

**LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN**  
**Third Session — Sixteenth Legislature**  
**13th Day**

**Wednesday, March 4, 1970.**

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

**WELCOME TO STUDENTS**

**Mr. Speaker:** — I wish to introduce to the Members of the Legislature the following groups of students situated in the galleries: 58 students from the Wilson school in the constituency of Saskatoon City Park-University, represented by its Member, Mr. Charlebois. They are under the direction of their teachers, Mr. Hart and Mr. Lamb; 36 students from the Alvin Buckwold school in the constituency of Nutana South, represented by their Member, Mr. Forsyth, under the direction of their teacher, Mrs. Kish; 55 students from Aberdeen school in the constituency of Rosthern, represented by their Member, the Minister of Highways (Mr. Boldt) under the direction of their teacher, Mr. Peters; 19 students from the School District of Waldron in the constituency of Saltcoats under the direction of their teacher, Mr. Hagel; 23 students from the Yellow Grass high school in the constituency of Milestone, represented by Mr. MacDonald, the Minister of Welfare, under the direction of their teacher, Mr. Wagner; 22 students from Strathcona school in the constituency of Regina South East represented by His Worship, the Mayor (Mr. Baker) under the direction of their school teacher, Mr. Falkowsky; 30 students from the Goodwater high school in the constituency of Weyburn represented by the Member from Weyburn, Mr. Pepper, under the direction of their teacher, Mr. Medwid; and 30 students from the Hollister school in the constituency of Nutana Centre represented by the Minister of Municipal Affairs, the Hon. Mr. Estey, under the direction of their teacher, Mr. Lozecki. I am sure that all of the Members of the House will wish to extend to each and every one of them a very cordial welcome to the Legislature, to express the sincere wish that they will enjoy the proceedings and will find the information educational and wish each and every one of them a safe trip home.

**Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**LETTER OF APOLOGY**

**Hon. D.V. Heald (Attorney General):** — Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day and due to the fact that this matter was raised in the Legislature by the Member from Regina North West (Mr. Whelan) the other day, I thought that I should indicate that I am today in receipt of a letter, dated March 4, 1970, from Warren Carragata. I will read the letter and then I will table it. It is addressed to myself.

I wish to apologize without reservation to Premier Ross Thatcher and Mrs. Thatcher and to Provincial Treasurer D.G. Steuart, for the remarks which I made on CKCK TV, referring to a rumor that Mrs. Thatcher and Mr. Steuart have a controlling interest in a trucking firm which hauls logs to the Prince Albert pulp mill. I wish to make it clear that I had no foundation whatsoever for making such statements and now realize that I should not

repeat rumors or say that I am investigating a rumor or that anyone else is doing so, and that to make such remarks is slanderous. I regret that I made the statements in question. I also apologize for the wording in my previous apology I submitted to The Leader Post and as published herein, as I did not realize that it completely overlooked the fact that rumors must not be repeated in any way.

Yours truly,

(Signed)  
Warren Carragata.

I table this, Mr. Speaker. In the light of the unconditional retraction and apology, the Government proposes to take no further action.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

## QUESTIONS

### SELLING PRINCE ALBERT PULP MILL TO AN AMERICAN COMPANY

**Mr. W.J. Berezowsky (Prince Albert East-Cumberland):** — Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day I would like to ask the Premier a question. In view of the action taken by the Prime Minister of Canada to safeguard the mining industry for Canada, I was wondering if the Premier and the Government are still contemplating selling their 30 per cent interest in the Prince Albert pulp mill to an American company called Parsons & Whittemore of New York?

**Hon. W.R. Thatcher (Premier):** — I find the question a little strange because Hon. Members opposite for three or four years have been complaining bitterly that we have got this company in and we are selling our resources out to them. A good offer has been made to the Government, which would permit the Province to come out with a fairly substantial profit if we chose to sell the pulp mill. In addition, an offer has been made to proceed with further expansion in the province along the same line if we desire to give Parsons & Whittemore timber rights. But the Government will not be making a decision in this regard until after the Session is over, and we have time to thoroughly analyze the whole matter.

**Mr. R.H. Wooff (Turtleford):** — . . . Whether in view of a lot of the criticisms and the difficulties under its burning policy in the north, whether there are going to be any changes or differences in regulations?

**Mr. Speaker:** — Well, we have already passed to Questions put by Members and we have passed the time on the Orders of the Day when oral questions could be considered. We have no proper process here for all the questions, I draw to your attention. I suggest the Member ask his question tomorrow at the proper place.

## ADJOURNED DEBATES

### BUDGET DEBATE

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Mr. Steuart (Provincial Treasurer) that Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair.

**Mr. A.E. Blakeney (Regina Centre):** — Mr. Speaker, when I resumed my seat on Monday I had made a number of comments on the Budget Address. I want now to add to them. I want first to refer to the fact that I am standing up here on a Wednesday. I have stood up to reply to Budgets on a good number of days but I think this is the first Wednesday. In 1968 the Provincial Treasurer brought down his Budget on a Friday and that Budget is still burning in our minds and also in our pocket books.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Blakeney:** — I think all of us remember that Budget fresh after an election, an election in which their platform was that they would reduce taxes. The Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Steuart) came into this Legislature four or five months later and introduced a Budget which piled on almost every conceivable tax.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Blakeney:** — There used to be — some of the older Members of the House will remember — a character by the name of Wrong Way Corrigan. He was an Irishman like the Provincial Treasurer and a flying Irishman like the Provincial Treasurer, but he flew the wrong way. He started for San Francisco and ended up in Europe and like the Provincial Treasurer, that other flying Irishman, he started out to lower taxes but all of a sudden they went up on every conceivable front.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Blakeney:** — Now we call that infamous day Black Friday. Since 1968 the Provincial Treasurer has been experimenting a bit. Friday Budgets were decidedly unpopular so last year he tried Tuesday and that didn't work either. That last Tuesday Budget didn't win friends and influence people, for the flying Irishman who is resuming . . .

**Hon. W.R. Thatcher (Premier):** — It is getting better each year!

**Mr. Blakeney:** — . . . so that this year he is having another try. He is trying Monday. Now I don't think a Monday Budget is going to work any better than a Friday Budget or a Tuesday Budget.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Blakeney:** — We called the day of the first Budget Black Friday, and I am sure that when the people of Saskatchewan look at this Budget they are going to call it Blue Monday.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Blakeney:** — As for the taxpayers, after the hammering they got from the Provincial Treasurer in income tax and gasoline tax and the hog dog tax, they are going to be black and blue.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**An Hon. Member:** — What about Manitoba?

**Mr. Blakeney:** — I'll come to Manitoba and I'll look very fondly and very wistfully at a good number of the figures which are coming out of Manitoba.

I want now to deal with some of the remarks in the printed portion of the Provincial Treasurer's Budget. The Provincial Treasurer opened his remarks by saying that Saskatchewan in 1970 faces a situation unique in our history. He says that we are caught between the forces of local recession and national inflation. Mr. Speaker, we in the Western world have progressed in our economic knowledge and expertise to the extent that a country can, if it wills, substantially control recessions and inflation. True a Provincial government alone cannot completely overcome the effects of nation-wide inflation or recession. But Provincial governments and Federal governments acting together can very largely control our economic destiny. Therefore if we are beset with inflation or recession it is fair to blame the combined Federal and Provincial governments for not guiding us through those shoals and for not seeing that we are on the proper course.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Blakeney:** — Mr. Speaker, it is understandable that a country might be faced with inflationary pressures. But to let them get out of hand shows incompetence. It is understandable that a country might be faced with a recession and unemployment. To let them get out of hand shows incompetence. But to let inflation run rampant in one province and have unemployment and recession in another province is to elevate incompetence to the level of an art.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Blakeney:** — And it is just that condition brought on by Federal Liberal governments and Provincial Liberal governments that the Provincial Treasurer complained about last Monday. We have had a Liberal Government at Ottawa for seven years, we have had a Liberal Government in Regina for six years and they and they alone have responsibility for the economic health of this province. But they have been so incompetent, they have bungled the job so badly that we are faced with this unique position, recession with inflation. We have, Mr. Speaker, recession with inflation with all of the deleterious consequences of that and it is to be laid squarely at the door of the Trudeau-Thatcher axis.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Blakeney:** — It is they who have to answer for this. They have to answer to the businessman who sees his business dying; they have to answer to the man who is without a job; they have to answer to the farmer who has no markets and no alternative income; they have to answer to the old age pensioner who sees his savings being robbed by rising prices; and they have to answer to the housewife who sees her pay cheque being chewed up by the jaws of the Trudeau-Thatcher inflation.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Blakeney:** — They have to answer for that too, to the electorate. They will be called to account by the electorate. They will be called, Mr. Speaker, but they will not be chosen.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Blakeney:** — On Monday, Mr. Speaker, I had something to say about the Trudeau folly in fighting inflation by creating unemployment. The question must now be asked: how is it that Saskatchewan has a recession when there is inflation in the rest of the country? How is it that we have recession when every other province or most other provinces are booming, booming to the extent that the National government has to fight inflation? How is it that we have recession so that the Provincial Treasurer has to engage in massive deficit financing at interest rates which are historically high, while British Columbia and Alberta and Ontario and, yes indeed, Manitoba have a level of prosperity we don't enjoy?

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Blakeney:** — Well, Mr. Speaker, the answer is not far to seek. The Saskatchewan economy has been stagnating. Growth has been painfully slow.

**An Hon. Member:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Blakeney:** — Where did I get the word 'stagnating'? I got it by looking at the figures which I am about to tell the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Guy) that he will agree that the economy is stagnating.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Blakeney:** — In every field since 1964 growth has been disappointing and in the last two years it has been a near disaster. Let me make it very clear that the Government opposite can't blame its problems on wheat marketing or wheat sales, because since 1964, we have had some of the largest crops in history and the largest wheat sales in history.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Blakeney:** — Its troubles cannot be blamed

on the farmer who has done his part to grow wheat, and they cannot be blamed on the wheat Board who have sold the wheat over the years. But aside from grain, agriculture has been stagnating. Take cattle. How many speeches have we heard in this House about how the economy of Saskatchewan is going to be diversified, how we are going to switch grain farmers out of grain and into cattle, how we have succeeded with fodder programs, with all manner of programs. You would have thought, Mr. Speaker, in listening to the Premier and the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. McFarlane) that the number of cattle on Saskatchewan farms has been going up and up. But what indeed are the facts? The facts are that comparing 1969 with 1964 there are fewer cattle on Saskatchewan farms now than there were in those dark days of stagnation.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Blakeney:** — Here are the figures: In June, 1964, 2.3 million head; June, 1959, 2.2 million — 100,000 less. Hardly impressive results, hardly impressive for a government which has been dedicated to the proposition that it was going to diversify agriculture.

Let's compare cattle marketings, and I want the Premier and some others who are talking about Manitoba to attend on the facts with respect to cattle marketings. In 1969, cattle marketings in Canada went down by four per cent; in Alberta they dropped just over four per cent; in Manitoba they dropped seven per cent; and in Saskatchewan they dropped 14 per cent.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Blakeney:** — I admit to the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. McFarlane) that there has been some increase in hog production but except for hog production the picture in agriculture is almost uniformly dismal. Turkey production is down, milk production is down, and incidentally milk production has gone down every year this Government has been in power, every single year. Butter production is down sharply. The whole picture, Mr. Speaker, is one of abject failure in its efforts to diversify agriculture.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Blakeney:** — Now let's, Mr. Speaker, turn to resource industries and we have heard quite a bit about oil production. I wonder if some of you were listening to the Provincial Treasurer on Monday, he was skipping portions of his speech. And do you know one portion he left out altogether. Any reference to the oil industry? This tells more about the position of the oil industry in Saskatchewan than I could tell in a half an hour. The Provincial Treasurer doesn't even want to mention it on the air.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Blakeney:** — And if I had the record of the Provincial Treasurer or the Minister of Mineral Resources (Mr. Cameron) I wouldn't want to mention it on the air either.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Blakeney:** — I admit I am speaking in a voice which sounds quiet to the Premier and to the Minister of Mineral Resources, I am not up to their usual tone but I will give them a few facts. Let's talk about the increase in oil production and I emphasize the word 'increase', so the Minister of Mineral Resources can hear it and not make the same mistake he made last year. The increase in oil production in 1963 was 7 million barrels; 1964 — 10 million barrels; 1965 — 7 million barrels; 1966 — 5 million barrels; 1967 — no increase at all, an actual drop; 1968 — another drop, a drop of 1 million barrels; and 1969 — a drop, not of 1 million barrels but of 4½ million barrels.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Blakeney:** — For three successive years oil production has been down over the previous year and 1969 production was actually lower than that of 1965.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Blakeney:** — I am afraid, Mr. Speaker, that it is not only oil production which is declining, but oil exploration is declining. Let's compare oil exploration with the days of 1964 that we have heard so much about. The number of wells drilled in 1969 compared with 1964 is down 7 per cent and the footage of wells drilled is down, not 7 per cent, but over 20 per cent — a depressing oil picture; production down, exploration down.

