

**LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN**  
**Third Session — Sixteenth Legislature**  
**18th Day**

**Wednesday, March 11, 1970.**

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

**WELCOME TO STUDENTS**

**MR. SPEAKER:** — Before the Orders of the Day I wish to introduce to all the Members of the Legislature the following groups of students which are situated in the galleries: 60 students from the Mayfair school in the constituency of Saskatoon Mayfair represented by Mr. Brockelbank, under the direction of their vice-principal, Mr. Cowan and their teacher Mrs. Sutherland; 17 students from the Langbank school in the constituency of Moosomin represented by Mr. Gardner, under the direction of their teachers, Mr. Shoemaker and Mr. Blackwood; 72 students from St. Augustine school from the constituency of Regina South East represented by Mr. Baker, under the direction of their teacher, Mr. Frohlich; 61 students from the W.C. How school in the constituency of Regina South represented by the Hon. Minister of Health, Mr. Grant, under the direction of their school teacher, Mr. Wollenberg.

I am sure all Members of the Legislative Assembly would wish to extend to these students an extremely warm welcome and express the very sincere wish that they will find their stay here educational, informative and pleasant, and to wish to each and every one of them a safe journey home.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**QUESTIONS**

**QUOTAS RE U.S. CRUDE IMPORTS**

**MR. J.E. BROCKELBANK: (Saskatoon Mayfair)** — Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day I want to direct a question to the Government. I had hoped that the Minister of Mineral Resources (Mr. Cameron) would be here today. In view of the fact that the President of the United States has put import quotas on the amount of crude that can be sent to the United States, I was going to ask the Minister of Mineral Resources what the loss in revenue to the Province of Saskatchewan would be per month. I would direct this to the Premier in the absence of the Minister.

**HON. W.R. THATCHER: (Premier)** — Mr. Speaker, I think that would be rather difficult to ascertain, but I will direct the question to the Minister of Mineral Resources. Perhaps he can provide an answer tomorrow.

**MR. BROCKELBANK:** — Could I have the Premier direct a supplementary question to the Minister so that we can get some more information about this topic. I would like to know if our Government has made representations to the Federal Government on this particular matter of extreme concern to the Province of Saskatchewan. I

would also like to know if our Government has made representations to any authorities in the United States about this particular matter.

**MR. THATCHER:** — Mr. Speaker, at the last Federal-Provincial Conference, the Prime Minister called Premier Strom and myself in to discuss this matter. At that time, the Americans had given an indication of what they proposed. Mr. Greene in the Federal Government, I think, made the strongest possible representation against the representations. This was American action not Canadian. I don't know what more can be done to counteract it.

### **POINT OF PRIVILEGE**

**MR. A. THIBAUT: (Kinistino)** — Mr. Speaker, I was away for a couple of days with the flu. I did listen to the broadcast, and on a point of privilege, my name was referred to by the Member for Humboldt (Mr. Breker). He was wondering whether I had my quota book or not. I want to tell this House that when the investigation took place in Humboldt, that the RCMP were over at my place and the book was checked and the book did not leave my house. They found my book OK. I would advise the Member for Humboldt to settle his debts from the Kelvington by-election. I'm still waiting.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

### **QUESTIONS**

#### **WILD GAME DAMAGE ON SEEDED AREAS**

**MR. E. KRAMER: (The Battlefords)** — I would like to ask the Government through the Minister of Natural Resources whether or not it has given some thought to the situation that is likely to arise next summer, if the black land policy of the Federal Government is carried through to any extent. There are going to be less acres, quite a number less acres — it is suggested 22 million — in black land. This will cause higher concentration of ducks, geese and other game on the seeded acreages and it is going to create a real hardship and hazard for many people. While we are aware, Mr. Speaker, that insurance is available, I wonder if the Government is considering some further action to compensate these people that will be suffering high concentrations of ducks, geese, damage etc.?

**HON. J.R. BARRIE: (Minister of Natural Resources)** — Not up to the present time.

#### **ADDITIONAL INDUSTRIAL DESIGNATED AREAS**

**MR. J. KOWALCHUK: (Melville)** — In view that it has been confirmed that Saskatoon and Regina are included in the Designated Area — and thank goodness I say to that — and knowing the serious financial difficulty of farmers and business men in Melville and the Qu'Appelle Valley region, has this Government used its offices to make representation and urge the inclusion of Melville, Yorkton and the Qu'Appelle Valley region in the Industrial Designated Area?

**MR. THATCHER:** — Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Member probably knows that for some

months we have been making vigorous representation in this connection. At the Federal-Provincial Conference we met with the Prime Minister and several other Ministers. We officially asked that the whole of the province, which is not now designated, be included. However, the decision was made that a compromise would be adopted. Saskatoon and Regina as was pointed out today, was designated. The Minister told me that he hoped our Provincial legislation would look after the rest of the province. The Hon. Member knows there is a Bill in front of the Legislature or will be tomorrow, under which any provincial area which isn't designated federally, will be able to get up to 20 per cent assistance. We are grateful for the fact that the Federal Government moved as it did today, though we wish it had gone further.

**MR. W.S. LLOYD: (Leader of the Opposition)** — Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. I take it from the Premier's comments that he is not going to continue the request that areas like Yorkton, Melville and the Qu'Appelle Valley be included in the Federal program?

**MR. THATCHER:** — No, we have a letter dictated already. I only talked to the Minister this morning, asking that the area be included. But he has taken the position that for the time being this is as far as the Federal Government will go.

### **ADJOURNED DEBATE — BUDGET DEBATE**

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion by the Hon. Mr. Steuart (Provincial Treasurer) and the proposed amendment moved by Mr. Blakeney (Regina Centre).

**MR. H.H.P. BAKER: (Regina South East)** — As I said yesterday, I was very pleased to take part in the Budget Debate. First of all I would like to congratulate Dr. Worobetz on his appointment to the position of Lieutenant Governor of this Province, representing a very strong ethnic group in Saskatchewan. I want to pay tribute to the former Lieutenant Governor, Mr. Hanbidge, who gave yeoman service to this community and to the Province as a whole. He was a very dedicated man and one whose shoes will be very hard to fill.

I congratulate too the Member for Kelvington, Mr. Byers, who was elected this past year. As a Member on this side of the House I can honestly say he has given a very good account of himself in his first appearance.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. BAKER:** — Naturally I want, if I may, Mr. Speaker, to welcome some 70 students from St. Augustine school with Mr. Frohlich, who are in the galleries, I hope, to hear me this afternoon. I am sure they will pick up many points from their visit on proceedings.

I am also very pleased with regard to the designation of our city for incentive monies from Ottawa. We had hoped that we would have been included last year. We have all worked hard over these past few months, as I am sure others across the way have, and not until we appointed Dr. Archer some six, eight weeks ago did we get some real action. I want to express

appreciation to all that had a part in bringing the designation to our city, which will mean a tremendous amount in the development of industry in this area, particularly in the field of steel. With the tremendous steel facilities we have here at IPSCO, we are bound to get secondary industries and primary industries such as the building of machinery, and we hope for a car assembly plant. This designation is going to mean a lot to us in Regina as well as for our sister city. I hope that we will continue to press for designation, as the Member for Melville (Mr. Kowalchuk) mentioned, for that community too. I thought that the line would have been drawn along the Qu'Appelle Valley, from the Manitoba border taking in Melville on the other side and some of the others. However, these are things we can try for in the future. We should be very happy that we have these designations even as set out. I guess I am getting close to my air time. I have something that I wanted to speak on further.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. BAKER:** — As I said, I am pleased to enter into the Debate on the Budget as brought down this year. A lot has been said that more concrete suggestions should be made here to alleviate problems, we encounter, by our urban dwellers and our farmers too. Today our farming population are poor amidst plenty. I would just like to relate a little story that perhaps some of you heard about the doctor, the lawyer and the farmer, who bought a share in a \$150,000 sweepstake ticket which they won. The doctor was asked what he was going to do with his \$50,000. He said, "I'm going to buy a resort in the Caribbean and spend my winter holidays there." The lawyer said he would buy a spot along the Mediterranean and build a resort and take his winter holidays there. The farmer was asked what he would do with his \$50,000. He said, "I'll keep mine, continue farming until I go broke." That's about the situation of the farming industry today, they are poor amidst plenty.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. BAKER:** — Agriculture, particularly wheat, is and always will be our number one industry in Saskatchewan. Agriculture from the West keeps the wheels of industry going across Canada too. Since there is a glut in wheat sales, Eastern Canada, particularly the industries are feeling the pinch more than ever now. That is why I always say our wheat industry must be kept strong at all times. The wheat policies of Canada these past few years have been disastrous. The new policy announced as far as I am concerned, is wholly inadequate. It is not the answer for long-term programs. As one small farmer said to me, it is a chicken feed policy and poor chicken feed at that.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. BAKER:** — Does this House and Province realize that taking 6 million acres out of production, at 20 bushels per acre, reduces wheat production by 120 million bushels, which means around \$200 million? Six million acres at \$6 per acre gives the West only \$36 million. Who is going to pick up the tab for the other \$165 million by reducing the acreage? The West again is subsidizing the rest of Canada, and Saskatchewan again pays the lion's share. They tell me if you want to seed acreage to grass

there is insufficient available now. My question is: what will happen to the man who owns a smaller farm and to those who own them and lease them to others? This Legislature should send a delegation to Ottawa to work out better arrangements. If we accept this poor plan, they'll keep pushing us down with other inferior programs. Do you realize, Mr. Speaker, that they haven't taken into account a possible drought? Don't they understand that a drop of 10 bushels per acre on 24 million acres could mean a reduction of 240 million bushels in one year? It could mean a loss to the Western farmer of over \$400 million. Let's face it, we are probably due for a few dry years and crop failures. None of us want to see the Dirty Thirties again, but it could happen. What is the answer? Had this House pressed the Ottawa Government to follow my plan of a two-price wheat system, which I have outlined in this House these past six years, we wouldn't be in this predicament today.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. BAKER:** — I said then, let the first 2,000 bushels be sold at \$3 per bushel, a certain amount sold at prevailing rates and perhaps large productions on a diminishing scale. This was a plan to save the family farm, those with acreages of two and two and a half sections. Restrictions could have been put on so that the farmer with two sections and under could be given preference for quotas. Do you realize that, had this been instituted then, I venture to say today most farmers would have sold grain by now on a six to eight bushel quota. We wouldn't be in the muddle we are in today. If we have to live with this new Ottawa plan, then the payment should apply to those who farm more than two and a half sections. This would be the way to save the family farm, and let the small farmer sell an eight bushel quota on cultivated acreage. I was pleased to see my own party adopt my plan of 2,000 bushels at \$3 per bushel at the New Democratic Winnipeg Conference. If I were a farmer with less than two or two and a half sections, I would continue to plant wheat because it will be needed. The world is hungry. Ottawa today should set aside at least \$300 million a year to see that wheat is shipped to the hungry world. Forty to fifty per cent of the world's people are hungry and undernourished. Sell it to them even on credit, even if they pay for it over the next 20 years, even if we suffer some losses on these sales. It is the human thing to do. We have heard a lot about hunger, starvation and undernourishment in our own province. We hear stories of children going to school with lunch kits containing a piece of bannock and rabbit meat. I am not saying it is true or it isn't, but I believe all of the people of Saskatchewan should enjoy the fruits of their labor. Therefore, I strongly recommend to this Legislature that we get the wheels of our flour mills going at full speed. Let's open up the mill at Moose Jaw and put 200 people to work and give business to other mills as well. In line with this, I strongly recommend that we include in our Budget this year provision for a 100-pound sack of flour to every man, woman and child in Saskatchewan, if they wish and desire it.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. BAKER:** — This will mean turning some of our wheat into flour, flour for our Saskatchewan people, who deserve the best. To be distributed — I know they wish they had thought of this before — to be distributed by our wholesale and retail outlets on the basis of a mark-up as if they were

handling it for sale. Also a grant of flour would have to be given to compensate the bakeries for some possible loss. In order to have a healthy provincial people, let's have them eat some of our best food products. Bread of course is the staff of life.

Also, seeing Ottawa has not proclaimed a sensible agricultural plan, our Province will have to go it alone on a wheat policy. Therefore we have to establish a comprehensive wheat plan, as I see it for the next four or six years. It will cost money, yes, it will cost this Province money if we are going to stabilize and save the farming industry. I report that I have a self-liquidating plan in the main worked out. I will not introduce it at this Session, because this House did not accept the one I proposed six years ago, which would have been the answer. We certainly don't want to delay or scuttle another. However, Mr. Speaker, I will unveil it before the next election or at a future session of this Legislature, if nothing concrete is done in the meantime. We need more storage facilities. Let us build inland terminals, to store millions of bushels of grain.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. BAKER:** — We must work out new means of transportation to be ready when needed. Perhaps pipelines will be the answer in the future. Perhaps large trailer-truck vehicles on super highways will be a must as well. If the farmer has money, every city, town and village thrives economically. All of Canada thrives on this real wealth. Let's negotiate with Ottawa again and again, perhaps it will come in with another plan, or support us in one of ours.

I looked for the Budget Speech to say that a minimum wage of at least \$1.50 and \$1.60 per hour would be set for the workers in Saskatchewan, because of the rapid increase in the cost of living. Labor and management are being divided more every day. The division between the farmer and the worker is being widened. This is not good, because the worker must have the purchasing power to buy the products from the farmer. The machines that the farmer buys are made by the workers. Increased costs are not because of wages as they would have you believe. You and I know when machine prices run up to unreasonable percentages, this is wrong. Every company and person deserves a good profit on his investment, but there should not be daylight robbery. The division between management and labor in Saskatchewan has been caused in the main by Bill 2. I agree there must be some form of arbitration that creates better labor-management relations. Bill 2 creates a greater wedge and greater animosity between employer and employee. That is why it reaches militant proportions. I ask the Government to withdraw Bill 2 and bring in a new Act to bring about better arbitration and create better labor-management relations.

This year's Budget should contain money to provide chiropractic services, covering the cost of at least 7.5 per cent of the treatments taken. Practically all provinces in Canada and private industry compensate patients for chiropractic treatment. This could mean a considerable saving to our hospital and medical service plan. Hospital facilities would be relieved for other illnesses. It would undoubtedly improve the quality of services for health care to the public. I also look for a start to be made on a drug plan for children and pensioners in this Budget.

