

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN
Third Session — Sixteenth Legislature
19th Day

Thursday, March 12, 1970.

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

WELCOME TO STUDENTS

MR. SPEAKER: — I wish to introduce to all the Members of the Legislature the following groups of students situated in the galleries: 36 students from Richmond Heights school from the constituency of Saskatoon City Park-University represented by Mr. Charlebois, and under the direction of their teacher, Mr. Hill; 41 students from Star City school in the constituency of Melfort-Tisdale represented by Mr. Willis, under the direction of their vice-principal Mr. Barry; 65 students from the Canora composite high school in the constituency of Canora represented by Mr. Matsalla, under the direction of their teacher, Mr. Kobrynski; 34 students from King Edward school from the constituency of Saskatoon City Park-University represented by Mr. Charlebois, under the direction of their teachers, Mr. H. Reddekopp and Mr. T. Huslak; 34 students from Sutherland school again from the constituency of City Park-University, under the direction of their teachers, Mr. Davis and Mr. Smithson; 30 students from the Balgonie school district from the constituency of Lumsden represented by the Hon. Attorney General (Mr. Heald), under the direction of their teacher, Mr. R.A. Greenall, vice-principal; 31 students from Richmond Heights again from the constituency of Saskatoon City Park-University represented by Mr. Charlebois under the direction of their teacher, Mr. Roy Berg.

I am sure that all Members of the Legislature would wish to extend an extremely warm welcome to all of these students and express the hope they will enjoy themselves, that they will find their stay here educational and interesting and that they will all have a safe trip home.

HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

ANNOUNCEMENT

LIEUTENANT GOVERNOR'S DINNER

MR. SPEAKER: — I would draw the attention of all Hon. Members to the notice which appears on their desks concerning the change of date for the reception and dinner by His Honour the Lieutenant Governor. This date had to be changed due to circumstances over which His Honour had no control and I have been asked to express apologies therefor. He expressed the sincere wish this hasn't inconvenienced anybody.

WELCOME TO VISITORS

HON. W.R. THATCHER: (Premier) — Mr. Speaker, I wonder before Orders of the Day, if I might introduce to you and the Hon. Members two guests we have in the gallery today, the Hon. C.M. Drury, President of the Treasury Board at Ottawa, and Mr. Al Johnson, former Deputy Provincial Treasurer of this Province. These gentlemen are up

March 12, 1970

in the gallery directly ahead of me in the back row. They are here to discuss cost-sharing grants with the provincial Treasurer and certain other Cabinet Ministers. I have already indicated to them that the Government of Saskatchewan will agree to most proposals, as long as we get more money and not less.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. THATCHER: — I am sure I speak for all Members in welcoming Mr. Drury and Mr. Johnson to Regina.

HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. W.S. LLOYD: (Leader of the Opposition) — Mr. Speaker, I simply want to join with the Premier's welcome to the Hon. Mr. Drury and to Mr. Johnson whom we welcome to the many capacities in the Chamber. Let me just add to what the Premier just said that I am glad to note today we are on talking terms with Ottawa and secondly to assure our visitors that never did we need help more than we do today, so we are very glad to have them.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

QUESTIONS

REDUCTION IN EXPORT OF CANADIAN OIL TO UNITED STATES

MR. J.E. BROCKELBANK: (Saskatoon Mayfair) — Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, I placed a question with the Premier the other day with regard to the reduction in the exports of Canadian oil to the United States. He said he would relay that question to the Minister of Mineral Resources. The question briefly was: if the present regulations are enforced about restrictions, what per month will be the dollar value loss to the revenue of the Province of Saskatchewan?

HON. A.C. CAMERON: (Minister of Mineral Resources) — Mr. Speaker, I might say in answer to the question, I'll give a bit of background if I may, although I'll try to be very brief. We are presently shipping about 250,000 barrels per day of which 75,000 are exported to the United States. That is about a 4,000 barrel increase over 1968. We are going to take the position and — rightfully so — a very strong position that our contribution to this excess supply being shipped to the United States has been negligible, less than 2 per cent. Since we didn't over-supply, we should not be saddled with any of the penalties. This is the position that Saskatchewan is going to take, that the reduction should come from those areas that have been responsible for contributing to the over-supply of exports of oil into the United States. We are hopeful that if our voice is heard and understood we will not suffer a penalty, but we can suffer as much as 25,000 barrels per day which is considerable to the Province of Saskatchewan. But we are going to take the position, we didn't create the problem, we didn't enjoy the fruits of it. Therefore, we should not accept any of the penalties.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. BROCKELBANK: — Could I ask the Minister a supplementary question. Exactly what does 25,000 barrels per day translate itself into in dollars and cents and who will he make these representations to that he said he would be making.

MR. CAMERON: — Well, I think if you do a bit of arithmetic you can calculate what the loss might be. Our royalty is approximately 25 cents per barrel on this type of crude, so you can figure it out instead of having me do that mental gymnastics for you if you will. Secondly, of course this I presume will be guided by the National Energy Board. It will be making suggestions to the oil producers and likewise we will be making our position known to the National Energy Board and to the oil producers.

MEAL TAX

MR. A. MATSALLA: (Canora) — Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day I would like to lay on the table a petition I received this afternoon signed by some 330 young people of Canora.

MR. SPEAKER: — If the Member wishes to present a petition he should have presented it at the proper time of presenting petitions.

MR. F.A. DEWHURST: (Wadena) — Mr. Speaker, I think if you will listen to the Hon. Member, it is not a petition in the sense of petitions where petitions are applying to the House. It is just for the information of Members. I am aware of what the Member is talking about and I am sure that, if Mr. Speaker you listen to him, you will realize that it is not a petition in the sense where it would fall under Petitions on our Order Paper.

MR. SPEAKER: — Well, I am willing to listen to what the petition is, but a petition is still a petition.

MR. MATSALLA: — I would like to lay on the table a petition I received this afternoon signed by some 330 young people of Canora voicing protest of the imposition of the snack and meal tax effective April 1.

MR. SPEAKER: — No, no. If the Member wants to present a petition protesting anything or asking that anything be done, he has to do it in the proper place. The proper place is when the Chair calls for Presenting Petitions.

HON. D.G. STEUART: (Provincial Treasurer) — Mr. Speaker, I suggest next time the students give it to a government side they might get some action. There is no use giving it to the Socialists, they can't get anywhere, not even with hamburgers.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: — Order, order! Now there is a proper way for doing these things. Presenting petitions, on one day you read and receive the next day. If there is any comment to be made in connection

March 12, 1970

with any petition, it gets made on the day following.

MR. E. KRAMER: (The Battlefords) — On a point of order, the Provincial Treasurer said that if they present it to a Government Member they might get action. They have already had the action; that's what they are protesting.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: Yes. Both yourself and the Provincial Treasurer should have reserved your comments for the proper place.

WELCOME TO PIONEERS

MR. A. MITCHELL: (Bengough) — Mr. Speaker, I think I have something, perhaps that is in order. I would like to draw attention to the Members of this House and to introduce a pioneer of our constituency who is sitting in the Speaker's gallery, Mr. and Mrs. Parker. Mr. Parker I believe celebrates his 86th birthday this week. He is now living in Regina these last two or three years. They have raised a fine family of seven daughters. I am sure other Members of this Legislature join with me in welcoming them and complimenting him on his keen interest in our Legislature.

HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

QUESTIONS

SHORTAGE OF FORAGE SEED

MR. J. MESSER: (Kelsey) — Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Minister of Agriculture. In view of the increasing evidence and indications of forage seed shortages, I am wondering if the Minister of Agriculture is taking any steps to obtain necessary forage seed for the program that has been launched involving Saskatchewan?

HON. D.T. McFARLANE: (Minister of Agriculture) — I would like to inform the Member from Kelsey and the Members of the House that the Minister of Agriculture and the Department of Agriculture have been taking steps for some three or four months anticipating an increased demand in this province for forage seed and by virtue of the fact that the Federal program came out — it was just announced about a week ago — that further steps are being taken not only in Saskatchewan but in Eastern Canada and even in the United States to try and procure quantities of grass and legume seeds.

MR. MESSER: — A supplementary question. Can you guarantee us and the farmers of Saskatchewan that the seed is going to be in place at a realistic time so that the farmers can plan their seeding operation?

MR. McFARLANE: — Well, I will just have to answer the question, Mr. Speaker, by saying that the farmers should be taking all precautionary measures now to make sure that their orders can be placed and if they can't be filled then they can place them at

an alternative point. If they contact the Department we'll help them all we can.

MR. LLOYD: — A supplementary question. Is the Minister or the Government taking any action to prevent undue price increases because of this shortage?

MR. McFARLANE: — The Government hasn't got control of the prices. The seed houses and the Wheat Pool which is the biggest supplier of forage seed in Saskatchewan, if they haven't already published their price list, will be doing this in a very short period of time. I would hope that the price lists that do come out will reflect a price that will be suitable to the farmers.

MR. KRAMER: — Is the Minister aware, Mr. Speaker, that the seed that the Wheat Pool has, has already been entirely spoken for, according to the information that I have, and that at present I don't believe they have any available.

MR. McFARLANE: — The information the Minister gets from the Wheat Pool is that there has been strong demand for the supplies they had on hand. They were still contacting the United States and Eastern Canada if they can further their supplies.

STATEMENT ON PRESENTING PETITIONS

MR. SPEAKER: — Just before we proceed further, I draw the attention of the Member for Canora (Mr. Matsalla) who moved to present a petition that under Standing Order No. 55 which is the relevant Standing Order of the Legislature of the Province of Saskatchewan — I will just read the first two sections.

Subsection (1) A petition of the Assembly may be presented by a Member at any time during the sitting of the Assembly by filing the same with the Clerk.

(2) Any Member desiring to present a petition must do so during the Routine Proceedings and before the introduction of Bills.

I would further draw Members' attention to the balance of the rule where it says how a petition can be taken into discussion and so on. I refer all Members to Standing Order No. 55, subsections (1) to (9).

ADJOURNED DEBATE

BUDGET DEBATE

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

HON. D. BOLDT: (Minister of Highways) — Mr. Speaker, before I go on with the Highway Program I would like to make a few comments regarding the present Debate that has been carried on now for seven days. Having had the opportunity of listening to the radio over the last couple of days, I am quite amazed at some of the speeches that I hear, particularly from the NDP. I listened the other day to the

March 12, 1970

Member from Yorkton and I heard him say that he had a good deal to say but time would not permit him to speak because he had only 10 minutes of radio time. I can sympathize with him and he made a recommendation that there should only be four speeches given over the air, one by the Premier, one by the Treasurer, one by the Leader of the Opposition and one by the financial critic. I don't know why he was so generous, I can't see why the Leader of the Opposition and the critic should be on radio at all. I want to say this that we are in a democratic country, we have democratic government, but the Member from Yorkton isn't treated in a democratic way if he is tied down to 10 minutes. This is a matter that has been discussed by the former Government — you can talk some other time, I've got the floor now. I'll give you time to speak some other day — I would say, Mr. Speaker, that when radio time is discussed next year perhaps we can save the people of Saskatchewan an extra \$16,000.

I also heard the other day this young lawyer from Saskatoon, Romanow the Member from Riversdale . . .

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. BOLDT: — I am always intrigued by the lawyer profession. Here is a young acrobat that's a professor of everything. He doesn't know whether wheat is harvested above ground or dug from the ground. He is an authority on the Wheat Board. I certainly can't agree with what he said. He stated the other day that I had said that we should do away with the Wheat Board. Well I would like him to look at my speech and at no time did I indicate that the Wheat Board should be done away with.

During the course of the Debate we have heard quite a bit about the Indian and Métis problem. I would like to make a point here. We have a problem with the white. We have a problem with the Indian and we have a problem with the Métis. The real problem — nobody wants to put his finger on it — but the real problem is liquor. I would like somebody to put a question on the Order Paper to see how much liquor is consumed in the Meadow Lake area. I would like to see a question put on the Order Paper to see what the liquor consumption is on a per capita basis in Meadow Lake and La Loche areas as compared to those areas of Osler, Hepburn, Rosthern, Dalmeny, etc. That's where the problem is, but nobody puts it there. The Hon. Member Mr. Cuelenaere, before he died, and I made a tour of the Indian reserves. I can tell you there was many a home that we went in where they had \$200-\$300 and then some. They didn't have a decent chair, they didn't have food in their home, they didn't have blankets. Yet, they say they are mistreated. The big problem is liquor and the moment we will face up to this problem, the sooner it will be solved. So let's not say that these people are discriminated against. You can walk into any beer parlor today at 2:00 o'clock in the afternoon, you watch and see who is in there. If you find two white men in there, then I'll give you a buck, I'll buy the beer for him. The real problem is this, where they spend our money, yours and my money, Mr. Speaker. I am just so fed up with the Federal Government on the reserves and in many cases with the Provincial Government on welfare, that we are giving welfare to those people, white, Métis and Indian, that spend most of their money in the liquor stores.

Mr. Speaker, it is a real pleasure for me to get up and support this Budget that was brought down by my colleague, the Hon. Member from Prince Albert. No matter what the NDP say, no

matter how they twist the figures and deliberately try to mislead the public, the facts are . . .

MR. W.J. BEREZOWSKY: (Prince Albert East-Cumberland) — On a point of privilege, the Member said that I brought down the Budget. I am the Member from Prince Albert and I wish he would clarify this.

MR. BOLDT: — Well, the Hon. Member from Prince Albert East-Cumberland, I would never give that prestige to you.

The facts are that this Government has done more for the farmers in the last two years than the NDP did in 20 years. There is no argument about that.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. BOLDT: — I believe that every sincere individual will agree that we have made a most sincere and genuine effort to assist the farmer in the time when the Federal Government was more concerned about constitutional matters and forgot that we had wheat to sell. They almost forgot that we even existed. I had not intended to speak on wheat at all, but when the financial critic of the Opposition tried to lecture the farm Members on the subject of the Wheat Board, I felt that I should put his mind at ease, and tell him that he had better stick to law, although I would never recommend him to anybody. Can you imagine, Mr. Speaker, this chap a Nova Scotian — I am sorry he is out of his seat, but he can't take it . . .

AN HON. MEMBER: — Hear, hear!

MR. BOLDT: — Fine, that's very good. This chap was barely out of law school . . . I'll start over again. Can you imagine, Mr. Speaker, this chap a Nova Scotian just out of law school only a few years ago, being invited by the Saskatchewan Government, by the Socialists as the Securities Commissioner of Saskatchewan? During his stay in office more Saskatchewan citizens were fleeced by shysters that were permitted to operate in this Province of Saskatchewan. He suddenly now becomes an artist and an authority on the Wheat Board. Even the Winnipeg Grain Exchange looks like a white dove compared to the operation of the office of which he was the commissioner. All he had to offer was that, if the Government cleaned out the few Liberals in the Wheat Board, the Board would begin to sell wheat. This is all very interesting, coming from the New Democratic party. All I ever said about the Wheat Board, and I said it before, was that I wanted it cleaned out. I don't care whether it is Liberal, Conservative or Socialist, I wanted it cleaned out. I think it is about time the Federal NDP and the Provincial Socialists held a convention and adopted some kind of unified policy because their friends in Ottawa speak with a different tongue, which the Saskatchewan NDP don't seem to understand.

In recent debate in the House of Commons, as reported in The Leader Post on March 4, 1970, we read, I quote:

Arnold Peters NDP Timiskaming charged that W.C. McNamara, head of the Canadian Wheat Board has spent more time and

March 12, 1970

money in propagating his own position than in selling wheat.

The report goes on to say:

It's damn near time we got rid of McNamara.

That's a quote. I believe a good number of people will agree with Mr. Peters if we want to save the Wheat Board.

The other day I received the Western Producer which I have here. It is a very interesting paper. I call it the Socialist paper. Here you have on the front page, "Board needs applause, not criticism." Next beside it you read, "McNamara raps Premier," on this Romanian deal. On the second page you read, "Boden replies to Boldt, says charges unfounded." But at no time can I see in this paper or have I in the past, what I said about the Wheat Board. Nor can I see what the Premier said about Romania. No, just a one-sided story. That is all they can say about the situation in Saskatchewan. Well, the Hon. Member from Kelsey (Mr. Messer) who seems to be an authority on wheat, one day is all for the summer fallow plan, the next day he opts out. He said the other day about a barter deal that wasn't a barter deal that wheat was still in the granary or in the Pioneer elevator or whoever took it. Well, you know the Wheat Board three years ago, 1967, sold some wheat to Russia and some of that wheat is still in my bin. What's wrong with that? So here we have made a barter deal and the wheat is still supposed to be in the Pioneer Elevator Company storage space. He thinks it isn't a barter deal. How silly can you get. Let's look at this chap McNamara when he rapped the Premier about this Romanian deal. He says Romania is an exporting country and if it had sold the 200 million bushels to it, Romania would be competing with the Canadian market. Well, you know when Russia bought that wheat in 1967 and only a few weeks ago, when it took up the other 175 million bushels, headlines in the paper declared, "Most of this wheat will go to Cuba." What is wrong with that? Nothing. I don't care whether McNamara sells all the wheat to the United States, and sells it back to Canada, as long as the farmer gets rid of it. That is the main thing.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. BOLDT: — Never has the Western Producer carried any statement about what we said, but here is the latest Western Producer talking about the criticisms that we are supposed to have said. When I turn to pages seven and eight on the Open Forum, it would be good reading material for the NDP, there are eight letters to the Open Forum. Out of the eight, seven find something wrong with the present marketing system. I think it will be a very sad day for Canada when heads of political parties, corporations, or companies feel that a Member should be expelled and branded as opposing the party or company when someone tries to constructively criticize something he believes in.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to comment on the speech made by the Hon. Member who now is the highway critic, as reported by The Leader Post. Well, I have a clipping here from The Leader Post — very interesting reading. "Meakes opts for education." He says, "The Liberal Government is spending money on highways like a drunken sailor." I believe if I were the Hon. Member, I would try to get myself educated too. I want to tell the Hon.

Member that I don't drink and I just wonder whether the Hon. Member would have submitted to the breathalyzer test at the time when he made that statement. I must inform my officials that the representative of Touchwood constituency doesn't want any highway expenditures in the Touchwood constituency. As Members know, 1970 has been a good year for the Department. We officially opened a few projects. I would like to remind the House of a few of these projects that we did open, one was the Idylwyld Freeway in Saskatoon, No. 5 from Saskatoon to Borden Bridge, and No. 11 Highway from Saskatoon to Rosthern. As usual, the Rosthern constituents were very pleased about these services and a good number of businesses and municipalities expressed their appreciation in the Saskatchewan Valley News. I see the Member for Redberry (Mr. Michayluk) has left, I know why he has left. A week later, the following advertisement appeared in the Valley News, authorized by the Redberry Constituency NDP and here it is:

Thank you, Mr. Boldt, for the extravaganza placed in your highway program at the expense of eight hospitals, 134 beds and accompanying staff.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. BOLDT: — When I saw this advertisement, Mr. Speaker, I asked my officials to take out all capital programs in the Redberry constituency. He doesn't want any highway expenditures. I am real sad, Mr. Financial Critic, I am real sad to report that not one red cent will be spent in the Redberry constituency at the expense of one hospital bed. Indeed, I might even ask my officials to curtail the maintenance of the highways in the Redberry constituency. Never, Mr. Speaker, will I be accused of spending funds on highways at the expense of the poor sick people of the Redberry constituency. But, Mr. Speaker, after all the criticisms of the expenditures on highways, they have finally decided to lay off, and have even moved the highway critic up almost beyond the rail. They have found it necessary to remove the former highway critic and have him replaced by one that has already opted out.

Having examined the questions he is asking on the Order Paper, Mr. Speaker, I find that in most cases he has copied every question that the Hon. Member from Melfort (Mr. Willis) asked last year. And, indeed, in some cases he even forgot to change the date. So we told him that he should refer to the Journal and they think they are getting a big deal out of it. He is asking questions and he hasn't got the ability to ask a sensible question so he has to go to the Hon. Member from Melfort for advice. But this is the way that the NDP have fallen apart. They have fallen apart right in the middle. They moved the Front Bench to the back and the back bench to the Front Bench, and so now you have those young fellows like the fellow from Riversdale (Mr. Romanow) jumping up and down, talking all day and saying nothing.

Now let me come to the Highway Program, Mr. Speaker. In terms of broadness, the 1969 Highway Program will be the largest in the history of the province. In terms of broadness, the Highway Program is designed to assist all regions of the province and its broad distribution indicates projects from Bracken to Reindeer Lake; from Alameda to Goodsoil; and from Kindersley to Kamsack.

March 12, 1970

One of our outstanding accomplishments as a Government is the massive improvement of our Highways System, and in particular the emphasis we have placed on paving and bridge construction.

Let me point out, Mr. Speaker, our record of bridge construction as compared to the Socialists' of 1944 and 1964. Since 1964 we have already completed five new major bridges and if we want to count the bridge over the Gardiner Dam, in which the Provincial Government participated, the total number of completed bridges is six. One major bridge is presently under construction between Prince Albert and Birch Hills and will be officially opened this fall. Two more bridges are on the drawing board for 1970 and starts will be made on the Leader and Nipawin bridges this year. In less than six years in office we have completed six new bridges and moved towards the construction of three more, for a total of nine bridges. When the Socialists were in power it was a different story. The Socialists have had very little to say in this Session about our Highway Program. They have finally realized that roads and bridges are very popular amongst the people of Saskatchewan, and they have been told by their constituents that they had better not criticize the Highway Department.

The Socialists have finally realized that if the Premier decides to call an election tomorrow, the voters of Maple Creek . . .

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. BOLDT: — Just keep on clapping boys because you won't clap after the election. If the Premier decides to call an election, the voters of Maple Creek and Kerrobert-Kindersley constituencies will not vote against the Government that gave this area a long-awaited bridge. I believe this also holds true in the Cut Knife constituency. The voters there will remember who gave them the good highways and the Deer Creek Bridge, so beneficial to the Lloydminster area. The voters from Prince Albert and Nipawin will not forget the bridges and the highways that this Government provides as services for these communities.

I don't want to forget the Gabriel Bridge, as this one happens to be in my constituency. Mr. Speaker, with the good highways in Rosthern and the new bridge, there just aren't any Socialists in Rosthern. The only time the Rosthern constituents see a Socialist is when the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Lloyd) appears on television.

Now let's take a look at the NDP record of bridge construction when they were in office from 1944 to 1964. The first bridge they built was the Saskatchewan Landing Bridge. Not having much experience in bridge construction, the first year after completion when the river ice broke up, the poor thing flipped into the river and it had to be rebuilt. Then in the early sixties they constructed the Petrofka Bridge. They did share in the construction of the Diefenbaker Bridge in Prince Albert, but the Federal Government was the major contributor, and the Provincial Government of the day, the Socialists, insisted that the small city of Prince Albert share in the cost. I want to tell my hon. friend from The Battlefords (Mr. Kramer), that noisy Member, what we did to the Battlefords Bridge. They claimed that we are not doing anything to aid the cities in their street and bridge costs.

I ask the Hon. Member whether his city was asked to contribute to the Battleford Bridge when we built it there a few

years ago.

MR. KRAMER: (The Battlefords) — It's not in the city.