Now let's take potash. I don't know that there is anything we heard more about a few years ago than potash — about all the wonders of this development. I hope to have a little more to say about the Government's mismanagement of the potash resource a little later but now I want to talk about production. Certainly the production in 1969 is higher than the production in 1964. In 1964 the industry was just beginning to roll. But growth has been anything but impressive. In 1967 production was \$68 million; 1968 — \$87 million; 1969 - \$78 million — a drop of potash production of \$9 million between 1969 and 1968.

Oil production down, oil exploration down, potash production down, potash exploration all but non-existent. A story of almost unrelenting failure and gloom.

**Mr. Thatcher:** — Gloom and doom!

**Mr. Blakeney:** — Well let . . .

**An Hon. Member:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Blakeney:** — I hear someone over there saying, "What about the North?" Well, what about this burgeoning North? Last year we heard the annual speech from the Minister of Mineral Resources (Mr. Cameron) telling us how many claims had been staked and all about the frantic pace of exploration and he said, "Before the curtain rings down on 1969 we should know about these promised mines." Well the curtain has rung down on 1969 and so far as I am aware we do not know about the promised mines.

**Mr. Thatcher:** — We know!

**Mr. Blakeney:** — Certainly, certainly we know . . . I probably should have phrased that the other way. We certainly know about the promised mines, we have heard about those year in and year out, but I mean the ones which have any ore in them, those are the ones we don't know about.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Blakeney:** — Yes, just around the corner. Like prosperity in the dark days of that Liberal Government of another era.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Blakeney:** — But we certainly hope that there is a mine at Wollaston Lake.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Blakeney:** — But we are a little more cautious about the optimistic view of this mine than some Members opposite. We are cautious because we have had our fingers burned a few times by all of the announcements of the giant mines just around the corner, about the jobs for all. We all remember the Minister of Highways (Mr. Boldt) as he now is, and the Minister of Welfare as he then was, telling us how many thousands of jobs there were going to be for native people in those mines up north. We have been told of these roads which were going to knife into the North and maybe indeed railroads and we have been disappointed again, and again, and again. When we read the results of the last fiscal year of the Department of Mineral Resources which were just tabled today, we are going to be disappointed again. Metal production is up in dollar terms very fractionally — 2 per cent. And in terms of volume it is well down compared with 1964, hardly impressive. When the Minister of Mineral Resources (Mr. Cameron) has to report as he did to this House today that the value of all mineral productions is down this year compared with last year, that the amount of money that he brought into the Provincial Treasury this year for minerals is less than it was last year, that mineral revenue was providing a progressively smaller portion of the Budget than it did years ago, indeed the whole resource revenue is now under 10 per cent of the Budget, whereas in the last CCF year it was about 16 per cent of the Budget.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Blakeney:** — When we have to report things like that to this Legislature as the Minister did today, it is a record of failure, five years of failure.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Blakeney:** — Well, I now come to the record of the Premier in his capacity of Minister of Industry, because the record for commercial and industrial development is far, far worse. In 1969 as in 1968 as in 1967 — and I could keep going — the increase in our manufacturing was less than the average for Canada and far less than our sister provinces of Alberta and, yes, Manitoba.



**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Blakeney:** — Consider jobs in manufacturing and how we have heard about jobs in manufacturing. You remember the Liberal promise made again and again — 80,000 new jobs. In the four years between 1964 and 1968 jobs in manufacturing in Saskatchewan increased, not 80,000, not 20,000, but less than 2,000 — 2,000 in four years and that is its effort at creating jobs in manufacturing. That, Mr. Speaker, is not the worst of it. In 1969, jobs in manufacturing actually dropped by 100. In Saskatchewan employment in manufacturing dropped. In 1969, in Alberta, they went up 4,500 jobs. And in 1969, and note the year, in Manitoba they went up by 3,400 jobs.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Blakeney:** — Wouldn't we like to have some of those 3,400 jobs right here in Regina. But Saskatchewan is down 100 jobs. Mr. Speaker, if you take last year or you take the last five years — take your pick — Saskatchewan's performance in creating jobs in manufacturing was worse in every year than the Canadian average, worse than Alberta, worse than Manitoba and worse than any province west of the Atlantic. Mr. Speaker, in creating new jobs of all kinds, taking manufacturing, mining and all of the service jobs, the Saskatchewan Liberals last year did worse than the Canadian average, worse than Alberta, worse than Manitoba and worse than any province west of the Maritimes. Mr. Speaker, in 1964 the Premier promised 80,000 new jobs and here is what he said, "This is a realistic province, because Alberta is doing that already." Mr. Speaker, Alberta has continued to do it. Between 1964 and 1968 Alberta created 90,000 new jobs. Mr. Speaker, the Premier can't blame his failure on the agricultural crisis because between 1964 and 1968 there was no agricultural crisis. Instead we had agricultural prosperity and yet the Premier, the Minister of Industry, has failed. He has shown to this House and to this province a record of failure unequalled west of New Brunswick.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Blakeney:** — And the consequences are for all to see. The public in this province don't have to listen to their politicians to find out the words of doom and gloom. They can see them. Consider Regina. There are right now thousands of people unemployed in Regina. In the Regina area alone, according to Canada Manpower figures, there are over 1700 unemployed construction workers alone. Construction workers alone, Mr. Minister of Labour (Mr. Coderre). House construction is almost nil. Indeed, housing starts in January of this year were down over last January by 95 per cent. I kid you not, down 95 per cent. I invite anyone to walk around the downtown area of Regina. There are many, many empty business premises in the downtown business core. Store after store is empty, signs which say, For Sale, To Rent, To Let. Drive around your streets, almost every block has a house for sale, some of them several houses. Retail trade is slow, some would even say stagnant. Long established businesses are closing. There have been over 100 businesses discontinued in Regina in the last little while and one of them, I may say, was Thatcher's Hardware. All the prosperity that that chain of stores enjoyed during the stagnant CCF years, and now they have closed shop.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Blakeney:** — National and international businesses are leaving. In the last few months oil companies have left and I invite the Minister of Mineral Resources (Mr. Cameron) to say whether there is even one oil exploration office left in Regina. There may be a couple but there used to be 10, 15, 20. The one in our building just left a couple of months ago. Chrysler has moved its staff, John Deere has moved staff, the tire companies have moved staff, and in those cases, Mr. Premier, in every case, to Winnipeg. It's a discouraging time. Mr. Speaker, for Regina and Saskatchewan. Let me quote a letter received from a constituent of mine. I just got it the other day, totally unsolicited, which tells a story which is all too typical. He talks about some problems and then he goes on to say:

I worked for the Beaver Lumber Division Office for 2½ years when they moved to Winnipeg. Last winter for five months I worked for Ski-Doo (Saskatchewan Division) and by June, 1969, they had moved their office to Winnipeg. In both cases the work was most enjoyable to me and I know my work was appreciated.

Unfortunately this man can't move to Winnipeg so he is out of a job. Dozens and dozens of people in Regina are faced with this choice, either move to Calgary or Edmonton and Winnipeg or be out of work. We used to call this the opportunity province and it was, under the previous Government and for some years under this Government. This Government used to emblazon its publicity material with the slogan, and the Member for Regina South (Mr. Grant) will remember this, "Saskatchewan — Open for Business." Judging by what we see that should now be changed to this, "Saskatchewan — Up for Sale." The Liberals have made this the 'for sale' province of Canada. No longer is the slogan in Saskatchewan, "A place to stand — a place to grow," but it's "Let's sell up and off we go."

The Premier used to say and still does when he's not watching his words, "The state owes no man a living but the state does owe a job to a man who wants to earn his living provided he is not too lazy to work." How many of us have heard the Premier say this at virtually every public meeting that he addresses. Well let's put that another way; even the Premier used to admit that every man ready, willing and able to work has the right to a decent job. Now, Mr. Speaker, where are those jobs? In Regina alone there are 500 more construction workers unemployed this year than last year at this time. These men, many of them I know, have never been out of work more than a week in their lives. Construction workers frequently are out for short periods of time but many of them have been out of work for 12 weeks, 14 weeks, three months, four months, for the first time in their working lives. Now what has happened to all these men? Have they got lazy all of a sudden, have they suddenly lost all their skills? Mr. Premier, you are denying to those men their right to work, you are denying to many teenagers just coming on to the labor market their right to a first job. These people are not asking for charity, they're asking for the right to make an honest day's pay for an honest day's work. Skilled men have the right to use their skills; young men have the right to their first job. Parents have the right to know that there are jobs for their young people. These rights are being denied. Yes, Mr. Speaker, for those who want jobs for themselves, and opportunity for their children, Liberal times are hard times.

Mr. Speaker, some may say: but what would the New Democrats do about it? Well, to a very large extent, Mr. Speaker, we have already said what we would do about it. One year ago we predicted much of this hardship and in this very Debate last year I pleaded with the Government not to follow the foolhardy policy set out in its Budget.

Now let's consider the errors made at that time. The Government delayed the start of the Base Hospital. If this had been started last year, as we asked, there would now be hundreds of jobs for construction workers in Regina. It cut out entirely capital grants to build nursing homes throughout the province. If this foolish policy had not been adopted there might be now badly needed nursing homes under construction and largely financed with Federal mortgage money.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Blakeney:** — It cut back money for building technical institutes by almost 50 per cent and if that program had not been cut last year but expanded, there would now be jobs for building technical institutes and there would be skills that people had because they went to the institutes. It cut back money for park development by about 50 per cent eliminating many dozens of jobs. Many more projects were cut, resource roads and airfields, municipal road re-gravelling and on and on. These, it cut last year and it wonders why there was unemployment in Saskatchewan in 1969. These were cut, Mr. Speaker, in the sacred name of a balanced budget. We protested every one of these cuts and predicted some of the unemployment which we now have. We recommended that these projects could be financed partly by paring some unnecessary expenses, partly by reduction in the highway construction program, and I point out that that program creates relatively few jobs per \$1 of Provincial money spent, and partly, if necessary by a budget deficit. That, Mr. Speaker, was a sensible and responsible alternative. Last year, it was rejected scornfully by the Liberal party.

This year, they are belatedly adopting some of the very policies we advocated. Or, Mr. Speaker, I should say, they say they are. But we wonder, we wonder whether this Government wouldn't rather have a balanced budget to show its banker friends than a good job and full dinner pail for the ordinary working man of Saskatchewan. We wonder on two counts: First we wonder whether this Budget does promise all the construction jobs that the Provincial Treasurer's speech seems to suggest. An analysis of the estimates tells another story.

Let's look at the four big capital spending departments; Highways, Public Works, Agriculture and Natural Resources. Then let's look at university construction, school construction and hospital construction, and those, Mr. Speaker, are the big money capital projects in this Budget. I want to summarize: Highways, the capital spending is up by \$2.0 million; Natural Resources is up \$.2 million. So these are up \$2.2 million. Public Works, down \$1.1 million; Agriculture, down \$.4 million; university construction grants, down \$2 million, and may I say, Mr. Speaker, that the Provincial Treasurer has apparently decided that he would try to hide that fact by putting some wrong figures in his Budget Speech. They are there on page 52; there is simply an error, and the figures do not agree with the Estimates; school construction grants, down \$.7 million;

hospital construction grants, Mr. Minister down \$1.1 million. Total cut, \$5.3 million. Net change down \$3.1 million in construction. Now, Mr. Speaker, if I added the grants to the Power and Telephones Corporations, and they are a little bit more difficult to translate into construction, the decrease would be even greater. It might be possible to quibble with this figure or that figure, but what cannot possibly be argued against is the validity of the proposition that, in spite of all the sound and fury to the contrary, this Budget does not provide any major increase in construction. It does not represent any real effort at pump priming.

If this was a year of pump priming would university construction be cut — Estimates page 60; would the funds for school construction be cut — Estimates page 19; would the funds for hospital construction be cut — Estimates page 46; would the funds to build nursing homes be cut — Estimates page 64; would the funds for resource roads be cut — Estimates page 39; and would every single item in the capital budget of the Department of Agriculture be cut — Estimates page 12; would the funds for the construction of technical institutes be cut drastically — Estimates pages 52 and 53?

Mr. Speaker, this Budget gives no evidence that the Government realizes what it should do and what it must do to prime the pump of economic activity of this province. The Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Steuart) talks a good fight. But if this is the best the Provincial Treasurer can do at pump priming, we need another man on the pump handle.