I was hoping, Mr. Speaker, the deterrent fees on hospitals would be removed.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. BAKER:** — We need a plan now to establish a dental program for all boys and girls under the age of sixteen. Optical services should not only encompass eye-testing, but should cover a good portion of the cost of glasses too. I recommend that this Legislature keep pressing the Ottawa Government to have the means test removed so that all pensioners would receive the full pension of \$111 per month. This program should be put under the Canada Pension Plan and old age pensioners today should be receiving at least \$130 per person. I sincerely hoped that those on welfare would have been given a \$30 per month increase this year for food, clothing and rent. The increased cost of living has dictated that this is a necessity in this province of ours.

It is only fitting that I, who advocated homeowner grants first in my maiden speech here six years ago and recommended to the Government that this be done for the people of Saskatchewan, should refer to it each session. I stated in my 14-point program in 1965 that grants of this type be made available to relieve property taxpayers owning homes and to those renting them. In my talk at that time, I also pointed out to this Assembly that \$150 should be paid our old age pensioners toward their taxes on homes to cover the mill rate for education on their properties. I also stated six years ago that those pensioners renting be paid \$120 a year because they too were paying taxes indirectly. Last year I expected the Government to increase the homeowner grant to \$100, and I said so in the House. I called on the Government with its \$60 payment this year for \$10, a very small increase. I would hope that this would be changed in the future or even during this Session that a total of \$110 would be made available for each homeowner grant and particularly for those who are renting suites and homes.

I call on the Government to move the present Power House and establish it near the oxidation pond area to the northwest part of our community. I am sure some of the equipment could be used in a new plant from the old one. A \$30 million new power station is certainly coming to Regina. You got our city plant for a song, your profits are soaring every year since you took it over. Ten million dollars is taken in the Budget this year again to help defray costs. Most of these profits come from the Regina area. I strongly recommend that plans get under way to move and replace this power plant as soon as possible.

The Saskatchewan people are very proud of their civil servants. This involves something like 5,000 who are a very dedicated group. Their bargaining and employment rights must be safeguarded. I don't like, Mr. Speaker, that every once in a while, they are told that their increments are not going to be given to them. To me this is a signed contract with the employees and it is an agreement. I am sure that they have the right legally to claim that year after year. With a 5.8 per cent and a 5 per cent increase recommended by conciliation, I understand that still leaves them 12 to 18 per cent behind Regina and Saskatoon and other Western cities. In order to have a good public servant, he must be given comparable pay rates, so he too can provide the means for his family in the proper manner.

I see I have, a minute or so left. The \$500 grant given for winter construction in the Budget will help somewhat. The city of Regina has had a plan for three years, selling lots at \$750 a piece, for low- and average-income people. These lots are probably worth \$2,500 to \$3,000 each. In other words, the city of Regina is also giving a grant of \$2,250. This \$500 will help and we appreciate it. I am not belittling it at all. We welcome it to this community. The only unfortunate thing is, Mr. Speaker, that it didn't come last fall so that we could have made use of it this winter.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. BAKER:** Finally I want to say that we certainly need a technical institute in Regina. We need a community college as well as community colleges in towns and other cities throughout the Province of Saskatchewan. I see my time is up, Mr. Speaker, I tried to stay within my 15-minute limit, and I think I have. I want to say that because there is nothing in the Budget to take care of a wheat policy or wheat programs for the wheat farmer of Saskatchewan, I cannot support the motion and therefore I have to support the amendment.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. W.J. BEREZOWSKY: (Prince Albert East-Cumberland)** — Mr. Speaker, I can't help but notice that Hon. Members opposite have a half a dozen adding machines, in order that they can add up the failures of this Budget.

There are some things I am not going to talk about today — they can add them up right now — and that is the farmers' relationships with labor, because we have friends that are in labor the treatment of welfare recipients and the social status of some of the people in my part of the country. I am not going to talk about housing for young married couples, about high mortgage-money, or the closing of the Prince Albert sash factory, or the bad situation of the Victoria Union Hospital and its costs or the need for a library in Prince Albert, for which we have some \$100,000 or \$150,000 left us by the late Mr. Cuelenaere. You can add those things up, and you can add what I am going to say, Mr. Speaker. I am going to begin this way. Last year the Provincial Treasurer told us that the Government had an \$80 million investment in the Prince Albert pulp mill. He now admits there have been substantial losses in the production of pulp. We also have his financial statement which shows there is a \$46.5 million loan for the mill on which we the people of the Province are paying interest. With all this assistance, the Prince Albert pulp mill is now able and stands to make \$9 million of net profit. The Premier advised this House, when I questioned him the other day, that after the session, he may sell the Province's 30 per cent interest to foreigners, Parsons and Whittemore of New York. I ask; is he ready to give away the \$3 million as a profit belonging to the Province and to the people of Saskatchewan after the terrific advances that we have made. And if this happens I say this to the Premier that he should be impeached. He should be impeached, certainly. It would have been fair to say that this grant . . .

**HON. W.R. THATCHER: (Premier)** — Well, the Hon. Member, Mr. Speaker, we haven't made . . .



**THE DEPUTY SPEAKER:** — Order, order!

**MR. THATCHER:** — . . . we haven't made any advances. All we did was guarantee a loan. We haven't made . . .

**THE DEPUTY SPEAKER:** — Order, order!

**MR. BEREZOWSKY:** — But I do say this, that it is fair to say at this time if . . .

**MR. THATCHER:** — No wonder they moved him to the back benches if he can't add better than that!

**MR. BEREZOWSKY:** — If he should make a deal like that, it would be wanton and deliberate neglect of Saskatchewan's people and Saskatchewan's future.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. BEREZOWSKY:** — I urge the Premier of Saskatchewan, who is the Government, to carefully consider the duty to the people of this Province. If there is to be any purchasing I suggest to him that he should buy the pulp mill for the benefit of the state, for the Province of Saskatchewan.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. BEREZOWSKY:** — Mr. Speaker, 60 years ago a British Prime Minister Balfour advocated a policy of broadening the base of taxation which meant at that time that the citizens who were poor had to pay more taxes. In 1900, from history, I find that 27 per cent to 34 per cent of Englishmen lived in poverty. The richest society in the world was upheld by the toils of one-third of the population who lived in chronic poverty similar to what we have in Saskatchewan today. Trevor Lloyd, a historian, says this:

This striking disparity of incomes was an important factor in the rise and election of the British Labour Party.

But Liberals just can't learn lessons from history, Mr. Speaker. This Liberal Government is following the Balfour Tory tradition. It is imposing more taxes on the poor instead of on the rich and is perpetuating poverty.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. BEREZOWSKY:** — Truly the New Democratic party is rising and as a result of such Liberal policies will be elected with a vast majority when the Premier decides to call the next election.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. BEREZOWSKY:** — Mr. Speaker, our people, my people just can't understand why they are being exploited to satisfy the greed of those who are permitted to develop our rich natural resources, and why

March 11, 1970

these corporations are not being asked at this time to share in the tax increases that the Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Steuart) demands.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. BEREZOWSKY:** — Our people ask: are there no alternatives? And I say, yes, there are. The Premier went to Israel and he went to Japan and in Japan it was demonstrated to him that this country used its resources to provide health, education, good living standards, and other benefits by sensible policies. In Japan unemployment is virtually non-existent. Government supports and subsidizes not only industry but the farmers and workers as well. This has been good for Japan. The Premier has been in Israel and he has seen the same thing and he has admitted for once in his life. Yes, this is one country where Socialism works.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. BEREZOWSKY:** — Well, it could work here too and it will work with a new government.

**AN HON. MEMBER:** — And it has worked!

**MR. BEREZOWSKY:** — Persistently, Mr. Speaker, this Government has been destroying our health plans for our people with deterrent fees of one kind or another. It is ignoring the education needs of our province. Saskatchewan Liberals are closing their eyes to the farm crisis and in collusion with their counterparts in Ottawa are rapidly forcing our people to move into the cities.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. BEREZOWSKY:** — And when they move there they find suffering, hardship, unemployment, slums, a hopeless future because they are unprepared. So like the people of Britain 100 years ago, Mr. Speaker, who lived under impossible conditions, one can say today of Saskatchewan, "They too have nothing to lose but their chains," for such is the new Saskatchewan of the Liberal party.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. BEREZOWSKY:** — When we hear about taxes from the Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Steuart) we see how stupid and ridiculous these taxes are. Just like the gasoline taxes on farm fuel which it was forced to remove. It has unfairly taxed farmers. It has unfairly taxed the sick and now it is going to tax the young. We now have a new tax on meals, Mr. Speaker. This one is a nuisance tax as well as being ridiculous, because anyone buying a hotdog, a bowl of soup or a cup of coffee with a bun, must pay a tax. Imagine the embarrassment of the Provincial Treasurer or the Premier when the church organizations and the service clubs and other associations, ball clubs, if you like, are asked to obtain licences and required to remit taxes collected for the Provincial Treasurer. Big deal!

Since the Liberals took office, Mr. Speaker, in spite of their original promises to cut taxes they have not. There have

been no tax reductions. Indeed the Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Steuart) stole profits from the Power Corporation and from the Telephone Company to the tune of \$27 million this year and this is of little satisfaction to farmers and workers whose taxes are going up and up and whose income is going down and down.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. BEREZOWSKY:** — Mr. Speaker, you must agree with me that is the prerogative and duty of democratic governments to plan for economic and social progress and project plans for the future for the good of the people. And this Province of Saskatchewan is now in deep trouble because this Government has done no planning. Our economy has been contracting with the assistance of the Liberal Governments both here and in Ottawa. There has been a reduction of wealth such as in oil, in mines, in potash and some of it is deliberate to protect the interests of big business. Production is controlled to assure profits for big business, but we have as well, Sir, wheat and other wealth which we cannot sell because of Government laxity. All this is bad for the economy. It has brought hard times and poverty to too many. In the midst of plenty, Mr. Speaker, we find ourselves in a form of economic starvation.

Surely it is an advantage to have surpluses of wheat just as corporations know it is an advantage to have stockpiles of potash, or copper, or steel. Wealth to the producer is money in the pocket, Sir. But this wealth must be sold. Farmers and fishermen do not have a market monopoly as do mining or oil or potash corporations. And so if the governments are the instruments of our society, as they should be, then it must be incumbent upon them to find markets for our wheat and fish and other primary products without being exploited by capitalistic exchanges.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. BEREZOWSKY:** — I say it is essential that governments establish or encourage the establishment of marketing boards such as the Wheat Board and the governments must in addition subsidize and equalize payments so that hardships such as agriculture and fishing and trapping industries have experienced are no more.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. BEREZOWSKY:** — Mr. Speaker, I have a resolution I received this noon from my executive. I think it is a good one and this is a suggestion as to what should be done by the Governments of Canada and Saskatchewan. I shall read it:

Whereas grains especially wheat are a national asset which form a large part of our gross national product, therefore be it resolved that the Federal Government purchase all grains from bona-fide Canadian farmers and consider all grains as a national asset and that the farmers be paid a price to provide a desirable living standard.

And I think that this is an alternative that could be considered.

Mr. Speaker, the Federal Government has failed to understand the needs and aspirations of our people of Saskatchewan. It has not injected the necessary money into our economy although it thinks so. It is only concerned with the reduction of wheat to make our Prairies black. Certainly in my area in Northern Saskatchewan, Mr. Speaker, the program of Mr. Otto Lang is of no benefit whatsoever. No one will benefit.

**AN HON. MEMBER:** — Liberals everywhere!

**MR. BEREZOWSKY:** — Well, getting back to the Budget I will say this to the Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Steuart). This is at last a deficit budget but I am not impressed with it. I am not impressed with it. Nor am I happy with its deficiencies. What I am really concerned with and what the Provincial Treasurer should be concerned with is action to stop this recession with its unemployment and to get moving towards prosperity.

Mr. Speaker, our Governments, Federally and Provincially, as I have said have planned poorly. They have been influenced by financiers from outside this country and in this country. We have made laws to allow banks to have their way. Tight money or loose money either way and this hurts our people. Banks virtually lend non-existent money and charge high interest rates by virtue of the charters which our Government has given them.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. BEREZOWSKY:** — As Judy LaMarsh dubbed it, and I quote her:

Governments that are made of plastic and steel, that have no blood or guts and a Prime Minister that has no heart.

And I could apply that to the Premier of this Province.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. BEREZOWSKY:** — Mr. Speaker, we know that in the year 1969, October 31st, Canadian chartered banks reported fat profits, the highest in the history of Canada. These usurious banks' net profits were 26.5 per cent more than in 1968. The 1969 gross profit before income taxes was \$469 million, 23.5 per cent up from 1968. Canadian banks have increased their own revenues by nearly \$3 billion. The profits of the Bank of Montreal alone went up 89 per cent. These are statistics. High interest loans are of little comfort to the farmer or the businessman or a man who needs to build a house just to make profits for banks.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. BEREZOWSKY:** — The whole thing means simply this, Mr. Provincial Treasurer, that people in need of loans today must now pay 40 per cent to 50 per cent more in interest-rate charges to sustain these financial robber barons supported by your Government in the Parliament of Canada.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. BEREZOWSKY** — That is why I say, Sir, that poverty, instability and economic starvation must be laid at the door of our Federal and Provincial Governments. Far away governments, far away from the people are governments which derogate people and people's rights. And they are not democratic.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. BEREZOWSKY:** — Mr. Speaker, our laws are made for the rich because rich men make the laws.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. BEREZOWSKY:** — But in Britain where the banks are nationalized, I have a report from the Press here, which I could read but I have no time to read, indicating they are using the profits of banks to reduce taxes for that country. That's what we should be doing here, Sir.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. BEREZOWSKY:** — Mr. Speaker, in the one minute or so I have left I would add this. I can't say it all. Mr. Speaker, when the New Democratic party becomes the Government we will initiate new mechanisms to obtain Provincial revenues, possibly by more public investment in resource development. It is only fair that we the people benefit from the harvest of our own resources. For example, we could operate our own pulp mills and certain mines. We will assist those who need most help. Instead of relief we will undertake a meaningful program of capital works. I could mention some of them — I must mention some of them even if I go over a half a minute — no, I haven't time, I have to conclude but I do want a power line, Mr. Premier, to Candle Lake. I do want a road to Deschambault. I do want many things and I am going to talk about them when we get into Estimates and you will hear plenty, Sir.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. BEREZOWSKY:** — I will talk about grants for education, for students, bursaries and other things. But as I have no time now all I can say is this that I cannot agree that the Budget is sufficient. It is deficient in every way. This Government has failed to do the kind of things it should have done and I cannot vote for the Budget but will vote for the amendment.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. H.E. COUPLAND: (Meadow Lake)** — Mr. Speaker, I would first like to add my congratulations to Dr. Stephen Worobetz on his appointment and wish him the very best.