MR. BOLDT: — Oh, come on. You know better. And so, Mr. Speaker, the record speaks for itself. In 20 long years of Socialism, only three bridges and one slipped in to the river, as compared to the Liberal Government's record of six completed major bridges and three under construction, for a total of nine in six years.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. BOLDT: — I want to announce another three rather major bridges for this year, although they are not of that major complex, but they are quite large bridges and are going to be constructed at a cost of \$320,000. One on No. 6 Highway over the Qu'Appelle River at a cost of \$100,000; one on No. 26 Highway over the Beaver River at a cost of \$120,000; and one on Highway No. 47 over the Qu'Appelle River at a cost of \$100,000.

Some of the highlights of the 1970-71 program are: The continuation of the program of four-laning No. 1 Highway between Moose Jaw and Swift Current; construction will take place between Mortlach and Valjean, and Swift Current and Rush Lake. All grading of the new set of lanes on No. 11 Highway, between Chamberlain and Hanley, will be completed with the exception of the section between Bladworth and Kenaston. A start will be made on the construction of an additional set of lanes and related interchanges on Highway No. 1 Bypass at Regina. By the end of this year's construction season it is expected that there will be 175 miles of four-laned highways in operation, as compared to a meagre 35 miles in 1964 when we took office. Our emphasis will again be on paving and major contracts will be let on Highways 14, 6 and 11.

Roads for industrial development will again receive priority. A timber haul road will be constructed at Bodmin northwards to enable extraction of pulpwood for the mill at Prince Albert. There will be an aggressive program of grading and paving on No. 9 Highway to accommodate the IMC Potash truck haul to the United States border. Sections of No. 9 Highway south, and No. 3 Highway west of Hudson Bay will be paved to heavy duty standards to accommodate timber hauling.

A winter road has been completed to the Wollaston Lake area and construction of an all-weather road to the south end of Reindeer Lake will be continued. This will provide ground access to a large part of Northeastern Saskatchewan. And for the benefit of the Members, I just spoke to my Deputy just a few minutes ago. He came back on Tuesday from Wollaston Lake and tells me that on a good portion of this road you can travel 50 miles per hour to get to the uranium mine site.

MR. KRAMER: — It will be gone when . . .

MR. BOLDT: — Oh, sure we know that. So will you.

There will be extensive resurfacing done on the old lanes of the Trans-Canada Highway, particularly between Moose Jaw and Regina, as this is the last year in which the Federal Government

March 12, 1970

will participate in the cost-sharing program. I might say that this shared program will be about 90 per cent Federal and 10 per cent Provincial. We will be allocating \$390,000 for roads to our tourist facilities. The handling of traffic in construction zones is always a problem for the local people and the tourist, so this year we will try to assist the public in construction zones at the cost of \$300,000.

The Department feels that emphasis should be placed on inter-city roads, and once again major work will be done this year between Regina and Swift Current; Saskatoon and Yorkton; Saskatoon and Regina; and Saskatoon to Prince Albert.

On the capital projects other than highways and bridges, the Department of Public Works will complete a new repair depot at Saskatoon and a major start will be made on a new repair depot at Moose Jaw to replace the one in Regina. Several weigh scales will be constructed, one east of Saskatoon and one at Kindersley. Storage buildings for highway equipment and repair work will be constructed at Central Butte, Alameda, La Ronge, Southey, Unity and Creighton.

These capital cost expenditures by the Department of Public Works are greatly appreciated and will enable the Department to operate more efficiently. The investment of more than \$63 million in the Provincial Highway System is a confirmation of our commitment to the people of Saskatchewan to invest \$250 million in the system in a period of four years.

The Highway Program, except for this year, has been vigorously criticized by the Socialists and yet now they would almost seem to infer that we should spent more. It is estimated roughly that 286,000 man-days of work will be involved on site. In addition, there is employment generated in providing materials such as culverts, cement, asphalt, timber, etc., which are prepared off site.

As President of the Canadian Good Roads Association during this year, I had the privilege of visiting every province in Canada and meeting with the respective Ministers, deputies and other highway officials. I drove over many miles of highways in other provinces and returned to Saskatchewan proud in the knowledge that our highways measured up extremely well with those of other provinces. Indeed, I am convinced that many of our highways, both in design and construction, are superior to those in other provinces. In discussing highway needs and problems with my colleagues in other provinces, without exception the Ministers reported to me that there were just not enough dollars to go around to meet the demands of the public.

I think it is absolutely ridiculous and foolish to vote against a realistic highway program. The West was opened up by the railroads, in other words, by transportation. Train service, even for freight, can no longer be relied on so the public is demanding highways and our Government is prepared to give the Saskatchewan people as good a highway system as we can afford.

Before I go into the detailed program I want to again challenge the Members opposite that, if there is something in your constituency that we are spending too much money on, would you please come to me and I can delete it. It is entirely up to you if you think there is too much money spent on highways.

Now the capital program on No. 1 Highway the Regina Bypass which I mentioned, grading and paving between Mortlach and Parkbeg — Parkbeg to Valjean — grading; east of Waldeck to east of Swift Current grading and paving; Regina to Belle Plaine resurfacing; east of Parkbeg to Valjean resurfacing; Swift Current to Junction 32 resurfacing; Webb to east of Tompkins resurfacing.

On No. 2 Highway from Junction with No. 165 to La Ronge we will let a contract this year. This, then will be the end of construction for that area with a brand new highway from Prince Albert to La Ronge — completion of grading; north of Cudworth to Wakaw — resurfacing on the existing highway.

No. 3 Highway — Hudson Bay to Veillardville — paving; Crooked River to Tisdale — grading; Birch Hills to Prince Albert — grading; Shellbrook to junction 50 — grading; west of Junction 26 to Deer Creek Bridge — grading. Of course we will finish that great big bridge at Muskoday Reserve between Prince Albert and Birch Hills.

No. 4 Highway — Swift Current Bypass — grading and paving; No. 304 Highway to Meadow Lake — paving; Midnight Lake to south of Meadow Lake — oiling.

No. 5 Highway — east of Quill Lake to Watson — commencement of paving this year. Junction 2 to Junction 27 — resurfacing.

No. 6 Highway — Junction No. 18 to Junction 13 we will apply a cold mix surface; from eight miles north of Regina to the Qu'Appelle Valley — grading and paving; from Junction No. south 12 miles — resurfacing. And of course the new bridge over the Qu'Appelle River on No. 6 Highway.

No. 7 Highway — We will complete the paving between Vanscoy and Delisle.

No. 8 Highway — We will oil between Redvers to Fairlight. And we will oil the stub-road to one of our potash mines, the Sylvite Mine Access Road; oiling between Wroxton to Kamsack.

No. 9 Highway — Junction 18 Highway to Carlyle — paving; Yorkton to two miles north — grading; Carlyle to south Junction 16 — completion of paving; South Junction 16 to north Junction 16 — paving; Hudson Bay south — paving and completion of grading; Lady Lake to Usherville — oiling.

No. 10 Highway — Melville to Duff — grading and commencement of paving this year.

No. 11 Highway — Between Saskatoon and Regina and parts south of Prince Albert are the following projects: Lumsden to Junction 54 — paving of the additional lanes; Aylesbury to Craik — completion of grading; Junction No. 6 to Lumsden — resurfacing; Hanley to Dundurn — completion of paving; Chamberlain to Aylesbury — grading; Chamberlain to Craik — commencement of paving; Craik to Davidson — paving; Kenaston to Hanley — grading; Davidson to Bladworth — grading; Hague to north of Rosthern — completion of paving; MacDowall to Prince Albert — grading.

No. 12 Highway — Junction 305 to Junction 312 — grading.

No. 13 Highway — Carlyle to Arcola — completion of paving. Arcola to Stoughton — cold mix surfacing; Junction 34 to Verwood

March 12, 1970

oiling. Shaunavon to Eastend — oiling.

No. 14 Highway — Saltcoats to Yorkton — completion of grading; Saltcoats to Yorkton — paving; Yorkton to Springside — completion of paving; Springside to Insinger — paving; Junction 2 to Clavet — completion of grading and paving; PCA Access Road — paving; Wilkie to Unity — grading; Biggar bypass — grading.

No. 15 Highway — East of Broderick to Junction 45 Highway — completion of grading and paving; Junction 20 to Junction 2 — oiling.

No. 17 Highway — We will complete the paving in the Lloydminster area.

No. 20 Highway — Humboldt to Pilger — completion of grading.

No. 21 Highway — Grading of the approaches to the Leader bridge; commencement of construction of the Leader bridge.

No. 22 Highway — Junction No. 47 Highway to Junction 10 will be oiled.

No. 23 Highway — Weekes to Carragana will be oiled.

No. 26 Highway — Junction No. 55 to Goodsoil will be oiled. The bridge over the Beaver River.

No. 30 Highway — Glidden to Kindersley — grading.

No. 32 Highway — Junction No. 1 to Success — commencement of paving and completion of grading; completion of the Interchange at Junction with Highway No. 1.

No. 35 Highway — Francis to No. 1 Highway — completion of oiling; Rose Valley to Archerwill — grading; Nipawin Bridge approaches; commencement of the Nipawin Bridge.

No. 36 Highway — Junction No. 13 to Crane Valley — oiling.

No. 37 Highway — Swift Current Creek to Gull Lake — cold mix surfacing.

No. 39 Highway — Yellow Grass west — shoulder widening and resurfacing; Drinkwater to Pasqua — completion of paving; Halbrite to Weyburn — resurfacing.

No. 40 Highway — West of Battleford to Wilbert — oiling; Freemont to Marsden — completion of grading.

No. 41 Highway — Aberdeen to Junction 5 — oiling.

No. 42 Highway — Central Butte to Riverhurst — completion of oiling.

No. 43 Highway — Junction No. 19 to Vanguard — oiling.

No. 46 Highway — Climax to Bracken — grading.

No. 47 Highway — through the Qu'Appelle Valley — grading and a new bridge.

No. 49 Highway — Okla to Kelvington — completion of grading.

No. 54 Highway — No. 11 Highway to Regina Beach — completion of grading and oiling.

No. 55 Highway — Smeaton to Meath Park — grading; Meath Park to pulp mill — paving; Shellbrook to Shell River — grading and a new bridge; Access road from Bodmin to the Smoothstone timber block — grading; east of Meadow Lake to the West Junction with No. 4 Highway completion of grading and paving; Junction No. 4 to Junction No. 26 — oiling.

No. 102 Highway — McLennan Lake to Reindeer Lake — grading.

No. 163 Highway — from Junction 109 to Shoal Lake — completion of grading.

No. 211 Highway Dundurn to Blackstrap Lake — oiling.

No. 212 Highway — Wakaw Lake to No. 2 Highway — oiling. And I want to say that the Member for Kinistino (Mr. Thibault) didn't ask for this, it was the Member for Watrous (Mr. Schmeiser). So don't go home and . . .

MR. A. THIBAUT: (Kinistino) — On a point of privilege, Mr. Speaker. You did not want me on the delegation.

MR. BOLDT: — Well I thought that the first thing that he would do would be to run to the Wakaw Socialist paper and tell them that he had worked for this oiling project.

No. 219 Highway — from Junction 345 south to Danielson Park — oiling.

No. 301 Highway — Junction No. 1 to Buffalo Pound provincial Park — oiling.

No. 373 Highway — Lucky Lake to Birsay — oiling.

These are the main projects that we will be working on this year. There are numerous smaller ones, about one-half dozen stub roads to smaller communities that will be oiled. They are included in the program, but I haven't listed them. I want to say, again, that this is the largest highway program in the history of the province. We made a pledge in 1967 that we would spend \$250 million on our highway program and I am absolutely certain that it could very well exceed the \$250 million.

I want to say a word about No. 9 Highway before I sit down. No. 9 Highway will receive major emphasis this year. I.M.C. have been in again and they have confirmed with us that the potash haul is going to continue. It is hoped that by the year 1971, No. 9 Highway will be completely rebuilt and paved to number one standard. We have to do this in order to compete with the railroads. A great deal has been said about the freight rates in Western Canada as compared to Eastern freight rates. And, here again, is a typical example of what the Americans are doing with the potash industry to assist I.M.C. and what the Provincial Government is doing to assist this mine. We have to have competition and this Government is going to build highways wherever we can compete against the railroads, because I believe competition is a very healthy thing.

March 12, 1970

I just want to say just one more word about the freight rates. I met with some of the Canadian Good Roads officials. It was pointed out to me that it was cheaper to ship a repair part from Montreal to Vancouver for Edmonton than to ship it directly from Montreal to Edmonton. Certainly there is something wrong there. We want to compete wherever we can. I want to say again that this Highway Program is a reflection of the Government's thinking. When it comes to highways it creates jobs, it creates good roads that the people want. I will not support the amendment, but I will support the main motion.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. D.W. MICHAYLUK: (Redberry) — Mr. Speaker, would the Minister permit a question. I was not in the House when the Minister gave some of his projects. However, he did mention when he was in the process of mentioning stub roads, that there would be no stub roads in Redberry. Is the Minister not contemplating building that connection from No. 5 to 40 to 3 to the Chitek Lake area?

MR. BOLDT: — No, I was sorry that you were not in the House, but I said that the Redberry NDP had put an ad in the paper, when we opened No. 11, 5 and the Idylwyld Freeway, that said, "Thank you Mr. Boldt for the extravaganza placed in your Highway Program at the expense of eight hospitals, 134 beds and a competent staff." I will not be accused of building one mile of road in your constituency for the sake of a poor sick person in your constituency. You are not going to get anything.

MR. MICHAYLUK: — Mr. Minister, we will remember that.

MR. F.A. DEWHURST: (Wadena) — Mr. Speaker, I was sorry to hear that the Minister of Highways (Mr. Boldt) has been sick the last few days. But by listening to the first portion of his speech, one could be of the opinion that he is still sick. When he mentioned that he was opposed to radio time, that he was opposed to letting the people of the province hear the different points of view, I can't understand that kind of thinking. He mentioned that he would like to see someone put a question on the Order Paper re-sales of liquor in the northwest part of this province. He, the same as any other Member of the House, has the right to put a question on the Order Paper if he wants. No one has prevented him from getting that information. He has that right and he doesn't need to place the blame onto someone else if the question isn't asked.

I would at this time, Mr. Speaker, congratulate Dr. Worobetz on his appointment as Lieutenant Governor of this Province. I know that it is going to be pretty difficult for any Lieutenant Governor following our previous one, Mr. Hanbidge.

Mr. Hanbidge who, regardless of what politics he may have pursued while he was in politics, was a man who endeared himself to all people regardless of their race, creed, color or political persuasion. And Mr. Hanbidge will long be remembered by all who knew him. I sincerely hope that when the day comes that Dr. Worobetz retires from this office of the Lieutenant Governor that he too will be revered by the people just as much as Mr. Hanbidge has been.

HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. DEWHURST: — I would like also to congratulate my colleague, Neil Byers, on the winning of the Kelvington by-election.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. DEWHURST: — And I wish to welcome him to this Chamber. I will have a little more later on Kelvington.

I would also at this time like to pay tribute to some of the sports activities in my constituency and wish them well. As an example, the Wynyard high school two years ago won the Provincial Championship of eight-man football. This past year they won the Provincial Championship of nine-man football. I think a lot of credit comes to those boys in the high school and to those who work with them, training them to win as many high school football championships over the past number of years as they have done.

The Wynyard group have also excelled in track and field, high school curling and their hockey and baseball teams for that size of a town are very comparable to other communities of its size. I wish them well in their future endeavors. Wynyard isn't the only sports centre in my constituency. Other areas, Wishart, Wadena, Quill Lake, Rose Valley and other points, have also done well in their sports. I do believe, Mr. Speaker, that society is not spending enough money on the promotion of sports. Too often we hear the young folks being condemned for being delinquent, getting into mischief, getting into trouble for one thing or another, but what happens? There is no place for the young people to turn to, by and large, to express their activities in the form of sports. Too often we find that sports are created for one segment of our community, but not enough done for the other segments. I believe if society as a whole, starting from the Federal Government and on down, would see its way to put more money in promoting sports throughout our nation, we would have a better and healthier nation of young people growing up. We would have better competition in international sports and we would have a much lower cost to society for juvenile delinquency and other problems. I believe that these are some of the things we should work toward and I realize that no one government can take on the whole load.

Last fall we watched on television the Conference that was on at Ottawa on the Constitution. We saw our Premier there and the Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Steuart). But several questions were asked of me. Why were two Government backbenchers seen on the scene there? What were they doing there? In what capacity and who paid the expenses of that trip to Ottawa last fall? Maybe some time our Premier or the Provincial Treasurer will tell us. It was also very amusing to watch our Provincial Treasurer as the camera picked him up on several occasions as he sat there playing with a string. People suggested that the next time the Provincial Treasurer goes to a conference he should take a yo-yo with him. It would be better entertainment for the television audience than playing with the piece of string he had in his hand.

I would like at this time to officially thank the city of Regina for the parking permit for MLAs during the Session. I saw in the paper the other day one person writing in "My

March 12, 1970

Favorite Gripe” that they didn’t agree with it. But I think all Members will agree that Members do not Come to the city here to abuse parking privileges downtown. Most of the time when we are downtown it is to take a delegation or other people who come in to see us. Actually we bring business to the city and do not interfere with their normal business, so I believe it is very welcome and I would like to go on record as thanking the Mayor and the City Council for the favor that has been shown us.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. DEWHURST: — I would, however, also like to mention the Wascana parking permit which we get for our cars. And I hope whoever is responsible for the Wascana Centre will take this matter up. We have on our cars the Wascana parking permit to park here in front of the buildings, but last fall I had an occasion to go over to the University. I parked my car where there were no restrictions on parking. I didn’t see restricted parking or no parking or anything else. When I came out I had a ticket on the car. When I took it up with the Director of the Wascana Centre, he informed me that the parking permit was not good for Wascana Centre, just for the buildings here. Well, I would like to know the reason why this Wascana parking permit is not good for Wascana Centre. Why is it just good for in front of the buildings where we have reserved space during the Session anyway? So I would hope that the Minister in charge of Wascana Centre would look into this and see that, if we are going to have a parking permit for the Wascana Centre, it should be good for any place in the Wascana Centre.

Now I would like to turn my remarks for a few moments to the Kelvington constituency. I see the Minister of Highways (Mr. Boldt) has left the Chamber, but I would like to ask him when he was in Kelvington did he tell the farmers in Kelvington what he told us in the Legislature last winter, that as a farmer he had more than enough money in his hip pocket to buy out any laboring man, that farmers would be well off if they didn’t have cabs on their tractors or on their combines or other up-to-date equipment. I wonder if he told the farmers of Kelvington those statements. I wonder if he told them that the farmers don’t need to have up-to-date equipment to prosper with the times in order to compete in today’s world.

Over the last 20 years the farmers have become the most efficient segment of Canadian society. Twenty odd years ago they were told they had to become more efficient if they were going to be able to produce wheat and sell it on the world market. Well, today the cost of production has gone up and up for the farmer over the past 20 years but his selling price is less now than it was a number of years ago. The farmer would still do all right if markets were found for his grain, but the only way he could do this was to get mechanized equipment in order to have better production. Now last year they were told by the Minister of Highways (Mr. Boldt) that they shouldn’t have the up-to-date equipment and then they would be well-off.

I wonder if the Attorney General (Mr. Heald) told the farmers of Kelvington what he told us in the Legislature here last year. And he said he accepted full responsibility for the statement that he read. I wonder if he told them that he had never seen better times than there are now and that the farmer’s wife drives to town in a new car, the husband comes after her in a

New truck and with a snowmobile in the back.

HON. D.V. HEALD: (Attorney General) — That was last year, Fred.

MR. DEWHURST: — Yes, but did you tell the farmers of Kelvington that? Did you tell them that or did you tell them that or did you tell them that you said . . .

MR. HEALD: — You said you were quoting from the letter.

MR. DEWHURST: — Now listen to this. He says . . . I will go on and quote from his speech last year — listen to this. This in particular, Mr. Speaker, should be read and re-read and inwardly digested by Hon. Members opposite.

MR. HEALD: — You said you were quoting from the letter.

MR. DEWHURST: — I am quoting from the . . .

MR. HEALD: — . . . the letter I quoted from.

MR. DEWHURST: — I am quoting from the Debates and Proceedings of February 28th, 1969 Session, page 814 and page 815.

MR. HEALD: — I was quoting from the letter.

MR. DEWHURST: — Yes, which you said you took full responsibility for.

MR. HEALD: — Right!

MR. DEWHURST: — You said you took full responsibility when you quoted from the letter. The Attorney General is well aware, the same as I am, that when you take full responsibility for it it is the same as though it were your own thoughts. Oh, yes.

MR. HEALD: — You show me that in the book, Fred.

MR. DEWHURST: — He said:

In 1942 the farmers and the elevator agents looked after all their problems. You know all things cannot be done in a day. The average farmer knows you cannot take a cow to the bull and bring back the calf in your arms. The average farmer has his bins full of wheat, his barns and corrals full of cattle and feed, and most wives are full of babies for the bonus.

He says:

Just how could times be better. I hope you tell them good and plenty.

MR. HEALD: — Did you disagree with it a year ago?

MR. DEWHURST: — I disagreed with it then and

March 12, 1970

I disagree with it now. You took full responsibility for it then and you are taking full responsibility for it now.

In the Kelvington by-election — I Spent a few days in there, not as much time as I had hoped but I spent some time in Kelvington. Oh, Neil Byers did not lose the poll I was in.

AN HON. MEMBER: — Hear, hear!

MR. DEWHURST: — Don't worry about that. He won it and he will win it the next time.

I found in the poll that I worked in that there was one young lady that was told that she had no right to vote. She was 23 or 24 years of age. She was well past her twenties and the reason that she had no right to vote, she was told, was because the fall before she had taken on to teach a school up in the northern part of the province. She took sick in the late fall and had to come home and they had to get a substitute teacher because she was sick. At Christmas time she was still sick. She resigned from the school so that the school could hire the other teacher full time, and she was at home still recovering from her sickness. She was still home when the election was on and she went to the local enumerator to have her name put on the list and the enumerator refused to put her on because he said he was ordered by some of the officials from Regina that she wasn't eligible to vote.

Now I would like to know who that official was. I know Mr. Harrington and his assistant Grant Chamberlain were in that constituency and were travelling around. So those type of things should just not be tolerated. They tried to stop this young lady from voting but I told her that she had the perfect right. She was going to go to the poll and demand to be sworn in and I imagine she likely did.

Statements were made last spring that the Kelvington election would be a test of leadership, especially for this party and it would be a test to see if Woodrow Lloyd was through as leader or not. The papers said, well, the NDP might win it by a very slight majority, but after the overwhelming majority that my colleague got, I think then that this challenge was well vindicated when they said it was a challenge of the leadership.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. DEWHURST: — And our leadership has well been vindicated.

AN HON. MEMBER: — What about the other party?

MR. DEWHURST: — What about the Liberals? What about their leadership? Has his leadership been vindicated? I think that there is a lot of room for doubt as to the leadership of the Liberal party.

You know on the same day, Mr. Speaker, there was a Manitoba election and we hear the Premier (Mr. Thatcher) talk about after 20 years — after 20 years — but in Manitoba after 100 years, 100 years of Liberal, Tory Government, Tory, Liberal, Coalition of them both, both of them going together, after 100 years the farmers and the working people of Manitoba said it is time to call a halt to this tweedledum tweedledee outfit so they threw

them both out and they put Ed Schreyer in.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. DEWHURST: — And Ed Schreyer is doing a good job. The popularity polls that have been counted up this past while show that his going up and not down.

