

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN
Third Session — Sixteenth Legislature
16th Day

Monday, March 9, 1970.

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

WELCOME TO STUDENTS

MR. SPEAKER: — I would like to introduce to the House the following groups of students situated in the galleries: 32 students from the Brunskill school which is in the constituency of Saskatoon City Park-University, represented by Mr. Charlebois, under the direction of their teacher, Mr. Allen; 77 students from the Weyburn junior high school represented by the Member for Weyburn, Mr. Pepper, under the direction of their teacher, Mr. Weinmaster; 43 students from the MacNutt school from the constituency of Saltcoats, under the direction of their teacher, Mrs. Elizabeth Roe; 33 students from the Queen Elizabeth school from the constituency of Saskatoon Nutana South, represented by the Member, Dr. Forsyth; 39 students from the Saltcoats junior high school under the direction of their teacher Mr. Farquharson; 41 students from St. Mary's school in the constituency of Regina North West, represented by their Member Mr. Whelan, under the direction of their teacher, Mr. Adams; 36 students from the Allan school district in the constituency of Hanley, represented by Mr. Heggie and under the direction of their teacher, Sister Augustine. There are 50 students from the Yorkton composite junior high school, who are yet to arrive. We welcome them in absentia.

I wish also to draw to the attention of all Hon. Members a group of distinguished guests that we have seated to my left and your right, in the Speaker's gallery. These are representatives of the Canada Winter Games 1971 and I call upon the Member for Saskatoon City Park-University, who is general chairman and president of the Canada Winter Games, to make the introductions to the Members of the Legislature.

INTRODUCTION OF YOUTH AMBASSADORS FOR CANADA WINTER GAMES

MR. J.J. CHARLEBOIS: (Saskatoon City Park-University) — Mr. Speaker, it is indeed an honor for me to have the privilege to introduce these very fine young Canadians to this Assembly. These are the youth ambassadors for the Canada Winter Games and they are starting across Canada. Their first chore in this regard was to invite the Premier of Saskatchewan to attend the Canada Winter Games in February of 1971. They go, too, to Eastern Canada and to Western Canada. They will invite the various Premiers and also the Prime Minister, of course, on this trip. I would ask each one to stand and be recognized: Mr. Bill Ehman, Marie Robson, Debbie Gunther, Bill Brittain. Now with them as escorts, Mr. Ed. Sebestyen, Mr. Don Burgess, and the PRO for the Canada Winter Games, Mrs. Willy Tosh.

It is indeed a pleasure for me, Mr. Speaker, to welcome these young people and introduce them to this Assembly.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: — I would draw the attention of the Hon. Member who just took his seat that he neglected to introduce Augie Doggie and I think he looks very well up there.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

ADJOURNED DEBATES

BUDGET DEBATE

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

MR. I.H. MacDOUGALL: (Souris-Estevan) — Mr. Speaker, when I adjourned the Debate on Friday night I was about to offer congratulations to the Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Steuart) for what must be considered a very suitable Budget for the coming year. It will help our economy in so many ways that I find it very difficult to think that the Opposition will do anything but support this Budget. Mind you, when the Budget was delivered many of the people I spoke with in Estevan considered it a very favorable Budget and, of course, I am proud of this.

I was rather amused how hard-pressed for valid criticism the Member from Regina Centre (Mr. Blakeney) was when he was asked by the Press what he thought. He appeared almost tongue-tied and finally he blurted out something about how bad last year's Budget was. It was enough to make me laugh but I have a big soft heart and therefore I did sympathize with the Member in his predicament. Since he spoke, all other Members opposite have had similar trouble but I expect that some don't care since their demotion, which I consider most cruel. I can only say that the Members for Prince Albert East-Cumberland (Mr. Berezowsky) and Melfort (Mr. Willis), Turtleford (Mr. Wooff) must feel like those old worn-out funeral horses that the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Lloyd) spoke about. To the Members who made the front benches I can only say, you'd better invest in armoured vests because the knives behind you will be sharp, long and very handy.

Now with this, Mr. Speaker, I am going to say that the year 1969 was a year of cutbacks and attempts were made to hold the line. We had a few incidents in the city of Estevan which were not particularly designed to help our economy. I refer to the numerous strikes which were staged, organized and supported actively by some Members who sit opposite. By and large the people of Estevan were not, and I repeat were not, too sympathetic when these strikes were called. Estevan has enjoyed a relatively peaceful labor relationship ever since the 1930s and that speaks pretty well for Estevan. Lately, however, we have had a strike at the brick plant staged just prior to the 1967 election. The NDP-orientated union organizers, one a former NDP candidate from Medicine Hat, kept the men out for several months largely for their own political purposes. Eventually the brick plant workers settled their strike a few days after the election and went back to work for less money than they were originally offered. There have been numerous smaller strikes at the construction site around Boundary Dam during the past couple of

March 9, 1970

years. Various trades have been out on strike at one stage of construction or another. Early last fall we experienced a strike at the Estevan Co-op. I could not figure out, Mr. Speaker, why the union, led by Mr. Smishek, the Member for Regina North East, organized the strike against the Estevan Co-op.

Here we have a Member who on the one hand claims to be a great co-op supporter, while on the other hand he was last fall, big as life, engineering the strike at the Co-op, pitting workers against the management. Mr. Speaker, this; did not rest well with the majority of the people who patronize the Co-op. In the end, after the settlement, there were open wounds and scars which will be a long time healing. The people of Estevan have become ever more fearful of the ties between the union and the NDP. Yes, even the old NDP supporters have serious reservations about the NDP today.

Lastly, the hospital strike, again led and fostered by incompetents who in my mind convinced the hospital union employees that they should go out on strike because they had nothing to lose, telling the poor workers that the Government would invoke Bill 2 and they wouldn't lose anything, so to speak. The Government did not, however, invoke Bill 2 much to chagrin of the union organizers. But the poor people who suffered most were the ones least able to afford it, the hospital employees. And make no mistake, Mr. Speaker, the employees were duped by the union. If that wasn't a political strike there never was one. The very signs and placards that the workers carried indicated how closely tied that union is to the NDP.

The union at one stage threatened to bar all people who needed hospital care from entering the hospital. And now I ask you, Mr. Speaker, did the union leaders have the sick of the area at heart? Not on your life. The CUPE organizers had their own pride first and foremost in mind. The very existence of the union and the jobs of the union leaders who, in my opinion, ill led and ill conceived the strike in the first place were their prime concern. Let no union official tell you that there was no harassment or no threats carried out either. Several workers eventually defied their own union officials and went back to work in the interest of the sick. Some of these people were insulted openly. Some received anonymous phone calls with threats and some private homes were picketed. This strike, as in all other strikes, in a community such as Estevan will long bear the scars of hatred, grudges and disrespect between management and labor. I think that it is high time that the weapon of the strike is banned from our labor scene. Even now, some pressure by labor coordinating groups to have Bill 2 removed from our Statutes is under way.

But I say that Bill 2 should become a national bill where no workers are talked into strike action by power-hungry union-political officials. The people who lose most are the workers themselves. Some form of labor court should be set up to settle all these disputes over contracts for wages and working conditions. How long does it take workers to regain but a portion of the wages lost during a strike? And how many workers can afford this luxury? I wager that if you put the organizers on strike pay after a strike is called the strikes would be very short-lived.

I have particular words of disdain for Mr. Qualle who spearheaded the CUPE workers against the St. Joseph's Estevan

Hospital. He, like so many other union organizers, from time to time, has to justify his existence. So a strike was organized but after almost three months and a near collapse of the strike, he was forced to get down to the business of serious negotiation. Many of the workers wanted to go back to work and indeed some did, much to his chagrin. Prior to final negotiations, however, a grand display of union activity took place around the Estevan hospital. There were three or more bus loads of activists who arrived in Estevan one Sunday afternoon from far away points such as Regina. They stayed at their picket lines for a couple of hours. It was all very peaceful but very stupid as it left the local citizens completely turned off. There were very few Estevan people from other unions involved in that display.

They had an Eastern CUPE organizer called McMillan on hand who announced that Estevan's hospital would shortly be shutdown by the union. Our people's reaction to this was, "We in the West have been dictated to by the East long enough, but if this blustering joker wants trouble he came to the right place."

Now a day or two later, the CUPE representatives agreed to accept the same arbitration settlement as for the Prince Albert hospital, which had asked for the implementation of Bill 2. After the arbitration award Mr. Qualle had harsh words to say about Judge Flynn's settlement of the case. In my opinion and in the opinion of many citizens, this was to say the least a lack of good manners. After the OCAW strike at Estevan three or four years ago The Essential Services Act was set up. I had some of the strikers tell me they were glad that the Saskatchewan Government saw fit to implement The Essential Services Act because now they don't stand to lose their shirts every time a dispute arises.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MacDOUGALL: — Now, Mr. Speaker, I should like to turn your attention to a rather disturbing situation which is taking place in and around some of our high schools particularly in Regina. I have spoken to several parents with teenage children and they complain about certain publications being distributed to high school students. And so help me the ones that I have seen are really raw, to put it mildly.

One publication is called the Fourth Estate and I have a copy here from which I am about to quote, and it says:

The Fourth Estate is published by the Regina Union of High School Students to fan the flame of discontent among our fellow students and to encourage the development of alternatives to the present system.

Interested students can contact us at 525-9973 or write us letters at Room 210, Northern Crown Building on Scarth Street.

Up until recently, Mr. Speaker, this rag was distributed from the private address of a university professor at 2640 Angus Blvd., the home I believe, of Professor Livant. Now, however, it is being distributed from a downtown office in the same building where the Communist party have their offices. The phone number, Mr. Speaker, listed in the Fourth Estate is listed under the

March 9, 1970

name of Jeff Goodman. Until recently the name of Jeff Goodman, along with Mike Lloyd and Norm Bolen, Bill Livant — a Professor at the Regina Campus — and, a number of other well known NDP Socialists or members of the socialist families, have been listed as writers or staff members of the Prairie Fire, another rag produced by the same group. It is interesting to note, Mr. Speaker, that some of these people also are listed as writers and staff members of the Carillon, the official undergraduate journal of the University of Saskatchewan, Regina Campus.

The Carillon, Mr. Speaker, is printed by the Service Printing Company which is also the printing plant owned by the CCF-NDP of Saskatchewan. Just to complete the picture, Mr. Speaker, I would point out that the November 21, 1969, issue of the Carillon devoted its entire front page to a story about Jeff Goodman who was not rehired as a sessional lecturer in Sociology at the Regina Campus, because of his being apprehended and charged with a criminal offence in May 1969, which he pleaded guilty to and paid a fine of \$54. I have a copy of the issue of the Carillon here and I would like to table it along with copies of the Fourth Estate and the Prairie Fire.

According to the Carillon, Mr. Speaker, Jeff Goodman on his return to Regina following the Banff incident was interviewed by a Canada Immigration Official, to determine whether or not he should be deported to the United States from whence he had come to Regina. Mr. Speaker, we have some 25,000 draft dodgers in Canada. They are no good to their own country and they no good to Canada. There must be 25,000 decent citizens of some other countries whom we would accept into this country.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I should like to quote a few paragraphs from articles printed in the Fourth Estate which Regina parents objected to. This issue bears no publication date but was distributed early in February, 1970. I would quote from the article entitled "The Pill" and it says:

Since the birth control pill was developed the most valid reason for not making love is no longer a threat. Girls are free to go out with guys without making a life commitment because they no longer have to be afraid that they will get pregnant by some guy and cling to him to save her honor, and the kids that we didn't want in the first place.

And in another place in the same article, Mr. Speaker, it states and I quote:

The parent scene is bad too. If you are still living at home you have to worry about how much they know about your life. And for girls it is pretty hard to be honest about making it with guys, even though we think it is the perfectly natural thing to do. But that should not stop you from making a decision to get the pill. In the long run it will save you your boy friends and your parents from a lot of trouble and pain.

Mr. Speaker, the article goes on with further advice to these teenagers and presumably they would be under the age of 16. Oh, it goes on and you can read these when I table them, Mr. Speaker. I won't waste anymore time with that. But the article ends with an admonition to our teenage students and I quote:

We all know that schools are (shit) (and it is a four letter word). We know that they aren't giving us good education. We know that they should be changed and completely changed.

The article goes on to say:

Get together, we have nothing to lose and everything to gain. Power to the people.

The last part of the foregoing quotation, Mr. Speaker, is a well recognized battle cry of the Black Panthers and the SOS. I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that the parents who have called and contacted me to protest this filth being handed out to their children by friends and relatives of some of the Members who sit opposite, have a perfectly legitimate reason to complain. Legitimate dissent and ferment, Mr. Speaker, can be the yeast and change of improvement, but at the same time let us not be naive. Let's squarely look at those others who hide behind legitimate dissent while they plan riots and orgies of destruction.

Mr. Speaker, in an attempt to appear neutral, the last issue of the Prairie Fire does take a run at the Regina Socialist Mayor for taking a trip to Expo at the expense of the taxpayers, but that is just a little window dressing. And then they refer to an aging politician who dares to make a brief presentation to Regina City Council urging that people should have greater control over their police.

I would urge Members opposite who have members of their families or their friends advocating violent revolution and destruction of our society and the breakdown of moral and ethical standards to do something about this matter. I think the people who have called and contacted me to protest circulation of these rags have a perfectly legitimate complaint.

Mr. Speaker, with the time left at my disposal I should like to say a few words on behalf of our law enforcement officers, a group of people who more and more find it increasingly difficult to perform their duties. If there was ever a thankless job it is the one that we expect of our various police officers. On our behalf they work to protect our rights, our persons and our property and are ready to put their lives on the line for us to maintain law and order and to prevent crime.

With each passing day we read and hear of law enforcement officers being interfered with in the performance of their duty. Some are assaulted, wounded or even killed. They undergo this type of treatment for us and I say, if they are prepared to risk their necks to protect us, the very least that we can do is support them to the fullest. Law and order is a necessity if our society is to function with some semblance of rationality. There must be respect for the rights and properties of others. Above all there must be respect for the people who carry the responsibility for seeing to it that society conducts itself in the best interests of all its members.