I would also like to pay tribute to Mr. Hanbidge for his service to the Province and wish him well in his retirement.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to take part in this Budget Debate because it is a good budget and I hope to point out some of the

March 11, 1970

benefits that the Meadow Lake constituency will derive from having a Liberal Government in Saskatchewan.

Mr. Speaker, every year one has to listen to the criticisms from the Members opposite, watch them shed their crocodile tears, but I suppose that is the role of the Opposition. It is too bad, Mr. Speaker, they couldn't come up with something constructive.

Mr. Speaker, there has been a lot of bad publicity given to the Meadow Lake area in the last few weeks, so I intend to use some of the time allotted to me in this Debate to point out to the Members of this House that things are not as bad as some would have you believe. It seems strange, Mr. Speaker, that a person can go into an area for a few hours and come back knowing all the problems but never offering a solution.

Mr. Speaker, I would like every Member of this House to read the letters to the editor in the Tuesday, March 10th issue of the Saskatoon Star Phoenix. There are two letters in there written by ladies from the Meadow Lake area, Mrs. Fabiola Rediron of Green Lake and Mrs. Mary Gehl of Meadow Lake, fine outstanding citizens of the Meadow Lake constituency. I am very happy and proud that they saw fit to put in writing their views and concern of the statements made by Howard Adams and Father Owens in regard to the Meadow Lake area.

Mr. Speaker, Meadow Lake is a thriving community and I feel it is just beginning to come into its own. We have a gas field out there now in the area which would not have been there had we have had the Socialists in as the Government.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. COUPLAND:** — This in turn should encourage industry into the area. In fact, Mr. Speaker, the Premier and the Cabinet have been working hard for the last two years trying to get a major timber operation into the Meadow Lake area. Mr. Speaker, I am informed that we should have an announcement and a major announcement on this very soon. They have also been working hard to get the Northwest declared a special Designated Area. I am happy the Federal Government has made that designation today, Mr. Speaker.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. COUPLAND:** — Mr. Speaker, we will have telephone services throughout the rural areas which we never had under the Socialists. Our highways are being oiled, grid roads built and gravelled. Mr. Speaker, some of the members opposite like to take exception to our welfare programs in the North and programs to help people in northern areas. Mr. Speaker, I am going to say a few words about some of them, one of which is the fur program. The Member from Shellbrook (Mr. Bowerman) mentioned it the other day and said the NDP started the program. If they did, Mr. Speaker, it was in name only because they did nothing. When the Liberal Government took over it allowed the people in the North to run their own program and I am happy to say, Mr. Speaker, that this is a very good program. Mr. Speaker, the fur program operating now is doing a wonderful job. The fur program is not only a means of fur management but also of people education in self-government. The establishment of Fur Council schools is we feel a natural outcome of trapper education gained from the fur

program. We could say it is a segment of community development.

Mr. Speaker, the community development can be considered an act of faith — a faith in people to improve their own lot. It acknowledges that people can think, decide and act with regard to their own problems even when they are illiterate or inexperienced. It recognizes that the common person presents the greatest possibility we have for development.

We feel, Mr. Speaker, these programs will help to develop a people with a different attitude, a people that will not ask for continuous gifts, a people who will ask instead to be allowed to plan and succeed in their own type of programs; a people who will be able to see their own faults as well as their good points — in short, Mr. Speaker, a real participating democracy.

Paternalistic programs of the past have proven not to be the answer. Such programs breed contempt and a very poor attitude — an attitude of trying to get all for yourself. This situation is a very fertile field for the agitators. Mr. Speaker, I feel the Fur Council schools is one of the most important means of education in the North and I am not talking here of academic education but education that deals with fur, fish and local problems, a program with which people are well acquainted and in which they are vitally interested.

Mr. Speaker, I attended one of these Fur Council schools last fall along with the Minister of Natural Resources (Mr. Barrie), out on the shores of Turner Lake, 250 miles north of Meadow Lake. It was a wonderful experience, Mr. Speaker, to watch these trappers and people of the area plan their own fur programs, and here I would like to quote a few figures which I feel show what these schools are doing.

Mr. Speaker, in the year 1966-67 Buffalo Narrows or N51 as the fur block is called took \$4,793 of furs. In 1968-69 they had increased this to \$14,181. In Patuanak N16 they increased from \$16,000 to \$32,000; in Turner Lake from \$5,480 to \$22,458; in Cree Lake N18 from \$4,185 to \$10,049. In La Loche (and this one is really interesting) in 1966-67 they took \$23,287 worth of furs. In 1968-69 they had increased that to \$76,004; N21 which is Dillon from \$3,387 to \$23,613.

Mr. Speaker, there may have been a little bit of a price increase in fur but mainly this is done by their own planning and with the help of the Liberal Government to make this possible . . .

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. COUPLAND:** — . . . by cooperating with these people and offering help in such things as financing of motor toboggans, flying trappers into their trap lines and offering assistance until they can catch and sell fur.

Mr. Speaker, I offer no apologies for trying to help people earn a living rather than be on welfare.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. COUPLAND:** — Mr. Speaker, the only

program I saw in the Meadow Lake constituency when the Member from The Battlefords (Mr. Kramer) was minister of Natural Resources was having the people out taking the bark off the poplar trees. These men were wading around in the snow up to their waist cutting the bark off to kill the trees. It looked to me like there had been a bunch of beavers in the area. There was quite a laugh about it. It has all been burnt over by a forest fire two years ago so I don't know what they had hoped to prove, but I think a lot of tax dollars went down the drain on that one. In fact, Mr. Speaker, some of that area is in the 700 acres we have cleared and broken to set up a cattle operation in the Ile-a-la-Crosse area with another 700 acres to be cleared which will carry over 400 head of cattle and provide jobs for six families and train men to come out and work on ranches farther south.

Mr. Speaker, the Government has cleared and broken 845 acres at La Loche, 150 acres of this seeded to rye and to grass. This is expected to support about four families and give these families in that area an opportunity to see how cattle are raised as there will be up to 200 head at La Loche. Corrals and sheds have already been built.

Then, Mr. Speaker, there is the central farm at Green Lake with 2,400 acres under cultivation, 300 head of cattle on the farm, a 2,000 hog barn in the process of construction. This farm has a 1,500 acre community pasture with 900 acres seeded to grass. We have another farm started at Green Lake which has 2,000 acres cleared and the plans are to ultimately develop 15,000 acres to carry approximately 5,000 head of cattle. This farm will have a feed-lot, operation finishing cattle from this farm and from the other training farms in the North. It is estimated, Mr. Speaker, that 25 families will find employment in this operation.

Mr. Speaker, these are the farms in the Meadow Lake constituency. There are also farms at Cumberland House, Lebret and Mortlach. The Government has spent a lot of money on draining, diking, clearing and breaking at Cumberland House. Twenty-three Indian and Métis work on that farm. The Lebret farm, Mr. Speaker, has 15 families or 102 persons living on the farm. These people raise 1,000 chickens, 600 hogs, 300 sheep and 200 head of cattle. On this basis, Mr. Speaker, the farms are an excellent place for training people in basic agriculture.

Mr. Speaker, I want to turn to welfare again. We seem to have a lot of do-gooders who seem to know all the answers. It is too bad they won't pass them on. Mr. Speaker, there are five Indian bands in the Meadow Lake community who are handling their own welfare. It is very interesting to note that, when these people took over their own welfare, and in most cases it is the Chief who looks after the welfare, they have cut their welfare costs by \$75,000. This shows, Mr. Speaker, that these people are capable of handling their own affairs. In most cases the Chief is the man responsible and I can assure you, Mr. Speaker, they will not let their people starve.

Mr. Speaker, Chief Solomon Billette got in touch with me after the starvation stories came out in the paper and he really was upset over the fact that people should make these statements. He said it reflected on his handling of welfare in his area and he said, "I can assure you, Mr. Coupland, that none of my people are starving."



**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. COUPLAND:** — Mr. Speaker, the other chiefs in the area were also upset over the stories which they claim are untrue. They should know, Mr. Speaker, they live there.

Mr. Speaker, our Governments give grants to the Saskatchewan Métis Association. I am wondering if maybe it wouldn't be better to give it to such groups as the one we have in Buffalo Narrows who are called the UTC. They put out a paper and they are an organization that is out to help the people. They are presently trying to get a small radio station. I wish them every success, Mr. Speaker. Something like this will go a long way in helping the people of the area keep abreast of what is going on in their neighborhood as well as in the rest of the Province.

Mr. Speaker, the Government is concerned about the people in North-western Saskatchewan. We have done a lot but there is a lot more to do. At present the areas north of Meadow Lake have a radio communication with the outside which is not very private. We need a better telephone system in Ile-a-la-Crosse, Mr. Speaker. I understand the contract will be let for an auditorium in Ile-a-la-Crosse very soon.

Mr. Speaker, these are just a few reasons and a few things that the Liberal Government is doing for the people in Northwest Saskatchewan and one reason why I will support the Budget and vote against the amendment.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**HON. J.R. BARRIE: (Minister of Natural Resources)** — Mr. Speaker, in rising to participate in this debate I first wish to associate myself with previous speakers in their complimentary remarks regarding the appointment of Dr. Stephen Worobetz to the honorable and important post of Lieutenant Governor of our Province.

Likewise I concur in the remarks made by so many with respect to the highly regarded friend of everyone, Mr. Hanbidge. He served faithfully and well and endeared himself to a large majority if not all our citizens. I hope he enjoys many years of good health and happiness in his retirement.

Now I wish to congratulate the Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Steuart) on the Budget he presented to this House last week. It amply demonstrated not only the ability and integrity of the Treasurer but also his and the Government's concern for all the residents of Saskatchewan and the variety of complex problems confronting them. Taking current economic conditions into consideration, the Treasurer has accomplished a commendable feat in providing generous assistance in so many areas for the benefit of individuals, institutions and programs, while at the same time imposing very modest tax increases and forecasting a comparatively small deficit for the coming fiscal year.

I sympathize with the opposition's financial critic, the Member for Regina Centre (Mr. Blakeney). He had a most difficult task in attempting to criticize this Budget. His speech lacked the usual lustre and certainly failed to impress or convince anyone that this is not a good Budget. This was confirmed when he was so generous in conceding that there was very

little amiss with the proposals outlined in the Budget for 1970-71 during his television interview on the evening of the day the Budget was introduced. At this point I congratulate the Member for Kelvington, Mr. Byers, on his success at the polls last summer. However, I wonder if he has had, or is currently having some second thoughts, on his political alignment and his association with those to your left, Mr. Speaker, especially as to their attitude expressed toward the Budget now being debated. When the test comes in the vote, it will be interesting to note whether or not those opposite support the increased assistance provided all segments of our society in this budget document. I feel the constituents represented by those opposite will be keenly interested in the action taken by their representatives in this regard. Dare they vote against, and register their opposition to the many benefits provided by way of extra assistance and aids to so many as outlined by the Treasurer? Will they vote against this Budget and in so doing, vote against \$9 1/2 million increase in expenditure to maintain a high standard of health services in the Province of Saskatchewan, or will they vote against a budget, 34 per cent of which will be spent on education thereby providing very substantial increases toward the overall cost and thus relieve the tax burden on real property? Will they oppose the \$8.8 million provided for technical and vocational training; or the assistance in grants to our University amounting to three and one-half times that provided in 1964?

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. BARRIE:** — Do they propose to vote against the increase in the homeowner grant of 20 per cent to \$60? The Member for Regina South East (Mr. Baker) complained about the modest increase but even indicated he was going to oppose when it comes to a vote on this particular motion.

Will they vote against the amount provided for the highway program and then proceed to ask for even more consideration in highway construction and maintenance in their constituencies?

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. BARRIE:** — Will they oppose the Budget provision for substantial equalization grants to the rural municipalities or for the snow removal and police cost assistance to our cities? Will they fail to support the Budget which provides for increased municipal road assistance toward grid roads and farm access roads; or the increased assistance to villages, towns and hamlets for the gravelling and oiling of streets? Again I ask them, will they oppose by voting against this Budget, the increased allowances for welfare recipients or the increased assistance to our native citizens of Indian origin?

Mr. Speaker, a vote against this Budget cannot be interpreted as other than opposition to the expenditure of the vast sums which will benefit all the people of our province during this difficult economic period.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. BARRIE:** — Reference has been made in this House in recent days

to the NDP Convention held in Winnipeg a few months ago.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. BARRIE:** — Also, to the Watkins Manifesto or declaration of the objectives of the NDP. It was a shock to the moderates in the NDP — and there are some — to witness such substantial support for the radical element' in their party. I am certain many supporters of the NDP have great misgivings as to where they are headed and the political future of their party. I am sure they are deeply concerned and have every reason to be. When declarations of intent such as nationalization of all the means of production is their objective, then what will be the ultimate result? The ultimate result will be unadulterated Socialism put into practice.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. BARRIE:** — I wish to point out that it is a mistake to assume that the type of Socialism sponsored and promoted by the NDP would be any different in the end result to the kind of Socialism which brought disaster by the conflict of classes wherever it has been tried.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. BARRIE:** — Socialism appeals to sentiment and prejudice and would destroy the right of private enterprise to succeed. Socialism idolizes the offerings of economic security. History records that wherever people have exchanged freedom for economic security, invariably they have lost both. It is apparent from the snide remarks of many of those opposite, Mr. Speaker, that they are chafing at the bit for the announcement of a Provincial election.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. BARRIE:** — They have, it seems, great hopes of being the Government party following a contest. I am certain they are like the little colored boy whistling in the dark to keep up their courage. We, on this side of the House, may have our shortcomings — we are human. However, I have enough faith in Saskatchewan people that they will never accept the ideologies and declared intentions of the group of Socialists as an alternative to a government that expounds, endorses and practises sound, practical, realistic business principles and supports a private enterprise system along with reasonable social services, thereby creating a political climate conducive to individual enterprise and initiative.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. BARRIE:** — Mr. Speaker, in recent weeks much has been said in this Chamber regarding the serious problems faced by those engaged in agriculture, our basic industry. Typical of our friends opposite, they seize on the unfortunate circumstances of many of our farm people to promote political capital for themselves. This is not their first attempt, nor will it likely be their

last. This has always been their policy in the past to capitalize politically in times of adversity through the misfortune of others. They accuse governments of being wholly responsible for the situation with little regard to the facts. They offer unrealistic solutions and deny any credit to others for any and all actions taken to try and remedy our problems.

