

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN
Third Session — Sixteenth Legislature
17th Day

Tuesday, March 10, 1970.

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

WELCOME TO STUDENTS

MR. SPEAKER: — I wish to introduce to all Members of the Legislative Assembly the following groups of students situated in the galleries: from the W.P. Bate school, Saskatoon, in the constituency of Saskatoon-Riversdale represented by Mr. Romanow, 25 students under the direction of their teacher, Mrs. Head; 30 students from the St. Matthew school in the constituency of Regina South represented by the Hon. Minister of Health (Mr. Grant), under the direction of, their teachers, Mrs. Buckowski and Mrs. Sturgeon; 97 students from King George school from the joint constituencies of Prince Albert West and Prince Albert-East Cumberland, represented respectively by the Member for Prince Albert East-Cumberland (Mr. Berezowsky) and the Member for Prince Albert West, the Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Steuart), under the direction of their school teacher, Mrs. Schmidt; 68 students from the Rosthern Junior College in the constituency of Rosthern represented by the Hon. Minister of Highways (Mr. Boldt), under the direction of their school teacher, Mr. Andres; and 33 students from the Queen Elizabeth school in the city of Saskatoon in the constituency of Saskatoon Nutana South, represented by Dr. Forsyth. I am sure that all Members of the Legislature will wish to extend to these students in the galleries the warmest of all possible welcomes and to express the very sincere wish that they will enjoy themselves and that they will find their stay here informative and to wish them a safe trip home.

HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

ANNOUNCEMENT

AD-FAB STRUCTURES

HON. W.R. THATCHER: (Premier) — Mr. Speaker, I wish to announce to the Legislature this afternoon a modest new industry for the city of Prince Albert. The new plant will require an investment of approximately \$1 million in capital costs when complete. Construction will start almost immediately to produce housing units, primarily modular single family dwellings. These units will be designed to come off the production line in the \$8,000 to \$12,000 range. This new industry qualified for Federal Designated Area legislation and a major portion of the financing has been arranged through SEDCO. When in operation the plant will employ about 75 people with a payroll of approximately \$500,000 annually. The president and general manager of the new company is Ross Ducommun; the vice-president is A. Marud; secretary treasurer is Ab Pellegrini. May I suggest that the new company is a good example of local citizens showing private initiative in utilizing grants and loans which are available from senior governments. I should like to particularly congratulate the Prince Albert citizens involved on their courage in proceeding with this plant despite high interest rates and tight money.

March 10, 1970

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

QUESTIONS

PROPOSED SALE OF PULP MILL — CONSULTING WITH PRIME MINISTER RE SALE OF

MR. W.J. BEREZOWSKY: (Prince Albert East-Cumberland) — Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day and concerning Prince Albert there is another kind of courage I want to ask the Premier about. It is in reference to the proposed sale of our people's share of 30 per cent interest in the pulp mill. The question I would like to direct to the Premier is this: has the Premier communicated with the Prime Minister of Canada with respect to whether or not he approves or the Government of Canada approves of the sale of this valuable resource industry in Prince Albert to foreign interests?

MR. THATCHER: — Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the concern from the Hon. Member who fought against the pulp mill for so many years, and opposed it in every way possible. He put every obstacle in the way of this Government project. Thus I am really touched by his concern at this time.

MR. BEREZOWSKY: — Mr. Speaker, I wish the Premier would answer my question. He refused to answer the question last week that I asked about it.

MR. THATCHER: — I have no intention of talking to the Prime Minister about the matter. This Government will make a decision as to whether or not we will sell the mill. When we make that decision we will have the interests of the people of Saskatchewan at heart.

MR. BEREZOWSKY: — Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask a supplementary question then. Has the Premier and the Government considered making a counter offer to the Parsons and Whittemore Company from New York for the purchase of their interests in the Prince Albert pulp mill so that we can retain . . .

MR. THATCHER: — No, not at all. We are interested in getting them to pay out the first one because then we think perhaps we are not too far away from a second one.

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).

HON. A.C. CAMERON: (Minister of Mineral Resources) — Mr. Speaker, in rising to continue my remarks on the

Budget Address, I think it is timely that we remind the Legislature and ourselves that the Budget of course is the most important document to be placed before the Legislature for its consideration. The Budget before us now of course is a big one. It provides for the raising and spending of sums of monies exceeding \$400 million. This is the largest Budget that any Government has ever presented to the Chamber in the history of Saskatchewan. Such expenditures as these, Mr. Speaker, I think surely warrant a close scrutiny, not only of the amounts which are allocated, but also in scrutinizing it to assess the priorities the Government has assigned to the various sectors of the economy. From the point of analysis from this point of view, I am compelled to say that in my judgment, at least, the contribution of the financial critic (Mr. Blakeney) in his assessment of the Budget was little better than nothing. Let me recall, Mr. Speaker, what did the financial critic have to say in his attack on the Budget. He said, and I want to quote from Press clippings:

Blakeney says the Budget is a hoax.

You will recall, Mr. Speaker, he said that last year. He said it the year before and the year before that. Then he says:

The Government has robbed the piggy banks.

You know he said that last year, Mr. Speaker, and he said that the year before. You know he is the strangest financial critic. You can spend \$100 million and he doesn't bat an eye, but he is always concerned about whether or not we are putting our fingers in the piggy banks. This is the extent of his interests in the financial resources. Then you know he called it a beer tap budget. I thought this is a most interesting description, because you know there are people in Saskatchewan who consider this a very pleasant refreshment and if this is what he meant by the Budget I think he just about summed it up. Then he went on to say:

The Budget shows that Liberal times are hard times.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. CAMERON: — Then I thought, you know, he reached his ultimate heights when he used the present Lenten season to speak of the Budget. He says:

Saskatchewan people are being crucified — they are being crucified on fiscal orthodoxy and Trudeau and Thatcher are pounding in the nails.

Well, I thought the best thing to do to analyze it is to go to the Press to see how Saskatchewan was enjoying or otherwise this so-called crucifixion. I wanted to see if they really felt the pain of the Thatcher nails. It is interesting when you turn the pages of the Press after the Budget came down. "We are pleased," were the words of the president of the Rural Municipal Association. These words were echoed also by the president of the Urban Association. These two large and influential organizations did not feel the pain of the Thatcher nails. They were pleased with the Budget. A little later, the Saskatchewan Chamber of Commerce placed its stamp of approval on the Budget. Then the Star Phoenix had this comment, one of our leading daily papers:

March 10, 1970

The Budget appears to be tailored to meet the pressing needs of the economy.

I was interested in The Leader Post, the second daily paper and it said: "Considering the times, not a bad Budget." I was interested in the reaction of the urban people to the new grants and assistance to urban municipalities:

Saskatoon will be a major beneficiary of the Budget,

said the Mayor of Saskatoon.

With the increased monies for snow removal, police protection, library grants, together with the increase in grants to education, Saskatoon looks forward to holding the tax line and hopefully a drop in taxes. The Saskatoon Chamber of Commerce said:

It is gratifying that the Government has seen fit to earmark such substantial sums for capital works programs.

You know, Mr. Speaker, everybody seems to be out of step except the financial critic. I want here to congratulate the Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Steuart), not only on his masterful delivery of the Budget Speech, but for the manner in which the expenditures on each sector of the economy are laid out separately and distinctly for the Members to analyze.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. CAMERON: — One cannot at this time, of course, comment on all aspects of the Budget, but I want to comment on one or two items of interest to Saskatchewan.

I turn to agriculture. The financial critic in desperation termed the agricultural budget a package of tinsel and gimmicks which fails the farmer. I think it is significant, Mr. Speaker, to point out that this Legislature will be asked to vote in excess of \$15 million for agriculture. This is a massive sum and I challenge the financial critic and I challenge the NDP to state where they stand on this vote. Are they going to vote against this request for \$15 million for agriculture? Are they going to vote against the amounts required for the Government's guaranteed loan to farmers to purchase livestock? Do they oppose the loan of \$3-1/2 million to the Wheat Pool to assist its members in the purchase of livestock? I wonder, Mr. Speaker. We know the NDP do not approve of these programs. The Member for Touchwood (Mr. Meakes) summed up the position of the NDP when he said the other day these programs are of no value to the farmer. These programs really mean they will only run the farmer further into debt. Are they going to vote against this assistance to the farmers to diversify? The new agricultural critic, the Member from Kelsey (Mr. Messer) — I was interested in his remarks and I spoke on them last night and I want to repeat it here — supported the Federal Government's acreage reduction plan when it was announced. The next day he rose, not too enthusiastically, and said he had some reservations about, the plan. Friday he rose again, you know, and he made up his mind. You know the message from Eastern Canada from the labor bosses had come through clearly. In essence what he said to this House was, "I am sorry, gentlemen, but I must rise today and condemn this policy to take wheat acreage out of production."

He got his orders and he's reversed himself three times in the House. This is a great record for the new Member, the new front bencher, the new financial critic for the NDP . . .

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. CAMERON: — . . . the new critic of agriculture. His record is so near that of the financial critic that I confuse them on this issue.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. CAMERON: — I asked yesterday, Mr. Speaker — and I think I want to place it before this Chamber again today — I asked where the NDP stand on issues that are of vital concern to the people of Saskatchewan, are of vital concern to our farm population, are of vital concern to every sector of the people of Saskatchewan. They sit strangely silent in this House and never make a peep about them. The people of Saskatchewan, Mr. Speaker, are entitled to know where the NDP stand on the Watkins Manifesto. This was the new Manifesto brought out at the Winnipeg Convention of the NDP. This was the Manifesto that called upon the NDP to turn left. This is the Manifesto which called upon the NDP to state clearly for all to see that they are determined that capitalism shall be replaced by Socialism. That Manifesto called for the nationalization of all means of production including the nationalization of farm lands in the Province of Saskatchewan. I think the people of Saskatchewan are entitled to know where the NDP stands on this Winnipeg Manifesto. As . . .

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. CAMERON: — . . . we never found out where they stood on the Regina Manifesto I'd like to know then where they stand on the Winnipeg Manifesto. We have in this House the Leader of the Opposition. We know where he stands because he voted for it and he fought for it. He believes in the Manifesto, the Watkins Manifesto. We have sitting beside him the financial critic, who is also the president, the national president of the NDP. Why does he sit quiet and say nothing on this issue? We are entitled to know where he stands on this key issue likewise. It isn't good enough for the financial critic to waffle, we want to know where he stands.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. CAMERON: — Mr. Speaker, I want to turn to another important aspect of the Budget which is receiving a great deal of discussion throughout the province and that is in the matter of education. I was interested in the comments of the Press because the Press described education as the fair-haired child of this Budget and I think they might well have done. This Budget will be asking the Legislature to vote a sum of \$138 million for education, a sum which but a few years ago would boggle the imagination. It is most significant, I think, to note that this Budget is asking this Legislature to vote \$73 million for school operating grants. This is \$2 million more than the actual increase in school operation which should give this surplus amount as a buttress to reduce taxation, at least to hold the line. I'm going to ask where

March 10, 1970

the Opposition stands on this vote. The financial critic had a lot to say about the University and he said, "We are not spending enough." This statement, Mr. Speaker, comes strangely from a man who sat on the Treasury bench as Provincial Treasurer and during his term of office allocated \$6.6 million to the University of Saskatchewan.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. CAMERON: — This Budget, Mr. Speaker, provides not \$6.6 million but the huge amount of \$39.5 million for our education.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. CAMERON: — Yet the financial critic has the audacity today to stand in this House and cry that it isn't enough.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. CAMERON: — I say, Mr. Speaker, that no government in Canada has as poor a record of university spending as the NDP in Saskatchewan.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. CAMERON: — During the years from 1961 to 1964, when the University was desperately pressed for space, what was voted for university construction? During the five years from 1961 to 1965 the NDP Government spent a total of \$10.3 million on university construction.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. CAMERON: — Five years — \$10.3. During the past five years this Government has spent, not \$10.3 million, it has spent \$60.6 million on university construction.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. CAMERON: — Mr. Speaker, this Chamber will be interested, I'm sure, to know that the average expenditure on university construction of this Government is \$12 million per year. This average expenditure yearly has been more than the total five years' expenditure of the NDP Government in the last five years of office.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. CAMERON: — In terms of this record the financial critic should be the last person to criticize university-construction expenditures. There are many other aspects of the Budget I would like to speak about, such as the increase in the homeowner grant, the increased assistance to urban municipalities, snow removal, the tax removal on farm fuel, but time doesn't permit, Mr. Speaker, but I do want to take a moment to answer the charges levelled by the financial critic against the resource development in this province.

The financial critic, this year as in past years, proceeded to berate the efforts of the oil industry; he berated the efforts of the hard-rock miners; he joined his colleagues in kicking the potash industry; and I am going to lay before the House this afternoon the records of these industries so that the people of Saskatchewan may judge whether or not they have contributed to Saskatchewan.

It is true we have suffered a cutback on shipments of oil to the United States. The U.S. market is an important market for Saskatchewan oil, and when the U.S. closes its gate we feel it. Indications are we may feel it even more but that is no reflection on the efforts of the oil industry in this province.

The potash industry, it is true, is experiencing a difficult time, but I am certain, Mr. Speaker, of this that these men in the potash industry, who had the courage and the stamina to conquer the unconquerable in finding our potash, are not the men to despair in the face of present difficulties. In spite of the criticism levelled against the potash industry by the opposition, I am confident of this, that it will surmount these difficulties. What is the record of the industry during the past five years — the years the financial critic appears to be so concerned about?

Mr. Speaker, this is the record. The oil industry in the last five years, Liberal years, has spent \$800 million in Saskatchewan in exploration and development of oil. This is the faith, Mr. Speaker, that the oil industry has placed in Saskatchewan. When we speak of injecting monies into the economy, let us keep in mind the oil industry alone is injecting \$150 million annually into the economy of Saskatchewan. The oil industry has contributed by way of royalties and taxes during the past five years to the Provincial Government, Mr. Speaker, \$200 million. Of the total revenues received since 1930 when the resources were turned over to the province, 60 per cent of that total accrued during the past five years. Let us express it in another way: 60 per cent of all the monies which Saskatchewan has received from the development of our natural resources were received during the past five years under a Liberal Government.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. CAMERON: — I want to say this, Mr. Speaker, that although the daily production of oil has dropped below that of a year ago, the industry is still producing 1-1/2 million barrels more each month than it did in 1964, the last year of the NDP regime. This has been the record of the oil industry in Saskatchewan. These are some of the benefits that are accruing to the people of Saskatchewan as a result of the efforts of the oil industry.

Now I want to turn to Northern Saskatchewan. Typical of the financial critic — this year as in last and the year before — he poured scorn on the efforts of the hard-rock miners in Northern Saskatchewan. He poured scorn on these mining companies that are in the North opening up this great potential. Let us look back to 1964. If we do this the financial critic should be the last man in this Chamber to criticize the activity of the mining industry in Northern Saskatchewan. In 1964, Mr. Speaker, 12 lonely little mining syndicates were all that could be found looking for minerals in Northern Saskatchewan. And these 12 lonely little companies had only a budget of \$250,000. Since 1964, when this Government instituted an incentive program tailored to the

March 10, 1970

North, the mining companies have poured into Northern Saskatchewan \$40 million in the search for minerals. Mr. Speaker, there are today in Northern Saskatchewan not 12 lonely little companies but 10 times 12 companies. The 1970 expenditures by the mining companies in the North will reach this year not \$250,000 but, Mr. Speaker, it will exceed \$15 million. Over \$1 million per month is pouring into Northern Saskatchewan in the search for minerals. Yet the financial critic would berate the mining industry of Northern Saskatchewan. He would do so in the hopes of gaining some small political gain. I think Saskatchewan people will be interested to know not what the politicians are saying about Northern Saskatchewan but rather what other than the politicians are saying. I want to read just a few excerpts from The Northern Miner. "The Northern Miner", as some Members will know, is in essence a spokesman for the mining industry in Canada and has world-wide distribution. It is recognized as a responsible mining journal. Last summer they sent a man into Northern Saskatchewan to see what was happening there. This is what they had to say and I want to read just an excerpt — June 30, 1969 from "The Northern Miner". They came back and spoke about what they saw in Northern Saskatchewan. It said:

The scope of exploration work getting underway in this remote area boggles the imagination.