Authority today seems to be resented by far too many of our citizens. The permissive society that has developed in the last few years had created a 'do what you like' idea and in turn many of the standards of the past generations have slipped

March 9, 1970

from a position of acceptance to a state of non-acceptance. Children defy their parents and get away with it. Then they defy their teachers and later on, because the policeman also represents authority, he is also defied. If this progression is allowed to continue it won't be many years before we are faced with complete anarchy. While the law officer has to contend with law breakers he must also contend with another kind of individual, the do-gooder, the new moralist, the underminer of the establishment. These people are particularly dangerous because they are like a cat's paw, soft on top but with claws inside. This individual sets out to defend the abnormal act of some elements of our society whose behavior is based on a lack of discipline and disrespect for everyone and everything. He seeks to destroy a system which he finds unsuitable but offers no substitute to replace the system and its methods.

Looting, breaking and entering, thievery and robbery, drug peddling and the use thereof must be clamped down on immediately and hard. Recent incidents in Regina whereby a group of protesters marched on City Council and the city police station over some thug being shot down during a police investigation of crime, leaves me completely cold. I feel that these protesters led by a university professor and I am told several United States draft dodgers plus a group of socialist crack pots should be exposed for what they are rather than being given the publicity they received. These people daily undermine our law enforcement and should be censured, some university groups in particular who irk the citizens who pay the bills for their education by entertaining individuals and groups such as the. Black Panthers and other offbeat who refer to the police as pigs or in other derogatory terms. Generally in sight are their listeners who rebel and riot.

Recently a group of Regina citizens led by a former Socialist Member of this Legislature appeared before City Council and demanded an investigation into the problems of law enforcement in this city. This group of do-gooders suggested that the police department practised abuse of its authority almost constantly. The group also seemed to feel that: there should be even greater perpetuation of the 'do what you like' idea for repeat offenders instead of a tougher approach to these individuals. The most serious allegation that they made was to the effect that the quality of police training, administration and leadership was something less than adequate, and that there should be an investigation into the recruitment and hiring, practices within the department.

Now I ask you, Mr. Speaker, what the heck do these people know about running a police force? After looking into the matter and having a discussion with the city police, Chief Cookson, I can only express my regret that this group of do-gooders got the reception and the publicity that it did in the presentation of their views. I am even more concerned that this group, by its action in tearing away at the Chief and his department, contributed even further to a lack of respect for the police and law in this city. It also contributes to a loss of morale in the police force.

Chief Cookson has devoted some 39 years of his life to the field of law enforcement, the last 15 or 16 as Chief of the Regina Police. He holds a law degree. I venture to say that he knows considerably more about the problems of law enforcement and the need for competent police officers than anyone in that group which appeared before City Council to criticize the police

system. It is a mark of his devotion and his ability that he is the current president of the Canadian Association of Police Chiefs. He is a recognized expert in his field and he should not have to put up with a bunch of crackpots who are out to undermine everything that he is trying to do mainly to keep law and order.

Educational requirements are higher today than in the past years for a police recruit. Tests to determine the individual's makeup and character are more stringent. Training is more advanced and more comprehensive. The responsibility of being a police officer is much greater than it was ever before. The citizen who qualifies to become a police officer is entitled to a new degree of respect. Groups who continue to criticize policemen and the job they do without any concern whatsoever should be ignored.

I should like to take a moment and mention some very disturbing factors that seem to be developing in the methods of dealing with some persons who wind up in our courts. I believe that these practices are offshoots from the extreme permissiveness that we find all around us and the approaches being developed to combat the problem. I don't pretend to be an expert on dealing with criminal offenders. I speak only as a concerned citizen and as a representative of other concerned citizens. The thing that concerns me very much is the practice of granting bail to accused offenders. I can well understand that bail is a democratic right and such should be available to each and every one of us when the need arises. But I also feel that more attention must be paid to the consequences of granting bail to people who appear in court repeatedly and have no respect for either the law or the people in the community.

How many times have we heard in recent weeks of someone being granted bail after being charged with an offence while being out on bail for some other charge or having received bail privileges, not just once, but several times? How many times have we read of bail being set at an extremely low level presumably based on the economic situation of the individual involved and then read a few days later of that person being charged again with breaking and entering or armed robbery?

Another problem confronting police and other law officers is the trend of late to what appears to be extreme leniency by the courts in dealing with offenders. I don't wish to appear to be unduly critical of the courts, but I question the merits of continually low sentences or in many, many cases no sentences for repeat offenders. A person assaulting police officers frequently is fined a very small amount, in effect a mere slap on the wrist. For endangering the lives of others such as armed robberies, assaults or even dangerous driving, the penalties assessed often do not seem to take into consideration the effects of the offences on the rest of the society.

There is much to be said for compassion in sentencing offenders or for probation or for suspended sentences for first offenders, but the molly-coddling of obviously hardened cases, who persistently ride roughshod over the rest of the community is neither justice for the victims nor service to the citizen. How many times have we read of Crown prosecutors in this province asking for tougher penalties against perpetual law-breakers and having their request turned aside. I wonder how many times judges of lower courts have wanted to pass a heavier sentence on some individual but felt that it would be a waste of time because the sentence

would be appealed and ultimately reduced. It seems to me that somewhere along the line we have lost our effective ways of dealing with these thorns in the side of society. Perhaps the fault lies right in the home where many people no longer discipline their children and teach them respect for others. Penalties for crime today don't seem to fit the offences. Perhaps it is because we pay too much attention to the behavioral experts and not enough to the requirements of family living. We need to return to the days when child psychology was applied about midway to the anatomy rather than at the top of the shoulders. I say that a good, sound paddling even for first offenders would end their life of crimes very early in life. I openly advocate a return to corporal punishment.

In closing I should like to quote from a news item which appeared in The Regina Leader Post which a judge from Colorado gave. The judge said to the high school kids in his community in answers to questions of what are we going to do and where can we go. The Judge said, "Go home, hang the storm windows, paint the woodwork, wash the car, learn to cook, scrub the floors and so on."

Mr. Speaker, I have gone over my time now but, however, I did want to get these messages across and I want to table these papers which I quoted from earlier.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. P. SCHMEISER: (Watrous) — Mr. Speaker, as I rise in this Budget Debate, I have words of congratulations for our new Lieutenant Governor, the Honourable Stephen Worobetz, and may I, on my own behalf and on behalf of my constituency, wish him a term of fruitful and happy service to our province. May I also take this opportunity to wish the past Lieutenant Governor, Mr. Hanbidge, many years of good health and happiness. Mr. Speaker, I also wish to personally extend my best wishes to the new Member from Kelvington (Mr. Byers).

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to be the representative for the constituency of Watrous, to belong to a party which has helped to bring to my area developments which help to make life more interesting and are in line with the ideal frame of living that we all dream about.

Mr. Speaker, we have done an extensive amount of work on our roads, thus providing the constituents and other groups with better facilities for transportation and also helping many with the jobs that were created. The nursing home in Cudworth has been completed and because of its central location it is of assistance to a large area. I am also proud that we have the Noranda Potash Mine that provides work for many of my constituents.

Mr. Speaker, my constituency has one of the best grain-growing areas in Western Canada when you are looking at the protein content of the wheat grown. Yet there is an increasing tendency to switch to mixed farming. I am strongly encouraging my constituents to follow that pattern, as it will help to bolster our economy within the constituency, solve to an extent the present problem of accumulated wheat piles, and provide the individual with a steadier flow of income which will affect the groups associated with providing services to the communities as a whole.

Mr. Speaker, we have been particularly pleased with the results of the new guaranteed livestock loan program. We are also very pleased to note that our December cattle population is up about 8 per cent. The decline in marketing this year is further evidence of a strong build-up in cattle numbers in this province. Marketing of cows alone is down over 30 per cent from last year. However, in addition we are especially pleased to observe the continual and marked improvement in cattle quality. It does not take a particularly keen observer to note this as he drives around the province. Particular emphasis has been laid on the ROP for beef cattle. In 1963-64 there were 83 herds in the province that weighed out 2,691 calves. We are proud to say that in 1969 we had 268 herds, 250 of which were purebred and these 268 herds weighed out 9,400 calves on the ROP program.

Our role in Saskatchewan as a producer of top quality cattle is demonstrated every year by exhibitors from this province at the Royal Winter Fair. I can remind you that within the next few weeks the largest sale of purebred beef bulls in Canada will be staged here in Regina. It may also be a good time to remind the House that a member from my constituency, Mr. Bill Kirsh of Pilger, last year sold a Hereford bull to buyers from the United States for a record price of \$39,000.

Mr. Speaker, in 1963-64 thirty community pastures were operated by the Province. They took in about 17,500 head of breeding cows. In 1969 the Lands Branch operated 51 pastures plus five sheep pastures. They carried more than 38,000 breeding cows and almost 6,000 ewes in these pastures. This development has been a major contribution to the maintenance of our livestock herds in this province. I need hardly remind this Legislature that during this period farm cash receipts from cattle and calves have increased from the \$100 million level to exceed \$160 million in 1967 and 1968.

I was pleased to note in the address of the Minister that provision is made in the Budget for increased grants to veterinary service districts and that legislation to remove the limits placed on these grants is presently before the House. Mr. Speaker, this is a continuing reflection of the emphasis that this Government places on the agricultural industry.

I would refer to our new veterinary laboratory built with almost 50 per cent assistance from the Horned Cattle Fund, as fine a laboratory as exists in Canada, that was completed last year. The Veterinary Division now comprises a staff of 12 people compared to seven when this Government took office. With completion of the Western College of Veterinary Medicine we can say with pride that during the past five years we have moved in this province from occupying the weakest position in veterinary services of all of Canada to where this essential service to our livestock industry is at least among the best in Canada now.

Mr. Speaker, may I also point out that in 1964 this province not only did not have a decent veterinary laboratory and had no soil-testing facilities at all and no feed-testing facilities. You are aware, I am sure, that both a Provincial Soil-Testing Laboratory and a Provincial Feed-Testing Laboratory are now in full operation on the campus of the University of Saskatchewan. It was with much pleasure that I heard the Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Steuart) say that our Government was prepared to contribute the sum of \$200,000 to a Crop-Breeding Institute at Saskatoon.

March 9, 1970

Mr. Speaker, there is much that could be done to improve the crops we now have. I would refer particularly to barley. Higher yielding varieties, better straw strength, non-shattering and disease resistance are all factors that could be improved in this crop. It is the crop that offers us our best opportunity of competing with corn. That competition will not be easy we know and we need the best adapted varieties possible. In our present situation new crops such as white wheats to meet the needs of a particular market will be required. With some improvement in varieties we could probably replace expensive imported soybean meal as a protein supplement. Other crops such as sunflowers, safflower, and buckwheat offer some market opportunities but we need varieties suited to our soils and climate. I trust the Federal Government can see its way clear to meet us half way on this proposition.

May I emphasize that all is not bleak in the agricultural scene. I refer to our expanding cattle industry and the added services available for its support. Our hog population is undergoing a population explosion with a 40 per cent increase in numbers last December.

Mr. Speaker, we may take some pride in the production accomplishments of our farmers. Last year we had the highest yield of wheat on record, the second highest barley yield on record, the highest average yield of flax since a limited acreage reported in 1905. The average yield of rapeseed was the second highest on record. In the case of rapeseed our production of 19.6 million bushels was more than 50 per cent higher than our previous record set in 1966. This crop has proven to be a lifesaver on many farms across the North.

Our problem is one of marketing and adjustment. Our farmers with the assistance and encouragement of various policies are moving rapidly to adjust to market prospects. We call upon the Federal Government and Wheat Board to redouble their efforts in marketing.

Mr. Speaker, during the Debate in the past few days I have been listening to our Socialist friends to determine just what they have in common, what goal, what program and what solutions. On looking back over their statements and comparing these with their actions in office I find two things common to all of them their short memories and their hypocrisy. Member after Member on the Socialist side of the House has spoken about their concern for the farmer, for the laborer. To start with, may I congratulate the Hon. Provincial Treasurer for exposing some of the facts of their record during the Budget Address.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SCHMEISER: — Not only have they proven their inconsistency and insincerity with regard to our farmers. Let us look at the attitude towards the working man. The working men of this province should be shocked with the attitude of the NDP in this Legislature towards programs to help labor which have been outlined in this Budget. Let them tell the laborer who wants employment in the road construction industry that this is not a good Budget. Well, I dare them. Let them tell the building construction worker who has been laid off during the winter and hopes to get employment on one of the construction projects outlined in this Budget that this Government is not trying to help them. I dare them. In this House and in the Press earlier

This year the Members from the Socialist side of this House have condemned and downgraded our Premier and our Mineral Resources Department for the action which they took to preserve thousands of jobs in the potash industry. Let the Socialists tell the men working in my area who were going to be faced with layoffs that the new regulations are not good. Let them tell those men working in potash mines in my constituency that this Government is anti-labor. I dare them.

Mr. Speaker, their hypocrisy and inconsistency shine through bright and clear in the light of our current problems and the lack of any constructive Socialist program. They are not for the farmer. Their record proves this. They are not for the working man. They criticize programs designed specifically to help him. Well, who are they for? By a process of elimination there is only one group they could possibly be working for. There is only one group not mentioned in this House so far that the Socialists have not criticized either directly or by condemning programs designed to help them. And that group must be the big labor bosses, the only people not helped by the Budget Speech and also the only group with whom the NDP and their program and speeches have been consistent.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SCHMEISER: — Mr. Speaker; I doubt that this allegiance on the part of the NDP will do much to endear them to the farmer who has no money, to the laborer who has no job, or to the businessman who has no sales.

Mr. Speaker, this hypocrisy I mentioned before has been carried in to the change of name of their organization. Socialist propaganda extols people's involvement and even democratic planning, but democratic planning is a contradiction in terms because planning is done by experts and by the minority. Tommy Douglas speaking at the CCF National Council meeting in 1956 reckoned with this non-involvement of the people and bluntly asserted that the party must aim for the hundreds of thousands of people who will accept the objectives without necessarily understanding the political philosophy or ideology. I shudder to think and recognize how the mass of supporters needed to obtain power can ever become intelligent planners without understanding the party's philosophy or ideology.

In 1961 the New Democratic Party was founded. It was a joint venture of the labor movement now united in the Canadian Labour Congress and the old CCF. The main reason for the new party was a desire to improve its image and thus to broaden its base of support. No longer must the party come through as a doctrinaire Socialist movement but it must be recognized as a modern pragmatic one. I quote:

The new party will therefore not abandon the goals of democratic Socialism but it will be prepared to revise traditional Socialist techniques.