We have heard a lot about the NDP Convention in Manitoba last fall. When I was in Winnipeg last fall one person that I was talking to told me that Premier Weir had been phoned by the Premier of our Province (Mr. Thatcher) telling him to hang on, not to let go because if you get these guys in you will never get rid of them. Now I didn't see a copy of the phone call but the person who told me was in a position to know.

Now what has happened since the Manitoba election? When Manitoba wanted to try and have a look into the insurance business they asked to be able to get the loan of one of the men from the Government Insurance office here, which was granted by the Minister concerned. As soon as the Government, the Premier and the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Guy) found out about it — according to the Press — then there was no room left for heaven, hell was popping.

MR. GUY: — What? What did you say?

MR. DEWHURST: — The sum total of it was that this man was recalled back from Manitoba before he had a chance to help Manitoba to look into government insurance.

It is a funny thing, Mr. Speaker, that the Premier and other Members opposite did get up in this House and tell us what Cass-Beggs is getting in Manitoba, what he isn't getting, what others are getting. But when we ask for the salaries that are being paid here to our Power officials we can't get it. They say it is not in the public interest. Yet this Manitoba Government, which they are not too friendly with right now, has made available what it is paying. Well, I don't know whether there is any truth in it or not, but I have heard rumors that the secretary for the manager of the Power Corporation gets \$11,000 to \$12,000 a year. I hope that the Government will give us the facts and relieve any suspicion because this is public money that is being spent and we have a right to know.

MR. HEALD: — We never did refuse . . .

MR. DEWHURST: — It was refused in Crown Corporations last year when we asked what the different officials were getting.

MR. HEALD: — You didn't give them either!

MR. DEWHURST: — Oh, yes we did! These were questions we asked a year ago. We are waiting for the answers and we still haven't got them. In fact, Mr. Speaker, I am still waiting for the answers to two letters I wrote to the Premier over five years ago. They are still not answered yet after five years. They are still not answered. So when they talk about a business government I wonder just how much business-like management there is when that's

March 12, 1970

the way they carry on their business.

We listened a few days ago to the speeches from the Member from Souris-Estevan (Mr. MacDougall) and the Member from Nipawin (Mr. Radloff). I don't think their speeches deserve too much comment. I think I can sum up their speeches in one four letter word and that word is just "mush".

It is no wonder after people listen to speeches like that why the word "Liberal" is becoming a bad word throughout the country. It is almost a type of word now where people throughout the country will wash their children's mouths out with soap when they use that word. It is getting to be that bad a word.

Now the Member from Saskatoon City Park-University (Mr. Charlebois) was talking about the wonderful success of a Crown corporation in Northern Saskatchewan, a Federal Crown corporation. We know they have had some good success but this is a socialized venture. I don't care whether it is set up by a Liberal Government or a Conservative government, these are socialized ventures when they are Crown corporations. Just because it is set up by a Liberal Government or a Conservative or a New Democratic Government, when an organization is set up for the benefit of the people, it is a socialized service run by society.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. DEWHURST: — You know it amuses me to hear the Member for Saskatoon City Park-University try to make mountains out of little molehills on certain statements he has made. On this little mole hill that is being built in the Black Strap he is trying to call it a mountain. It is just the reverse. And this, Mr. Speaker, is being paid for by the taxpayers. He is one of the greatest exponents of free enterprise but the people are paying for it themselves. Yes, he is doing it . . .

MR. CHARLEBOIS: — Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, this gentleman is breaking my heart.

MR. DEWHURST: — It is not a point of order and it is pretty hard to break something that you don't have.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. DEWHURST: — If he was wishing to really be a free enterpriser he should have built it himself out of his own money and not use the taxpayers' money to build this Black Strap hill of his.

MR. CHARLEBOIS: — Do you want me to be a bum?

MR. DEWHURST: — Oh, you are now! The Member for Maple Creek, or the Minister of Mineral Resources (Mr. Cameron) was chiding us about the difficulty the Federal NDP party has been having with the leadership. He was quoting one of the Toronto papers that there were no leaders available and they would have to maybe settle for David Lewis. Now I just wonder why he didn't go back to the records. I would like to quote just a very short bit from some of the records of a little over 10 years ago, Mr. Speaker. I

quote from the Winnipeg Free Press of September 21st, 1959, dealing with the leadership convention of the Liberal party. It says:

A group of Regina businessmen, including several doctors, have pledged financial support to Mr. Thatcher but there is a rider to this pledge. The condition is that the pledge will be honored only if Mr. Thatcher is chosen leader. There are also rumors that Mr. Thatcher and the Regina group are agreed on the need for a revision of Saskatchewan's labor legislation, a revision that would result in legislation more favorable to management than to labor.

Then I will turn next to the Free Press of September 28th, one week later. I would like to quote in part from the Free Press issue. It says:

Personal hard feelings continued right down to the wire between pro-Thatcherites and anti-Thatcherites. It stemmed largely from the doubts of some Liberals, including some MLAs, that a former member of the CCF was the best man to lead the party.

AN HON. MEMBER: — Where do you stand, Alex?

MR. DEWHURST: — An example of how high feelings ran is a story told by J.H.C. Harradence of Prince Albert in the speech in which he nominated Mr. Alex Cameron of Maple Creek for the leadership. And here is what Mr. Harradence said:

After praising Mr. Cameron's principles and character, Mr. Harradence said he was reminded of the story about the half-reformed pickpocket who saw an exposed purse on the bus. The pickpocket quickly changed his seat so he would not be tempted. That, said the speaker, showed strength of character but would not greater strength have been shown if the pickpocket had stayed where he was.

I would like now to go backstage in Ottawa to Maclean's of October 24, 1959. and this is by Blair Fraser. I will quote part of his item. Part of it deals with the \$50,000 pledged if Mr. Thatcher became the leader. In part he says:

This was the kind of thing that led Alex Cameron, the MLA from Maple Creek who was Thatcher's chief opponent, to say in his nomination speech, "When they say to hell with Liberalism, let's go out and beat the CCF, I say look at the plight of our country today led by men who tried to assume power without principle. As for me I would rather go down to defeat with honor than win by selling the Liberal party short."

But evidently Mr. Cameron wasn't chosen the leader.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. DEWHURST: — No, Mr. Speaker, they had to go to get — as one of the Members who is sitting opposite in this House these days said to me "Can you tell me why it is any political party should have to have some other political party's renegade cast off as

March 12, 1970

their leader?" And those items tell the story.

I would like to tell the Members opposite that they don't need to worry about the New Democratic party. We have lots of good men and women to choose for leaders and when the time comes we won't have to do like the Provincial Liberals here, or the Federal Liberals, take an ex-CCFer to make into our leader. We will have leaders of our own that will give leadership and guidance. We have done it in the past and we will do it in the future.

I would like to turn now to the topic of agriculture for a few minutes. We heard a lot about agriculture in the Budget Speech. The Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Steuart) was saying how little had been done for crop insurance a few years ago. Well, you know there is only one thing wrong with his statements. He didn't go back far enough. If he had gone back one more year than he did go back he could have shown there was no farmers' insurance whatsoever because the program was just starting. But he started off in the first year before we got the details straightened out with Ottawa and before we got the agreement for re-insurance, and so forth.

I notice in this year's Budget that the vote for crop insurance is down by over \$9,000 so evidently they are going to put this freeze on the farmers' crop insurance because the vote is down by \$9,400 from what it was last year.

We see these great champions of the farmers. What have they done? Soon after they first took office one of the first casualties was the AMA, the Agricultural Machinery Administration branch which was testing farm machinery for the people of this province. Farmers of Manitoba and Alberta were also getting great benefit from it. This was done away with. We were assured that we would continue to get reports from the University. I know not of one person who has received any report from the University to help him on his farm.

Now we have the Barber Report which confirms some of the things which the AMA were proving. They were proving that better parts, better repairs could be made from machinery at lower costs but this Government wouldn't allow the AMA to continue. The Barber Report has exposed that now that the horse is stolen and the AMA has been done away with.

I remember last summer I was looking in the Saskatoon Star Phoenix at about the end of July. They were quoting the first six months' financial statement report of the Massey Ferguson Company. In summary this is what it said.

The sales were down in the first six months of 1969 compared to 1968 by 17 per cent, but after paying all taxes and all expenses the profits this year were up by \$10 million over what they were in the first six months of last year in 1968. There is only one or two ways they can get this extra profit when they sold 17 per cent less machinery. One is by charging the farmer a higher price for the machinery, which they did. The second way they can get it is by cutting down on the commissions and the service they give to the dealers, which they did. So both the dealers or implement agents throughout the province and the farmers were the sufferers of the inflationary tendencies and prices and attitudes of the Massey Ferguson Company.

We heard a lot about the Wheat Board in the previous debates and some of the statements I would like to reply to but can't refer to because they are in a previous debate. I would like to have a few words to say about what has been some of the issues of the Wheat Board. You know the Premier and two of his little men fell for some story about a farmer who was supposed to be able to sell 200 million bushels of wheat to Romania. You know the Premier seemed to swallow it hook, line and sinker. Here apparently appeared to be another opportunity to knife the Wheat Board. Here was another opportunity for him to kick on the door of orderly marketing. So he sends two of his backbenchers, the Member for Watrous (Mr. Schmeiser) and the Member for Yorkton (Mr. Gallagher) on their noble crusade to Winnipeg to inform the Wheat Board of this possible sale. You know, back they came saying that the Wheat Board had given them a cool reception and seemed uninterested. No wonder the Wheat Board was cool. On Friday, February 27th, Mr. MacNamara described the charges (as was reported in The Leader Post) as "totally unfounded." Headlines read "MacNamara raps Thatcher's MLAs." Quoting from that paper Mr. MacNamara said:

The proposal as outlined by the Alberta farmer Ted Puskas would destroy price stability and end cooperation in international grain-trading policies.

Mr. MacNamara went on to say that Romania is an exporter of wheat. It would only be interested in acquiring Canadian wheat at a lower price and then attempting to sell it in competition with Canadian wheat, a proposition to decrease world price levels by approximately 50 cents a bushel. It seems an incredible proposal from responsible officials, yet the Premier accused the Board with complacency. If the Premier could only stay landed in Saskatchewan and try to run the business of the province here instead of kicking on the door of the Wheat Board, farmers would be much better off.

The Canadian Embassy approached the trading agency referred to by Mr. Puskas. The General Manager of that agency denied that Romania had any proposal to purchase or a purchase offer. Later the Vienna Embassy denied interest in Canadian wheat or any proposal to Mr. Puskas. Commissioner Charles Gibbings later explored the sale with negative results and pointed out Mr. Puskas quoted a price which is from 42 to 55 cents a bushel below current prices of Canadian wheat being sold internationally in competition with other suppliers. The Hon. Otto Lang got into the argument. Quoting again from The Leader Post of February 27th, Mr. Lang is quoted as saying:

I am particularly annoyed at the suggestion of Premier Thatcher and his two MLAs that the Board members are sitting in their offices rather than pursuing sales opportunities. This is not correct and is an irresponsible allegation.

Here the Member for Yorkton (Mr. Gallagher) and the Member for Watrous (Mr. Schmeiser) had the audacity and the arrogance to say the Wheat Board was trying to scuttle the plan rather than trying to sell the wheat. The two Members should hang their heads in shame. Apologies are due to the farmers of Western Canada. Here again the Premier and his party in every possible way are ready to attack the Wheat Board and orderly marketing. That is bad enough but at the same time they are running the economy of this province into the ground. It is actions like

March 12, 1970

these that can well destroy the orderly marketing of the wheat on the international market and ring the death knell of the Canadian Wheat Board.

I was very pleased to see that the Member from Humboldt (Mr. Breker) and the Member from Kerrobert-Kindersley (Mr. Howes) in their speeches in this Debate went on record as favoring the Wheat Board and the Wheat Board orderly marketing system. But I would like to know where the rest of them stand; they have never made themselves clear. The Minister of Highways (Mr. Boldt) speaking today denied certain statements attributed to him in a previous debate, but he still didn't say where he stood. He still didn't make himself clear as to where he stands on the Wheat Board. I would like to see the Liberals say where they stand. As I say, I am pleased that the Member for Humboldt and the Member for Kerrobert-Kindersley stood up and said so.

Today we see regulations coming out of the Federal Government for the delivery quotas this fall for wheat and how they will be delivered. If this is not satisfactory to the farmers then we are going to hear the fellows across the way telling us, "Well this is your Wheat Board, these are the orders and regulations of the Wheat Board." The rules and regulations for the Wheat Board are laid down not by the Wheat Board but by the Federal Government. And I think that for each and everyone of us in this legislature it is our duty to point out to the farmers of this province and to other people that the rules and regulations the Wheat Board has to function under are not of its own making, it is rules and regulations laid down for it by the Government at Ottawa. And I agree that all the rules and regulations aren't right, but let's attack the source of the trouble, not attack the Wheat Board when it doesn't make the regulations. For the Premier to have sent the Members from Watrous (Mr. Schmeiser) and Yorkton (Mr. Gallagher) to investigate the sale policies of the Wheat Board, is just about as sensible as the Minister of Public Health (Mr. Grant) sending the Member for Souris-Estevan (Mr. MacDougall) and the Member for Nipawin (Mr. Radloff) into the University Hospital at Saskatoon to investigate the maternity ward.

MR. E. KRAMER: (The Battlefords) — They would have never got out of the psychiatric ward.

MR. DEWHURST: — If we are going to have these different things investigated you have to have people who know something about them and these Members didn't. No, Mr. Speaker, for all that schmozzle and bad publicity for the Member for Yorkton and for the Member for Watrous, the responsibility lies with the Premier, because those two fellows wouldn't have gone without the blessing and the knowledge and the consent of our Premier. He is kicking on the door of orderly marketing at every opportunity, but what will happen this fall? Will he kick on the door of the Wheat Board or will he put the blame where it really belongs? Mr. Speaker, when we see things turn out like this, the way that the Premier is using his backbenchers, there is no wonder when we hear rumors that some of the Members are considering leaving his party. I don't wonder that some of them would leave his party because they cannot tolerate that kind of activity.

This Government here, the Government that we have here today, is destroying local government and local initiative. It

has this zest for power, it wants all power, it wants to centralize all power. A few years ago local municipalities, cities and others were involved in the administration of social welfare. That has been done away with. They have no say in it whatsoever, but they do pay part of the cost, a small percentage it is true.

In the schools we see the same steps taking place. We saw the compulsory area-bargaining, I am not going to say whether the area-bargaining was better than before, or worse, time will tell. But for there to be compulsory area-bargaining when some areas had volunteered to do it on a voluntary basis shows that the power has been taken away from them and centralized here in the Minister (Mr. McIsaac) because there is compulsory area-bargaining. We see the budget review now and some school boards tell me that they will have to come in four and five times or will have to before they have completed getting their budgets reviewed. More centralization of power, more authority to Caesar of Wascana.

Then we see the Local Government Board. The local board of a school district wants to build a school, it happened right in the town of Wynyard, they wanted to build a school three or four years ago. They were told they couldn't do it because they couldn't get debentures on the school at that time. Now that school is being built, but in the meantime the cost of construction has gone up, the cost of material and everything else has gone up. The Wynyard district has had to manage with little cottage schools pulled-in buildings of one type and another to continue to educate the children. They have been denied the use of this new school for the last three or four years which they should have had at an extra expense of operating the old school. Now they are going to have to pay a higher price for the school that is being built than they would have had to, had they built it three or four years ago. The policies which are being pursued today make trustees puppets, due to the actions of this Government. What power is left to the school trustees? The area-bargaining sets the salaries. All that they can do is requisition the municipal councils, urban or rural, for the mill rate they need. So others than themselves set the salaries, someone else has to levy and collect the taxes, so the school boards are just becoming puppets, just do what they are told, and their powers are being eroded and taken away from them.

Now another arrogant thing that we saw has been the closing indiscriminately this past year of some of our small hospitals, Quill Lake and Leroy are two examples. Those hospitals were functional to a limited extent, to a limited capacity but they were both closed down. The Government didn't use The Hospital Standards Act to close them down. What it did was just withdraw the money from them under the payments to the hospitals and closed those hospitals down. Those people there are living, roughly 100 miles east of Saskatoon. Naturally a lot of those people then would have to turn to Saskatoon for hospital purposes. So what happened? When they want to go to the city of Saskatoon my colleague from Riversdale (Mr. Romanow) has already outlined what happened in the Saskatoon hospitals. They weren't allowed to get the money to make up their deficits and therefore they had to close beds. So these people are being denied service at home, they are being denied service when they go away. The Member from Saskatoon City Park-University (Mr. Charlebois) sits there and laughs about it and thinks it's a joke. The people will show him who's the joke when the next election rolls around.

March 12, 1970

It's an arrogant Government.

Another thing to show their arrogance, this Legislature one year ago adopted an ensign for a Saskatchewan flag. It passed this Assembly I think without any dissenting vote, but when the flag came out we saw that the designs are located in a different position on the flag. Did they come back to the Assembly and say we should change it and give reasons? No, they just changed the lily and the ensign in a different position on the flag. If that isn't arrogance then what is it? It's a government who thinks it can take all power unto itself.

Now I took out of today's paper, to show what the Government is doing here in this province, a clipping which says: "Southey Company to reopen the doors". This clipping in yesterday's and today's Leader Post points out that:

The Anderson Construction Company will now have new management and a major loan from Saskatchewan Economic Development Corporation, Premier Thatcher, Minister in Charge of Industry, announced Wednesday. He would not say how big the loan is. Premier Thatcher said that the plant has a patent that the Americans felt was valuable.

It is very interesting to note that the plant had a patent that the Americans felt was very valuable for most of the shareholders now of the new company are North Dakotans.

But under the circumstances we have agreed to run the plant here. The revitalized plant manufactures some items in farm equipment in addition to its old stock. It is going to be sold in the Northwestern States of the United States and across the prairie Provinces.

Well why didn't this Government, if the Anderson Manufacturing Plant in Southey was in trouble, why didn't it take the same amount of money out of SEDCO and give this company a loan to help it out. If it was managerial trouble, surely there were people in this province that could have given them technical advice to overcome their difficulty. I wouldn't have objected if the Government had said, "We'll give you a loan but we want some right to talk about management in there, if their management was bad." It doesn't say here it was, it just says that they have got the loan to start a company here which is going to be pretty well wholly owned by the Americans — selling out the patent, selling out other rights. This is the type of government we have; then we talk about Saskatchewan's economy.

I would like to turn now to another topic which I know we will hear more about today. The Government Members like to comment on the seat arrangements that was made on this side of the House. That's their right, it's their prerogative, if they can get fun out of it. If benches are arranged according to seniority, the number of years in the House on the one hand, or the seniority in the Cabinet, as to the first in the Cabinet getting the front benches, I wonder how the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Guy) got a front bench. But I want to assure the Members opposite that Members on this side of the House that have got a front bench didn't get it by marrying their Leader's secretary.

HON. A.R. GUY: (Minister of Public Works) — Pretty cheap.

MR. DEWHURST: — It hurts, don't it, Allan, it hurts. We'll see how cheap the speech is when you get up.

On the Highways Department this year, we have heard the Minister today bring down his budget or his highway proposal. It is up by several million dollars over last year. I hope that the Minister of Highways (Mr. Boldt) sees fit this coming year to keep the weeds mowed off the side of the road which he didn't do last year on his highway program. The weeds on a lot of the highways were not mown last year and they became a menace for winter travel on the roads because they hold the snow. Furthermore, those weeds go to seed, the seed falls in the ditch and in the spring the water runs down the ditch and washes the seeds on to the farmers' land, so these weeds should be cut on the highways. I hope that the Minister of Highways will see that a better job of maintenance, maintaining the ditches, is done this year.

The property tax in this province has continued to rise in spite of all the glowing reports we have heard about tax reductions from the Government and the Members opposite. I have here the table compiled from the questions from the Legislature, showing the increase in property taxes in this province in the past five years, from 1963 to 1968. For the rural municipalities, for local purposes, that is for the municipalities' own purposes, the amount of taxes levied in 1968 is over \$6 million more than they were in 1963. In the rural areas for school purposes the school tax in total is \$9.8 million more in 1968 than it was in 1963. And for urbans it is even more than that. The local tax has been increased in round figures by \$13 million from 1963 to 1968, and for school purposes by \$18 million. The grand total of the increase on property tax for this province from 1963 to 1968 is \$46.8 million. An increase of over 54 per cent. If we take the increase from 1963 to 1968 for local purposes the tax has increased by 49 per cent, for school purposes over 59 per cent. Yet 1969 saw still further increases so, if statistics were available today, our increase would be much more than what I am quoting here this afternoon.

I was glad to see that the Government responded to one Resolution which the Opposition has placed on the Order Paper in this Legislature, and I give them credit for acting on this Resolution in a reasonably quick fashion. On February 18th, 1970, Mr. Berezowsky moved the following Resolution:

That this Legislature censure the Government of Saskatchewan for its continued imposition of the two cent tax on farm fuels and strongly recommend that the government immediately remove the tax so that farmers of Saskatchewan may get some economic relief.

So I am glad to see that the Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Steuart) has seen fit to adopt the proposition made by the Member for Prince Albert East-Cumberland and that this Resolution will not be debated now when it comes on the Order Paper. But the Government did see at last the errors of its ways and remove the two cent tax that should never have been there in the first place, because it was an unfair, unjust tax in the first place and should never have been levied. This was a .wrong tax in the wrong place at the wrong time. This Government for the past five or six years has been spending money like drunken sailors and I would like to turn to a few of the statistics from

March 12, 1970

the Budget. I am not going to quote all the figures but I would just like to show that from the first budget that this Government brought in, and including the budget which is ending on the 31st of March this year, the amount of money voted for the Government, plus the amount of grants which came from the Federal Government and other income it has, it has had over \$2 billion in the past five years. On top of that there was a 1964-65 budget which was left to them by the CCF Government. The present Budget shows \$405 million but when you go through that Budget and you look at over-income which isn't included in the vote, money from Ottawa such as for Public Health, for Welfare, etc., etc., — and I have a list of them here which I won't read to the House — it brings the total to over another \$104 million. So in reality this year without considering the money that comes in from Power Corporation, Telephones, to help pay the interest on those debts, the money that is going to be used for Departments, money coming from Ottawa, without the \$72 per family, MCIC, the medicare tax, without including those monies, it will be spending over one-half billion dollars this coming year. So I say that they are spending money like drunken sailors. The people of this province cannot see where they are getting value for their money.

I would like to talk for a moment or two about the inflation of our society before I conclude my remarks. I would like to quote from an editorial in the Toronto Daily Star of Saturday, January 21st, 1970, and I would just like to quote in part the editorial commenting on the policies that are being pursued by the Federal Government to try and curb inflation. It says:

The real indictment of the Government's brand of courage is that it is futile. With much patriotic shouting the Canadian people are being led in a charge up the wrong hill against the wrong enemy. And they are being exhorted all the while to ignore the casualties. It was the kind of courage that persuaded the Polish army in 1939 to send horsemen against German tanks.