No one is more conscious of the serious problem confronting our wheat producers than the Government Members on your right, Mr. Speaker, nor of the effect their problem has on the business sector and the provincial economy generally. For the NDP to state that the Provincial Government Members have shown no concern and are complacent regarding this problem is utterly ridiculous and false. Every reasonable effort has been made and pursued to assist our farm population to overcome the current situation. It is due entirely to world-wide over-abundance of wheat and the lack of sales for our product outside of Canada. As a result of the actions and initiative of this Government, and particularly the Premier, the Federal Government has activated itself as demonstrated by placing responsibility for The Canadian Wheat Board with a Westerner, a Saskatchewan Member of the Federal Cabinet, The Hon. Otto Lang.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. BARRIE:** — Indications are that the Canadian Wheat Board sales and trade policies are being re-aligned in an endeavor to meet the situation. Despite the criticism of the plan to reduce acreage sown to wheat and convert substantial acreage from wheat to other crops or to fallow, it will certainly provide some financial assistance to our farmers. While it is not all we in the West had hoped for, the Federal Government still is not committed to a long-term land-bank program. At best the proposed plan is a temporary measure to get some cash into the hands of our farmers. I am convinced that the fact that some cash will be available is better than none at all. This is the reason, I am sure, the plan has received the support it has from farm leaders and farm organizations in the province. It does not seem proper that production of wheat or any other staple food, should be discouraged and curtailed when there are many hungry people throughout the world. However, farmers, or any one country or government, cannot be expected to take the blame for this tragic situation and condition. It is an international problem. The solution must be determined by countries and governments throughout the world, including those countries and governments where hunger exists. Any and all efforts at solution must necessarily be directed to several commodities because wheat is not the only surplus food in the world today. We in Western Canada may be increasingly vulnerable to wheat surpluses. It is not too early and may possibly even be a little late, to plan a long-term policy for the future which will result in some rather drastic changes in grain production in order to survive. It could happen with nature — climatic conditions being what they are — that the wheat surplus could vanish within a year or two. However, continued demand for comparatively low yield, high quality wheat as we have known it, produced at a comparatively high cost may be practically non-existent on world markets in the future. Chiefly because of crop failures and other determining factors elsewhere over the years, we were able to dispose of all the high quality wheat we produced. Such circumstances and conditions may return but on the other hand, they may not. To maintain ourselves as a

competitive grain-producing and exporting nation we must explore, develop and adopt every worthwhile technique available such as new grain varieties and advanced agricultural processes.

The proposal by the Government of this province to establish a Crop Breeding Institute in Saskatchewan is a step in this direction and should receive every encouragement and support both from individual farmers and their farm organizations. Further research and experimentation should be increased drastically without delay. It is essential, in my opinion, that every individual, association and organization who have a stake in Western Canada must lend their assistance in providing the tools and techniques necessary to meet the challenge of our competition in grain production and sales.

Mr. Speaker, before proceeding to deal briefly with certain items directly associated with the Department of Natural Resources, I wish to take this opportunity to pay tribute to the memory of the revered, honored and highly respected Taras Shevchenko, who was a Ukrainian patriot, artist, poet, philosopher and a Ukrainian national hero. The constituency I represent and have the honor to do so and where I have resided for over 40 years has a large population of Canadians of Ukrainian ancestry. To these people Taras Shevchenko was a symbol. On visiting private homes and Ukrainian meeting places, one will invariably see pictures of this patriot displayed on the walls. I have witnessed this so often that I am immediately able to recognize portraits of this outstanding gentleman if I see them anywhere. Those of Ukrainian ancestry are joined by a host of other national and racial origins in paying homage to this illustrious man. Many are familiar with the heart-rending and inspiring poetry that flowed from his mind and his pen. I am certain every Member in this House appreciated the reference made to this Ukrainian notable by the Member from Riversdale (Mr. Romanow) on Monday last. I am surprised and rather disappointed that other Members of this House of Ukrainian origin did not dwell on this anniversary of this particular Ukrainian patriot. It can be truly said Taras Shevchenko was one of those men who had a message for all humanity, for the victims of oppression and injustice everywhere. He died 109 years ago this month at the comparatively early age of 47.

Mr. Speaker, a year ago when I spoke in the Budget Debate I mentioned 1969 would be a year of reassessment of the programs and policies of the Department of Natural Resources. This plan has been carried out during the past 12 months. Priorities have been established for future programs and department activity. During 1969, we were able to maintain the high standard of service in every branch of this Department. A degree of expansion and improvement was accomplished in the field of recreation within our parks and the camp-site system. Every facility was taxed to its utmost during the summer by campers, tourists, and day users. As a consequence of this ever-increasing patronage of our recreational facilities, substantial improvement and expansion will be proceeded with during 1970. Development of Diefenbaker Lake and the surrounding area and the Blackstrap area will receive special attention.

I believe it will be of interest to the Members to know that in excess of 2 million people visited our Provincial Parks last season and in excess of 70,000 camping permits were issued in our Provincial Parks and Trans-Canada Highway camp-grounds — an increase over 1968 of 46 per cent. Four and one-half million

people visited all of our Provincially operated and maintained areas in 1969. This figure does not include regional park visitations.

With the advent of motorized snow toboggans and the spectacular upsurge in their use, keen interest is being taken in winter sports, both by the young and old. The promotion of winter carnivals and festivals has grown dramatically. Many of our parks being ideally suited as the locales for these sport events, has meant their use has been stepped up significantly. This added interest requires that we in the Department of Natural Resources must direct our attention and consideration to the development of winter recreational facilities in many of our park areas, including and especially Cypress Hills, Moose Mountain, Duck Mountain, Buffalo Pound and others. This changes the concept of recreation in Saskatchewan which was formerly directed chiefly to outdoor activities in the summer months. During the next few months a study will be made to determine and formulate suitable programs and policies for the development of facilities related to such winter sports as skiing, tobogganing, snowshoeing and the recreation pleasure use of motorized vehicles. Saskatchewan has a very large capital investment in our recreation areas throughout the province. The cost of maintenance amounts to significant sums each year. Our short summer season limits their use and public benefit. Hence, we are pleased to note the increased interest and activity in winter sports and recreation, as this will increase the use and benefit to the public of our park facilities for a longer period each year. It will enhance their value considerably.

During the 1969 season, I am sure that the Member for The Battlefords (Mr. Kramer) will not say we are five years too late. They were 20 years too late in expanding regional parks. During the 1969 season, the 72 regional parks, well distributed throughout the province, experienced a decided increase in patronage. A conservative estimate of the number of visitors to these parks in 1969 is also in excess of one million persons.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. BARRIE:** — Improvements and expansion of facilities are steadily being carried out by most of the regional park authorities on a carefully planned and supervised basis, making them more attractive and adding to the service they render the public.

Most Members have no doubt read of the need expressed by the Federal Government for a Prairie National Park. This news item has come through news releases and by means of other media. Often reference has been made in these releases to the Cypress Hills area. However, the only area that is currently being considered is located east and south of Val Marie. It will not under any circumstances include the Cypress Hills Provincial Park. Negotiations have been continued for some time between our Provincial Government and the Federal Government with regard to the establishment of a Prairie National Park. However, there are many problems to be resolved before any agreement can be finalized. Such items as mineral rights, land acquisition, grazing privileges, hunting activities and the extent or area of the park are under consideration and subject to continuing discussion. The staff of the Department of Natural Resources have done a great deal of work in this connection and we will continue negotiating with the Federal

authorities.

The management programs administered by the Department of Natural Resources officials for the conservation, control and propagation of wild life and fish have proven effective. Satisfactory population levels of fish, game, birds and fur bearing animals have been maintained, while at the same time providing reasonable harvesting of these resources during the appropriate seasons.

Commercial fishing in 1969 was most rewarding to our fisherman. The Freshwater Fish Marketing Corporation's operation proved very successful. The objective of the corporation, to provide greater returns to the actual fishermen, was realized beyond all expectations. The unfortunate circumstances of mercury contamination of predator fish in the South Saskatchewan River is certainly of concern to everyone. With the alleged source of pollution removed, it is hoped this problem will diminish rapidly and be overcome in the near future. Our Research Division of the Fisheries Branch has worked very closely with the Western College of Veterinary Medicine and the Federal Fisheries Research Board in conjunction with The Water Resources Commission and the Provincial Laboratory to determine the effect and source of this pollution. Unfortunately, in the past there has been no standard testing method for mercury, thus causing certain delay in test results. Close watch is being maintained to discover any further occurrence affecting the fish in the river, but to date the findings have been nil, which we appreciate very much.

1969 proved to be a very successful year for our trapping industry. Fur prices were generally higher and the catch or harvest was most encouraging. Staff members continue to provide information, direction and assistance to trappers by means of Trappers' Schools, held in various locations during this year. As mentioned by the Member for Meadow Lake (Mr. Coupland) just a few moments ago in the House, I also had the opportunity of attending one of these schools held on Turner Lake last fall. I was impressed by the attendance and the attention given to those offering instruction and advice in the various aspects of trapping. I am convinced this is a worthwhile service we provide for many of our northern residents.

Another service provided by the Government through the Department of Natural Resources is the Northern News radio program. The information provided by this means is really appreciated by all the residents of Northern Saskatchewan, especially those in remote areas with no other means of communication except DNR radio and the Northern News programs.

The Saskatchewan forest industry continues to expand. The Department of Natural Resources staff have been busily engaged in recording forest inventories, mapping and marking forest areas, carrying out inspection of timber operations to ensure proper lumbering and pulpwood cutting regulations and practices are observed. In addition, considerable fire suppression work was necessary during 1969. Fire suppressions costs amounted to well over \$1 million last year. Despite more rigid control regulations and the adoption of more modern and effective suppression procedures, unfortunately we continue to experience forest fires, large and small. Fortunately loss of merchantable timber in 1969 was comparatively light.

Our nurseries produced and distributed large quantities of seedlings, tublings and young trees. In the past year, 3 1/2 million nursery units were distributed by the Department. The total northern area planting amounted to 1,342,000 units, including 190,000 trees planted by Saskatchewan Pulpwood last fall. 153, 000 trees were planted in the southern part of the Province by the Department. A total of approximately 11,000 trees of various species have been planted along the Trans-Canada highway between Moose Jaw and the city of Regina.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I would like to deal with the matter of pulp industry. The production of pulpwood to supply the Prince Albert pulp mill has been the chief source accounting for the expansion of our forest industry. This production of course is mainly from the northwest portion of the province tributary to the city of Prince Albert. The purveyors of doom and gloom continue to forecast that the raw material required to supply the Prince Albert mill will deplete our timber resources and will ultimately have to cease operation due to lack of wood supplies. A detailed inventory of the timber resources in this north-western area has recently been completed by a professional team. I feel certain the inventory information obtained and reported by them will be of interest to the Members of the House, Mr. Speaker.

They reported that the potential forest resources in this part of our province will support in perpetuity the following wood manufacturing operations: 2 — 1,000 tons per day soft wood pulp mills; 1 — 500 tons per day and 1 — 1,000 tons per day hard wood pulp mill; 2 — 50 million annual cut lumber sawmills; 1 — 300 ton per day hard board mill and 1 — 300 ton per day particle board mill. In the light of this survey and this information has anyone reason to question the continued supply of raw material necessary for the Prince Albert pulp mill? Certainly not, Mr. Speaker, and in addition an ample supply of wood is available in perpetuity to maintain many more wood industries in this area.

Prospects for the pulpwood industry are good. There is keen demand for pulp of the quality our wood supply produces, at good prices. The Prince Albert pulp mill is an outstanding success. Despite scepticism and criticism from many sources, it will prove to be one of the best investments Saskatchewan has ever made. It is interesting to note the concern now being expressed by some regarding this pulp operation. It suggests quite a change of attitude and opinion. It is hoped those from the area in and around Prince Albert who derive a decided benefit from this industry will appreciate what the Premier and this Government did for them and their section of Saskatchewan.

We in Saskatchewan have our problems currently but they will be resolved, possibly sooner than our friends opposite will agree. In the meantime, my advice to them, Mr. Speaker, is not to sell Saskatchewan or Saskatchewan people short. It may embarrass them earlier than they would anticipate.

Mr. Speaker, again I wish to confirm my previous remarks by saying I believe this Budget is a good one, well planned and designed to provide substantial benefits for Saskatchewan and its citizens in the year 1970-71. I will certainly support the Budget and oppose the amendment.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!



**MR. W.J. BEREZOWSKY: (Prince Albert East-Cumberland)** — Mr. Speaker, I would just like to ask a question of the Hon. Member if he will answer. It's a short question. I have a report here from Stanford Research Institute and they suggested that we could have four pulp mills I think. I think the Minister mentioned only two. Has there been such a tremendous reduction in the forest . . .

**MR. BARRIE:** — I was referring to the northwest section of the province, not the whole northern part of the province.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. D.W. MICHAYLUK: (Redberry):** — Mr. Speaker, because of the remarks that were made by the last speaker, the Hon. Member from Pelly and Minister of Natural Resources (Mr. Barrie), I feel obligated to say a few words on behalf of the Ukrainian poet and artist, the late Taras Shevchenko. My constituency, Mr. Speaker, is made up of many various ethnic groups and I am aware that each ethnic group in my constituency and in other parts of the province has individuals of great esteem, be they in poetry, in politics, art, music or any other aspect in which they were dedicated. Therefore for me as a Ukrainian to devote a few words to the native son of the Ukraine, I am speaking as a Ukrainian, with the feelings which he deserves from the people of Ukrainian descent which I and other Hon. Members represent.

Taras Shevchenko was born on March 9th, 1814. His family was under the domination of Baron Engelhart. As a serf's child, young Taras up to the age of 12 was a chore boy or a page to this Baron. Taras at this very early age, Mr. Speaker, exhibited talent for art and at the Baron's request was sent to school to take lessons. He also showed an inclination to the writing of poetry and as a serf he longed for freedom that was enjoyed by his baron and the other people of means. This economic situation of the young boy enticed him to write poetry. The pen unfolded his words to the Ukrainians. The Hon. Member from Pelly (Mr. Barrie) mentioned that Taras Shevchenko was a great poet. How true. Shevchenko during his 47 years — and 47 years in terms is a short life — produced some of the finest and the richest poems which have been translated into many Western European languages.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. MICHAYLUK:** — The name of his book is *Kobzar*. Most of the poems, due to the fact of the circumstance under which Ukrainians lived, were poems of hope and guidelines for the emancipation of the Ukrainians from serfdom and from economic dominations. For his writings and strong national feelings, Mr. Speaker, Catherine the Great, the Czarina of Russia, sent Taras Shevchenko into exile. His friends, some of whom were university professors, sold Shevchenko's paintings and liberated him from the bonds of serfdom. Shevchenko became a free man.