It was not a question of abandoning the basic principles and the program; it was a question and a pressing need of removing the aura, the image, and the reputation of the CCF.

Mr. Speaker, the inconsistency I have previously mentioned may easily be illustrated by taking two specific cases which

March 9, 1970

should. appeal to the understanding minds of the Saskatchewan farmer. Mr. Speaker, first I will refer to the words of the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Lloyd) who said the other day that the Saskatchewan barter deals were a sham and yet the Star Phoenix on August 23rd, 1969, carried the following article:

Federal action to support Premier Thatcher's proposal to barter wheat for Japanese goods was urged by W.S. Lloyd, Provincial NDP Leader.

It is also reported that while commenting on the barter idea Mr. Lloyd said:

I am pleased to see the Premier promoting a good Socialist-type proposal.

Now he suddenly has a more grandiose plan. He wants the Federal Government to inject some cash immediately for all farmers.

The Hon. Member from Kelsey (Mr. Messer) is also another Member who can proudly boast that he has a very short memory. I am sure that he wishes that the farmer will try to forget his past records and actions of wisdom. Now he is presenting a resolution calling for an immediate cash injection to the farmer. Where was Mr. Messer's deep interest in the welfare of the farmer when on July 11th, 1969, he opposed the same type of assistance? I quote from the Star Phoenix of July 11th, 1969:

Mr. Messer also opposed a resolution calling for immediate cash of \$5.00 an acre to a maximum of \$2,000 to help farmers.

Mr. Speaker, the word 'injection' is being used so often by the two mentioned Hon. Members that I have a feeling that possibly an injection may assist them in recovering some measure of stability.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SCHMEISER: — Mr. Speaker, I take great pleasure in supporting the motion and in voting against the amendment.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. T.M. BREKER: (Humboldt) — Mr. Speaker, may I extend my congratulations to the new Member from Kelvington (Mr. Byers). He replaces a dear and personal friend of mine, and I am confident that the people of Kelvington think that they have sent us a man having those same sterling qualities that Bryan Bjarnason possessed. Whether they are right or wrong only time will tell if the Member can measure up to those expectations.

Years ago when rape was introduced in Saskatchewan I had an old friend of mine who used to farm in Ohio. He used to say to me, "You know what they get for rape in Ohio?" And then he would say, "In Ohio they get two years." And if things don't improve in the Humboldt area many of us likewise will be serving time, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. BREKER: — Seeing that the Opposition is in such a jovial mood I cannot understand why some of the old stalwarts have just about almost been shoved out of the Chamber, Mr. Speaker. It is probably typical Socialist doctrine where human importance is measured only by the usefulness to produce.

MR. D.W. MICHAYLUK: (Redberry) — Look where you sit!

MR. BREKER: — It reminds me of the story of the Musicians of Bremen. If you have a horse too old to ride he has got to go. If you have a dog too old to bark he has got to go and if you have a cock too old to crow he has got to go. Even behind the Iron Curtain the only way to get out is to outlive your usefulness.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. BREKER: — In the Humboldt area there are 220 some farmers being charged with 235 infractions involving over-delivery of rapeseed. I see the Member from The Battlefords (Mr. Kramer) hasn't been feeling himself lately.

Our local Humboldt flour mill is being charged with 248 infractions exceeding the quota, 263 charges of not entering transactions in quota books, and 159 charges of making false entries. I am not very much interested regarding the charges of not entering the transactions, nor am I concerned about the 159 charges of making false entries. I am . . . No, I still have my quota books. I wonder if the Member for Kinistino (Mr. Thibault) still has his. I am, however, deeply concerned about the 220 farmers that are charged with over-delivery as well as the 248 infractions of exceeding the quota. I say this that, if a farmer is guilty of over-delivery at any time of grain, be it oats, barley, wheat or flax, at a time which is financially critical, at a time when every farmer needs his right and just share of quota, he is guilty of robbing his neighbor just the same as the fellow that steals from his neighbor.

I believe too that the regulations should be enforced and that elevator agents and farmers alike should be prosecuted and if found guilty should be fined.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. BREKER: — The intent of the quota regulations is to ensure every farmer equal delivery privileges. It just simply wouldn't be fair if the farmer at Humboldt delivered all his rape at \$2.50 a bushel and the farmer at Meadow Lake, because of the distance and because of no similar facilities such as the Humboldt flour mill, could only deliver half of his crop, the other half to be carried over until next year at an expected price of approximately half of what it is now.

Now if the intent of the Wheat Board regulations was to give everybody equal delivery quotas, how come then by special permission the Wheat Board gives the people around Nipawin and those around Saskatoon, extra delivery privileges. You know, Mr. Speaker, there is a plant in Nipawin and this plant is

March 9, 1970

called Agro Vegetable Oils Products and it crushes rape. And I imagine the Member from Kelsey (Mr. Messer) has many shares in this venture. Now for every 100 shares of common stock the price of which is \$5.60 each farmer can deliver 1,000 bushels of rape. This is over and above the allotted legal quota. When everybody has delivered his allotment they start another round of buying. This year that crusher is completing three rounds which means any member having those 500 shares of common stock would have been able to deliver 3,000 bushels of rapeseed over and above, and I re-emphasize, Mr. Speaker, over and above his regular Wheat Board allotted rapeseed quota.

I contend, Mr. Speaker, that this 3,000 bushels is much more rape than 85 per cent of the farmers in the Humboldt area are guilty of over-delivering.

Now, what is the situation regarding the Saskatchewan Wheat Pool's crusher plant at Saskatoon? They buy 1,000 bushels of rapeseed from any farmer that supposedly has the right oil and the right protein content, and I understand that in some cases a good deal more than 1,000 bushels has been delivered by some. I emphasize again, Mr. Speaker, this is over and above the legal quota. There is an opinion in the Humboldt area that much of the rapeseed bought in this manner gets into the export market. But I have been assured by the Wheat Board and by the Saskatchewan Wheat Pool's Industrial Division that the rapeseed that the crusher cleans and exports is bought through the quota system and that every bushel can be accounted for in the farmers' quota books.

But what I don't understand is why the Pool, with its own grain-gathering system, should be allowed to collect or accept rape from farmers for their crusher. Why shouldn't they as well as the Nipawin plant be forced to buy their rape through the normal channels just the same way as the Humboldt flour mill is forced to buy . . .

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. BREKER: — . . . making it possible for us all to participate in rape sales regardless of whether those sales are in the form of whole rapeseed or in the form of oil or rapeseed meal. I ask you, Mr. Speaker, do you not find something extremely strange and extraordinary in a situation where 200 and some farmers are prosecuted for doing something that hundreds of other farmers are doing — over-delivering? Does it matter what the over-delivery is for, whether it is for oil, whether it is for birdseed or not? I don't think so.

The reason for the Wheat Board quota is to ensure equal delivery privileges as I said before. But granting the two crushers in question special privileges the Wheat Board has circumvented the end result which the regulations were intended for. Therefore, the charges against the Humboldt area farmers involving over-delivery and the charges against the Humboldt flour mill for exceeding their quota should be dropped.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: — Order, order! I draw to the attention of all Hon. Members the fact that specific charges against a specific person or

corporation are sub judice and should not be mentioned in this Chamber. You can mention the general charges in a general way but you can't specifically mention the fact that the charges against the Humboldt flour mill or some other specific defendant should be dropped because that is a specific instance. Members may broadly and generally touch on these things but not specifically or individuals.

MR. BREKER: — You know, Mr. Speaker, nowadays it is not very popular to be in favor of or to defend the Wheat Board. It is not very popular to say anything about the Minister in charge of the Wheat Board (Mr. Lang) but I say this that the minister in charge of the Wheat Board is probably a breath of fresh air in the political arena.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. BREKER: — He is telling the people the truth, something that the people haven't heard too much of from the political arenas for a good many years.

When Lang said our cash position would be better if we raised less wheat, he meant it and it is true. When I say, if it costs a farmer 80 cents a bushel to raise wheat, he is better off to buy it for 60 cents regardless of whether he feeds it or not, this is also true.

I am sure that this year is going to be a traumatic experience for the farmers in the Humboldt area to leave their tractors partially idle. In the Humboldt area where some black summer fallow is the mark of a good farmer, where black summer fallow is synonymous with good field husbandry, I am sure that the people never thought that they would see the day when their land wouldn't receive the best tillage methods, their crops the right amount of fertilizer to ensure the maximum yields, and when their gross income from wheat would be the same whether they seeded the land or not. But some farmers say to me, "I need the feed." If you can raise wheat for 60 cents a bushel, the current price laid down in our granaries for No. 2 wheat, then go ahead and seed. Go ahead and take the chance. Go ahead and buck the elements. But buying a bushel is like getting a suit of clothes at wholesale less 10.

And what about the inter-provincial movement of grain, Mr. Speaker? There are strong advocates of this policy and I say to this, absolutely No. There is no way that I would approve of the movement of feed grain and wheat provincially. I might, however, entertain the idea of feed grain and feed wheat movement in the three Prairie Provinces because first of all I think it is hard to police, and secondly, we are really one unit, sociologically, physically and commercially. But in no way should grains be allowed into British Columbia or east of Manitoba.

Last year Ontario farmers were using United States corn. Wheat Board officials, either through ignorance or lethargy, didn't see or didn't recognize the seriousness of the situation and didn't lower the price of barley. And so 30 million bushels of corn moved into Ontario. Now this year barley is competitive with United States corn, and Ontario hog and cattlemen are using Canadian barley. If we allow the inter-provincial movement of

March 9, 1970

grain, each and every farmer can load cars of barley, oats, wheat and send it down East. This in itself is not bad. This is good. If salesmanship alone determines who gets the barley sales, sooner or later price will enter into those sales with the result that the farmers will undercut one another until the price of barley is at basement values in Ontario just like it is in Saskatchewan.

There is a limited market in British Columbia, Ontario, Quebec, and the Maritimes for feed grains and there is no reason why the Wheat Board didn't drop its price last year to meet outside competition. There isn't any reason why the price of barley wasn't dropped to meet the competition on the overseas market. Today for the first time we have a two-system in barley, one for domestic and one for export use. But because of the rigidity of the regulations, because of the lack of foresight, the prices weren't dropped. But here in Canada the normal market for barley is 50 million bushels at about 86 cents. The same amount of barley sold at 56 cents a bushel means only a net loss of \$15 million. And to whom? To the Western farmer.

I have listened to the criticism of the Wheat Board. Well, you know how hard and dictatorial even a government can become. This was the downfall of the CCF — too hard, too dictatorial, and too long. Some of this criticism is warranted. I believe Otto Lang will reorganize, revitalize and thoroughly shake up this tired, old government agency.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. BREKER: — But, Mr. Speaker, this problem of agriculture is as much of a problem of the Saskatchewan Government as it is of the Federal Government.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. BREKER: — Canada's agriculture is doing things backwards. We are always looking for markets for our surpluses rather than finding what the market is and producing for it. We are clearing land for community pastures rather than buying existing sub-marginal wheat land. We are ruining irreplaceable vacation land, like the Cumberland Delta. What for? To grow wheat. What research is Saskatchewan doing?

AN HON. MEMBER: — Nothing!

MR. BREKER: — Maybe we should be growing bananas and avocados. I noticed in the Annual Report of the Saskatchewan Research Council that they did a study on Russian thistle, but it fell, and I quote:

It fell in disfavour because of its spinney character and allergy problems.

Something a farmer farming in the Thirties could have told them without any research.

I also noticed that they are doing a study on the rate of evaporation on prairie potholes. Hardly a solution to our farm crisis.

We in Canada, if we exclude wheat, were the net importers of food products in 1968. Has anyone made a study that really looked in a searching way at the possible markets for food products? Where does the starch come from that is used in the purification of potash? Not from wheat. Do we realize that in every bushel of wheat there are 2-1/2 gallons of grain alcohol? If we added 20 per cent alcohol to our gas in North America our surplus would disappear and our pollution problem would be substantially less critical. Yes, Mr. Speaker, I am pleased with the Budget, especially the increased agricultural budget, but I am sorry to say that in the field of agriculture, one of Canada's largest industries and very definitely Saskatchewan's largest industry, we are lacking in research, lacking in planning.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. BREKER: — I feel this increase should be directed in this time of crisis to research, first and foremost. I will support the Budget and not the amendment.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. E.I. WOOD: (Swift Current) — Mr. Speaker, in rising to take part in this Budget Debate, I would like to first compliment the Hon. Dr. Stephen Worobetz upon his appointment as Lieutenant Governor of this province. I believe he is well qualified to fill the position. I hope that he will have a happy and useful term of office and prove a worthy successor to our dearly beloved Lieutenant Governor Hanbidge.

I would also like to compliment the new Member for Kelvington (Mr. Byers) upon his election to this Assembly. I believe he has already shown himself to be an able Member and the choice made by the people of his constituency shows not only their good judgment, but indicates the way the political winds are blowing in this province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. WOOD: — Now, Mr. Speaker, I would if I may like to make a couple of comments on the speeches that have just preceded mine. There is one thing which they all had in common, these three speakers, and that is that they missed a quite a few good opportunities to sit down. The Hon. Member from Estevan (Mr. MacDougall) has provided quite a smoke screen considering what has happened in his city concerning the hospital workers who had been inveigled into working for some of the lowest wages for that type of work in Canada at, if not below, the poverty level, because the Premier had issued an edict that hospital costs must be held, come what may. I would like to say to the Hon. Member from Watrous (Mr. Schmeiser) that I am pleased to see the soil-testing laboratories which he has referred to, and I am glad to see them in operation, but I want to say that unless things change and if Mr. Otto Lang has his way they'll be testing soil that won't be growing anything.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to say that, if this Budget is what it purports to be and what the Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Steuart) says about it is all true, it has some things to commend it. There is the removal of the 2 cents tax for farm fuel. At the time this tax was put on and since that time, we

March 9, 1970

in the Opposition have been pointing out that this was an unjust tax upon the farming industry at a time when it was in severe difficulty, and I am glad that the Government has finally seen its error and removed it.

