I think, that there should be a recognized and a legal age for a person to become of age, but I suggest to you that 21 is too old. I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that 19 ought to become the legal age of majority and that anyone reaching this age ought to be able to participate fully in the legal and social life of our province.

Further, Mr. Speaker, I believe that all the resources of the Government and particularly the Attorney General's Department should begin a study immediately of the problems inherent and be prepared to bring to our next session some ideas about revising downward the age limit prescribed by many of the outdated Acts of this Legislature. I know that this opinion is going to rouse the anger of some groups and individuals and perhaps some Members of the House. However, Mr. Speaker, you know that the chronological age of 21 does not necessarily impart wisdom and responsibility. I believe that our young people, 18 to 21 years old, have demonstrated that they are ready for the responsibility of adulthood, and I don't think that we ought to deny them this any longer.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I want to say one word about the speech from the Member for Riversdale (Mr. Romanow). He had some huge and empty words to say about the Budget. He said among other things that this is the time for deficit financing, to give the people of Saskatchewan what he thinks they want. Well I want to tell my friend from Riversdale something that almost everybody else knows and something that he ought to know, that, when municipalities have to pay between eight and nine per cent for borrowed money, then it is time for everybody, all levels of government, to put their house in order. It is time for each of us to have a good look at our borrowing requirements and wants and especially at any new capital investment and then to look again before we borrow money for them. If we value the economic health of our province and our nation, this is not the time for deficit financing, and the people in other governments of Canada are coming to this realization very quickly. It is all very well for the Member from Riversdale to bleat for \$100 million or \$200 million Provincial deficit so that school boards and hospital boards and municipal bodies build what seems desirable now. But I think that he is sensible enough to realize that not only will he be repaying at an exorbitant rate, but his children and his grandchildren will still be repaying what is foolishly borrowed now. Because this is a balanced Budget, Mr. Speaker, because it is eminently sane and respectable in 1969, I will vote for the motion and not the amendment.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**March 3, 1969**

**Mr. Lloyd** (Leader of the Opposition): — May I say to the Member who has just taken his seat that I share his enthusiasm and his support of the good work which has been done and which is being done at the School for the Deaf in Saskatoon.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Lloyd:** — And I share with him the pleasure which he has in seeing that there is to be an extension to that school. He recalled that a former Premier and former Minister of Education in this Province, Dr. Anderson, was once principal of that school. It was my responsibility to make that particular appointment and I would like him sometime, the Member who has just taken his seat (Mr. Leith), to discuss with me some of the changes that were made as a result of that and some of the improvements in the school shortly afterwards.

Mr. Speaker, I want to say something about the remarks of the Minister of Welfare (Mr. MacDonald) who embellished the atmosphere with oratory for some half hour in this Chamber this afternoon. I recall one of his latter comments when he said, “Don’t worry about the Young Liberals. The Young Liberals can look after themselves.” May I say to him that Young Liberals in Canada have already started looking after themselves, and I quote as evidence a statement in the Star Phoenix three days ago, Friday, February 28th, on page 3. Here we have the wording of a resolution sent to the Government of Saskatchewan by no less an unbiased group than the Canadian University Liberal Federation — Liberal university students. Here is what they had to say following their convention or during their convention:

This convention is on record as condemning certain Saskatchewan Government Members and hence Liberal Members for undesirable treatment of University of Saskatchewan students and the University in general, for example, through the press. And furthermore, let it be resolved that this Canadian University Liberal Federation Convention demand responsible, educated and progressive government action, Liberal party action, toward education in the future particularly at the university level.

And the telegram from the University Liberal students went on to say:

The negative attitude of your Government . . .

Your Government, Mr. Minister,

towards education has been of growing concern to Canadian student Liberals. A failure on the part of your Government to change can only lead us to consider other courses of action to bring about the changes necessary.

Mr. Speaker, I am inclined to agree with the Minister of Social Welfare (Mr. MacDonald) that the Young liberals can probably look after themselves and probably look after this Government in the doing of it.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Lloyd:** — Now let me turn to some of the other remarks of the Minister of Social Welfare. His remarks were most distinguished I submit by their lack of reference to the Budget, which presumably we are discussing. He talked almost entirely of the past. One comes to the conclusion that the Liberal Government has shot its bolt in that it is failing to talk about the future at all. His talk was almost completely of a defensive nature, and he tried to defend the Government by being offensive with respect to individuals, mostly those on this side of the House. He reminded me, Mr. Speaker, more than anything else of the story of the Holy Roman Empire which consisted mostly of boasting about alleged past glories.

His address was distinguished for something else, Mr. Speaker. It was distinguished by the amount of venom, vindictiveness and vilification which he used during that half hour. You know there was a time in the history of this Province when the crowned prince of venom, vindictiveness and vilification was one Mr. Hubert Staines. What I have to say after this afternoon is, “Move over, Hubert, you’ve been displaced in that doubtful category.” Mr. Speaker, it is not unusual for those of us on this side of the House to hear ourselves described by Members opposite as hypocrites, as liars, and in other ways of that kind. What is unusual is to have it repeated as often as that good, kind Minister of Welfare (Mr. MacDonald) did this afternoon in his address here.

The fact remains that after listening to him, he must know this that, whatever the accomplishments of his part in the past may have been, they can’t erase the future. The fact must be that the trouble with his oratorical embellishment of those activities is this, old people who need more money in order to have decent food can’t eat his oratory, students can’t use his oratory in order to pay the fees to go to university.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Lloyd:** — I admit, Mr. Speaker, if you could have bottled it and distilled it, you could have used it to dry grain but unfortunately you can’t even do that.

I was interested in his comments with respect to changes in this year’s Budget — and this was his one reference to the Budget — in regard to assistance to organizations building homes for old people or operating homes for old people. He spent some three minutes on this as I recall. You know since he

**March 3, 1969**

talked there has been a telephone call to my office saying that it is all very well for the Minister of Welfare to talk about more money from the Government to the public assistance program but at the same time the rates that the people are going to have to pay to these homes have gone up. The whole assistance to the individual is wiped out in that.

I couldn't help but be somewhat surprised listening to him with respect to how adequate is our supply for homes for senior citizens in the province and then reading his Annual Report. This arrived on our desks just a few days ago. According to the Minister they have reached the objective of the Liberal party in this regard. Yet his Annual Report on page 7 says:

The most serious obstacle encountered was the acute shortage of acceptable housing for low-income-bracket families and persons.

And the response of the Government to this is to call a halt for at least a year.

The report says again not only was the shortage of housing evident but "the rising cost of shelter provision was a major factor in inflation of welfare costs." On page 14 in the same document there is repeated this statement, "There is a serious shortage of acceptable housing for those in low-income brackets." The response of the Government in this is to cut down on the building program and to cut down on the assistance for operating these particular homes.

Mr. Speaker, there are some obvious conclusions that can be drawn with regard to the comments of the Members opposite about the Budget. One is that all of the Liberal MLAs have been well coached. I can in my mind's eye see a meeting of the MLAs and the Provincial Treasury is instructing them with regard to how to conduct themselves in the Budget Debate. He is saying to them, "Now look boys, everyone of you who gets up must chorus, 'The Budget is balanced, the Budget is responsible.' And I can hear the boys responding, "Aye, aye, Davey, we'll do it." I can hear some secondary coaching from the bench of the Minister of Highway (Mr. Boldt) and he says something like this, "Listen you kooks, the first one of you that fails to mention the Highway Program in your constituency gets some highway cut out of your constituency program this year." And I can hear the boys saying, "Aye, aye, Davey No. 2, we'll do what you say."

The second conclusion that comes from listening to this Debate is the unwillingness of the Government to face facts about Saskatchewan, unwillingness to admit that there are any real problems. Consequently we can't expect them to solve them. The only problem that they all seem to agree on, Mr. Speaker, is that the people of Canada made a big mistake in electing a Federal Liberal Government last fall. On that they are agreed.

Let me pinpoint some of this unwillingness to face facts.

The Minister of Mineral Resources (Mr. Cameron) was telling us a few days ago, and the Minister of Welfare (Mr. MacDonald) echoed it today, that everything was rosy and great and blooming with respect to oil production. Just a few hours before the Minister of Resources spoke he and his Government had received a brief from the Saskatchewan Petroleum Association which referred to “the lagging petroleum industry” in the province.

But I thought that the Attorney General (Mr. Heald) on Friday expressed the ultimate in assurances that all was well in 1969 in February. You may remember that he saw fit to use as evidence a letter from one of his constituents. The letter was something to this effect about how well the farmers are doing. He said, “The farmers’ bins are full of grain, their stalls are full of fat cattle and their wives full of babies to obtain the family allowance.” On the basis of that the Attorney General concluded and said that “the Government had done all that it could responsibly be asked to do.”

Thirdly, Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Education (Mr. McIsaac) said when he was speaking, “Not all school boards will get a grant increase of eight per cent.” Now there was a perfectly safe statement if it was ever possible to make a safe statement. They sure won’t all get a grant increase of eight per cent. But he goes on to underrate and to conceal the problem by suggesting that probably some more students per teacher will take care of the job. He didn’t say so but he may have thought that with the help of his carpenter friend from Unity he will recruit enough British teachers to look after the matter of teacher supply.

Mr. Speaker, speakers for the Government inside this House and outside this House try to perpetuate the myth that all the growth in this province started or at least took a tremendous spurt in 1964. The Minister of Social Welfare spent time on that this afternoon. Let me look at three indicators that ought to concern the Government if it is willing to remove the blinkers which blind it. Those three indicators are: the rate of growth of total personal income; the rate of increase in the value of mineral production; and the change in retail sales in Saskatchewan.