The Hon. Member from Pelly (Mr. Barrie) mentioned that Shevchenko died at an early age of 47 years. This is correct. His health failed him in the concentration camps of the Siberian steppes of Russia. His wish was that after his death he be buried in his native land, the Ukraine. This was done.

March 11, 1970

Taras Shevchenko died on March 10th in 1861 and was buried on the banks of the great Dnieper River which was the highway of the Cossacks who so prominently stand out in the history of the Ukraine.

Mr. Speaker, in rising to participate in the Budget Debate may I congratulate the Members who have added their contributions to the proceedings. I must admit, Sir, as no doubt you would, that the content and scope were rather divergent as to application and to reality. As usual some Members, particularly the Liberal back benchers, wanted to find other matters to discuss far a field from the Budget content, Mr. Speaker.

The Hon. Member from Nipawin discussed Mafia. He is not in his seat, Mr. Speaker. The Minister of Mineral Resources (Mr. Cameron) found more interest in the Waffle Manifesto than in the Department of Mineral Resources. The Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Estey) — and I regret that he is not in his seat, Mr. Speaker — devoted a great deal of time fighting the usual straw man which he himself set up, namely ‘socialization’ of farms.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Member for Yorkton (Mr. Gallagher) could be likened to Shakespeare’s opponents in Shakespeare’s play ‘Julius Caesar’ to Brutus and Cassius before the Battle of Philippi. “The Ides of March,” and the Hon. Member’s ghost, Mr. Speaker, in this Legislature are the legislative broadcasts. He’s riddled with fear, perturbed and disturbed over the mismanagement of his free enterprise Government and he wants to expose Saskatchewan and the electorate to the daily press, radio and television. He is worried about the presentation of live speeches by individual Members from these Chambers. Mr. Speaker, the truth haunts the Member from Yorkton. If not, why should he express concern of what Hon. Members or I want to say on radio? If I am out of order, Mr. Speaker, the Member from Yorkton (Mr. Gallagher) — and rightly so — has the privilege to rise in his seat and put me in order. Or you, Sir, likewise, bound and versed on established tradition, could and should put all Members in order if we overstep the bounds of privilege proceedings in this Legislature. The Hon. Member’s suggestion that only four political speeches be made on radio makes mockery of the established tradition. Once again, Mr. Speaker, it confirms my contention that the Members opposite are afraid of the broadcasts and the truth that they would reveal.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. MICHAYLUK:** — Mr. Speaker, justice will prevail and truth will make this province free from the Liberal Government. Just to listen to one side of the story, aided and abetted by our democratic Press, which puts on a defence of this Government in this fashion. And may I quote the Liberal platform of 1964 that stated:

We will give the people of Saskatchewan or we will be obligated to pick up the major cost of drugs.

And when this issue was being discussed by our Leader, the Saskatoon Star Phoenix in its April 1st edition of 1967, ran to the Minister of Public Health’s (Mr. Grant) defence or to the Government’s defence. And this is, Mr. Speaker, how they were defended. May I quote in part:

No Government should feel honor bound to implement every election promise necessarily.

Listen to this gem:

This is particularly true when parties which were not in office when promises were made.

Listen to this:

They should be permitted ways of honorably withdrawing from pledges which prove less reasonable in view of the realities of governing.

Well, Mr. Speaker, the people of Saskatchewan have been exposed to this type of information by the Liberals in promising and by the daily press, which I say aids them, abets them, and takes them off the hook. What perturbs me more, Mr. Speaker, is that the overall stroke of the editorial brush on the Members of the Legislature in this morning's editorial page in *The Leader Post* entitled, "The Silly Season," in which the Hon. Member from Nipawin (Mr. Radloff) is criticized for his total remarks in his recent speech on the Budget.

It is certainly too bad that irresponsible, silly and actually senseless remarks such as were given by the Hon. Member should find any place in our Legislature in the Budget Debate paid for by the taxpayers.

If the constituency of Nipawin, Mr. Speaker, wants this type of representation, wants these types of speeches, his presence here will no doubt be confirmed by the electorate when the Premier gets the gall to call an election. Let it be understood, Mr. Speaker, that just on account of the action of one Member in this House reflection should not be cast as they were cast in this editorial on each Member of this Legislature. And may I just read the closing remark of this editorial "Silly Season":

The speeches can be torn to pieces all the way through. It is laughable but it is tragic that the Legislature has to put up with speeches of this nature which unfortunately come from both sides during the session.

I hope sincerely, Mr. Speaker, that *The Leader Post* has no intention of including the members on this side who honestly, sincerely and truthfully are trying to present the cause of our party to the Members in Government.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I align myself with those of my colleagues who disagree with many aspects of the Budget. I disagree with its priorities and with its lack of consideration for ordinary people of my constituency and the people of Saskatchewan. The last Budget, Mr. Speaker, brought down in this Legislature by the New Democratic Provincial Treasurer was slightly higher than \$200 million in 1964. The Budget brought down by the Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Steuart) and the Hon. Member for Prince Albert on Monday, last, is twice as large or \$405 million, to be exact. Mr. Speaker, because of the increase of Provincial revenues so mercilessly extracted by the Liberal Government, the people of my constituency would have expected some form of tax relief. I would have expected a removal of the deterrent fees on doctor and hospital services. Mr. Speaker, the people of my constituency would have expected the removal of the five per cent sales tax

from such essentials as children's clothing and shoes. Mr. Speaker, might I remind the Liberals and the Liberal Government that one of their pledges as enunciated in the April 10, 1964 issue of the Saskatchewan Liberal stated this, and may I quote Sir:

A new Liberal Government will lengthen the list of goods now exempt from the sales tax to include such essentials as children's clothing and shoes.

Well, Mr. Speaker, they sure did lengthen the list by adding meals, telephone bills, power bills, soaps, detergents, bleaches, and a host of other commodities. They lengthened it by taxing more commodities. Mr. Speaker, this Government couldn't be accused of reneging on that pledge, as it honestly and sincerely lengthened the list of goods in respect to the sales tax.

Mr. Speaker, the people of the Redberry constituency would have welcomed the extension of medical care insurance to cover the major cost of drugs. In the same issue that I made mention of a few moments ago, in the same issue of the Saskatchewan Liberal, Mr. Speaker, here is what the Liberal party and the now Government promised and up until now have reneged on this pledge. May I quote again:

A new Liberal Government will institute a drug insurance program to care for major drug costs.

Need the Hon. Members opposite, Mr. Speaker, be reminded once again that they have lost faith with the Saskatchewan taxpayers for their utter disregard of implementing their pledge in respect of the sales tax also. Mr. Speaker, here is their pledge about sales tax:

A new Liberal Government will immediately cut the five per cent sales tax to four per cent with a further objective of reducing it to three per cent.

It is a known fact, Mr. Speaker, that the Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Steuart) has been encountering difficulties in the collection of the tax on meals. As a matter of fact, he made a statement to the effect that some people were cheating the Government by receiving separate bills for family groups. So to make the tax on meals more equitable to all segments of our population and all age groups, he slaps on a hotdog tax on hamburgers, sandwiches and every meal over 14 cents. It seems, Mr. Speaker, that justice shall now prevail in the realms of food tax, hotel and motel tax, and gasoline tax, so that it doesn't really matter where you are in Saskatchewan, or where you are going — and I know that you are not going anywhere Heavy Water MacDougall — you will contribute to the Provincial Treasurer on a pay-as-you-go or travel basis.

The agricultural industry, Mr. Speaker, welcomes the removal of the 2 cents per gallon tax on farm fuels. This tax should never have been imposed in the first instance. The Provincial Treasurer justifies his generosity by a further imposition of a 2-cent per gallon tax increase on automobile and non-farm trucks. May I assure the Government and the Provincial Treasurer, Mr. Speaker, that for their mercies the Liberals will be rewarded once they get the courage to call a Provincial election.

Mr. Speaker, 20 years ago the Liberal party was in opposition in this province. During these 20 years, their approach to

public affairs was characterized by a high degree of irresponsibility and destruction. A party in opposition can adopt such a posture without too much harm to the public. The only ones that are really hurt are themselves. However, Mr. Speaker, in 1964 the people of Saskatchewan entrusted the Liberal party with the reins of office. When the Liberal party and the Liberal Leader accept this responsibility they accept the responsibility on behalf of all the people of the province, not just on behalf of the Liberal party and its members or supporters.

This, Mr. Speaker, of necessity entails a change of attitude and requires those people in positions of responsibility, be they either Ministers of the Crown or Members of the Legislative Assembly, to conduct themselves in a responsible fashion and to guide their approach in public affairs in a direction that will be in the long-term interests of all the people of Saskatchewan. It would be quite reasonable, in my opinion, Mr. Speaker, to grant a group of people accepting high responsibility in government some time to get used to the idea of being members of a government. After such a transition period, the public have a right to expect their elected officials and Ministers of the Crown to conduct themselves in a responsible fashion that will bring credit to the province. The Premier in his speeches at various places in Canada and outside its borders, has made unfounded, unwarranted and inaccurate speeches about the growth and development of industries, minerals and Crown corporations during the period 1944 to 1964.

May I, Mr. Speaker, with your permission, make reference to a press release reporting on a speech made by the Premier in the Bahamas and reported in the Minot Daily News on January 24, 1968. May I quote in part:

Saskatchewan struck oil in 1964, the year Thatcher was elected Premier.

Thatcher struck oil in 1964. Well, Mr. Speaker, to all fair-minded and unbiased people this is utter nonsense and untruth. I want to make reference to a report in the Saskatoon Star Phoenix of December 26, 1964. Four years earlier — this speech was made in 1968 and may I quote: “Oil production exceeds half a billion barrels.” 1964, December. This report, Mr. Speaker, was given by J.M. MacNicol, Manager of the Saskatchewan Division of the Canadian Petroleum Association. Here is what Mr. MacNicol is reported to have said and I quote:

J.M. MacNicol, Manager of the Saskatchewan Division of the Association said that while it took 14 years for the province to produce its first half million barrels, it will take fewer than six to exceed one billion barrels. As Canada’s second largest producing province, Saskatchewan is now producing 28 per cent of all the oil produced in Canada.

And in 1964, Ross Thatcher struck oil, to quote again.

The province produced 221,000 barrels per day from 76 oil fields and pools. Because of the growth and development of the petroleum industry, Saskatchewan and the provincial government have received \$200 million in direct royalties, land sales and mineral taxes.

Last year . . .

March 11, 1970

Mr. Speaker, this refers to 1963.

the provincial government received \$24.3 million dollars for royalties and sales. This amounted to 13.4 per cent of the total revenue received by the Government. In 1964 this figure reached \$28 million.

This is not a Member of the New Democratic party speaking. This is Mr. J.M. MacNicol, manager of an oil company in Saskatchewan.

Just one more quote from this release, Mr. Speaker, to indicate how unfounded the report on the Premier's remarks is. May I quote:

That industry has come a long way in the past 14 years, but it wasn't until 1950 that Saskatchewan showed progress as an oil-producing province. In that short space of time the oil industry has risen to the leading mineral resource industry in the province and the third largest single revenue-producing source for the provincial government.

These are remarks, Mr. Speaker, by the Manager of the Canadian Petroleum Association, Saskatchewan Division. And any reference to these remarks, so factually and clearly put, shows how unfounded, misleading and unrealistic the statements made by the Premier are, when he refers to this period of development as days of stagnation.

Just one other point, Mr. Speaker, with the recent discovery of oil at deeper levels, Mr. P. Neilson, President of Mobil Oil Canada Limited was asked if the change of provincial government had made oil exploration in Saskatchewan easier. Here is, Mr. Speaker, a part of Mr. Neilson's reply to that question, quote:

You must remember that the majority of our discoveries were made during the 1950s under the previous government. I don't think we can relate our activities to governments. Our activities have been regulated by our success. We make every effort to steer clear of politics. Our business is oil exploration and production. We have operated under both governments and have had good relations with both, Mr. Neilson said.

Again, Mr. Speaker, the contention of the Premier and the Minister of Mineral Resources (Mr. Cameron) that all companies were reluctant to come to explore for oil are ill-founded and are merely fabricated for distortive purposes to confuse the electorate.

I want to again mention this quote which I have used in this Legislature on other occasions, and with your permission, Mr. Speaker, I will do so. Mr. Tom Ware, President of International Mineral and Chemicals, speaking at the opening of the International Mineral and Chemical plant at Esterhazy on September 20, 1962 had this to say about their relations with the New Democratic Government. And may I quote:

How lucky we were to find an appreciation in your wise government of the economic laws with which a company must operate. How fortunate we were to find understanding and a sound gauge of the risks we had to take to be encouraged to take this very long-term gamble with special financial

consideration that was given. With the wisdom, the care and the judgment and the experience which the government here in Saskatchewan provided and to realize a host of services from your government in many other ways.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. MICHAYLUK:** — Likewise, Mr. Speaker, Mr. Clyde G. Kissinger, President of Kissinger Petroleums Limited, published in the Financial Times, November 19, 1962 had this to say:

The incentives for operating and for continuing to operate in Saskatchewan include favorable prices for that province's crude, a healthy market and a good governmental atmosphere.

If that means anything to the Members opposite every time that they get up and make statements that oil companies and mineral development companies were reluctant to come, here are some of the proofs.

Mr. Speaker, I trust that I have demonstrated to the Members in the Government how unfounded, erroneous and misleading some of their remarks are with respect to the attitude of the New Democratic Government to companies who had undertaken our mineral development. Just for the benefit of the new Members of this Legislature — and we have a few of them — may I give several undisputed facts in respect to development of the mineral resources in Saskatchewan. The picture in Saskatchewan was something like this prior to the election of the Liberal Government.