They said further:

It's the country's new hot spot and promises to far surpass such previous booms in the Timmins area following the Texas Gulf discovery.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. CAMERON: — They went on further:

Unprecedented too is the money that has been committed for grassroots mineral exploration. Expenditures this year (referring to 1969) are expected to run around \$22 million.

The same paper carried an editorial, put the prestige of the editorial section on Saskatchewan minerals and this is what it read. The heading read: "New age dawning for Saskatchewan mining." And it said:

Sooner or later it had to happen, now it is coming on with a vengeance.

It comments further:

It may have been the lack of transportation or it may have been a rather cool political climate of a few years ago. In any event, it remains a mystery as to just why this great potential of the Pre-Cambrian shield should have remained virtually unscratched for so long.

Then it says:

While uranium started the current boom, feeling is that there are major hidden nickel, copper and zinc deposits crying to be found.

Mr. Speaker, I want to quote the remarks about Northern Saskatchewan from someone far-removed from the political scene of the

province. The bitter denunciation levelled against the mineral industry of this province by the financial critic reveals the depth to which the NDP will sink to thwart the development of resources in this province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. CAMERON: — I am gaining increasing confidence daily that the day is fast approaching when Northern Saskatchewan will bare its secrets, will open its treasure chest and the beneficiaries shall be the people of Saskatchewan.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. CAMERON: — Mr. Speaker, if I may I would like to turn for a moment to a matter of telephones, particularly because of the interest in the rural areas on the unserved areas. Hon. Members will recall that in 1965 I informed the House of a new program designed to bring telephone service to thousands of farm homes that didn't have telephones. I said at the time, in this House, Saskatchewan cannot rest content so long as we have thousands of farm homes that have never heard the ring of the telephone, that we cannot remain aloof when thousands of farm people are denied the amenity of the telephone, something which thousands of us take for granted. Under this program today, 25 unserved-area projects have been completed. To date this program has brought telephones to 1,500 farm homes that until now didn't know what a telephone was in the home. It has cost money, it has cost this Government \$2.5 million to bring these phones to 1,500 farmers. But I would ask: is the Opposition opposed to this vote? If they are, let them stand up and state them. In 1970, turning to the present year program and I want to outline it, we have allocated in Sask Tel \$1,300,000 for this year's construction program to bring telephones to another 700 farm homes. This will involve 12 projects. I want to give Members an insight as to where the projects are. In the southern part of the province the following projects will be undertaken: Coronach-Frontier, one project connecting to Moose Jaw, and one connecting to Saskatoon. In the northern area of Saskatchewan we will be completing unserved-area programs at the following points: Glaslyn, Lloydminster, Meadow Lake, Shell Lake, Speers, Spiritwood, Tisdale and Turtleford. These projects will involve the laying of some 350 miles of buried cable and 1,000 miles of pole line. By the end of 1970, the current year, we will have brought telephone service for the first time to 2,300 farm homes in Saskatchewan. I would remind the House that this amount, costing \$3-3/4 million, might be added to the \$15 million we are asking you to vote for agriculture. Again, we would ask: where does the NDP stand on that?

In addition to this, Sask Tel will be converting some 25 manual exchanges to community dial offices. This will bring dial service to all and direct dial service to all but a very few. These are the points that will be converted to dial in 1970: Big River, Burstall, Canwood, Climax, Debden, Dundurn, Elbow, Frontier, Glenavon, Herschel, Kenaston, Lang, Limerick, Maymont, Montmartre, Osler, Paradise Hill, Plenty, Val Marie, Beechy, Cutbank, Dinsmore, Outlook and Creighton. This again will involve the laying of almost 1,000 miles of buried cable and a good deal of micro-wave, but it will bring direct distance dial to a great number of the rural areas.

March 10, 1970

Mr. Speaker, I have answered some of the accusations levelled against this Budget and against the mineral industry by the financial critic. I have outlined to the Chamber something of the program of Sask Tel, of which I am the Minister in Charge, to continue our program of bringing telephone service to the rural areas. When we look at the budget for education, the budget for agriculture, the increase in the homeowner grant, the removal of the tax from farm fuels, the introduction of free text books to grades 9, 10, 11 and 12, the increased assistance to urban municipalities, then I say that the newspaper reports about this Budget being in keeping with the time, being a good Budget is a correct assessment. We will be interested, as will the people of Saskatchewan to see where the vote will be from the NDP, comes the time to rise and declare whether or not you support these programs in the interest of the people of Saskatchewan. Mr. Speaker, I will support the motion.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. W. McIVOR: (Arm River) — Mr. Speaker, first I would like to congratulate our Provincial Treasurer for the noteworthy Budget he brought forward on March 2. Although this Budget shows a deficit, it follows on the heels of five successful balanced Budgets, which sets our credit rating at the very top in the market for money. Again university and education grants were increased by fantastic amounts. Our health and welfare also received very substantial increases. Municipalities are also getting larger increases and can qualify for new grants. The urban municipalities will receive snow removal grants for the first time. Per capita grants for our police force, an item this Government realized necessary, is very timely in the light of the increase of crime, especially in the field of drugs, something we should all join together to help stamp out. Paying lip service to a problem as damaging and far-reaching as drugs is not enough. It is our duty as good citizens to stand behind our police and courts, to work to the goal of having drug offenders especially peddlers and pushers punished to the point of eradication.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. McIVOR: — This Budget eliminates the two cents gas tax on purple fuel, a saving of approximately \$3.8 million. On top of this figure, it increased the grant of 12 per cent from \$13.8 million to \$15.5 million making a combined saving and increase in grants to the amount of \$5.5 million for agriculture.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. McIVOR: — Mr. Speaker, another \$2.3 million will be spent on irrigation on the east side of the Dam. This will bring the first phase of irrigation well on the way to being completed. Several hundred acres were irrigated during 1969 and more will come under the program in 1970. A sprinkler method of irrigation was also set up on a farm at Elbow in cooperation with the Department, which by all reports worked out very well when used on a flax crop. Mr. Speaker, the increased spending on highways certainly meets with my approval. As No. 11 Highway runs through my constituency, being the shortest route between our two major cities,

Regina and Saskatoon, this highway has a very heavy traffic count. At present there are over 30 miles of road with absolutely no shoulders, a condition that has been responsible for many accidents and deaths, a true sample of the former Government's highway construction ability. I have at all times stressed the need for completion of this highway and will continue to do so until Regina and Saskatoon are linked by a first-class highway.

Mr. Speaker, Natural Resource spending is to be increased, and more development is to take place in the parks adjoining Lake Diefenbaker which will create employment and result in better recreation facilities.

Mr. Speaker, this Budget includes money to be spent on natural gas lines, and I have been advised natural gas is to be brought into my constituency this year for the first time. Although it will only serve residents of Bladworth and Davidson in my constituency, it is a start. In order to get to Davidson it will serve other towns and villages in the Hanley constituency — an area although represented here in this House for years by a former CCF-NDP Member that was in fact totally neglected.

Mr. Speaker, Public Works spending is up and will go a long way in creating jobs for our labor force in this province. Although I did not get in on any major building projects this year, I will be asking for full consideration for the expansion of the senior citizens home in Davidson. Residents of several municipalities have witnessed the services given since 1967 and have on numerous occasions asked to become part of the housing corporation to work towards expansion in order to accommodate more guests.

Mr. Speaker, this Budget has advanced more aid in the field of diversification to the farmers. Many farmers of my constituency have taken advantage of these programs, and by all actions must intend to continue. Hundreds of female cattle have been purchased in the recent months under the new program of guaranteed livestock loans. More feeder cattle have been purchased through the Pool since we loaned them our financial support. Mr. Speaker, in the northern part of my constituency, one farmer operates a cattle feed-lot with a capacity of 450 head, which he operates on a continual fattening and replacement basis throughout the entire year. Most of the stock are his own but some of this program covers commercial feeding for other farmers. At present this feed-lot is feeding 100 tons of grain or a mixture of 40,000 bushels of wheat, oats and barley per month, which comes to almost one-half million bushels of grain fed at this one feed-lot alone in one year.

Mr. Speaker, with the aid of SEDCO and other means of finance there are five large pig operations recently established in the Davidson-Liberty area, with total capacities of 400 sows, and an estimated output of 8,000 pigs per year, and an estimated 120,000 bushels of grain to be fed. These are the large operations, but numerous other farms have diversified on a smaller scale, or have bettered themselves by growing crops other than wheat. However, many other farmers who have been caught in this wheat situation are going to be able to take full advantage of this plan recently announced by the Hon. Otto Lang. Mr. Speaker, no matter how black a picture the Opposition are trying to paint, I am quite confident the farmers in my area will continue to take full advantage of any program we offer. These farmers also realize we are not fighting with Ottawa, but are attempting to negotiate a better deal for Saskatchewan and the Saskatchewan farmers.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. McIVOR: — Mr. Speaker, I challenge the Opposition to stand up in this House and tell us that the farmers from their areas are happy with some of the actions of the Wheat Board, or the actions of some of the unions, in regards to the continual disregard for the movement of our Prairie grain. As to the Wheat Board, I and the largest majority of farmers are firm supporters of the need for a Board, but like the barn on the farm, it becomes of no value unless it is cleaned out every so often. Mr. Speaker, I also believe workers are entitled to their unions, but I do not think they should conduct their actions in such a way that they hinder or directly affect another part of our society to the extent that they have displayed, when sales for our wheat have been lost, which reflect on the entire economy of the country and in the end on themselves as well.

Mr. Speaker, an item on the editorial page of the Western Producer of March 5th, 1970, under the heading of “An irresponsible strike,” points out to us very strongly that the actions of the workers towards their own unions show very clearly another method other than strikes or lockouts to settle differences between labor and management must soon be arrived at. Until that time comes about, we the farmers will continue to be one segment of the economy who will continue to suffer from their lack of consideration.

Mr. Speaker, I have endeavored to outline in a short period of time how this Budget will both affect and help my constituency and others. This Budget is being recognized by all as a very good one, one that even the Opposition’s financial critic made himself look weak and lacking in good constructive criticism. Calling a Budget a hoax is one thing, but pointing out to the people where, how or why it is a hoax is another. Public opinion in my area indicates he certainly failed. Mr. Speaker, I will vote against the amendment and for the Budget as presented by our Provincial Treasurer.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. B.D. GALLAGHER: (Yorkton) — Mr. Speaker, I find myself today in the rather unenviable position of speaking in the latter part of the second major Debate in the House, when everything that I might say has probably been said at least 20 times before. To compound the matter, I find myself speaking on radio time with a limit of 10 minutes to make my remarks heard. I am not blaming the party Whips for allocating the radio time, or I am not blaming the Radio Broadcasting Committee for having it this way, but I don’t see, Mr. Speaker, how anybody can deal with an issue, substantiate his case, do a good job on it, offer constructive criticism on the particular issue and know that 10 minutes after he starts to speak on it the bell is going to ring and he is going to have to sit down. I can’t waste any more time on this issue today, Mr. Speaker, but I am going to offer a solution to it. I suggest that from this year on that radio time be abolished in this Assembly with the exception of four speeches, the speech of the Premier, the speech of the Leader of the opposition, the speech of the Provincial Treasurer and the speech of the financial critic from the Opposition. Any time that I want to make a political speech, Mr. Speaker, I’ll be prepared to buy my own radio time. I think that the taxpayers of this Province should not

have to spend \$15, \$20 or \$25,000 listening to political speeches from the House. Besides, Mr. Speaker, we would get a lot more work done in the House if it wasn't for the radio time. I will spend the remaining eight and a half minutes of my time, Mr. Speaker, dealing with agriculture and particularly wheat. It seems to me that everyone in this House has become an expert on agriculture lately. It is almost amusing when even the financial critic has joined the group that pretend to be the voice of the farmer. Mr. Speaker, I wish that somebody in the Opposition who really knows what the problem is, would get up in this House and tell us exactly why we have a farm problem, just where we are heading and offer some really positive and practical solution. One year ago I thought the agricultural critic in the Opposition was the man who had the courage to come out and pin-point our troubles and offer us some solution. I am sorry he is not in his seat today and I notice also, Mr. Speaker, that most of the farm Members in the Opposition are not in their seats today . . . Yes, I notice the Member for Swift Current is: he wasn't a few minutes ago but I am glad he is there. Today, Mr. Speaker, I am beginning to wonder if the agricultural critic is the man that I thought he was a year ago. I still think the Member for Kelsey (Mr. Messer) knows the root of the problem, and might even have a few suggested remedies, if it were not for the fact that coming out openly might not enhance his political future. Just the other day I heard him give a comparison of cattle population figures in Saskatchewan for the years 1961-64 and 1965-68. He was trying to prove that there were more cattle produced in the last four CCF years than there were in the first four Liberal years. Mr. Speaker, I don't question his figures, I'm sure they were right, but what did his figures prove? They certainly didn't prove that a CCF Government did more to encourage beef production than a Liberal Government. Anyone who has followed what has been going on knows that this Government and particularly the Premier have been advocating and encouraging a diversified farm economy ever since we became the Government.

Mr. Speaker, do you know what the figures prove? I'm referring to the figures on cattle production quoted by the Member from Kelsey on Friday last. They proved that from 1964 to 1968 there was an easier dollar made on the farm by growing wheat than there was in raising cattle. Every Member of this House who is honest enough to admit it knows this to be a fact. How many farmer Members haven't heard their neighbors say — and I know I have heard it many times — “Why should I work 12 months of the year keeping cattle to make an extra \$1,000 or \$2,000 and then pay 25 or 30 per cent of it back to the Government in income tax when I can make just about as much growing wheat and work for 90 days a year?” I'm not saying they didn't have the right to do this. In Canada you have the right to run your business as you please as long as you stay within the law. Those were the days when a bushel of wheat was selling for \$2.00 to \$2.12. They were also the days when the Roy Atkinsons and the Alf Gleaves and the rest of the NDPers were saying the farmer should be getting \$3.00 a bushel for wheat. Of course they had to say this to keep popular amongst their supporters. They knew that time, Mr. Speaker, that the United States had a billion bushels of wheat, they knew that the soil bank program wasn't curing the surplus problem south of the border. They should have known that the developing countries were producing more cereal grains every year. They had to be blind if they couldn't see what was happening in the European economic community. Surely common sense would tell them that Canada couldn't compete

March 10, 1970

with the United States Treasury in supporting a policy of subsidizing the production of something that was in over-supply in the United States. It was a lot easier five years ago to say, "The farmer should get \$3.00 a bushel for his wheat," or "Grow all you can and we'll sell it," than to come out honestly and say, "The end of the road is not too far ahead, Mr. Farmer, and when you hit it you are in for a shock." The fact of the matter, Mr. Speaker, is either we are producing too much of something we cannot sell or we are trying to sell it at a price that cannot be paid by the people who need it.

It seems odd to me, Mr. Speaker, in a world that is only a split second apart by television and only a few hours apart by jet aircraft, where every two and a half seconds someone is dying of malnutrition, that Western Canada which used to be called the bread-basket of the world is being asked to quit growing food. Not only are they being asked to quit growing food they are practically being forced to quit growing food. If you grow more wheat, you don't have a quota. Yes, Mr. Speaker, we got to the moon after spending hundreds of billions of dollars to get there. We are admitting defeat with the challenge to feed a hungry world. We are trying to buy world peace by supporting and financing a United Nations organization but we can't distribute the food we produce which is the only way that we can have true and lasting peace in this world.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. GALLAGHER: — Mr. Speaker, I don't buy the idea that we are producing too much wheat or too much anything else that feeds hungry people. If we are content to isolate ourselves from the have nots of the world, or if we are determined to keep to ourselves the cosy North American standard of living, then we had better quit growing wheat, and just produce what North Americans are willing to buy. I would suggest that we can't afford to try and isolate ourselves from the rest of the world and if we do try we won't be around in the 1980s to tell the story.