Further on it says:

The fact is that we have very little to say about inflation in our own country. Its level is determined almost entirely by price performances in the United States and transmitted to Canada through imports.

And then further on it says:

We must start by accepting that we can't beat someone else's inflation.

Referring to the American inflation.

And that beating inflation is, therefore, not our national task. Rather it is to maintain our social goals in spite of inflation and to prevent rising prices from destroying human lives willy-nilly like some medieval plague. For Ottawa it would mean a complete reversal of most current policies. Instead of withdrawing from our national life like a spider in a rainstorm the central government should be extending itself vigorously. Instead of pleading austerity at every turn it should be using its resources more generously than ever to ease the load of rising prices on many Canadians who find they can't compete —

people on the fixed incomes, the unemployed, the poor, residents of the depressed regions. These people need help, and they can only be helped by a central government that senses the urgency of the times and sees the human suffering that lies behind the charts and graphs. To start spending money is hardly the conventional way to react in the line of rising prices, but Ottawa has to concede that the conventional reaction hasn't helped either and Canadians are being hurt in the bargain. If we must make mistakes in fiscal policies — and it seems nations are condemned to that — let's at least make sure that we are really on the side of people.

So the Toronto Daily Star is saying that, if we are going to fight inflation, let us not try to fight inflation by creating more unemployment, by putting more suffering on the old and the sick and the unemployed in the have-not regions of our country. We should be doing it in a proper, sane manner

The Conference that they had at Ottawa of business communities to try and hold the price line hasn't amounted to very much, Mr. Speaker. We have already seen the railroad, other places, announcing increase in prices. I think David Lewis summed it up when he charged that the agreement arrived at by the Conference indicates that the business community has absolutely no intention of sacrificing its present unnecessarily high profits. It has merely agreed to keep what it's got and slow down on asking for more money. We haven't been able to prove, Mr. Speaker, that they are even slowing down, Mr. Speaker, because they are continually asking for more money for the profits of these corporations. I agree that if we are going to curb inflation certain things should be done. I think one of the things that should be done should be done by the Bank of Canada with the Federal Government taking the initiative. The Bank of Canada creates our money, loans it to our chartered banks at a reasonable rate of interest. When the chartered banks get that money they can, in turn, loan it out to customers. And for every dollar that they have, they can loan out many times the amount of money they have on reserve. The amount of money they have doesn't limit the amount of money they loan out. I believe the Government of Canada should get money from the Bank of Canada at cost price, and they should make it available to provincial Governments and to local governments at cost — I don't know what that cost would run, it would maybe be one to two per cent — when they are building projects for society such as sewers and schools in the local areas, highways or provincial buildings on the provincial scene, or greater buildings on the Federal field. Why should society have to pay a toll to the banks and the money lenders of our nation? Why should we have to pay penance to people in Wall Street, or people in New York or Chicago when we have the power here to do it for ourselves. During the war we financed the war effort without borrowing money outside of Canada. If we could do it in times of distress, if we have the courage we can do it in times of peace. But we haven't got a government at Ottawa with the courage to do it. The Bank of Canada being a nationally owned bank should be used for the nation and not the nation used by policies at Ottawa for the privileged few, whether they be on Wall Street, Bay Street or St. James Street.

MR. I.H. MacDOUGALL: (Souris-Estevan) — Who wrote that for you?

MR. DEWHURST: — If you can read my notes

March 12, 1970

you're a better man than most people. You come and look at my notes — Bank of Canada — here come and have a look at it.

MR. GUY: — Table them.

MR. DEWHURST: — I'll table them if you want them. You can't read my notes, you can't read period. I wonder if you will use as few notes as I do when you get up, Mr. Minister.

I believe that Canada should be organized and a government should be organized to serve people, rather than policies where they are trying to organize people to serve a privileged few who are given special privileges by the Government of Canada. And the Government at Ottawa and the Government we have in Regina are trying to organize people to serve a privileged few, a special group. I cannot support the motion but I will support the amendment.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

HON. A.R. GUY: (Minister of Public Works) — Mr. Speaker, I would first of all like in my Budget Speech today to deal with three main areas. At least I intended to deal with three main areas: first of all a brief review of the work of the Saskatchewan Water Resources Commission during the past year; a review of the Department of Public Works; and finally a reply to some of the irresponsible statements that have been made by Members opposite. But I am very pleased that, since the matter has been raised by Members opposite, I can say also a few words on another matter, and that is the leadership question of the two main parties of Saskatchewan.

I would like to remind the Member from Wadena (Mr. Dewhurst) that perhaps I will not use as few notes, but let's hope I can say a lot more than he did in the time that he spoke. You know, he said he wanted to talk about leadership. If there is any party in this province today that has problems of leadership you only have to look across the way.

MR. DEWHURST: — We're doing it.

MR. GUY: — Yes, I know you are looking at the leadership. I hear that you are looking very closely. I am very proud to be looking at our Leader that came into the Legislature in 1960 with an increased number of seats. Then he won five or six by-elections and then he won the Government in 1964. he increased that majority in 1967. now what have you had to offer during that period of time? You have a man that took over a party at the height of their success and what did he do, he led you to immediate defeat. He led you to a greater defeat in 1967 and when the time comes, which will not be too long from now, you will have the biggest disaster that ever hit the NDP in this province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. GUY: — We are glad that we have the Premier with a record of province. You asked a few minutes ago where I stood — I think it was the Member for Saskatoon Riversdale (Mr. Romanow . . .

MR. ROMANOW: — Hear, hear!

MR. GUY: — Yes, you did, you whispered it across. You didn't stand up and say it, you whispered it across. You said, "Where do you stand on the leadership question?" Well I want to tell you that the 35 MLAs on this side stand foursquare behind their leader.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. GUY: — And that is far more than you fellows can say on your side of the House. The best report that we've had is that there are eight over there that will support their leader when the crisis comes. The rest of you are waffling. You don't know whether to support the boys that have made the big jump forward or to support the boys that have made the big jump backwards.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. GUY: — Or maybe you are going to go with the boys that didn't get anywhere at all. We are proud of our leadership in the Liberal party. Where can you get a record of success like we've had and where can you get a record of failure like you've had? Then the Member for Wadena got onto the Federal leadership campaign and said, "Oh, we've got lots of leaders." That's not what the Financial Post said today. It said, "Lewis was likely to emerge as the inevitable leader of the NDP." It says the NDP faces an exceptionally difficult year with its leadership succession. I think we all agree with that.

According to the Gallup Poll, NDP popularity has lately undergone exceptionally wide swings. Having received 16 per cent of the popular vote in the Trudeau election, the party's standing dropped down to a low of 14 per cent in November, 1968. Then it rebounded to 24 per cent and now it is back to 19 per cent. It said Provincial politics played some part in the swing. The NDP received a great short shot in the arm from Edward Schreyer's victory in the Manitoba election, but the euphoria was short-lived when high hopes for a repeat in the British Columbia election turned to ashes. Indeed the politically wily Premier Bennett, whose Social Credit Government owes its existence to anti-Socialist sentiment, is credited with a master-stroke in calling the election while memory of the NDP victory in Manitoba was still fresh in British Columbia's mind. In other words what he is trying to say is even the people of Manitoba realized they made a mistake.

Well, I only want to spend just one second more here on this Financial Post statement of today. It says:

The Federal Party's National President Allan Emery Blakeney, 44, Saskatchewan MLA, former NDP Minister of Education . . .

They could have gone on and elaborated and said that he was with the Government from the time he came from Nova Scotia when he was fresh out of law school.

. . . gained wide acclaim of his handling of last October's Winnipeg Convention. He is however, a work-horse like

March 12, 1970

Stanley Knowles and does not set the prairie afire.

Well if anyone listened to his speech the other day in this House they will recognize that this statement in the Financial Post is certainly true. He doesn't set anybody afire.

Also, the Member that took his seat was quite concerned about Cass-Beggs in Manitoba and he said: "Nobody knows what Cass-Beggs is getting in Manitoba." I agree with him — nobody does know. But I'll tell you that every person in Manitoba knows what they are getting with Cass-Beggs. They are getting a 14 per cent increase in their power rates. Yes, the same as the people in Saskatchewan got with Cass-Beggs — that got shafted. I could make it stronger except I'm in the Legislature and I try to maintain some decorum in this particular place.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. GUY: — You know, Mr. Speaker, I could hardly believe that there was one man in this Legislature that would get up and oppose the Canada Games coming to Saskatchewan. Every Member on that side has spoken, I think, with the exception of one or two and who had to get up and make the big opposition to the Canada Games coming to Saskatchewan? The Member for Wadena (Mr. Dewhurst) and that should be put into the CCF Commonwealth. Let it go right across . . .

MR. DEWHURST: — Mr. Speaker,

MR. GUY: — Sit down, sit down you made your speech. Sit down.

MR. DEWHURST: — Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege. I never mentioned the Canada Games. I mentioned the society was paying for building the ski slide. I never mentioned the Canada Games. I asked for more money spent on sports for young people.

MR. GUY: — He never mentioned the Winter Games. He talked about the mountain. In his ignorance he doesn't even know that the mountain is part of the Winter Games. Never in this Legislature during this Session has one Member had the temerity to oppose these games. Regina, Saskatoon and Prince Albert — every place in this province wanted these Winter Games. The Wadena Member gets up and says, "I am opposed to those games, they will cost too much money. We don't want these athletes to have the opportunities to participate."

MR. DEWHURST: — That is a lie!

MR. GUY: — That is not a lie. You got up on the floor of this House and the record will show it. You are a disgrace not only to this House but to your party and to this Legislature, opposing something which the whole province has gone out and worked hard for and tried to get for its people. We on this side of the House are proud of our mountain builder. He substituted as Whip for the last two or three days and he did a pretty good job of that too. No, Sir, we are looking forward with great anticipation to Home Coming '71 which will be started off with the Winter Games and our province and our cities, Regina and Saskatoon are both to be congratulated for the fine efforts that they

made in getting the games into this province. I am sure that all the citizens of this province with the exception of one will be very pleased to participate actively in the games when they occur next year. Now he got around to seating arrangements and he wondered how I got my seat in front here. Well, I am very proud to be here in front. All I can say is that probably after the speech that he made the other day he will be the next one in the leap backwards. He also made reference to my marriage which I am very happy and very pleased with. You know what could have happened? I could have married his former leader's daughter, Shirley Douglas, and be holding sex and pot parties down in California today.

MR. W.E. SMISHEK: (Regina North East) — You are getting in the gutter where you normally are.

MR. SPEAKER: — Order, order! It is time we got the House back into order and let's have no more talk of liars and gutters.

MR. GUY: — I have always been able to hold my own in this Legislature and I am prepared to answer anything from the other side of the House. All I ask is that we all be treated equally. If they want to make comments about me that's fine, but just don't forget that I am quite capable and prepared to make replies to any comments that come from that side of this House.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. GUY: — Now I would like to get down to the work of the Saskatchewan Water Resources Commission over the past year. We had a good year in 1969. I think one of the most forward steps in the field of inter-governmental cooperation occurred last November, with the signing of the agreements apportioning inter-provincial waters in the Prairie Provinces. Our Government had been instrumental in getting talks started and in keeping them on track until a successful conclusion was achieved. For years the question of jurisdiction and ownership of our common waters has been unclear. Each government was faced with great uncertainty as to what its share was of the natural flows in our common rivers. This uncertainty was a great handicap to rational provincial planning and development of these water resources to meet our future needs. Thus, the signing of these agreements between Alberta, Saskatchewan and Manitoba should remove the last major constraint in the way of integrated planning and development of the water resources of the prairie Provinces. No longer need we fear that early development of projects upstream will deny us of our rightful share of our common waters. It will allow the Prairie Governments and Canada to work together on projects of mutual benefit with the costs allocated in accordance with the benefits received by each jurisdiction.

Good progress was also made on the Saskatchewan Nelson-Basin Study during the past year. This joint study by Canada and the Prairie Provinces is examining the feasibility and costs of storage and diversion works required to provide various levels of supply at a number of key points in the large river basin. Projects both in the Basin and involving diversion from continuous river basins are being examined. When complete, the government will have a much clearer picture of the kinds and relative costs of projects we will need to meet our future water demands.

March 12, 1970

We have tried to keep this study on a course that will make the most practical and possible applications of its findings.

Perhaps one of the most important pieces of legislation to hit the Federal Parliament during the past year was The Canada Water Bill, which is presently before that body. The Bill is designed to provide the national legislative framework for a joint Federal-Provincial approach to Canadian water management problems. A great deal of discussion was held between the Provinces and the Federal Government prior to the drafting of this Bill and since its introduction into Parliament many further consultations have been held. Since the Bill outlines an approach to water management very similar to that followed in Saskatchewan, we have endorsed the broad objectives of this new legislation. We believe that our growing water needs can best be provided for through cooperative Federal-Provincial programs, programs that recognize the important role that each level of government must play, and that recognize the desire of all Canadians that this vital resource will be properly protected and developed for beneficial use.

Our main concern with the legislation — and we have made this point known to Ottawa — is that the Bill appears to place too much emphasis on water-quality management, while Saskatchewan's major problem is still water supply and distribution. We recognize that water pollution is a serious national problem, but we believe it must be attacked as part of the larger general water-management problem and not at the expense of the tried and tested PFRA and ARDA water-development programs. We fear that the bulk of the funds made available under this Act will be spent in Eastern Canada, where the pollution problem is the greatest, leaving less than a fair share for problems of water supply and distribution in Saskatchewan and the prairie Provinces. We have urged the Government to ear-mark funds separately for water-quality control and water-quantity projects, so that provinces which have done a creditable job of controlling pollution will receive a fair share of the total funds available to meet water supply and distribution problems.

We have shown our concern also with the wide variety of proposed new agencies permitted in the proposed Act for water pollution control. Saskatchewan municipalities, for the most part, have done a good job of providing for sewage treatment. We have nothing to gain from adding new agencies. Therefore, we have recommended to the Federal Government alternatives to encourage more rapid action on pollution problems, including additional financial assistance to municipalities, beyond that provided in existing programs, to assist them to provide higher levels of effluent treatment, and loans to established industries to enable them to construct needed treatment-works.

In the area of common water-quality standards, we support the idea of using common criteria on a national basis to assess the degree of pollution in our water supplied, but we are hesitant to accept the concept of national minimum standards because such standards often come to be considered as a maximum requirement. We believe that common standards on a regional or river-basin basis are more practical and will produce better results. In Saskatchewan we anticipate no problem in communicating and cooperating with Ottawa, since our Water Resources Commission is geared to the approach that Ottawa appears to be taking. We do believe that pollution is a sufficient problem in Canada, that if the Provinces are unwilling or unable to take the necessary steps to combat pollution, the Federal Government must have the

power to act on inter-provincial streams. Many of the criticisms in Parliament have been that the proposed Act does not go far enough, but I suggest that it is a forward step and one that has to be taken slowly, due to the constitutional and jurisdictional implications that are involved. I believe Ottawa is sincere and determined in this regard and should be given the opportunity to demonstrate it. No doubt the Act will have some weak areas, but they will not become known until the Act has been in effect for a while.

Over the past two years, the Saskatchewan Water Resources commission have been undertaking some components of a comprehensive study of the Qu'Appelle River Basin. We are pleased to announce that an agreement in principal has now been reached with the Governments of Canada and Manitoba to complete the study jointly by March 31, 1972. The objective of the study is to provide a comprehensive framework plan for the future development of the water resources available to this important river basin. On completion of the study it is our intention to negotiate an implementation agreement with those other governments as provided under the new Canada Water Act.

We are fortunate in Saskatchewan, that compared to Eastern Canada, we do not have a serious overall water pollution problem. We have local problems, but our relatively sparse population and the efforts of urban municipalities and industry in providing treatment facilities, have kept our problem within manageable limits. However, there are isolated problems that need immediate attention, and for this reason the budget of the Pollution Control Branch of the Saskatchewan Water Resources Commission has been substantially increased this year. We will be providing more technical staff to conduct regulatory and pollution investigation programs; additional staff and facilities are provided for in the Provincial Laboratory for the sole purpose of analysis of water and effluent samples. And finally, the Qu'Appelle Basin Study Board will devote almost one-third of its budget towards developing plans to resolve the vexing problems of water quality in this important river basin. We were pleased that our share of CMHC assistance was increased to \$5 million for the coming fiscal year. As a result some 35 municipal governments could benefit from this program. I might mention that the Member for Saskatoon-Riversdale (Mr. Romanow) was concerned that Saskatoon had not received a full commitment of the tender which it was prepared to award, but I think I can tell him here today that we have through this year's Budget provided him with \$2.4 million and that we have also given Saskatoon the commitment for another \$.5 million out of the 1970-71 program, regardless of what we get from CMHC.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. GUY: — We have local problems that we recognize and for that reason as I said, we are prepared to increase our funds for the Pollution Control Branch. Our Provincial program introduced during last year's session providing to cities a grant of 10 per cent to a maximum of \$500,000 has been eagerly accepted by the cities. Again the other day, the Member for Riversdale suggested that it is a good start, particularly when you consider that cities like Regina, North Battleford, Yorkton, Weyburn, Swift Current did provide their primary treatment without any assistance from the Provincial Government under the former government. Therefore today, I think, this 10 per cent to a maximum of

March 12, 1970

\$500,000 will be welcomed by Saskatoon and Prince Albert.

During the past year the officials of the Saskatchewan Water Resources Commission have been called on more than ever to speak to groups that have been organized to study the problems of pollution. I have encouraged this, as this is an important aspect of educating the public to the problems of pollution and one that will be continually emphasized over the coming years.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I would like to turn to the Department of Public Works for a few minutes. Last year was a satisfactory year for the Department of Public Works with most projects completed on schedule. Since many of the major projects for the coming year have already been announced in either the Throne Speech or the Budget, I will not take the time of the House by going into the details of the smaller projects, but I would like to table them and I believe they will also appear in the Press.

I do, however, wish to deal with some of the comments that have been made by the Opposition financial critic and others from that side of the House. As I said earlier, many of these statements are completely irresponsible, with no foundation in fact whatsoever. We do not deny that the construction industry and related professions have had a difficult year. High interest rates and the shortage of money have affected all Federal, Provincial and private industry construction programs. It is also true that many construction companies, architect and engineering firms in Saskatchewan have had to layoff personnel during the past two or three years. This is not entirely due to a recession in our economy. You will recall, Mr. Speaker, that from 1964 to 1967, our construction industry was inflated out of all proportion by the Federal and Provincial Centennial and Jubilee projects. Because funds for these projects were available for only a limited time, architectural and engineering firms and construction companies had to take on a large number of additional personnel to handle this great influx of work. After 1967, regardless of what the Provincial economy did, these firms could not sustain such large staffs and had to lay off a large number of their personnel. Our economy in any normal year to date could not sustain the competence which these companies and firms had built up during the period of Centennial and Jubilee construction. Unfortunately there was a slow-down in our economy at the same time due to the wheat crises, so that lay-offs have occurred in larger numbers than would have ordinarily have happened and certainly that are desirable. I submit, however, Mr. Speaker, that the Provincial Government did take recognition of this fact that there would be a slow-down once the Centennial projects were completed and a look at the Department of Public Work's budgets will clearly show it. From 1965 to 1967, while the Centennial projects were underway we reduced our capital expenditure, but from 1967 to 1970 we increased our expenditures from \$3.5 million in 1965-66, to \$6 million in 1966-67; to \$8.2 million in 1967-68; to \$10 million in 1968-69; and to \$9.5 million last year. So your Government was aware of the slow-down that would occur in the construction and related industries as a result of the end of the booming Centennial construction period, and the necessary planning was started to alleviate the situation.

The financial critic said that during a time of unemployment, there should be increased capital expenditures, and no one will deny that this is probably a good procedure to follow. Then he referred to the fact that the Public Work's budget is down from

\$9.4 to \$8.4 million this year. Mr. Speaker, one must look at more than the absolute dollar figure to determine whether the construction industry will receive more or less help than last year. The two important factors are how much new work will be created with this money and how much of the appropriation is actually spent. For instance, last year, out of the \$9.5 million budget, \$4.4 million was committed to two projects — the Saskatchewan Centre of the Arts, and the Institute of the Applied Arts and Science Building in Saskatoon — both of which were continuing projects of several years duration, where all architectural and engineering had been completed and construction contracts let. Therefore, in 1969-70, there was really only \$5.1 million available for new projects which would provide work for architects, engineers and contractors. This year, however, with the completion of these two major projects, out of the \$8.4 million total budget there will be \$7.6 million available for new construction projects — an increase of nearly \$2.5 million over last year.

In 1969-70, 67 projects were completed, while this year we will have 92 projects underway. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I submit there will be a significant increase in the employment opportunities and the work available to architects, engineers and contractors in the coming fiscal year as a result of this Government's policies, and we are not cutting back as the financial critic (Mr. Blakeney) is trying to suggest.

But what is even more important, I suggest, is not what is appropriated, but how much is actually spent. The financial critic tried to leave the impression that the present Government does not spend a very high proportion of what is appropriated each year by the Legislature — and I see some of the fellows shaking their heads over there, agreeing with this statement by the financial critic — but again the financial critic is completely unaware of the facts. I would have thought, in view of the Government's record when they were the government, that he would have shied clear of this topic. However, since he raised the question and left a false impression, let us look at the record. While comparing these figures I wish to do so in the context of yet another statement the financial critic made the other day and one with which I agree, namely that, when periods of high unemployment exist, capital construction should be increased. Let us look at the record, Mr. Speaker.

In the 1960-61 fiscal year, as unemployment under the CCF Government began to rise significantly, it appropriated \$5.3 million for Public Works. I . . .

AN HON. MEMBER: — Hear, hear!

MR. GUY: — Who said they spent it? Would the Member stand up please. I would like to see him. Where is he? The Member for Redberry (Mr. Michayluk) said they spent it. Well, let's see whether they spent it or not. This was an election year too, I want to remind you, and their planning always followed the pattern — up for the election, down three years; up for the election, down three years; up for the election, down three years. You go back to 1944, this record was carried through regardless whether it was Public Works, medical care premiums or anything you want to mention. It was there. So after the election in June of that year, they were re-elected and they didn't spend their money — I hope the Member for Redberry is listening. Of

March 12, 1970

the \$5.3 million appropriated, only \$3.8 million was spent — 71.7 per cent. And remember, Mr. Speaker, unemployment was on the rise. But now that is only the start of this marvellous record of our friends opposite. The master planners really outdid themselves the next year. In 1961-62 when unemployment under the NDP had risen to 7.1 per cent, they had a dynamic public works program. Would you believe, Mr. Speaker, that they appropriated the magnificent sum of \$2.4 million. \$2.4 million — down from the \$5.3 the year before. I want to remind this House that today's Opposition financial critic was the Provincial Treasurer that year.

AN HON. MEMBER: — Hear, hear!