No one, including the Members of the Opposition, is pleased to see a new tax adding to the already crushing burden of taxation in this province and I am not in any way condoning further tax increases. I thought that we had about all that there were in the last couple of years. But if we have to have taxes I suppose that an income tax is one of the fairest ways that such a tax could be imposed, although one is forced to question why there should be an increased tax upon individuals, anyone earning over \$1,000 a year, but not upon corporations, even though they may be making a thousand times as much.

Then there is the matter of the deficit. We regret that the Liberals have allowed the Province to fall into such a state that this is necessary. But seeing that we have arrived in this position, I have to agree that it is better to borrow this money than to allow the province to slide down into unemployment and economic decay. Taken by itself there are some things to commend this Budget, but taking into account the historical background, it is the climax of the road to ruin along which this Government has led the Province of Saskatchewan.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. WOOD: — I note that the Provincial Treasurer admitted that this is a deficit Budget but brags about having had five previously balanced Budgets. I do not quite agree that all those five budgets were balanced. Is a budget balanced, Mr. Speaker, when in order to keep expenditures down in line with receipts the Provincial Treasurer starves the Medical Care Insurance Fund so that it is depleted to the tune of some \$10 million? Is a budget balanced when in order to do so the Provincial Treasurer takes \$2 million from the Student Loan Fund, or \$1 million from the Saskatchewan Public Administration Foundation? Is the Budget balanced when the Government borrows some \$6,500,000 for building four-lane highways but doesn't call it borrowing, because the roads built with this money are credited on the books of the Province as assets, although all the hundreds of millions of other highways and public works buildings are not? Just glance at page 405 of the Public Accounts for the year ending March 31, 1969, to see what I mean. Is the Budget balanced when the Government borrows \$4 million for university construction and doesn't call it borrowing for purposes of the Budget? There is no doubt the money will have to be repaid by the taxpayers of this province. Is the Budget balanced when the Government takes up to \$8 million a year from the Saskatchewan Power Corporation which in turn has to turn around and borrow just that much more in order to complete needed construction?

This kind of subterfuge cannot go on unnoticed in the end. Although the statement on page 505 of this year's Public Accounts shows the figure for net assets of this Province has grown by some \$21 million between March 31st of 1969, it is well known that this does not include the statements of Crown corporations, boards and commissions. For instance, the Medical Care Insurance Fund of March 31, 1964, shown in page 892 of the Public Accounts of that year showed cash and

investments on hand of some \$9,700,000 and at March 31st, 1969, page 609 of the Public Accounts of that year, which are the latest available, shows no investments but an overdraft of \$325,000. But this decrease of \$10 million in public funds does not appear on the statement of assets of the Provincial Government. When one considers this reduction of \$10 million in the Medical Care Insurance Fund; the depletion of the Public Administration-Foundation by \$1 million and of the Student Loan Fund of \$2 million; the remaining \$5,850,000 worth of four-lane highways which continue to be carried as a cash asset; the \$4 million owing by the University and carried as a contingent liability, but which must in fact be repaid by Provincial tax payers; and the \$6,500,000 taken up to March 31, 1969, from the Saskatchewan Power Corporation which has by just that much increased that Corporation's indebtedness, you find that in the five years between March 1964 and March 1969, years of supposedly balanced Budgets, the net assets of the Province actually decreased by over \$8 million. This, Mr. Speaker, does not count the \$8 million taken from the Saskatchewan Power Corporation in 1969; nor the proposed \$10 million taken from that corporation in the present Budget; nor the \$10,400,000 deficit which is actually acknowledged at this time.

This looks to me, Mr. Speaker, that this present Budget will lead us to a drop in net assets of the Province in six Liberal Budgets of something over \$36 million, although this is the first time they have admitted a deficit and that of only \$10,400,000. Mr. Speaker, if it had had truly balanced Budgets in the past this deficit would not be necessary at this time.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to say a few things that particularly concern the constituency of Swift Current. I am pleased to know that assistance is being forwarded for new construction and alterations to the Swift Current Union Hospital. This, of course, had been promised some time ago and recently the Federal Government has confirmed a grant of \$310,000 for this purpose. This will assist in maintaining Swift Current's position as the major medical centre in Southwestern Saskatchewan, and I can assure you that it is much appreciated. But where, Mr. Speaker, is the proposed Psychiatric Unit? Although I understand the structural changes were contemplated in the new wing that would permit its construction at some later date, the actual construction of this unit has been indefinitely postponed. I believe that the 50 per cent utilization of facilities at Moose Jaw has been cited as a justification for this. However, facilities may have been over-built elsewhere, it does not mean that we do not need something of this type at Swift Current. One hundred and ten miles is a long way for the people of Swift Current to travel to visit relatives, but the 175 to 200 miles the people of Shaunavon, Maple Creek and Leader areas have to travel to make visits to members of their family undergoing psychiatric care make this a real strain upon their resources. I do believe that frequent visits from those who know and love the patients are an important feature in their rehabilitation and psychiatric treatment, and a unit at Swift Current could mean a good deal to the people of the Southwest.

The present hospital is just not equipped to handle this type of patient. When we have patients endeavoring to commit suicide or molesting other patients, it is grossly unfair to nurses and other patients, as well as to the psychiatric patients

themselves. I trust that the Hon. Members from Shaunavon (Mr. Larochelle), and Elrose (Mr. Leith) and Maple Creek (Mr. Cameron) will support me in this that we may before too long realize that we have in Swift Current a Psychiatric Unit which will encourage our first-class personnel to remain in Swift Current.

Mr. Speaker, there are a good many other things which I had wished to say concerning the wheat situation, concerning the reasons, if any, why we are not getting a Chinook Library in the Southwest, and concerning some of the statements which the Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Steuart) has carelessly made on TV in recent days, but I find that the time allotted to me has elapsed. I will say at this time that in view of the fact that this Budget is the culminating feature of years of Liberal inability to keep in step with the times and to give satisfactory government to the Province of Saskatchewan so that both property and Provincial taxes have doubled and we are now in the place of deficit financing, I say that I cannot support this Budget.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. E. WHELAN: (Regina North West) — Mr. Speaker; in rising to participate in this Debate I must make reference first to the constituents whom I represent. Regina North West is a cross section of young people, older people, working people and business people. Its citizens are energetic and aggressive they are experienced and enthusiastic. Their future is tied up in the future of Regina and in the future of Saskatchewan. With pride and humility I rise to speak on their behalf in this Debate.

Before I begin, Mr. Speaker, I would like to make some reference to some of the remarks by the Hon. Member for Estevan (Mr. MacDougall). He confirmed that those still working in this province, when he talked about the hospital strike at Estevan, in order to keep their wages from dropping to the starvation level, had to go on strike. Mr. Speaker, if there are differences between workers and employers, you can be sure that the Hon. Member for Estevan will promote them. His whole policy is to divide and rule. Divide the farmers and the workers, divide the co-op members and the co-op employees. What are the facts regarding the hospital strike? There was an unanimous report by a Government-appointed conciliation board headed up by a former Liberal MLA, Dr. John Egnatoff. There was unanimous acceptance. The reason for the strike was that the Liberal Government opposite refused to give hospital operators the money to back up its own conciliation board, Mr. Speaker. If there was a hospital strike the reason for it rests entirely with the Government opposite.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. WHELAN: — It probably accepted the advice of the Member for Estevan. The Member for Estevan seems to be worried about army deserters, about student newspapers and protests in Regina. When will he worry about the jobless, the pensioners, the farmers' economic situation, the deterrent tax and the sick? No, the protesters are not responsible for these situations. The responsibility rests with the Hon. Member for Estevan. Let him assume it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. WHELAN: — The Hon. Member for Watrous (Mr. Schmeiser) challenges us: “Prove that Liberals are anti-labor.” We don’t have to prove it, Mr. Speaker, just listen to the Hon. Member for Estevan for a while.

Mr. Speaker, at the outset I want to cite the Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Steuart) and his Budget Speech and I quote him. He said when he was introducing the Budget Speech to this House:

And let us remember who really gets hurt by growing inflation, the farmers, the old-age pensioners and the men and women in the lower-wage brackets.

Mr. Speaker, it is my intention to prove that Liberal times are hard times for the farmer, the old-age pensioner and the men and women in the lower-wage brackets. Their record of performance in the past bodes no bright prospect for the future. The Speech is contradictory — it is going to cut back and yet at the same time increase its commitments “until we have our economy back in high gear once again,” to quote them, — when faced with the complex problem of those who instruct them and those who elect them.

Mr. Speaker, let me turn first to senior citizens in my constituency. Much has been said in this House about groups of people in our society who are unable to defend themselves and are in economic trouble. The Budget speaks of housing units for senior citizens. Fine. What about the senior citizens and this Government’s treatment of them? I think it is enlightening, I think it is pertinent, I think it really reveals who it is using in what it calls its fight to cut rising costs in the battle against inflation. Mr. Speaker, I think it is typical, let me quote one case.

This lady a constituent of mine who lives in Pioneer Village is 80 years of age. Because the maintenance cost has risen and because this Government cut back by withdrawing the maintenance grant when it should have increased it, the rent in the unit occupied by this widow has risen to \$53. It is good accommodation, it is a nice place to live, but I suggest that this is the last place where rents should have risen. If there is any kindness, any consideration, it should have been given to these people. The rent should not have been increased. If there was going to be money paid out for any reason — for building mountains, or for Homecoming ’71 — the senior citizens’ maintenance grant should not have been liquidated, but should have been increased to prevent rises in rent of \$6 to \$53 per month.

This lady’s budget is as follows, and I want all Hon. Members to listen carefully. Unfortunately there are only about nine Members of the Government in the House, and the Minister of Welfare is not on hand. I have the Welfare Department’s decision sheet in my hand and I quote from it: her monthly total income from the pension is \$111; her rent is \$53; food allowance according to the Department’s calculations is \$28.50. She is not going to be eating out, there will be no hot dog tax here that’s quite evident. Clothing allowance \$10; telephone \$4.36; personal allowance \$3.25; household allowance \$1.60 and then they said she could pay her medicare premium, \$3. This left her the magnificent surplus of \$7.29. For ten years, Mr. Speaker, this lady had a blue card for medical coverage, but she has never been sick. Since she gets the magnificent sum of \$111 per month, and

March 9, 1970

remember she pays nearly half of that \$53 in rent (which it didn't prevent from being raised and I understand that Pioneer Village cannot operate without again raising rents while this Government sits idly by, allowing it to happen) it figures that this pensioner has a budget surplus and so after ten years her blue card was taken from her. The security that she thought she has is gone. Although she has never been sick, the possibility of becoming sick became a worry. Oh, it was cutting back on government expenses, it was cutting back on expenditures, it was using the pensioners as the front-line troops — her medical card was taken from her. She was dunned: pay up immediately, or else. With what, I suggest, Mr. Speaker? Mr. Speaker, the explanation, which I have in my hand was that, "the only way she could qualify for medical coverage is as a medical indigent." She was not eligible because she has a so-called budget surplus — on paper.

I don't remember what I said on the telephone to the Regional Welfare Office when I appealed the decision. The case was reconsidered and the pensioner was granted her medical card temporarily. She may get a permanent one. I want to express her sincere thanks to the Minister. In the face of this situation can you imagine the Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Steuart) saying in his Budget Speech:

Our Government has recognized a responsibility to help those in need to the full extent of our ability?

Mr. Speaker, how ably it has recognized its responsibility! How efficiently it has assessed the real need. It is amazing to see it operate to the full extent of its ability, by withdrawing from senior citizens blue cards they have had for ten years.

If we are going to cut government expenditures, if we are going to hold the line against rising medical costs, I say to the Government, in all sincerity: leave the senior citizens alone; don't starve them and worry them by taking their blue cards. If you cut costs in this way, if you do this, you will have me down your neck and you will have every relative of every pensioner down your neck, and there will be no member of our political party who will agree with you that the pensioners should bear the brunt and carry the so-called battle against inflation.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. WHELAN: — Mr. Speaker, the pensioners are paying tax on their telephone, they are paying outrageous prices for their food because of the profits made by the food manufacturers who are friends of the Members opposite. But in the name of decency, in the name of good representation, what kind of representation can you call this? Don't take their blue cards when they are getting \$111 a month, and finally, don't come before this House in a mealy-mouthed fashion saying:

Let's remember those who really get hurt by growing inflation, the farmer, the old-age pensioner, the men and women in the low-wage brackets.

Mr. Speaker, I want to talk for a moment about deterrent fees. These are the most damnable thing ever introduced in a free society, for they tax people, worry people, and penalize

people when they are sick. If this addition of \$1.50 fee for the therapist indicates your kindness to the pensioner, the pensioners in my constituency want you to know how much they appreciate paying \$1.50 each time they see a therapist, a therapist who gives them treatment so they can walk and so they can stretch their limbs. On behalf of this party, I will make a commitment to the pensioners, to the senior citizens: they will have blue cards, if they are on a pension and a pension alone, for medical coverage and drugs, and there will be no deterrent fees for hospital beds when they are sick, for doctors' visits when they are ill at home, and no deterrent fees when they have to see a therapist. This is a solemn commitment that we make to the pensioners of this province. We know we will have to keep it, we realize full well the seriousness of the commitment, because we fully expect to be the Government after the next election is held.; To the pensioner who has had his blue card lifted, to the pensioner who pays deterrent fees to see a therapist, to the pensioner who pays deterrent fees to a hospital, to the pensioner who has had his rent raised because of a withdrawal of maintenance grants and failure of the Government to increase grants for operation of senior citizens' homes, to the pensioner who understands better than anyone else, I repeat, Liberal times are hard times.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. WHELAN: — Mr. Speaker, there are some things that the Minister in charge of Government Insurance (Mr. Boldt) has failed to explain, and the Budget does not explain either. There are three things the automobile owners of this province want the Minister to tell them: first, there has been only a small increase in vehicle registrations, yet the cost of premiums on all cars, all vehicles, has risen from \$12 million in 1964 to \$25 million in 1969. Why?

Question No. 2. Why did the insurance on a 1963 car, which is worth approximately \$3,000, less \$200 deductible, which means the vehicle is insured for \$2,800, cost \$44 in April 1964 or \$1.57 per \$100? Yet the same vehicle now, a 1963 vehicle, in April 1970, when it is worth \$600, with a \$200 deductible, which means he has \$400 insurance protection, costs him now \$57 for insurance, or \$14.25 per \$100 for his protection. Why? This is the question I want to ask the Hon. Minister.