The other day I had occasion to talk to a farmer who is known I'm sure to all Members of this House. This farmer had the familiar story you hear every day, the farmer with 50,000 to 60,000 bushels of wheat on his farm that he couldn't sell. Incidentally he comes from the constituency represented by the Attorney General. He told me he could grow a bushel of wheat for \$1.25 if he could sell all the bushels that he grows and make a profit. I have no reason to question his statement because he is farming in the Regina Plains area where you can grow wheat cheaper than anywhere else in Canada. These are the people, Mr. Speaker, who today should be growing hard red spring wheat. The rest of the Prairies should be given a chance to grow what we can grow cheaper. The future market in the world is not for No. 1 Manitoba Northern or other top grades of Western Canadian spring wheat. Milling and baking techniques have changed to make the market for our wheat a shrinking market. The developing countries have moved quickly to try and be self-sufficient. The faster developing ones have moved so fast they are now exporters of wheat and not importers. Pakistan is a good example and India is apt to follow.

Mr. Speaker, I am suggesting that it is high time the Plant Products Division of the Department of Agriculture was shaken up. To my knowledge there has only been one major wheat variety

ever licensed in Canada that wasn't developed in Canada. That was when Thatcher was licensed after we were nearly bankrupted in the 1930s and the 1920s because of rust in Saskatchewan and Manitoba.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. GALLAGHER: — If some of the new varieties of high-yielding dwarf wheats were licensed to grow in Western Canada, we could grow them for the same price in almost any part of the Prairies as the farmer on the Regina Plains can grow No. 1 Manitoba Northern.

Some NDP Members will likely get up and accuse me of trying to start a price war. Mr. Speaker, I think there is a market for a billion bushels of wheat a year, of high-yielding wheat if we go after it and go after it now! I ask the NDP to join with me in promoting this cause if they are sincere when they say we should be feeding a hungry world. Today it is costing the Canadian taxpayers about 15 cents per bushel per year to store wheat that is in our elevator system in excess of 178 million bushels. True, the grain handling companies receive 1/35 of a cent a bushel per day, but add to this the interest on the money plus the cost of administration and 15 cents would be a close figure. Anyone who suggests the Wheat Board cut the price to sell more is told that we don't sell more wheat, we don't sell an extra bushel by cutting the price, it would only start an all out price war. Maybe this is right but I question this theory, Mr. Speaker, when I look at what Australia has done to our Japanese market, and when I look at how our percentage of the world export market has dropped compared to the United States. Politicians and farm leaders are very reluctant to recommend that we increase our share of world trade by becoming more competitive, but at the same time they see farmers who must sell wheat to live, selling it at 60 cents a bushel or one cent a pound.

About two years ago, Mr. A.M. Runciman, whom you all know, suggested we should be moving into the production of new high-yielding varieties of wheat. I think he was right when he suggested this. I think that it is right today. I notice Mr. E.K. Turner, president of the Saskatchewan Wheat Pool, speaking on television last Saturday night, when asked to comment on the new wheat acreage reduction program, commented to the effect that this was only a temporary program designed to fill in the gap until some rationalization takes place in the whole industry. I imagine he was thinking of some shift to cattle production. This is sound thinking but increasing cattle production by itself is not the answer. The licensing of new varieties of high-yielding wheat to grow in competition with the rest of the world would go well with an increase in cattle numbers in getting the agricultural industry back on its feet. It seems to me there are few farm leaders and even fewer politicians who will suggest anything that might disrupt things or jeopardize their positions, even though they might believe they have some answers to the farm problem. None of them dare suggest that we lower our standard of living to raise the standard of hundreds of millions who live far below the poverty level in other parts of the world. Those are the people, Mr. Speaker, whom we are expecting to buy our wheat.

Mr. Speaker, I see that time is running out. I say this, that if we don't act now it will be too late. There is much more I would like to say relating to this whole matter but time

does not permit me to say it at this time. Mr. Speaker, I would like before sitting down to associate myself with the many Members who have spoken before me in congratulating the Prime Minister on the appointment of our new Lieutenant Governor. I have the privilege of representing a large Ukrainian group in my constituency. Those people are not only very pleased with the appointment of His Honour Dr. Worobetz, they are very proud that one of their sons is representing Her Majesty in our Province. I will support the motion.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. J.E. BROCKELBANK: (Saskatoon Mayfair) — Mr. Speaker, as a Member of the Opposition I have two main responsibilities to perform. First, I must point out the weaknesses and the failures of the Government's programs and secondly, I should advance some reasonable alternatives.

In the short time available to me today I intend to point out some of the many weaknesses of the Budget document which we are now debating. Secondly, I will suggest some remedies which the Government is unable to see or comprehend because of its blind acceptance of Thatcher free-enterprise leadership. To begin with, the Provincial Treasurer spent more than two depressing hours telling us that his Government had failed in many of its election promises of 1964 and had failed most of its election promises of 1967. He attempted to blame this shortcoming and failure on the Federal Liberals, on the Federal Conservative party and on the Federal and Provincial New Democratic party. Therefore, the result was that it would have to raise Saskatchewan taxes to a higher level than they were raised in that record Liberal tax-raising year of 1968.

The Treasurer listed the failures of his Thatcher free-enterprise Government as follows:

1. The general level of our economy in 1969 fell below 1968.
2. Farm cash income dropped 20 per cent from 1968.
3. Realized farm net income was 37 per cent lower in 1969 than in 1968.
4. The value of mineral and oil production in 1969, down.
5. Housing starts down over 19 per cent in 1969.
6. Private and public investment down 7.4 per cent in 1969.
7. Retail trade, below 1968.

In addition, Mr. Speaker, the Treasurer remained silent about some other indicators. He didn't mention that our Saskatchewan minimum wage continues to stagnate in relation to other provinces. He didn't mention that our Provincial debt continues to rise to new levels each year we have a Liberal Government, whereas only a few short years ago the Liberals said the Provincial debt was outrageous. For example, the gross debt of the Province has been increased by the Liberal Government by \$193.5 million in five years. It has been said many times, Mr. Speaker, that you can't make a silk purse out of a sow's ear. This Liberal Government has demonstrated beyond a doubt its ability to do the

reverse. By its priorities and its successive budgets, it is making a sow's ear out of what was once a silk purse.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. BROCKELBANK: — The people of Saskatchewan, lacking an election where they can protest the dismal performance of this Thatcher Liberal Government, have begun to vote with their feet, Mr. Speaker. They are voting with their feet in the manner of all tormented people and escaping from Saskatchewan in alarming numbers. Saskatchewan people are leaving our province in numbers greater than they did in 1943 when we last had a Liberal Government that wouldn't improve their conditions and refused them the right to vote by ballot. Finally in 1944 when they could no longer hold back an election the Liberal party was thrown out of office and into the wilderness. After 20 years in the wilderness and six years back in government this Liberal party has gone a full cycle and are ready to be cast once more into the wilderness.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. BROCKELBANK: — The people of Saskatchewan can rest assured that the New Democratic party is ready and willing to take over the reins of government. Our first efforts will be to again make Saskatchewan an attractive place in which to live and raise a family by:

1. re-establishing a priority of people before profits and balanced budgets.
2. strengthening and expanding the health care plans that we introduced.
3. recapturing the lead we once held in the treatment of people unfortunate enough to be struck down by mental illness.
4. reversing the awesome burden of municipal taxation for education that the Liberal Government has loaded on every property owner in Saskatchewan. We all know, Mr. Speaker, that an average family of four paid \$428 municipal tax in 1964 but now pays close to \$688.
5. continuing to expand senior citizen facilities which we as a Government pioneered the development of in Saskatchewan.
6. demonstrating to the younger generations of Saskatchewan people that we won't be prepared to sit idly by and allow pollution of streams and field and air to advance beyond the point where the forces of nature cannot deal effectively with that pollution.

I can recall since this Government came to power that some of its officials have made go-slow public statements on the matter of pollution. Recently the Minister of Public Health has advised Saskatchewan people not to eat predatory fish from the Saskatchewan river system. Additionally \$700,000 worth of fish taken from the Saskatchewan river system has been ordered destroyed because of pollution of their flesh.

March 10, 1970

Mr. Speaker, my constituency of Saskatoon Mayfair and the city of Saskatoon generally have been buffeted by the economic condition that pervades Saskatchewan. Recently Westeel Rosco closed down its manufacturing division in Saskatoon which has operated for many years. The manufacturing operations, Mr. Speaker, were shifted to Alberta and Manitoba.

MR. J.J. CHARLEBOIS: (Saskatoon City Park-University) — Shipped to Nutana South.

MR. BROCKELBANK: — Obviously the Member from, Saskatoon City Park-University doesn't know what he is talking about because its manufacturing operations closed down in Saskatoon. Two of the large electric companies have retrenched — some of that retrenchment actually causing them to move out of the Saskatchewan area.

As I look back I see a sad picture of misdirection and mistaken priorities which are having serious repercussions on the city of Saskatoon, not to mention the balance of the province. A series of newspaper clippings from the Saskatoon Star Phoenix beginning at the end of the last session will serve to highlight the folly of this Liberal Thatcher free enterprise Government.

On March 28, 1969, the headline: "Housing starts plummet." The article states that the Saskatoon housing starts were 71 per cent lower for February, 1969, as compared to February, 1968. Another article on June 19, 1969: "Building below '68 figure." Another article on August 22, 1969: "July housing starts here cut almost in half from 1968." The article states that housing starts for July, 1969 had dropped 46.6 percent from July, 1968. These headlines were indicative of the serious dive that our province was being steered into. Also, Mr. Speaker, the headlines bore out the predictions we had made in the Legislative session just a few months before that.

According to the Financial Post of September 6, 1969, reporting on the 1968 Provincial economic situation, the growth curve was flattening. I ask you, Mr. Speaker: where was the man on the economic pump-handle in September, 1968, when all the economic danger flags were up and the rush of people out of the province was beginning? Mr. Speaker, the man on the economic pump-handle said, according to the Star Phoenix of September 4, 1969, that he was trimming \$11 million from the Provincial budget and I quote the article in part:

mostly by deferring some capital construction.

You know, Mr. Speaker, when I was a little boy on the farm I sometimes used to get on the pump-handle and pump water for the cows. On a hot summer day it seemed as if each of those cows would drink a barrel of water. However, Mr. Speaker, they had to be watered because if they weren't there would eventually be less milk in the pail at the end of the day. I suggest there's a moral in that story for the Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Steuart). In this Debate I have often thought that it is unfortunate that the Provincial Treasurer never had the benefit of the practical experience on the pump-handle that I had.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. BROCKELBANK: — The headlines continue, Mr. Speaker. In the Star Phoenix

of November 22, 1969: "Housing starts plummet." Mr. Speaker, it is obvious that these downward trends in housing starts were taxing the ability of the Star Phoenix staff to come up with a new headline to describe the direction in which housing starts were going because this is the second time in 1969 that they used the headline "Housing starts plummet." The article reported a 50 per cent drop for October, 1969 over 1968. The next headline, Star Phoenix, December 18, 1969: "Housing starts dip 29 per cent in November." The most recent headline brings us almost up-to-date, "Housing starts drop 12.4 per cent." Star Phoenix, January 29, 1970. The article also shows Saskatoon 1969 housing completions were 516 down from 1968.

Finally this Government makes a big flourish by announcing it will "prime the pump". Everybody knows that it is several months late, Mr. Speaker, and in addition it needs a bigger man on the pump-handle and I don't see him here.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. BROCKELBANK: — I find it difficult to believe that the Member for Nutana Centre (Mr. Estey) — unfortunately he is not here, Mr. Speaker — was not able to recognize some of the danger signs in the construction downturn that began at that time and advise the Premier and the Provincial Treasurer. After all it was he who stated to the Star Phoenix on January 10, 1968:

Planning is so essential that if it is not done well there may not be a home-building industry.

I can only conclude, Mr. Speaker, that there was poor planning and the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Estey) from Saskatoon Nutana Centre failed to understand the situation. I know that all of us on this side of the Legislature saw the danger signs and we sounded the alarm.

No wonder, Mr. Speaker, that the moving vans are busy moving people out of Saskatchewan.

The Minister of Mineral Resources (Mr. Cameron) dealt briefly with the subject of oil in his discussion and I just want to bring some statistics into the Debate. The oil picture with each passing year of Liberal rule has become more dismal than it was in the previous year. Liquid petroleum gas decreased 6.0 per cent; capital expenditures decreased 6.5 per cent. The percentage increase of oil production over the previous year has dropped each year since the Liberal Government came to power in the Province of Saskatchewan. In addition, depleting reserves are not being bolstered.

I want to say, Mr. Speaker, a word about energy. I want to take this opportunity to issue a warning. I believe that an international power play is shaping up which, if successful, will have an undesirable effect on Canadian energy resources and possibly on other resources. The United States may reduce the quotas of Canadian oil sold to them by several hundred thousand barrels. The purpose could be to put severe economic pressure on Canada in order to force us to give concessions to the United States for resources in other areas, possibly water. And I have just been advised a few moments ago, Mr. Speaker, that the United States has put restrictions on the importation of Canadian oil to the United States, and this part of my remarks is borne out.

March 10, 1970

If in fact a power play is shaping up it will take all the force of our Government, backed up by an informed public, to resist the pressure. If there is no power play, then it seems strange indeed that the Canadian study of energy policy, the United States new oil policy management committee and the ever-increasing United States need for fresh water should all concurrently be under consideration on both sides of this great undefended border.

There are conflicting statements coming out of Ottawa, Mr. Speaker, and I just want to quote two of them to highlight this situation. Mr. Greene said on February 24, 1970 in the Commons that there will be no export of water without the approval of the Government and that the Government has no intention of giving such approval. However, Mr. Trudeau was reported by the Toronto Star the next day as saying that we have more pure water than we can possibly use and that we should be prepared to sell the surplus water for good hard cash. I draw to all Members' attention that a comprehensive study of our water resources has not yet been done therefore speculation on sales of surplus water is premature. The matter of Canadian control of Canadian resources is hanging in the balance and we should all be wary of a situation arising whereby we could lose control of more of our Canadian resources.

As you may have drawn in conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I do not intend to support this document but I will support the amendment.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. R. ROMANOW: (Saskatoon-Riversdale) — Mr. Speaker, at the very beginning, I would like to just bring to the attention of the Hon. Members that this week is Taras Shevchenko week for the people of the Ukrainian communities in Saskatchewan. Last night the MLAs of Ukrainian background had the pleasure of attending a very nice — well a few Irishmen were there as well — banquet put on by the Ukrainian Self-Reliance League in commemoration of Shevchenko who was a poet and a painter and is well recognized as our greatest Ukrainian by the Ukrainian people.

Now, Mr. Speaker, this afternoon we had entered into this debate a few wise words of wisdom by several Members of the Liberal Government side. I want to make mention very briefly of some of the arguments advanced by two of them. The last Liberal speaker was the Hon. Member from Yorkton (Mr. Gallagher) who brought out two things, I think, of importance. First of all, he emphasized that it was a shame that the present agricultural policy of the Liberal Government at Ottawa was such that many, many acres of wheat in the Province of Saskatchewan have been put out of production when there are starving people in the world at this particular time.

He described the fact that starvation was rampant in so much of the world's population and that it was actually a crime in many ways to put acreage out of production as a result of a Liberal Government policy in Ottawa.