First, the change in total personal income — this comes from page 61 of the Budget Speech, that little blue book which everybody ought to read completely — in 1962 personal income increased \$446 million; 1963 \$166 million; but in 1964 it dropped by \$155 million. In 1965 it increased by \$288 million; in 1966 it increased by \$269 million. In 1967 it dropped by \$53 million. In 1968 it increased only \$62 million; the smallest increase in a period of about eight years. What is important from this set of figures I suggest is that the largest increase in our total personal income was the increase in 1962 over 1961, a time when supposedly we had stagnation in this province. What is further significant is that the increases in 1962 and 1963 together were greater than the total increases in 1965 and 1966



**March 3, 1969**

and 1967 and 1968 under a Liberal Government.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Lloyd:** — Quite clearly the rate of growth in personal income, even using inflated dollars, has slowed down since 1964, and the Government should not try to sweep this under the rug.

The second indicator — this was referred to by the Minister of Welfare (Mr. MacDonald) a while ago — has to do with the value of mineral production. You can get this on page 59 of the Budget Speech. Mineral production increased in 1962 by \$25 million. It increased again in 1963 by \$31 million. These were years of alleged stagnation. In 1964 it increased by \$20 million. We had our big year in 1965 when it increased by \$36 million, but ever since then the rate of increase has been going down. In 1966 the increase was \$21 million, in 1967 only \$13 million and in 1968 only \$9 million, and that is the Government's estimate which I distrust. This declining rate of increase doesn't substantiate the Liberal boast of performance and the origin of wealth in 1964.

Thirdly, let's look at retail sales for Saskatchewan and the information here is from a bulletin of the Retail Merchants Association. In 1968 retail sales dropped by \$17 million, or 1.29 per cent. Since costs have gone up it is a fair assumption that fewer actual goods were purchased. Let the Government particularly note some of the areas in which the amount of purchases even in dollar value went down. Family clothing went down last year by 3.5 per cent. And a lot of kids not as well clothed as a result I suggest. Lumber and building materials went down by 4 per cent and there are a lot of people less well housed as a result. Last year, 1968, was the first year since 1961 that retail sales have dropped. Even in 1961 with a poor crop the drop was only \$11 million, this year it was \$17 million. The Liberal claims of great diversification and great expansion don't stand the test of crunch and economic slow-down. In particular the Liberals ought to look at the whopping, frightening decrease in rural retail sales, because that drop, Mr. Speaker, and Mr. Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Steuart), was \$26.3 million and that ought to wake them up a little bit.

Mr. Speaker, if you look at the Budget Speech on page 54, there we see the percentage of total Government revenue which comes from resource revenues. That's all the revenue the Province gets, from the petroleum industry and from the potash industry and from the coal industry and all the rest of it. This year resource revenue accounted for some 12.8 per cent of the Budget, according to the Provincial Treasurer. But, if one looks at previous Budgets back in 1960 and 1964, at that time resource revenue amounted to some 15 to 16 per cent. In other words a small percentage of our total spending is coming from revenue from resources under this Government and larger percentage is coming out of personal taxation. There is continued

diversification in the province, yes, but the diversification is slowing down.

Mr. Speaker, I want to say something about one matter which was discussed in the Budget Debate recently by some of the Members opposite, and that is the estates tax proposal of the Government in 1969. May I say that the real major, human or economic problem arising from the effects of the estates tax is the effect on a person or persons receiving relatively small or medium estates by inheritance. This problem, Mr. Speaker, may be of two possible types. First, the amount of the tax may be such as to force the sale of some assets. This could reduce the remaining unit to a size too small to be economical. For example, if it is necessary to sell a quarter section of a section or a section and a half unit, then this could cripple the future of that enterprise. Secondly, the tax may be such as to require borrowing of some tens of thousands of dollars as an alternative to sale of some of the assets. It is obvious to everybody except the Members who sit on the Government side — that many farmers today can't meet their operating costs. That's the real rub. They can't meet those operating costs because of interest rates which are usurious and confiscatory. They can't meet them because of past experience and future prospects of selling grain. They can't meet them because of the present cost-price crunch which has been with us for too many years. Any added debt therefore compounds that problem. Mr. Speaker, what is true for farmers is equally true for persons who inherit a small business.

May I submit, Sir, that the question before this Legislature is or will be: does the same problem face all of those who inherit estates regardless of the size of the inheritance? I submit that this problem decreases in size as the estate increases into the higher levels. The human and the economic question for us is: do we apply the same solution for those who inherit estates regardless of the dollar size of the inheritance? Do we do the same things regardless of whether the inheritor lives now or ever has lived in Saskatchewan or ever intends to live in Saskatchewan? Do we follow the same pattern regardless of whether the person who has inherited contributed anything to the building up of the estate? Obviously the son or the daughter who has worked with or on the father's farm is in a different position. Do we do the same thing regardless of how the estate value was created?

Before deciding that, Mr. Speaker, I suggest that we look at some of the examples from the Alberta experience and I refer to a Globe and Mail report of recent weeks. They told there of grants totalling almost \$1,400,000 going to the beneficiaries of just three estates. The largest of these grants was over one-half million dollars. Three people, Mr. Speaker, received almost one-half as much in grants as did 403 others. Judging from the Premier's example of specific persons whom he named, the Government proposal would pay amounts of this category even if the beneficiaries no longer lived in Saskatchewan or

**March 3, 1969**

even in Canada. And what is plain is this, the Government proposes such large sums may be paid to those who inherit large estates.

At the same time the Budget tells us this Government is going to continue to collect deterrent fees from sick people. It is going to discontinue operating grants for homes of elderly people. The Government can't find money for those who wish to attend technical institutes and universities. The Government's program this year is forcing school boards to cut down on special services such as guidance councillors, to reduce expenditures such as those for libraries. Moreover, Mr. Speaker, the Government is going to keep under another law the authority to tax 100 per cent of some estates in excess of even \$10,000. My reference here is to the estates of some people who die after having been unfortunate enough to have had care and treatment at a mental health institution. This Government has the authority to tax 100 per cent of everything on that estate above \$10,000.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Lloyd:** — The question before the Legislature then, Mr. Speaker, will be whether we can justify such measures as those I have just referred to, which the Government is carrying on and, at the same time, propose to pay say a half a million dollars to someone who doesn't live in Saskatchewan and who may never have lived here.

Mr. Speaker, before this session ends, we will give the Government an opportunity to vote on how the money of Saskatchewan taxpayers should be used in measures of this kind.

Should it be used to add hundreds of thousands of dollars of wealth and power and opportunity to those who inherit large amounts, regardless of where they live or how the amounts were accumulated? Or should we restrict and confine the use of Saskatchewan tax dollars to those who inherit small or medium estates, who live in Saskatchewan, who have contributed to the value of the estate? Should we use the tax dollars in that way so that this small or medium-sized farm or business can continue to operate in Saskatchewan and be operated by Saskatchewan people? That I submit is the real question to be voted on in this Legislature. I urge the Government to amend its proposal so that tax dollars will help those whose financial position justifies protection by public action, those who will continue to live and work right here in our Province of Saskatchewan.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Lloyd:** — Now, Mr. Speaker, may I turn to some more general comment with respect to the Budget. We have heard, repeatedly as I said before, that the Budget is balanced, we've heard that it is a responsible Budget. Well let's look first of all at

this question of whether or not the Budget is balanced or whether the Budget is responsible.

Let me ask questions. Is the Budget responsible to the school boards and property taxpayers in Saskatchewan? I submit it is not. Is it responsible to students who are paying higher costs and finding work more difficult to get? I submit No. Is it responsible to farmers who face piles of damp grain, much of which is going to spoil unless they get cash help? The answer is No. Is it responsible to businessmen with large sums of outstanding credit for farm machinery or fuel? The answer is No. Is it responsible to those people who hope to own their own homes? The answer is No. Is it responsible to those sick people who are still paying and still going to be asked to pay deterrent fees? The answer is No. Is it responsible to unemployed people, many of whom are still looking for one of the promised 80,000 new jobs? The answer is No. Is it responsible to pensioners who had a cost of living increase awarded by the Federal Government and taken away by this Government? The answer is No. Mr. Speaker, this Budget fails the test of responsibility to those people in the province who most deserve a helping hand and an understanding approach.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Lloyd:** — Let me ask for a moment about the matter of balancing the Budget. The Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Steuart) claims that it is a balanced Budget. I think the more important question is: if it is balanced, how is it balanced? Well let's summarize. If it is balanced, it is balanced by some regrettable omissions, some unfortunate decreases and by continuing last year's savage increases in taxation. It is balanced because it included nothing to help farmers dry millions of bushels of damp grain. It is balanced by cutting down or cutting out grants for senior citizen homes. It is balanced by cutting out entirely the vote for student bursaries or scholarships. It is balanced by cutting down on conservation education. It is balanced by slowing down the development of outdoor recreation facilities. It is balanced by slowing down regional library extension. It is balanced, furthermore, Mr. Speaker, by drastically restricting the increase in school grants. The total increase this year, operation and construction, Federal and Provincial, is only \$2 million. It is balanced by maintaining all of last year's \$35 to \$40 million of tax increases. Mr. Speaker, this includes the tax on fuel used in farm tractors. It is balanced by maintaining the iniquitous tax on sick people. This the Government estimated last year would take some \$7 million out of the pockets of people at doctors' offices or in the hospitals. Mr. Speaker, to get any satisfaction from this Budget for most people in Saskatchewan is like trying to quench thirst by drinking water out of the ocean.