Mineral production first commenced in what we know as Saskatchewan in 1886. By 1944 when the CCF took over, Saskatchewan had produced a cumulative total of \$170 million mineral wealth over a span of 60 years. In 1963 alone — and this was during the period of stagnation, Mr. Premier — mineral-wealth production surpassed \$280 million. That is long before your day as Premier. It took Saskatchewan 73 years from 1896 to 1958 to produce the first billion dollars of mineral wealth. In June of 1963 in less than five years, we reached the second billion dollars of mineral wealth. And the prediction at that time was — and that was 1964 — that the third billion dollars of mineral wealth will be reached within the next three years. And that is from 1964 to 1967. Mr. Speaker, in spite of all this factual evidence, Mr. Thatcher, while in the Opposition, sneered and kept repeating stagnation.

In 1963, Mr. Speaker, this was the best year for oil drilling since 1957, the companies had drilled over 1,000 new oil wells, 400 more than 1962. This is stagnation, Mr. Premier! The oil companies in 1963 spent over \$100 million in exploration and development of new oil resources. The world's largest potash mine at Esterhazy produced and sold over one million tons of potash. This industry, Mr. Speaker, in 1964 sank another \$10 million shaft to increase production, until you goofed it up.

Kalium Chemicals, a \$40 million potash mine at Belle Plaine opened in 1964. The Potash Company of America near Saskatoon — another \$40 million plant was in production in 1964. Alwinsal Potash Company of Germany announced it would be building a \$50 million potash plant at Lanigan commencing its work in 1964. That's before you, Sir, became Premier. Helium in 1963 saw the

March 11, 1970

first helium industry near Swift Current.

Direct Government revenues: from mineral resources, in the form of royalties, fees, mineral land sales, have risen from \$233,000 in 1944 (and this is when we booted out the Liberals) to an estimated \$28 million in 1963. This is stagnation. This, Mr. Speaker, is a partial story of the development of our minerals; potash and oil during the era the Premier refers to as a period of stunted growth and stagnation. You know even the Hon. Member, the Junior Member for City Park-University (Mr. Charlebois) seems to have convinced himself and only himself, because here is what he said and he is talking about mineral development.

Those people knew what was there,  
probably referring to mineral development companies.

He said in reference to mineral exploration.

And he added:

They simply refused to take any chance under the Socialists.

Well this is nonsense, Mr. Speaker.

**MR. G.G. LEITH: (Elrose)** — Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. I think that we should know what the Member is quoting.

**MR. MICHAYLUK:** — I am quoting from today's edition of The Leader Post, Monday, March 10, 1970 — "Liberal intent of policy" and it mentions J.J. Charlebois, Liberal Member from City Park-University. I will read it again for the benefit of them.

Those people knew what was there . . .

Here is a quotation, taken from the Hon. Member's script.

He said in reference to mineral exploration but added they simply refused to take any chance under the Socialists.

**MR. LEITH:** — Why don't you . . .

**MR. MICHAYLUK:** — Well, it will take time, George. I want to make a brief reference to the Government employees and their dealings with the Provincial Government over the period of years. Mr. Speaker, under a CCF Government in 1944, Saskatchewan became the first Provincial Government in Canada to give Provincial Government employees the right to organize and bargain collectively and to take part in political activities. The Trade Union Act of 1944 extended this basic democratic freedom to civil servants of the province. And in appreciation of this, the employees of the Government of Saskatchewan on December 21, 1961 presented the Hon. T.C. Douglas a plaque on which was inscribed the following words:

In recognition of your consistent support and effort exerted towards the achievement of improved working



conditions and collective bargaining between the Government of Saskatchewan and its employees during your term as Premier. Your humanitarian point of view and the understanding you have shown to their problems, your leadership and the examples you have set will be long remembered. Sincerest appreciations expressed by the employees of the Government of Saskatchewan, Regina, Saskatchewan, December 21, 1961.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. MICHAYLUK:** — Mr. Speaker, may I quote some remarks made by Mr. Leonard, Secretary of the Civil Service Association of Saskatchewan during the presentation. May I quote in part from *The Dome*, January and February edition 1962, page 6:

You Sir,

And this is in reference to the Hon. T.C. Douglas.

You, Sir, more than any other individual are responsible for the rights of government employees in Saskatchewan to bargain collectively — a right, I may say, that employees of no other constitutional government in Canada as yet enjoy. It was given to you in 1944 in a great flash of insight to perceive that government employees could be entrusted with the right to bargain collectively in the same manner as non-government employees.

Further on the same page, Mr. Speaker, may I quote in part again:

By giving collective bargaining rights to Saskatchewan's government employees, you lifted them up and out of the Slough of Despond wherein they had languished for several decades. You gave government employees and their organization the priceless gift of dignity.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. MICHAYLUK:** — The Slough of Despond, Mr. Speaker, wherein the Government employees languished for decades was that period when the blood brothers of the Members opposite held the reins of government and would not call an election for six years.

Mr. Speaker, Premier Thatcher, upon his election and on the day on which his Government was sworn into office in 1964 spoke to the delegates to the Annual Convention of the Saskatchewan Government employees and was reported in *The Dome* of June, 1964 under the title "You have nothing to fear. Your jobs are secure." In part, Mr. Speaker, here is what the Premier had to say:

I am very well aware that yours is the only Civil Service Association I think in Canada which has the right of collective bargaining. You have the check-off of union dues. Some people have been rather sceptical that the Liberal Government would continue those gains which you have made. May I again give you my fullest assurance in this regard. I sincerely hope that no Liberal Government would be either so foolish or so reactionary as to try to turn the clock back in such a manner.

March 11, 1970

The Hon. Member for Prince Albert West and now Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Steuart), during the by-election, in a full page ad said:

Civil Servants will be given freedom and security in their jobs and they will have the right to bargain collectively, and also political choice.

And he said:

The truth is a Liberal Government will take political pressure off all Government employees and treat them as free independent individuals.

It didn't take very long, Mr. Speaker, for the Hon. Member from Prince Albert West to change his opinion. Reported in the Star Phoenix, January 21, 1966 under title "Government and its employees" and, may I quote:

Last week D.G. Steuart, the Minister in charge of the Saskatchewan Power Corporation issued a warning that the corporation would not accept, allow, or condone political activity in the Provincial field by its employees. Such activity, the Minister said, would result in dismissal.

Mr. Speaker, I want to make reference to one more editorial in The Dome, the publication of the Saskatchewan Government employees, of June 1969, under title "A return to the dark ages." Mr. Claude Edwards, President of Public Service Alliance of Canada condemns the action of the Minister of Labour for his denying the Saskatchewan Government Employees Association a Board of Conciliation in a dispute over several open-ended items in the Public Service Agreement. And may I quote in part from this editorial:

The anger which this arbitrary decision triggered (and that of refusing the appointment of an arbitration board) was given strong expression to in a resolution adopted unanimously by the 110 delegates attending the 56 Annual Convention of SGEA on May 28th, 29th and 30th.

The Resolution referred to, Mr. Speaker, is as follows:

Resolution No. 43, 1969

Protesting denial of contract disputes procedures:

Whereas, the Government has refused to establish an Arbitration or Conciliation Board to deal with several "open-ended" matters in the Public Service Agreement; and,

Whereas, this is the first occasion since 1944 when collective bargaining rights were legislated for government employees that a board has been denied in any matter in dispute; and,

Whereas, this action violates the pledge given to the SGEA in 1964, when the government assumed office, that it would not turn the clock back to pre-1944 years; and,

Whereas, the question of how impasses in bargaining are to be resolved is central to any collective bargaining scheme that may be devised; and,

Whereas, there can be no realistic collective bargaining where management unilaterally makes the final decision even though that decision is made after consultation or negotiation; and,

Whereas, the denial of access to a conciliation or arbitration board is a denial of due process and reverts public employees to the status of second-class citizens that was their unfortunate lot up to 1944;

Therefore be it resolved: that this Convention go on record as deploring the policy of the Government of denying the availability of the ordinary peaceful measures of conciliation or arbitration under The Trade Union Act for the settlement of disputes with its own employees, thereby turning the clock back to pre-1944 years and relegating them once more to the status of second-class citizens; and,

Be it further resolved, that the Government be urged to reconsider its reactionary policy and restore democracy to its relationship with its own employees by introducing disputes procedures policies, which are fair and impartial and favor neither party.

The final paragraph of the editorial has but one request of the Government and may I for the benefit of the Members present, quote:

We close this editorial with a frank appeal to the Government to allow the board. It does the Government no good to set the clock back twenty-five years. It depresses the morale of its entire work force. It adds nothing to the cause of good government. Indeed, from any angle you approach it, it is a negative, backward step, totally inconsistent with the times in which we live, and a society in which even government employees and their organization have a right to feelings of dignity in their relations with elected governments.

Let's remember, it is 1969 now.

This demonstrates amply the feelings of the people who have had the misfortune to serve under the new Caesar of Wascana.

Mr. Speaker, before I conclude may I turn my remarks to the constituency and the people which I have the honor to represent. In the constituency of Redberry, Mr. Speaker, the people rely totally upon the basic agricultural industry. The economic plight of about 50 per cent of my constituents is compounded by unharvested crops that are wintering in the fields in swaths or in the stand. There are many farmers in the north half, in the north central, and in the northeast portion of the Redberry constituency that are waiting for an early dry spring to take off some of the unharvested crop. Their economic plight is reaching a point of disaster. Many of them have taken out cash advances on their crops and have used up the money to pay the taxes, power, and to buy the much needed clothing. Some have applied for assistance through Welfare and in most instances have been rudely turned away. Mr. Speaker, if help of an immediate nature is not provided there will be further exodus of rural people into our urban centres with dangers of higher unemployment. In some instances those that are applying for assistance are being asked to sell some of their milk cows or some

of the cattle on which they want to rely later.

Mr. Speaker, I want to appeal to the Minister of Welfare (Mr. MacDonald) that an ounce of prevention at this time will be a pound of cure in several months. In several months some of these farmers will start milking and shipping cream and probably sell a few sucking calves, some of them will harvest some of their unharvested crops, and the financial burden will be eased considerably on all concerned. It is understandable, Mr. Speaker, that the Welfare officials under this Government must wield the heavy hand of authority as directed by the Minister. However, Sir, may I suggest to you that if basic and urgent need is longer deferred, the crucial point of no return will be reached in most instances.

I want to thank the Hon. Member from Kinistino (Mr. Thibault) for his statistics the other day respecting the decline of rural population. This enticed me over the weekend to check into the area which I represent and the figures were quite revealing. I was astounded, Mr. Speaker, by the great loss of rural people, much larger than I had anticipated. Might I, Sir, just give a few figures to this House.

Let me begin with the Rural Municipality of Blaine Lake #434. In 1964 the total, population of this municipality was 1,394. In 1969 it dropped to 869, a loss of some 525 people. Mr. Premier, you'll have to expand the Redberry constituency. That is 105 people lost for every year for the last five years since the Liberals came into office. I checked the population of the town of Blaine Lake with the idea that they may have moved to live and farm out. However, the figure shows that in 1964 the town of Blaine Lake had a population of 658 in 1964 and in 1969 there were still people less — 654 to be exact — four down. Five hundred people from my municipality have packed up and gone out. What did go up in the rural municipality and most of the school units in my area was the school tax, as high as 15 and 16 mills.

Mr. Speaker, the total drop in population in the municipalities lying wholly or in part within Redberry was 2,063. In calculating the population for the towns and villages there is an overall drop of 16. Some may have died, that is true, but there were some more born during the same time. And yet there is a decrease of almost 2,100 people.

Earlier in this Session, Mr. Speaker, I had requested and proposed to the Minister of Natural Resources (Mr. Barrie) to issue warnings to hunters in hunting guides in respect to infection in wild game, particularly moose. May I at this time suggest to the minister that, if game taken is found on checking to be infected, the hunter be permitted to use the same licence to take another animal.

The Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Steuart), in his Budget Address announced that due to improved management of the Power Corporation an \$8.1 million dividend will be paid to the general revenues. He inserted his contention that this may be construed as a tax on power-users by the Opposition. Well, Mr. Speaker, what in the name of honesty could it be called, astute as the Hon. Member for Prince Albert West is? I have seen him in action inside and outside of this House. He could probably in his usual, fashion try to convince his television audience and his constituents via the television media and his bi-weekly

program "Face to face with Davey Steuart." When a corporation's net income increases to a total of \$16.2 million the only conclusion a user of the utility could arrive at is that the Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Steuart), you and the Saskatchewan Power Corporation are socking it to him in higher rates than is necessary.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. MICHAYLUK:** — The Saskatchewan Power Corporation management was accused of mismanagement after the 1964 election. The Premier, Mr. Speaker, repeated his claims of inefficiency, high administrative costs, too much investment, too little profit. It was presumably for these reasons that the general manager's position became untenable and he left the corporation.

Mr. Speaker, what did the Liberal party promise in their 1964 pre-election pamphlet with respect to hydro-power and natural gas? May I quote:

A new Liberal Government will reduce hydro-power and natural gas rates to the level comparable of other provinces.

Well, Sir, I am not aware what the comparable rates in the neighboring provinces are. And I don't intend to find out. However, I am aware of one fact and one fact only as far as the Saskatchewan Power Corporation is concerned, and that is that a rate reduction to its users is justified and justified now.

Mr. Speaker, Sessional Paper No. 150, 1967 Session, Return No. 27 by Mr. J.E. Brockelbank, the Member for Saskatoon Mayfair, Tuesday March 21, 1967 asked this question (and may I repeat the question):

With respect to the Saskatchewan Power Corporation and its predecessor, the Saskatchewan Power Commission, since June 1944:

(a) the number of general increases in electrical power rates; and the date on which each took place; and (b) the number of general decreases in electric rates and the date on which each took place.

Answer to (a) in respect to increases — nil. There was no increase. Answer to question (b) (and note this, Mr. Speaker) on May 1, 1945 there was a general reduction; June 1, 1946, general reduction; July 1, 1947, general reduction; June 1, 1948, reduction general; January 1, 1956, residential and farm run-off rate decreased. At that time the majority of accounts were in these two classifications. And on April 1; 1964 (and they'll say election) general rate reduction excluding street lights and oil-well pumping. Mr. Speaker, with a net increase of some \$16 million of dollars, the users of both power and gas are entitled to further reductions. On the other hand, Mr. Speaker, if the rate reductions are not forthcoming from this tight Liberal Government, as it appears they will not, would it not be possible to lower the charges for the second installations on some of the farms, a farmer who moves from one place to another? Only recently, Mr. Speaker, it was brought to my attention by a farmer who paid an initial cost of \$520 on an instalment plan to get power that last year he moved to another quarter because of a grid road and was again charged \$520 a

March 11, 1970

second time; he moved one-half a mile. Surely, Mr. Speaker, with such a huge net profit some concessions should be given in cases which I have just made reference to.