To that I say to the Hon. Member from Yorkton, we agree. But we also ask the, Hon. Member to look at the Government and the man who instituted that policy. That' policy of deprivation for the needy people of the world was instituted by the Hon. Otto

Lang, Minister without portfolio, a member of the Hon. Member's governing party at Ottawa. That policy of ruination, that policy of putting out of production wheat acreage is a folly. It's a plan that is implemented by the Liberal Government that the Hon. Member subscribes to. And he said one other thing that I thought was of interest. He said that the only significant wheat to be licensed in a long while was Thatcher. He called upon the licensing of some additional wheat in the future and with that we agreed. I can tell the Hon. Member that before the Federal Government moves in that area, there is going to be a de-licensing of Thatcher in the Province of Saskatchewan of a political variety.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. ROMANOW: — I can tell the Hon. Member from Yorkton that the people of Saskatchewan are looking for a new strain of politics in the Province of Saskatchewan that is going to be de-Thatcherizing. He also complained that he didn't have enough time on radio, only 10 minutes. I can sympathize with the listening audience because for a while there I thought that for 9-1/2 minutes he had actually used too much time of the 10 minutes allotted to him.

Now this afternoon also, Mr. Speaker, we are treated to another performance by the Minister of Mineral Resources (Mr. Cameron). You know the Minister of Mineral Resources is really the most entertaining performer that the Liberals have and probably one of the most entertaining performers that this House enjoys from time to time. Unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, his performances are akin to the heroes of the silent era, a vaudeville performance. He reminds me of the silent movie heroes of the golden days when you go down to the movies from time to time and you see them bursting through the paper doors, tissue-thin arguments that he advances and breaks through with such vigor and gusto.

If you look behind what the Minister of Mineral Resources says you find not a particularly substantial performance. He kept on challenging us. He said, "Where does the NDP stand?" when he talked about the Watkins Manifesto. "Where does the NDP stand on the White Paper?", and a series of questions of this nature. Well, I would like to ask the Hon. Minister of Mineral Resources and the Hon. Minister of Public Works (Mr. Guy) where they stand on one or two things. Where does the Minister of Mineral Resources (Mr. Cameron) stand with respect to the Minister of Highways' (Mr. Boldt) position that the Canadian Wheat Board should be abolished? Where do you stand on that one, Mr. Minister of Mineral Resources? The Member from Elrose (Mr. Leith) sort of, in a half qualified way, supports the Minister of Highways. The Member from Yorkton (Mr. Gallagher), I don't know whether he himself exactly knows where he stands. The Member from Nipawin (Mr. Radloff) is lucky if he stands. The Minister of Agriculture (Mr. McFarlane) is confused on the Canadian Wheat Board policy. Some are for it. Some are against it. Some attack it. Some say that they are speaking personally and not for the Government. Where, Mr. Minister of Mineral Resources, does the Liberal Government stand on the Canadian Wheat Board? Are you really out to destroy the Canadian Wheat Board and destroy orderly marketing in the Province of Saskatchewan as we suspect? Well, that is only one question. Do you know what the Prime Minister of Canada said respecting wheat? This was the Prime Minister's attitude towards agriculture and the Western farmer. He said, "As far as we are concerned the Western farmer can sell his own wheat." That's what the Liberal party said at

Ottawa! Now I ask the Minister of Mineral Resources: where do you stand on that? Where. does the Liberal party in Saskatchewan stand about the, farmers selling their own wheat? Perhaps that is what is behind the attack on the Canadian Wheat Board that the Liberal Members one after one, after one, have launched in the Saskatchewan, Legislature.

Where does the Minister of Mineral Resources stand when he refuses to talk about his record in Mineral Resources? He didn't mention anything about metal production being down this year, nothing about revenue petroleum being down, revenue from potash being down. No, he was more concerned about the New Democratic party convention and not worried about mineral resources and the farmers being mismanaged.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. ROMANOW: — Oh, he didn't want to talk about 1969 and 1968 figures because they tell the sad story of mismanagement by the Liberal Government that the financial critic (Mr. Blakeney) documented a couple of days ago. He didn't want to talk about it that way. What he wanted to talk about was the five-year plan, the great five-year leap forward that the Hon. Minister of Mineral Resources and the Liberal Government have attempted to perpetrate on the people of Saskatchewan. But the record shows that everything is down in mineral resources. Where do you stand, Mr. Mineral Resources Minister? I can tell you where you stand and where your Government stands — on the quicksand of electoral discontent. It will be proven the next time the Premier decides to call an elections in this area.

MR. CAMERON: — Do you want to go to Maple Creek in challenge?

MR. ROMANOW: — Do you want to come to Riversdale on that challenge, Mr. Minister?

MR. CAMERON: — You are making the challenge, not I.

MR. ROMANOW: — The Hon. Minister of Public Works (Mr. Guy) says old Riversdale and perhaps I shouldn't be so quick. That's right, Riversdale Prince Albert West-Cumberland. That's likely to be what the Treasurer will come up with.

You know, Mr. Speaker, we have seen a very interesting performance by the Liberal Members with respect to this Budget Debate. In fact the entire Budget of 1970 has been very interesting. I have a little nephew who told me about a very interesting fairy tale that I think applies when one describes the Budget of 1970. Some Members may know that there was an emperor who was very greatly fascinated by new clothes to the extent that affairs of state and his interest in soldiers all went by the board. He was so interested in his new clothes that one day he was talked into purchasing a new set of garments by two rascals who were going to weave this for him. The fact is that nothing was being woven, but the emperor refused to admit it, because to do so, he thought, would in fact be admitting that he was unfit for office or that he was too stupid to see that nothing was being woven. All the members, of the emperor's court, like all of

the Members of the Liberal party opposite, flattered that which they could not see, because they were afraid of being called by the emperor unfit to govern or too stupid. And so in this Debate, Member after Member of the Liberal party opposite, has been following that children's fairy tale as far as the 1970 Budget is concerned.

The Liberals, Mr. Speaker, have produced a Budget of nothingness. The Members opposite talked and praised it for fear and only, like in the fairy tale, will the Budget be exposed when the emperor has the courage to walk among the people at the next election, which we hope is coming soon.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. ROMANOW: — Mr. Speaker, Members opposite say, "How could anyone not support a Budget such as this." No one could support a budget, I say to you Mr. Treasurer (Mr. Steuart), that has come from a Government that is directly responsible for Saskatchewan's hard times. To support this Budget would be to merely flatter the Emperor of the Wascana, as someone has so aptly described the Premier. And like the emperor in the story, it would be a delusionary process, ignoring the sordid facts of Saskatchewan's economic hard times. These hard times have been told many, many times by the Members on this side: such facts as private and public investment down 7.4 per cent; total farm cash receipts down 17 per cent; mineral production down 3.4 per cent; retail sales down 8.3 per cent; Saskatchewan's population down by 22,000 people. All of the economic indicators are down under Liberal mismanagement. That is the story that Liberal Government has painted after five years in its great leap forward.

My concern this afternoon, though, is going to be with the city of Saskatoon and what Liberal mismanagement has done to that city. It is my honor to represent the constituents of Saskatoon-Riversdale and I think that five areas can briefly tell the story.

First, in the area of construction, the value of permits for building in Saskatoon in 1969 (note this if you will, Mr. Treasurer) is down nearly \$10 million from the year 1968. \$10 million reduction! This is not only a Saskatoon problem. Statistics show that in Saskatchewan the dollar value has decreased by over \$7 million. And the most startling statistic is that the Province's overall building permits are down a total value of \$42 million under the Liberal regime in the five-year plan.

Second, how about the area of retail sales? Very quickly the facts are clear there. In the city of Saskatoon retail sales fell over 6.3 per cent in 1969 from 1968. How about the third area, housing starts? My colleague from Mayfair (Mr. Brockelbank) documented that very ably. The housing start situation is actually very critical. Fewer than 350 housing units started in 1969. With respect to housing sales, they have been going steadily down in the city of Saskatoon since 1967. And the fourth area, unemployment. The number of jobs available is down again from 1968. Unemployment is sharply up.

I want to give Members an example referring to one particular trade that is indicative of many of the jobs in the city of Saskatoon, that is electrical workers. They reflect the wide-spread unemployment that is now about in the Province of Saskatchewan.

March 10, 1970

They reflect the wide-spread unemployment in the city of Saskatoon. One year ago, Mr. Minister of Labour (Mr. Coderre), there were 531 electricians employed in Saskatoon jobs. Today there are not 531 electricians but less than 200 electricians employed in the city of Saskatoon, or if you will, a reduction of 331 electricians in one year. It doesn't just stop with the electricians. You have to take into account that most of them are married with families and children. They are now unemployed and in most cases have left the city of Saskatoon causing a depressed economy for us.

Fifth, in the area of bankruptcies. Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Hon. Treasurer would be interested in this figure about businesses going belly-up under this Liberal Administration. Do you know that in the city of Saskatoon business failures in the year 1969 totalled 12? In 1968 they totalled six. If you will, a 100 per cent increase over the year 1968. Twelve business failures in the year 1969 under the Liberal Government. That's the type of situation that paints a very gloomy picture for the residents of Saskatoon. All I can say about private enterprise is that they never had it so good under the dark, stagnant days of the Socialists from 1944 to 1964.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. ROMANOW: — So to summarize, Mr. Speaker, construction retail sales, housing starts, employment opportunities, business successes are all down under the Liberals in the Province of Saskatchewan. It has not been a good year for the city of Saskatoon. I understand that the Member from Nutana South (Mr. Forsyth) is to follow me in debate and I ask him to challenge me if that is not correct. The people of Saskatoon are asking why. And their bewilderment is all the more increased when you examine the record of other cities and other provinces. For example, Winnipeg in the stagnant New Democratic Province, of Manitoba, in the area of bankruptcies didn't increase at all from last year. Edmonton in the Province of Alberta even effected a reduction in the number of businesses that went belly up. Calgary maintained its long-time average on bankruptcies. In the area of construction, Mr. Minister of Public Works (Mr. Guy), I know you are a great follower of the Province of Manitoba — you'll be pleased to know that the value of construction has increased over \$15 million under the New Democrats in 1969 but it has gone down under the Liberals in Saskatchewan. British Columbia and Alberta have held their own. The Minister I know will be very interested in housing and so will the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Estey). In the city of Winnipeg in Manitoba, housing starts more than doubled from the year 1968, but not in Saskatoon where they decreased by over 350. The same story for Calgary and Edmonton. Mr. Speaker, Manitoba and Alberta are dependent to a large extent on a wheat economy. Now if the Liberals argue and would have us believe, as they do, that this recession is due primarily to wheat then, why is it that Alberta and Manitoba aren't suffering to the same extent as Saskatchewan and in fact are prospering. The simple fact of the matter is that the reason for this decline is Saskatchewan's poor mismanagement under the Liberal Government of Premier Thatcher. The Province of Saskatchewan is suffering badly economically. In fact if I was inclined to the very colorful prose of my friend from Nipawin (Mr. Radloff) I would say that it was suffering under the "lustful, sinful, wicked avarice" of the Members of the Government of the Province of Saskatchewan when he used it to describe the New Democratic party. Well, Mr.

Speaker, we have all heard from the Liberals opposite in this Debate. They speak of this year's Budget by saying, "Look at the Emperor's new clothes." And I can tell the Members of this House that it is a budget like the Emperor's new clothes, a budget of absolute nothingness for the Province of Saskatchewan to alleviate this major economic crisis we are in.

Then if you compound the economic fiasco, Saskatoon has also had to endure some very bad political decisions that have hampered services in a number of vital areas. I want to give you an example of just two. First, in the field of education, parents and teachers have expressed their concern that Liberal policies are wrecking one of the finest school systems this province knows. The Department of Education has told the Saskatoon Collegiate System that it must trim its budget by thousands of dollars, that it must reduce its teaching staff by at least 40, because, according to the Minister (Mr. McIsaac), somewhere on some computer some Department official says they have overspent and they have too many teachers. Not a question of improving their teaching staff, not a question of expanding new curricula courses, not a question of devising new techniques of teaching, nothing about looking forward in the 1970s to the technological demands on education. Nothing! Not even holding the line but a reduction of thousands of dollars and 40 teachers. The Members from Nutana and City Park-University know that to be the case. The parents of the city of Saskatoon are upset and concerned about this. They write to us. This type of political decision by the Department of Education has two effects, Mr. Speaker. First, it makes a mockery of the principle of local government autonomy in education. The implication behind the Minister of Education's ruling is that Saskatoon's school boards and administrators are simply incompetent and unqualified to make the right judgments, financial and academic, as far as our school system is concerned. And I don't buy that. The people of the Province of Saskatchewan don't buy that either, Mr. Minister of Education. That's the first effect of your decision to cut back by those thousands of dollars and those 40 teachers. The second implication is this. The Department's decision has the effect of reducing the quality of education. Make no mistake about it. Parents and teachers, and if the Minister doubts my word then he had better get out about his constituency, among the teachers and trustees and some parents to find out. They have written to MLAs expressing the point that this reduction is going to ultimately cost the Province of Saskatchewan millions more by the temporary saving of today.

You know, Mr. Minister of Education (Mr. McIsaac), you remind me sometimes of the character, Nathan Detroit in the Broadway play, "Guys and Dolls". You know Nathan Detroit and his concern about the numbers game when you talk about student-teacher ratios: 25 to 1, 23 to 1, 24 to 1. He shoots them off glibly, shuffling them around. It's like the world's largest floating crap game. Now you see it. Now you don't see it, using whatever ratio is necessary to justify for his political party and his political friends why he is wrecking the educational system of the Province of Saskatchewan. And all the while, Mr. Minister, all the while, we, the teachers, the trustees, the parents, we have never heard about your concern for curricula and courses. We have never heard about your concern for new techniques of teaching. We have never heard your concern for individualized teaching. What we hear about is the numbers game — 25 to 1, 23 to 1, 24 to 1 — as if you can play with education in this manner. He uses simplistic, catch-all formulas, anything at all that happens to be going this week to justify the Department's position. All I can say about

March 10, 1970

24 to 1 is that those are about the odds you would get at the next election when the Liberal Government calls it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. ROMANOW: — Mr. Speaker, this Government has upset the balance and purpose of Saskatoon's education program. The Minister and the Government of Saskatchewan have exhibited backward political thinking. And on top of this, Mr. Minister, I want to bring to your attention the special educational problem in Saskatoon and that is concerned with university students and high school students. Because of this economic mess that this Government has created summertime jobs are going to be very difficult to obtain for some university students and high school students. A great portion of university students depend upon summer jobs to get back to university in the fall. Absolutely no form of assistance, apart from Federal loans, no form of assistance for these people. High school students are going to be even more disadvantaged because they are competing against university students. I was sorry the Member from City Park-University (Mr. Charlebois), in whose riding the University is located didn't see fit to make any mention of this problem that many of his constituents have communicated to me. But there is absolutely no concern by the Minister of Education (Mr. McIsaac) and the Member from City Park-University or this Liberal Government about the plight of university and high school students. You know, Mr. Minister of Education, about 50 per cent likely will not be able to obtain summer work and thereby a great percentage likely not able to come back to university. And if that is a saving then you have got to look at all the other reports concerning savings on education.

Now, Mr. Speaker, a second area of political damage that I think has done irreparable harm to the city of Saskatoon is in the, area of health services. Last August City Hospital was told by the Minister of Health (Mr. Grant) that the officials would not be giving to City Hospital much needed funds to cover a deficit. Now primarily, this deficit not only but primarily, was due to a contract that was negotiated, in fact had just been concluded sometime around June or July of 1969 after sincere, honest collective bargaining between the Board of Governors and City Hospital and the employees, long before any indication was communicated by the Government to these officials about picking up this deficit. So finally the Government steps in and says, "We are not going to pick up your deficit." The result was that substantial numbers of workers were laid off, some beds were not being used at that particular time. There was a crisis in a hospital financing in the city of Saskatoon and the Board of Governors was caught in the dilemma.

HON. G.B. GRANT: (Minister of Health) — It's all over.

MR. ROMANOW: — Oh, sure, it's all over but look at the harm you have caused by this type of action. I can tell him that it's all over for the 80 people who were laid off by City Hospital. That's how it's all over. Mr. Speaker, what happened by this action was simply this, and it is happening at St. Paul's: a \$59,000 deficit exists at St. Paul's Hospital. Are you picking that up, Mr. Minister of Public Health? There is no indication by the Minister that he is going to be picking it up, so I guess St. Paul's

hospital has to do as it can on its own, left on the hook with the deficit of the hospital just like City Hospital was left hanging by the Liberal Government's indecisiveness . . .