One other thing that is obvious from this Budget and the discussion of it by Government Members, is that the Government

**March 3, 1969**

is very obviously, in this Debate as in the Throne Speech Debate, trying to avoid any discussion of agricultural problems. It is trying to avoid discussion of agricultural problems for many reasons. First, its record for speaking for agriculture has been so shamefully inadequate. It is shamefully inadequate because it has nothing to say. It is shamefully inadequate because it is not convinced that there is a problem in agriculture, as the Attorney General told us the other day. It has nothing to say about meeting these problems because the things that have to be done to rescue a perishing agricultural economy are in conflict with the Saskatchewan Liberals' economic and social philosophy. There is a conflict because of Saskatchewan Liberals' unrealistic, unrelenting, and unquestioning support of a corporate enterprise philosophy. It bows down completely to corporate enterprise philosophy about government. It accepts without reservation the corporate enterprise methods of expanding corporate power over the lives of people.

I want to suggest some fourteen priority ways in which I think this Government should act at this session. In doing so it would help the family farm, it would help the family business. These proposals will give some help to the farmer while he is still alone and working on his farm.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Lloyd:** — First, take the tax off farm fuel used in tractors on the farm.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Lloyd:** — Secondly, get some hot air into damp grain instead of just hot air in the press about the Government's so-called help.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Lloyd:** — Listen to the Member from Humboldt (Mr. Breker) who told you just the other day, Mr. Treasurer, that there is a problem in getting grain dried simply because farmers don't have the cash to pay it.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Lloyd:** — Money spent now will prevent some spoilage of grain later on. It will also help the farmer to pay some of his bills. It will help the merchant, it will help the municipalities, it will help the communities, help Saskatchewan and it will help Canada. Why not, Mr. Premier and Mr. Treasurer and Mr. Minister of Agriculture, go at least as far as you pretended to be willing to go last December. Now, Mr. Speaker, last December Members will remember the Government got into the press saying it was arranging a meeting with Ottawa. It was going to put a proposal to Ottawa and this proposal was that the Federal Government should

pay something and the Provincial Government would match that amount to help farmers dry their grain. Why doesn't the Provincial Government if it meant that pay its share now? Why not, Mr. Speaker? Why not? I submit this, if it doesn't there is only one conclusion to come to. That is that last December's offer was simply a get-off-the-hook gimmick which it knew wouldn't cost it any money.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Lloyd:** — It made the proposal being completely sure that the Federal Government wasn't going to take it up and it would have something to talk about and say, "We tried." I think the question before this Legislature now is this: the Saskatchewan Liberal Government should put its money now where its mouth was last December about drying grain.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Lloyd:** — Let it support New Democrats and Conservatives in urging the Federal Government to put some money also into drying grain now. Let it put as much energy into that as it does in persuading the Government not to tax mining companies on a basis similar to what it does other companies.

Fourth, let it remove the deterrent fees charged . . .

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Lloyd:** — . . . fees which are charged even to people as they die before the very eyes of their own family. Let it relieve some of the living from some of their financial hardship.

Fifth, let it put something more than a grossly inadequate \$2 million more into school grants.

Six, let it vote some money for bursaries and scholarships instead of wiping out the vote entirely. Let it in doing this help some farmers' sons and the sons and daughters of other people of low and medium income to get to university and technical schools.

Seventh, let it remove the charges on estates of persons who have been unfortunate enough to have had mental health treatment. This was a charge which it imposed for the first time last year. I say again in doing that the Government reserved to itself the authority to tax 100 per cent of the value of some estates over \$10,000.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Lloyd:** — Eight, let it reduce the

**March 3, 1969**

power rates for farms and homes and small businesses. Last year it taxed the Power Corporation to the extent of \$3 million. This year it has gone up to \$4 million. What it will be next year with the Provincial Treasurer's passion for balancing budgets, heavens only knows. But let's remember that the power rates are part of the production costs and part of the cost of living of people in Saskatchewan. The record according to a Return tabled in this House in 1967 shows that in 1945 there was a general decrease in electric power rates. In 1946 there was a general decrease in electric power rates. In 1945 there was a general decrease in electric power rates. In 1956 residential and farm runoff rates were decreased and that took in the majority of accounts. In 1964 there was a general rate reduction excluding street lights and oil well pumping. Let's remember also there has been according to this Return of this Government no reduction since 1964.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Lloyd:** — We have had an increase in gas rates in some of the newer communities who are paying more than other communities before, and we've had a \$4 million tax on the users of power and gas.

Nine, let the Government improve crop insurance programs. The Minister of Agriculture (Mr. McFarlane) made a statement this afternoon about how much had been spent. I urge this Government to make crop insurance available for crops such as flax and fall rye, rape and mustard in addition to wheat, oats and barley, which are now covered. The Province of Manitoba under a Conservative Government includes all of these, includes in addition to these sugar beets and sunflowers. Manitoba has announced it is going to cover field peas this year. I draw attention that the increase in Provincial expenditure for crop insurance in this Budget is only \$40,000.

Ten, let the Government restore the Agricultural Machinery Testing program.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Lloyd:** — The cost of maintenance of farm machinery is a big production cost I feel relatively sure that this program, by testing grain dryers this fall, might well have paid for its complete cost of operation. It can do something to advance farm safety. Members will recall the first report from the Royal Commission on farm machinery saying at one point, "Little or nothing has been done by the manufacturer or the Provincial Government to make farm machinery less dangerous." Every farm organization in Saskatchewan has endorsed the testing program, every farm organization has requested its reinstatement and extension. This Liberal Government destroyed it and injured the farmer's productive position in doing so.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Lloyd:** — Eleven, let it do something about creating a Consumer's Agency to work for the consumer, to speak for the consumer, to listen to the consumer, and to give the consumer some protection in the market place. Let it do something about getting some action about the recommendations of the Batten Royal Commission. It has done precious little if anything about it. We should be reminded of the increased cost of food. We should be reminded that the food handling corporations have increased their profits in the last year reported by \$150 million. At a time when farm earnings were going down and at a time when costs of food were going up, large food corporations increased their profits in Canada by \$150 million. This Government should be interested, it should give people some machinery to deal with consumer problems.

Twelve, let it restore the cuts from the assistance made when the Federal Government paid added amounts because the cost of living had gone up. Why, Mr. Treasurer, tax these people? That's what you do when you take off their allowance. Why tax these hardest pressed of all, our old people, farm people and others in that particular way? I recently had a letter from one of these older citizens, Mr. Speaker. He informed me that he was a pensioner, that he was 77 years of age. He said, "I would work if I could." He went on to observe how shocked he was when the Saskatchewan Government took off the amount of the supplement that the Federal Government had added to the old age pension. He had just had his assistance reduced by something like \$2.10. He made an observation with which I think everybody here would have to agree. The old gentleman said, "It was a most cruel thing to do." And the people who perpetrated that cruelty are the gentlemen who sit on your right.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Lloyd:** — Let them restore in full the maintenance grants and the construction grants for senior citizens homes which this Budget decreases or takes away.

Fourteen, let this Government raise its voice and level its argument at the Federal Government of Canada to correct some of these problems which are economically crippling many living farmers; some of these problems which are destroying many Saskatchewan businessmen; some of these problems which are liquidating many small and medium and even larger farmers right now; some of these problems which are forcing some of our merchants to the verge of bankruptcy, if not into it. Let it do something to solve those problems which prevent a great many people from building an estate or protecting the present one. Let this Government demand with a vigor it does some other things, a two-price system for wheat. Let it demand and give its support to the Wheat Board and the Wheat Board idea. From all over this



**March 3, 1969**

province come reports of farmers selling No. 2 hard dry wheat for 60 cents or 70 cents a bushel. They are so hard pressed for cash that many of them are forced to undertake fire sales of that kind. Let this Government say something where it might count in regard to price production for livestock farmers. Let it urge action to study obsolete methods of handling and transporting grain in Canada. Let it take some action or urge some action to prevent the growth of corporation farming in Canada.

Mr. Speaker, those are fourteen proposals which would help many family farms and many farm people and other family people now, while they are still living.

Let me turn to one or two other aspects of the Budget and what it doesn't do. I want to refer to the space needed at the University and the space which was expected at the University. You know in February, one year ago, at Saskatoon, the Veterinary College was expected to be available for substantial occupancy on August 1, 1968. Well in February, 1969, the Veterinary College was ready to the extent that it has three classrooms, one lecture lab and four labs, that's all, since Christmas, since January 1, 1969. They had hoped to have substantial occupancy in August 1, 1968. At Saskatoon, the Education Building was supposed to be available for substantial occupancy on September 1, 1969. Well, we know that out of a contract bid of about \$6 million only \$2½ million has been spent. I doubt if that target is going to be met. It was expected that the Medical and Dental addition would be available for substantial occupancy on September 1, 1970 in Saskatoon. We know, Mr. Speaker, that this building which is to cost some \$7 million was commenced in 1968. One and one-half years later, the Government has spent on it, \$260,000. It isn't going to be ready by September 1, 1970, obviously.

Here in Regina the situation is even slower. The Education Building was to be ready for substantial occupancy on September 1, 1970. The contract was for almost \$6 million. \$3½ million is spent. It is doubtful it can be ready in time. And the University had expected the Engineering Building a year ago to be ready for substantial occupancy in September 1, 1971. My impression is that this building hasn't even fully been approved as yet. The point is that the progress is much too slow to meet the actual needs of the University or of Saskatchewan's young people.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Lloyd:** — I want to examine one more aspect of the Government's record, and that is its tax record. I do this because in speaking in this Legislature a week or so ago, the Premier said, "You know there has been a lot of tax reductions since the Liberals took over." Well let's look at some of them. Let's compare this year's Estimates in the little blue book with the 1964-65 records. And if you do so you will find this: The

Government this year proposes to collect some \$20 million more in sales tax than was collected in 1964-65. Well there has been some inflation, there has been some growth, but there have also been some increases in rates and there have been a lot of new items taxed.

If you look at gasoline tax, it proposes to collect this year \$17 million more than was collected in 1964-65. The rate has been increased twice and there is a new gasoline tax on those fuels used in farm tractors.