MR. GUY: — Now, does the Member for Redberry (Mr. Michayluk) think that they spent this magnificent fund of \$2.4 million? Does he think that? Well, I want to just put it on the records. Do you know how much they spent during that year? \$2.4 million appropriated when unemployment was at a high of 7.1 per cent. Would you believe that they spent \$1.2 million? 51 per cent. Just half of their appropriation. CCF times in 1962 were hard times. In comparison, Mr. Speaker, this year out of the \$9.4 million appropriation we will spend \$8.9 million or 93.6 per cent. Liberal times are honest times.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. GUY: — Four times more money available and seven times more honesty in carrying out the work. The next year when unemployment had increased to 7.3 per cent, the highest in the province's history, and no wonder it did after the previous year when they cut their budget to \$2.4 million and then only spent half of it. I must admit that they did increase their budget. They wanted to put on a good show the next year so the gross appropriation was \$9.6. But did they spend all this \$9.6 million? Will the Member for Redberry say they spent this money? Would you believe, Mr. Speaker, they only spent \$7.3 million or 77 per cent at a time when unemployment was at its highest level in the province. And the financial critic says we should increase the Public Works' spending when unemployment is on the increase. That's the record of the financial critic when he was Provincial Treasurer. CCF times were hard times in 1962-63 also and they continued to be hard times until they were kicked out of office in 1964. The electorate had had enough of the misrepresentation and mismanagement. They were good at promises but awful poor in action. During the past three years since a slow-down in the construction industry in this province our record of expenditures has been almost perfect. In 1967-68, of \$8.2 million appropriated, we spent 90.6 per cent. In 1968-69, of \$10 million appropriated, we spent 96.2 per cent; and of the \$9.5 million in the current fiscal year, we will spend 93.6 per cent. Certainly a record far ahead of when they were the Government of the day, both in the total dollars appropriated and the percentage of money spent.

I want to also say a few words about Northern school construction. The financial critic was critical of the amount of money that was being spent in the north half of the province for improved educational facilities. And I am not surprised when one looks at his record when he was Provincial Treasurer. In 1961-62 at a time that enrolments were increasing rapidly,

he spent the magnificent sum of \$151,000. The next year old Santa Claus spent \$177,000. These small budgets continued until their last year in office when the people in the North along with the people of the South decided they had enough of the CCF. That year they budgeted \$ 212,000. Mr. Speaker, CCF times were hard times for the pupils of Northern Saskatchewan. What has our record been?

In our first year we spent \$237,000 and then after first-hand observation we realized the deplorable conditions that continued to exist as a result of the miserly attitude of the CCF and the tremendous need for new facilities and accommodation in our North. The next year we increased our budget to \$768,000. The following year we spent \$762,000. Last year, we asked for \$725,000. In 1969-70, \$738,000 and this year we are having the largest construction program in the history of the Province for northern schools in Northern Saskatchewan — a tremendous \$1 million program.

In spite of the severe criticism of Members opposite, our Government makes no apology for the money we are spending on education for our Indian, Métis, and white students in Northern Saskatchewan. The schools provided by the party opposite when they were the Government were a disgrace. They could no longer be tolerated. Since we have become the Government we have built a new school and replaced many of the old ones in every Northern community. Shops and home economic labs and auditorium gymnasiums are being provided. And we have provided sewer and water facilities in nearly all of them. We are proud of this record. We have said before and I wish to say it again today for the record of this House that our Liberal Government believes that students in Northern Saskatchewan are entitled to facilities equal to any found in Southern Saskatchewan, and until this is achieved we will not stop spending money for educational facilities in the North. Liberal times are good times for the students and teachers in Northern Saskatchewan.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. GUY: — The financial critic (Mr. Blakeney) and the Member for Weyburn (Mr. Pepper) accused us of spending far more money in Northern Saskatchewan than in the southern half of the province. Again there is absolutely no truth in their accusations and I have the figures here to prove it. When one adds up the totals of projects in the Department of Public Works' estimates for 1970-71, we find that the city of Saskatoon and the North will receive \$4.2 million, while the South of the province including the city of Regina will receive \$4.1 million. Thus we have split our money almost equally between North and South, and this was done intentionally, Mr. Speaker, as we want all parts of the province to benefit from our great program. If we go further, we find however that the city of Saskatoon receives \$1.5 million while the city of Regina, \$2.1 million. So again the financial critic was way off base, hardly in keeping with the statements that he made. He cried the blues so hard on behalf of Regina that I thought I had better look and see what treatment they received when he was the Provincial Treasurer. In 1961-62 we find that he put in the estimates for Regina — \$404,000 to complete the Court House; \$200,000 for the Regina jail and that was all. \$604,000 for the city of Regina when unemployment in Regina was well over 7 per cent compared to the \$2.1 million Regina will receive this year. CCF times were hard

March 12, 1970

times for Regina and the construction industry. Did the financial critic see the errors of his ways the following year when unemployment continued to rise? For this year he reduced Regina's share of the Department of Public Works budget to less than \$300,000. Another black year for Regina under the CCF. The workers had tears of thanks in their eyes for their beloved Provincial Treasurer as they walked the streets looking for work.

So much for the Department of Public Works' capital budget and its fair allocation to all Saskatchewan. But, as all Hon. Members know, this is only a small part of your Government's massive injection of capital to assist the economy. When this is considered, Regina comes out in even a better light, and I'm surprised the financial critic didn't have the intestinal fortitude to acknowledge this the other day, because Regina will receive this year — and I am glad that the Mayor (Mr. Baker) is listening — some \$11.7 million of this massive program. And the Member for Weyburn (Mr. Pepper) was crying the other day that Weyburn was forgotten. I am sure his constituents will be glad to know that he calls a \$1.4 million injection into their economy, being forgotten. Perhaps we should do as the Minister of Highways, take this money for areas that would be more appreciative. Before concluding this portion of my remarks, Mr. Speaker, I want to make it categorically clear to the architects, the engineers, the construction companies and the workers in Regina. that will benefit from this injection of money, that they can thank the Hon. Gordon Grant and the Member for Regina South West, Don McPherson.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. GUY: — If the Government had listened to your Mayor and the NDP Members, Regina would have received very little because they didn't need it. On January 31 while we were still determining how we could divide our money up between the various cities and areas, in an honest and forthright manner, we read in The Leader Post: "A record building year forecast."

Mayor Henry Baker Thursday, forecast building permits valued at \$53 million would be issued in Regina in 1970.

He said:

I have every reason to believe this will happen.

He was talking to the Wascana Kiwanis Club when he made this statement. He forecast \$38 million would be spent on institutional and commercial construction and another \$16 million on residential construction. If the Mayor's forecast proves accurate, Regina would have the best construction year in its history in 1970. There is a little bit of discrepancy that we have to take into account here. Last year, Mr. Baker forecast a \$38 million construction year for Regina but actual construction was only \$30 million. But the Mayor told the Kiwanis Club his prediction last year was the first time he had been wrong in 12 years. Well, when we knew that this was going to be the greatest construction year in the history of Regina we knew that the Provincial Government wouldn't have to do very much to contribute to this. But fortunately the architect profession and the engineers and the construction industry soon let us know that what the Mayor said wasn't the truth. It is significant, Mr. Speaker, that none of the other NDP MLAs from Regina denied these good times for their city until only the last few days.

Why didn't the Member for Regina North East (Mr. Smishek) get up and say, "We've got workers in my area of the city that haven't got employment." But he went along with the Mayor's statement that this was going to be the greatest construction year in the history of the city. However, as I've said it wasn't long before the industry and others contacted us and said, "What the Mayor says is not true, he just doesn't know what he is talking about. We do need provincial assistance to our industry." Regina's two Government MLAs were well aware of the need for assistance with the result that we are giving Regina a massive infusion of capital, and by so doing, Mr. Speaker, probably we will keep the Mayor from being too far out on his prediction. But without our help I'm afraid he would have been a further embarrassment to the City Council and the NDP. So I would suggest that Liberal times are good times for the city of Regina. Not only that, if we follow the Mayor's suggestion we will have a hundred-pound bag of flour in every home in the province before the year is over.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the real test of a good budget is the success, or lack of success, that the Opposition has in criticizing it and the reaction to it from those outside the political arena. Using this criterion on the Budget we are now debating, it has been an outstanding success. The Opposition has failed hopelessly to come to grips with it. In fact most Members opposite have ignored it completely in their remarks, they talk about everything but the Budget. The financial critic spent the last 25 minutes of his speech on the Canadian Wheat Board and we found out that he knew less about wheat than he did about the Budget. The NDP MLA for Kinistino (Mr. Thibault) talked mainly about grain handling. He wanted to say something about the homeowner grants but he didn't know what to say. He didn't want to praise them, but he was afraid to oppose them because his constituents welcome them, so he ended up by saying he didn't like the envelopes they were sent out in.

The NDP MLA for Weyburn, Auburn Pepper, suggested moves for orderly marketing but nothing about the Budget and the assistance provided for the city of Weyburn. The NDP for Kelsey, (Mr. Messer) the so-called agricultural critic, better known as "Flip-Flop", tried to get out of the hole he dug for himself the night the Federal Acreage Plan was announced. But before he was finished he had completely buried himself for all time. But again the Budget was by-passed. The MLA for Canora (Mr. Matsalla) and the MLA for Regina North West (Mr. Whelan) didn't want to talk about the Budget either, so they started making promises for the next election. This is a little early, Mr. Speaker, even for the NDP. The MLA for Canora (Mr. Matsalla) said the NDP would pay 75 per cent of the costs of education immediately upon election. Now this is likely to create great expectations among the school boards when one considers that in 20 years of Government the NDP never got higher than 47 per cent.

The MLA for Regina North West (Mr. Whelan) promised the NDP would pay grants totalling \$10 per capita to Regina and construct more buildings on Regina Campus, more community colleges and a technical institute during their first term of office — even though they couldn't build a technical institute in Regina during their first 20 years. So within two days, Mr. Speaker, we have NDP election promises costing the taxpayers of Saskatchewan from \$100 million to \$150 million depending on how many community colleges they build. And they didn't even caucus on these commitments. They are right off the top of their

March 12, 1970

heads. I doubt if the Leader of the Opposition, who I understand will follow me, will get up and make these promises and commitments to the people of Saskatchewan that his back benchers did in the last two days. Yesterday we listened to perhaps one of the most conceited Members that has ever sat in this House. It is no wonder that the NDP Members hung their heads while the Mayor (Mr. Baker) made his usual speech. There is only one question that the people of Saskatchewan wish to know and that is whether he is talking official NDP policy or whether it is Baker for Leader Policy. We thought we could . . .

MR. H.H.P. BAKER: (Regina East) — Both.

MR. GUY: — Both, good, glad to hear it, glad to hear it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. GUY: — You know we thought that we could keep up to his spending spree by bringing some adding machines into the Legislature, but we found out that we couldn't even do it with adding machines. Next year we are going to have to rent a computer. But I'm glad that my Member is going to run for the leadership. Mind you I was a little dismayed after that statement about this being the best year in Regina's construction history. I was a little dismayed yesterday when he made all these promises that would cost the taxpayers money and I was ready to withdraw my support for him as leader. But, seeing his smiling face over there now and his acknowledgment that he is going for leader as well as this program, I am afraid that I'm still going to have to support my MLA for Regina South East (Mr. Baker).

We listened again yesterday for an hour to the rantings and ravings of the Member for Redberry (Mr. Michayluk), while he told us all about mineral production in 1888 and he read lengthy excerpts from magazines and periodicals 20 years old, but he never once mentioned the 1970 Budget which was under debate. Then finally yesterday we got in on the death-bed repentance of the Member for Prince Albert East-Cumberland (Mr. Berezowsky). Now that he has been forsaken by his party and is ready to retire because of his age as stated by the Leader of the Opposition, we find he has had a change of heart. For five years he has fought . . .

AN HON. MEMBER: — Hear, hear!

MR. GUY: — Oh, I would welcome him in Athabasca along with anyone else over there that would like to go up there. The trouble is you would probably get lost because when you were the Government you never managed to get north of Prince Albert to see what was really going on.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. GUY: — For five years, the Member for Prince Albert East-Cumberland (Mr. Berezowsky) fought with every means at his disposal to destroy the pulp mill. He called the deal a nefarious one. He claimed the pulp mill would be a dark blot on the Liberal records. He preached doom and gloom about it ever going into production. He said that our share of the mill would never be worth one cent. But now yesterday, out of the clear

blue sky, he pleads with the Premier on bended knee, with tears in his eyes, "Please don't sell your interest in the mill. We need it for the people of Saskatchewan." Where was he four years ago when we were promoting this mill and we needed the encouragement of every Member on that side of the House? He was going from door to door in his constituency telling them what terrible things the mill would mean to this province. Such hypocrisy at this time will leave a dark blot, I suggest, on his political image forever more. Again, while he cried his crocodile tears, he forgot to mention the Budget. The Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Lloyd), I understand is going to be almost the last speaker. I would hope that he will talk about the Budget because he'll be the first one that does. After the failure of his Throne Speech perhaps this will be his last speech that we will have the opportunity to hear, so hopefully he will stay on the subject that is under debate.

But almost without exception, Members opposite have been afraid to discuss the Budget. Why is this? Well, the answer is clear. They are afraid to criticize it because they don't want to take issue with those who took the time to analyze it and who recognize it for the good Budget that it is. Let us look at what the Press and the community leaders have to say about our Budget. These are the people who are the true critics of any budget. They are not politically motivated, they have no axe to grind, but they are vitally concerned with the people who serve them. When they agree with governments, it is because it is in the best interest of Saskatchewan people to do so.

And here is what the Saskatchewan's three leading daily newspapers have to say about our Provincial Treasurer's Budget:

Saskatoon Star Phoenix — Budget reflects reality of current economic squeeze! Saskatchewan's 1970 Budget brought down Monday appears to be tailored to meet the pressing needs of an economy beleaguered by agricultural recession, troubled potash industry and by the ever-present pressures of country-wide inflation.

They felt that we had taken the right direction in this.

What about The Leader Post?

Considering times, not a bad Budget.

What about the Prince Albert Daily Herald?

Saskatchewan Budget designed to stimulate the economy. Provincial Treasurer, D.G. Steuart's Budget Monday contained considerable evidence that it is designed to bolster the Saskatchewan economy and lessen the tax burden of property owners.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. GUY: — Surely these respected papers would not lead the people of our province astray. Their assessment of the Budget must be taken ahead of our politically oriented friends opposite.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. GUY: — They may laugh, Mr. Speaker,

March 12, 1970

but these statements will come back to haunt them in the days ahead. Now, what do the mayors of our three major cities say? They too will have to live with this Budget. So they won't support it unless it is in their best interests to do so. The Mayor of Prince Albert says he sees this Budget aid as an initial step. Mayor Longworth said he agreed with the principle of deficit-budgeting in the light of the Province's adverse conditions. The mayor said he thought the most encouraging aspect of the Budget was the sharply increased grant to education. It is encouraging also to note that some tax relief has been granted to our farm community. Noting that there appeared to be more money for social welfare recipients the mayor stated that this further assistance to them should be more than welcome. What about the Mayor of Saskatoon? Let's see what he has to say.

Buckwold says tax drop possible. A combination of tight budgeting by local authorities and generosity by the Provincial Government should mean that Saskatonians will not have to face higher taxes this year. In fact taxes may even go down.

This was the Mayor of Saskatoon. Now I was going to take the comments of the Mayor of Regina, but, since he is also an NDP Member of the Legislature, I thought that he might be politically biased, seeing he is going for the leadership so I thought maybe we had better take someone who is a little more creditable because of his position. So, let's see what the city manager from Regina has to say. Bruce Smith, city manager, says: "The Provincial Budget has brought happiness to the hearts of city officials." He called the Budget one of the better treatments we have had from the Provincial Government. Mr. Smith said, "The Budget puts us into an area of support from the Province which we didn't have before." So it is received with great enthusiasm by the Regina city authorities.

Now, Mr. Speaker, even some of our political opponents, are enthusiastic. I would like to, just for the records of this House, read what Alderman George Bothwell says. I think he was a former NDP candidate, but he complimented the Province for adopting many of the recommendations that City Council has made through SUMA. Here are men who admit that we have helped them hold down taxes, that we have helped the poor, that we have helped the farmers and the municipalities. They are in effect saying that Liberal times are good times. Is it any wonder that Members opposite have forgotten about the Budget?

Now let's go on and see what some of the other leaders in the community have to say. What do the secretaries of SUMA and the SARM say about our Budget? Now no one is more concerned about our province than these two gentlemen. Jim Connor, executive secretary of the Saskatchewan Urban Municipalities Association, called the grants to municipalities a good start. He said they will work into really worthwhile assistance to municipalities. Lorne Wilkinson, executive secretary of SARM, was enthusiastic over the tremendous amount for schools and he said he would be disappointed if school mill rates continued to rise. He said it was a Budget to get the economy rolling, and anything that we do will benefit them. Surely these are men who have great concern for the economy of this Province and cannot be accused of political statements. Now what about the Chamber of Commerce, another respected organization in Saskatchewan. The Chamber president is pleased with the Budget. The

president of the Saskatchewan Board of Trade said the tax hikes are realistic.

Now what do the school boards say? They are concerned about the high costs of education. From the Prince Albert Daily Herald, March 3:

Boards express satisfaction with Saskatchewan Budget. Increased grants for education hopefully will make it possible for local boards to hold the mill rate this year.

What do the farmers say about the Budget? Again from the Prince Albert Daily Herald:

Budget agriculture steps welcomed by area farmers.

So, Mr. Speaker, it is hard to believe Members opposite would not speak about the Budget, but it is not hard to understand. Almost without exception, every responsible group in this province welcomes and supports our Saskatchewan Budget. It may not all have been what they would have liked, but they recognize it as an honest and positive approach by your Government to the problems of the day. In view of these comments by responsible people, is it any wonder that the NDP have had so little to say about the Budget? They talk about the Federal grain problems, they try out their election platform for size, but they do not and will not discuss the Budget. The MLA for Touchwood (Mr. Meakes) was so hard pressed for something to say that he took considerable time reading from an article about a Young Liberal Meeting in Ontario. We were impressed with the subjects they discussed, even though our friends opposite apparently were not. They discussed foreign ownership, party decentralization and party finances. These are the bread and butter issues of all political parties today and they are to be commended for their responsibility and concern for these vital questions. Since he was kind enough to inform us about what Ontario Young Liberals are doing at their meetings, I am pleased to reciprocate by informing Members opposite and this House what the Young New Democrats do at their meetings. Then we can leave the Members of the House to decide which young party members are contributing the most to society. I have here a clipping from the Winnipeg Free Press, February 16, 1970.

William Zoch retiring secretary of the Ontario Young New Democrats lashed out at his own organization Saturday, criticized members for vandalism, drug taking, and drunkenness. He presented a report to the 134 delegates at the annual convention saying the conduct of members was appalling at two meetings last year. He said an unnamed executive member supplied drugs to youth delegates attending a Provincial NDP Council meeting. This irresponsibility if detected by the police could have damaged not only our organization, but also and more importantly the entire labor movement in Brantford.

The report also said the United Automobile Workers Union at Port Eldon had refused to allow the Ontario Youth New Democrats to use its facilities again because of drunkenness and vandalism at a meeting last year. Decrying the public drunkenness at the Conference, Mr. Zoch termed the incident deliberate acts of vandalism.

March 12, 1970

Mr. Speaker, the question we must ask is: who will the people of Saskatchewan listen to? Will they listen to their Press, their mayors, the heads of their municipal organizations, the Chamber of Commerce, and the farmers, or will they listen to the NDP?

Tomorrow will be the day of reckoning for Opposition Members when they must decide not only whether they will vote for our Budget, but whether they are going to tell the Press, SUMA, SARM, Chamber of Commerce, school boards, and every responsible organization in Saskatchewan who are made up of their constituents that they are wrong and don't know what they are talking about. Mr. Speaker, any NDP Member that would stand tomorrow and vote against the measures that these responsible groups openly support, has no concern for the people that they represent. I submit, that they will be put aside by the electorate in the next election, as they deserve to be as a result of their irresponsible actions. Mr. Speaker, I cannot support the amendment, but I am very pleased to support the motion.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. W.S. LLOYD: (Leader of the Opposition) — Mr. Speaker, just a moment is left before adjournment for the evening meal. The Member who has just taken his seat, is the Minister in charge of pollution. He spent the early part of his remarks, and most of the rest of it, in demonstrating his qualifications for the position.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. LLOYD: — I make only one more comment with respect to that, Mr. Speaker. Thank God that I as Leader don't have to depend on the support of individuals such as that one who just sat down.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. LLOYD: I would suggest that we call it 5:30.

ANNOUNCEMENT

CORRECTION RE ANNUAL REPORT DEPARTMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCES

MR. SPEAKER: — Before I call it 5:30, I call to the attention of all Hon. Members to the fact that I received on my desk Bill No. 46. Nos. 41 and 45 are outstanding, they are the only ones that are outstanding.

I also want to draw the attention of all Hon. Members to the pink slips that have been placed upon their tables, which is a correction in the Annual Report from the Department of Natural Resources. Every Member has that pink slip, I trust.

If anybody hasn't got it, they will find it in the Legislative Assembly office. The pink slip is correcting a mistake in figures on page 3 of the Department of Natural Resources.

The Assembly recessed until 7:30 o'clock p.m.

MR. LLOYD: — Mr. Speaker, I have one general comment to make about the Budget as a budget speech to begin with. When the Provincial Treasurer was delivering it, he undertook to put more fire into his speech by interjecting some supposedly hot political comments. That was tactical error I suggest. What the speech needed was not to have more fire put into it, what it needed was to have more of the speech put into the fire.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. LLOYD: — If, while the Treasurer was burning, he had added the speech of the Member from Nipawin (Mr. Radloff), and the speech of the Member from Souris-Estevan (Mr. MacDougall) then he would have done a considerable service to this Debate.

I do want to comment about the Budget Speech as a budget speech, because the Budget Speech is supposed, is expected to be an accurate statement about the Provincial economy. It is supposed to interpret for the public at large trends in the economy. It, together with the Estimates, is to make public an honest and accurate appraisal of the Government's proposals with regard to raising and spending money. Instead of this, I submit, we got in this Budget Speech a partisan political speech and one certainly not distinguished for its accuracy. I suggest to my friends across the way, who have had so much praise about this Budget, to read the Budget Speech together with the Estimates tabled at the same time. They will find in there example after example of contradiction and of mis-statement.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. LLOYD: — I think we need to look at the scene on Budget Day, because gathered here at that time are the leaders of Saskatchewan's business community and the leaders of many of the provincial organizations. They are here by invitation. They come to get information about the economy and the Government's financial plan. They got I suggest a partisan political speech, inaccurate, contradictory, and misleading. Unfortunately, this Budget Speech goes all across Canada and outside of Canada. It goes into offices and into libraries where people come to read it to find out an accurate picture of the Saskatchewan economy. I think it is most unfortunate that under circumstances of that kind, a document to be so used gets the kind of political treatment which the Provincial Treasurer saw fit to give it in the House the other day.

When the Provincial Treasurer was speaking, he saw fit to invite all of us here to make some comparisons between the 1962 Budget Speech and that which he made. Hon. Members will recall that in 1962 the financial critic, my seatmate, was then the Provincial Treasurer. I hope that Members accept that invitation and do read indeed those two speeches. I hope they contrast the information in the 1962 Speech with the political propaganda in the 1970 Speech. I hope they contrast the upward

March 12, 1970

momentum in that same 1962 Speech with the downward listless drift in the 1970.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. LLOYD: — I invite them to compare both problems and prospects. I submit that, if they read these two speeches, they will come to the conclusion that the only thing better in 1969 was the weather and for that I think the Hon. Members opposite can hardly claim credit.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. LLOYD: — In 1962, the Provincial Treasurer had to report a wheat yield of 8.3 bushels per acre. In 1969, the Treasurer could report a wheat yield of 27.8 bushels per acre, that was some measurement of the problem. But in 1962 on farm diversification success, the Treasurer could report from the year before that the cash income from livestock was up 23 per cent. The Treasurer this year had to report that cash receipts from livestock in 1969 were down 10 per cent. Diversification was on the move at that time.