There are many other things that I would like to have discussed, Mr. Speaker, but due to the time element I'll have to take some of the other matters that are pertinent on Estimates.

By now, Sir, it must be evident to you and to the Members in this Legislature that I will not support the motion but will support the amendment.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. N.E. BYERS: (Kelvington)** — Mr. Speaker, I welcome the opportunity today to add my comments and observations and perhaps some criticism to some of the items in this Budget. I realize that this debate is merely a forerunner to the more detailed and exacting scrutiny of the Estimates which this Legislature will undertake shortly. I am certainly looking forward to an item-by-item analysis of those Estimates, at which time I will discuss some additional questions in agriculture, highways, welfare and telephones that I may not comment about today.

Mr. Speaker, permit me as a relatively new Member to this House to comment on some of the observations and the impressions that I have formed respecting this Budget Debate. I want to assure you that I have been one who has always had a rather deep admiration for the British Parliamentary System as we know it. My belief in that system has certainly been strengthened and not weakened in the few weeks that I have been here.

The performance of the Members in this House, I'm sure; is undoubtedly reflected in the public's attitude toward their elected Members and to the whole parliamentary process. I think it is fair to say — and this has certainly been my opinion from the debates I have listened to in this House over the years — that this Legislature is renowned, perhaps throughout Canada, as the forum where some of the best political debating occurs.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. BYERS:** — I'm certainly not willing to grant all Members full marks for their analyzing ability or for their debating skill. I don't expect that for myself. I might say that when I started in politics I wrote out my first speech and I had my wife criticize it. When I got home I said, "How was that? She said, "Well, you read it," and, "Secondly, you read it poorly," and "Thirdly, it wasn't worth reading." Well, I don't know whether that will be the opinion of my comments this afternoon or not, but I want to say, Mr. Speaker, that I have been pleased at the general temperament of most of the Members; in most cases it has been relatively good. The atmosphere in this Chamber has been relatively good — I have enjoyed it. I can certainly get used to this job, and I hope I have the privilege of staying here for a good many years.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. BYERS:** — I couldn't profess, Mr. Speaker, to be quite as

eloquent and philosophical or convincing and colorful as many of the Members who have taken part earlier in this debate. I do this afternoon want to bring to the attention of some of the Ministers two or three problems that have arisen in our constituency, which affect a number of people in our constituency. These are questions, I am sure, which have application to many people in rural Saskatchewan. First on agriculture — I do not profess this afternoon to be discussing even what I consider the more salient problems in agriculture at this moment, but I would certainly like to say at the outset, Mr. Speaker, that the farmers in my constituency will certainly welcome the removal of the 2-cent tax on farm fuel.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. BYERS:** — I believe it is the farmers in my constituency who really deserve a good deal of credit for it was they who registered their strong objection to this tax last June. Most Saskatchewan farmers who I have talked to — and I have talked to a good many of them as a teacher in a rural area, a hail adjuster and more recently as a Member of the Legislature — wonder why a government which pays lip service to incentives would levy a tax on the production costs of the Saskatchewan farmer in the first place.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. BYERS:** — On other occasions I have referred to this tax as the “invisible plank in the Liberals’ 1967 election program.” Which Liberal Members in this Legislature sought re-election in 1967 on a promise to impose this tax? To the best of my knowledge no farm organizations have ever supported this measure. Certainly the NDP opposed strongly the imposition of this tax. We welcome its repeal; we shall not mourn its passing.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the Government Members in this debate have delighted in chiding the Opposition to bring forth some positive suggestions. I think our record for positive suggestions has been pretty good. Perhaps we shouldn’t be overly critical of the Government for this offer to us. In asking for suggestions I think they are admitting that the pump of free enterprises has had an unusually higher rate of depreciation.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. BYERS:** — The man who once had a firm hand on the handle has grown weary. The leathers of the pump have dried out and withered and at last he beckons the Provincial Treasurer to scamper to the public purse for some public pump primer to patch up their old machine before their lease expires. I want to raise a suggestion, particularly for the Provincial Treasurer — I regret that he is not here — and that is on the question of the refund of the sales tax on grain storage facilities completed by December 31, 1969. Members will recall, I believe, that the Government announcement to refund the sales tax on grain storage was made in late July or early August. I am glad to say a number of farmers in my constituency took advantage of this small bit of help. However, there are a number who were still short of cash from last year due to low quotas, people who had heavy expenses for drying grain the previous year, some who are still awaiting anxiously and even in hope for a cash injection from the Federal Government

into the farm economy, simply lacked the funds to make granary purchases last fall. I have some correspondence on this. But the point I want to make is — and I think that this echoes their sentiments quite adequately — that they consider it rather discriminatory that this tax refund is not obtainable after the 31st of December, 1969.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. BYERS:** — I would certainly appeal to the Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Steuart) to give consideration to making this refund available on a permanent basis.

I would like to draw one other point to the attention of the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. McFarlane) this afternoon. Mr. Speaker, I think at this point it may be difficult to determine how well the farmers of Saskatchewan will respond to the Federal Government's wheat acreage reduction proposal and to what extent the farmers will convert their present wheat land into forage crops. I'm certainly in no position to make that kind of a prediction. I understand though that the possibility exists that there may be an extreme shortage of forage seed for farmers who want to undertake the conversion system recommended by the Federal Government. I hope that the Minister of Agriculture will bend every effort to make certain that adequate forage seed supplies are available for those farmers wishing to take part in this program.

I want to raise another point. If the Provincial Government believes that the Federal Government's most recent proposal has merit, I want to invite the Minister of Agriculture, to review the policies under which the Department of Agriculture presently grants assistance to farmers converting marginal land into perennial forage. It has come to my attention from farmers in my constituency that they believe the present regulations to qualify for assistance are too harsh. I have an example of a letter from Mr. J.E. Johnson, the soil specialist in the Department of Agriculture, in which a farmer in my constituency was refused assistance for converting marginal land to perennial forage because the final rating was 54 on his land whereas the final rating to qualify is 46. To the Minister of Agriculture, I suggest that, if you want to promote greater farm diversification in these troubled economic times which our farmers are facing, here is one small area that you might revise your policy of assistance for converting marginal land to perennial forage.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. BYERS:** — I am glad the Minister of Natural Resources (Mr. Barrie) who has spent some years in this Legislature is here today. He seems to have a lot more stamina than some of the younger Members on the Government side.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. BYERS:** — I want to discuss briefly at this time in rather general — and I confess rather inadequate terms — some policies respecting Natural Resources that pertain to the logging and lumbering operations in my constituency. I raise this matter because the timber policies of the Government have had an adverse effect upon several people in my riding. Many farmers in my riding



have had a diversified operation for years. They have been in grain growing and raising herds of cattle. But in one corner of the constituency a number of farmers there have over the years supplemented their farm income through logging and lumbering operations, which in many cases was the very part of their operation that enabled them to remain solvent. Under the CCF Government these farmers were able to obtain permits to cut up to 30,000 board feet of spruce over a six-year period for their own use. This policy was in effect from 1950 — I don't know the exact dates at which it was cancelled. It was sometime after this Government came to power. The Simpson Timber Company was granted and still holds a 25-year lease in the forest area where many farmers formerly carried on lumbering operations. There is a good deal of timber in that forest area which Simpson Timber will never harvest because it is uneconomical for them to do so. Yet the farmers are unable to obtain a permit to harvest spruce either for their own use or for commercial marketing. This policy has forced dozens of farmers who for years operated their own private enterprises to abandon their farms and move to British Columbia, or Alberta or else join the labor market. I am told that in one area on the fringe of the forest, 12 farmers have been forced to move out of the district because of these very stringent policies.

Mr. Speaker, the policies of this Government have resulted in the destruction of a large segment of the private enterprise section of our rural economy.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. BYERS:** — I certainly call upon this Government to re-examine its position with a view to restoring to these farmers their traditional way of life.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the question of taxation levels in Saskatchewan has been adequately discussed in this Debate by Members on this side of the House. During the course of this Debate we have heard numerous Government speakers rise and compare various department expenditures now with those of the previous CCF Government. I suppose that is a permissible part of the political process as they like to play it. But the Members opposite seem to have rather poor memories. They forget now that they were elected initially on a firm commitment to reduce taxes — not just some taxes, but all taxes — Provincial taxes, municipal and school taxes. May I remind this Government that the Estimates now before us are for nearly twice the amount of the 1954 Estimates. In 1964, the Estimates, I believe, were in the neighborhood of \$214 million whereas in 1970 we are considering Estimates of \$405 million. And that means that this Government will in the coming year spend almost \$2 for every \$1 that was spent in the year of the last CCF Government.

Well, their promise for good works has certainly not spilled over into rural Saskatchewan. In spite of the increased grants for school costs — and I submit there were some increases — the facts are, Mr. Speaker, that these grants have not been sufficient to meet the normal and natural increases in school operating costs. Consequently, there has been a steady climb in the mill rate charges in the school units in Kelvington constituency ever since the Liberals came to power. The mill rates in these school units which are partly or wholly in Kelvington, if you take the Canora school unit, a mill rate in 1960, 29;

March 11, 1970

Foam Lake 31; Wadena, 35; in 1963 Canora was still 29; Foam Lake had gone up to 34; and Wadena was still at 35. Over that period there was an average increase of one mill in the property tax level for taxation.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. BYERS:** — But under the Liberals — we take the same units — in 1964 to 1969, Canora, 29; Shamrock 34 mills; Wadena, 35 had increased from 43 to 46 to 41 respectively or an average increase of 11.3 mills from 1964 to 1969.

The Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Estey), referred earlier to the increase in equalization grants paid by this Government to some RMs in Kelvington constituency. Now I appreciate a Minister doing this type of research work for a new Member. I wish that he had gone on and given the entire picture respecting total municipal grants. I just happened to pick up some old Public Accounts and I just came across these rather by accident. Sasman RM which is totally within my riding for the five-year period 1959 to 1964 — take in the grid road and maintenance grant, regravelling grants, snow removal, equalization grants — in that five-year period grants to Sasman totalled \$184,360. But did these grants increase in total in the five-year period from 1964 to 1969? From 1964 to 1969 you take the same grants, grid road and maintenance, \$80,000; regravelling, \$12,000; snow removal, \$3,600; equalization, \$25,000 for a total of \$122,514 — down from \$184,000 to \$122,000. These were compiled from the Public Accounts.

Mr. Speaker, I haven't really had time to get down and check out all the other RMs but I am going to get at that after this Debate.

I think that the people of Saskatchewan will remember this Government's promise to reduce taxes. We certainly haven't had that benefit out in our area. The people of Kelvington didn't forget — they remembered last June.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. BYERS:** — You know there is a saying in our constituency that "as Kelvington goes, so goes Saskatchewan" and . . .

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. BYERS:** — . . . I think the Saskatchewan people will remember that when they get a chance to speak.

Mr. Speaker, my time is running out. I want to turn and deal today with a couple of subjects respecting education. First of all, I want to deal with the question of student assistance and loans that are available to students under the present Government. Permit me to bring before this House some facts concerning the Student Aid Fund as it is known. I think Members will recall that it was in 1949 that the CCF Government recognized the need to provide some incentives to our young people and established the Student Aid Fund with a capital investment of \$1 million at that time.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. BYERS:** — Over the years, loans granted by this fund enabled thousands of Saskatchewan young people to attend university. It enabled teachers to upgrade their qualifications. It enabled young people to graduate from our University in several professions. By 1964 the capital investment of the Student Aid Fund had increased to \$5 million. This was one of the first piggy banks to be robbed by this Government to balance the 1965 Budget — one of the piggy banks to which the financial critic (Mr. Blakeney) referred the other day. One of the first acts of this Government was to reduce the capital investment from \$5 million to \$3 million in 1965. This Government has never seen fit to restore the \$2 million filched from the Student Aid Fund in 1965. Now admittedly, it was in 1964, I believe, that the Federal Government introduced the Canada Students Loan Plan. Since that time the functions of the Provincial Student Aid Fund have been reduced to a minor role so that today, as I can gather from the reports of this agency, they now serve two rather minor functions with \$3 million. Loans from the Student Aid Fund are now restricted to students enrolled only in post-secondary education programs attending the School of Agriculture, University of Saskatchewan, Saskatoon Campus. Now we certainly have and I certainly have no objections to students entering either a career or the business of agriculture receiving these loans. But from this \$3 million loan fund only 39 loans for a total of \$19,980 were granted to students attending the School of Agriculture in 1968-69.

Some years ago, Members will recall, a CCF Government introduced a scholarship program. Under this program the students graduating from Grade XII with a specified average were awarded a \$500 scholarship in the rural areas, and \$300 for city residents. Each year this Legislature appropriated funds for this scholarship program. At one time these scholarships were available on the basis of about one to every ten grade 12 students. Under this Government the ratio has altered so that it is now substantially less. But instead of this Legislature voting funds annually for this scholarship program, the interest on the invested capital of \$3 million in the Student Aid Fund is now used to meet the cost of the first year University Scholarship program.

Now there is one other item which reveals this Government's lack of concern for our youth. I refer to Public Accounts, page 395 for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1969. What do we find there? Under the main grants to Saskatchewan Student Aid Fund scholarships: the main estimate, \$182,000. Well, that's not bad. When you look across in the other column, expenditure, nil. I think that shows up their attitude towards this.

Mr. Speaker, I think that in view of the economic conditions, which we know are severe, that the time has now come for this Government, and I particularly invite the Minister of Education (Mr. McIsaac) to re-examine his administration policies for the Saskatchewan Student Loan Fund. That re-examination is going to be particularly essential for the coming year; otherwise, hundreds of our students may be forced to discontinue their university studies due to the lack of funds. A survey at the Saskatoon campus in 1969 revealed between 18 and 23 per cent of the student body who actively sought summer jobs a year ago were unable to secure them. Another 11 per cent found only part-time employment. All the present economic signs do not indicate an improvement for summer employment this summer for

students. This Legislature will certainly hold you accountable.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. BYERS:** — And the people of Saskatchewan will hold you responsible if you fail to improve substantially the operation of a fund capable of alleviating some financial distress to our young people.

Mr. Speaker, I wanted to spend some time today on the question of the teacher-pupil ratio. I don't want to be guilty of keeping this House past its hour of normal adjournment but if I may just make a few general comments.