Let's look at the personal income taxes collected by the Federal Government and paid over to the Province: \$47 million more there. Some decrease in Provincial rates but a much larger share for the Province and consequently the Province is getting 240 per cent of the 1964-65 income taxes.

Let's look finally at the tax collector's best friend, liquor profits. Here we find that the Government proposes this year to take \$10 million more than in the year when it first took office. Now there has been added consumption of liquor it is true. You can't have four years of Liberal Government without driving a lot more people to drink.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Lloyd:** — There have been several price increases and it adds up to some \$10 million.

From these four tax fields alone, Mr. Speaker, \$94 million more is being obtained by the Provincial Government. Add even a few of the newer taxes: the tobacco tax, the hospital revenue tax, the surcharge on drivers under 25, the 2 per cent tax on automobile accident insurance premiums, and you easily get \$100 million more of taxes being garnered up for spending by the Provincial Treasurer than was available when the present Government first took office. That's tax reduction.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Lloyd:** — You know, Mr. Speaker, I am reminded that the Liberals promised 80,000 more new jobs. These we didn't get. I am reminded that they promised tax reductions. Tax increases we got. It seems that, if one listens to the promise and expects almost the opposite, you are likely to be right.

This Government will collect then \$100 million easily more. But this doesn't count the tens of millions of dollar increase in local government taxes. These too the Liberals said should, could and would be decreased.

\$100 million more not counting either the increase in medical and hospital insurance premiums it imposed, not counting

**March 3, 1969**

the deterrent fees on sick, some \$7 million which it admitted to last year, not counting several increases in insurance costs. (Some of these increases I submit were simply to make Government insurance rates less competitive with private insurance rates.)

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Lloyd:** — A \$100 million and more, more tax monies they are going to be spending. But even this isn't the whole picture. This doesn't count a host of other increases on charges. Let me list a few of them: increased charges for grazing leases; increased charges for telephone rates; for land title services; for Local Government Board service; for writing high school examinations; for correspondence school courses; for going to technical institutes; for going to university; for board and room at university; for using Provincial parks and camp sites; for care in nursing homes; for advertising in telephone directory — you'll find it even in the yellow pages, Mr. Speaker — for registering births and deaths, and if I hadn't run out of breath I could go on with that list, Mr. Speaker.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Lloyd:** — I think the conclusion is this. Since this Liberal Government acted last year, prenatal care costs are more because of deterrent fees. A few years ago it increased the costs of registering deaths. Before you are born and after you are dead the Liberal tax collector is waiting.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Lloyd:** — Surely, Mr. Speaker, this is a Government whose program of tax increases stretches from the womb to the tomb and you can't get much more comprehensive than that.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Lloyd:** — Perhaps we shouldn't go back so far. Let's go back to just last year, post-election year, when it put on tax increases of \$35 million to \$40 million. They amount to much more than that this year. This again didn't count the substantial property increase for local governments, and that was as high as 12 mills for education alone.

But you know the tax increases didn't stop when the Legislature finished in 1968, not even with a \$35 million increase. Since the last session but before this session, the Liberals increased charges in at least 10 other ways. By Order-in-Council on April 11, it cost more to write grade 12 examinations. I don't know what the principle was here. Was it a deterrent fee,

a utilization based on income or what? By Order-in-Council in April the cost of correspondence schools went up and the cost of going to technical schools went up. By Order-in-Council a couple of months later, in June, new fees for real estate brokers were added. By Order-in-Council in August, the Liberals are busy fellows, these guys, camping fees went up. By Order-in-Council in August again, services of land titles office went up. By Order-in-Council in November, the surtax on insurance premiums was increased. By Order-in-Council in November again, the cost of registration of special-care homes went up; and the charges on local government boards went up and probably there are others that I have not noticed.

I want to make one other comment about this Budget, Mr. Speaker. If you look at the little blue book again, I repeat, in 1964 almost 16 per cent of the revenue came from resource revenues; in 1969 this had decreased to about 13 per cent. The Liberal philosophy is to shift costs from public revenues to personal pocket books. Look at the help the Government had from Ottawa during this period of time. The Federal Tax Agreements are going to produce \$52 million more this year than they did in 1964-65. They are going to take care of 30 per cent of the Budget as compared to 26 per cent of the Budget at that time. The Federal Assistance for welfare is about \$5½ million more than it was in the year it took office. And of course this year and next year it has for the first time, one-half the cost of medicare. I estimate there is something over \$70 million more collected by the Federal Government and turned over to the Saskatchewan Provincial Treasurer than was the case in 1964.

In the face, Mr. Speaker, of last year's increase in taxation, in the face of all of the increased assistance from Ottawa, then small wonder that the Provincial Treasurer can call a halt to taxation increases in 1969. Small wonder about that. What must be wondered about is, however, his audacity and that of his comrades to boast of how much better Saskatchewan is doing than other provinces. What must be wondered about is his complete and utter arrogance in pretending that the Liberal Government is responsible in this Budget to Saskatchewan people or to the promises which Liberals made to Saskatchewan people.

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

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Smishek** (Regina North East): — Mr. Speaker, at the outset I want to talk a few minutes about some specific needs in my constituency. The Liberal Budget we are asked to vote on virtually does nothing to attend to the problems of the people I represent in Regina North East.

Last year when I spoke during the Throne Debate, I informed the Legislature that in my constituency there is no high

**March 3, 1969**

school and none were close to the various boundaries of my constituency. The population of my constituency is close to that of the city of Moose Jaw and larger than that of Prince Albert. The people in my constituency are deeply concerned about this problem. In the north part of my constituency the citizens have formed an organization whose chief objective is to promote the building of a high school. They have made representation to the Regina City Council. In the area north of McKinley Avenue, between Albert and Winnipeg Streets alone, it is estimated that by 1972 there will be close to 1,000 students trying to enter high school. About another 500 must be added to that figure from the Eastview district.

Many of the youngsters going to high school from the north part of Regina have to catch buses as early as 7:15 in the morning and don't return home until 5:30 in the evening. It has been brought to my attention that for one family in this area that has three teenagers going to high school, transportation costs alone to send these children to school costs almost \$20 per month. The father's gross income is slightly over \$400. It means that almost 5 per cent of his monthly wage is used to transport his children to school. A similar situation exists with respect to the Glen Elm and Glen Cairn districts. I realize that there is a plan to build a vocational "A" school in Glen Elm South. The purpose of this school is to accommodate students between the ages of 15 and 18 from all over the city. This school is to meet the needs of students who have not completed grade 8. Emphasis will be on vocational, not academic instruction.

The Minister of Education (Mr. McIsaac) speaking in this Debate the other day mentioned that there is a comprehensive school to be constructed in the city of Regina. I did discuss the matter with him later, and he concurs that there is no comprehensive school to be built in the city of Regina. What he meant was the vocational "A" school. Last year I urged the Minister of Education to initiate talks with the Regina Board of Education, the Separate School Board and to try to work out a tripartite agreement for building a high school in the boundaries of Regina North East. I proposed a tripartite agreement because I realize that a modern high school, properly equipped and staffed, costs a lot of money. I said last year, "This could be a useful experiment, both economically and practically in meeting a desperate need in this large area of our city." I repeat this request again. I know this proposal has the support of the public and separate school supporters in Regina North. The Citizens' Committee I mentioned earlier is advocating the same plan. During this session, Mr. Speaker, I propose to discuss the matter further.

We need an effective air pollution control program. Air pollution continues to be a serious problem in Regina North East. In case some of the Members are not aware, this includes most of the city's industrial section, most Regina manufacturing plants are located in or near the residential area of Regina

North East, oil refineries, meat packing plants. The steel and cement plants are not far off our boundaries. These plants send off fumes and debris which constantly contaminate the air. Because of this condition, a majority of our residents seldom breathe fresh air. Again, last summer, dozens of citizens in Regina North were faced with discoloration of their homes, caused by chemical fallout.

The Government has announced its intention to introduce legislation which will help prevent pollution of our water. I hope, Mr. Speaker, that the Government's program will be more effective than the program to control pollution of air. It is not enough to pass a law, establish an advisory committee, appoint a few staff people and then hope the problem will disappear. An air pollution control program requires an adequate staff. It needs money for testing and research. It must compel under a severe penalty of law, those who pollute our air to install equipment to prevent the endangering of the air. Mr. Speaker, I urge the Minister to get on with it. He has the responsibility to protect the health of our citizens from industrial and other fallout and ensure that no one is compelled to breathe impure air.

We need an effective housing plan within the financial means of our people. Anyone studying the housing problems of our people will agree that Canada is facing a serious housing crisis. But this Government is oblivious to the problem. In the present Budget, a meagre sum of \$197,350 is provided for housing. Look at page 34 of the Estimates; it is only \$6,000 more than last year.

Thousands of citizens in Regina North East are compelled to live in inadequate housing conditions and those who have decent homes are faced with extremely high payments. These are either high mortgage payments or high rental payments. Interest rates are unbearable. Municipal taxes are too high, because the Government has failed to provide sufficient funds for education and adequate grants to municipalities for their programs. In 1964, Mr. Speaker, the Liberals in Regina promised to reduce the mill rates. They said that they would provide from Provincial funds 50 per cent of all education costs in Regina. They only paid 28 per cent last year. And look at the 1969 proposed grants. It appears obvious that the percentage will even be less this year than it was last year. They promised to provide an equitable share of gasoline tax revenues for Regina road and street maintenance construction. Gasoline revenues have been increasing sharply. On the average, every citizen in Regina pays \$50 of such taxes, but the city only receives a \$5 per capita return for road construction and maintenance.