I said, Mr. Speaker, that we wondered about pump priming on two counts. The second reason why we wonder is that many of the projects which are talked about by the Provincial Treasurer may well fall by the wayside like so many projects in the past. Some of the projects were the very projects announced by the Premier a couple of weeks ago. We will remember the Premier (Mr. Thatcher) saying that these projects were going to go ahead as soon as architectural plans are completed. To me, Mr. Speaker, those words had an ominous ring because I'd heard them somewhere before. And then I remembered. In December 1966, and I quote the Star Phoenix of December 23rd:

Premier Thatcher has announced the Provincial Government will provide \$700,000 to begin construction of a student housing complex on the Regina Campus of the University of Saskatchewan. Construction will start as soon as the architectural plan is completed.

Mr. Speaker, it is well known that this Government doesn't like planners, but I guess it doesn't like plans either because three years have gone by and those plans are not yet completed. Not a shovelful of dirt has been moved to build that housing complex on the Regina Campus. Does anyone wonder why we doubt the Premier's pronouncements? This was to be a multi-million dollar project. This looked like it would create jobs and it vanished in a puff of the Premier's breath. This Government which now talks about pump priming was, as late as last October, cutting back its construction program. Last October, and the Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Steuart) boasted about it then on the grounds that it would give him a balanced budget; he cut back university construction, school construction, Public Works capital and Agricultural capital projects.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Blakeney:** — And in so doing he was able to march into this House last Monday and say, “I have had a balanced Budget” and he also should have said, “I have put 2,000, 3,000, 5,000 men out of work.”

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Blakeney:** — Can anyone doubt, Mr. Speaker, that for people who want jobs, for people who want a decent job here in Saskatchewan for their children, can anyone doubt that for these people, Liberal times are hard times?

Mr. Speaker, I’m told the Provincial Treasurer is Irish and I’ve already perhaps referred to him as Wrong Way Corrigan, but there is another chap that we used to talk about as kids and he was a fellow by the name of Off again, On again, Gone again Finnigan. And when I think of the Provincial Treasurer’s handling of the matter of nursing homes I am reminded of Off again, On again, Gone again Finnigan. But he is not the only one that has his little troubles about nursing homes and geriatric centres. I don’t think I need to remind the House of the personal promise of the Minister of Health (Mr. Grant) and I quote from his platform in 1964. The Liberal candidate’s pledge, ‘pledge,’ Mr. Speaker, “Immediate provision of a 600-bed geriatric centre.” Six years have passed. No geriatric centre, not even architectural plans for this one. No hope for one. Just another broken promise. And last year the Government apparently decided that we had enough nursing homes. For more than 15 years the Provincial Government has provided capital grants to churches, lodges and municipalities to build nursing homes in Saskatchewan. As a result dozens of homes were built and thousands of senior citizens are living in pleasant accommodations and incidentally paying far less than they would in commercial homes.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Blakeney:** — Everybody thought this was a good program. The older citizens appreciated it. The churches and organizations were glad for this help in their work of charity. Municipalities particularly like the idea that they could build an old-folks home or a nursing home in their community. In many instances the nursing home made a real contribution to the life of that community, to enabling it to survive. Everybody liked the program but two groups: the commercial nursing home operators, mainly financed by the life insurance companies; and the Liberals. And so last year the program was scrapped. Nobody even pretended that we had enough nursing homes. Nobody even pretended that our smaller centres didn’t need help in creating institutions in their localities. No one even pretended that there was an excess of jobs in the building trades. But either to save a little bit of money — less than half a million dollars — hardly enough to build two or three miles of highway, or perhaps to keep their life insurance friends happy, the Government opposite scrapped that program. It just paid out its commitments on homes already under construction. Now this year — guess what? We are apparently to have grants for nursing homes again; 1968 on, 1969 off, 1970 on. On again, off again, on again. This is beer tap budgeting, Mr. Speaker. These programs can’t be turned on and off like you turn on and off a beer tap. I said last year

and I say again, that what is needed is some sensible long-range planning, so that our churches and municipalities and organizations will know where they stand with respect to Government help.

We need more nursing homes. We need the jobs that these nursing homes would create and our smaller centres need help to resist the relentless pull to the cities. We needed all these things last year and we didn't get them. Instead, our churches lodges and municipalities were told, no more grants to build nursing homes. The Government has now seen the folly of its policy last year. It has reversed itself and it has agreed with what we said last year. But the damage has been done. Homes which should have been built are only in the planning stage now. So what do we have? No jobs, no nursing homes, no places for senior citizens, no places except in the private nursing homes run by their insurance company friends at \$400 a month. It's nice if you're an insurance company, Mr. Speaker, but, Mr. Speaker, if you are a senior citizen — Liberal times are hard times.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Blakeney:** — Now, Mr. Speaker, these problems which I have been talking about are partly caused by and partly the cause of a veritable exodus of people from Saskatchewan. During the decade of the 1950s Saskatchewan's population increased by about 9,000 a year. And at that time the Member for Morse (Mr. Thatcher) used to go around the country saying — and I admit that 9,000 wasn't our full natural increase so some people were leaving the province, "This is the greatest exodus since Moses." He was particularly fond of that comment when he was in Los Angeles or New Orleans or Chicago. Now speaking of this Moses, there is some historical dispute over what tyrant ruling Egypt caused the children of Israel to leave Egypt and look for better things. But there is no dispute whatever who has caused the people of our province to leave Saskatchewan and look for better things. It's our very own Premier (Mr. Thatcher). He has said, "The greatest exodus since Moses"; he has said that over and over again and it's begun to rankle with him. He said "Why should this Moses be ahead of me."

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Blakeney:** — "I could do better than Moses." Moses led his people into the desert, a land where there were very few people living, a land where no crops grew, a land where the people had to rely on manna from Heaven. And I can almost hear the Premier saying to himself: I can make Saskatchewan a land where few people live and I'll arrange with these Ottawa Liberals to make Saskatchewan a land where no crops grow.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Blakeney:** — And then we'll do Moses one better. All I can say, Mr. Speaker, is I hope the manna falls because I don't know what else there is going to be for many Saskatchewan people next year.

Mr. Speaker, the Premier seems to have lost interest in his old vision of a verdant Saskatchewan alive with a vibrant and

growing population. But it wasn't always so. Immediately after his election in 1964 he gave this as the reason for his success: *Western Business*, October 1964:

Our people decided that they wanted a government which could get some new industries, provide jobs right here in Saskatchewan and keep our young people at home.

In another famous phrase of his in this House in 1964, he said, "I say that population figures are the acid test of growth." Let's apply this 'acid' test, and I want to make clear that I don't mean LSD. I suppose that may now mean Long Since Departed but I am not talking about that. I am talking about the Premier's acid test. In 1969, Saskatchewan lost 13,000 people net, according to the Dominion Bureau of Statistics, far more than any other province, measured in absolute terms, measured percentagewise, measured any way you want them. Indeed the only other province that lost any people was Liberal New Brunswick. Contrast this with Manitoba, which had a modest increase of 2,000 people, or Alberta which had an increase of 37,000. But this 13,000 doesn't tell the whole story. The natural increase — the difference between the number of births in a year and the number of deaths in a year is about 10,000 which means that last year in 1969 23,000 people left Saskatchewan. That, Mr. Speaker, is a staggering figure. Not since the days of mass recruitment during World War II have 23,000 people left this province in a single year. Almost 2,000 every month, almost 60 a day. Yes, indeed, more than 60 a day.

Mr. Speaker, I invite you to look around the Chamber. If everyone was in his seat — and I regret they're not — there would be 59 Members, more people than that have left Saskatchewan since yesterday at this time. More people than are sitting in these seats have gone since yesterday at this time. And this is happening every day of every week of every month. The prairie sun as it sets in the west not only silhouettes that symbol of prairie fertility — the grain elevator — but it also silhouettes the moving van, as it transports the effects of yet another family to Alberta or British Columbia. And the prairie sun as it rises etches against the horizon yet more vans taking families to Manitoba or Ontario. For many of us, Mr. Speaker, this is a melancholy sight. Yes, Mr. Speaker, if you had any hopes, any dreams of seeing Saskatchewan grow, of seeing our young people making their contribution to our province right here, then for you and those like you who had this hope and this vision, then for you and for them — Liberal times are hard times.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we come to the Provincial Treasurer's 'piece de resistance' — the promise, in his words, "to shift the burden from the local taxpayers." If this can be believed the news will be welcome, not to mention surprising. The Liberals are concerned about property taxes. Mr. Speaker, the Liberals have been concerned about the level of property taxes for a long time, a very long time. Let's start in 1964. You will remember that year. Let me quote from Volume 4, No. 2 of "The Saskatchewan Liberal," published occasionally by the Liberal party. Under the headline, "It's a fact," this paper noted with horror that the average property taxes for a family of four in 1964 would be \$428. And then it stated and I quote: and here is a word of wisdom in the Saskatchewan Liberal:

High municipal taxes result from the very inadequate financial assistance paid to local governments by the Provincial Government.

I want you to remember that word of wisdom and also that figure of \$428 for a family of four. So what did the Liberal party promise to do if it was elected? That same issue of the Saskatchewan Liberal told us the answer. It solemnly pledged that a new Liberal Government would, and I quote:

Initiate a massive study to find ways to reduce the land tax burden borne by farmers.

A massive study! And so it came to pass that a Liberal Government was elected in 1964 and, presumably, set in motion its massive study on how to reduce property taxes. Come 1965 and the Provincial Treasurer of the day made his first Budget Speech. He hadn't forgotten about taxes. Oh no! He said:

We intend to keep the burden of taxes at the lowest possible level.

Meanwhile back at the municipal office in 1965, average property taxes for a family of four increased to \$480 — \$428 to \$480. But of course it was a new government and perhaps it hadn't had time to complete this massive study. In 1966 the Provincial Treasurer was still concerned. In his Budget Speech of that year he said:

Our Government is extremely concerned over the alarming increase in property taxes throughout Saskatchewan.

Extremely concerned! What happened to property taxes in that year? Up by \$56 for a family of four to \$536.

Then 1967. How was that massive study coming along? The Provincial Treasurer didn't say but he hadn't forgotten the taxpayers. The Budget Speech said:

The Liberal party has long expressed concern over the level of property and land taxes in Saskatchewan.

Long indeed! Mr. Speaker, that was the swan song for that Provincial Treasurer. In 1967 property taxes climbed another \$56 reaching \$592. Then came 1968 and, Mr. Speaker, that was a year for our Provincial Treasurer. He was so busy raising every Provincial tax that I wondered if he had time to remember about the property tax. He didn't tell us about his massive study, but he didn't fail us. He said:

We recognize the problems facing municipalities with regard to their every-mounting costs, coupled with the already high property tax burden.

Note that: "already high!" They recognized them all right. In 1968 property taxes maintained their steady climb and our family had to dig for another \$48, total \$640. Then came 1969 and the Provincial Treasurer's concern took a new twist. He said nothing about the tax burden but he said:

I'll tell you what we will do. We will have a Provincial-Municipal Conference and you can tell us all your troubles. We will talk about revenue.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I attended much of that Conference and I hoped against hope that this would be the occasion when the Government would tell us the results of its massive study. But



I and the taxpayers were disappointed. Meanwhile, mill rates and property taxes kept climbing. We don't have the final figures yet but I think we can rest assured that the 1969 figure was not less than 1968, so add another \$48. It's a sure thing then that in 1969 our family of four was paying \$688, \$428 in 1964 to \$688 in 1969. Sixty per cent in five years. Five years of touching Liberal concern for the local taxpayers. And were they touched!

And then came 1970 and the Provincial Treasurer tells us that he is concerned about mill rates and that he is going to hold the line on mill rates. Perhaps it would be instructive to know just where this line is.

The Member for Morse (Mr. Thatcher) in this Chamber in 1964 said:

Some method must be found for reducing taxes . . . not holding the line even, but reducing taxes on land and property and we will find some method. We will find a way.

So let's look at the property taxes. I will make a few quick mill rate comparisons. The average mill rate from 1960 to 1964 in the NDP years — average mill rate all across the Province was up three mills, less than one mill per year. From 1964 to 1968 during those years of Liberal concern, average mill rate was up 12 mills, four times the NDP rate. Average school mill rate: school mill rates went up from 1960 to 1964 two mills, half a mill a year. From 1964 to 1968 eight mills. Again four times the NDP rate! I don't know whether the people of Saskatchewan can stand much more of this concern.

Now rural per capita taxation. From 1960 to 1964 up \$30. From 1964 to 1968 went up \$71, an increase of 50 per cent in four short years. But the Provincial Treasurer tells us that after six years the massive study is apparently complete and he is going to hold the line. Suppose he did hold the line on mill rates for a year. Suppose he held it for two years or even three. If the mill rate in this province stayed stock still for three years and the Liberals were in power for three years (which they won't be) its record would still not be as good as the NDP record from 1960 to 1964.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Blakeney:** — Now, Mr. Speaker, how is he going to hold the line? How has he found a way? On page 38 of his Budget Speech he lists the components of the \$20 million increase in grants which, he says, will assist local governments and their ratepayers.