Speaking of non-agricultural growth in 1962, it was possible to report an increase of 11 per cent. This year we get the report of mineral output down 3 per cent. Up 11 per cent in 1962, down 3 per cent in 1969. If one considers confidence in prospects in the province as measured by public and private capital investment per capita, then we find that in 1962, the investment in Saskatchewan was 5 per cent more than the increase for all of Canada, whereas in 1969 the rate was below the average for the rest of Canada.

Let's look for a moment at another indicator, the growth in job indicators, particularly growth in job opportunities, as represented by the construction industry. The value of the construction industry reported in the 1962 Budget was up 9 per cent. The value of the construction industry in 1969-70 Budget is reported as being down 4 per cent. The average number of employees in the construction industry in 1962 was up by 1,500, up by 6 per cent, whereas the average number of employees in the construction industry was down in 1969, by over 5,000, down by 16 per cent. As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, in 1969 the average number of employees in the construction industry dropped to its lowest in 17 years with the exception of one year alone.

I want to look also for a moment at the tax take in 1962 as compared to the news which the Provincial Treasurer gave us the other day, the difference in the amount that the present Government is going to take out of the pockets of the people of Saskatchewan by personal taxes. This year through the education and health tax, this Government will take \$40 million more than was the case in 1962. In gasoline tax, it will take \$25 million more. In the special tobacco tax it will take \$6 million more. In individual income tax levied by the Province, it will take \$56 million more this year than was taxed for in 1962. In the levy on the Power Corporation, nothing was taken in 1962, and \$10 million will be taken this year. Just in those five taxes alone, this Treasurer is going to take \$127 million more out of the pockets of the people of Saskatchewan than did the Treasurer in 1962.

All the while these people complain about what they are getting or not getting from Ottawa. Yet in 1970 they are going to get \$30 million more assistance from Ottawa than was the Case in 1962.

You have to compare, Mr. Speaker, again, the momentum in the 1962 Budget facts with the listless downward drift in 1970. We have to remember that the cost of the ticket for going on that downward drift, the taxes we pay, is a lot more than the ticket for going up was in 1962.

There were things happening in 1962 that make the happenings of today look just a bit sick. The Squaw Rapid dam and power development was under way. The South Saskatchewan dam and power development was being built. There was a new head office building of the SPC changing the sky-line of Regina and demonstrating the new sight line of Saskatchewan. This new building was using brick made in Saskatchewan, cement produced, in Saskatchewan and steel fabricated in Saskatchewan. The Otonabee and Hanson Lake Roads were nearing completion, building transportation into the northern part of our province. The Regina Court House was being completed; the Provincial Technical Institute at Moose Jaw was being extended; a Provincial Technical Institute at Saskatoon was being replaced and enlarged; a new Provincial Technical Institute built at no cost to the local taxpayers was under way in Prince Albert; facilities were being added to the Regina jail; a geriatric centre at Swift Current was under construction; a Provincial office building at Meadow Lake was being built; the Prince Albert Sanatorium was being converted to a training centre for mentally handicapped; the new Regional Mental Health Centre at Yorkton was under construction; a new psychiatric research centre at the University Hospital was being planned; the Wascana Centre concept which has been called one of the most imaginative in all North America was under way.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. LLOYD: — Water and sewage was being installed in farm homes at the rate of about 7,000 per year, compared with under 2,000 last year; Saskatchewan's expenditure in mental health per capita was the highest for Canada; Saskatchewan's expenditure on research into the causes and cure of mental health was the highest in Canada. Indeed we were spending more than all the other provinces in Canada put together.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. LLOYD: — One other point to be remembered, Mr. Speaker, was this, that in 1962 the first comprehensive Medical Care Plan in the continent of North America began here in Saskatchewan.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. LLOYD: — It came in Saskatchewan in spite of the Liberal party who first tried to destroy it, then to distort it, then finally to discredit it. The 1962 Budget had to provide the payment for that entirely out of Saskatchewan proceeds, not with half of it coming from Ottawa, as is the case now. As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, the net cost to Consolidated Fund in 1963, the first year of that plan was almost \$16 million. Today, last

March 12, 1970

year, the net cost to the Consolidated Fund was down to \$6.7 million. Saskatchewan carried it by itself. Furthermore, Mr. Speaker, there was at that time no deterrent fee, no tax on sick people when they went to the hospital or when they went to a doctor.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. LLOYD: — Mr. Speaker, the 1962 Budget presented by the now financial critic of this party had momentum and courage. In that Budget growth was reported, and in that Budget confidence was reflected. In contrast in 1970, we get in the Budget the dry dust of partisan political phrases and promises. This is leavened somewhat by some long overdue additional grants to local governments to hopefully hold the property tax line. This, Mr. Speaker, let's not forget, is a line which five years ago the Liberals promised would be lowered, but since has shot up. As a matter of fact the only qualification that the Liberal Government has for being in the space age is the way property taxes have soared beyond the horizon, since they became the Government.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. LLOYD: — I want to take a minute to look at the rural tax levy in nine representative school units in this province, three across the south of the Province, three across the centre, and three across the north. They are representative because of their geographic distribution. They are representative because of the spread in assessment, they extend from high assessed units like Eston-Elrose to a low one of Meadow Lake. They're representative in density of population, a relatively thickly settled area like Canora as opposed to a sparsely settled one like Eastend. Let's look at the change in the mill rate in those nine representative areas in the five years when the CCF was the Government. In one of them, the mill rate decreased by five mills. In two others, there was no change, in three the increase was two mills, in two the increase was four mills, and in one the increase was five mills. Let's see what those same areas experienced as a result of five years of Liberal priority in sharing the cost of education. There weren't any decreases in mill rate, there weren't any mill rate which had no increases. As a matter of fact they all had increases. The smallest increase was nine mills under Liberal priorities and the biggest increase was a shocking 22 mills of taxation as a result of the handling of education financed by this Government.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. LLOYD: — You take the average during the five CCF years in these nine units. The average increase was 1.5; the average under the five years of Liberal priorities was 14 mills. Mr. Speaker, if one looks at the overall picture of what portion of the costs of education are being carried by grants from this Government, one gets a picture that contradicts entirely what is being said from that side of the House. I invite my colleagues on the other side of the House to look at the tables in the Department of Education Annual Report, tabled just a week or so ago. A table there shows the amount of grants received by all the school districts in the province, and the same table shows the

expenditures of all of those school districts in the province is table is for the year 1968. That table shows that school grants in that year constituted 42.2 per cent of the expenditure of the boards. If you go back, Mr. Speaker, you will find out that this is a smaller percentage than was the case in 1964. In 1964 the percentage of expenditures by school boards carried by grants received from the Government was 42.6 per cent — higher than was the case in 1968, after years of loud and long talk by my friends opposite.

So the large increases of this year — and they are quite substantial — are at least five years overdue. Again we see the philosophy of the Liberal Government at work. That philosophy is to let things get worse, to indeed help them to get worse, and then when it does something it seems to look better. That is the philosophy of this party.

Mr. Speaker, even these grants are mainly financed by ways for which Saskatchewan Liberals can take no credit. \$6 million more of the money comes from the Saskatchewan Power Corporation, a Socialist enterprise, a publicly owned enterprise. An extra \$10 million to \$15 million comes from the Federal Government. This Provincial Government pretends not to like, although it helps to elect. To finance its capital program, it took last year some \$40 million from the Canada Pension Plan. This is investment capital at more favorable interest rates than the market provides, which has been available for the use of the Province only since 1966. I submit that this Canada Pension Plan is the kind of a public program which Saskatchewan Liberal philosophy, left to itself, would reject but ought to have.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. LLOYD — But of course, Mr. Speaker, the Saskatchewan Government does make its contribution to financing the added grants. Now it doesn't do so out of Provincial revenue from resource development, which is where it said it was all going to come from. As a matter of fact, revenue from resource development this year will be down \$1.6 million from what it was last year. As a result of the announcement about oil restrictions in the last few days, it will probably be down more than that. But they do get more from public corporations, such as the Power Corporation. They don't ask for more from private corporation profits, but they do apply a higher tax on personal incomes, including married people whose income is as low as \$2,000 and single people whose income is as low as \$1,000. They contribute to paying for these grants by its new hotdog, plate-of-beans, bowl-of-soup tax. They do contribute by putting on more gasoline tax and they do contribute by keeping on that iniquitous, inequitable tax on sick people, the deterrent tax.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. LLOYD — Certainly, Mr. Speaker, when the Provincial Treasurer says, as he did in his Budget Speech, that he doesn't believe that equity is the main concern of taxation, that statement he means, that one he carries out. Unfortunately increased taxes we found out in recent years don't necessarily end with the Budget. Members of the Legislature had hardly got home from the session last year, when new charges appeared. We had hardly got home before university fees went up; before fees of

March 12, 1970

technical schools went up; before charges for grade 12 examinations went up. These people were so hard up to balance the Budget that they even put an extra cost on the kids who have to write their grade 12 examinations.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. LLOYD: — Now, Mr. Speaker, our lead-off spokesman in this Budget, the Member for Regina Centre (Mr. Blakeney), who did such an admirable job as he always does, described this Budget as being too little and too late. If we need any added convincing of the accuracy of this description it is provided, I submit, when we look at the Budgets of last year and this year, together with the Annual Report of the Department of Welfare. I hope that all Members will take time before too long to read the comments and the assessments. It is a good comment and a good assessment on page 19 of that report.

Let me just take a few quotations from it. The Report says that “two large-scale problems surfaced in reports from regional offices — Indians and general unemployment.” It goes on to say:

The general unemployment and under-employment of farm resources . . . was signified by the increase in applications for assistance from marginal farmers . . . more jobless teenagers left home and applied for assistance on their own.

It refers to the “rural exodus by the young labor force” and it comments that “the largest city, Regina, experienced such an increase in applications for assistance from employables that it was most difficult to adequately process and service them all.”

Mr. Speaker, these were 1968 and early 1969 facts. Presumably they were known to the Government at least one year ago. At the time of making up the Budget, the Government had these facts in its possession. How did it act? It acted by cutting back the money for employment in that Budget. There was, the Report of the Department of Welfare says, “A rural exodus of young labor force,” and yet the Government did nothing to provide jobs for these. There was in Regina such an increase in applications for assistance from employables yet the Government did nothing to provide work for these people. There was, according to the Report, and I quote: “An increase in juvenile runaways due to economic insecurity at home,” and the Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Steuart) sat and fiddled with his surpluses. This, it did, to maintain the sanctity of that Holy Grail, a balanced Budget. This Government was willing to sanction, it was willing to encourage, it was willing to ignore the effect of a rural exodus, of jobless teenagers, of increase in juvenile runaways. These kind of people were conscripted into the front line of the Liberal battle against inflation. Small wonder that many of them left Saskatchewan for other provinces and left, unfortunately, by the thousands.

I have to ask: where was the voice of the Minister of Social Welfare (Mr. MacDonald) when last year's Budget accentuated all these problems which his Department was so properly worried about? Where was that voice? And where were the ears and the hearts and the conscience or even the economic sense

Cabinet when in September the Provincial Treasurer cut back even more?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. LLOYD: — Mr. Speaker, on the night after the Budget I listened the Provincial Treasurer on television. I heard him try to claim then that the September or October cutbacks didn't affect employment. He actually tried to pretend that what the Cabinet did back in September or October had no adverse affect on employment. And yet — he is quoted on September 4th of The Leader Post — he mentioned the fact of \$6,100,000 capital project deferrals. "No effect on employment," he said in March. He mentioned in the same news item, "The largest single area of education resulted through delays and deferrals of general building construction at the local level." And yet in March he was saying that it had no effect on unemployment.

With respect to the University he said that it was agreed at \$750,000 could be taken out of the construction grant. And yet in March he said, "This had no effect on unemployment." He commented that the Public Works Department budget was also reduced by \$900,000.

Mr. Speaker, the Provincial Treasurer did more than balance his Budget and build his surpluses when he cut back that way just a few months ago. He contributed more jobless teenagers to the too large group already there. He contributed to more applications from employables which couldn't be handled. He contributed to "economic insecurity at home" and to more in juvenile runaways" in the words of the Department of Welfare Report. More troops from the unfortunate and the insecure were conscripted by the Provincial Liberals into the army against inflation and the Generalissimo at Ottawa shouted encouragement as his battle plan was executed by his sub-generals here in Regina.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. LLOYD: — Mr. Speaker, when action was needed last year to create and to add to, the Liberal action was to destroy and to subtract. The message, I submit, is clear. We need a new willingness to take public action to build Saskatchewan. We need some immediate work and wages program and longer term programs alike. We need a new revived concern for individual people. We need, Mr. Speaker, a new government in this province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. LLOYD: — And if one examines the scene with respect to agriculture, there is the same failure to act, the same total eclipse of imagination and leadership. May I recall for you, Mr. Speaker, that the Department of Welfare Report said, "The general trend of movement from rural areas to the larger urban centres contributed to the rising costs in the cities." Underemployment of farm resources was mentioned. Exodus of the young labor force was mentioned. Let's recall last year when we were discussing the Budget. There was a problem throughout this province of damp grain, a problem of handling it; a problem of the extra costs of keeping and saving it were paramount issues. The

March 12, 1970

Provincial Treasurer, as you will recall, when he spoke tried to heap his puny scorn on previous governments. Yet an earlier Conservative Federal Government and a Provincial CCF Government, when the problem was not as acute, had put \$6 million cash into the pockets of Saskatchewan farmers.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. LLOYD: — That was cash as cash, not loans to be repaid. And yet last year's Federal and Provincial Liberal Governments refused to contribute one single red cent of cash to help farmers with the cost of handling and holding damp grain piled on top of grain unsold and accumulated earlier.

As one result of this, more people were conscripted into the army against inflation. More farmers had their years of work liquidated. There was more dislocation by a forced move to the cities and the problems of the cities got worse.

Last year, Mr. Speaker, this Cabinet was pretending that nothing was wrong. The Minister of Highways (Mr. Boldt) who spoke this afternoon and who declared again to us that he is against sin and for four-lane highways, was talking with scorn about farmers who complained and who had cabs on their tractors. Imagine that! He was referring to a stupid farmer who happened to have damp grain. The Attorney General (Mr. Heald) was reading letters of assurance which he thought should be put on the books of this Legislature. The Premier was saying nothing about economic distress. All of them were saying, "Now it is all right, Jack. Don't worry."

Since that time Federal and Provincial programs have created more marginal farmers. They have added more deserted farm homes. They have increased the insecurity on farms. These programs have encouraged more rural exodus of young labor force to join the ranks of the unemployed and the unsatisfied in cities outside of Saskatchewan.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. LLOYD: — The Department of Welfare Report analyzes well the effect of rural poverty on rural life and urban life one year ago. The Government didn't listen then and it doesn't listen today. Indeed, I submit, the Government continues to be a part of the problem rather than part of the solution. This year's Budget encourages again the trend because it's too little in vital spots. This year's Budget maintains a double standard. I invite Members to think of two Bills now before this Legislature. One is to help farmers get established in livestock and it is in the form of a loan. The other is to help industry get established, and there is assistance not by loans but outright grants available.

This Government's policies have continued to contribute to the population drain which has become of caravan proportions. Our population, 13,000 less than one year ago and the 13,000 less was a couple a months ago and goodness knows how much less now. The only exodus, Mr. Speaker, that can serve this province is the exodus of the present Government out of the Government offices.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. LLOYD: — I submit, Mr. Speaker, that among other reasons, the way in which the Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Steuart) proposes to deal with inflation, or proposes inflation be dealt with, simply cannot be supported. The Provincial Treasurer continues to put all of the blame on public spending for public programs. I submit that this is one of the oldest tricks in the world. This tendency to put all the blame on public expenditures is used by those people who dislike and who distrust public expenditures, is used by those people who dislike and who distrust public programs and public services and who would like to destroy them.

The Provincial Treasurer's picking of pockets is selective. He specializes in picking public pockets. That is one reason they add \$6 million of taxes from the Power Corporation, a public corporation, while maintaining the existing level of tax on the profits of private corporations.

Mr. Speaker, among the major causes of inflation are the facts that prices are too high, profits are too high and that interest rates are excessive. These escape any responsibility in the attention given by the Provincial Treasurer. This is a dangerous, wrong way of leadership which Saskatchewan can't afford and that is the major reason why we can't support this Budget.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. LLOYD: — Just recently we have had dramatic evidence of how international machine companies can gouge farmers, can increase the cost structure of our economy, can contribute to inflation. The Provincial Treasurer is silent about this while he hacks off a few more Saskatchewan jobs. We know that the profits of finance, insurance and real estate companies in Canada were up 47 per cent in 1969. The result was higher interest rates, higher cost of living and production and housing, and more inflation. The Provincial Treasurer is silent about this while he hacks a million off school construction grants and holds down wages of low-paid hospital employees. Private profit and price-fixing are part of the Provincial Treasurer's unmentionables. He sees no evil in them, he hears no evil of them and certainly speaks no evil about them. And yet, Mr. Speaker, he claims in his Budget Speech that the monster of inflation must be slain. Instead of fighting the monster he is holding hands with it. I recall that little bit of doggerel which I think can be adopted for the occasion:

There was a Treasurer from Saskatchewan
Who went out for a ride on a dragon
He came back from the ride
With the Treasurer inside
And the smile on the face of the dragon.

I don't mind the Treasurer being inside the dragon, but unfortunately a lot of good Saskatchewan people are there too.

Mr. Speaker, I urge, as we have urged in the past, the Government of Saskatchewan and the Government of Canada to establish a Prices Review Board with instructions and teeth to roll back and hold back price increases. I urge the Governments to introduce a genuine income policy including controls on profits and one which recognizes income in addition to that from

March 12, 1970

wages and farm production. It should be an income policy flexible enough to take account of increases in the cost of living; problems of low paid workers and producers; disparities within industries; and other factors causing disadvantage to groups or regions.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. LLOYD: — Not only does the Government fail to speak for the Province of Saskatchewan in regard to inflation control and indeed give long-way leadership here; it fails to speak for the needs of farm people. And that is another reason for supporting our amendment. Why didn't this Government urge storage payment for grain stored on farms? Why didn't this Government urge supporting payments on grains? The cash deficiency between what is needed to keep our farming in Saskatchewan alive and the businesses serving our farm communities alive, is a tremendous one and this Government has nothing to say about that whatsoever in the Budget.

Why didn't the Government say: agricultural diversification will succeed only if there is a forward marketing policy including some price guarantees? It is grossly unfair to do as is being done today, put on the back of the farmer the entire cost of adjustments within the industry caused by the inability or willingness of the Federal Government to market the produce.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. LLOYD: — The farmer, today, is being pushed by external economic pressures into purchasing livestock at high prices, into purchasing equipment at high prices and to do this by borrowing money at high prices. The farmer is being pushed into doing this and the risks that he runs is having to pay for all of these high-priced products when the selling price of his production is lower.

Mr. Speaker, if that happens, the farmer is left with his high-priced cows and the high-priced debt. In other words he is left in his traditional position of holding the bag again. Let this Government, Mr. Speaker, say, as it has not done, "We support orderly marketing and the Canadian Wheat Board." This Government has shied away from a commitment. On the other hand, Cabinet Ministers and some private Members have joined in the chorus of those who would weaken orderly marketing and who would destroy the Wheat Board idea. This Government has gone so far as to say that the Wheat Board idea should not be extended to cover other grains. This Budget has nothing to say to the effect that the prices of inputs, such as the cost of machinery and fertilizer and chemicals, into farm production should be controlled at a reasonable and decent level.

I submit that it has failed in not mentioning these things. This document will be read in Government and business financial offices right across Canada. And here was a chance for this Provincial Treasurer to interpret to many non-Saskatchewan centres of influence the essential needs of Saskatchewan farmers and the Saskatchewan economy, and he failed to do so.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

I submit, Mr. Speaker, that failure was not accidental. The Budget doesn't speak out on these things because this Government doesn't really believe in the kind of public program that is necessary to save the farm economy. And the Budget cannot be supported because of that. Mr. Speaker, I want to talk for a while about the problem of Welfare and the program with respect to welfare.

Because of the increased cost of living, some 4.6 per cent in the last year, because there are fewer job opportunities, full and part time, because of the restricted farm income the increase in level of welfare benefits was imperative. I want to add, Mr. Speaker, that it is not just the level of assistance which the schedule provides that is important. It is the humanity and the humility with which the program is administered. I think there is a growing feeling in Saskatchewan that the present Government lacks the necessary humanity and humility to do a proper job in this field.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. LLOYD: — This is an opinion which comes to me from farm areas and urban areas and the North. All of us, Mr. Speaker, in this House and elsewhere in the province are, I am sure, concerned and distressed by the recent reports from Northwestern Saskatchewan that had public exposure. Among other things these reports should remind us of the fact of poverty in our own home territory. They should remind us that hardship is a way of life for too many people in Saskatchewan. They should remind us of the extent of our collective failure to distribute justice and opportunity. They should remind us of the extent of unfinished human business on our agenda.

Mr. Speaker, I had the opportunity to discuss this matter the recent happenings in Northwestern Saskatchewan with the Minister and I appreciate that. I appreciate the fact that the Minister of Pollution is back in the House and continues to spread more pollution, as he is one to do and as he is fit to do.

MR. GUY: — I wasn't talking to you.

MR. LLOYD: — I know you weren't. You were talking to yourself and you are answering yourself back and that is a pretty bad sign. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the fact that the Minister made some members of his staff available to myself and to some of my colleagues to discuss this with. I appreciate the fact that the Minister, as was urged in this Legislature, is having many of these files reviewed and is indeed reviewing many of them himself. Whether such a review can be adequate is an item to which I want to return later on.

Before I do that, Mr. Speaker, I want to attempt some more general comment. All of us will agree that the objective of this program is not just more welfare or continued welfare. But in the interim I do feel, and I say in all sincerity to the Minister, that there is a need for more adequate and sensitive welfare benefits. I admit the evidence from time to time and place to place of abuse of such benefits, but that I submit doesn't destroy the need. The objective is certainly that of providing

March 12, 1970

more employment and more training for employment. And I grant the fact that there is a gratifying increase in the amount of money made available for this in this year's Budget.

I do have some questions with respect to what might be called lack of wisdom or lack of understanding in the spending of this money.

Mr. Speaker, the objectives and the procedures which we follow in this respect must include to a greater extent than I think we have, acceptance as reality of different cultures and the requirements that this places on us for a different approach. Not everyone wants to be like the white man. Not everyone accepts existing values. Not everyone is willing to conform to our concepts of work and life. Yet in so much of what we do, there is a pressure to provide jobs like ours, in conditions like those we work in, performed according to our standards and done by people like ourselves. We should stop assuming that everyone wants to be a white man, that everyone accepts the existing values and that everyone is willing to conform.