They promised to exempt city purchases from the Provincial sales tax. Nothing has been done here either. Despite their promise, they refuse to exempt the citizens from paying this tax. However, according to the Hon. Member for Regina South

**March 3, 1969**

West (Mr. McPherson) they will rebate industry with the sales tax paid. They also propose to rebate some \$4 million of estates tax. This will benefit only 5 per cent of the population who are the well-to-do and who have acquired large estates.

We need a special program for the Indian and Métis people. I believe, Mr. Speaker, there are more Indian and Métis people in Regina North East than in other parts of our city. The immediate program should include employment opportunity and adult education and training program, a special plan to meet their needs. Time permitting, I will discuss the needs of our native Canadians in more detail a little later.

We need a publicly supported day-care and nursery program. Because of the constantly rising cost of living, I find that in a great many families both parents are forced to work in order to make ends meet. The need for a publicly supported day-care nursery scheme becomes more urgent with each passing day. I urge the Government to give this immediate attention.

My next proposal, Mr. Speaker, is that I ask the Government to have some improvement in the labor standards. Specifically I propose the introduction of \$1.75 an hour minimum wage, a legal 40-hour work week and a sick pay plan. These three proposals would benefit many wage earners in my constituency. We have many unskilled and semi-skilled employees in Regina North East. A great many don't belong to unions and don't have the benefit of collective bargaining rights. Raising minimum labor standards to the level I have just suggested would help greatly to improve their living standards, improve their working conditions and give them a measure of security.

Regina needs action on the Base Hospital. Citizens are getting fed up with the delay and the procrastination on the part of this Government in getting the Base Hospital started. I know the Minister of Public Health (Mr. Grant) gets annoyed any time we raise this important issue. But as a Member of the Legislature I have a responsibility to keep prodding and insisting on action, especially when I read such reports as the one appearing in last Friday's Leader Post. Dr. G.E. Sinclair said we have an "extremely acute" shortage of beds. He went on to say "the situation is such that patients are being admitted only when their illness reaches the emergency level." The newspaper report tells that in the General Hospital "there have been times in the last few years when the hospital wasn't even able to admit an emergency case." This, I suggest, is an extremely serious situation. In view of this, Mr. Speaker, I plead with the Minister to take action. There is an additional cause for concern. I am worried that the delay beyond this year will mean that we will lose our rights for national hospital construction grants. The Provincial Treasurer warns us that the Federal hospital construction grant will terminate on March 31, 1970, with exception of those projects approved and under construction as of that date. I ask, Mr. Speaker, that the Minister of Health give this Legislature before it

prorogues, the full details on the Base Hospital, its size, method of financing, cost and especially the definite date when construction will start.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Smishek:** — Mr. Speaker, I now want to turn to a topic which is of serious concern to this Legislature and to the people of Saskatchewan. My colleagues have already discussed the total inadequacies of the money the Government is allocating in this Budget for education. Ever since I took my seat in the Legislature in 1965, Government spokesmen have talked long and loud about their interest in improving the quality and quantity of education, but the true facts are that this Government has given education a low priority. One aspect of education I want to discuss this afternoon is the technical and vocational education. I propose to prove to this Legislature and to the People of Saskatchewan that technical education has received very shabby treatment from this Government. In fact the Government has carried on a skeleton operation, at best it's a minimum program. Let me first recap the Government announcements in this field of education. Then I will compare it with the facts of the situation. In 1965 during the first Budget, Premier Thatcher made these statements in his Budget Address. Let me quote:

To meet the growing demands of skilled tradesmen and semi-professional and technical people, the Government proposes to expand the vocational and technical facilities in the province.

He then called for an estimated expenditure of \$2.5 million to \$3 million.

In 1966 in his second Budget, the Premier became more generous and said:

This Budget proposes major steps to emphasize and expand the technical and trade training program. Such a program is urgently needed . . . By training our young people in the province, we hope to encourage them to remain in Saskatchewan.

Then he carried on and he said:

In this Budget we have provided for: 1. An extension of facilities in the Saskatchewan Technical Institute, Saskatoon, at an estimated cost of \$4 million . . . 2. We are extending the facilities at Moose Jaw to handle another 125 technology students. \$125,000 is included in the Budget for this purpose.

Thirdly he said:

Work has commenced on three technical vocational schools



**March 3, 1969**

in Regina, Yorkton and Lloydminster.

The people of Regina, Mr. Speaker, are still trying to find where and when the work on the Regina institute was started.

In 1967, in his third and last Budget, the Premier said in part:

We must provide for a substantial increase in enrolment in the technology courses. We are, therefore, proposing to increase the operating budget for the technical schools by approximately \$2.2 million, bringing the total in the coming year to about \$5 million.

Mr. Speaker, the total appropriation for operating and living allowances and equipment costs for the year 1967-68 was in fact more. It was \$5,333,750, less Federal reimbursements of almost \$1½ million with the Provincial net amount being \$3.8 million. Mr. Speaker, don't get excited, this amount was not spent. The operating expenditures were cut by almost \$¾ million, even though the Federal Government kept its commitment and did provide \$1.5 million.

In 1968, the new Provincial Treasurer took office. He was even more generous and he said:

We propose to spend \$6.8 million for technical and trade training in 1968-69.

In this year's Budget — look at the words he uses here:

Our Government plans to spend \$8 million on technical and vocational training, an increase of 15 per cent over last year's high.

Mr. Speaker, don't believe that figure. This Government since it took office, to the end of 1968 fiscal year has spent only \$7.6 million on operating and equipment costs on the total technical and vocational programs, and only, Mr. Speaker, \$2.7 million on construction.

Let us briefly look at some of the other grandiose announcements made by Cabinet Ministers regarding technical and vocational construction. The Leader Post, February 19, 1965, a statement made by the former Minister of Education (Mr. Trapp) said:

Six vocational schools initiated.

He then went on to say:

Size of the buildings has not yet been determined and no expenditures have been made.

It doesn't know where it will build them, it doesn't know what

kind of schools, but it makes the announcements.

In the Star-Phoenix, December 17, 1965:

Plans for a \$4 million expansion program will be made to double the present capacity of the institute in Saskatoon was announced by Education Minister Trapp.

In the Regina Leader Post, October 22, 1966 and let me quote:

A major technical institute may be built in Regina by 1970. Education Minister Trapp said Thursday.

The Minister, who had earlier said such an institute was under consideration said in an interview:

I think we must have it here by 1970.

Well, Mr. Speaker, 1966, 1967 and 1968 came and went with no plans, no land purchased, no money appropriated to keep a promise made by the former Minister of Education. We are now budgeting for part of 1970. But look at the Estimates. There is no appropriation for a Regina institute, not a red cent. There is no doubt that Regina needs a modern institute of technology, properly equipped and staffed to meet the needs of the citizens of Regina and the surrounding community. Thousands of young people and adults are being denied the opportunity of getting training for the new skills required by industries that are automated. The people of Regina agree the need is desperate. Organized labor, business, Chamber of Commerce, our educators, all agree that the time is long overdue for such an educational institute to be located in Regina. I doubt that there is a city in Canada the size of Regina that today does not have such facilities. I again urge the Minister of Education (Mr. McIsaac) and the Government to give this matter early consideration. We would welcome an announcement from the Government before the session ends that plans are proceeding forthwith to construct an institute of technology in Regina.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Smishek:** — Mr. Speaker, here is another announcement made by a Government spokesman, Leader Post of May 26, 1967:

‘A \$6,247,000 contract for construction of stage two of the Saskatchewan Institute of Applied Arts and Science in Saskatoon has been awarded,’ Public Works Minister Gardiner announced today.

Our new Minister of Education to prove that he can also count in the millions was not going to be outdone by his predecessors, who every few weeks announced vocational and technical schools to be constructed, but which never materialized,

**March 3, 1969**

a \$2 million school here, \$5 million school here, \$6 million extension somewhere else. One day it even announced that an \$11,850,000 school construction plan was underway.

Our new Minister of Education was taken for a ride to Prince Albert by the Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Steuart) and what did he do? He announced an \$8 million vocational school for Prince Albert. He had the project on the way to Ottawa for approval, he had plans ready for the okay of the Local Government Board, and a vote among the burgesses. He issued a big press release and got a big headline on March 6, 1968. But what are the results a year later? No land has been purchased, no money appropriated last year, no appropriation this year. He has spoken twice during this session, during the Throne Speech and the Budget Debate, but did not say a word about the Prince Albert school.

Well, let us put aside all the grandiose announcements and the windy speeches, and let us look at the cold facts as they appear in the Public Accounts. Let us first look at the capital expenditures for technical and vocational schools: In 1964-65, appropriation, \$1.9 million; actual expenditure, \$132,000; Federal reimbursements, \$35,000; net Provincial cost, \$97,000. We had originally appropriated \$1.9 million. In 1965-66, appropriation, \$455,000; actual expenditure, \$27,000; Federal reimbursement, just about \$9,000; net Provincial cost, \$19,000 only. Some of this expenditure included small portions of money for the Teachers College in Saskatoon and the School for the Deaf. In 1966-67, appropriation, \$2.6 million; actual expenditure, \$1,036,000. No reimbursement from Ottawa, Mr. Speaker. Take note of this.

This was the year, I believe, if my memory is right, that Walter Gordon was the Federal Minister of Finance and you know what the Premier thought of him. He hated him so much that it looks as if he wouldn't even send him the bills for Federal reimbursement. Under the Federal-Provincial Government Agreement, Ottawa agreed to pay 75 per cent of the cost of technical institutes. These businessmen across the way lost the people of Saskatchewan three quarter of a million dollars. This is the way they applied the recommendation of the Johnson Commission of "modern management science."