Take Item 1 — Increased grants to school boards and the University \$16.1 million. Will someone please tell me by what laborious bit of logic it is thought that grants to the University are going to lower property taxes? This is pure nonsense. Grants to the University no more help local ratepayers than say grants to the medicare fund or grants to any other agency of the Government. So let's take that \$5 million off and that gets it down, not \$20 million, but to \$15 million. Still not a bad sum but not \$20 million. Now let's look at these school grants. The Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Steuart) says they are up \$11 million. Well I looked at the Estimates and what do I find?

I find that this year for the first time they have split operating grants and capital grants. I have no objection to this change at all, I think that is a good idea. But let's keep the record straight. If we calculate school grants this year the same way we did last year the increase is \$10.5 million, not \$11 million.

I leave aside such little bits of padding as doing away with the vote for school text books and putting that into the school grant vote. We have seen this little operation going on year after year. The Government compares its school grant figure with grant figures of earlier years which went for the operation of schools and did not have any text book component in them, did not have any teacher-superannuation component in them. They have now put every text book from grade 1 to grade 12 into the school grants vote to pad their figure a bit. The figures for the payments for Canada Pension Plan for teachers now goes into the school grants. That makes the figure look a little better. The Government even put the grant for building at Campion College in school grants, if you can believe that. But it did and that makes the figures a little better. Leaving those little things aside we still don't have a very impressive figure.

Now, Mr. Speaker, it just might hold the line this year and that would be welcome. It is disastrously late but I suppose any port in a storm. But let's see what Saskatchewan taxpayers will be up against even if it does hold the line, even if we take the Government at its word and say there is going to be no increase in municipal taxation. As a starting point let's refer to that trusty periodical, Volume 4, No. 2 of the Saskatchewan Liberal. In its shocking disclosure of the terrible level of taxation in 1964 that issue stated that Provincial Government taxes, not local but Provincial Government taxes, for a family of four totalled \$416.

Mr. Speaker, do you know what that same family of four will pay this year in Provincial taxes, not local government taxes, but Provincial taxes? Counting all the Liberal tax increases of the past years and adding on this year's crop — income tax, gas tax, the hot dog tax, diesel tax — the figure will not be \$416 per family of four but it will in fact be over \$1,000.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Blakeney:** — And if we hold the line on property taxes in 1969 the level of tax in 1969 for local taxpayers will be \$688. So that makes a total of about \$1,700 for our family of four. That, Mr. Speaker, is over double the tax load that was true five years ago.

Mr. Speaker, it has doubled the tax load to nearly \$1,700 counting both provincial and local taxes and now we are told that something is going to be done. Now, after six years of concern — expressed concern — and skyrocketing taxes, something is going to be done. Now after its massive study something is going to be done. It's as if it is going to stop hitting us over the head with two hammers and it is going to hit us over the head with one. Mr. Speaker, I wish the Government well in its effort to slow down the steep rise in property taxes but like everything else in this Budget it comes too little and it comes

too late. And can anyone doubt, Mr. Speaker, after listening to this record of Liberal concern for the local taxpayer that for the local taxpayer Liberal times are hard times.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Blakeney:** — Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to say a word or two about the specific taxes in the Budget. Let me make a few remarks first about the Treasurer's revenue estimates. I think that they are pretty chancy. It wouldn't surprise me if they were plus or minus \$10 million. Some of them I think are clearly inflated. I leave that aside and say a few words about the income tax.

In general I agree that an income tax is a fairer basis of taxation than say property tax or a per capita tax levied on an individual or a family. But I believe that with the income tax exemptions so low that there is a tax on a family of four with an income of under \$3,000 and a tax on a single man earning the minimum wage, that the income tax is no longer a fair tax. We believe, Mr. Speaker, in much higher exemptions for low incomes. We say it is a scandal to extract money from among the poorest of our citizens, many well below the recognized poverty line.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Blakeney:** — And we believe, Mr. Speaker, even more firmly that, if personal incomes are to be taxed, then corporations should be taxed too. We cannot support a Budget which heaps taxes on personal income including income of people making the minimum wage and does not levy a single penny of extra tax on any corporation in this province.

A Treasurer who would do that has a severe case of perverted priorities. He says this, "Yes, it is true that the F.W. Woolworth Company or the S.S. Kresge Company may have some sales girls. And it is true that they may pay them the minimum wage, but we need some more money. So we will put an extra tax on the sales girls who are working at the minimum wage, but we won't tax Woolworth or Kresge. After all their New York offices or Detroit offices may be feeling the pinch."

Surely an extra tax on personal income cannot be justified when corporations are asked to pay no more. The Treasurer says, "Well we are competing for industry. We have to keep our taxes down or we won't get any industry." Well, I think we'd have to abolish income taxes in this Province to get any industry judged by the way this Government administers the Province. But I say this, too, we are competing for people too. We are competing for people and in that competition we are losing to every province in Canada.

**Mr. Steuart:** — How about Manitoba?

**Mr. Blakeney:** — Manitoba? If it has a higher income tax it also raised the corporation tax and I commend that to you. I commend to you a province which says we need more money and if we need more money we will get it not only from personal income taxpayers but also from corporations as well.

Now, Mr. Speaker, what about the hot dog tax? The Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Steuart) has slapped a sales tax on all meals right down to 14 cents. Every hot dog and hamburger, every sundae which is sold at the football games or sports day or an exhibition will be taxed. This tax will create nuisance and annoyance. It will be expensive to collect. It will hit the most modest meals in the most modest restaurant. If someone wants a plate of barley soup and a plate of beans, he is going to have to pay the Provincial Treasurer. I suppose that it will have one advantage. It will be educational. It will teach the toddlers and the teeny boppers who buy a hamburger or chips and gravy that in the new Saskatchewan everything is taxed, in the new Saskatchewan all must pay tribute to the Caesar of the Wascana.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Blakeney:** — Now I want to say a word about the homeowner grant. I want to repeat to some extent what I said on Friday. I say that I welcome the homeowner grant as a small relief from the burden of municipal taxes. I am sorry it brings no relief to the people who need it most. It is represented as a dividend from our resources. At some risk, let me take the Government at its word. If this is so why is there not a dividend from our resources for our older people who live in senior citizens homes or other rented accommodation. Surely they need the dividend. Don't they, our pioneers, deserve a share of our resources? What about our young people who live in rented accommodation as they well should because they never know when they are going to have to leave Saskatchewan to find a job? Don't they need a dividend? Shouldn't the Provincial Treasurer give a dividend to them as a sort of bon voyage present? What about our poorest people who can't afford to own a home? Don't they need a dividend? Are the resources any less theirs because they are poor? What of our Indian and Métis? Very few of them own homes on which municipal taxes are paid. Who has a better claim to share in our resources than the descendants of those people who owned them all short years ago.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Blakeney:** — Why, why indeed, should we white men say that the fruits of these great resources belong only to the people who own their own home, sitting on their own land, paying their own taxes, white-man style? It is unjustified and ought not to be continued.

A word about the tax on farm fuel. What indeed can be said about that tax? It was a bad tax when it was put on. It was totally unjustified then and it is totally unjustified now. The Government should take it off and have the good grace not to claim any credit for undoing that which it should never have done in the first place.

And as for the gasoline tax; taxes are never welcome, certainly not welcome at the rate they are being piled on by this Government. I think it is a new Liberal record and a new record for Saskatchewan, indeed, to have increased the gasoline tax three times in six years. That has never happened before. We will soon be approaching the levels prevailing in Newfoundland with its Liberal Government and New Brunswick with its Liberal Government, which have the distinction of having the highest

taxes in Canada. We are approaching those levels rapidly. We on this side of the House will be considering these taxes and we will be advising Members opposite of our stand at the appropriate occasion, I think that there is no point in whetting their appetite at this time with further comment on whether or not we approve or disapprove.

I want to say a word or two about Regina. I believe . . .

**An Hon. Member:** — Where is Regina?

**Mr. Blakeney:** — Now I believe that is an appropriate comment from a Minister of the Crown. I said that I want to say something about Regina, and the Minister says, “Where is Regina?” All I can say is that the Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Steuart) doesn’t know where Regina is. He certainly knows where Prince Albert is. I will have an opportunity to make a few comparisons later on about just how well he is able to draw a distinction between those two cities.

I want first to say something about the Base Hospital. It is now six years since the Minister of Health (Mr. Grant) was elected on the promise to build the Base Hospital. Six years ago the voters of this city were told that the need was urgent, indeed critical. But the urgency came to a rapid and sticky end when the Minister was elected. The Minister uses his election platform like some people would use a railway platform. It is something to get in on but not to go ahead with. He now promises us the Base Hospital. Once again he promises it. We hope that this promise, this time, will be more reliable than the ones in the past.

If the previous Government had known that the Liberals were going to be elected in 1964, we would never have called that hospital, when we brought in the Act, the South Saskatchewan Base Hospital. Because those words, “South Saskatchewan,” have a really ominous ring in the mouth of the Liberals. These people promised the South Saskatchewan dam for 25 years before the Tories built it. I was wondering whether they are trying to beat that record with the South Saskatchewan Hospital.

They have had six years of planning, so called. Now we have promises of action. But if the hospital comes, and from now on I am going to be optimistic and say when it comes, it will be welcomed by people of Southern Saskatchewan. It’s a pity that it is not under construction right now because it would provide jobs for some hundreds of people right here in Regina. We are sorry, too, that the hospital is apparently going to cost something like \$60,000 a bed. I well remember that the new St. Paul’s at Saskatoon opened about seven years ago was built at a cost of under \$15,000 a bed. I know that a base hospital is more elaborate and I know that costs have gone up, but a cost of four times that of St. Paul’s seems a little strong. It looks like some of those highway contracts that the Minister used to let out when he was Minister of Highways. I am reminded of the connector between No. 2 and the Hanson Lake Road, built by a private contractor at a reported four times the estimate of the Department of Natural Resources. It may have well been a better road. But if there is action on building the Base Hospital, and I hope there will be, Mr. Minister, I want to thank you on behalf of my constituents who will use its services. In my term of Minister of Health I had the honor to commence the study of

that project, to commission and receive the Agnew-Hartman Report on which the centre is based and to introduce into this House, The Saskatchewan Hospital Centre Act. I am naturally very pleased that construction of the first phase seems about to be commenced.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Blakeney:** — My pleasure will be widely shared in Regina, because right now the waiting lists in Regina are the longest in the history of the city. At the Regina General alone the waiting list has jumped by 15 per cent in the last year. And I am sure this will be agreed with by Members who know more about this than I. Action, though much belated, is nonetheless appreciated.

There are a number of other things that I would like to say about the Budget in Regina. Year after year I have included in each Budget speech a plea for help for the city for the cost of police protection. Regina citizens pay for police protection about \$2.2 million a year. That is \$16 for every man, woman and child in Regina and this is far, far more than is paid by other people in this province.

In the town of Morse for example, the figure would be less than \$3. In the rural municipality of Morse they pay about \$1.50. I admit that a rural municipality is a little different comparison. You may ask how this can be that Regina citizens have to pay \$16 for what the town of Morse pays \$3 for and the rural municipality of Morse pays \$1.50. Surely on a per capita basis it is cheaper to police a densely populated area than a sparsely populated area. The answer, of course, is that the Provincial Government pays the lion's share of police protection for villages and rural areas and I would think that they would pay the lion's share in the village of Morse and the R.M. of Morse.

Now the sum for the assistance for rural municipal and village and town policing is increased in this Budget, the vote, for police and prisoners is substantially increased.

I was about to renew my request for assistance for the cities in a fairly vigorous way and I am glad that I don't have to be quite so vigorous because a start has been made. Regina has thousands of people without jobs and that's bad news for the police. Hundreds of our teenagers who have dropped out of school have no technical training facilities to go to and that's bad news for the police. All these things along with the additional Provincial laws which are passed are putting extra burdens on our police. These are Provincial problems, not Regina's problem, and Regina's ratepayers need relief.

When we are paying \$16 a person, a grant of 50 cents or about 3 per cent is not going to be an excuse for a civic holiday: I'll tell you that.

**Hon. D.V. Heald (Attorney General):** — Are you using net figures?

**Mr. Blakeney:** — That's the figure which is stated in the report of the Department of Municipal Affairs. We have to break down the combined figure for police and fire protection, I don't know to what extent this figure is netted.

I note in passing that the grant is apparently not going to be a percentage grant or even a mill grant based upon the rate but a flat grant of 50 cents per capita. I venture to think that while the grant will pay 3 per cent in Regina it will pay perhaps 10 per cent or even 20 per cent in a place like Morse. I've been there many times as a matter of fact. It is the place where Saskatchewan minerals, that burgeoning industry which we established at Chaplin, used to do its banking and when I was out there attending to my duties at that vigorous and prosperous Crown corporation I occasionally went down to Morse.