The objective and the procedure, I submit, must include more and more the right of people to make decisions that count and to influence the decisions that count. It must include more and more the resources with which to make these decisions including the wrong decisions. It is pretty well established that people become creative and alive when they have such rights. It is when they are denied such rights that there is passiveness, frustration and even violence. Those of us who live comfortably in modes we accept as satisfying must be willing to risk more and invest more in this "other Saskatchewan." We have failed, I submit, in our willingness to do that. We have at least failed in our wisdom of doing it.

These symptoms I know are not new. These symptoms are not peculiar to the Province of Saskatchewan. I want to read a sentence or two from one of the world's greatest thinkers, the philosopher historian, Toynbee. Speaking of symptoms of this kind he mentions, "These symptoms are manifestations of one and the same complaint, namely frustration. The individual feels he is not the beneficiary but the victim of social system." Mr. Speaker, if frustration would buy food and build houses, there would be no poverty in Northern Saskatchewan.

The result is — after the individual has tried putting his case and obtaining redress and frequently finding himself up against a wall and unable to obtain a hearing — that he feels the Establishment shows no intention of taking him seriously and no intention of mending its ways. This, I submit, is the life-history, at least the unarticulated conviction, of hundreds of people in communities like Green Lake, La Loche, Cole Bay, Beauval and similar communities across our North lands.

I had the opportunity of talking in recent days with some people who live there, with some people who had been there, and as I said with the Minister and some of his staff, admittedly and not unnaturally there is some conflict in the statements that are made; admittedly there are many gaps in my own information about it. But I do want to make this submission as to a number of things which I think need doing.

I think, first of all, there are many who need and who deserve more tolerant, more adequate welfare assistance. They

deserve it because they are human beings and no additional reason should be needed than just that. This is an immediate and urgent need for many. In the long run, I submit, Mr. Speaker, that the problems of these people will not be solved until we have some form of guaranteed annual income applicable to them and to the rest of the people of Canada as well.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. LLOYD: — Secondly, I think there is a need, as was urged by us previously in the House, for some kind of an impartial investigation — call it assessment if you will. I agree with the Minister that a galloping two-day invasion such as that of two Federal MPs — his fellow Liberals — does more harm than good. Particularly does it do more harm than good when it is undertaken with a blare of publicity. It then becomes suspect, increases the suspicion and the distrust of people. People in our remote communities have had too much, too many, of such excursions.

The assessment should be carried out by an organization outside of the Government. Inevitably, Mr. Speaker, the Department, the Minister (Mr. MacDonald), the Government become defensive. And I invite the Minister to examine his own feelings and those of the Government. And I say inevitably under circumstances like this the Minister and the Government become defensive. Inevitably they are going to be considered as less than objective. We urge that some group like the Canada Welfare Council, supplemented by or including people of native origin, might well do a job for all the people of Saskatchewan if they were asked to do such an assessment.

As a very minimum I hope that there can be a survey of nutritional deficiency undertaken. Starvation after all is a relative word and there is no point in arguing, I think, whether a person is starving or not quite. Where does starvation begin anyway? I don't know. I suspect it begins any time there is any denial of adequate diet over any period of time. I submit that all of us, Government, Opposition, public would be better equipped if we knew more of the facts which might be obtained by such an assessment of nutritional deficiency.

Thirdly, this whole incident, plus some others, underlines the need for a continuing method by which government authority and decision may be questioned and appealed. I would hope the Minister (Mr. Estey) in charge of the Indian and Métis Department might recall a proposal that I made last year during the discussion of the estimates of his Department. I mention it again and I urge it again. That proposal was that the Government consider the establishment of an Ombudsman of native ancestry, chosen by native people, for work with the native people. This would be a person with the authority and the staff to examine all the necessary and relevant evidence.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. LLOYD: — It would be a person who having investigated would have the status to walk into the office of the director or the Deputy or the Minister and talk plainly and squarely. It would be a person who in the final analysis if necessary could report right to this Legislature.

March 12, 1970

I think there are many events in addition to those of just recent happening which underline the need and underline the value of having an office of this kind. I submit it would be good for the people. It would be good for the Government. It would advance justice. It would build trust and confidence in the idea of government generally and this we need.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. LLOYD: — Fourthly, if my information is adequate and I think it is in this respect, there is considerable interest and traditional skill in community handicrafts. Yet I gather for the most part people who are so interested must rely on voluntary contributions of machines and money to get underway. I can't help but think we could do more in that respect.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. LLOYD: — Fifthly, I want to refer to the way in which we harvest our timber resources in that area. I understand there is a pulp-cutting project under way now and that the contractor is an out-of-the-province contractor. Why not, I suggest, turn this cutting of pulp over to a local association of the people right there? They will need some equipment for operating and for capital. They will need some advice and I submit that we could get some real dividends by saying to them, "This is your contract, you go ahead and do it."

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. LLOYD: — Why not make available to them a timber berth and a sawmill and some working capital? Two privately owned sawmills in the area have gone bankrupt in recent months, or at least one is bankrupt and the other in serious problems. There has been a loss of wages and confusion and frustration. Certainly the community-operated sawmill couldn't do much worse than that and conceivably could do a lot better as well as giving the community, say the local chapter of the Métis Society, the responsibility of organizing and managing and possibly building homes and building tourist cabins as a result of this community-sponsored program.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I think we must as quickly as possible — and I hope it doesn't take too long — remove the white and the external power structure as the main source of decisions and the centre of all meaningful authority.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. LLOYD: — Let the white man who can make a contribution to those in the community who call that community 'home'. May I submit, Mr. Speaker, that 'home' in the context of these people and that culture has a particularly vital and real meaning. I don't think that those of us, like us here in this Legislature, a majority group without too many roadblocks in our way, can really understand the security and the necessity of a 'home' community as do a minority group with monumental roadblocks. We have to build up the strength of that home community.

There is, I am afraid, Mr. Speaker, some growing common denominator of frustration and bitterness and distrust. As a very minimum many of these people don't understand how the assistance they get is determined. They don't understand some of the delay and the irregularity and the amounts. The fact that there is an appeal board conveys little meaning and less comfort to them. They do understand a shortage of food and perhaps inadequate clothing. They do conclude, I am afraid, that no one understands them and many, I am afraid, doubt if anyone cares too much about them.

Let me just add this one point. The greatest cause of unhappiness and frustration may not necessarily be the lack of physical goods. It is consequently not to be cured by more physical goods. The greatest cause of unhappiness and frustration may well be the lack of freedom, which these people feel, to take part in making decisions that count. It may well be the conflict between the cultures and the attempt to make ours dominate; at least so they feel. It may well be their feelings being imposed on and dictated to by white people and I am afraid particularly by government officials with the best of intentions. It may well be a fragmentation because the structure as a community has been greatly weakened. In the end I suggest that redistribution of power is as important as redistribution of physical things. Indeed I think this is a vital starting point.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. LLOYD: — Mr. Speaker, I want to turn to a couple of other subjects. Here I am glad that the Member for City Park-University (Mr. Charlebois) is in his seat and I want to welcome a statement which he made the other day. My reference is to the statement he made when he in turn was welcoming the extension of activities of the publicly owned Eldorado Mining and Refining Company. We welcome his endorsement of public ownership.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. LLOYD: — Public ownership is particularly valid with respect to strategic material like uranium, particularly when that strategic material is a major source of power production. And public ownership takes on greater validity when we are talking about something like uranium because Canada is one of the world's largest producers. I think we produce about one-sixth of the . uranium in the world and we need to maximize the use we can make of the fact that we are such large owners and producers.

I think this extension of public ownership in the field of uranium takes on some greater urgency because of the pressures from the United States with regard to a continental energy program. This program, if it is developed, uncontrolled at least, will commit in perpetuity even more of Canada's resources to produce benefits outside of Canada. It will produce a situation such as to reduce our authority inside Canada even more. So I welcome the fact that the Member for City Park-University is welcoming this extension of public ownership.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. LLOYD: — We need, Mr. Speaker, to

March 12, 1970

mobilize all our Canadian strength to maintain Canada's opportunity for independence both economic and political. So let's get all of our trumps arranged into one hand to be used with maximum effect.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. LLOYD: — Such being the case, Mr. Speaker, I want to invite the Member (Mr. Charlebois) and I invite the Government to go with me further along the path of public ownership and the development of strategic resources. Just recently another source of Canadian uranium, that controlled by Denison Mines, was about to be sold to non-Canadian interests. The Prime Minister of Canada, acting for the Government of Canada, intervened. And so I invite the Member from City Park-University and the Government of Saskatchewan to join me in congratulating the Prime Minister on this action.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. LLOYD: — I invite them also to join me in urging the Government of Canada to take the next logical step and I urge the Government of Canada bring Denison Mines under full public ownership.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. LLOYD: — The situation seems to be laid out for us. Eldorado, which is our own Canadian, publicly owned Canadian company, has the know-how and it has the structure to do the job to undertake the management. There is no logic in having competition between public and private companies in this field, particularly having in mind the nature of the uranium market. There is every logic in having the production of this strategic mineral, of which Canada is such a large source, owned and operated by institutions fully responsible to the Canadian people through Parliament.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. LLOYD: — Denison wants to sell, we need to own, let's get together on it. We are in a world-wide power game and we need to get our trump cards into one hand and that hand we need to get them into should be the hand of the Canadian people.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. LLOYD: — I don't think there is any doubt about it. We can expect additional pressure from the United States public and private sources. We have some manifestations of it, I think, in the recent restrictions on their import of our petroleum products. It is worth noting, I believe, a comment which I find in The Leader Post of just a couple of days ago, March 11th. It is referring to a meeting of the United States Cabinet-level committee. It says:

In the opinion of this committee after a transitional period of three years the U.S. market would be opened up to Canadian oil, provided . . .

(and this is important)

provided Canada cooperates in a controversial continental policy on practically all sources of energy.

There is a power-play with respect to Canadian water and its use in the United States in the making, I am sure of that.

If we are going to stay in this game as Canadians then we need to organize all of our resources. Denison Mines is one of these resources, and I urge the endorsement of the Government of Saskatchewan in urging public ownership of this resource.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. LLOYD: — Mr. Speaker, the Government supporters in this debate, well, the Member for City Park-University has already committed himself to support of the principle of public ownership.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. LLOYD: — We are just asking him to be logical about it, that's all.

Mr. Speaker, the Government supporters in this debate have attempted to argue against the amendment proposed by our financial critic (Mr. Blakeney). This amendment says, you will recall, that the Budget will fail Saskatchewan people. It will fail Saskatchewan people because it won't adequately relieve farm people from oppressive taxes directly or indirectly caused by previous failures. It will fail Saskatchewan people because it won't adequately provide jobs for the growing number of unemployed. As a matter of fact there must be doubt as to whether this Budget will even keep jobs for many of those already employed.

We have had from the Federal Budget this evening a suggestion that unemployment will probably increase in Canada in the months to come.

Government supporters have used the age-old line that, if they were to vote for the amendment, they would be voting against those few useful benefits which the Budget does provide. This argument obviously misses the whole point of the Budget discussion. Voting on the Budget neither endorses nor supports any individual item in it. On the other hand, voting on the Budget is a vote on the record of the Government and its current and previous financial management. I submit that as a result when the MLAs on the Government side support this Budget, they are voicing approval of the Government's handling of the finances of the Province. In so doing they voice approval of all the promises broken: the promise to decrease in a major way provincial taxes; the promise to decrease in a major way property taxes; the promise to decrease power and gas rates; the promise of 80,000 more jobs; the promise of low interest rates to farmers; the promise of vastly increasing Saskatchewan's population. This is what these people claim they are willing to vote approval of. If they want to endorse that record they will vote against our amendment and for the Budget.

We will also be voting not only on the past record of the

March 12, 1970

Government of course. We will be voting on the totality of the proposals in the Budget and whether in our judgment these proposals will meet the economic and human needs of our province. This Budget doesn't meet those needs.

In voting for the Budget they vote for continued and perhaps additional unemployment, for less farm security, for more people leaving the Province.

Mr. Speaker, this Government is guilty of so much short-sightedness and demonstrated mismanagement that it can't expect to have the confidence of Saskatchewan people and I will vote for the amendment.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

HON. G.B. GRANT: (Minister of Health) — Mr. Speaker, as one grows older in years you gradually get a thicker skin on disappointments and I have gone through two disappointments today. The major one was the lack of substance in the Opposition's remarks about the Budget. The minor one was that the Member from Regina South East (Mr. Baker) is not with us this evening. I should have realized that he doesn't attend here in the evenings. I can't understand where he is because most funerals are held during the day time — he can't be attending a funeral. The only thing I can surmise is that he is out campaigning for the Provincial leadership, giving away more Regina cuff links or wheat broaches or buffalo hats, to the people of Kipling or to the people of Qu'Appelle. This is what he has been doing and I think the taxpayers of Regina are getting sick and tired of it, and we would be glad to share him with the rest of Saskatchewan if they would like him.

Just in the hope that he will be here later on I will save my remarks in connection with him to a later time.

What I would like to comment about primarily tonight is the question of hospital deficits which were touched on by the Hon. Member from Riversdale (Mr. Romanow) the other day. One would think that the former Government never heard of hospital deficits in their holier-than-thou attitude when they happen to have the floor.

The Hon. Member from Regina North East (Mr. Smishek) has suggested that we had moved away from a hospital plan which paid all hospital operating costs. I am aware of no provincial plan which pays all hospital costs and I doubt whether he can point one out.

AN HON. MEMBER: — There never was!

MR. GRANT: — Certainly it has never been the practice in Saskatchewan.

AN HON. MEMBER: — It never will be!

MR. GRANT: — Let's look at British Columbia. Their annual report says (they are referring to a message that has been directed to the hospitals) I quote:

They are further advised that deficits incurred through

expenditures in excess of the approved budget will not be met by the local governments.

I would like to quote the Hon. James Henderson, Health Minister of Alberta:

If any hospital spends more than the allowable 12 per cent increase it will be that board's responsibility to raise the money locally.

It is difficult for me, Mr. Speaker, to understand how a member of the respected legal profession, a front bench, could stand in this House and say that the present Minister of Health created a crisis in Saskatoon and elsewhere in 1969,

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Shame, shame!

MR. GRANT: — and state that it is our intention to wreck the Saskatchewan Hospital Program. Just complete hogwash and he knows it. There is no doubt about it that his definition of a crisis differs considerably from mine. If a crisis did exist in Saskatoon it was because the previous Government did not face up to the seriousness of escalating hospital costs. It lacked the backbone to call a halt to unlimited budget requests.

Let's look at the hospital deficits before 1965. Now he's the one who says that I was the one who started the crisis by suggesting that the Saskatoon City Hospital would not have their deficit picked up. Well, let's look at the picture. In 1960 the previous Government passed on to the local municipalities \$653,000 in deficits that were not picked up by the Saskatchewan Hospital Services Plan; in 1961 \$162,000; in 1962 \$386,000; in 1963 \$626,000 passed on to the poor local taxpayer. By who? By the Members opposite.

AN HON. MEMBER: — NDP!

MR. GRANT: — In 1964 — it is funny they didn't do a little better that year — \$733,000.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Shame, shame!

MR. GRANT: — In other words, Mr. Speaker, who started the whole idea of leaving a portion of hospital deficits with the local authorities? Mr. Speaker, it was the Members opposite. They are the ones who, as the Member from Riversdale (Mr. Romanow) said, opened the door to shift the burden to the local taxpayer, pointing the finger at us that we opened the door. Now who opened the door? It was the Members opposite.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. GRANT: — Let's just take a look and see how serious this terrible crises is that he spoke of and that he called a meeting of all MLAs. I am very proud of the Member in back of me who did not rally to the call of the Member from Riversdale.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

March 12, 1970

MR. GRANT: — Well, last July this terrible crisis was anticipated at a figure of some \$90,000. That was what they suggested the deficit would be. The deficit now is about \$57,000, and a recent article from the Saskatoon Star Phoenix dated February 21st says:

City Hospital deficit down to \$57,000 could be wiped out.

I would like to read from this article. Just a minute now . . .

Mayor Buckwold asked if the quality of care had been maintained in spite of the staff reduction. Executive Director, James D. MacMillan, said it had.

I am quoting now what Board Chairman Judge E.N. Hughes said:

The suggested closing of 86 beds considered as an economy measure in October would not have been any hardship.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. GRANT: —

The Board approved a motion that the administration continue to seek methods of controlling the size of staff while maintaining standards of care. Mayor Buckwold said that the budget allowed this year is about 6 per cent increase over that of previous years. 'This is reasonable,' he said.

So this is that terrible crisis which the Hon. Member . . .

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. GRANT: — In other words, Mr. Speaker, I maintain the Hon. Member from Riversdale (Mr. Romanow) is nothing but a scare-monger and a pretty good one at that too.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. GRANT: — He suggests that we are ruining the Saskatchewan Hospital Plan. Well, let's look at what has happened since 1961. We will be fair. We'll go back to 1961. The figures I am quoting are the percentage of increases over the preceding year; 1961 4.1 per cent; 1962 5.4 per cent; 1963 8.9 per cent; 1964 10 per cent. Now we get into 1965; the highest that series was 10 per cent and the lowest was 4 per cent. From 1965 the rate increase was 8 per cent, 10.1 per cent, 8.7 per cent, 10.7 per cent and last year 11.3 per cent. The lowest was 8 per cent which is almost as high as the highest they gave in the period 1961 to 1964.

The great oil Province of Alberta has frozen the hospital increase at 12 per cent for 15 months. Last year Saskatchewan increase was 11.3 per cent for 12 months.

Let's look at the Dominion Bureau of Statistics per capita costs of increase in services as of January 21st, 1970. I think this would lead anyone to believe that Saskatchewan is not skimping on hospital dollars. The per capita cost in Saskatchewan was \$77.71, British Columbia \$71.15. We are spending

more per capita in Saskatchewan than even the rich Province of British Columbia. There are only three other Provinces in Canada exceeding Saskatchewan and those are Ontario, Quebec and Alberta.

Mr. Speaker, our budget this year recognizes priorities. Hospital services up by \$7 million — the biggest increase in the history of this Province,

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. GRANT: — an amount equal to the original cost of the entire program. Let's look at what happened in 1963 — you would have thought that would be a pretty big year because they were anticipating an election — an increase of \$.3.5 million; in 1962 \$2 million; in 1961 — a real magnanimous year, it must have been a tough year — \$1.5 million, a magnanimous 3 per cent.

AN HON. MEMBER: — Big deal!

MR. GRANT: — Over the three-year period an increase of \$7.2 million or slightly less than 20 per cent. Let's look at 1966 to 1969. The 1966 figure for the Province was \$57.6 million, and in 1969 \$77.3 million, an increase of \$19.7 million for that period or 34 per cent.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. GRANT: — I would like, Mr. Speaker, to quote some figures from Saskatoon City and the Regina General because these two hospitals have been cited. We will just take a look and see how generous the people opposite were when they were the Government.

The Regina General from 1961 to 1964 \$995,000 difference, an increase of 21 per cent. From 1966 to 1969 under our Government the Regina General has been receiving \$3.3 million more, an increase of 50 per cent, 50 per cent over what they were getting in 1966 as compared to a 21 per cent increase for a three-year period under the former Administration.

Let's look at the Saskatoon City Hospital. Under the previous Government in that same period the Saskatoon City Hospital budget went up by \$374,000, 15 per cent or an average of 5 per cent for the three-year period. In 1966 to 1969 the increase was \$1.7 million or 51 per cent, a far cry from the 15 per cent that the previous Government gave.

Mr. Speaker, reference has been made by the Hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Lloyd) to the Psychiatric Program. This Budget acknowledges the necessity of continuing to upgrade our psychiatric program and I would point out that during the period 1960 to 1964, the increase in the Psychiatric Branch amounted to \$2.4 million; the period 1966 to 1970, \$4.3 million. I don't think anyone can accuse this Government of short-changing the psychiatric program. We are still among the highest in the country and producing a good program and will continue to give that branch of the Department its rightful priority.

It appears that His Worship (Mr. Baker) is still absent but I hope that someone will convey the message to him that

March 12, 1970

17 years ago I made a vow that I would never criticize a succeeding mayor, because I had one of my predecessors who spent a lot of his time telling me how to run the city and I resented it. For 17 years I have kept my word, but I can tell you it is getting more and more difficult year by year to continue to keep this vow. I am not a large taxpayer. There are many larger taxpayers than I am in the city, there are many smaller, so I suppose I could be called an average taxpayer, but I am getting a little sick and tired of His Worship using my tax dollars in Kipling, in Fort Qu'Appelle, in Qu'Appelle, handing out wheat broaches in his campaign for the leadership. Apparently, that is the only justification I can see that he is doing it for. A quick summation would indicate that I am personally paying his entire salary and I am beginning to doubt whether I am getting value for my money. I am beginning to think that it is time that I, as a taxpayer, went on strike because I am getting just a little bit tired of His Worship. Now if there is anybody suffering from an inferiority complex it is not Mayor Baker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. GRANT: — I was so pleased the other day when speaking in this House, he gave me some credit for the Base Hospital, even though the Member for Regina Centre (Mr. Blakeney) doesn't expect to see it built and blames me for all the delay and all the wrongdoings. So I think he should really look to His Worship from Regina South East (Mr. Baker) because it is really his hospital. He said it was, it's his hospital. So if he is going to take 90 per cent of the credit for the hospital, I would suggest, Sir, that we give him 90 per cent of the blame for anything that goes wrong with it. A complete inferiority complex, homeowner grant, two-price system of wheat and all the other things that he went onto tell us about. I am reminded of what my Dad used to say about anybody who had suffered with lack of an inferiority complex, such as the Member from Regina South East does, "I'd like to buy him for what I think he is worth and sell him for what he thinks he's worth." I can tell you, if you did that with the Member from Regina South East the deficit at the Regina General Hospital would be well looked after.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. GRANT: — I think that after his 14-point program in 1965 and his promises this year that he should from this day forward be known as King Henry XIV.

Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Member from Moose Jaw North (Mr. Snyder) in his remarks last week accused me of not producing too many good ideas. Well, it was kind of cruel, I thought I had had the odd good idea but maybe he is right, I'll have to take his word for it. But after listening to the Hon. Member from Regina Centre (Mr. Blakeney) I feel a similar observation could be made. No new ideas, the same old harangue, too little, too late, we always did better, we are the ones with the bright new thoughts. As usual the Hon. Member from Regina Centre pointed scornfully at the proposed Base Hospital. Almost six years, he said, and only starting this year and he wasn't too sure whether we would start. But he said that he would give us the benefit of the doubt. So maybe we will get started this year.

Let's check back to those good old golden days when the Members opposite were building the University Hospital. Well, they conceived the idea in 1944, but they really didn't deliver the baby until 1954 — ten years later. One year work was stopped. I understand they either ran out of stone masons or they ran out of money, I'm not sure which, but there was one year apparently when work was called off. Well, this delay of ten years was bad enough, and I am sure the Opposition of the day must have picked on them a bit, but now we are faced with \$3 million to try to update the University Hospital and \$15 million to expand it. The building was not well planned, Mr. Speaker. It is one of the most inflexible buildings in the province. They should have taken 12 years and planned it properly. Let's look across Canada. Teaching hospitals are taking on an average of ten years or more to get into operation. He made a fantastic comparison when he cited St. Paul's in Saskatoon at \$15,000 a bed as compared to \$60,000 for the Base Hospital, comparing apples and grapefruit and the apples were ten years old. A service hospital versus a teaching hospital, a 1961 hospital versus a 1971 hospital.