Take 1967-1968. Appropriation \$3,772,000, actual expenditures \$3.1 million, Federal reimbursement \$1,546,000. Net Provincial cost \$1,555,000. So in the four years, 1964 to 1968 fiscal period, the Legislature approved expenditures for vocational and technical schools for capital alone totaling almost \$9 million. To give you the exact figure \$8,914,850, but the actual expenditure was only \$4,297,000, less than 50 per cent, Mr. Speaker. Federal reimbursements amounted to \$1.6 million, but the Budget estimates for reimbursements were over \$5 millions. The total net Provincial expenditure for technical school construction, Mr. Speaker, was only \$2,707,000 in the period of four years, and these people have the nerve to tell

us that they place education in a high priority. Well, Sir, I think they have a priority, but it is a low priority, a priority that's at the bottom of the totem pole.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Smishek:** — The Minister tries to give us excuses why we are not providing technical and vocational training, saying there isn't a demand for the vocations and skills for which people are applying. The simple truth is that we do not have the space, we have no facilities, no programs to accommodate the needs of our people.

Is this the way, Mr. Speaker, I ask the Premier as well, to encourage young people to remain in Saskatchewan, by starving their educational needs? This is one of the reasons why, Mr. Speaker, year after year Saskatchewan is losing its natural population growth. And we are going to continue losing our people unless we start moving with an adequate education program. No province in the Dominion of Canada has done less than this Saskatchewan Government in meeting the urgent need for technical and vocational training and education in the last five years.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Smishek:** — Well, Mr. Speaker, let us look at 1968-69. What about the current fiscal year? A few days after the session opened, I asked questions respecting Moose Jaw, Weyburn and Saskatoon institutes. I asked the Government to tell us for the period April 1 to December 31, 1968, the amount of money spent for new capital construction, the amount of money spent on renovation, amount of Federal and Provincial expenditures, the number of square feet for additional space provided, the number of additional students who can be accommodated as a result of such additions.

Last Friday I got the answer to the Weyburn Vocational Centre. The answer was Nil to all five questions. Not a single penny was spent on construction or expansion or renovation there. I expect a similar answer in respect to Moose Jaw.

Last year we appropriated \$3,525,000 for the Saskatoon Institute of Applied Arts and Science. I will wait for details of the answer, but we do know now that this amount has not been expended.

Let us now take a look for a minute, Mr. Speaker, in regard to operating expenditures. The total this Legislature appropriated in the four-year period was \$16,549,000. The actual expenditure was \$15,736,000, \$808,000 less than we have appropriated. Federal reimbursements amounted to over \$8 million. The Provincial Government from its commitment shortchanged the Vocational and Training Program by \$581,000 during

**March 3, 1969**

this period.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Smishek:** — These figures include the general operating costs of technical institutes, the equipment and living allowances for trainees that qualify. This Government is cutting corners and chiselling in every way it can on technical and vocational education and training. The Government admits that thousands of people have been denied the opportunity of getting the necessary education and upgrading, because it has failed and refused to provide adequate facilities and develop needed programs, even though generous amounts of money are available from Ottawa for sharing the cost of vocational and technical education.

Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Education (Mr. McIsaac) is reported in the Regina Leader Post of January 10, 1968, to have said:

The Saskatchewan Government has adopted an energetic program of vocational training.

The unvarnished truth is that in the last five years there has been a minimum operation, a minimum program in this field.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Smishek:** — I have provided the proof that this Government in the four-year period has only spent \$2.7 million on capital and only \$7.6 million on operating and equipment costs.

One can almost say that this Government's pinching pennies on technical, vocational education in today's technology is a crime against society.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Smishek:** — Cutting costs on these programs is going to cost Saskatchewan dearly. Young people are leaving Saskatchewan because it is not providing them with adequate educational opportunities. I urge the Minister (Mr. McIsaac) to make an immediate review of the present inadequate program, to invite the advice of management, labor and educators, to establish a Research Branch on Automation suggested by the Hon. Member for Saskatoon Riversdale (Mr. Romanow).

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Smishek:** — I ask him to take a look at what is going on in other provinces. I ask him to stop short-changing technical and

vocational education. I ask him to get going, time is running out.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Smishek:** — Mr. Speaker, I want to pursue further the allegation that was made by the Opposition financial critic, the Hon. Member for Regina Centre (Mr. Blakeney) that the figures quoted in the Budget are not to be trusted.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Smishek:** — I must say that even the Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Steuart) gets mixed up in his own figures and does not believe them himself.

I draw your attention, Mr. Speaker, to page 19 of the Budget Address, under the sub-heading of 'Education'. In part, in paragraph three, he states:

Net expenditures on education are expected to reach \$121.4 million, up \$10 million.

I ask you to turn to page 45, under the sub-heading 'Summary of expenditure proposed.' In paragraph three he states, and I quote:

Education spending will increase by \$10 million to \$118 million.

A difference of \$3.4 million, Mr. Speaker. I ask him which figure are we to believe?

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**An Hon. Member:** — We've got to get another accountancy.

**Mr. Smishek:** — Mr. Speaker, we can all remember a Liberal Cabinet Minister in Ottawa several years ago saying, "What's a million." Since these words have been spoken we have had some inflation. Perhaps we will hear the Hon. Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Steuart) one day say: "What's \$3.4 million?" The Liberal Governments gave several times that amount out of the public purse to Parsons and Whittemore, owners of the Prince Albert pulp mill.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Smishek:** — Now, Mr. Speaker, I was interested in the remarks of the Welfare Minister (Mr. MacDonald) when he talked about the pulp mill. He gave us a figure that there were in the total

**March 3, 1969**

operation some 550 employees employed. Mr. Speaker, I have a news clipping here dated December 4, 1965, when the Premier made the announcement about the pulp mill and here's a quote, "A joint statement by Mr. Thatcher and Mr. Langer said the woods and the mill operation would employ 5,000 people." What happened to the other 4,500 people, Mr. Speaker?

**An Hon. Member:** — . . . exaggeration.

**Mr. Smishek:** — Mr. Speaker, during the last three years I have had the privilege to serve on the Public Accounts Committee. I invite all the Members to spend a few hours studying this document. I admit it's not the most exciting document to read compared to some of the novels one can pick up in a news stand, but it gives a telling story of why you should not believe and why you cannot trust Liberal Budgets.

Let me refer to the Public Accounts for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1968. I invite the Members to examine the Statement of Legislative Appropriations, Expenditures, Unexpended and Overexpended Balances, on pages 387 to 407 in the Public Accounts.

Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Minister of Welfare (Mr. MacDonald) made reference to 1960-61 Budget, I believe, there were certain expenditures that were not made. The figures he quoted were in the hundreds, a few were in the thousands. Let me quote some figures to him from this current, or the latest Public Accounts.

These are the revealing facts about the previous Budget. When you add up all the underexpenditures and the overexpenditures, you will find that the Government chiselled the people of Saskatchewan to the tune of over \$7¼ million in that year alone. It had failed to spend \$7¼ million on programs approved by the Legislature.

**An Hon. Member:** — Hid it under the rug.

**Mr. Smishek:** — And let us take a look at some of the departments in which they chiselled. Agriculture, not in the thousands, not in the hundreds, Mr. Speaker, it was \$1,237,000.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Smishek:** — Education, Mr. Speaker, \$1,887,000. Public Health, Mr. Speaker, \$2,669,000. Public Works, Mr. Speaker, \$490,000. Primarily the chiselling went on technical education. Add these figures from these four departments alone, \$6 million were not expended. This is not in the thousands, in the hundreds, it is in the millions, Mr. Speaker. Furthermore, if you examine the 1968 financial statements, you will see that many of the projected revenues were not realized. This was the

year that the economic prospects were much brighter than they are today, but had not Ottawa provided an additional \$5½ million and Crown corporations, the ones they continue to condemn always, had not provided \$850,000, we would have had a serious deficit.

Mr. Speaker, it is most interesting that while the Liberals criticize the Crown corporations, they never hesitate to dig into them, as they did dig into this year's profits of the Crown corporations to the tune of almost \$11 million. Where would they be without these Socialist enterprises, Mr. Speaker?

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Smishek:** — Well, Sir, the farm economy was not faced with the same kind of crisis back in 1968 as it is now. Retail sales were on the increase and not on the decline as they are today; unemployment was not as high as it is now. The Labour Minister (Mr. Coderre) talks to us about full employment, then how come, Mr. Minister of Labour, that at the end of December there were almost 28,000 workers registered with the Manpower offices as unemployed and seeking work?

**An Hon. Member:** — Shame, shameful.

**Mr. Smishek:** — Mr. Speaker, I have very serious doubts that we will realize the revenues projected in this Budget or that the Government will be able or even try to spend the amount that it is asking us to provide. It is a padded Budget in many, many ways.

Mr. Speaker, let me conclude by referring to the report of the Provincial Audit. The Liberals talked about the balanced Budget. Let us look at the report of the auditor for the year ending March 31, 1968. On page 9, Mr. Speaker, it is an interesting revelation. The Government disbursed \$11 million more than it took in on programs which were financed from the previous cash balances. We were \$11 million worse off at the end of 1968 than we were in 1967, in terms of our cash position. In 1967 our financial position, that is we had a balance of some \$45 million. This was our cash position, but in the year 1968 our position was reduced by just about \$11 million. In other words the Government financed out of previous reserves the current operation. Had it not been for that again there would have been an \$11 million deficit.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Smishek:** — Mr. Speaker, these are the reasons why we cannot trust the Budget that's before us. As the critic for the Opposition (Mr. Blakeney) has described it, this is a Budget not to be trusted, this is a Budget of the old, ailing and failing



**March 3, 1969**

Government. Mr. Speaker, I cannot support the Budget, I will support the amendment.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Hon. Mr. Steuart** (Provincial Treasurer): — Mr. Speaker, I would first like to deal with some of the remarks made by the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Lloyd) when he spoke this afternoon.