And the third question. If insurance rates have not gone up, why is it that a new 1963 car in April 1964, worth \$3,000 less \$200 deductible, with a possible realization of \$2,800, was insured for \$44, or \$1.57 per \$100, while a new car, a 1970 model in April 1970, worth \$3,400, with \$200 deductible, or a possible full cash settlement of \$3,200, costs \$85 to insure, or \$2.65 per \$100, an increase of \$1.08 per 100, or a 68 per cent increase.

Why, these fantastic increases; if rates have not been increased? Overall premiums have been: increased 108 per cent. The rate for a new vehicle has increased 68 per cent. When you consider the actual cash value, the insurance coverage on an older car has increased from \$1.57 per \$100 in 1964, to \$14.25 per \$100 on the same car in 1970.

The Estimates in the Budget call for \$1,900,000 in insurance tax. When we get in a car we pay taxes. We pay the health and education tax on the car when we buy it. This takes in the pensioner, the people on unemployment insurance, it takes in

March 9, 1970

absolutely everyone, Mr. Speaker. At a time when people are desperately short of money, what are the facts? Income from premiums written with the insurance of a licence have risen from \$12 million in 1964 (\$12,018,906) to almost \$25 million (\$24,937,395) in 1969. This is an increase of 108 per cent in income from premiums.

I am holding in my hand, Mr. Speaker, a statement that the Hon. Minister made about the drop in accidents. I quote from The Leader Post of April 30, 1969:

Hon. Dave Boldt, Minister in charge of SGIO said that approximately one-third reduction in accidents was 'most noteworthy.'

He attributed the reduction largely, to implementation of a surcharge on drivers found responsible for an accident. and other legislation aimed at cracking down on drinking drivers.

In light of this statement, and similar ones made by the Hon. Minister, one is bound to ask: have accidents gone up 108 per cent? Maybe taxes he has imposed have gone up 108 per cent. I suggest the people of Saskatchewan deserve an explanation of the 108 per cent increase in the premiums for their compulsory automobile insurance.

The Minister rises in his seat and says that the rates have not risen. What has happened to insurance rates? As the car becomes older it has dropped in value. Let's look at the rate for this 1963 model, 119-inch wheel-base with insurance which expired on April 30, 1964. This was about the time the Hon. Members opposite became the Government, Mr. Speaker. The compulsory insurance rate for that 1963 model in 1963-64 licence year was \$44. Let's follow that rate and see what happens to it. In 1966-67, 119-inch wheel-base, \$51; 1967-68, \$57; 1968-69, \$57; 1969-70, \$57; and for this year it is still \$57. Compulsory insurance on this automobile when it was new, the year it was purchased, 1963-64, when it was worth \$3,000 cost the purchaser \$44 — \$44 to insure this new piece of automotive equipment, equipment worth \$3,000. What is a 1963 car worth today? I phoned three automobile agencies in the city and asked them for 1963 models and their values. Mr. Speaker, the average price they gave me was \$600. Look at what has happened to that insurance rate. I had an insurance underwriter in the city holding his ownership card for 119-inch wheel-base vehicle in his hand point out that for anyone to say that insurance rates have not risen may be accurate, but to leave the rate unchanged as has been the case represents a 30 per cent increase from \$44 to \$57 to insure a vehicle that has dropped in value from \$3,000 to \$600 — a drop of 80 per cent and remember there is a \$200 deductible on the \$600 price. This Government Insurance Fund . . .

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. WHELAN: — This Government, Mr. Speaker, because it does not reduce the rate in accordance with the value of a car, is perpetrating an undue levy on the vehicle owners of this province. A car seven years old worth \$600 now costs 30 per cent more to insure than when it was new and worth \$3,000. But the Minister says the rates have not changed. Let me sum it up in this way. We have heard in glowing terms of the drop in highway deaths and

automobile accidents. We have heard that there is no increase in rates, that we are holding the line. Mr. Speaker, if anyone is holding the line, it is the owners of the older vehicles. Of course the rates haven't gone up — the Hon. Minister said they haven't gone up. The total premium has increased 108 per cent and everyone knows that automobile registrations have increased about 12.5 per cent, so they will probably go down now that people are leaving the province. I want to make it absolutely clear that with older vehicles it is utterly unfair to retain a rate that is higher than when the vehicle was new. This practice will be discontinued and the rate will be reduced as the vehicle drops in value when the party on this side of the House takes office.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. WHELAN: — The skyrocketing rise in the cost of premiums, 68 per cent from 1963 on new cars, when there is only a slight increase in the cost of repairs and little change in the value of the new car, and when there is a drop in accidents according to the Hon. Minister, illustrates clearly that the rate has increased, Mr. Speaker. To use this plan to take in taxes which are shown in Estimates is often a hardship, and I say it is unrealistic and will please only one group of people — a group of people who are closely associated with the Members opposite — the private insurance companies. There is no question in my mind that these rates can be reduced 25 per cent and on older cars the percentage of reduction in the rates should be even greater.

Mr. Speaker, when we flick a switch in the house we pay taxes on electricity. This time the Budget Estimates show that we will take \$10 million from the Power Corporation. Ten million dollars. That isn't all, Mr. Speaker, it is painless turning on a light and paying taxes each time you turn on a light, but when you pay your electricity bill you pay a 5 per cent health and education tax as well. Our electricity sales were \$67 million. Check your own electricity bills; look for something else if you are in Regina; have a look at it before you pay the next bill. Not only do Saskatchewan people pay \$10 million to the Provincial Treasurer when they use electricity, not only do they pay this education and health tax, but in Regina there is a 10 per cent levy added which is not for electricity but is by way of payment to cover the cost of purchasing the city power plant. It welshed on the payment to the city, to the tune of 5 per cent by collecting 5 per cent education and health tax levied on that payment. In other words we are paying 10 per cent on our bills for the plant and that 10 per cent is being levied with another 5 per cent education and health tax, a levy that does not apply anywhere else in the province and is completely unfair. It is not for electricity but in effect is for payment for the arrangement that was made when the power plant was purchased.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. WHELAN: — It is outrageous; I didn't know it existed in other places but it is outrageous wherever it is.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. WHELAN: — I ask Regina residents to figure how much education

March 9, 1970

and health tax they pay, not on electricity, but on the 10 per cent levy each year. We have a question on the Order Paper and it will be interesting when it is answered in the Crown Corporations Committee. My bet is that the grant this Government will allow for police protection, the increase in the library grant and the increase in the health grant will not cover the education and health tax we pay on the municipal surcharge. I urge Regina residents to get their bills for electricity and examine them. You are paying a tax on the power plant payment. Our proposal will be to reduce rates to the domestic consumer. When you receive your homeowner grant there is a little note with it which says — oh, I've got a whole gang of these things; they are the most blatant propaganda I've ever read — "The payment is your dividend from Saskatchewan's continuing economic development."

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. WHELAN: — If you take them all and read them, they are losing their enthusiasm. The last one isn't as enthusiastic as the first one. I've read all five of them, and they are really dropping off in enthusiasm. They know what is going to happen. In his Budget Speech when he is talking about income from the Power Corporation, the Provincial Treasurer says and I quote him:

The Saskatchewan Power Corporation makes most of their profit from industrial and commercial users.

If this is so, and if these people can give us a homeowner grant as a result of Saskatchewan's continuing economic development, then I suggest that the hard-pressed domestic consumers of electricity who are directly responsible for the construction, maintenance and very existence of Saskatchewan Power Corporation are first entitled to relief from the rates . . .

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. WHELAN: — . . . because it takes in all of the people the Provincial Treasurer talks about, with crocodile tears, in the introduction to the Budget Speech when he speaks of the farmers, the old-age pensioners and the men and women in the lower-wage brackets.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. WHELAN: — I challenge him to apply the principle for paying the homeowner grant to use the profit from industrial rates to lower these domestic rates to consumers. No one needs relief more than consumers of electricity, more than hard-pressed farmers, those who are named by the Hon. Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Steuart) in his Budget Speech and again I quote him:

. . . the farmers, the old-age pensioners, and the men and women in the lower-wage brackets.

This relief should go directly to them at this moment of economic hardship in the form of a rate reduction and not to prevent — and I want him to listen to this — or head off an increase in the private corporation tax because that is what is happening with the \$10 million. To the man who owns a 1963 automobile, who is paying 30 per cent more for something that has dropped 80 per

cent in value, who can see no sympathy, no relief in the Budge — Liberal times are hard times.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. WHELAN: — To the pensioner, the men and women in the lower-wage brackets, to the farmer, who can't pay his electric light bill, who put up the money to build a \$10 million surplus, who have helped build the Power. Corporation, to them, Liberal times are hard times.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. WHELAN: — Our commitment, Mr. Speaker, to the owners of the Saskatchewan Power Corporation, to the people who use its facilities, to the people of Saskatchewan, is that there will be a reduction of rates when there is a surplus and the Saskatchewan Power Corporation will not be used, particularly in times of stress, as a taxing vehicle.

Mr. Speaker, the cost of health services produces constant and continuous tirades from the Premier and the Provincial Treasurer. "Hold the line," they say. "Man the barricades, stop the hospital workers," and yet in this Budget, there is \$1 million for the medical profession, an average of a payment of around \$1,200 a piece. What a strange way to reason, Mr. Speaker! But I think it is typical. Its reasoning can be displayed in so many ways and is so obvious.

Let's look at the cost of the use of the ambulance plane. When you need the services of the ambulance plane — and no one sends for it unless there is someone in the family who needs medical care, needs attention immediately — the cost for the patient to go to hospital, the basic charge is \$75. There is an additional charge for a relative accompanying the patient of \$15 — that is \$90. The charge for a return trip from the hospital is 85 cents per mile for the patient, 15 cents per mile for the relative — \$1.00 per mile. The ambulance plane charge to the farmer who hasn't been able to sell his grain and who can't pay his electric bill is rough — it is \$1.00 per mile. To someone who is ill, paying these ambulance charges, Liberal times are hard times.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. WHELAN: — But, Mr. Speaker, if you are a Cabinet Minister and if you travel with a Cabinet Minister, and you are flying high in the clouds, you are not sick, there is no emergency, you just charge it to your Department, it is as simple as that. You might even go to tea parties and certainly you can float into Foam Lake for a political meeting. And that rate, Mr. Speaker, is 30 cents per mile, paid by the Department. To the Cabinet Minister and to his friends who fly with him, because the rate is the same regardless of the number who fly, to all these people, flying high on a cloud, in perfect health, they fly at a good rate — 30 cents per mile. To these people, Liberal times are good times.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

March 9, 1970

MR. WHELAN: — To the patient and his wife returning home from hospital it is \$1.00 per mile — 70 cents more — 3 1/3 times higher, for these sick people, for these people who are ill, Liberal times are hard times.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. WHELAN: — Mr. Speaker, the Attorney General's Department is a department that constantly deals with people, people who have problems, who are in trouble. I had the good fortune to work in the Attorney General's branch some years ago with one of the present Attorney General's predecessors. His instructions were: anyone who comes to you is in trouble, will be in trouble and under no circumstances should you delay replying to any of his correspondence. And if he comes to the office, see him immediately. If they write you about anything, they are looking for help, they need assistance, answer them, and if you can't answer them immediately, acknowledge their letter.

Mr. Speaker, correspondence from Moose Jaw was produced last session that had gone unanswered a long period of time, unanswered and ignored. The Attorney General (Mr. Heald) had been written by the Mayor of Moose Jaw. The last letter was written October 28, 1968, and there was no reply when the session was held last year. The Mayor of Moose Jaw represents thousands of people.

Mr. Speaker, on December 18, 1969, a person who was very troubled because of a personal problem came to me with a clipping dated December 13, 1969, and he requested information from the Attorney General's Department about legislation that had been passed in the Province of British Columbia. I am not sure whether the Attorney General received the letter I wrote; it was never acknowledged and the letter was never answered. And it was never returned. I wrote on December 18, that is 2 1/2 months ago and I have had no reply nor any acknowledgment. The man phones me constantly asking me for information. I say to the Attorney General, 'Please reply,' please, so that I can tell the fellow we have an Attorney General, that we have an Attorney General who has reviewed the British Columbia legislation and is now prepared to advise this taxpayer, this constituent.

In the most grandiose terms, with flowing adjectives, the Attorney General introduced in this House legislation for the Orderly Payments of Debts under The Bankruptcy Act. We all remember this. Mr. Speaker, since this House opened I have asked for the number of settlements that have been made, a question that is relatively easy and should be answered immediately. There has been a Standing Order for Return — I have not received a copy of the Return. I am not sure how many of these debt problems have been settled under 'this legislation. But, Mr. Speaker, each person seeking relief from debts that I have sent to the Department has received information from dedicated civil servants, good people who have worked in the Department for along time, that indicates that this is a very involved procedure with 20 some forms to complete. The result has been that these people have not proceeded any further. In my estimation, when the Attorney General answers the question I have put on the Order paper, listing the number of cases, the answer will be less than 20.

The Attorney General puts out a booklet on his legislation. I remember before the last election I had the pleasure of reading his little blue book that floated around his constituency. It was good back-slapping propaganda, quite congratulatory to the Attorney General. I suggest that he write one on the Orderly Payment of Debts legislation, reducing the number of forms from 27 or 28 to maybe 2 or 3. This legislation is unmanageable and impractical because of its cumbersome and involved process. Thus, very few people have used it, even lawyers. I have on occasion sent debtors to see lawyers, even they have thrown up their hands. "Phooey," they say, "I will talk to the creditor myself; this is a lot of bureaucratic nonsense." If we are going to have the orderly payment of debts, the first thing those in debt trouble want is something simple and easy to understand. The Orderly Payment of Debts legislation qualifies on neither score; it is neither simple nor easy to understand. I recommend that it either be thrown in the garbage can or rewritten so that the average citizen can use it and understand it, Mr. Speaker.