MR. GRANT: — Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. That question was answered by myself in this House just a few days ago.

MR. ROMANOW: — Mr. Speaker, the point I am making with respect to City Hospital financing is that it was in August, 1969 the Liberal Government manufactured and created a crisis in hospital financing, not only in Saskatoon but in a number of other hospitals in the Province of Saskatchewan. You, Mr. Minister of Health, were the author of that crisis, aided and supported by your Government, by virtue of your refusal to pick up these deficits as they came due.

Now we tried at one time to get the MLAs of Saskatoon to attend a meeting in a small attempt to get a united stand.

MR. CHARLEBOIS: — What night . . .

MR. ROMANOW: — I know the Hon. Member from City Park-University is very, very touchy with this because he knows what's coming up.

MR. CHARLEBOIS: — A meeting of MLAs? Does he think he is the Premier of the Province?

MR. ROMANOW: — Well, you know we can laugh about this, Mr. Speaker. You just listen, Mr. Member from City Park-University (Mr. Charlebois), you had your say yesterday and you made no mention of this crisis in your riding. And I know that constituents in your riding have been telling me about this and you didn't mention it. You haven't raised it in this Chamber on behalf of your constituents. So get out among your people before it's too late, before the next election. I can say simply this to the Member from City Park-University, as I was about to say, that we attempted — I didn't say that I called a meeting — we attempted to call a meeting of MLAs to get a united stand of the MLAs because this was an area of prime concern, an area of prime concern of the people of the city of Saskatoon. You know, Mr. Speaker, that the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Estey) attended.

HON. C.L.B. ESTEY: (Minister of Municipal Affairs) — Yes, I was there.

MR. ROMANOW: — The Member from Nutana South (Mr. Forsyth) attended and expressed his concern. The Member from Mayfair (Mr. Brockelbank) attended and expressed his concern. I attended. The only Member who did not attend and subsequently told the Press that he refused to attend was the Member from City Park-University . . .

MR. CHARLEBOIS: — I want to tell you in this House, Mr. Speaker, that I am proud of the fact that I didn't get sucked down that path by that nut.

MR. ROMANOW: — Well, Mr. Speaker . . .

MR. SPEAKER: — Order, order! I don't think it is proper for one Member to refer to another as a nut.

March 10, 1970

MR. CHARLEBOIS: — I withdraw that, Mr. Speaker, but I think you got the implication. You know just what I think of that meeting.

MR. BROCKELBANK: — The Member withdraws and then he qualifies it.

MR. SPEAKER: — Order, order! Now let me tell you people, let me tell the Members on this side that once in a while I come to their rescue and I don't expect them to make a political issue out of it. One of these days you will bounce that political football too thundering far.

MR. ROMANOW: — Mr. Speaker, I accept the apology from the Hon. Member, I really . . .

MR. SPEAKER: — The Member for Regina Centre.

MR. A.E. BLAKENEY: (Regina Centre) — Excuse me. Was there reference to me, Mr. Speaker?

MR. SPEAKER: — Yes, I told the Member from Saskatoon Mayfair (Mr. Brockelbank) that if he didn't know what I was talking about, he could discuss the matter with you and probably you could give him a pretty good explanation.

MR. BLAKENEY — I am sure I could, Mr. Speaker.

MR. ROMANOW: — I am sure that in fact he will, Mr. Speaker. But, Mr. Speaker, I want to say that I do accept the apology by the Hon. Member from City Park-University. I really didn't treat it as an insult because I know the Hon. Member doesn't know nuts from peanuts, to wit, his example about the peanut mine that he talked about yesterday. So I really wasn't offended by that.

The important thing about this though, as I said, unfortunately nothing concrete was resolved by this meeting. But one thing was clear.

HON. D.G. STEUART: (Provincial Treasurer) — That doesn't surprise me.

MR. ROMANOW: — It doesn't surprise me either with the two Liberals we had to deal with. It didn't surprise me either, Mr. Treasurer. But what the entire exercise did show to the Province of Saskatchewan and to the people of Saskatoon was your Government's intention to wreck the hospitalization program as we know it in the Province of Saskatchewan. In effect what that entire exercise resulted in was the city of Saskatoon adopting the principle that a part of hospital financing might have to be picked up by the already overburdened local taxpayer. What that action indicated was that the door was open for the Provincial Government now to start a wholesale shift of the hospital financing expenses from the burden of the Provincial tax base and on to the already overburdened local taxpayer, thereby wrecking the Saskatchewan Hospitalization Program as we know it. That, Mr. Speaker, is the degree of concern that the Liberal members opposite and the Member for City Park-University (Mr. Charlebois), in particular, showed for City Hospital in the Province of Saskatchewan.

Mr. Speaker, the year 1969 has been a very difficult year for the city of Saskatoon. A story of unemployment, a story of substantially decreased economic activity, a story of Liberal bungling locally, provincially and nationally. Mr. Speaker, Members opposite ask if we will vote against a Government with this type of a record. I can say to the Member from Nipawin (Mr. Radloff), don't hold your breath. Members cannot and must not expect that anyone in this House is going to vote for a Government that has bungled this job so badly in economics, health and education as the Government of this Province has for the constituents in my city. This is not an attitude or an example of a businesslike administration.

Mr. Speaker, I want to talk very briefly about one area of particular concern to the city of Saskatoon. That is the question of the Water Sewage Treatment plant that is being constructed there or about to be constructed. Members will know that the Water Sewage Treatment plant is a much needed program designed to combat pollution. Plans are on the way to have this plant constructed. Members know that the South Saskatchewan River goes through the city. Sometimes in the summer with the Dam in operation, Mr. Minister of Public Works (Mr. Guy), water levels have been so low in Saskatoon that the polluted river has impaired the beauty of the city. Now I think you know about this and you have expressed your concern. I think a plant of this nature is an absolute must. It's going to be very expensive and costly. Financing apparently has been agreed to from the city, the Province to a small extent, and the Federal authorities. Now the Member from Nutana South (Mr. Forsyth) eloquently talked about pollution, according to newspaper reports, and we all agreed with his concern. It is a source of some regret, Mr. Minister, that the Provincial Government has not seen fit to guarantee more than the 10 per cent of the cost of the program. I understand that's the guarantee up to a maximum of \$500,000. The amount for water sewage treatment is going to be a very expensive operation. This pollution needs commitment by the Provincial Government, by your Department, Mr. Minister (Mr. Guy), if the Water Treatment plant is going to become a reality. From time to time it has been a trend to be called off because of financial problems. This Budget has made no mention of this and I would ask the Minister and the Government to reconsider the amount of financial assistance and ease the burden on the local property owner by giving a more substantial grant.

Now, Mr. Speaker, one other small word respecting incentives for the city of Saskatoon. I know that the Hon. Member from City Park-University (Mr. Charlebois) made no mention about the Federal incentives program and the inclusion of the city of Saskatoon in it. I am now asking the Government to make sure that the city of Saskatoon is included in the Federal program. I see by the newspaper reports that there is some indication that this is likely to come about and we welcome that. If it shouldn't come about certainly a strong case has to be made and I am putting it forward to the Treasurer (Mr. Steuart) for inclusion of Saskatoon and Regina, provincially, in the provincial scheme. The simple fact of the matter is that I am really somewhat amazed at the Liberal Government's attitude to exclude the city of Saskatoon and the city of Regina when the program was announced initially provincially. The exclusion of the city of Saskatoon federally only indicates, as Mayor Buckwold said in a newspaper report, that the Government of the Province of Saskatchewan just wasn't behind the city of Saskatoon in including it in the program. That reflects a very bad, bad thing for the city of Saskatoon as far as this Government's concern is for industry.

March 10, 1970

Mr. Speaker, this Budget is that of a tired and irresponsible Government out of touch and out of tune with the needs of the 1970s.

Now very briefly, Mr. Speaker, I just have another five minutes on one of the related areas. Pollution and industrial growth, I have talked about very briefly, and they are but two of the problems facing Saskatchewan cities. Probably the most pressing problem, generally speaking, is the question of a city tax-base. Simply put it appears that a city tax-base is not large enough now to meet the expenses a modern-day city incurs. As these cities grow, slowly albeit under the Liberal Government, they are faced with a myriad of problems such as housing, recreation, law and order, and good urban planning. Members will agree with me that cities are caught in a cost-price squeeze of their own. Tax funds to carry out these projects are largely in the hands of the Provincial and Federal authorities.

Now the traditional method of solving the cities' financial problems has been to have cities travel to Provincial and Federal authorities and to try to justify or plead the case for financial assistance, so that specific projects can get under way, such as the Water Sewage Treatment plant. You have to show the Provincial and Federal Governments that a particular project for a city is within the jurisdiction and within the merits and that it's a worthwhile project for the city of Saskatoon, or whatever city. Often, it is safe to say that these requests have not been met with favor, not maliciously in some cases, but simply because the senior authorities are too far removed from the local problem. This method has resulted in a tug-and-pull atmosphere with respect to municipal financing of our projects and with respect to an orderly planning of city growth. For a country that is fast becoming one of the most highly urbanized countries in the world, it is an unsatisfactory and inefficient method to deal with city problems. Frankly I do not think it right that cities have to go to senior governments with cap in hand to finance their day-to-day needs.

Therefore, it is my position to put forward to the attention of the Hon. Members that there is an urgent need to examine in detail the entire area of municipal-provincial-federal relations with a view to working out a new taxation distribution formula and method and also perhaps a new decision-making process for those matters of large financial expense that are deemed to be in the interests of the country not only the interest of the city. This calls for a commitment on the part of the Provincial Government to start working toward setting up this new distribution program, this new decision-making process, because all Members will agree the present burden on the local taxpayer is unbearable. It reflects an old and antiquated taxation program. We have all talked about it but not done very much about it and new approaches are needed.

Now today I have a very brief suggestion to make that I don't say is the answer. It is an idea for discussion. It is merely an attempt, hopefully, to prod the Hon. Members' thinking toward a program that might alleviate the present pressures and update the program for the future. The proposal is that the Provincial Government look at the possibility of creating provincially at any rate, for the time being — it can't stop here — a new level of decision-making and planning respecting municipal problems in those areas where the cities are going to have to go to the Provincial Governments for financial needs, for those areas where the

projects are perhaps by definition deemed to be in the interests of the public at large. I think this body has to be expanded to ultimately incorporate the Federal authorities so that you might have someday a joint Federal-Provincial-Civic Government that deals with this particular type of problem and concurrent with this a total redistribution of the taxation schemes in the Province of Saskatchewan.

One of two things can exist under the present tax system now. The city of Saskatoon or any city can say simply, "We can't do it" and turn it over to the Provinces and the Federal Government or alternatively, to expand its tax base. I think a meeting point can be the answer. So, therefore, as a first step there must be action initiated by the Province with the Federal Government urging Ottawa to discuss the entire principle of taxation as it relates to municipalities and cities. I suggest that perhaps one small concrete way to start today in our Legislature would be to use our Municipal Law Committee or a similar committee to start studying the problems, to start accepting now representation from cities and every other province conceivably in the future following a similar process. It might be possible that this body could be the basis for this new decision-making body that I talked about. Representatives could be elected by SUMA or other organizations, Legislatures could pick their members in the ordinary course as the Federal Parliament as well. This committee could very well be the so-called Provincial Parliament for cities where decisions for the orderly and progressive development of our cities can be made in the spirit of cooperation together by all the authorities. There would also be the advantage of the civic officials being involved on the day-to-day running of all their affairs.

Mr. Speaker, as I have said, this is not the complete answer. The important thing is to start some study now. Perhaps our present Municipal Committee in the Province could be used to work on this, as I have suggested, to contact Ottawa and contact urban municipalities. The important thing is a commitment from the Provincial Government that it will undertake to launch a serious review of this entire area of taxation and decision-making, as it affects cities so that all citizens can be assured that our cities can grow physically and aesthetically, so that we may all flourish and live in harmony.

Therefore, to sum up I propose an in-depth study of the entire municipal-provincial-federal relations with a view to implementation of this new decision-making body devoted to the solution of urban problems and, perhaps this Legislature could start now with the use of the Municipal Committee of the Province of Saskatchewan.

Mr. Speaker, the Budget for 1970 has talked about none of these problems. It has made no mention whatsoever of the problems of the future. It has attempted to cover up the problems this Government created in the past and for those reasons I cannot and will not support the main motion.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. W.A. FORSYTH: (Saskatoon Nutana South) — Mr. Speaker, the lot of a backbencher is a very sad lot and I must at this moment just share with the Members of the House some of the problems. I am sorry that I must do this but I think you should understand my situation. I really come, as

March 10, 1970

all good backbenchers come to the support of other backbenchers, to relieve my good friend, the Member from Hanley (Mr. Heggie), from rising from his sick bed to deliver an address, so I dug up an address which I wanted to give for some time and brought it into this House. Now I find myself squeezed between the white knight charging out of Riversdale (Mr. Romanow) and the Hon. Member from Regina South East (Mr. Baker), the black knight, as he might be called, with his eight-point program. Now I really haven't time to do justice to what I wanted to do. I have been challenged to reply to a lot of half truths and what really worries me is that if I go overtime on this that the Member from Regina South East, the hon. Mayor of all Regina, will take away my parking privileges. So you can see my dilemma, Mr. Speaker, and I am going to just partially mention a few of the things since this is Saskatoon day in the House, obviously, I am just going to mention one or two things of interest as a Member from Saskatoon.

I think number one on the list really should be that again we have a momentous day in Saskatchewan. It is now only 338 days until the opening of the Canada Winter Games in Saskatoon and if you haven't your reservations, my mountain-builder friend from Saskatoon City Park-University (Mr. Charlebois) will be glad to furnish these for you.

I would just like to mention one little item here if I can find it amongst all these papers, that the Member from Mayfair, (Mr. Brockelbank) was quite concerned and really chastising a fellow Saskatonian, the Hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Estey). He was chastising him about taking no interest in housing. I wish that he would just come down Arlington Avenue which runs through my constituency and notice the direct influence the Minister of Municipal Affairs has had upon housing in Saskatoon with the construction of 79 units of economic rental housing which form Sturby Place. And Sturby Place is only a portion of the development because there are 60 other units presently that are under construction or ready for occupancy. And this is 139 units in the city of Saskatoon, the type of housing which I am sure the Member from Mayfair would welcome when he talks about the lack of housing for people in the lower income brackets.

I really don't know where to start on the challenges. I wish the Member for Riversdale (Mr. Romanow) was here to prod me a bit, because he probably knows what he would like to be challenged on, so that he could reply fittingly at a later date. But since he has left the House I really don't know where to begin, except perhaps that it would be wise to start at the place that he obviously didn't start, at a place where I do know something about what I am talking. And that is in the field of education in Saskatoon.

When we start talking about the cutting of budgets in Saskatoon, I wish people like my hon. friend from Riversdale would take the time to do a little investigating on the budgeting procedure of a city school board. The budgets that were brought down in Regina for discussion with the people in the Department of Education were preliminary budgets. For all the years that I sat on the Saskatoon school boards I have never yet seen a school board accept a preliminary budget as its final budget. So, therefore, when we talk about changes we are talking about relative things. The changes in the budget, many of them would have been made anyway. A preliminary budget represents what a board would like to do if it had unlimited funds, unlimited resources of

manpower and money. From there the budget takes shape in a series of meetings sometimes extending to as many as 12 to 14 meetings and finally takes shape as the real budget.

Now the preliminary budget which was brought down here would have been cut anyway. It certainly wasn't the final budget. There is an item in that budget which sets aside certain sums as a reserve and this is a matter of great concern and great debate in any school board as to whether it should set aside a large sum for reserves. I think that it is a matter that can be debated but one of the largest amounts in the budget that was brought down certainly did concern the setting aside a reserve.