You know when he started off he talked about the Young Liberals, but I noticed that he failed, as he always does and as all Members do, to talk about the NDY the Young New Democrats. Well I don't blame them. If I was a Member of that discredited party over there I would be ashamed to talk about the NDY myself.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Hon. Mr. Steuart:** — He also charged that we instructed Dave Boldt and Hon. Members to talk about a balanced Budget on highways. And he referred to our Members here as gooks. Well, they are not gooks, they are intelligent people that you over there would have trouble recognizing. But I will tell you one thing, I don't know what they talk about, they make up their own mind, but they write their own speeches and that is more than can be said about those dandies on that side of the House.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Hon. Mr. Steuart:** — As a matter of fact, not only does somebody write their speeches for them, but as witnessed by the Member from Regina North East (Mr. Whelan) they can't even read them right.

**Mr. Bowerman** (Shellbrook): — Translate it now.

**Hon. Mr. Steuart:** — But at least I wrote it. Mr. Speaker, the Leader of the Opposition talked about growth in this province and attempted again, as did the financial critic, to show to the people of this province that there hasn't been any real growth in the industrial business economic development in this province. He attempted to do even more mental gymnastics with the figures than did the Leader or the financial critic. He picked out one item that was interesting and that is personal income. Now he knows, or he should know, that personal income includes farm income. He picked out 1962 and compared it to 1961. Well, that is rather odd as he was the Treasurer in 1961. And 1961 was one of the worst years that our province ever saw as far as the agricultural industry was concerned. So of course when we came back to 1962, a return to normal, there had to be a tremendous increase. When you look at the records, twice nothing is still nothing. It was still among the lowest income of any province

anywhere in this nation.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Hon. Mr. Stuart:** — Then he really got into the estates tax. It was really interesting to watch the Socialists at work. He stood up and talked about the estates tax. He said, “This is going to help the rich.” Once again it is the old CCF Socialist trick of attempting to blackball successful people, to turn those people who are successful and who made a success of their lives, against the unhappy and the unfortunate. Did he at any time say whether he was for the estates tax or against it? Did he at any time say, “We will support the estates tax because we think that it is an honest effort to try and do something about the family farm or the small business?” No, all he talked about was the one, two or three millionaires that we might have left in this province after 20 years of Socialism and said, “Look what you are going to do for your rich friends.” He never once said whether he was going to support this or whether the Socialists are going to support it. None of them have stood up and said this. They have attempted to divide and conquer before this Legislature is through. Make no mistake, Mr. Speaker, before this Legislature is through, they will all have to have the guts to stand up and be counted on how they stand on this fact.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Hon. Mr. Stuart:** — Then you know, Mr. Speaker, he turned to the Saskatchewan Power Corporation. I must say that I have great admiration for the intestinal fortitude of any Member on that side, especially those that were in the Government back before they were thrown out of power, to talk about the Saskatchewan Power Corporation. This was a classic case of the Socialists who hired a Socialist Cass Beggs, to run a business. I don't know where he is now, but wherever he is, it is a disaster area I can tell you that.

First he talks about reductions. In 1963, and 1964, he says there was a reduction in power rates. Well, Mr. Speaker, we took over in 1964 and I know about that so-called reduction in power rates. They reduced some power rates, they raised others. The total power rates to the people of Saskatchewan was not reduced one five-cent piece. But look at their record. They never made enough money in the Saskatchewan Power Corporation, in all the years that they ran it, to turn back one five-cent piece to the people of the province. They did it with the Telephones but not one five-cent piece. When we became the Government and took over the Power Corporation we found it in an unbelievable mess. We straightened it up. It is now returning a decent profit. What are we doing with that money? We are turning that money back to the people, a good portion of it, as a dividend that belongs to all the people of this province.

**March 3, 1969**

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Hon. Mr. Steuart:** — As a matter of fact not only are we turning back millions of dollars, but we reduced the rates to the consumers once we got them out of the clutches of Henry Baker and his council. We reduced the rates to the citizens of Regina by 10 per cent.

Let's look at the record of the Leader of the Opposition when he was the Treasurer and he was the Treasurer very briefly. He raised the sales tax from three per cent to five per cent.

**Mr. Willis (Melfort-Tisdale):** — For what purpose?

**Hon. Mr. Steuart:** — He needed the money I guess. That's the purpose, George, that you raise taxes you know. You stick around another 20 years, George, and you might find out how the government works, but I doubt it. He raised the gas tax two cents a gallon. He raised the tax on diesel fuel by five cents, still a record in this province. He raised the liquor prices by \$1 million. In fact he was a Member of that Government that still holds the record, in spite of what I did, of 500 new taxes and over 500 increases. On top of that he brought in the greatest deficit that was ever seen in the history of the Province. Then he talked about consumers. Now there is a dandy, second only to his intestinal fortitude to talk about how they mishandled the SPC and never bring it in, is to talk about how they handled the consumer. His deskmate should be squirming a little now, because what did they do for the consumer. By their actions and inactions, they made Saskatchewan a paradise for every fast-buck artist in North America. They came in here — and the financial critic his deskmate was the kingpin who let them come in — and fleeced the farmers and the people of this province by millions of dollars while they sat idly by. At least I hope they sat idly by, and didn't do anything.

When we became the Government we cleaned up that mess along with a lot of other messes and we put on good, sound legislation, records that will stand up in the face of any government in Canada.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Hon. Mr. Steuart:** — How he talked about what he had done for the people. I don't know what he is waving there.

**An Hon. Member:** — What about your Budget?

**Hon. Mr. Steuart:** — My Budget? It's a good Budget. And I will talk about it too which is more than you people did.

Let's look at how he treated people. He talks about the University. Mr. Speaker, do you know how much, when he was the Treasurer, he gave for operating cost increases to the University of Saskatchewan? \$550,000. We gave a \$4 million increase. You know how much he gave to build buildings? Do you know how much he gave out of his Budget? Zip, nothing, zero, that's what he gave, not one cent. What did he do for the students? He raised the fees for the students, that's what he did for the students, left them with no buildings, raised the fees, gave them nothing for building new buildings. What a record!

Let's look at what he did for the hospitals — and I quote from his Budget Speech. What did he do for the hospitals of this province? Here is what he said, on page 24 of his Budget Speech:

The Hospital Services Plan asks all hospitals to keep their expenditures within three per cent.

The lowest increase in the history of this province, that's what he did for the hospitals.

What did he do to develop natural and mineral resources? They like to talk about development and what they did for the people of this province to push this province ahead economically. They spent on mineral and natural resources in the year that our friend across the way who seems frozen in that position of holding up two fingers . . .

**An Hon. Member:** — The statue of Liberty.

**Hon. Mr. Steuart:** — The statue of something. He spent \$1 million less than they did the year before. Let's look at what he did for the farmers. In 1961 we had the worst crop year that we ever had almost right back to the '30s, one of the worst years in the history of agriculture. What did he do? Look at his Budget. He says that we will hold the line on agricultural spending this year. Not one added cent for the farmers. What did he do for the farmers? Not a red cent, not added one cent to the Budget. What did he do for the poor and needy? Take a look at his Budget. He didn't add a cent, nothing. What did he do for the old age pensioners? I'll tell you what he did. He kept on the most vicious, the most vicious means test to be found anywhere in Canada. That's what he did.

This great humanitarian, this Member from Biggar, Mr. Speaker, he has the worst record of any Treasurer in the history of this Province. The worst record. What did they do then? With typical Socialist logic they made him Leader of the party. Now what is his record like as Leader of the party?

**Mr. Kramer:** — Good!

**Hon. Mr. Steuart:** — It is good. Oh, I like it.

**March 3, 1969**

I think that it is good too. Five by-elections and two general elections, seven elections. Won one, lost six. You know even Casey Stengel of the New York Mets had a better record than that and they fired three managers.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Hon. Mr. Steuart:** — I plead with the Members opposite, don't fire Woody. He won't wake you up and by the look of some, you couldn't stand much shaking. Mr. Speaker, for eight days we have listened to the Opposition. They paid this Budget the greatest compliment in the world because they refused to talk about it. They talked about damp wheat, they talked about strikes, they talked about highways, new centres and the pulp mill. The Hon. Member from Prince Albert East-Cumberland (Mr. Berezowsky) even talked about the Russian Revolution. Once again, I am a little confused as to whose side he was on, but that is what he talked about.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Hon. Mr. Steuart:** — The Hon. Member from Regina Centre, the financial critic (Mr. Blakeney), talked about something for two hours. But even after reading his speech I am not sure if he was talking about this Budget or last year's Budget. In fact most of the time he seemed to be determined to prove that, in spite of the new mines, the new mills, the new jobs, the higher wages, or five balanced Budgets, our excellent financial position, that Saskatchewan is really a depressed area.

Well, Mr. Speaker, the people of this province remember the mess left by the Socialists. They remember our province being by-passed by industry after industry, and they will long remember that this Province stagnated under the CCF while the rest of Canada boomed.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Hon. Mr. Steuart:** — Our people can see the signs of progress on every side. You know what they know? They know that this progress was sparked by the Thatcher Government. Let's examine some of the statements made by the financial critic. At the same time, Mr. Speaker, let's measure his statements against the record when he was Treasurer — and he was Treasurer for about one year. I don't know why he only lasted for one year. They said at the time that they had to take him out of there and put him in charge of the Health Department. Well if they did, somebody boomed, because, after two years as Minister of Health, when I became Minister of Health I found the Medicare Plan in a mess, the hospitals in turmoil, the medical profession was in open warfare and it took us almost two years to clean that dandy up. However, Mr. Speaker, I wouldn't be so unkind to say, blame it all on the Member from Regina Centre (Mr. Blakeney). Maybe the

fact that every department that he ever touched or worked for fell apart was just bad luck.