Last Friday, Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Member for Regina South West (Mr. McPherson) spoke about the grants paid to the city of Regina since the Liberals have been in power. The figures were so persuasive and he spoke with such confidence and with such authority that I rushed home to see if I had been paying someone else's taxes instead of my own. Mr. Speaker, I don't know where the Member's figures came from and I don't know what good it is to unravel a great quantity of them. Frankly, I cannot see how he expects the \$60 homeowner grant to make an impression on the mill rate increase in this city. The taxes on my home which is an ordinary bungalow in 1964 were \$312.29 and the taxes in 1969 were \$453.44. A similar situation applies on every piece of property in the city of Regina. These are the figures in the face of the mill rate and the commitment the Liberals made to the voters of this city when they were elected. Figures like these when the mill rate continues to rise will only anger the voters and only convince them that talk is cheap. What they want to see is a reduction in the mill rate. In 1964 this party opposite led by the Hon. Member for Regina South (Mr. Grant) — and I am pleased to see that he is in his seat — made a specific set of pledges, which if they had been kept would have reduced the mill rate or kept it at a par. Its failure to keep the commitment it made when it was elected is the cause of the rise in Regina's mill rate. Allow me to quote from their own pamphlet:

Vote a principle as well as a promise. The Regina candidates are dedicated to the principle that the people of Regina deserve better than a doubtful future. Your Liberal candidates in. Regina promise . . .

and under the sub-headings:

Reduce Regina Mill Rate

(a) by providing from Provincial funds 50 per cent of all education costs.

The Hon. Member for Regina South West can quote figures if he likes; he can ignore the fact that Regina has been growing by leaps and bounds; he can ignore the need for new schools, new facilities, more teachers, but he cannot deny that this promise has been ignored and its share of payment of education costs is about 30 per cent and not 50 per cent. Even with increased grants — and I haven't seen the evidence yet — it would fall short of its commitment under the heading "A principle as well

as a promise.” Then there was part (b) of this pamphlet. This one, Mr. Speaker, is even more fantastic in view of the evidence. Regina people had been pressing for a greater share of the gasoline tax; through their City Council so they wrote in their platform:

(b) provide an equitable share of gasoline tax; revenues for Regina road construction and maintenance.

For the calendar year 1968, what was our share? We got \$535,000 under the Urban Assistance policy. Don’t forget that Regina had to put up 50 per cent of the cost of the roads and we had to light the streets as well. There are approximately 140,000 people in Regina. On a per capita basis they will pay in the next fiscal year \$52 each approximately for gasoline tax. Last year, in answer to a question which I placed on the Order Paper the other day, we learned that this Government spent for Urban Assistance and Maintenance — they were really generous — \$378,000 in the city of Regina — less than \$2.75 per capita. Last year was closer to \$5.00. This is the way the Liberals keep a principle as well as a promise. This is the way they reduce Regina’s mill rate. This is the way they keep a commitment to provide an equitable share of the gasoline tax levy. Every man, woman and child in the city of Regina will pay \$52 in gasoline tax in 1970-71. If this Government operates in the same munificent and generous way to which we are accustomed, Mr. Speaker, they will get \$52, and its version of an equitable share of the gasoline tax for the city of Regina will be \$2.75.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. WHELAN: — You made the promise, you got elected on this. You fellows, listen. This is what I am telling you. You got elected because you were going to improve this situation.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. WHELAN: — The Hon. Member knows all that they gave them was the pamphlet — I am reading it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. WHELAN: — It will keep \$49.25 of the per capita contribution of the gasoline tax levy paid by Regina residents. It will take \$52 and it will give us back \$2.75. This is its version of an equitable share — I am quoting your own words, your own words . . .

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. WHELAN: — It will keep \$49.25 and this is its way of dispensing a principle as well as a promise. These are Liberal principles, this is the way they keep their promise to Regina residents regarding the gasoline tax. There was also going to be “Action on these city problems.” That is another of their sub-headings. They were going to:

(a) proceed immediately to correct the critical hospital bed shortage by the erection of a general hospital free of political interference.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. WHELAN: — There must be a lot of political interference. There is something wrong here. Mr. Speaker, the late John F. Kennedy in 1962 announced that American technology would put a man on the moon by 1970; it had never been done before. They went to work on it and they put a man on the moon in July 1969. These people opposite have been working on the erection of a base hospital for this city for about the same length of time. It hasn't moved a spadeful of earth, and every time the Hon. Minister of Public Health (Mr. Grant) has stood up since 1964, I have fully expected him to announce the construction of the base hospital all over again.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. WHELAN: — It is now like the heavy water plant. It is a standing joke, but the people who are sick in our city, who are in desperate need of medical care, the 1,600 on the waiting list at the General Hospital and the 1,000 on the waiting list at the Grey Nuns' will tell you, Mr. Minister, that it is a lot easier to go to the moon and you will get there a lot sooner than you will get a bed in a base hospital built by the Liberals. That's what they will tell you.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. WHELAN: — On top of everything else it has aggravated the situation by closing a number of small hospitals in Southern Saskatchewan. Let me put these on the record. These hospitals were all, closed during 1969: Qu'Appelle Memorial Hospital, March 1, 1969; Willowbunch Union Hospital, June 1, 1969; Frontier Union Hospital, July 1, 1969; Hodgeville Union Hospital, July 1, 1969; Leroy Union Hospital, July 1, 1969; Neudorf Union Hospital, July 1, 1969; Maryfield Memorial Union Hospital, August 1, 1969; Sutton Lake-Johnston Union Hospital, Mossbank, November 1, 1969. When I asked the Minister, and I asked an oral question in the House, what he was doing about the hospital situation and shortage of beds, he said, "We are building the base hospital."

Regina is in desperate need of geriatric beds. People are not in our hospitals but people who need level 4 care are in our nursing homes. One nursing home in our city has some 40 of these people. The nursing home gets no consideration, the rates for looking after them are paid at level 3, but there they are. The hardship engendered as a result of the Liberal failure to keep part (b) under the heading, "Action on these city problems":

(b) immediate provision for a 600-bed geriatric centre.

The hardship cannot be estimated. But it must be measured in mental anguish, pain and heartache, for those who are ill and for their relatives.

Mr. Speaker, the Budget talks about grants for Regina City: 50 cents for police protection; 50 cents for snow removal; 35 cents for assessment; 10 cents for the library; 10 cents for health services. Mr. Speaker, this generosity shakes me. I am overcome by the magnificent sum of \$1.55 . . .

MR. D.M. McPHERSON: (Regina South West) — . . . \$1.55, Ed.

March 9, 1970

MR. WHELAN: — Thank you. I now thank the Hon. Member for Regina South West (Mr. McPherson). He knows what it is. I am amazed that he'd even mention it, when you consider that in the gasoline tax it picked up \$52 per capita from the citizens from Regina to say nothing of the education tax we pay, not only on our, electric light bills, not only on our telephone bills, but on the surcharge that is the payment for the old power plant. And it gives us \$1.55. Mr. Speaker, I wish to thank the Hon. Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Steuart) for his generosity.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. WHELAN: — He has established a principle, finally, of paying police protection grants and snow removal grants in the urban areas, and a sum of money for assessment, but we will trade him on a per capita basis, his entire per capita increase of all grants, if he will give us — and I suggest to the Hon. Member for Regina South West taking me up on this proposition — the same amount per capita as his health grant for the city of Prince Albert. It would be a better deal. Allow me to point out, Mr. Speaker, if he will leave our health grant the way it is, and the library grant the way it is and pay us a per capita amount at the same rate that the payment for health services to Prince Albert is paid — and health grants paid to Prince Albert are around \$2.56 per capita — we would be better off. For the people of Regina who look to them for grants, Liberal times are hard times. With the gasoline tax as high as it is, with the addition of the tax on electricity and on telephones, the New Democratic party without hesitation will make a total payment in grants of \$10 per capita to the city of Regina.

One of the commitments, Mr. Speaker, made by the Liberals was to:

- (a) revitalize industrial development programs to create new opportunities and jobs designed to aid and keep our population gainfully employed;
- (b) absorb our most costly export, namely, educated youth, and retain for the benefit of Regina our most valuable asset.

Isn't that a beautiful piece of quoting, beautiful propaganda?

Mr. Speaker, they failed here beyond belief. Each day since Child and Gower closed down, I walk past their sign — they had been in business 64 years — it is difficult to believe that the Liberals made a promise to “keep our population gainfully employed.” When Regina Sash and Door closed after operating since 1912, it was difficult to believe that they had made a commitment to “keep our population gainfully employed.” When one large machine dealer after another laid off its entire complement of people, and the dealerships went into receivership, I could hardly believe that they could sit idly by and maintain a “principle as well as a promise,” that they would “keep our population gainfully employed.”

Saturday last, a constituent of mine who has worked in this city regularly since 1935 and had never been out of work, told me that his firm had gone into receivership and with it has gone a fund that had been set up for him as a participant in the

earnings, that he was penniless. He had a company car and it was gone. He was going to hitchhike to Winnipeg or Calgary to look for work. He was in a state of shock, Mr. Speaker. I should have read him the Liberal promises, they had said they would “keep our population gainfully employed.”

In Regina 129 businesses, 128 maybe or more since I got the last figures, have ceased operation in the last short while. To this man, the word “Liberal” is the bitterest word in the English vocabulary. This man is not gainfully employed and they promised to keep him gainfully employed. He is only one in the part of the city that I represent, consisting of homes of people, of people that have gone, suites that are left vacant, people who have fled not only because they have no jobs, but they have no confidence in the future. With bitterness they echo, “Liberal times are hard times.” No one knows better than they the accuracy of this statement. The Liberals were going to:

Absorb our most costly export, namely, educated youth, and retain for the benefit of Regina our most valuable asset.

A survey among high school students in my riding showed that they cannot continue their education because there is no technical institute and they cannot pay university tuition fees. Even the untrained are not being absorbed, because they are going elsewhere to get their education. If youth is our most valuable asset, there is limited evidence they are interested in educating youth or upgrading those whose employment has changed.

There is no imagination, no initiative, no courage in the Budget, or any policies to suggest that it will retain for Regina our most valuable asset. Mr. Speaker, these young people are turned away for life when the Government refuses to build housing on the campus, when the construction industry is in a shambles and when housing is needed. They are turned away when there is need for a community college and a technical institute, and they are turned away when they see industry after industry close its doors, whether it is Chrysler, Regina Sash and Door, or Child and Gower. It spells disenchantment and despair for these young people. To them I say, Liberal times are hard times.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. WHELAN: — If we are elected, Mr. Speaker, we will instigate construction of homes, construction of buildings for Regina Campus housing, construction of community colleges and a technical institute. We will offer them opportunities for education. There is no principle in a party that fails to keep a promise. You made these promises and you didn’t keep a principle as well as a promise. Mr. Speaker, where is the principle? What happened to the promise? This is the question the people of Regina will answer, I suggest, when an election is held.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. WHELAN: — So many industries closed and so few have opened that I think almost every Member on that side of the House has talked about the new scrap metal plant at IPSCO. I think it is a good idea, but I think they could start a great industry, a roaring industry, if they could use the scrapped promises and the scrapped business plans and the scrapped careers of the young people,

March 9, 1970

the scrapped employed older workers, for in this area they are experts in developing scrap programs.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. WHELAN: — It talks about a scrap metal plant that has been established. The people of this city talk about the plans for homes they have scrapped, the plans for education that have been scrapped, the plans for industry that have been scrapped, and the plans that they have for scrapping this Government when an election is held.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. WHELAN: — The Budget is contradictory, self-contradictory. It won't hurt the old age pensioner and the men and women in the lower-wage bracket. I have proven, Mr. Speaker, I contend that it does hurt the old age pensioner and that it has failed to find employment for men and women in the lower wage bracket. It blames the slow-down on our economy, and I am quoting them in the Budget Speech, on 'national and international forces'. Even if that was so, it has been accelerated by its failure to accept any responsibility and initiate any action, until now, and it is too late, Mr. Speaker. I will support the amendment and I am opposed to the main motion.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. J.J. CHARLEBOIS: (Saskatoon City Park-University) — Mr. Speaker, I suppose I should apologize. The Hon. Member who has just taken his place complained of the fact that we had only nine sitting on this side listening to him. I promptly went out and rustled it up to 21, but with that long harangue of his, he put them all back to sleep in the lounge, I guess. They are going to miss a great speech right now.

I for one wish that our Hon. Provincial Treasurer was here, because I do want to congratulate him for the Budget that he brought down at this Session. This certainly is a good Budget. It brings assistance to many parts of our economy, to the farmers, to the construction industry, to municipalities. It is definitely a very good Budget, and I think to finance a deficit Budget at this time says something for this Government. It is worthy of note . . .

AN HON. MEMBER: — Hear, hear!

MR. CHARLEBOIS: — Thanks very much. I think it is very worthy of note that this fellow is at least one who understands what I am talking about.

I think too it is worthy of note that our present Government has continually budgeted sensibly. I think that for this reason we shouldn't overlook some of the continuing activities that have been instigated in our province because of the good sensible budgeting of this Government. In this vein, I would like to speak today about the many benefits that are coming to the people of Saskatchewan as a result of the money we are spending in the northern part of our province. I think this is a

thing that we could very easily overlook because it is not mentioned too much in this present Budget. In doing so I would like to commend our Government for having foresight in its programs and for the very practical and orderly manner in which its programs have been introduced and carried out. I am sure that in our north country we have also a very clear picture of the difference between a Liberal Government which believes in private enterprise and the initiative of the individual and a Socialist Government which is a declared enemy of private enterprise and the initiative of people and still believes that only the state should handle the resources of our country. No matter how the NDP try to disguise their philosophy, it still boils down to this: destruction of the ambitions of the individual for the sake of the state. What is happening in our north country is certainly an example of what happens when these two philosophies are placed side by side.

What happened in this part of our province under the Socialists is a very well known chapter in our history. A lot of talk but no action. This talk in essence said, "This is a vast country that looks like it is very rich and if you just wait some day we will create a new department with full authority to spend your money. We'll see if we can hire a bureaucracy that we hope will be knowledgeable. Then we'll see if we can find something up there for you. If we do we can bet your life we'll build up a bureaucracy like you've never seen before because this is what makes Socialism look efficient."

Well, we all know what happened in our north country during the term of the Socialists. It was nothing, absolutely nothing! Here was almost 40 million acres of land lying dormant and not one thing was being done about its potential. So then let us take a look at what is happening in this part of our country under our present Government. This Government . . .

MR. R. ROMANOW: (Saskatoon-Riversdale) — Zero!