When we talk about this numbers game, the pupil-teacher ratio, I think again the Hon. Members might take a look at some of the things that have gone on and some of the things that will always go on in education, and some of the things that I think the Department of Education regardless of what government is in power, will have to take a rather firm attitude toward. They are usually picked up by the local boards but I don't think it does one bit of harm to the education system of the province to have an across-the-board scrutiny of what is going on in the school systems of Saskatchewan.

I can just mention one thing that I know about, where there was a pupil-teacher ratio in a language class in Saskatoon. Two classes were being taught. One of them with two pupils enrolled and the other less than 10 pupils enrolled. These were employing full-time teachers. Now this was several years ago and this was a situation that was corrected by the board. This is the sort of thing that can arise and it will happen many times. I see absolutely no reason why the pupil-teacher ratio has to cause all the disturbance that it is causing. We have, in the public school system of Saskatoon, for many years worked towards a pupil-teacher ratio that is not at all different from the one that the minister of Education (Mr. McIsaac) is proposing today. And he is proposing it with the thought that it cannot be implemented in every school in the province.

I would also just like to mention these terrible figures that were presented about the decline of all conditions in Saskatoon. This is a terrible city that I come from, I guess. I just wish that the Member from Riversdale (Mr. Romanow) would take a look around when he goes back and try, if he can remember back three or four years, to remember what the skyline of Saskatoon looked like at that time. I think he would be rather surprised if he just did a little catalogue. If he took the Avord Towers which is presently under construction away; if he took CN Towers down; if he took the 22-storey apartment complexes which have three blocks involved; if he took away the new YMCA; if he took away the Bank of Commerce Building; if he took away all of these things which represent a high point in construction in Saskatoon, I am sure that he would find himself in a very flat-looking city, a city that was the way it was when the Socialist Government was in power.

The other thing that I would like to talk about just for a moment is this terrible hospital crisis that he speaks of. I wonder if he has ever thought about this whole process of deficit financing by boards which are not financially responsible. It can be a terrible thing to take away any local autonomy. On the other hand we really cannot allow unbridled spending with the thought that the Provincial Government is going to pick up the

tab in every case. Now at the time that this became a crisis, a great crisis as the Hon. Member from Riversdale called his crisis meeting over, the budgetary deficit of the City Hospital was projected at somewhere about \$90,000. There was no question that the Provincial Government was prepared to pick up a portion of this. However, we certainly as the Provincial Government were not prepared to take it all. Now after the soul-searching and the sound and the fury died down, we find that that budget has been reviewed, we find that the deficit is now less than \$50,000 and we find that a good portion of this, of course, will still be picked up by the Provincial Government.

But look what happened. The deficit was in a sense cut in half merely because we demanded a soul-searching look at it. This business of the numbers game that the Member for Riversdale, (Mr. Romanow) was deploring, good heavens, he engaged in it when he started talking about beds in the City Hospital. The City Hospital has all kinds of vacant beds and the Mayor of Saskatoon and the City Council were very, very shocked to learn that at the very time that the hospital board was complaining about closing beds and some of the medical staff were screaming at them, that those beds were empty anyway.

This is a tremendous game, this bed-counting game, and I don't pretend to understand it, but I don't think that we should ever take any one set of figures from either the hospital administration or the medical staff's side as a firm and absolutely irrefutable set of figures on bed occupancy at any one time.

Now what I would really like to speak about for a few days . . . well it may seem like a few days but it really won't be that long. It is really rather interesting that the Member from Riversdale ended up by speaking largely along the line that I would like to study in perhaps just a bit more depth. It is the whole field of regional planning, regional government. I don't intend to cover it to any great extent. In order to find time to do this I am going to have to forego some very complimentary remarks that I had prepared for the Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Steuart). I am sure when I do this that he will cut off my piggy bank but at the same time I really would like to make these few remarks on the subject of regional planning.

In introduction, I must say that I do welcome the increased grants to school districts and to school boards and to municipalities which have been made in this Budget. And while I welcome all this increased aid, I do hope that at some future stage of financial planning we can come up with a method of increasing the tax-base for our municipalities. I say this — and I am not being inconsistent here — because I am a firm believer in the principle that the government which spends the money should have the responsibility of raising the money. In a province with such geographic and economic variations as Saskatchewan, a measure of equalization payments will always be necessary. For the same reasons consideration will always have to be given to some equalization in the Federal-Provincial relationship. However, I believe that our whole system of municipal government tends to get out of touch with reality if it becomes over-dependent on handouts from the Province.

This statement of the philosophy that the municipal government or a board who expends the money should be financially capable of raising most of the money leads me quite naturally to an examination of the structure of local government in our

province. Any debate concerning the finances of our province should contain reference to this subject because the planned integration of municipal and provincial government administration is of vital concern to the internal economy of our province.

Let us take a look at the mechanisms which we are presently employing to govern and to administer the affairs of less than a million people.

First, we have 13 Federal constituencies and 59 Provincial constituencies. Then at the municipal level we have 295 rural municipalities, 11 local improvement districts, 362 villages, 130 towns and 11 cities. Using the 1968 Municipal Estimates, the smallest rural municipality had a population of 237 while the largest had a population of 3,759.

In the field of education, we find 60 school units whose population of students varies from 1,027 to 3,526 and 74 school districts which are not in units. With no relation to these, teachers salaries are negotiated in 13 area bargaining units.

Time does not permit me to detail the myriad of districts to which various departments of government administer Provincial Government programs. However, a quick sampling reveals that we have 10 public health regions, 11 social welfare districts, 40 AG REP districts, 44 veterinary service districts, 12 family farm improvement districts, 19 water users districts, 27 drainage districts, 8 minimum wage inspection districts, 9 gas inspection districts. I could go on and on listing an almost interminable number of provincial agencies and top it all off with an equally formidable array of federal service areas which criss-cross our province. However, the point that I wish to make is that none of these areas of administration have boundaries that are co-terminus.

I am not saying that the services performed by any of these local governments or provincial government agencies or federal agencies are not needed. Nor am I necessarily critical of the original reasoning which dictated the establishment of their boundaries. What I am suggesting is that when we consider them as a whole we must admit that we have a hodgepodge, a hodgepodge which makes regional coordination difficult if not impossible.

When the nine-township municipality was created, 36 miles was a good half day travel and half-section farming gave a potential population of 650 families per municipality. Now 36 miles is really a trivial drive, while in many areas the half-section farm is no longer consider to be an economic unit. The original location of our towns, villages and hamlets was more often than not the product of a calculation by a railroader based on what grain deliveries could be expected. For a number of years these trading areas served their residents rather well, but then population distribution began to change, and recently we have been witnessing a tremendous move in the direction of urbanization.

In 1951 approximately 66 per cent of our population lived on farms or in villages. Today we have over 60 per cent living in our larger towns or cities. The move to urbanization in Saskatchewan has been somewhat slower than in other parts of Canada but I think it has now reached the stage where we will have to take a good look at our patterns of local administration. It is always instructive to note what has been going on in other parts

March 10, 1970

of Canada and while I cannot pretend to have made an exhaustive study, I would like to outline one or two developments that have taken place in other provinces.

In 1967 the Government of Nova Scotia in cooperation with the Union of Nova Scotia Municipalities set up a provincial-municipal fact-finding committee with Premier Smith as its chairman. The summary of the text of Premier Smith's second report contained some interesting observations. I only want to quote two. The first is:

The population of Nova. Scotia is 760,000. To serve this population there are 65 municipal units, 89 municipal regional and vocational school boards, 686 local boards . . .

This sounds very much like Saskatchewan, doesn't it?

. . . of school trustees and a variety of boards and commissions relating to grant expenditures, planning, library and other services. The committee concluded that there were too many such units in municipal government.

And later the report goes on to say:

The committee believes that the stress should be on fewer units without the creation of a second tier of municipal government except in unusual cases. It suggests that certain services might very well be provided on a regional basis — the regions to be defined by. the province.

In Ontario much of the stimulus for the study of regional government seems to have come from a report of the Ontario Committee on Taxation which wrestled with the problems of equalization grants. Looking at the 1967 report of this committee I found some interesting observations. One of these is as follows:

As we have already had occasion to point out, the principle of local autonomy is not a haven for municipalities so small, so weakly organized that they cannot discharge their functions in an efficient fashion. On the contrary local autonomy stresses the importance of strong and responsible municipal institutions whose establishment and promotion are an important provincial responsibility.

The approach taken by the Government of Ontario towards the problems of regionalization has much to commend it. In the first place there has been no attempt to regionalize the entire province. Eight areas were selected for intensive study and there appears to have been no predetermined pattern foisted on them. Rather the procedure used has been varied and has depended on local circumstances and the wishes of local residents. In an address delivered in May to a Toronto audience the Director of the Municipal Research Branch of the Ontario Government summarized his remarks by saying:

Several areas are now at some stage along the road to regional government. Our purpose is to give, priority consideration to areas where need is the greatest. Beyond this we are not working towards an arbitrary or inflexible deadline. Implementation involves a four-stage process allowing for maximum discussion and participation by residents in municipalities in an area.

As might be expected, British Columbia has followed a slightly different pattern. In a government pamphlet published in 1968, the Hon. Dan Campbell, Minister of Municipal Affairs of British Columbia, indicates the province is divided into 29 regional districts. In regard to these he says:

Regional government does the same thing as metro government but the functions that it assumes, with the exception of hospitals, are not statutory functions. In addition the regional district has no authority to levy its own taxes.

It appears that British Columbia has gone to great lengths to avoid the establishment of a second tier of government. I have made this rapid and incomplete trans-Canada survey in order to point out that the problems of regionalization are receiving attention right across the country. One fact that stands out in all of this is that there is no single or universal solution to all of the problems involved. We, in Saskatchewan, should keep this very clearly in mind as we approach the stage where we will be forced to give consideration to our own situation.

I am well aware of the political furore which was created when the school unit system was introduced into Saskatchewan. I am sure that Members seated opposite are even more aware of the political fate which overtook them, when the continuing committee to the Royal Commission on Agriculture and Rural Life recommended the imposition of a county system in Saskatchewan. I can assure them that my party has no such suicidal tendencies.

However, there are increasing indications of grass-root interest in some type of change in our system of local government. Let me detail some of these indications.

In an evaluation and research project conducted by L.A. Riederer and W.N. Toombs, for the Saskatchewan School Trustees Association, and presented to that Association in August of 1969, the first recommendation for research is, and I quote:

An investigation into all aspects of regional development possibilities in Saskatchewan.

The recommendation is qualified by the statement:

While trustees generally expressed strong reservations (in fact many objected to) further centralization of school governments, it is inevitable that further centralization must come to broaden the level of educational opportunity for children of, this province.

In a submission to the Provincial-Municipal Conference held in this Chamber on June 16 and 17, 1969, the president of the Saskatchewan Urban Municipalities Association stated:

We believe that, if local government was restructured into viable units of such size as to provide economies of scale and coordinated direction, and if the explosion in the costs of education was contained, local government could look after itself. So it is to these two matters, regional government and education costs, which I will confine my remarks.

Then Mr. Murphy went on to say in his brief:

March 10, 1970

We would see much larger regions than had previously been considered, possibly even as few as eight or ten for the entire province. We think too that the large urban centres including Saskatoon and Regina should be included in these regions, not isolated from them. We see present local governments, urban, rural and schools continuing as they are at present without change in structure.

The approach of the Saskatchewan Association of Rural Municipalities was somewhat more cautious. Paragraph 36, of the statement which they submitted at this conference says:

While the SARM supports the concept of local self-government that is close to the people, we realize that many municipalities are reaching the point where they are being hard-pressed for funds due to their small tax-base. Through the process of amalgamation we believe municipalities can strengthen in their, economic base, while at the same time preserve the good points of their present administrations.

In the last edition of "The Rural Councillor," Mr. Ray Grant, who is a member of the council of the SARM and reeve of the rural municipality of Cut Knife, made the following observation:

In my opinion the time is at hand when the people of rural Saskatchewan must become aware of the forces beyond our control that will compel us to plan an adjustment that will meet our rural needs.

The submission of the Saskatchewan Hospital Association to the Provincial-Municipal Conference was quite explicit in its insistence that some form of regionalization must be looked at. The president of that association, Judge E. N. Hughes, speaking in Saskatoon said and I quote:

Personally I believe this province must take a close look at a system of regionalization where perhaps all boards and commissions, hospitals included, would come under the operation of a centrally located municipal complex. I say that with one end in mind only, and that is for the purpose of finding a way to restore local government, to the local level.

Speaking to the 51st annual meeting of the Hospital Association, Mr. George Smelley, who is an editorial writer of the Saskatoon Star Phoenix, made the following interesting observation:

There is a strange irony involved in this whole thing. The chief argument against larger units of local government is that it would make those who govern more remote from the governed. Yet, those who have studied the matter in greatest depth warn that continued attempts to govern within small inefficient units may result in the disappearance of local government altogether. If so, local government services would follow the way of welfare services, and become the administrative responsibility of the province.

The Saskatchewan Division of the Community Planning Association of Canada is performing a service for the people of this province by arranging a series of meetings to study regionalism and regional government in the context of Saskatchewan. One of these meetings has already been held in North Battleford, one is

planned for Weyburn and one for Yorkton. Since this association is completely independent of all governments it will be most interesting to learn of their conclusions when they have had a chance to assess the reaction at the grass-roots level.

Mr. Speaker, I have attempted to point out some of the strains which our changing social patterns are imposing on our present system of local government. I have no desire to see local government weakened. Rather I wish to see it given the tools to do the job for which it was intended, a job which only it can do. I have indicated that the problem is not one peculiar to Saskatchewan. However, I must caution that our answers must be made in Saskatchewan answers. We should take a careful look at what goes on in other provinces, but we should not expect to be able to apply their solutions to a province whose economy, geography and population distribution are quite unique.

I have indicated an increasing interest in regionalization amongst those who are intimately involved with local government at the municipal, educational and hospital level. Where do we go from here?

First, I think that our Government should display an increasing degree of leadership in coordinating the work of its various departments and agencies into a regional pattern. Second, we should encourage the Federal Government to follow a similar pattern of administrative units.

The Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Estey) has invited rural and urban municipal organizations, school trustees and hospital association officials to set up a forum with guidelines for continuing the discussion and investigation into the possibility of regional governments. I understand that this committee has already had one meeting. Since a workable form of local government can only come about with the cooperation of the organizations represented on this committee I wish for its members a super-human endowment of patience, tact and dedication to the people whom they represent. I await the result of their deliberations with keen anticipation.

I do appreciate the Budget which has been presented to us and before taking my seat I would like to express my thanks to the Liberal party for showing the flexibility which it has shown in the ability to meet a changing situation with a changing type of budgeting. I will support the motion and oppose the amendment.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. H.H.P. BAKER: (Regina South East) — Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to be able to take part in the Budget Debate. I didn't take part in the Debate on the Throne Speech. There were other Members who had not been given air time or an opportunity to speak on it last year so, therefore, some of us had to forego our opportunity leaving us to participate in the Budget Speech.

The Member who just sat down from Saskatoon (Mr. Forsyth) I noticed has been a replacement for the Member from Hanley (Mr. Heggie). I have never heard a man take up so much time and say so little. I must say that he has been a poor replacement, better if he wouldn't have spoken at all today. But anyway I am not here to tell him what to do or who to write his speeches for him.