I can't, Mr. Speaker, be quite so appreciative of the increase in the library grant. With the developing system of libraries across the province the libraries at Regina and Saskatoon act as basic resource centres. They are in a very real sense anchor men of the provincial system. They deserve support in some way comparable to that received by the regional libraries. But the Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Steuart) provides a grant for the regional library at, say Prince Albert, at a rate which is four times the rate provided in Regina. Four times, Mr. Treasurer.

**Hon. D.G. Steuart (Provincial Treasurer):** — You did that!

**Mr. Blakeney:** — You've had six years. If this was wrong you could have corrected it. You've had six years to remedy all these deficiencies which you talked about for so long.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Blakeney:** — Health grants is the same. The story is about the same with respect to health grants. The Provincial Treasurer provides Provincial money to the city of Prince Albert up to the tune of about \$2.80 per capita.

**Mr. Steuart:** — You did!

**Mr. Blakeney:** — To Regina \$1.10 — less than 40 per cent. This is unfair and more should have been done to close the gap.

**Mr. Steuart:** — Why don't they join up!

**Mr. Blakeney:** — Now a word about snow removal. Snow removal grants are also welcome even though tiny. It should be remembered that the snow removal grant, the police costs grant, the increase in the health grant, the increase in the library grant, all lumped together will not equal one mill, will not equal one mill in Regina. It's not exactly like hitting the mother lode.

Nor does it in any sense, Mr. Speaker, discharge the pledge made by the Minister of Public Health (Mr. Grant) to the voters of this city in 1964 to give Regina a fair share of the gasoline tax. Can anyone doubt that with another 2 cents piled on the cost of gasoline, anything resembling a fair share would yield Regina at least \$1 million. Suppose the Provincial Treasurer set aside 10 per cent — only 10 per cent — of his gas tax and distributed it among all the cities and all the towns in Saskatchewan, Regina's share would exceed \$1 million. And we are not impressed with a grant of 50 cents per capita or about \$70,000.

I am pleased with the day-care centres — something I have spoken of year after year.

I am intrigued by a relatively small sum in the Public Works capital budget under the heading “Institute of Technology, Regina.” I wasn’t aware that we had an institute of technology in Regina and I hope and trust that this means that there will be a start on this long-delayed technical training institute in Regina.

**An Hon. Member:** — They’ll take a long time doing it!

**Mr. Blakeney:** — The Minister of Education (Mr. McIsaac) will know that there is a real shortage of technical training and academic upgrading facilities in this city. I know of one case — and there are doubtless dozens — where a man will have to wait over a year to get into an academic upgrading course. I’ve got this strictly documented with all the letters which I can show the Minister, if he is interested, including one from the Hon. Allan MacEachen who says it is true. This man is a construction worker. He is unemployed. He’d like to take his course now but there’s no room. He applied last June. It looks like he’ll have to wait until next September. That’s not good enough and we hope that something more concrete can be done in this area. I know that this is an area primarily, I think, of Federal responsibility, but I ask the Minister to urge on his colleagues at Ottawa a better system of academic upgrading than that.

Mr. Speaker, there will be widespread disappointment at the meagre allotment for the Regina Campus of the University. Capital spending will actually be cut while facilities are still desperately overcrowded. Anyone who doubts that facilities at the Regina Campus are desperately overcrowded, I invite him to go out to the Regina Campus at any noon hour and see if he can find a place to stand, let alone a place to sit.

The increase in the operating expenses is so small that the staff increase will be 1 per cent and this seems far too small to deal with the growing student enrolment.

Taken all in all, Mr. Speaker, for the people of Regina this Budget offers some pretty lean pickings.

Mr. Speaker, I want to say a word or two about the Wheat Board. The Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Steuart) referred somewhat circumspectly to the Canadian Wheat Board. And I compliment him on his circumspection and I commend that measure of circumspection to the Minister of Highways (Mr. Boldt) and to several of his colleagues.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Blakeney:** — Well, as a matter of fact that may well be true, but I did a little research on the Canadian Wheat Board and I want to tell you about it.

**An Hon. Member:** — How little?

**Mr. Blakeney:** — That’s right . . . The Wheat Board has an interesting history and I think a study of the history of the Wheat Board



might be interesting and it might be instructive for Members Opposite. The Wheat Board was established by the Bennett Government.

**Mr. Heald:** — Conservatives — right!

**Mr. Blakeney:** — It was authorized at that time to buy the grain from farmers, to set floor prices, to operate elevators, but at that time it was still possible for a farmer to sell through the Grain Exchange. There was a dual system of marketing and in fact the Wheat Board was competing with the Grain Exchange.

Then in the fall of 1935 the Liberals were elected and a couple of years went by and a funny thing happened. Out of the woodwork came the friends of the Grain Exchange in all sorts of disguises, usually pretending to be the friends of the farmers, and they were telling us what was wrong with the Wheat Board. It wasn't aggressive enough. It wasn't doing the job. And sure enough the Liberals passed an Act which curtailed the operations of the Wheat Board.

**An Hon. Member:** — Same old Liberals!

**Mr. Blakeney:** — The Liberals passed an Act which said the Wheat Board couldn't buy more than 5,000 bushels from any producer. They said to the farmers: "Back to the Grain Exchange."

Then along came the war. And as the Provincial Treasurer says not even the Liberals could stomach the inefficiency of Grain Exchange marketing during the war and so we had the compulsory board, as we now know it. And the war was won and after the war there was an election, in 1949, and the Liberals won a substantial majority.

A few years went by and then a funny thing happened. A funny thing happened to the Wheat Board. Surpluses began to pile up and it couldn't sell our wheat. And out of the woodwork came the friends of the Grain Exchange in all sorts of disguises — usually pretending to be the friends of the farmers — and saying things are wrong with the Wheat Board. It isn't aggressive enough. It isn't doing its job. Fortunately before they could do anything about it the Liberals were defeated at the polls, defeated in no small measure due to the fact that Western farmers said they were going to keep their Wheat Board. They were going to keep it from those Liberal politicians who wanted to sabotage it.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Blakeney:** — Well, Mr. Speaker, in 1957 the Conservatives were elected and, Mr. Speaker, a funny thing happened. All of a sudden the Wheat Board could sell wheat. Hundreds of millions of bushels were sold to customers that the Liberals didn't even know existed. This continued until 1963. And Mr. Speaker, the Liberals were elected in 1963, Federally and Provincially in 1964. A few years went by and a funny thing happened, Mr. Speaker. A funny thing happened to the Wheat Board. Surpluses began to pile up and all of a sudden it couldn't sell our wheat. And once again out of the woodwork came the friends of the Grain Exchange . . .

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Blakeney:** — . . . in all sorts of disguises usually pretending to be the farmers' friends and telling us what's what with the Wheat Board. Oh, it wasn't aggressive enough. No. Its officials were sitting in their plush offices and smirking. It wasn't doing its job.

Mr. Speaker, the farmers in this province know what's going on. They know there are things wrong with the Wheat Board. They know there are plenty of things wrong with the Wheat Board. But they know there's nothing wrong with the Wheat Board that a clean-out of a few Liberal politicians wouldn't cure.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Blakeney:** — And when the next election comes, Federal or Provincial, the farmers of this province will do their part to defend orderly marketing, to defend the Wheat Board, and to clean out those Liberal politicians who are out to sabotage the Wheat Board.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Blakeney:** — Mr. Speaker, the farmers know. They know that if you believe in orderly marketing and if you like the Wheat Board better than the Grain Exchange, if you believe in those things, then, Mr. Speaker, Liberal times are hard times.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Blakeney:** — I want, Mr. Speaker, to welcome the Member for Kelvington (Mr. Byers).

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Blakeney:** — I welcome him because he is a good Member. I say "is" and not "will be." He has already demonstrated a capacity for work, a willingness to pursue the interests of his constituents, an ability to contribute expertly to the deliberations of this House.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Blakeney:** — And I welcome him too for what he represents. Among the things he represents is the determination of the people of Saskatchewan to rid themselves of the yoke of Liberal Governments.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Blakeney:** — In the 1968 Federal election the Liberal candidates all across this province complained that they couldn't get elected, they couldn't overcome the unpopularity of the Provincial Liberals. In 1969 up at Kelvington the Provincial Liberals were complaining that they couldn't elect their candidate, they couldn't overcome the unpopularity of the Federal Liberals.

Mr. Speaker, they were both right. The people of Saskatchewan don't trust Liberals — any brand. They showed that in 1968.

They showed that in 1969. And I say if the Premier thinks third time lucky we invite him to try and the sooner the better.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Blakeney:** — The people are waiting for a chance to even the score with the Liberal party. Federally or Provincially the Liberal party couldn't win an election in Saskatchewan or in Manitoba or in Alberta or in British Columbia. They couldn't win at any level in any of those provinces.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Blakeney:** — They are on their way down the road. And they will be helped on their way, Mr. Speaker, by this Budget. The Budget says it sets out to do three things: to relieve local ratepayers, to create employment and to help our hard-pressed farmers. Because of the massive deficit it might have some partial success for a year in relieving local ratepayers after punishing them unmercifully for five years. But in creating more employment it is hopelessly inadequate. Indeed it's a hoax. It promises a massive building program but it fails to deliver. As is so characteristic with the Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Steuart) his sound effects are excellent, but his performance is poor. It will create practically no new jobs nor are there any programs for real relief for our farm distress.

The Budget has its tinsel and its gimmicks. But it fails our farmers. It fails our working people. And after the Budget they will know, farmers and working people, as they know now, Mr. Speaker, that Liberal times are hard times.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Blakeney:** — And because they will think ill of this Budget I move, seconded by the Member for Biggar, (Mr. Lloyd):

That all the words after "That" be deleted and the following substituted therefor:

this Assembly expresses its regret that the Budget fails to propose measures which will relieve hard-pressed farm people from oppressive taxes and provide jobs for the sharply rising number of citizens who are now without work.

Mr. Speaker, I so move.

**Hon. L.P. Coderre (Minister of Labour):** — Mr. Speaker, I am sure that I can't go through the antics that the hon. gentleman has just done.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Coderre:** — I was just wondering whether I was watching one of those little puppet shows.

However, Mr. Speaker, I would request the Members of this Legislature to join with me to offer sincere sympathies to the

Hon. Member for Regina South East (Mr. Baker) on the loss of his dear Mother. I am sure that Members of the House would like to join with me on this occasion.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to congratulate his Honour the Lieutenant Governor Stephen Worobetz on his appointment as Lieutenant Governor. I would also like to associate myself with the Members of this House who have wished R.L. Hanbidge a pleasant retirement.

I would be remiss if I did not congratulate the Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Steuart) for his excellent Budget, truly indicating a responsible and progressive approach to the problems facing us in Saskatchewan.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Coderre:** — I would also like to congratulate the new Member for Kelvington (Mr. Byers). Sorry, but it could only possibly be for one session. However, my friend, I would like to tell you that's the way the mop flops as they say.

**Mr. Coderre:** — However, we hope you have the opportunity to express yourself fully in this House as the change will come for you much sooner than you reckon. I am sure that the Hon. Member for Moose Jaw South (Mr. Davies) would also like to take the opportunity at some very early date to express himself because no doubt that will be — no doubt at all — that will be his last opportunity.

Despite what the Hon. Member for Regina Centre (Mr. Blakeney) said there is nothing wrong with Saskatchewan and the Government of Saskatchewan. I, and 964,000 people in Saskatchewan, still want to stay here. According to the Dominion Bureau of Statistics the population figures for 1969 were 963,878. The population for '69 was based on DBS and Vital Statistics and MCIC and covered population figures which are about 99.9 per cent of the total population. The number of deaths and births are only estimated since these totals still lack the one-month's figure before being finalized for '69.

I should like to draw to the attention of this House, Mr. Speaker, that the net loss in 1963 was 16,700 persons. In 1949 the net loss was 21,000. In 1957 it was 19,200.

**An Hon. Member:** — Who was in then?

**Mr. Coderre:** — The population figure stands at 960,000, the highest, thanks to the programs of this Government.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Hon. Mr. Coderre:** — When we consider in 1963 the population figure was 933,000 and the population today is 963,000. It is a net increase. There are more people working and employed in the Province of Saskatchewan than there were at that particular time.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Coderre:** — I am rather interested in the issue of the Commonwealth of March 4th where Lloyd defines his policies. Now that he is Leader of the Opposition he's got great ideas. But where was he when he was the Leader of the Government? He played around and did absolutely nothing. Now he has great policies or programs. Really you know, Mr. Speaker, he reminds me of Pan, you know that mischievous little boy in Greek mythology who talks, plays and gambols around. Now the Hon. Member (Mr. Lloyd) is trying to play a game of chess with his pawns across the way. He's trying to keep his good pieces in the background and then can you imagine his downgrading stalwarts, like my good friend, Bill, (Mr. Berezowsky) one of the best Members this House has ever seen, one of the most sincere Members.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Coderre:** — Can you imagine downgrading the number one son of one of Saskatchewan's great politicians (Mr. Brockelbank)? Shouldn't he be in front? What about my good friend, George Willis, Member for Melfort, a former Cabinet Minister and Minister of Highways, a man who has been proud of his portfolio, being downgraded?