MR. CHARLEBOIS: — You have got a lot of sense to say, zero! That looks like the hole that goes right through the middle of your head! Imagine a man standing here, Mr. Speaker, to try and tell me that we are doing zero up there. Why don't you wake up and see what's going on. Just take a look at what is happening in this part. This Government, realizing the tremendous potential of the North, went to work to figure out a practical way to have this part of our province properly explored and developed.

AN HON. MEMBER: — Can't hear you!

MR. CHARLEBOIS: — Turn up your hearing aid! Would you get the runner to go over there and give that man a hearing aid, please.

Now first of all, the mining people on this continent were suddenly aware that there was an obvious potential, but there was no activity taking place. This was caused particularly because Socialism scares the living daylights out of the mining industry. Now with a Liberal Government they were aware of a new attitude toward resource investment and they showed their interest when the Anglo-Rouyn mine was established in the La Ronge area. These people knew what was there but they simply refused to take any chance under the Socialists. No sooner were the Socialists out than they came into our province and

March 9, 1970

established their mine. For the information of the Member for The Battlefords (Mr. Kramer) who doesn't happen to be in his seat, but if you others would be kind enough . . . oh, there you are, this mine that you say is a peanut mine and doesn't even give peanuts, this gentleman, Mr. Speaker, claimed in another debate that the Anglo-Rouyn mine was not paying royalties. For the benefit of this Member I would like to say that the Anglo-Rouyn mine has been paying royalties for the past year, and it is not exactly peanuts when you start running into \$100,000.

But this mine was not enough, so our Government devised a plan that would attract other mining companies. This plan has clearly demonstrated what can happen when a government recognizes the initiative of free enterprise and shows that it is interested in private capital investment, something that you fellows sure as heck don't understand. Our Government offered to go fifty-fifty on exploration costs with those who would come in and explore and only if the prospecting firm turned up a marketable discovery would the Government investment have to be repaid.

The result of this incentive program is right before us now. It is a clear picture of the difference between how Socialism works and how private enterprise works. Instead of a dormant area of the \$5.5 million invested by our Government, more than \$2.5 million has already been returned in rentals and fees and up to now more than \$20 million in activity has been generated.

At this time last year more than 30 million acres were taken up in permits with more than \$60 million committed to exploration by 122 companies and individuals. I think this is truly an outstanding vote of confidence in the philosophy of this Government and its attitude toward private enterprise and those who have capital to invest. This incentive plan was successful to such a degree that one year ago it was no longer necessary for the Government to commit itself any longer and this participation was discontinued. The initial thought would naturally be that this might have some derogatory effect on the enthusiasm of the exploring companies, but the reverse is true. Where a year ago it appeared that every possible area was taken up in permits, additional acreages have this year been taken up on the edge of the Pre-Cambrian Shield and not just by one company. In early December of 1969, the Department of Mineral Resources announced that a further 1,143,680 acres had been taken up in six Pre-Cambrian mineral permits by four applicants. Two of these permits were on the Pre-Cambrian Shield, one on the Churchill River near the Manitoba border, the other just east of the junction of the Mudjatik and Churchill Rivers about 100 miles northwest of Lac La Ronge. The other four are unusually interesting. Two are just east of Molonosa which is the geographical centre of Saskatchewan. This is about 30 miles south of the edge of the Pre-Cambrian Shield. The two remaining are between Flotten Lake and Dore Lake which is considerably south of the Shield.

These permits indicate very clearly the excitement and the anticipation that are involved. The leasing companies are substantial ones and these permits are not taken out for the sake of adventure. They involve the geological estimates of the best brains in the business. For example, in the Molonosa area we have the Anglo-American Exploration Company of Canada, a very substantial conglomerate of international mining interests, including one very large Canadian firm. We can look with confidence I am sure to some thrilling news from this rather

unexpected area. Already of course we have had a clear indication of satisfaction on the part of the mining companies, not only in their findings, but also in the very practical assistance being given to them particularly by our Department of Mineral Resources and our Department of Natural Resources.

Under the Department of Natural Resources our Government has established a Northern Development Committee which has been delegated to set up effective programs to meet the various needs in Northern Saskatchewan, which are bound to come along as progression takes place. The exploring companies have expressed appreciation for the Government's systematic release under its Data Advice program, under which the correlations are good and the data reliable. Very important to the industry is the expanding platform of useful information with such things as the joint venture drilling at Rumpel Lake with its resulting geological data. An extensive mapping and research program is being carried out in the Pre-Cambrian area by no less than five geological survey parties. Many similar measures are resulting in a generally valuable knowledge pool policy by this Government. Besides this we have a taxation attitude that favors industry. We have a flexible approach to special-circumstance problems and a record of prior discussion with industry regarding regulation changes. As a result of this, the mining industry has complete confidence that this Government will treat it fairly.

Now, with a proper atmosphere of this kind, what is happening on the discovery side? Certainly it is equally encouraging. The greatest publicity of course has been given to Gulf Mining company's uranium discovery at Wollaston. This is as it should be because this is perhaps the most important discovery of its kind in the world so far. This should not overshadow too completely some of the other findings that are taking place and the significance of the variety of hopes in explorations. Besides the search for uranium we have clear indications of possible helium discoveries in the Athabasca Sandstone area. In the hard minerals we have already signs of exciting discoveries such as that of the National Nickel Company where they have encountered deposits of high grade nickel ore in three of their test holes. Some of the test bodies show as high as 3 1/2 per cent nickel.

Just think of the economic activity that is being generated in our province by these exploring companies. Take the example of Eldorado. During this great surge of exploration they have spent approximately \$500,000 and I might say that as far as exploration was concerned under the NDP Government they were expending exactly nothing. As a result, they are now going into production at a new mine, which is about seven miles from their present site. With this new mine in operation they can see eight to ten years ahead at 250 tons per day. Their operation is valued at \$46 million. This discovery means that 25-50 employees will be added to their payroll. This one operation means employment for 600 people. Now many of the other companies exploring . . .

MR. A.E. BLAKENEY: (Regina Centre) — There is nothing like a good Socialist Crown corporation!

MR. CHARLEBOIS: — You repeat that!

MR. BLAKENEY: — I say, there is nothing like a good Socialist Crown corporation!

March 9, 1970

MR. CHARLEBOIS: — That was never set up by the Socialists; it was set up by Ottawa.

MR. BLAKENEY: — Ottawa!

MR. CHARLEBOIS: — When you say it is a Socialist corporation, you're nuts! It is not a Socialist corporation, and you know it. Ottawa was never Socialist and it never will be! You fellows would like to take credit for that mine. It never had anything to do with you people. You got in on the gravy train, that's the only thing that held you through for the couple of years you were in office.

Many of the other companies, Mr. Speaker, have equal potential. They are well financed and they are working three to five-year programs. A look at the roster is very convincing indeed and represents world-wide interest, and investment. The French Mokta Company of Canada, the United States-based Western Nuclear mines, Numac and Imperial Oil, Copper Range Exploration Company of New York, Tobe Mines with Japanese capital, Anglo-American Corporation of Canada Exploration Limited with South African capital. Any one of these companies has the same potential in our province as Eldorado. Companies like these do not spend this kind of money that is involved unless they hope to find something.

I think it is important to look at what is happening economically and to consider what all this means to our future. Since the introduction of our incentive program with La Ronge recognized and used as a take-off point and supply centre, a indication of the impact I think is the commercial flying companies that are based there. At least three of them have added substantially to their fleets and have added larger types of aircraft that would never be possible without the activity on the Pre-Cambrian Shield. This type of development is helping to change the pattern of transportation service away from Waterways in Alberta and Flin Flon in Manitoba. This is important during the exploration stage to have these aircraft to give the kind of service that is required when time can be such a critical factor. Now we must prepare for the mines that are very clearly on our horizon. Obviously a great chain of activity is being set off. At La Ronge again we have an urgent need for major improvements to the airfield. At Wollaston they are already handling the huge Hercules aircraft to fly in equipment and supplies and a permanent strip to handle this type of aircraft is being completed there. It is now a reasonable assumption that the permanent highway north will be built. This year-round road will eventually find its way to Uranium City, but for the present we have built a winter road to Wollaston. This has meant an expenditure of something in excess of \$200,000. I suggest that we look at the impact of this spending. It means that freight can be brought by way of Saskatoon and Prince Albert and delivered to the mining area as cheaply as through Manitoba. It will result in a major reduction in costs for the mining companies. The future of course will require a much more substantial year-round highway, but we are doing now what is completely practical at this stage of our development in this area.

Industrial chemicals produced in Saskatoon will be assured of a market. Trucking will benefit in the hauling of a

tremendous variety of produce and equipment. One mine can use as much as one million dollars worth of caustic and sulphuric acid. In trucking alone, this means 650 trips with its involvement of employment and transportation and equipment. One wholesale house in Prince Albert estimates conservatively that this road will double its business into the area that this road will serve. Others indicate the same, mine supply houses, automotive suppliers, electrical firms, foundries, food supply houses, all of these will benefit.

Besides these benefits we must also consider the tremendous increase in the demand for natural gas and electricity in the chemical plants and the other industrial plants involved in this activity. These economic benefits will be felt throughout our province. Think what one mine means by way of construction alone, the housing that is required to complement the mine. Quite feasibly we can expect discoveries to be made on the west side of the Shield and this will require the road through Meadow Lake and our story will be repeated.

Mr. Speaker, the mining exploration incentive program of this Government must be recognized as some of the best money ever spent for economic development in our province. The eventual spending that will take place in the development of our north country defies the imagination. Certainly this province could not begin to do it on its own and this is why we sincerely invite capital including foreign capital to come in and help us to do this tremendous job that lies immediately ahead. And this too is one more reason why we have before us the most thrilling economic future of any province in our great Dominion.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. CHARLEBOIS: — Mr. Speaker, I will be supporting the motion.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

HON. A.C. CAMERON: (Minister of Mineral Resources) — In this particular Session we have completed the Throne Speech, we are now well on in the debates in the Budget Debate and I think it gives us an opportunity to pause a moment and to assess the tone, shall we say, of the Debate of the Legislature and to assess the position both of the Government and of the Opposition in regard to matters that are of vital concern today.

I have sat here during this time listening to the speeches of the Opposition. Mr. Speaker, those speeches are more noted for what they omitted to talk about than what they talked about. There are matters of public concern being discussed in Saskatchewan today, in fact being discussed on every public platform in which the NDP in this House are remaining strangely silent. We have in this Chamber today not only the Leader of the Provincial Party of the NDP (Mr. Lloyd), we have sitting beside him the National President of the NDP (Mr. Blakeney), and we have a chap who visits this Chamber very regularly and lives in the city of Regina, the Treasurer of the National Party of the NDP. Surely one might expect with these pillars of the NDP in this Legislature and in our midst we would be told something of the NDP position on issues of key importance both provincially and nationally.

March 9, 1970

Oh, their members both here and in Ottawa are busy. They are so busy supporting great causes. I notice in the House. of Commons in the Press the other day that the NDP Members had a sit-in in Parliament, a sit-in in protest and what are they protesting? They refuse to rise to hear a message from the Governor General.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. CAMERON: — They oppose the carryover from the days of the kingship. All of the problems of Western Canada our Western MPs might battle over, we find Mr. Benjamin, Mr. Skoberg, Mr. Burton, devoting their time to a sit-in in Parliament.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. CAMERON: — Oh, and we find another Saskatchewan NDP, you know the youngest Member elected to Parliament. He's going out too chasing issues that he can get his teeth into. And he's busy. I read in the Press the other day with considerable interest this young man from Saskatchewan is in the front line of attack. We find him on the picket line. And what is he picketing? He is protesting a grave injustice. He is picketing above all things the annual ball of the Press Club in Ottawa.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. CAMERON: — And he says he. is picketing the annual ball because the Press men in Ottawa do not admit women.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. CAMERON: — Well, what did he think they were doing behind those doors — dancing with one another?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. CAMERON: — There are issues, however, in which the NDP stand four square. Oh, yes, they are all in favor of boycotting California grapes, but they are strangely silent on national guide lines to control inflation. They are very vocal about the need to control the prices and profits but again they are strangely quiet about restricting wage demands.

The Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Lloyd), you know, led a contingent. of MPs and MLAs to Winnipeg. They were to meet in conference to redefine the aims and aspirations of the NDP. They were to streamline the policy so that it would be in keeping with the new society. These aims were put forth, Mr. Speaker, in a very interesting document. The Watkins Manifesto. I was interested in watching TV last night where an NDP MLA from Ontario, in a public forum, reiterated his stand in. favor of the Watkins Manifesto and he said:

Capitalism is to be replaced by Socialism. The nationalization of all means of production is what was called for, which incidentally includes the nationalization of farm lands.

This we are told by the newspaper reports received strong endorsement by the Saskatchewan Leader of the NDP.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. CAMERON: — Yes, received strong endorsement. Capitalism to be replaced by Socialism, nationalization of all the means of production including farm lands. This was endorsed by the NDP Leader of Saskatchewan.

The Press reports, Mr. Speaker, it is very interesting to note, did not reveal the position of the National President of the NDP.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. CAMERON: — The people of Saskatchewan have the right to know where the National President, of the NDP stands on this issue. Where does he stand on the Watkins report? Where does he stand?

MR. A.E. BLAKENEY: (Regina Centre) — Mr. Speaker, would the Hon. Member permit a question.

MR. CAMERON: — The people of Saskatchewan have the right to know. I'll answer your question when I feel like it.

MR. BLAKENEY: — No, I am asking whether you will permit a question.

MR. CAMERON: — I'll give you the floor. I'll give you a chance when I sit down.

AN HON. MEMBER: — Henry, I think you'll be the new leader.

MR. CAMERON: — And I hope you'll rise to the occasion and tell us where you stand.

AN HON. MEMBER: — Henry for leader!

MR. CAMERON: — Now then, we have here the National President of the NDP and I read in the paper the other day where he is a prospective leader of the National NDP.

AN HON. MEMBER: — Oh, he said he wouldn't be!

MR. CAMERON: — Surely the people of Saskatchewan have a right to know where he stands on the issue of nationalization of all means of production.

AN HON. MEMBER: — Yeah, tricky, tricky, little Al!

MR. CAMERON: — We know where the Provincial Leader stands, Where does the National President stand? Let him declare his allegiance. Is it to his provincial Leader and to the Watkins Manifesto?

March 9, 1970

AN HON. MEMBER: — Oh, yes!