March 10, 1970

When I listened to the Budget speeches made in this House after the Budget was brought down, I think we as an Opposition have a right to request that this Government go to the people for an election.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. BAKER: — And let them speak with a strong voice. Let this Government know and the Ottawa Government know what we think of them particularly in regard to their wheat policies.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. BAKER: — I always enjoy the Member from Maple Creek, Mr. Cameron, the Minister of Mineral Resources. In all honesty he is one of the keenest debaters in this House.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. BAKER: — Fortunately not too many people believe what he says. But I do want to pay him that compliment and I mean in all sincerity that he is a very good debater. My good friend, the Municipal Affairs Minister (Mr. Estey), always likes to take a swing at me. He's very concerned about me tippy-toeing across the rice paddies of Japan just in case I go there to promote industry for the Province of Saskatchewan.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. BAKER: — You know there was a tour made two or three years ago by Members opposite and I haven't seen any results yet. Had he not been so rough on me, I did plan to bring back for him a Geisha girl. I assure you, Mr. Speaker, she wouldn't be alive because he wouldn't know what to do with her anyway.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. BAKER: — If you have ever noticed the Minister of Municipal Affairs he is always wiggling around in his seat. He is sitting this way and he is sitting that way. I asked one of his colleagues across the way what was the matter. "Well," he says, "he's suffering from a pimple and he is very concerned that he might have a tumour on the brain."

Well, the Member for Last Mountain (Mr. MacLennan), accused me last year that I said he didn't write his speeches, on the Budget Speech particularly. Well, after listening to him this year if he wrote the one he read this year, I suggest he go back to his ghost writer. I wish he was back in his seat today.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the Members across the way in all sincerity for their expressions of sympathy. It is important that we do congratulate Dr. Worobetz on his appointment. I too want to express appreciation to the former Lieutenant Governor of this Province who did a yeoman's job for the people in this city and throughout the province. He will be a hard man to replace as he was most dedicated in his work from day to day.

It has been said, "The strength of a nation lies in the heritage of its people." We have a great Canadian heritage when you look at the various ethnic groups that populate Saskatchewan; and Dr. Worobetz is a credit to the Ukrainian people of this province, one of the ethnic groups. Fifty-three to fifty-four per cent are people that come from continental Europe, outside of the seven per cent that are of French ancestry, the rest being Anglo-Saxon. It is nice to have recognition of this type. I think the CCF Government did in the first instance give recognition when they appointed Mr. Kuziak, a Ukrainian citizen from one part of this province, as the first Ukrainian ever to be appointed a Cabinet Minister in Canada.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. BAKER: — All of our pioneers gave this province and the people security. They built a country for you and we should be proud to be living in the greatest country in the world. Much of that security disappeared through the years when the Members opposite, not those present today, but their counterparts ruled this province for some 10 dismal years. They forgot about security for the people and so when the CCF got in in 1944 for a 20-year period a new great story can be told. There was real security. They had a glorious record for 20 years.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. BAKER: — And many of their pieces of legislation that they had put through in this House are being realized by most Canadians across this country. The people here in Saskatchewan are patiently waiting to go back to those good old days and certainly not the Thirties.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. BAKER: — We should never forget to tell this story in the Province of Saskatchewan about what the CCF did for those 20 years. Most of us can recall the things that happened. I think one of the most outstanding things was The Homestead Act where they gave security of tenure to the farmer.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. BAKER: — Gave security of tenure to the people living in the cities . . .

AN HON. MEMBER: — Not socializing lands!

MR. BAKER: — . . . when 90 per cent of the homes were lost through those dismal Thirties. I want to say that thank goodness that this law was passed after much litigation. It has been administered by the Mediation Board. I hope the Attorney General (Mr. Heald) will continue to recognize, and I think he will and I hope he does, to give maximum protection where needed to the people in urban centres and on the farms.

One of the most outstanding programs instituted, we should never forget, was the hospitalization plan and later on medicare and it was done without any utilization or deterrent fees.

March 10, 1970

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. BAKER: — We should not forget the air ambulance service. Those flights of mercy that were carried out for the people of this province. We should never forget the fabulous highway system developed under the CCF, . . .

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. BAKER: — . . . under J.T. Douglas. We should never forget the large grants that were made to schools for the first time in the history of this province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. BAKER: — The grants on road assistance to municipalities, the 50 per cent that was brought about and is still in existence. Let's never forget the regional parks, the recreational centres, the resorts that were established and are being extended. We should never forget the new schools constructed and the new hospitals.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. BAKER: — Someone mentioned we didn't help from the standpoint of spiritual values. I am sure there were three times as many more churches built in Saskatchewan under the CCF regime than we have seen under the present group. The geriatric centres, the nursing homes that were built. Low rental housing got under way then and I am patiently waiting for the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Estey) to announce the approval of two more projects that we'd like to get under way to put our tradesmen to work.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. BAKER: — Don't overlook that fine transportation bus system we set up.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. BAKER: — I notice there is something like \$370,000 paid into the kitty as a profit from last year. The Chaplin sodium sulphate plant, a tremendous Crown company; the brick plant at Estevan which I am very sorry to see is out of the hands of the Province; Saskair which has gone; Saskair I am sure did serve a great need in the North and would have continued if we'd have followed it through in earnest. The steel mill in Regina which received such ridicule years ago is one of the finest industries here and could be pointed to as a Crown company to begin with; new cement plants. We realize that there is a problem there now because of decreased construction but the plant' is good.

HON. D. G. STEUART: (Provincial Treasurer) — The box factory!

MR. BAKER: — The box factory, yes. That was the one in Prince Albert that Davey Steuart helped to destroy.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. BAKER: — Let's refer to the Power Corporation, that giant hydro development, the greatest in all of Canada. When you go back to 1944 you will see the electrical connections on farms totalled the gross number of 129. Today literally every farmer has it. If they haven't, they have the opportunity of getting it. And then you hear them say we are bringing electricity to the reservations. This is good and I agree with it. Had it not been for the power system established under the former Government you wouldn't have any power lines going past these reservations.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. BAKER: — Well, you know it takes three things to create industry. The CCF started the gas distribution system and with gas, power and water, this is what brought the industrial growth to every community in Saskatchewan.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. BAKER: — The CCF have a glorious story to tell. We should never forget to tell people that when we went out of office there were 5,800 oil and gas wells able to produce. We started the oil industry. What about the potash story? Who started that? Who started the Kalium plant and had it developed by '63? The Potash Company of America. The Alwinal Potash Company and everyone was on the drawing board when we went out of office. And here we have turned it over to new custodians and it is going to pot ever since. So we must see that we get our Government back in order that we get these industries back on their feet.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. BAKER: — You know we hear so much about inflation, high cost of living. I think everyone in this House can agree with each other as to the real cause of inflation in this province and in this country, namely, that of high interest rates. The banks and all lending institutions are having a field day. These high-jackers, Mr. Speaker, must be controlled now if we are to save this country. The Bank of Canada is not doing its job. The Government won't give direction. Why is it? Perhaps it is that too many of the Eastern people in Ottawa have their fingers in the pie, I don't know. There was too much talk also of restraint all these years in this province. We used to hear, 'Don't spend, don't spend.' This would stop inflation. It would bring down the cost of living. It would bring down the interest rate. It said it would cause unemployment. This is the only count the Government was right on. It screamed restraint and it wouldn't let municipalities spend in the building of schools. The Local Government Board stopped the development of certain projects. The other provinces like British Columbia, Alberta and Ontario didn't listen to this sort of foolishness. That's why they have a greater measure of prosperity in Canada today. You don't stop inflation by not spending. There is nothing wrong with planned spending. Every sensible businessman knows you have to spend money in order to make money. In all forms of government we know we must do our part to fill the gaps too, to fill areas of need, to create employment at the right time in order to put purchasing

March 10, 1970

power into the hands of the working masses, so that they can buy the goods produced by the manufacturer, the farmer, and others. This in turn helps the whole coffers of the Treasury through the tax and the sales structure.

What is the real answer to stop inflation? As I said the only and sound answer is to hold down interest rates, put the banks in the same position as they were a few years ago, tell them where they must put their money and not in places where they now reap 10 to 25 per cent interest in such things as mutual funds. They should draw the rates set by the Bank of Canada and pay the depositors accordingly. We can talk all we want about price controls, wage freezes, voluntary restraints, this is all futile if we really don't get back to the root of the matter.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. BAKER: — I also feel, Mr; Speaker, when I made the trip to Europe to find that our dollar set at 92 cents is not the answer for this country today. I think that this country has to look at a 96-cent dollar at least. I think that we are in many ways getting closer to the American rates paid. We are getting closer in prices of many products. Tariffs should be brought down. Today if we set a 96-cent dollar this would help to decrease the interest rate. This has to be done very soon if we are going to stop recessions, depressions, and of course these are followed by revolution and chaos. I say, spend at the right time and in the right places.

The Budget this year includes capital spending in the construction, as was reported, of \$2.8 million for the beginning of the Base Hospital. There is money in there for university construction, the college cluster complex, I hope. These monies will be utilized this year.

We appreciate this and other projects that have been announced. I must say that while we are getting probably a \$16 million hospital or \$18 million structure or whatever the figure may be, the University Hospital in Saskatoon I believe at the outset cost \$30 million. Now it is getting a \$27 million addition and we are just barely making a start on our Base Hospital here. I am not ridiculing the Minister of Health (Mr. Grant). I am sure he worked hard in helping me get this for Regina.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. BAKER: — So I want to say that we have been short-changed. I am not the kind of a person that complains too much about these things, but I know that there are some, particularly the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Estey), who detest anything that is to go to Regina. I am sure that Minister uses his influence in every way to try to keep projects from us.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. BAKER: — I notice the Member from Regina South West (Mr. McPherson) shook his head and agreed with me. Well, anyway the Government as you know stopped most large projects over the years. Regina Campus, I am sure you will agree, should have two or three buildings under way and perhaps one or two completed

by now. We know that it will take a lot of money to complete the university complex that was planned some years ago. So I say to the Members across the way that they should do everything possible to get these projects started earlier so that we will stop the exodus of our good Saskatchewan people.

Well, you know whenever you hear Cabinet Ministers across the way you would almost think it was their money that they were doling out of their own pockets. And I hear them criticize municipality after municipality particularly if there is a New Democratic Member representing those vicinities. Equalization payments and monies of this sort are coming to these municipalities. Every Cabinet Minister should look not only at one vicinity but it is his job to look over the whole province and not short-change one from the other.

I was interested when the Member from Regina South West (Mr. McPherson) gave figures on certain projects. As I said we do appreciate what is given. Every community appreciates what is being done. He mentioned that we got \$2 million for road assistance since the Liberal party or the Government has been in office. But did you know, Mr. Speaker, that until last year something like \$15 million has been spent on road assistance throughout this province and close to \$8 million of that went to one city. Now it was nice to have that city get a \$3 million Idylwyld Freeway for nothing. We are planning a freeway down the centre of our city, east and west. It will run into several millions. It would be kind of nice if the Government offered us \$3 million too so that we could go ahead. When I wanted \$20,000 last year to recap Albert Street and we would put in \$20,000 to give it a 2-inch lift, we couldn't even get it from the Government in order to make that a decent road. We couldn't get the \$20,000 to match it. We had to put \$10,000 to \$15,000 ourselves to do the best patching job we could. It is probably going to take another \$10,000 this year in order to bring it to a position where it will carry the traffic.

My friend, the Member for Regina South West (Mr. McPherson) — and I am not ridiculing him — is trying, I think, his best to get funds for this city. I think it is up to the Members across the way who represent their communities; they should do that. Now there is one thing I didn't agree with and I am sorry I have to bring it up, because it is the old auditorium story. I wasn't even going to mention it, Mr. Speaker, at this Session. He thanked the Government for spending \$7 million on the auditorium but he forgot to thank the Regina people for giving them \$4 million of that to do it. I just wanted to add this so the records are kept straight . . .

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. BAKER: — . . . and the million dollars that the people voted. As you know I am still going to get that back for the good people of Regina after we are elected following the next election.

He mentioned the \$78,000 on urban renewal. Had it not been for the Minister of Education (Mr. McIsaac), who was then Municipal Affairs Minister, that project would have been scuttled. The city of Regina had to add another \$80,000 paid out of our own treasury. We asked it to share in it. The Federal Government was going to. We couldn't even get \$20,000 to help cover that. Had we not gone ahead with it ourselves, that urban renewal scheme,

March 10, 1970

which was a good one, would never have taken place. We must keep the records straight on some of these things.

MR. CHARLEBOIS: — Henry, you . . .

MR. BAKER: — Well, I must say I am glad the junior member for Saskatoon spoke up because he should thank me personally for subsidizing and building his auditorium.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. BAKER: — Well, the Budget does give us \$195,000 net in a police grant and I thank the Attorney General (Mr. Heald) because we have discussed this on numerous occasions. It is a good start. I am not criticizing it. The others are the 50-cent snow removal, and so forth, but we are up against something here that I have to point out in this House. The net amount that we are going to get is \$195,000, but regarding the recent announcement from the Regina General Hospital that I have received, I find now that the Government has only picked up \$217,000 of the deficit, leaving \$205,000 for the city to find. This is close to a mill. A mill runs \$213,500. We got \$195,000 net on the one hand, and on the other hand it is wanting \$205,000 back. What are you doing? You are forcing the city of Regina to add a mill to its tax because of this problem. And not only that Regina is now paying \$286,000 out of its budget for hospital costs to the General. I want to make it abundantly clear, Mr. Speaker, that Regina and the Hospital Board will not be forced to accept this because the principle of hospital operating and maintenance costs is the responsibility of the medicare and the hospitalization programs.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. BAKER: — We will not accept this shift of costs to the people of Regina. You say, well, why didn't you close 200 beds? Why didn't you lay off 200 employees in order to compensate for the deficit? The Grey Nuns' Hospital did close 50 beds. What happened to our hospital? Our waiting list went up. The people were coming in at the rate of 40 to 50 per cent emergency cases. Were we to close beds and push these people out and let them die? Mr. Speaker, I realize we were taking a lot upon ourselves but I think we are human in our City Council and we tried to see that the hospitals were kept open . . .

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. BAKER: — . . . so that people not only from this part of the province but from the North and other areas came here to get service from our medical profession and hospitals. I want to say to the Government I hope that this will be changed, otherwise the Hospital Board will probably resort to litigation, and I don't want this to happen. I hope that we can renegotiate this to resolve the matter.

I must report to this House removing the \$25 utilization fee upon entrance to the Regina General has worked very well and people are honouring their obligations and paying when they are back earning money. It creates a real problem particularly on

emergency cases and I would urge the Government today that it remove this \$25 deposit in every hospital . . .

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. BAKER: — . . . because it did not, as some claimed it was going to run into the hundreds of thousands.

HON. D.G. STEUART: (Provincial Treasurer) — That's not our deposit!

MR. BAKER: — I would suggest that this be changed. At least be human about it so that people who come to the hospital don't have to get on bended knee to get in because they haven't the dollars.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. BAKER: — And I hope that when this side of the House is elected that that cursed deterrent fee will be removed entirely, . . .

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. BAKER: — . . . and bring back our health plan to what it should be or to what it was before.

I want to just say in comparing the education costs that from 1960 to 1964 the mill rate on education in Regina went up 6.22 mills. From 1965 to 1969 it went up 10.96 or approximately 11 mills so that there was a 4-3/4 mill increase since the party across the way has been in office as compared to a similar period. The gas tax that we as citizens of Regina contribute I think amounts to something like \$7-1/4 million. That is why we continually ask for the \$10 per capita grant in order to help us compensate for what we are giving and what we need to promote our community. Alberta is giving \$33 million to municipalities this year, in other words over \$20 per capita. British Columbia gives \$25 per person. If we followed Ontario's plan, we would be getting close to \$1 million annually.

The homeowner grant has been increased by \$10, I will leave that today and I will talk about it on the air tomorrow, as you know that was my plan. One of my 14 points I enumerated here six years ago.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. BAKER: — If you checked that 14 point program, not eight as someone said, you have picked up half of them, it looks like you've got quite a time to go in order to pick up the other seven.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. BAKER: — I just want in a few moments to touch on the Wheat Board, Mr. Speaker. I want to say to this House that the Wheat Board is the greatest thing for orderly marketing in any country in the world. I am amazed that Members across the way — and the Arm River Member supports me and I'm glad he does — but there

March 10, 1970

are some here that are tearing at the very roots of the Wheat Board. If this happens, gentlemen, the episode that occurred last year, and if it was under the Grain Exchange, you would once again have had 50-cent wheat and it would continue on until we had the 19-cent wheat. The Wheat Board has been the bulwark in stabilizing the Western farmer and orderly marketing. Mr. Turner outlined the policy, he stated it wasn't the Wheat Board at all but the Ottawa Government that must lay down the policies.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. BAKER: — If it needs subsidization, then the money must come from the coffers of Canada. I have continually said agriculture must be kept strong.