**Some Hon. Members:** — Shame, shame!

**Mr. Coderre:** — But then can you imagine too keeping 'the big horn,' you know from the North West (Mr. Kramer) in his seat and keeping these very important, very capable persons in the back? You know, Mr. Speaker, my friend Woodrow, I am sure now feels the skeleton in his closet must be breathing down his neck at this moment.

**An Hon. Member:** — Who's the skeleton?

**Mr. Coderre:** — Oh, there's quite a few of them. I would like to remind the Hon. Members that the voters will remember him in their constituencies, say in Regina South East, in Regina North West, Cumberland, Melfort, because the Hon. Leader of the Opposition overlooks these capable persons.

Well, the Hon. Member for Regina Centre (Mr. Blakeney) this afternoon said he was fondly looking at the budget in Manitoba. The Hon. Member wishes he would be in that Government. Well, it won't happen, he won't be in that one and he won't be in the next one here, I can assure you of that. But boy are the taxes ever going up over there, 2 to 4 per cent above the Provincial income tax in this Province. Power rates have gone up.

**An Hon. Member:** — Medicare, licence plates!

**Mr. Coderre:** — And then he said, "We're cautious. We've had our fingers burnt a few times." I should say, Mr. Speaker, that the young Members who are now sitting in the front benches across the way should know that. Yes, he's had his fingers burnt a few times. I should say that some of your Members should have had their fingers burnt, particularly after the Rubra deals and ask your friends about it, young man. You give away of millions

of acres of good Crown land, good Crown mineral rights made millionaires and multi-millionaires out of some of your friends. A few political Socialist friends. Ask him. Some now are basking in the South of Florida.

**An Hon. Member:** — Who? Who?

**An Hon. Member:** — Name them!

**Mr. Coderre:** — You just ask your friends. They'll tell you more about it.

Mr. Speaker, let us honestly examine the rather ridiculous criticism of this Budget put forward by the Member for Regina Centre (Mr. Blakeney) as he adjourned the debate yesterday and part of it today.

**An Hon. Member:** — No, he wasn't on yesterday.

**Mr. Coderre:** — First he trots out his usual complaint, his annual complaint, that the Liberal Government has robbed the medical care piggy bank and others to balance the Budget during the past years.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Coderre:** — Well, let's take a look at what he calls the medical care piggy bank by which, I presume, he means the Medical Care Insurance Fund. At the close of 1962-63 there was \$10 million in the Medical Care Fund. How then was this cash built up? I will recall for the Members that the then CCF Government raised the education and health tax from 3 per cent to 5 per cent on January 1st, 1962, to pay for medicare. In addition a 6 per cent surcharge was taxed on individual income tax and 1 per cent on the corporation income tax roll, apparently under the guise of financing a medical care program. But they never delivered prepaid medical care until July, 1962, six months after they began collecting the tax to pay for it. In fact, Mr. Speaker, they collected this money fraudulently. Then in 1963 just before the election the Socialists cut the medical care premium in half. How then did they intend to make up that money that this cut in the premiums would cost? By robbing the piggy banks of course. Thus the cash balance in the fund was reduced to \$7.6 million when we brought down our first budget return.

At the end of the current fiscal year the fund will have a cash balance of some \$3 to \$3.5 million. To suggest that this reduction in the cash balance has allowed this Government to present six consecutive balanced Budgets is sheer nonsense. With Government expenditures in six years of some \$1,600 billion the Members opposite suggest that a \$4 million draw-down in the cash balance of the MCIC fund was the only way our Government managed the present balanced Budget. Not only that but he has been using this same silly argument for five years. I would suggest that if he wants to stay in the Front Bench he had better get a new line and a new writer.

The financial critic has also complained that the homeowner grant doesn't help the old age pensioner, people on welfare or our Indian and Métis citizens. No Socialist should have the gall

to criticize our record for those in need or for the native people.

I was a Member in this House when those bleeding hearts, Mr. Speaker, across the way, the hypocrites on the Opposition, were the Government. The Socialists, year after year, had the poorest supplementary allowances program in Canada and the average payment was only \$5 per month.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order, order! Now we've got to get this debate back on the rails. I don't think hypocrites, even though it is generally applied and not specifically personal, is an orderly word to use in the House.

**Mr. Coderre:** — Well, Mr. Speaker, I suppose by saying directly hypocrites I am wrong and I will have to withdraw it. But somehow or the other they stand in this House with bleeding hearts. When they were the Government they didn't do one thing to help the poor people that I am talking about. It is a form of hypocrisy — they may not be hypocrites — but it is a form of hypocrisy. In spite of us pleading with them to show some heart they had the most vicious means test for citizens in Canada. Their treatment of people on social aid was actually disgraceful. Not one raise in their food allowances in the last six years as a Government. And only one meagre increase in clothing allowances during the same period. The bleeding hearts . . . Oh yes, you are talking now. You will have your chance. It is no wonder that the people kicked you out of office in 1964 and you will never see this side of the House again. And, Mr. Speaker, these bleeding hearts, these Socialists had no policy to help our Indians and Métis. They hired a few political hacks to try to fool the native people into voting for them but they failed. Our Government has spent millions of dollars, Mr. Speaker, to help the Indian and Métis people, and this Budget sets new records in giving them more help to take them off the permanent social aid roll and give them the dignity that you people, you bleeding hearts, didn't give.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Coderre:** — The Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Lloyd) claims that we are using the Power Corporation to tax our people. They used to give them power cost. We have not raised power rates since assuming office. In fact we have cut the rates for Regina residents by 10 per cent. Now Manitoba rates are going up. That's what Socialism means. Our dividends are for more efficiency. We have saved the people of Saskatchewan millions of dollars by operating the Power Corporation in a businesslike way, not a Socialist way.

You know they operated the Power Corporation and their manager was a man by the name of Cass-Beggs, a defeated candidate I think. Of course he dragged down the Power Corporation and now he has taken over the management of the Manitoba Corporation. What happens? The power goes up. That's right. He is running the Manitoba Hydro for that Province and Socialists and has already raised the power rates substantially, a tremendous amount. Mr. Speaker, the public will watch with interest how the Members opposite vote on this progressive Budget. Will any of you dare to vote against the grants for your cities, to help

with police protection, snow removal, health and library grants? Will the Regina Members or the Saskatoon Members vote against the Budget that contains assistance in these ways? Will the Regina Members vote against the South Saskatchewan Hospital Centre? And don't run away, Walter. You will have to admit that you will have to vote for it. How about the Saskatchewan and NDP Members? Will they follow the party line like sheep and have the courage to support the Budget that will pour millions into their cities? How about the few real farmers that you have across the way. The few, will they vote against the removing of the gas tax on farmers? Or an increase in the homeowner grant? Speak up and tell us about it later on. Do you know the Hon. Member for Regina Centre (Mr. Blakeney) a moment ago was saying something about the nursing beds, in 1963 there were 2,500 beds. It took 20 years to build 2,500 beds. Did you know that in 1969 there are well over 5,200 beds? That's twice the amount that it took you 20 years to build.

I am very much concerned about some disturbing trends in evidence in our society today, Mr. Speaker. These trends appear to have one element in common. They all accentuate the negative and, having just heard the Hon. Member from Regina Centre it clearly illustrates his negative attitude. Also the Hon. Member from Moose Jaw (Mr. Davies) has indicated negative attitudes from time to time. However, the Hon. Member from Regina Centre, when interviewed on TV after the Budget address was given, found himself admitting that it was a good Budget, and all he could find in his negativism was that it was good, but too late. I then ask my Socialist friends, when they had the chance to do something in 1961 or 1962 when the crop conditions were bad, what did they do? It was not too late, that is for sure. They did nothing at all. They say down like bumps on a log. It has become almost a matter of course to hear every morning of the previous night's crimes, protests, work stoppages, demonstrations, sit-ins and riots, which cause a large and tragic waste of our human, material and spiritual resources. These activities are resulting in ever-expanding economic losses and in many instances are the product of premeditated destructive influences at work in our society. They are a reflection of an attitude of mind which is characterized by discontent and selfishness. Every time that we hear of this type of thing we find that either Members opposite or members of their clan are often in the lead and pushing towards this energy. Often, you are promoting it.

I am sure that everyone of us realizes the right to dissent is quite in order. However, it appears that sometimes this freedom is being used to excess. The Hon. Member for Biggar (Mr. Lloyd) was looking at me when I said this, and I am sure that he probably was in Chicago pushing the boys onward to try to create more unrest. If he had been trying to keep peace I am sure that someone would have probably popped him on the head.

We have a clear idea today of the things that various segments of society are against, but don't you find it difficult, Mr. Speaker, to determine just what Members opposite are in favor of and really stand for? They are against everything. They cause all kinds of trouble.

I figure at this point I should mention something that the Hon. Member for Moose Jaw South (Mr. Davies) mentioned according to The Leader Post of March 3. I don't know where he spoke. He mentioned that in The Leader Post and I quote:



Mr. Davies said that Bill 2 pollutes the collective bargaining scene.

Now I just wonder what my good friend, Bill, is. I wonder what he is referring to. He has been a Cabinet Minister, has been in this House for a number of years and he is referring to Bill No. 2 and asks that it be withdrawn. I thought that the Hon. Member had intelligence and knew what all these things were. Does he want us to withdraw the Power Corporation Superannuation Act? That's Bill 2. Do you want us to withdraw The Alcoholism Commission of Saskatchewan Act? That's Bill 2. Do you want us to withdraw The Credit Union Act? That's Bill 2. Which Bill 2 do you mean, Bill? I hope that you have the opportunity to straighten out the House on this. Let's make it quite clear, trying to create deception by creating a polluted situation, a chance to really pollute the scene is quite evident. I think that he is the one that is really doing the polluting. Then he goes on to say in this article that he attributes poor employee relations to Government labor policy.

It has been my experience and observations, Mr. Speaker, that by far the greater majority of employees were happy when The Essential Services Act was invoked. I know that many members of some organizations who have not agreed with the walkout are sometimes intimidated to keep the strike going. I have had many phone calls before Bill 2 was invoked asking for quicker action. No one likes to be away from work without being paid. I must disagree most violently, Mr. Speaker, with the Hon. Member when he says that the right to organize has seldom if ever existed. I can assure this House, Mr. Speaker, the people of Saskatchewan and every working person in Saskatchewan, that the right to organize definitely exists in this province and will continue to exist as long as this Government is in here and that will be for a long time . . .

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Coderre:** — . . . much to the chagrin of the Member for Kelvington (Mr. Byers). Then when the Hon. Member for Moose Jaw South (Mr. Davies) goes on to say that Saskatchewan is losing skilled and semi-skilled workers. There may be some adventurous people who have moved out of the province and probably gone to see Schreyer's pie-in-the-sky. We had a pie-in-the-sky here for 20 years when they were the Government. And it is a pie-in-the-sky and will remain so. However, the whole process is a truly good attempt to confuse the issue, but you won't succeed, Bill. In fact for every force there is also an opposing force. You can't have the whole way by yourself.

Individuals and groups associated with the NDP continually announced their opposition to the Government, the church, the school, and royalty. That's right! The Member for Regina at Ottawa, members of your party, Mr. Burton and the Member for Moose Jaw (Mr. Skoyberg) do not stand up when the Government comes into the House. That is lack of respect. That's right, they don't stand up when the Queen's representative comes into the House in Ottawa!

**Mr. W.S. Lloyd (Leader of the Opposition):** — On a point of order.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order, order! The Leader of

the Opposition on a point of order.

**Mr. Lloyd:** — That statement is quite correct.

**Mr. Coderre:** — On a point of order. Let him state his point of order and not say whether it is correct or not.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order, order! Now let's hear the point of order from the Leader of the Opposition. I ask the Leader to start from the beginning because I didn't hear the beginning, so go ahead.

**Mr. Lloyd:** — Well, Mr. Speaker, the Minister is making a statement which is entirely inaccurate with respect to the conduct of certain colleagues of ours at Ottawa.

**Mr. Speaker:** — That's not a point of order. That is a debating question.

**Hon. C.V. Heald (Attorney General):** — I really don't think that that is a point of order.

**Mr. Coderre:** — There is a rather interesting thing when the Hon. Member gets up on a point of order, Mr. Speaker. He says, "That is entirely correct" and then he changes it away around. However, this is exactly what Members of this party opposite or some Members of their party are constantly doing, pushing and promoting this type of dissension, yet very few constructive alternative suggestions are ever brought forward.