MR. CAMERON: — Let him stand up and: declare where his allegiance on this lies.

AN HON. MEMBER: — Stand up! Now he wants you to go up on a pedestal!

MR. CAMERON: — Oh, the speeches of the Opposition have been strangely silent on matters of great national concern. Did you notice, Mr. Speaker, and I found this most interesting — all during the Debate not a whisper, not a whisper on the White Paper . . .

SOME HON., MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. CAMERON: — . . . Not a whisper by the best of supporters. Not a whisper. Why are they so strangely silent on the White Paper? An issue of public debate in every form from coast to coast in this country. Yet the NDP remains ominously silent. Surely Saskatchewan people have the right to know where the NDP stands on this national issue. Where does the National President stand? Why doesn't he speak up on these issues?

I say to you and to the people of Saskatchewan, Mr. Speaker, that to waffle or to remain silent is not good enough. The people of Saskatchewan today want to know where the Leader of the NDP of this Province and the National President of the NDP in Canada stand on these issues.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. CAMERON: — Former statements of the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Lloyd) showed where he stood on the Carter Commission Report. He' stood four square behind it. The people of Saskatchewan today are entitled to know where he stands then on the recommendation of the White Paper which incorporates most of the Carter Commission.

You know, Mr. Speaker, we can perhaps excuse the junior Members, the junior benchers when they waffle, but we can't excuse the Leader of the Opposition and the National President of the NDP (Mr. Blakeney).

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

AN HON. MEMBER: — I think you've got it made, Henry!

MR. CAMERON: — You know we hear a great deal of criticism in this House, criticism of business on the Prairies being controlled by head offices in the East. Now it is evidently clear that the decisions of the NDP party in Saskatchewan are made in Toronto and in Eastern Canada.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. CAMERON: — You know, I'm sorry he isn't in his seat. I really look forward with interest to the contribution that the new

agricultural critic may make to this Legislature. I was prepared to overlook the fact that he has changed his position on the matter of cash injections into the farm economy upon promotion to the Front Bench, but I could realize that this was probably the price he had to pay to move to the Front Bench. I too could commend the agricultural critic for his eagerness in the House to speak on farm issues. I thought that was commendable. Why, upon the announcement of Ottawa's plan for wheat acreage reduction, this young chap was quick to rise in the House and announce his support of the program.

MR. W.R. THATCHER: (Premier) — That was our idea . . .

MR. CAMERON: — Yes. The second day I noticed him rise again. He announced the second day that he on thinking it over had reservations. You know, Mr. Speaker, there had been time for that message to come through from Ottawa.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. CAMERON: — It wasn't long for that message to come and that message was loud and clear. You know that I read in the Press coming back from Maple Creek Saturday about the agricultural critic's contribution to the Debate on Friday. Again I watched this young, new bencher perform and, according to the Press reports, the agricultural critic rose again on Friday and he reversed himself again. He launched a vigorous attack against the whole affair of this injection into the farm economy and declared its reduction of the farm acreage a waste.

Now he waffled on that. I ask them, Mr. Speaker, where do they stand on anything?

MR. W.S. LLOYD: (Leader of the Opposition) — Where do you stand?

MR. CAMERON: — Why are they compelled to ride the fence and say nothing on anything of key importance?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. CAMERON: — You know, Mr. Speaker, I think it is evident too in this House, and I think it is evidenced by the speeches delivered here, that the Leader of the Opposition is no longer at the head of the flock leading them into the wind. No. The V-shape has divided and the flock has scattered and this is why we are finding this babble of voices, this waffling on the issues, this inability to stand up and be counted on any of the major issues that the people of Saskatchewan are concerned about.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. CAMERON: — It is evident to me that the opposition are torn asunder with internal dissension.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. CAMERON: — It is bereft of any fresh ideas. And this is why,

March 9, 1970

Mr. Speaker, they cannot come out on the side of any issue. I think you know, Mr. Speaker, the comment o. the new front bencher when he was moved to the Front Bench really, really summed it up better than I can do.

MR. D.G. STEUART: (Provincial Treasurer) — Here comes the old . . . himself.

MR. CAMERON: — He was heard to comment, “You know I am not afraid of what lies ahead, it’s what is behind me that I have to watch.”

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. CAMERON: — I thought this young front bencher really summed it up beautifully. Looking over the Chamber, “I am not afraid of my future that lies ahead but I have to watch what lies behind.”

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. CAMERON: — I notice one Member in debate complimenting the Member from Turtleford (Mr. Wooff) on the delivery of his speech. But I was interested not only in that but I was interested in his statement drawing attention to this Chamber and to Mr. Speaker that this would be the last Throne Speech that the Member was participating in. Mr. Speaker, if there was any indication of what they felt about this Session and this Budget they gave. it there. They . . .

MR. R.H. WOUFF: (Turtleford) — Mr. Speaker, on. a point of order.

MR. CAMERON: — . . . are sure there’s an election coming up this year.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. WOUFF: — Are we allowed to carry a debate into one that is already closed?

MR. SPEAKER: — No.

MR. WOUFF: — The remarks that the present Minister is making are from a debate that is already closed in this House.

MR. CAMERON: — I didn’t quote from any debates made in the previous session.

Mr. Speaker, I want to say to the financial critic (Mr. Blakeney) that I am going to reserve my criticism of him until I am on the air tomorrow, and I want to give him fair warning that I am going to ask him to be accountable for some of the statements which he made.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. CAMERON: — Mr. Speaker, there is one

other little thing that I found of interest in The Leader Post the other night. It was carried from the Toronto Star. You know it indicated that the National NDP party is in the same straits as the Provincial NDP party.

AN HON. MEMBER: — It waffles, it waffles!

MR. CAMERON: — Yes, and I want to quote one or two sentences.

The NDP (it says) is desperately short of credible candidates for leadership.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. CAMERON: —

The decision to hold a leadership convention has produced hardly a ripple of public interest.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. CAMERON: — It says further,

Elections within the NDP regard David Lewis' ascension to the leadership as dismally inevitable.

It says that the National President from Saskatchewan is a potential candidate, but the NDP will not have two leaders from Saskatchewan. So it summed up by saying this:

It is the case of the old guard handing over to the old guard.

In essence, Mr. Speaker, this great convention in Winnipeg or wherever it is being held in July, will be merely a changing of the guard. It had this further comment which I found interesting. It said:

The only thing that can stop David Lewis from the leadership of the NDP is that, if his son Stephen should capture the leadership of the NDP in Ontario it said they didn't think the NDP would be prepared to go with a King David and a Crown Prince Stephen.

I have one other thing, Mr. Speaker, that I want to deal with today and while it may not be strictly Budget it certainly has a bearing on this Budget and in many Budgets for many years to come in Saskatchewan. It pertains to my Department of Mineral Resources and the position which the Government proposes to take on the matter of off-shore minerals. We have heard a lot about off-shore minerals. We might question why a land-locked province like Saskatchewan would be interested in off-shore minerals. The Supreme Court has ruled that the off-shore minerals belong to all of Canada and not to the provinces bordering the coastal waters. We recognize that. But when the Prime Minister turned around and said to the provinces bordering the coastal waters, "We are prepared to relinquish the revenue from mineral resources up to approximately 1 1/2 miles off the shore line," we have no quarrel with that. But when he announced that, beyond the 1 1/2 miles, 50 per cent of the revenue which Ottawa would get from the development from these minerals will be refunded to the provinces bordering the coastal water, we have no quarrel with the coastal provinces receiving all

March 9, 1970

mineral revenues within the mile and one-half limit. Our Government takes a strong position that, if national revenues from beyond the mile and one-half line are shared with some provinces, it must be shared with all. We, in Saskatchewan, Mr. Speaker, have a very definite claim to a share of this national revenue because Saskatchewan has made an extremely heavy contribution to the growth of this nation.

Now I point out to the Members of this Chamber that, whenever the Federal Government asks the Province to donate land for an Indian reservation, it insists the mineral rights be transferred with the land. Since Saskatchewan has the largest proportion of the national Indian population of any other province, it has been called upon to provide more land for Indian reservations than any other province in Canada. Every time that Ottawa wants land for an Indian reservation, a penitentiary reserve, a national park or a weapons range, or a PFRA undertaking, it insists, not only upon the surface, but that we transfer the minerals as well. The National Government, today, controls four million acres of minerals in the Province of Saskatchewan.

None of the revenues from the development of minerals on that land comes to the Province; it goes to Ottawa. This is important enough, but, Mr. Speaker,, what is. more frightening and what has a more severe implication to the Province of Saskatchewan is the position of the two national railways. As an inducement to our two national railways to build their lines across the nation from east to west, Canada and the Ottawa Government at that time offered them huge tracts of land. In fact the CPR alone, under an Act of Parliament in 1881, was granted subsidies totalling \$25 million and 25 million acres of land, including the mineral rights to that land. The companies, under the agreements, were free to choose these tracts of land in any province. They chose in the main to obtain them in Saskatchewan. It is interesting to note, when we review this, that in return for building roadbeds in British Columbia, the CPR chose to take their tracts of land in Saskatchewan. History records that, in order to induce the Hudson Bay Company to give up its treaty secured from Britain to the trading rights of the Hudson Bay watershed, it too, was granted large tracts of mineral land within Saskatchewan. History likewise records that the CNR obtained tracts of land in Saskatchewan with the minerals in exchange for land it owned in Manitoba, land where the Federal Government wanted to establish the Riding Mountain Forest Reserve and the Duck Lake Forest Reserve in Manitoba. To obtain that land from the CNR it gave them land in Saskatchewan. All this happened of course before the natural resources were turned back to the provinces in 1930. You can see that every one of these companies had a hay day raiding Saskatchewan's mineral resources. Such a policy has caused the Province of Saskatchewan to give more than her proportionate share to the building of Canada. Let no one, Mr. Speaker, consider this as past history. The obligations imposed upon Saskatchewan by those treaties and agreements of almost a century ago are very much with us today and will continue to be with us far into the future.

These three companies, namely, the Canadian Pacific Railway, the Canadian National Railway and the Hudson Bay Company have derived millions of dollars from the sale of large tracts of land in Saskatchewan. In each of these sales they disposed of the surface but they retained the mineral rights. They have

thus been able to receive the greatest benefit from each of these titles, the titles to the surface and the titles to the minerals. These three companies today hold in Saskatchewan 8.3 million acres of our minerals. The checkerboard pattern of selection has given these companies mineral rights in the oil and gas-producing areas, in the potash-producing areas, in the coal and sodium sulphate-production areas. And of course we know that no royalty comes to the Crown when it is owned by these people. Each year in earnings from these millions of acres of Saskatchewan minerals from the production of coal and sodium sulphate and oil and potash, these three companies are siphoning out of Saskatchewan yearly approximately \$8 million. This tribute will grow as our resources are developed. Now, Mr. Speaker, I use the word 'tribute' advisedly, because 'tribute' I understand is defined as a 'tax paid by a vassal to his overlord'. In many respects that is the position that the Province is in, in regard to mineral resources.

Another interesting point is that these three major companies that are siphoning out this huge amount each year from Saskatchewan make no direct contribution to the Provincial coffers to support the economy of Saskatchewan. You will recall in this Chamber, when we became the Government, we moved to remove the mineral tax from farm lands of 3 cents per acre. Then we moved to increase it to 10 cents on the remaining companies. Then we moved in the potash area to put on a production tax in order that we would get some revenue from the production of potash produced from CPR and CNR and Hudson Bay land. We moved in that direction, but we found that they have contracts with the potash industry, that says that for any and all taxes levied by the Government of Saskatchewan against them, they shall be reimbursed from the potash industry. Therefore the production tax which we levied on these companies in order to bring some revenue to the coffers of the Province has been placed back on the back of the potash industry. They have burdened the industry with these particular taxes.

I want to say more but I will only take a moment and be very brief. I don't know why this Government or the people of Saskatchewan should stand idly by, when we see both these railway companies levying on every shipment of potash from this province everything the traffic will bear. In 1969, the United States potash companies enjoyed at the ocean port a freight advantage of some \$2.00 odd. The United States companies lowered their freight rate. The CPR raised its freight rates against the Saskatchewan potash. Thus today United States producers enjoy a freight advantage at the ocean port of \$3.65 per ton over Saskatchewan's products at the port of Vancouver.

Why, we ask, do the railways hauling from Saskatoon in Saskatchewan a carload of wheat, a carload of potash and a carload of Alberta coal have a different freight rate on every one of these products? They haul coal from Alberta over the same road-beds, the same train with the same engine, practically the same distance and what are the charges? For a carload of wheat from Saskatchewan to Vancouver, the freight by the CPR and the CNR is \$4.00 per ton in United States funds. On a carload of potash, the same engine pulling the same train, the same distance, it is \$8.37 per ton. Some may argue that this is because the freight charges on wheat are covered under the Crow's Nest Agreement. Coal isn't covered under the Crow's Nest Agreement and yet these same railroads will haul coal from Alberta to Vancouver at \$3.50 per ton. This gives the coal

March 9, 1970

industry a preferential treatment not even enjoyed by wheat under the Crow's Nest freight rates. On the other hand they have assessed our potash industry a penalty of \$4.37 per ton above the freight on wheat. We ask, Mr. Speaker, how long we can stand off and watch this discrimination against Saskatchewan industry? What is even of greater interest is that, when we talk about producing in Canada for Canadians, we find that these same railroads, as high as their freight rates are to Vancouver, have cut off total supply of potash from the Saskatchewan market to the Ontario market. It costs us more to ship to Ontario than it does to pay the freight rate to Vancouver, load it on ship and carry it across the ocean to the Chinese markets. Now surely we are entitled to ask for a full explanation as to why a company charges \$19 to take potash to Ontario. To carry a ton of potash within Canada by Canadian railroads to a Canadian market, we must pay an amount equivalent to what we pay to ship into the heart of the Chinese or the Japanese markets. The result of this discrimination is that the Ontario consumers of potash are compelled to go into the United States and to bring their potash and their fertilizer supplies both from there and from Europe. I say, Mr. Speaker, these are the things we are concerned about. We are concerned deeply and I may tell the House that we are now looking at legislation or regulations which will assure the people of Saskatchewan that these companies who are siphoning millions of dollars out of the economy of Saskatchewan will make some compensation in return.

Mr. Speaker, I adjourn the debate.

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