I'm going to say to the minister of Agriculture in Saskatchewan (Mr. McFarlane) that I do agree with his plans on diversification. The two million cattle that we have in Saskatchewan — I think we could handle 2-1/2 to 3 million, but I want to do it not by taking out good land for wheat production, but, to do it on sub-marginal land that should probably have never been broken up in the first place. So I endorse what he is trying to do. The hog production program we — need more hogs but 'I think we have to watch the market to see that it is not flooded, which could reduce the prices causing farmers to go out of them again. I do want to say this to him personally that I do agree with his diversification plan and I wish him every success in it.

Mr. Speaker, I could go on and on. I just want to end on this note. I intend to speak a little more on agriculture tomorrow. I would hope that the Government of this province would not only hold sessions once a year this is an archaic way of doing things. I believe we should have two sessions. One should be called at least by the end of August or September. Had that been done last fall, the \$500 being put into the construction for homes during winter months could have been earmarked for housing this winter. The university and hospital buildings might be under way. This could be a time where we could apprise every Member of what is taking place, whether it deals with the farmer or with the urban dweller. Mr. Speaker, I will now call it 5:30 and adjourn debate to speak on it tomorrow.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Debate adjourned.

SECOND READINGS

HON. L.P. CODERRE (Minister of. Labour) moved second reading of Bill No. 30 — An Act to amend The Boiler and Pressure Vessel Act.

He said: Mr. Speaker, what with modern technologies, it was decided that the Department should get in touch with the industry and the engineers in the industry. After a thorough consultation with all people concerned we came up with the following amendments to the Act. There is a new definition which includes the hot-water heating boilers with an added and a broadening and clarification where a stamping plate is not available on the boiler. There is also a section that would prevent the altering of the design of a boiler. Sometimes a boiler requiring repair has been cut into and the actual design which was passed by the Department has been

altered, which in fact makes it a different boiler. As I have said, what with modern technology taking over, it was necessary to change ratings slightly. Two years ago it required a first-class engineer to operate a 200-horsepower steam plant where today with the modern technological controls it was realized that a person could easily handle a plant of a much higher rating without too much trouble. The other one is an administrative change to avoid delays. The Act as it now stands refers specifically to the chief boiler inspector being away on an inspection job and he is not available to make a ruling, therefore, it was decided to change the name from the chief boiler inspector to the Department.

Another one was adding another class, a fifth class where in some cases it was given by permit. If all the classes, I, II, III and IV were raised, it was decided to bring in a fifth class.

With these explanations, Mr. Speaker, I move second reading of this Bill.

MR. W.G. DAVIES: (Moose Jaw South) — Mr. Speaker, I believe that the Minister has referred somewhere to this Bill accomplishing housekeeping amendments only. I don't really think, with respect, that this description fits. It does perhaps fit some of the matters that the Minister (Mr. Coderre) just referred to such as the change in the design of boilers. There should be an effective amendment accomplishing this. This probably would fit the description of a housekeeping amendment.

But I think the Bill does set out what really are fairly major changes. I feel, Mr. Speaker, a little concerned about some of them. I realize that amendments to our boilers and pressure vessel legislation need to be consistent to the needs of equipment and industry. I think, however, that the paramount consideration at all times must be safety for both the workmen directly concerned and the public who are sometimes directly concerned and sometimes less directly concerned. Safety it seems to me is the main consideration.

I am sure, Mr. Speaker, that the Minister has had consultation with members of the Power Engineers' Association and with people that are concerned as stationary engineers in the industry. I would, however, like to recommend to the Minister that he set out to create an Advisory Committee to which all changes to this Act and like legislation would first be channelled for scrutiny. I would propose, Mr. Speaker, that the committee would be composed of say, a representative of the Department of Labour, a representative of the employee group and a representative of employers, all of whom would have either first class or second class certificates. If this body were set up it would do a lot to assure that any changes that were brought before us would have had the best of the expert consultation and consideration.

Mr. Speaker, there is an enormous range of equipment that is governed by this Act. The use of power as controlled by the legislation is manifold. I am sure the Minister would agree when I say that it is increasing. Also, the capacities of the operators, their protection and the protection of all people are, as I've said, first considerations. I think that it can be said, Mr. Speaker, that over the years The Boiler and Pressure Vessel Act has maintained safety and it has maintained the best of the traditions and principles within the orbit of this type of

legislation. I would hope that we are not going too far in the changes that the minister has brought before us. When he closes the debate perhaps he can direct his remarks to some of the matters that I will be referring to.

First of all, the changes that govern refrigeration, as I understand it under this Bill, extend permission for plants to increase the tonnage of refrigeration plants, that is the tonnage handled under a 24-hour period, from 10 tons to 50 tons. (This of course with the operation of a person who would have a refrigeration engineer's certificate — these are not usually certificates of a very powerful order). In any case it will be seen that this is a five-fold increase in tonnage. With the number of refrigeration plants and like equipment that are operating all over the province, I have some distinct qualms about the wisdom of this move. I would like to hear from the Minister why we need a five-fold increase in the tonnage that is handled and how he can reassure us in this particular regard. I ask the Minister if he is prepared to restrict the legislation with reference to these increases here to sealed refrigeration units, so that this would have the added protection to communities, to plants, to their operators, because sealed units can't be tampered with as I am informed by steam engineers with whom I've had contact. The servicing of these units is accomplished by lifting out the entire unit and sending it to some qualified dealer who understands what must be done with the equipment. I'm just suggesting that this might be something that the Minister may be prepared to consider.

Second, as I understand it — and the Minister has referred to this point, I think — second class stationary engineers will by the Bill be able to operate, not on a limit of 500-horsepower plants, but that this will be extended to 1,000. In other words, a plant that formerly required a first-class stationary engineer will now require only a second-class man. I think this is correct, Mr. Minister. There is an accompanying change as well which would make it possible for a third-class engineer to operate up to 500-horsepower plants. I understand that the present limit for a third-class operator is only a 200-horsepower boiler. Mr. Speaker, both of these changes involve — I think the Minister will agree — a substantial lifting of the limits that have always been intended to effect more protection to everyone concerned. He may argue, and it may be argued generally, that the situation today permits changes to be effected without actually endangering people directly concerned or the public. I think that the Minister should amplify the remarks that he made in the beginning, to demonstrate more thoroughly that this protection will be afforded. However, since it is obvious that we are making an important change if we accede to the sections dealing with this subject in the Bill, he should give us something more fully in the nature of information than we have received, that will tell us why it is safe to have a second-class man operate up to 1,000, where formerly that person could only look after a plant of 500-horsepower.

Now, as well, I ask the Minister to consider this. If we permit, say a second-class stationary engineer to run a 1,000-horsepower boiler plant, which as I said now requires a first class engineer, are we not as well as risking some loss of protection, creating a certain disincentive to improvement of certification. The incentive that is now in force is, I think, pretty obvious. Employees that want to operate a 1,000-horsepower plant find it profitable to pursue a first-class certificate and finally,

secure it. To operate the higher pressure vessel they have to have a higher certification. Now doesn't letting this class of plant be operated by the second-class man mean that there will be less inclination on the part of the operator to make this advance? I put this question to the Minister. At the present time I understand that our legislation and our qualifications that all of the things that are written in are somewhat ahead of some other provinces. I'm not sure whether this applies to all of the provinces. Certainly it does apply to some. One of the arguments is that we will be standardizing to some extent at least our legislation with that of the other provinces. Yet it seems to me that in this standardization, when we are considering the lifting to some extent of restrictions, we should be rather careful because if an employee comes to the province and from other provinces, Mr. Minister, and he is a second-class man, he may thereafter have to improve his certification; he may have to improve his qualifications. If, however, a Saskatchewan man goes to another province where the requirements are somewhat less stringent, it would appear to me that this doesn't adversely affect him because he has, so to speak, superior qualifications. The main benefit it would seem to me would apply to those persons who were coming into the province.

I think that everyone would concede that the creation of a new fifth-class certificate is a sound move. At the present time there are regional certificates, fireman's certificates, that would appear to compensate for the lack of coverage of a fifth-class paper. However, I want to point out to the Minister that what has been drawn to my attention is that some stationary engineers feel that, if the fifth-class paper is authorized by the Legislature in this Bill, it would still be wise to maintain the provisional certificate that is as a certificate between the fifth and the fourth-class paper. Now I would hope that the Minister might give us the information that, I have suggested, would do something to dispel misgivings that have occurred to me about the effects of this Bill. I would also hope that he would make a statement on the recommendation that I advanced here, for an Advisory Committee. This I think may have come to the Minister's attention sometime during the past two or three years. I don't think, Mr. Speaker, I would want to deny my support to the Bill at this stage, but I do have a number of valid questions that I think must be properly answered if not now, then at the Committee stage.

MR. CODERRE: — Mr. Speaker, I would like to say at this time, have no fear. We'll look after you. We'll look after your safety very, very well as the Department of Labour has done in the past and as the personnel in the Department will continue in the future.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. CODERRE: — For some reason or the other, every time that there is some legislation brought into this House, the Hon. Member for Moose Jaw South has the uncanny knack of reaching under the table and bringing out the big boggy.

MR. E. KRAMER: (The Battlefords) — We don't trust you.

MR. CODERRE: — When I brought this legislation in a moment ago I did not say it was strictly housekeeping. I said, "In view of the

March 10, 1970

technological changes that are taking place in industry, it was found desirable to make the changes, and in consultation with the industry and engineers all over the province, we have had meetings with them, it was decided to bring the present legislation in." There is no lessening of the safety at all.

Regarding the question of raising the 10-horsepower rating for 24 hours to the 50-horsepower rating. Mr. Speaker, the reason it was raised to 50 is you will find in the many small rural areas we have curling rinks with three or four sheets of ice. It would require an engineer on the job at all times. They already have a contract to have it serviced by the person who installed it. It is an unnecessary cost for these small communities. You've heard that, you knew that, but you had to becloud the issue. I've worked around refrigeration and I know.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. CODERRE: — Mr. Speaker, all classes have been broadened for one reason and the reason is this, that very often many of our people have taken the training and sometime will either move to Alberta Ontario, British Columbia and find that their licence does not permit them to get a job in six of the provinces without rewriting the exam. It has been the objects of each Department of Labour across the country to have an easy interchange of the qualified people that we have due to the mobility in the work force. Surely if we have a limitation on our boilers here, say of 500-horsepower where they have the same qualifications, the same course, the same training and go to Alberta they are granted a rating of 1,000 and have to rewrite the exams. It seems to me unnecessary. Surely with such mobility of the force, let's give them the opportunity to change.

I would like to say, Mr. Speaker, on this point let's get out of the horse-and-buggy days. Fifty years ago we were driving a car, Mr. Speaker, of four or five horsepower. Today it is 380 some horsepower. I don't think we need a different licence for it, do we? We are not ahead of the other provinces. In fact, we were a little behind in our licensing, Mr. Speaker, and for this reason these are the changes.

MR. DAVIES: — Before the Minister takes his seat, may I ask him a question? I'm reserving my questions that weren't answered a few minutes ago. My question now is: has the Minister had any representations with respect to a grandfather clause in this legislation?

MR. CODERRE: — These are the matters that we are looking into at the moment.

Motion agreed to and Bill read a second time.

HON. W.R. THATCHER (Premier) moved second reading of Bill No. 34 — An Act to amend The Saskatchewan Centre of the Arts Act, 1969.

He said: Mr. Speaker, in moving second reading of this Bill I shall be very brief. All Members of the Legislature are aware of the long history of the construction of the Centennial project in

Regina. They also are aware of the fact that the Province of Saskatchewan is making a very substantial investment in completing what was originally a responsibility of the city of Regina. We believe that the total investment probably will be in the neighborhood of \$7 million. The figure could be a little higher but we don't think so. I think Hon. Members realize that many rural people and many rural Members in this House had some trepidation about the wisdom of the Province taking over this Centennial project in the capital city. Every effort is going to be made to operate the Centre of the Arts at close to a break-even point. However, it is anticipated that in the first year of operation, likely the loss will be in the neighborhood of \$147,000. That is the figure which is contained in the Estimates. We think when the Centre operates for a full year that this figure may be reduced. We consider that the Centre of the Arts is a provincial centre serving all the people of Saskatchewan, certainly all the people in Southern Saskatchewan.

The amendment to the Act which is now before us makes it crystal clear that the Centre of the Arts at Regina will be relieved of the obligation of paying any municipal taxes. Our Attorney General (Mr. Heald) thinks we would likely be relieved of taxation without this Act. However, he wishes to make certain. With a 10 per cent amusement tax, a theatre tax of some \$3,000 a year, and other municipal taxes on restaurant operation and concessions, it would have been possible for the Centre of the Arts to increase its deficit by paying as much as \$50,000 or \$60,000 to the city. It will be noted, Mr. Speaker, that this amendment also excludes from municipal taxation activities conducted by the Centre of the Arts anywhere in the province. It is our sincere hope that dramatic productions produced at the Centre will tour the province so that our citizens may receive some benefit from this substantial investment. It is also anticipated that tickets for attractions at the Centre will be put on sale in a number of communities in Southern Saskatchewan in order to make it convenient for our citizens to obtain tickets. This amendment would exclude such operations from any municipal taxation.

I might tell you, Mr. Speaker, as most Hon. Members probably know, that the Centre is fast reaching completion. We are opening the Centre which I think will be one of the better ones in Canada on May 4th, with the Governor General present to officiate. All MLAs will be invited, probably with complimentary tickets. Most others will be obliged to pay that opening night.

This Administration has undertaken the completion and operation of this Centre with some reservations. We are determined to run it in a business-like manner for the benefit of the largest number of people. Relief from municipal taxation will go a long way toward helping us to achieve this objective.

MR. A.E. BLAKENEY: (Regina Centre) — Mr. Speaker, I certainly don't intend to say very much about this Bill except only to say that I think no one will quarrel with the first principle in the Bill that any property owned by the Board which operates the Centre shall be free of any municipal taxation. The second principle: that anyone attending any functions at the auditorium or indeed at any other hall rented by the Board in Swift Current, or wherever it may be, shall be free of any tax and presumably anyone who sells any commodity shall be free of any municipal licence, is perhaps a little more questionable. People who operate facilities like the Exhibition Auditorium, or the Legion Hall, or the Trianon will, if their

March 10, 1970

premises are used for a function, be subject to the ordinary amusement tax. I suspect that is the case with respect to the Saskatoon Centennial Auditorium. It is perhaps questionable that the Saskatchewan Centre of the Arts should be exempted from all of that type of taxation. I, and I am sure Members on this side or perhaps on both sides of the House, appreciate the effort that the Government has made in completing this project and the fact that it may well not break even or probably won't for a couple or three years. I have to register this little caveat; that I do question this principle. It may now be necessary in purely financial terms. But if, in fact, the Auditorium or the Centre does rather better financially than we think, then I think we should be having a second look at the proposal that all of the performances be totally tax-free. I will, however, not oppose the Bill.

MR. THATCHER: — Mr. Speaker, I would only say in passing that we will look into the caveat that the Hon. Member (Mr. Blakeney) has made. I don't think that we can change the legislation, but we might be able to change the regulations. I say again that this Centre will open on May 4th. We may have some problems in the summer months, July and August, but we think it is wise to proceed. I am certain the province as a whole, and those Members who were a little bit doubtful about the wisdom of proceeding, will like the Centre when they see it.

Motion agreed to and Bill read a second time.

The Assembly adjourned at 9:57 o'clock p.m.