Each Member of this House and particularly on that side of the House has the responsibility to involve himself in a positive way in the day-to-day affairs of society in a constructive way, not in a destructive way. It has reached a point, Mr. Speaker, where there is a very real danger that the negative attitudes which exist are going to bring economic and social progress to a halt. And for some peculiar reason, we seem to be unable to profit from the lessons of the past. We say with pride that much of our civilization is based on systems like the form of democracy practised by the Greeks. Yet we ignore the fact that these systems eventually failed because their members were swallowed up by their own self-interest and greed. The every-man-for-himself philosophy can cause our downfall now. It is imperative that collectively and individually the citizens of this nation wake up to this realization. In the words of Thomas Edison, "Let's start to work where others have left off, instead of duplicating their trials and errors." We live in a jet age, Mr. Speaker, but so often principles are applied and attitudes are adopted which are as obsolete as the horse and buggy days. And still my Socialist friends are constantly contemplating the horse and buggy days of socialism which has been tried and found wanting all over the world.

We are simply going to have to face up to the fact that we are living in a rapidly changing world and the young Members opposite should soon realize that. When they dry behind the ears, Mr. Speaker, they will soon realize that they have been chasing a myth and the pie in the sky.

Nowhere is the need to adjust to changing circumstances greater than in the area of labor-management relations. Although it is only one of the many problems with which Canada is confronted, as Minister of Labour I am more familiar with the operation of the collective bargaining system and I would like to deal with this subject in a little more detail.

The outward manifestation of difficulties between employers and their employees is obviously the work stoppage. We are thankful that our work force and employers have found responsibility. There are indications today that the strike or the lockout is an outmoded instrument of economic power. It is hard to see who really benefits from actions of this kind. It appears that any gains won by the strikers are at best marginal and it takes many months and often years before these gains offset the loss in wages occasioned by the work stoppage.

The economic impact of the growing number of strikes which are taking place in Canada has become staggering. In the twelve-month period ending October 31, 1969, over 1,100 strikes occurred, involving over half a million workers and causing a time loss of 7.5 million man-working days. The wage loss produced by these stoppages amounted to the overwhelming sum of \$175 million. These losses, Mr. Speaker, this type of loss could have been avoided. Translated into practical terms if this amount had actually been placed in the hands of the Canadian workers, it would have bought 40,000 new cars, or 1¾ million suits of cloths. Through the eyes of the shopkeeper and the producer, it is equivalent to lost purchases of almost 300 million dozen of eggs, or 150 million pounds of prime beef. It represents, Mr. Speaker, three times the entire annual income of all the taxpayers of the city of Moose Jaw.

This is the impact of a loss in income to a lot of people that could be avoided. I know that Hon. Members may compare this to losses due to sickness or accidents. I am sure that accidents can be prevented in some things, but some people are accident prone. Some people faithfully cause accidents, so this is no comparison. But strikes we can stop if we want to. This we can stop if we put our hearts to it. It is true that the situation is not as serious in Saskatchewan as it is elsewhere, but even here, in the twelve-month period I have referred to, striking employees lost \$535,000 in wages. On the basis of the well known multiplier effect, this potentially could have contributed an additional \$2 million to the provincial income. Not too much imagination is required to picture the chain reaction effect of strike losses, in terms of the reduction of the standard of living of the employees involved and their families for the duration of the strike; the decline of consumer-employee layoffs; the effect on the employer of loss of business; the decrease in production; and the inconvenience and even hardship caused to the public.

I say quite bluntly, Mr. Speaker, that the time has arrived when we can no longer afford to tolerate the harmful and wasteful consequences of work stoppages. The day has passed when a labor union or an employer can go off into a corner and have a private dispute which affects nobody but themselves. In today's era of technological revolution and rapid industrialization, everybody depends on everybody else and a single strike can penetrate to every sector of our economy. Moreover, the economy can function smoothly only if our full potential is attained.

This applies also at the individual level. We enjoy, Mr. Speaker, one of the highest standards of living in the world, but each one of us must perform at maximum efficiency to maintain it. We cannot afford to stop earning and coast for a while, as in the old days. In this sense, a strike has a more severe influence today than in the past.

The tragedy of the situation is that nobody really wants a strike. Not one single soul really wants a strike. The employer obviously doesn't and neither do the majority of employees, although sometimes I suspect that some union representatives encourage walkouts for ulterior motives. But the average union member, Mr. Speaker, seems to feel that the strike is the only weapon he can employ to resolve some very basic issues or conditions of work. Is this the only means by which an employee can achieve a cooperative and mutually agreeable condition of work or share of the prosperity with which our nation is endowed? I don't subscribe to this view, Mr. Speaker. I sincerely believe that there are other ways of accomplishing this objective, without the need to resort over and over to strike action, and what happens? There is accompanying bitterness, misery and deprivation. Surely we have the imagination and ingenuity to devise something better. If we can go to the moon, if we can do this, surely we can do something to minimize these losses. The ultimate answer, I feel, Mr. Speaker, lies in the improvement of the practical operation of the collective bargaining system of the parties involved. And the major change required will have to take the form of better labor management relations in a spirit of cooperation. A great deal of attention has been focussed on this aspect of labor relations for some time and everybody pays lip service to it, but very few have genuinely practised it. The stage has been reached where it is not simply a question of getting along with each other because it is the nice thing to do, but because both labor and management will soon find that people generally won't stand for this shilly-shallying, the pie they are trying to divide is going to completely disappear while they are fighting over it. If there is to be any hope for permanent labor-management harmony, both parties are going to have to change their attitudes significantly and adopt the view that they are not enemies, but are in fact allied in a common cause. They are going to have to concentrate a little more on the shared goals and aspirations, particularly in relation to the enterprise from which they earn their living. At the same time both employers and union members must face up to the fact that they also bear some responsibility for what happens to the community at large, those on fixed incomes, young people, non-unionized workers, the small businessman and so on. There are too many autocratic employers who are slave drivers. There are too many power-hungry union leaders. There are too many interfering politicians.

In our contacts with workers and employers, Mr. Speaker, it has been our experience in the Department of Labour that the issues in dispute, whether they be wages, working conditions or some specific grievance, are very often like the visible portion of an iceberg, with the real cause of the disagreement lying beneath the surface. Often the difficulties between an employer and his employees reflect a general unconcern which is the product of misunderstanding and lack of communication over a small item. Over a period of time, attitudes harden and positions become entrenched. Too often, minds become closed and function as machines, churning over and over whatever little is inside, refusing admittance to anything new. And we find this, and I

have noticed this very often, Mr. Speaker, of business agents or employers who are holding on to old methods rather than using the progressive methods they should. An open mind, Mr. Speaker, is essential at the bargaining table. The kind of mind which regularly asks this question to prevent misunderstanding: "How does this look from where he stands?" An approach of this nature is an important ingredient of successful collective bargaining. To be effective, bargaining must be characterized by rational discussion, ending in, not victory for one side or the other, but fair and just compromise.

The calling of a strike represents a serious failure on the part of negotiators on both sides to avoid a costly work stoppage and should be regarded as such. Every possible alternative should be carefully explored before this serious step is considered. With careful investigation, for instance, on the part of an employer and his employees it may be discovered that a long deserved salary adjustment may be offset by a new work method designed to increase efficiency and raise productivity. It does not have to be followed automatically by a price increase or a drop of a profit margin. I have had an experience with one of those persons, Mr. Speaker. I had some difficulty at home with some parts of the building. Without mentioning the craft or the trade, my wife was chasing me to have these things fixed up and of course I couldn't do so, so I told her to get someone in to have it fixed. It cost 15 cents for the part and \$7.50 for labor. I gladly paid it and I didn't worry too much about it. A number of weeks later this same thing happened again in another area of the house, so I sent for the party concerned, the same type of work and the parts were 15 cents and tax and \$10 for labor. Well this time this aroused my ire and I phoned the party in question. "Don't you know," he says, "I have had a whopping increase with the labor union." I said, "Yes, 65 cents over two years." This is the type of thing that happens and blaming it very often unnecessarily on the individual. These are the type of things that I mean that creates this type of unnecessary inflationary trends.

A number of companies today, Mr. Speaker, are not operated in the most efficient manner and their management must recognize that their competitive position depends for its survival on the streamlining of the business. Elimination of waste is an economic necessity and contributes to the success just as certainly as it does profit itself. Inefficiency, Mr. Speaker, takes many forms and involves the squandering of time, space, material and energy, largely as the result of lack of thought. It is possible to have waste in every phase of a company's operation, from the floor to the desk, to the office and everywhere else. This cannot be rectified by making the employee work harder or faster, but by increasing his output through the saving of his energy expended in pointless lifting, moving, walking, reaching and bending. By the same token, the workers themselves have a responsibility to avoid sloppy, careless and useless work and to render reasonable and competent service for the wages they receive. In order to appreciate the consequences of waste, Mr. Speaker, unions must become better acquainted with the economics of the company which issues the cheques. This exercise in itself may well cause them to be prepared to be realistic and flexible enough to temper their demands. These are the problems, Mr. Speaker, that are facing us in the area of bargaining and surely it takes a concerted effort to look at things properly.

Another important bargaining item which has become increasingly important relates to work satisfaction, Mr. Speaker. This is one item which has been ignored for so long, and there is evidence that it is an important cause of our labor-management friction. A large number of jobs are specialized and of a repetitive nature which tends to detract considerably from the satisfactions derived by an employee in doing his job. Not so long ago, Mr. Speaker, a conference was held in the United States on the nature of work and in an attempt to properly define this term, a number of speakers put forward rather lengthy and complex descriptions of the work activity dealing with the historical perspective, the philosophical and psychological indications and so on. And finally one elderly union member was asked for his definition. It was short and to the point. "Work" he said, "is hell." In this case it is obvious that an employee's health and work performance will be affected and his feeling of belonging to the enterprise will be seriously undermined. Employers, Mr. Speaker, must start thinking of their employees, not as a depersonalized labor cost, but as a sensitive human being to derive satisfaction from work well done. Only too often, Mr. Speaker, we see people holding on to the antiquated and often times featherbedding positions in jobs.

Other topics which are logical candidates for inclusion in negotiations are training and retraining for newly emerging occupations, career planning and job mobility. In addition, new bargaining techniques and procedures can be effectively utilized to bring about earlier and more equitable settlements. These might include, Mr. Speaker, the establishments of labor-management wage councils at the national level, regional or industrial levels to set wage and price guidelines for the use of individual employers and employees during their negotiations. Many labor relations experts today are recommending multi-trade and multi-party bargaining as a means of improving collective bargaining. In any event I might say that it is no accident that I am the Minister of both Labour and Cooperation. However, Mr. Speaker, in a spirit of mutual respect, trust and understanding it is very important that management and labor work together in a cooperative manner. Just recently, Mr. Speaker, there happened to be strife and a strike going on, and both management and labor and the business agent came into my office. I found management holding on to antiquated ideas of what they should do and how they should do. They say this is it. Take it or leave it. The business agent didn't even have the courtesy in this particular case and kept his back at all time to management. This is the type of atmosphere that you have at the bargaining table. I have seen individuals who come to the bargaining tables and say, "Listen you so and so, you are going to do this or you are going to do that." How do you expect to bargain reasonably, cooperatively and properly? It is about time that this type of management, this type of business agent are out of the way. The membership themselves are soon going to take action. The Board of Directors will soon take action towards these personnel people. It goes without saying, Mr. Speaker, that governments too must adjust to changing circumstances by introducing new and better legislative and administrative procedural programs.

In the case of labor relations policy the Government of Saskatchewan has been primarily concerned with making improvements designed to streamline and make more effective the collective bargaining process. To this end a number of amendments to The Trade Union Act have been enacted over the past few years.

At the same time, the Department of Labour has intensified its attempts to resolve disputes before they reach the strike level. I don't think the conciliators of the Department of Labour, Mr. Speaker, receive sufficient credit for degrees of success which they achieve in this connection. I would like at this time to pay tribute to my staff for their devotion to duty and their untiring efforts to prevent work stoppages. The Department of Labour, Mr. Speaker, has also in the past few months initiated a program which will involve a continuing analysis of collective bargaining agreements. The results of this analysis will provide useful information to all persons associated in the labor relations field; and will help to satisfy the many requests for better and more clearly defined bargaining criteria. A by-product of this activity involves the contacting by the Department of employers and unions whose agreements are about to expire. I have been surprised at the number of letters commending the Department for this practice because many persons who have not had this type of service before are now becoming aware of it. I am sure it will do considerably to minimize the loss.

If we could resolve the problems before they reach serious proportions I think we will have done a good job. The fact is of course, however, that all of us are aware that strikes continue to occur and further efforts are evidently needed to control them. If these efforts are not going to be made by the parties themselves, they will have to be made by the Government.