But first what did he do? He cried great crocodile tears about us shortchanging education. Well let's look at the record. In this Budget we have set aside a total of \$75.8 million for school grants. What did he put aside in his school grants? \$34.4 million, less than half the amount that he sneers is inadequate today. That is only part of the story. Again the real shocker comes when you look at the University. What did he give? \$300,000 increase for operating grants. What did we give? \$4 million increase, 13 times as much.

Mr. Speaker, I think that we should clear up something right now. I want to go on record as saying in this House that the NDP, when they were the CCF, the Socialists, when they were in Government, were the greatest enemy the University of Saskatchewan ever had.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Hon. Mr. Steuart:** — Had these sanctimonious Socialists done even half as much as we have done for the University, I don't think there would even exist a shadow of a problem on either campus. Mr. Speaker, both this year and last, the Member for Regina Centre lashed out at what he termed our inept dealings with Ottawa. In fact, Mr. Speaker, he made this speech last year and he got great applause from his happy little helpers on that side of the House. I don't know if they know fiscal relations from those who come and visit them on the weekend, but it sounded good and they applauded him anyways.

I was even a little impressed myself. I went back and looked at the records. I thought, you know this little fellow goes down there with gang busters, and I bet he came back from Ottawa with his little hands clutched full of the good green stuff. I looked up his Budget Speech and I expected to see that he was the greatest negotiator that ever hit Ottawa. But what did I find? Almost two pages of typical Socialist whining and crying about what? The terrible deal that he got from Ottawa. He even carped a little petty criticism about the politics that the Conservatives were playing in those days.

In fact, Mr. Speaker, the proof is there . . .

**Mr. Willis:** — What Budget are you talking about?

**Hon. Mr. Steuart:** — I am talking about the Budget that you supported when he was the Treasurer, a disgrace to the province. When he is in the Opposition he is a big wheel. When he was in the Government he was a kind of broken wheel. Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Member from Milestone (Mr. MacDonald) referred to another

**March 3, 1969**

smokescreen that the Opposition put up. This is the pulp mill, charges about the pulp mill. Well, I can appreciate the bewilderment of the Members opposite that we have a pulp mill and that it is in operation and is producing pulp. Outside experts have informed us that it is a good mill and the product that it is producing is second to none in Canada. The members opposite are well aware of the terms of the Saskatchewan Pulpwood Limited contract we have with the Prince Albert Pulp Company. In spite of that fact, some Socialist Members have suggested that the investment to our Government finance office and our Pulp Harvesting Company, which has reached its peak this last year of \$7 million — and this is all on the records — represent the tax loss to the Saskatchewan taxpayers. Of course . . .

**Mr. Willis:** — It does.

**Hon. Mr. Stuart:** — It does, he says. Well there is one of them. Allan, you better talk to him. If he doesn't know any more about highways as he knows about this he is in real trouble. You should make him Treasurer if you ever get back into the Government. What kind of business acumen is this? The money you invest in a company is not a loss. It is an asset. Even the Socialists, when they were in office, treated their advances to the Crown corporations as assets. Furthermore, our Government has had the good sense to charge interest on its advances which is more than you people did when you were in office.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Hon. Mr. Stuart:** — Since much has been said about the gigantic losses that we are supposed to have suffered according to the Pulpwood Harvesting operations, I would like to set the records straight. I can tell this House, Mr. Speaker, to the end of December 31, 1968, our share of the accumulated deficit in the Saskatchewan Pulpwood Limited is less than half a million. The total loss that we expect to absorb on the completion of this contract in 1971 is unlikely to exceed \$1 million. We will get more than that back in E and H tax. In fact, Mr. Speaker, if we had followed the practice of the Socialists and not charged interest these losses would have been cut in half. Compare these facts, the facts presented by the Hon. Member from Milestone, and look at the untold good that this has done for all the people of this province, especially the people in Northern Saskatchewan.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I would note that the Members opposite continually complain that we are giving our resources away. This is an outright lie. We haven't allowed those resources to remain rotting and buried in the ground as they did. We have used them for the benefit of all our people.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Hon. Mr. Stuart:** — Mr. Speaker, the only way

that the public can really measure the worth and the responsibility of an Opposition is in what they say and speak. I have a list here of things that they have demanded in this House, tax cuts, increased spending programs. And the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Lloyd) added to it today. Mr. Whelan wants us to assist the City Health Regions to a tune of half a million in Regina and Saskatoon. He wants us to refund the gas tax in Regina, over \$5 million. Mr. Baker even agrees to homeowner grants up to \$200. We would do it, Henry, don't worry. We will do that. That would cost us over \$8 million. Mr. Baker also wants \$10 per capita to all the citizens, and that would be another \$9½ million. Mr. Messer wants crop insurance immediately for all of the farmers in the province. Mr. Blakeney wants 10 cents a bushel for all the farmers to dry their grain, another \$14 million. Farm fuel taken off, they all want that, another \$3 million. Utilization fees off, another \$5 million. Mr. Berezowsky wants us to pay for a whole school up at Prince Albert, \$8 million. Added to what they wanted last year, it comes to over \$230 million that these Socialists would have us add to this year's Budget. And on top of that, what do they say? We won't raise the taxes on the schools, the local government, the homeowners and the farm owners. What a fraud! What a lie! What dishonesty!

You know up to this point we have always given Henry the dubious honor of being the most irresponsible Member on that side of the House. But I have to take it away, Henry. Artful Allan almost had you beat out, but then good old Woodrow came in today and took back the championship.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Hon. Mr. Steuart:** — I think that he is getting a little worried that his crown is slipping and that he really has to get back in there and re-establish his reputation as the last of the big spenders. I want to make a quote here, George, this is for you. Just think of this little statement. Quote: "Bankruptcy . . .

**Mr. Willis:** — Now I didn't object when the Member from Regina South West (Mr. McPherson) called people over here by their first names or second names, or by the names that they are known in the business world, but I do object when the Minister who has been here for five or six years, should know that this is the Member for Regina East. He should be referred by that.

**Hon. Mr. Steuart:** — The Hon. Member for Melfort who never lives in his own seat. I want him to hear this quote.

Bankruptcy is the price that is paid by people who believe that you can have and continue to have something for nothing.



**March 3, 1969**

What do you think of that, Hon. Member from Melfort? Do you agree with that? That wasn't said by me or Ross Thatcher. It was said by the critic of Regina Centre. That is the statement he made when he was the Treasurer. This is the same man who last year became almost hysterical in opposition to our tax increases. It is the same man who is trying to lead the Opposition and forcing us to spend at least another quarter million dollars. Is it any wonder with this kind of leadership, that the NDP could only attract as new Members a bunch of wild-eyed radicals that make the skin of any decent citizen crawl. If the Members are repulsed by the action of their new adherents or maybe the old ones, in burning flags, confiscating the farms, trying to break up the country by encouraging separatists, let them stand up and say so, as they never have inside or outside of this House.

Mr. Speaker, the statements and actions of their leaders branded the NDP as a party that is financially irresponsible. Their silence and inaction of these same leaders is fast giving the NDP the reputation that will embrace any individual or any cause for a little publicity and a few cheap goals. Mr. Speaker, let me say that within a minute or two they will be voting. I predict that they will all vote against this Budget, against the estate tax, against more money. They will vote against the Loan Fund to help the cities. They will vote against help for the people who are taking foster children into their homes. They will vote against the new Indian and Métis Department, a real chance to do something for our native people whom they failed so badly for 20 years. This is a good Budget and it is a sound one. You know the Hon. Member from Melfort, it isn't too late to repent yet. There may be the odd man over there that has a conscience. There may be the odd man over there that wants to show the people back home that he is not a sheep but a man. If there is I challenge him to stand up and vote for this good, sound Budget.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Hon. Mr. Steuart:** — Not only will he be voting as a man, but he will be voting for the future of Saskatchewan.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

Amendment was negatived on the following recorded division:

**Yeas — 24**  
Messieurs

Lloyd  
Wooff  
Kramer  
Willis  
Wood  
Blakeney

Berezowsky  
Romanow  
Smishek  
Thibault  
Whelan  
Snyder

Pepper  
Bowerman  
Matsalla  
Messer  
Kwasnica  
Kowalchuk

Davies  
Dewhurst  
Meakes

Michayluk  
Brockelbank  
Baker

**Nays — 32**  
Messieurs

Thatcher  
Howes  
McFarlane  
Boldt  
Cameron  
Steuart  
Heald  
McIsaac  
Guy  
Barrie  
Loken

MacDougall  
Grant  
Coderre  
Larochelle  
MacDonald  
Estey  
Hooker  
Gallagher  
McLennan  
Breker  
Leith

Radloff  
Weatherald  
Mitchell  
Gardner  
Coupland  
McPherson  
Charlebois  
Forsyth  
McIvor  
Schmeiser

Motion agreed to on the following recorded division:

**Yeas — 32**  
Messieurs

Thatcher  
Howes  
McFarlane  
Boldt  
Cameron  
Steuart  
Heald  
McIsaac  
Guy  
Barrie  
Loken

MacDougall  
Grant  
Coderre  
Larochelle  
MacDonald  
Estey  
Hooker  
Gallagher  
McLennan  
Breker  
Leith

Radloff  
Weatherald  
Mitchell  
Gardner  
Coupland  
McPherson  
Charlebois  
Forsyth  
McIvor  
Schmeiser

**Nays — 24**  
Messieurs

Lloyd  
Wooff  
Kramer  
Willis  
Wood  
Blakeney  
Davies  
Brockelbank

Berezowsky  
Romanow  
Smishek  
Thibault  
Whelan  
Snyder  
Michayluk  
Meakes

Pepper  
Bowerman  
Matsalla  
Messer  
Kwasnica  
Kowalchuk  
Dewhurst  
Baker

The Assembly adjourned at 5:31 o'clock p.m.