Mr. Speaker, the announcement by the Minister of Education (Mr. McIsaac) last June that the Government intends to impose a 25 to 1 teacher-pupil ratio has had a demoralizing effect upon the education system in this province.

**MR. J. CHARLEBOIS:** (Saskatoon City Park-University) — . . . for how long?

**MR. BYERS:** — I think that this reveals the attitude of this Government toward education in this province. I know perhaps the Hon. Members aren't too anxious to hear this.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. BYERS:** — Their decision to impose a teacher-pupil ratio from the ivory Avord Towers in downtown Regina to me suggests to the school boards in this province that there has been an unnecessary waste in spending by local governments. Everyone I think believes that economy should be practised even within our school system.

**HON. D.G. STEUART:** (Provincial Treasurer) — Too many teachers!

**MR. BYERS:** — Mr. Speaker, I have been associated with and part of the school system in this province for a good many years. It is true there may have been occasions when some bad and wrong judgments were made with respect to school expenditures. But to suggest that the school boards of Saskatchewan are irresponsible with their finances, that they go on periodic and frequent spending binges is absolutely and totally false.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. BYERS:** — And that is what disturbs most people concerning the rigid and unilateral application of the proposed ratio by this Government. One would have thought that before this Government introduced the proposed ratio formula that it would have produced some concrete evidence of financial waste within our school systems.

**MR. STEUART:** — . . . if you add it up!

**MR. BYERS:** — If it has found specific

examples of waste it has refused to make it public. It is therefore proper to conclude, Mr. Speaker, that this is further evidence of this Government's desire to put dollars before people.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. BYERS:** — Mr. Speaker, if I may just quickly comment on two or three of the effects that this is going to have on our school system. One item that I think concerns a good many people in the school system and the proposed ratio formula is that the people such as principals and vice-principals and librarians will not be counted in the proposed ratio.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. BYERS:** — For several years the Department of Education has respected the judgment of the local school boards to hire what teachers they chose and the Government paid grants accordingly. And the failure of this Government to include this supportive staff for grant purposes now means that the enrolments in many classes will have to be increased maybe to 35 or 40 or 50 so that a school system can retain . . .

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. BYERS:** — . . . adequate supportive staff in the way of principals and vice-principals and guidance counsellors and librarians; and you can't escape that fact.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. BYERS:** — This is going to result in a further cutback in a good many school programs. I think the boards are back home now wondering whether they are going to have a guidance program or physical education, remedial reading, library. And these are basically the services, Mr. Speaker, that prevent many students in our schools from becoming dropouts into society and from our school system. I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that apart from all that — that most important of all — is the effect that this program is going to have on the students in the schools who have had the advantage of special classes, those students who for some reason or another may have difficulty in learning. I suggest that we have just now reached the point in our education system where many rural Saskatchewan school systems particularly have for the first time set up programs to give more individualized instruction for people in this particular category.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. BYERS:** — And these are going to be under this program the first programs to go; and they should be the last to go. These are programs that should be retained within the school system, otherwise many of our students are going to fall by the wayside. And all this is done in the name of money. We got the impression that all we have to do is put one or two more students into each classroom and we save \$2 million, It depends who is telling the story. It depends where this story is being told.

Sometimes it's a \$3 million saving, sometimes it's a \$6 million saving.

If you look at a number of schools you will find the case is this, that this isn't a case of putting 25 or 27 students into a classroom. Many of our larger centralized high schools are so organized that you have to make the decision where you put 35 or 50 students into a room, in some of the classes, if you are going to comply with his proposed formula.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I wouldn't be surprised as a result of this change of policy that we may some day have an announcement — I don't know who over there will get up and make it. But I wouldn't be surprised if we had an announcement that a new industry has come to Saskatchewan — an industry to make new double-decker desks to put into the classrooms of Saskatchewan to accommodate the increased teacher-pupil ratio.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I don't want to take any more of the Members' time. There is more I would like to say about this. But I want to make it very clear that I will not be supporting the motion but I will vote for the amendment.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. W.S. HOWES: (Kerrobert-Kindersley)** — Mr. Speaker, I don't know that there is any time left for a Member but . . .

**AN HON. MEMBER:** — Where are the Whips over there?

**HON. A.C. CAMERON: (Minister of Mineral Resources)** — Whips couldn't control them!

**MR. HOWES:** — All right, I'll go ahead. Thank you, gentlemen.

Mr. Speaker, in rising to say a few words in this debate I would like first of all to express to the Hon. Stephen Worobetz my congratulations on his appointment as Lieutenant Governor of this Province.

I would also on behalf of the people of my constituency extend to the Hon. R.L. Hanbidge — or Dinny as we in my constituency know him — my thanks and the thanks of all of us in my seat for a job well done. The Hon. R.L. Hanbidge represented my constituency as a Member of this Assembly many years ago. He also served my constituency as the Member of Parliament and he followed this of course by his service to this Province as Lieutenant Governor. I think it can be said that, without fear of contradiction, he has served the people of my area and the people of this Province well and we wish him the very best in his retirement.

**HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. HOWES:** — I would also like to express, Mr. Speaker, my congratulations to the Member for Kelvington (Mr. Byers) on his election:

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. HOWES:** — And I know that we all realize from his efforts so far in this Assembly that he will do a good job, although of course I would hope that after the next election that Mr. Bjarnason will be back. With a Budget such as that we are considering I would think there is little question about that.

Now I could say a little bit about the Mayor of the city of Saskatoon having his abilities analyzed in a computer. I wonder if the Mayor of Regina is going to do that. Perhaps it might help him in his leadership campaign.

I do want to say a few words about wheat. I think, however, I will leave that to sometime later and comment on matters in the Budget Speech which have direct reference to my constituency.

It has been announced by the Premier and by the Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Steuart) that a bridge is to be built over the South Saskatchewan River near Leader. Of course anyone who looks at a map will see that this connects into my constituency. The bridge is a dream that has existed in the minds of people in my constituency for perhaps 40 years. It has been promised at various times in the past but has never come to the stage that it is at now. I understand that the first contract with regard to this bridge was let last Friday and I feel that my constituency will benefit very greatly from this construction in the years that lie ahead.

Although the Minister of Highways (Mr. Boldt) has not announced his Highways Program as yet this year, I noticed the other day that tenders had been called for the construction of No. 30 Highway from Kindersley to Glidden, a distance of 16 miles. This highway was constructed many years ago and is badly in need of reconstruction. I know the people of my constituency will appreciate the work that is to be done on it as indicated in the tender call.

Mr. Speaker, the Budget also provides for largely increased grants to school units. I believe and understand from talking with school unit officials in my constituency that these will eliminate the need for increased rates in taxation and will be of help to those paying local taxes.

I have also noted in my constituency an effort by local government, and by that I am referring especially to rural municipalities, to decrease the tax load on their ratepayers during this year when serious economic problems are faced by farmers in my constituency. The increased sums for grid road assistance will help municipalities overcome the loss of revenue which may occur either from a reduced tax or from uncollected taxes, and the increased sums will permit the municipalities to carry on the programs of improvement of the services that they provide.

Mr. Speaker, I would also like to congratulate the Government and thank it for the efforts made by the Department of Municipal Affairs especially in the amalgamation that took place as of January 1st, 1969 in my constituency. The municipalities amalgamated were the RM of Mantario No. 262 and the RM of Royal Canadian No. 261 which became the RM of Chesterfield No. 261. I have the honor to be secretary of this municipality. We have found in our first year of operation that substantial benefits

have accrued to the municipality particularly in a financial way and that the amalgamation has been responsible in the first year of operation for a reduction in the tax rate of 3 mills.

As a matter of interest I might say that the name of the municipality came from Fort Chesterfield which was established near the forks of the Red Deer and the South Saskatchewan Rivers in the year 1799. We feel that the name of the new municipality gives recognition to some of the early explorers of the West.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. HOWES:** — I would like, Mr. Speaker, to turn my attention to the question of the movement of grain within this province and the movement without, and what has been referred to by many as orderly marketing. I think first of all, Mr. Speaker, the question of orderly marketing is something that deserves clarification. To my mind orderly marketing means the sale of grain within the provisions of the law as it exists at the time of sale. At the present moment under the law an individual is permitted to sell grain to an elevator under his quota as it exists at the time of sale. He is entitled, Sir, to over-deliver as over-deliveries are allowed. He is entitled to sell over and above his quota to feed mills. He is entitled to sell to other farmers for seed and feed. I think this in the main covers the major areas where sales can legally be made although there are some others.

The farmer is not permitted under the law, as I understand it, to sell grain to another farmer for sale on that other farmer's permit book. To me, as I have said previously, if a man fulfils the provisions of the law as they exist, then he is marketing his grain in an orderly manner and should not be subject to any penalty; but if he is not selling within the terms of the law then he certainly should be subject to the penalties of that law.

Mr. Speaker, in debates in this House reference has been made to the transportation of grain down No. 7 Highway and the number of trucks crossing the border at Alsask. I would like to point out to this Assembly that trucks with grain cross the Alberta border from Saskatchewan at many places other than at Alsask. I could name perhaps 20 in my own seat. In fact they cross the border all up and down the border and the inter-provincial movement of grain as between Saskatchewan and Alberta is a very difficult thing to control. Of course there is a question as to whether or not the movement of grain across provincial borders should not be allowed within the Wheat Board region. I believe that it should be allowed within the Wheat Board region but not outside the Wheat Board region.

I think, Mr. Speaker, it would be well to consider what laws regulate the inter-provincial transportation of grain. Is the reasoning behind the laws still valid or have other reasons for these laws appeared? If the laws are no longer valid, why are they retained? I think that the first question as to the laws governing the inter-provincial transportation of grain and the reasoning are found in the fact that the Canadian Wheat Board was empowered in 1939 to control the inter-provincial movement of grain under The War Measures Act, because we were then in a state of war and it was necessary for this action to be taken in the situation as it existed at that time.



The powers were written into The Canadian Wheat Board Act effective August 1st, 1946 when Canada entered into an arrangement with the United Kingdom commonly called The British Wheat Agreement and it was necessary for the Government of Canada to have control over the movement of grain in order to satisfy external commitments. It is beyond question that a government must have internal powers sufficient to honor its external commitments. This, I think, is absolutely essential in a federal system of government and this is one of the major reasons behind writing this into The Canadian Wheat Board Act in 1946. Also The National Emergency Transitional Powers Act in 1945 continued under this new Act and it was under the powers of that Act that P.C. 1292 in 1947 was passed which gave the Wheat Board control over all oats and barley in commercial positions. The latter action was taken, I understand, to protect Eastern feeders against extremely high prices and the price differential was made up to the Western farmer by assisting in equalization payments.

Now I would say, Mr. Speaker, that every date that I have used is in the 1940s and 1930s. I do not believe that the reasons that existed in the 30s and 40s for inter-provincial control of grain exist in the 70s. The capacity of the Canadian grain growers to meet all trade agreements that the Federal Government can make is beyond question. We have a billion bushels of wheat available for any future trade agreements. The growth of the feeder cattle industry in Western Canada has, to some extent, superseded the feeder cattle industry in the East.

Mr. Speaker, the retention on The Statute Books of laws that do not fit into the 70s brings the Canadian Wheat Board into disrepute. They bring disrespect for the police force and for the law and they are the cause of dissension between the stockman and the farmer and between farmers and other farmers.

I think, Mr. Speaker, that these laws regarding the inter-provincial movement of grain require very serious study.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. HOWES:** — For example, Mr. Speaker, I represent a constituency along the Alberta-Saskatchewan border in an area that feed grain has moved out of for many years into the south-western part of Saskatchewan and the south-eastern part of Alberta. This grain moves into these areas because they are grain deficient areas and cattle surplus areas. The Medicine Hat area produces a large number of cattle and has many commercial and custom feed lots that require large amounts of grain. There are people in my constituency feeding cattle in Southern Alberta that purchase their cattle on the Saskatchewan market. They feed them in Southern Alberta and they haul their own grain raised on their own land to feed them. Yet these people are hauled into court for hauling their own grain to feed their own cattle which they purchased in Saskatchewan. Mr. Speaker, to me this is the height of foolishness and is really almost persecution of people.

Also, Sir, in my seat and in those of the Minister of Education (Mr. McIsaac), and the Minister of Mineral Resources (Mr. Cameron), many portions of the area have grain processed in Alberta feed mills for use on their own farms. This is done because the distance factor makes it sensible. However, it is not legal and a permit must be obtained from Winnipeg to make it legal. Knowing what red tape is, I think all will agree that this complicates farming operations terribly. The present

March 11, 1970

practice has gone on for 30 to 40 years. The practice is logical and sensible and the only thing wrong with it is the enforcement of a law that needs revision.

Also, Mr. Speaker, much grain is hauled from my area to Southwestern Saskatchewan. As I mentioned awhile ago, this is absolutely legal. The trucks that haul this grain are not able to operate across the South Saskatchewan River for many months of the year — although when we get the bridge they will be able to — and they must detour through Alberta across this river. According to information I have from the Canadian Wheat Board each time they wish to cross they must secure a permit from Winnipeg. Again, knowing what Government red tape can be, this can be quite a delaying action to a man who is trying to operate a business and make a living.

In fact, Mr. Speaker, if you read The Canadian Wheat Board Act — and I read the prohibitions this afternoon — I believe you will agree that, if a man has a quarter section on each side of the Alberta-Saskatchewan border, he must farm the land in separate fields because it is illegal to run a disk full of grain or a combine full of grain across the border. How foolish can we get, I ask you, Sir?

Mr. Speaker, I think that the question of the movement of grain, the operation of the Wheat Board, is something that the Government of Canada should give consideration to and amendments to The Canadian Wheat Board Act should be passed that will eliminate some of the problems I have mentioned.

I do not believe that the sale of grain on another person's permit book should be sanctioned. I believe enforcement of this type of thing should be stepped up although I realize full well the difficulty of such enforcement. I believe, however, Mr. Speaker, that the operation of The Canadian Wheat Board Act and the operation of the Board deserve serious study.

I do not for one moment believe we should do away with the Wheat Board. I do not think very many farmers in Western Canada want to see the wheat Board done away with, but no organization is such that it cannot be improved upon and like all organizations the Wheat Board and the Act governing it can be improved so that the Wheat Board can serve the farmers from Western Canada better and promote a better life for them.

Mr. Speaker, the time has gone on. I will support the main motion but not the amendment.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

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