Some people have a strange idea just what government is and what it stands for. We do not, Mr. Speaker, represent ourselves. We are not here for our own self-aggrandizement. We are here to carry out our duty and obligation to protect the best interests of every citizen of this province. Perhaps we have failed in fulfilling this responsibility by permitting strikes to take place, particularly where the welfare and the convenience of the public are involved. In my capacity as Minister of Labour, I am facing pressures from all sides to take action to correct this situation. I will state right now that I am prepared to recommend to the Government more drastic measures than heretofore to curb these harmful work stoppages, unless in the very near future the parties themselves, Mr. Speaker, stop squabbling over who is to blame and become serious about putting their house in order.

I am pleased to be associated with the Government's plan to approve some capital expenditures to strengthen our economy. The effectiveness of this step, however, will be undermined if we are going to continue to have and to absorb the heavy losses produced by the strikes which are in our control. With regard to the specific kind of policy which could be implemented, a number of alternatives are available. It could involve labor courts. It might take the form of a more rigid Trade Union Act. It could be an extension of the areas of employment covered by The Essential Services Emergency Act. Whatever it may be, a growing number of Canadians, including those in government, business and unions are recognizing the need for positive action. No less a personage, Mr. Speaker, than Walter Reuther has been quoted as asserting: "Society cannot tolerate strikes that endanger the very survival of society. I don't think that we ought to have strikes in public service industries. We cannot live in a situation where a few workers who are denied their equity can paralyze an entire community." If conditions don't

improve very soon, and by that I mean within a few months, something is going to have to be done.

I don't want to recommend the introduction of harsh measures any more than the next man, Mr. Speaker, nor am I naïve enough to think that government involvement is a complete and tidy solution. In the final analysis you can't legislate human relations. The most elaborate legislative enactment imaginable cannot force employers and employees to get along together. Labor-management cooperation carried on in a sincere spirit of good will by both sides is the only permanent and meaningful method of achieving an effective labor relations system. My remarks today, Mr. Speaker, may well be brushed aside by some critics on the grounds that they constitute a too idealistic view of labor-management relations. But a government, Mr. Speaker, is expected to have ideals, as do business, science, education and all the other social facets of life or it is not living up to its responsibilities. Obviously the kind of positive interaction between workers and managers that I have been talking about works in practice, or this province, Mr. Speaker, would never have reached the present level of social and economic progress. As Minister of Labour, Mr. Speaker, I am proud to represent the working people of this province, who put in their quota of honest effort each day and make this province tick. These people, Mr. Speaker, don't want to walk around carrying pickets unnecessarily. They are interested in only one thing, in earning a decent living for themselves and their families. Management and union representatives must be very careful not to make the employee the victim of their own ideological disputes. It is my feeling, Mr. Speaker, that with a renewed and concentrated effort on the part of employers and unions, industrial unrest can be reduced; and I am confident, Mr. Speaker, that in this way the present system of the free collective bargaining can be adapted to the new demands of our technologically oriented society without the need for formal government intervention.

It is obvious, Mr. Speaker, and I challenge every Member across the floor to support the motion because it is very constructive, it is going to provide employment. I will not stand by idly as Minister of Labour to see it jeopardized. The program is fair and I am prepared to take very drastic action to see that these programs are carried out in the spirit that is intended to provide employment for the people who are unemployed. It is therefore evident, Mr. Speaker, that I will support the motion.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. W.G. Davies (Moose Jaw South):** — I wonder if I could ask the Minister a question before he takes his seat? Would the Minister answer a question? Is it the intention of the Minister of Labour, Mr. Speaker, to bring down at this Session any harsh and restrictive labor laws that he has said are necessary.

**Mr. Coderre:** — Government policy will be announced in due course.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. F. Meakes (Touchwood):** — Mr. Speaker, I might start off by saying to the Hon. Minister (Mr. Coderre) who just sat down, I for one certainly



didn't like his threatening, blackmailing attitudes in statements that he made in the last five minutes.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Blackmailing attitudes specifically referring to a specific method of a specific Member, I think, are out of order in this House. I would ask him to withdraw this statement.

**Mr. Meakes:** — I'm sorry, Mr. Speaker, I withdraw. I was really intrigued with the Minister when he first stood up. He got involved in those population figures and in some way or other he found 30,000 people. You know he spent five years hunting for a car he couldn't find that was somewhere on this property, the Government property. And boy, suddenly now he finds the 30,000 people. I don't know whether he found them in that car or around the car. I certainly wish he would have told us where he found them.

The other thing that really amused me was from the first few minutes of his remarks. Apparently he is the fellow who calls the election. He kept telling us there is going to be an election soon. I wasn't aware that he was the man who signs the document that calls the election. If he isn't then he must have a very close ear to that man who does and I say, we welcome it whenever it comes.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Meakes:** — Another very noticeable thing not only about the Hon. Member who just sat down, but all the Hon. Members across the way is that what is really bothering them is the way the Leader of the Opposition has moved certain Members on this side. The only reason they are talking about it is because it bothers them. They are scared. They have other reasons to be scared besides that.

Another thing he talked about was the financial critic needing a new writer. I can tell you, Mr. Speaker, there is one certainty, nobody else wrote that speech for the Minister of Labour. He roamed around and he talked about the power rates that the Manitoba Government was raising. They may be, but I'll tell the Hon. Minister this that while we were the Government in 20 years we lowered power rates four times. This Government in five years hasn't lowered it once.

**An Hon. Member:** — You raised it after every election.

**Mr. Meakes:** — We never raised the power after every election. This, Mr. Speaker, is not right. I challenge him to prove it. He knows it is not right and we all know it is not right.

**Mr. Coderre:** — Prove you lowered it.

**Mr. Meakes:** — As far as the Minister's charges about Members on this side and Members in Ottawa who are supposed to be opposing churches and royalty and all the rest of it, I say it is not even worth answering. The statements are not true. There are as many devoted church people on this side of this House as

there are on the other, and for him to get up and make this kind of a statement, is certainly . . . I'm surprised that he would lower himself to do it.

Mr. Speaker, I neglected in a previous debate to pass on my congratulations to the new Lieutenant Governor. I am sorry that I missed it last time, I guess I must have got up and was mad or something, but I do it now, I'm passing on my congratulations and I hope that his stay is a pleasant one. I also want to join with those others who spoke of our departed Lieutenant Governor, Mr. Hanbidge. All of us who knew him loved him. We wish him many long years of happiness.

I now want to turn and congratulate the financial critic on what I think was one of the most powerful, critical speeches that has ever been made in this Legislature. He tore the Budget to pieces; he proved that the Budget is not worth voting for. I feel very inadequate to rise and follow him.

I read the Budget, I listened very closely while the Provincial Treasurer was speaking and certainly I call it a barren Budget for the people of my constituency. It is a barren document for farmers and agriculture generally. It certainly does nothing for the grain farmer. It certainly is not going to put any cash into the farmers' pockets. There is nothing to help the businessmen who out in the towns and villages are so dependent on agriculture. It is going to bring agriculture further into debt. It is already too far in. But I am going to have more to say about that tomorrow, Mr. Speaker.

The Members across the way the last two or three years seem to be anxious to talk about New Democratic conventions. Well you know, Mr. Speaker, I think I should spend a few moments on Liberal conventions. I have here a clipping from the Toronto Globe and Mail, February 21, 1970, and the headline is: "Liberal delegates reach a consensus, the party is irrelevant."

Delegates to the annual Ontario Liberal Party Conference reached a general consensus yesterday, their party is irrelevant in modern society.

Speaker after speaker in an hour-long debate at the opening meeting expressed increasing frustration at the inability of Liberals to play, through the party structure, a meaningful role in dealing with contemporary problems.

There was broad agreement that they should become involved in social action projects and causes, but there was no record on what social action entitled or how the party should go about getting involved.

One of the panelists, Stephen Clarkson, chairman of the provincial party's policy committee and Liberal candidate for Mayor of Toronto last December — who incidentally got beat — told the Conference he had found traditional party channels to be inadequate.

I find that being chairman of the policy committee is too slow. Mr. Clarkson added, the party can be more effective when it involves itself —

And I want Members to listen to this,

— with community groups and local issues.

What did someone call this recently? Extra-parliamentary activity.

Thomas Bernes of the Ontario Student Liberals said that 65 per cent of the delegates to the 1968 Federal Leadership Convention that chose Pierre Trudeau had annual incomes in excess of \$12,000.

‘Who do we represent?’ Mr. Bernes asked. ‘Who are we fighting for?’ He suggested there should be more to membership in the Liberal party than the opportunity to come to Ottawa once or twice year, attend a few cocktail parties and call Cabinet Ministers by their first names. Most of the Liberal constituency organizations have no impact, he added.

**An Hon. Member:** — Were they on drugs like the Young Democrats?

**Mr. Meakes:** —

Mr. Bernes urged the party to start its own social action groups, establish drop-in centres and make members and resources available to existing community action groups.

I’m not going to read it all but . . .

**An Hon. Member:** — Oh, go ahead!

**Mr. Meakes:** —

One delegate wanted to decentralize the party to give riding groups more autonomy. Another wanted party administration to provide more guidance to the ridings.

John MacEachran, executive vice-president of the party urged the party to become more professional and conceded it is irrelevant at present. ‘We all want more involvement. I feel the party’s greatest irrelevancy is that we have no thought-out ways to overcome the bureaucracy that makes policy.’

To some delegates the sense of irrelevancy was underlined when the debate was cut short to permit Mayor Kenneth Fogarty of Ottawa to extend civic greetings.

Mr. Fogarty touched all bases. He praised political conventions as being an opportunity for deliberations, said he was sure that today’s Liberals would follow in the foot steps of their illustrious predecessors, stressed the contribution of women in politics and other walks of life and endorsed the continued existence of the party system.

Well, then I have another one here talking about this same convention.

The Ontario Liberal party is supported by 500 people, mainly lawyers, who each donate \$100 a year.

You know when I read this I thought well, by golly, it’s not a bad party after all. I know we have members in our constituency who could donate \$100. I want to read a little further:

The question came up during a seminar discussion on foreign ownership in the Canadian economy. A student asked whether a strong party position would alienate the corporations who support the party in its election campaigns.

Donald Deacon, York Centre, who will direct the party's activities in the next election and who headed the caucus group that prepared the party's position papers on foreign ownership, denied the party would be hurt by its stand and said if that danger existed he wouldn't have advocated the stand he had.

Mr. Rosebrugh, vice-president of the industrial division of Dover Corporation (Canada) Limited, did not say where the election funds came from. The money he talked about is used for the year-to-year operations of the party between elections. Dover Corporation is a Canadian subsidiary of a United States corporation.

I want Members to listen to this very closely,

When one member of the audience complained that the NDP gets its funds from international unions, another participant shouted, 'And we get ours from General Motors.'

Professor Lewis Hertzman, a member of the party's policy research group and chairman of the history department of York University complained that the existence of party bagmen who collect election funds is always denied but he believed they exist in the party.

There should be a session at a future conference on 'the bagman and the Liberal party' he suggested.

Well I want to spend just a few moments on education before I move adjournment and the attitude and the actions of the Department of Education. I am one who believes that the education of our youth should be one of our highest priorities in our society. We are now in this great new technological age. As never before it is important that our youth be equipped to meet the society they will be entering. Never before has education been as important as now. There are no more ditch-digging jobs. It becomes a fact that the dropout will have no role in this new technological age.

Here we find a Government that, instead of planning to meet this great challenge, has been dragging and continues to drag our educational system back into the 19th century. This Government is gradually making inroads in taking over local government. It is an arrogant Government. It demands less teachers, demands units to cut budgets. It forces bargaining units on teachers and trustees, and above all it is short-changing our youth.

The main criticism I level is on the priorities of this Government. When it comes to highways, it spends money like drunken sailors. We all want good highways and we all would like to see four-lane highways, but not at the expense of education and health. The choice of this priority shows clearly the philosophy of the Government, "Things are more important than people." We all want good highways, but as far as I am concerned, if the choice is between four-lane highways and better education for children, or better health care for the sick, then I'll opt to cut highways expenditures.

In talking to sub-unit trustees, they tell me the worst aspect of this Government's new policy on education is how it will affect our pupils. They point out that even with the present ratio there are classrooms with 35 pupils. When this Government lumped the principals, phys-ed teachers, etc., in with the rest of the teachers in making up this ratio, they actually raised the number of children who are in classes. They tell me that next year they will be forced to cut some of their "slow" classes. This means that the slower learning pupils will have less time spent on them. In the unit of Cupar they point out that they will be forced to cut their staff drastically particularly in towns like Dysart and Earl Grey because these schools have a smaller attendance. This may well mean that the unit will have to increase bus transportation. I suggest there may well be no saving in the end.

It seems to me that this Government is destroying the good educational system that we had. Whether the destruction is deliberate or not, I don't know. I do say that the Hon. Minister (Mr. McIsaac) may be a good veterinary surgeon but I question his ability as a Minister of Education.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to have more to say tomorrow, I beg leave to adjourn debate.

Debate adjourned.

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