Let's look at a current comparison not one ten years old. Canadian teaching hospitals are ranging in cost up to \$45 a square foot. I am confident that the Base Hospital will be built for considerably less than this figure. It will be lower than the average for Canada at the present price-levels. As far as the number of years involved to get it underway, the timing cited for the University Hospital project up there in Edmonton is 14 years for completion; the University of Manitoba 18 years; the University of Ottawa 15 years; the McMaster University in Hamilton 12 years. Mr. Speaker, these are complicated structures; they involve complex programs; they must be flexible not University-type hospital buildings such as in Saskatoon; they must be capable of future expansion; they must incorporate all facilities and programs so as to be capable of providing the best of care at the least cost plus teaching and research. There is a great tendency, Mr. Speaker, in this life to keep up with Jones or die trying to do so.

The 1970 Budget is a realistic one considering economic conditions. Certainly it is easy to point out other areas of Canada where prices are higher, wages are higher and the weather is better. But let's not go broke trying to spend faster than others. Even in oil-rich Alberta, they have announced a firm hand on health. Hospital increases limited to 12 per cent for 15 months warning that deficits will not be picked up. Not too different from Saskatchewan, we just recognized a little earlier that something had to be done.

Let's look overseas to see what's happening elsewhere with hospital progress and medical care programs and health programs. Britain has always been considered as the Socialist haven, the welfare state. This article from The Business Week of January 17th goes on to point out some of the difficulties they are having over there. Even with the importation of 2,000 odd doctors from the commonwealth annually one of the hallmarks of the service is constant delay. For health service patients the waiting time for minor surgery can run to months, even to a year or more. This is where the private health insurance goes to work in Great Britain. At the present time there are 9,000 business firms buying private insurance. About 2 million Britons hold private policies today compared to just 86,000 when the plan was set up. The largest health insurance company

March 12, 1970

in Britain is the British United Providence Association whose 1969 income was some \$36 million mostly from group coverage. A typical family premium is \$105 a year. So in spite of their welfare state medicare program, the private sector of the economy has to step in to try and fill the gap.

Let's look at Sweden. Sweden has always been upheld as a welfare state and the Members opposite have quoted what takes place in the health field in Sweden quite frequently. But Sweden too has run into its problems. There are long waiting lists for surgery; long line-ups at clinics; complaints of impersonal treatment at big hospitals; and some Swedish hospitals had to close for the summer months for staff vacations, Mr. Hon. Member from Riversdale (Mr. Romanow). Even in Sweden they are faced with a terrible situation. But the Government has the answer, the Government of Sweden has the answer. I want the Members opposite to pay particular attention to this because starting July 1st each patient will pay a fee of \$1.50 to \$2 each time he makes a routine visit to a doctor, hospital or clinic.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. GRANT: — Sweden, that great welfare state. They have seen the light. They have watched what was taking place in Saskatchewan and realized that we were progressive out here and they picked up the utilization fees. That great state of Sweden! I was sure the Members opposite would be interested in that.

Mr. Speaker, Members opposite seem to become almost fanatic when referring to Crown corporation dividends paid to the Provincial Treasury. One would think that to do so amounted to an impardonable sin. The Hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Lloyd) was very careful that in 1962 they didn't pay one cent out of the Power Corporation toward the financing of Government. Well, the Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Steuart) said the reason they didn't was that they didn't have any money. Maybe that is the reason. But just let's think back to the '40s when the Members opposite were promoting so-called free health and welfare plans. When asked how they were going to pay for these schemes the reply was, set up Crown corporations and use the profits therefrom. Mr. Speaker, when the NDP does it they call it social planning; using profits for the people. When we do it it becomes financial skulduggery. More of their Golden Age philosophy. Mr. Speaker, they can do no wrong.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is quite evident from the debate that has taken place that we demonstrated that the Budget presented by the provincial Treasurer (Mr. Steuart) is a realistic budget, a sound budget. It injects dollars into the economy where they are required to do a job. Consequently I will be supporting the motion and voting against the amendment.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. J. KOWALCHUK: (Melville) — Mr. Speaker, it is usual for a Member following other Members, and particularly if you are following Members who are in opposition, be they from the Government side or the Opposition, to comment on remarks made by previous speakers. I am sorry to say that neither the Minister of Highways (Mr. Boldt) nor the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Guy) warrants a reply. All I can say is that when a Minister of the Crown makes the

kind of statement he did regarding our native Indian people he isn't deserving of his position, nor is he deserving of an answer. All I say, Mr. speaker, that Indian people are people, and no better and no worse than their white fellowman.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. KOWALCHUK: — The Minister of Highways (Mr. Boldt) made some remark about one of our Members appointing himself the highway critic. Well, well do I recall, Mr. Speaker, that two years ago Mr. Boldt appointed himself the Liberal architectural critic, criticizing school construction. Last year, he appointed himself Chief Liberal Press critic calling the Press and the Press Gallery kooks and punks. You will recall that. How does he dare to even suppose that somebody else could beat him at self-appointments. I want to add, Sir, that our Leader (Mr. Lloyd) has already replied to many other important questions this evening in a manner far more efficient and able than I could have done so I will continue with other matters.

I want to take this opportunity, Mr. Speaker, to congratulate Dr. Worobetz in attaining the very important and highly esteemed position as Lieutenant Governor of Saskatchewan. At the same time I wish the distinguished retiring Lieutenant Governor, Mr. Hanbidge, many years of contentment and well-earned relaxation in his remaining years of retirement.

We are at the end of the 1970 Budget Debate, Sir. The Government says it's a good budget. We in the Opposition have not only said that it isn't good enough but some of the help, if it is forthcoming in many cases, is too little and too late, Mr. Treasurer. Not only have the Opposition Members said this but have backed their statements by facts and figures to prove their points.

Mr. Speaker, I must in the few remarks that I intend to make point out where it hurts the people in the Melville constituency. But I will be fair in mentioning areas where help has been given. I have already referred to a number of programs that assisted certain industries in Melville and I won't repeat this again. Still the fact is that Melville and the Qu'Appelle Valley regions are omitted from the Federal Designated Area whereby new industries, particularly larger new industries, haven't got a chance under the provincial plan due to the maximum limitations placed on it. I was surprised to hear the Premier (Mr. Thatcher) say in answer to my question yesterday that he had arranged with the Federal authorities to be a "fairy godmother" to the areas omitted from the Federal plan. Now, Mr. Speaker, the people of these areas resent having been bartered for a scheme which is far less in scope and dimension than the Federal Designated Area. It means going hat in hand to the Premier when we at Melville, Yorkton and the Qu'Appelle Valley region have the inalienable right as Canadians to fare in equal treatment as Canadians. It is probably for this reason, Sir, the need for financial support, that the carpet factory for Melville is being questioned. We who are in that parkland area and the Valley region are in real desperate financial trouble. Farmers, businessmen, big and small alike, need to be included in the Federal Designated Area. This outright discrimination for cities like Melville who need this assistance, probably more than any other city in Saskatchewan, is unacceptable. We must be placed in the Federal Designated Area. I hope that

March 12, 1970

something will be done soon.

Mr. Speaker, another serious question which is going to affect the Melville constituency is the wholesale cutting of CN and CP services. The CN Master Agency Plan is going to have a very serious consequence on the small community. It will displace people who have served faithfully for many years. Services, in spite of promises, will and must deteriorate. We all realize that technology makes some of this inevitable but to cut off all that is intended is unjust and unacceptable. Surely cities like Melville and villages and towns like Ituna, Balcarres, Lebret and Lestock should have better service than just an on-hand representative.

Mr. Speaker, I want to bring to the attention of this House, if I may, a topic so ardently and eloquently phrased by the Minister of Mineral Resources (Mr. Cameron) who is in charge of Saskatchewan Telephones. In his remarks yesterday he read so clearly the names of all the places that would be receiving the telephone dial system. Each name rolled off the Minister's lips almost in reverence. I am sure he was thinking of the ballots dropping. I listened, Sir, I listened and listened and at the end I still listened, I couldn't believe it, Sir, I had listened in vain. For neither did I hear the name of Goodeve where I live, nor the name of Lestock where my colleague from the constituency of Touchwood (Mr. Meakes) lives. Now, Mr. Speaker, what the Hon. Member for Touchwood pointed out in the Press late last summer, that it was outright discrimination against the Member for Touchwood and the Member for Melville by denying these two towns the dial system was undeniably confirmed by the Minister (Mr. Cameron) himself yesterday. The only two towns along the whole of the CN line between Melville and Saskatoon were chosen for reprisal. Why, Mr. Speaker? Probably because the only two Liberal Cabinet Ministers defeated in that 1967 election were in Touchwood and Melville.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. KOWALCHUK: — However, Sir, it proves beyond a shadow of doubt that discrimination is the right word. The Member for Touchwood (Mr. Meakes) was right. All these rantings and ravings by the Minister of Mineral Resources asking for the Member from Touchwood to withdraw his statement of discrimination was nothing more than a sham, Sir. Sounds of fury signifying hypocrisy on the part of the Minister.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. KOWALCHUK: — Sir, since I am on the topic of telephone services, surely my Indian friends on the four reserves north of Lorne deserve consideration. These people on the four Indian Reserves, Peepeekeesis, Okanese, Star Blanket, and Little Black Bear, should be receiving some of the generosity that spilled out of the Minister's lips yesterday. You know, Sir, smoke signals and tom-tom messages may have been all right 150 years ago but these people on these reserves are equal, compatible in every way to the white man, and deserve equal treatment.

Of the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Estey) I want to find out if these same people on these four reserves have waited for a number of years for a grid road running north and south entirely through these reserves. That road, such as it is, is

the only road in the north and south direction and it is used by the school bus every day. In conjunction with Stanley municipality and Indian Affairs a grid road has been constructed connecting these reserves to grid roads running east to Melville. This, and the road that I suggest, will make it possible for the people to attend the composite school at Melville when it is finished. But this north and south road is needed now.

There was once a school for training Indian men in the heavy equipment on the Peepeekeesis Reserve and I understand it was quite a successful operation. It operated one year and then disappeared probably because of the result of the last election as well. Now these people want these things on the reserves, They want roads and homes. They live in a modern world of modern schools, cars, television, etc. They are anxious to pull themselves up by their bootstraps . They need some of the assistance that is being given to other people.

Mr, Speaker, I hear a lot about housing, about aids to the native people, and somehow I have the feeling that this Government seems to be talking mainly about the Indian people in the North. That is how it should be since the greatest need seems to be there, but, Sir, I ask this Government not to neglect the Indians in Southern Saskatchewan. Many of these people are ambitious people, they want to be self-reliant. They need assistance in starting production on a small scale, in building boats or leather work, or even raising cattle. I hear from the Indians themselves that it is usual for Indian Affairs to send out an expert who in most cases in computerized mathematics calculates that the venture is a poor business risk and, therefore, the answer is No. I am told that that happens again and again. Constantly they hear the same story, No. I was a bit surprised to hear the Member from Meadow Lake (Mr. Coupland) say that the grant money given to the Métis people would be better allocated to some project in the La Loche area. Why deprive the Métis people? Why them? They who are having a more difficult time than many of their Indian brethren If the people at La Loche need help then give it to them, but don't deprive the Métis, the people who are really making a good effort to live in a white man's society. The Métis people are deserving of all consideration like everyone else, either white, Indian or Métis. Mr. Speaker, I want to suggest that this Government not penalize the Southern Indians because they have progressed further and better. Help them so they can still better themselves. I grant you that the Lebreton farms are a good example of the kind of aid needed. Let's extend it to more of them.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. KOWALCHUK: — Mr. Speaker, I want to spend a few moments on education. I don't intend to go into the matter of teacher-pupil ratio, nor into the loss of local autonomy and the respective effects of deterioration in education in general. My colleague following me will deal with that part fully and my colleague from Kelvington (Mr. Byers) has done an exceptionally good job of exposing the fallacy of this Government's educational policies. However, I will have many pertinent statements and comments to make when the Education estimates and the education Bill are presented. Mr. Speaker, I understand that the budget for operational expenses in Education will be around \$10.5 million for 1970. Let us not forget that this Government has thrown in many items into this operating fund that were never included

before, items such as the Canada Pension Plan, Teachers' Superannuation and others. But, Mr. Speaker, even with these extras, if we get the \$10.5 million and if we have hold the line on local tax increases, I don't intend to say Thank you or smile benevolently, Sir, to you people on that side of the House who deliberately deceived the Saskatchewan taxpayer again and again, to you who promised, "We will improve services and reduce taxes;" to you who said that you would relieve the people of the "socialist tax burden" placed upon their backs, and then proceeded to burden the people with the largest, most inconceivable property tax burden in the Province's history, an average of 12.4 mills in five short years. Today in this Budget you loosen the tax rope around people's neck to give them a year's breathing spell and you expect them to be thankful for the reprieve! The people of Saskatchewan will offer you no humble thanks, Mr. Speaker. After deceiving them with the wild, hair-brained school grants scheme like incentive grant formula, and a year later trotted out in great fanfare the foundation grant formula, and then proceeded to scrap it, the people won't forget that all this while — during this five-year period — the education thumbscrews were applied harder and harder on the local taxpayer. Today when the tax burden is too heavy, far too heavy, when there is no money for the farmer and other people's livelihood, does this Government take off some of the tax load? No, Mr. Speaker, it just says we won't make it any heavier.

But, Mr. Speaker, the most unfortunate and costly error this Government made was in not going ahead with capital construction cost of schools which were so desperately needed as far back as two years ago. These were the times to build when debentures were still being sold at five and six and six and a half per cent, when cost of materials was 10 to 15 to 20 per cent less. Instead of that an ironclad edict was declared to all schools — no building. Caesar has spoken. Today we still have those schools to build, but the interest rate on debentures is 9 3/4 per cent. The effect of this two or three-year period of waiting has placed on the backs of people additional millions of dollars of burden in order to get the required physical facilities.

Education in Saskatchewan today is in a state of agonizing disruption and swiftly heading toward chaos academically. The Department has become a pawn for the Premier and his Cabinet, the staff chosen not for its scholastic and academic qualifications but purely on political and so-called business ability. Mr. Speaker, carpenters make good carpenters and nut and bolt dealers make good hardware salesmen, but never in all history of education have I heard of this type of person placed in charge of an education department to guide the destiny of our young people.

Mr. Speaker, this Government in conjunction with the Federal Government has permitted itself to special financing for schools accepting the bilingual policy. I have received quite a number of letters referring to the possibility of the College at Gravelbourg being closed down for want of finances. Many people that send their sons and daughters to that school, were led to believe that it was destined to be a provincial bilingual college. Records prove that their attendance is commendable. I would urge the Minister (Mr. McIsaac) to review the situation and in view of the fact that the college does serve a very useful function accede to some financial assistance and keep the school open.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. KOWALCHUK: — Mr. Speaker, I had in mind to bring a number of other important items in regard to education but I only intend to touch on one more. To me as a school unit trustee involved in bussing hundreds of our students many miles, it places a responsibility on boards that I am sure everyone of us can appreciate. We as board members either buy our own unit buses or contract for their services. We roughly outline our needs when contracting or buying, stating size and so on. But, Mr. Speaker, and I know that the Minister of Education and other Ministers know as well that we as board members have little to say what kind of buses are being allowed into Saskatchewan. All kinds of buses are being brought in, unsuitable for our weather, wrong kind of seating, wrong kind of heating, and so on and so on. Mr. Speaker, I beg this Government to immediately update the code for buses being allowed into Saskatchewan . . .

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. KOWALCHUK: — . . . by either producing our own set of regulations or following those of Alberta which has a far superior code of regulations to ours. Studies have been initiated, Mr. Speaker, in Saskatchewan by the Trustees Association in conjunction with the Saskatchewan Safety Council and assisted by the Saskatchewan Traffic Board. Seminars have been held as far back as four years ago, that I remember. Ideas and complaints have been made by school boards and trustees, expressing dissatisfaction with the kind of buses allowed into Saskatchewan, which are unsuitable for climatic conditions as I said before. Sure we have some regulations such as pertaining to lettering on buses, signs and signalling but not much else with real teeth in the regulations. Other important safety and performance factors are almost entirely ignored. I recall that in our unit a contract was let. The contractor proceeded to get five new buses. Of these, three buses were a 24, a 36 and a 42 and all of them with a half-ton identical clutch in them. Some buses weren't even insulated. I ask you, Mr. Minister (Mr. McIsaac), and the Government to act immediately to implement more rigid, stronger and meaningful rules and regulations so that buyers of buses and school boards can be protected in their investments. But more so, Mr. Speaker, so that the young people using these buses be given the maximum protection and safety in transporting them to the schools.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. KOWALCHUK: — Mr. Speaker, the Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Steuart) in bringing down his Budget said:

Because we held down our spending when the economy was buoyant we are now in a position to prime the pump.

Let's just take a look at this statement. The fact that this Government, to balance last year's Budget, held down spending with pound-wise and dollar-foolish tenacity, even as late as last October by millions of dollars, was the most harmful and foolhardy and disastrous action of this Government.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. KOWALCHUK: A hold fast line and the

March 12, 1970

reduction of school building programs was the most serious and financially catastrophic amongst many other hold-backs. Mr. Speaker, this pump-priming is too little and too late, as I have repeatedly said before. The damage is done. It can never even be partly repaired in spite of some dosage of money. This pump-priming will never equal the increased amounts of interest rates being placed on prices of goods and materials and the skyrocketing of other factors relating to the building trades. After the skyrocketing in all sections of this inflated economy, the Provincial Treasurer even dares say anything about pump-priming our staggering inflated economy. It is like locking the barn door after the horse is stolen, Sir.

I say, Mr. Speaker, that even with these amounts stipulated in the Budget, and if they are used, they will never match the price-rise-cost factor of the last two years. Too little and too late. The losers are the people, the winners the financial institutions. The mark-up profits of this last year show booming percentage profit increases.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. KOWALCHUK: — This Saskatchewan Liberal Government made sure that by holding back and cutting back on the much needed programs it was aiding its real friends, the financiers, the financial institutions and their corporate friends.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. KOWALCHUK: — Now the farmers, a most important segment of our total Canadian economy and the most vulnerable in market fluctuations, to unpredictable vagaries of nature, and to Liberal politicians, are treated in a pretty shabby manner. The farming industry should have received a great deal more of pump-priming, but the Liberals of Saskatchewan just aren't oriented that way. If a farmer obtains a loan for \$6,000 to purchase female cows, he pays 7 per cent interest to the Liberal Government. (Its paternal attitude towards the financial institutions says without question, "We will pay the rest of the interest above the 7 per cent. Charge any amount you want to.") After two years the farmer pays all the interest and must repay the total \$6,000 borrowed. On the other hand loans to the industry, that's a different tale. There you can get \$300,000, and if you are successful, in five years time you don't have to pay this Government back not one red cent. Mr. Speaker, I am not against helping industry but let there be some equality.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. KOWALCHUK: — Let there be some equality. Surely the disparity is so glaring that no more need be said about it. This Government which prides itself on its efficient, business-like ways of running things is only presenting a superficial picture to be fed to the public. Its mismanagement has drained all cash reserves, millions of dollars taken out of medicare, from Power, from Telephones, from the Student's Aid Fund, from hundreds of other areas.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. KOWALCHUK: — This Government has increased the Provincial debt since its term of five years in office by over \$100 million. It has increased overall taxation on a family of four, which was \$428 to \$688. The tax load has almost doubled since this Government took office. But in spite of the difficulties in Saskatchewan for all people, farmers, laborers, small business and large ones too, this Government placed an income tax on all people. The poor who make more than \$1,000 will pay the 1 per cent increase as well, but not one red cent of corporation tax was raised or levied. Mr. Speaker, the people of Saskatchewan can readily see who the friends of this free-enterprise Liberal Government are.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. KOWALCHUK: — Mr. Speaker, the announcement that health and welfare payments are to be increased somewhat is welcome news. Certainly the Government should have looked at the deterrent fees once again — medical and hospital.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. KOWALCHUK: — The application of deterrent fees by Order in Council to apply to all physiotherapy is another blow to the old, the sick, and usually the needy. Now the move is out to cut the people who submit late bills. Instead of trying to ease the burden of the aged, pioneer citizens, this Government is callously applying the cold hard rule of indifference of the hard-nosed businessman. That cold, hard-nosed, business-like, computerized attitude is going to be your downfall, gentlemen.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. KOWALCHUK: — Your computer-like attitude towards education, to health and welfare, your worship of big business and big corporated farming, is going to mean your disappearance from the Western Canadian political scene altogether.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. KOWALCHUK: — Your last beachhead is Saskatchewan, and I am sure that when the Premier (Mr. Thatcher) decides to call an election it shall be his last Dieppe.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. KOWALCHUK: — The people to your right, Mr. Speaker, point their finger in derision at Manitoba. Those of you who listened to your radio and television last Sunday must have heard of the poll conducted on 1,000 Manitobans by the Winnipeg Tribune. The results should be revealing to Mr. Thatcher and his cohorts. The New Democratic Party of Manitoba polled nearly 48 per cent of the popular vote . . .

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. KOWALCHUK: — . . . and the Liberals a lowly

March 12, 1970

11 per cent. You know, Mr. Speaker, I have a strong suspicion that the McLaren Advertising Agency has conducted a similar poll in Saskatchewan and because we haven't heard the Premier announce the results with his usual bombastic flourish, I wager my bottom dollar that the results were equally unappetizing to the Premier and his Liberal strategists.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. KOWALCHUK: — Mr. Speaker, this Government has lost the confidence of all the people of Saskatchewan.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. KOWALCHUK: — The most unethical and deplorable and purely political infighting with the Federal cohorts fools no one on this side.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. KOWALCHUK: — Mr. Speaker, it is difficult to understand these Liberals. Everyone of you on that side of the House, all 34 of you, voted Liberal in the last Federal election. You are part and parcel of that whole package.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. KOWALCHUK: — The people of Saskatchewan know that Liberal times are hard times.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. KOWALCHUK: — Your Budget, Mr. Treasurer (Mr. Steuart) has an emergency kit, a pretty good emergency kit but it is a year or more too late. The lack of some cash injection for the farm economy is incomprehensible. Your dictatorial policies to hospital workers are abominable. Your consideration for dollar and cent values towering ominously over human values, I cannot support the Budget but I will support the amendment.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. M. KWASNICA: (Cut Knife) — Mr. Speaker, I am glad to be able to enter this debate. It is rather late but I still would like to bring some comments worthy of note to this House.

Mr. Speaker, this afternoon we were treated to a harangue in this House unprecedented in the history of Saskatchewan by the Minister of Highways (Mr. Boldt) who seems to have flipped again and appointed himself chief judge and executioner by cutting off all capital construction items in the constituency of Redberry, represented by Mr. Michayluk. Mr. Speaker, I understood it was the Hon. Mr. Heald that was going to go to the bench and not the Hon. Minister of Highways. But this is a typical attitude of this Government, and the Premier, and the Minister of Highways, and the Minister of Labour (Mr. Coderre), when it comes to dealing with people. Kick them, kick the Legislative Assembly door down, impose arbitrary courts, knock them down. That's the way they operate. And just like a bunch

of babies trying to get revenge on their opponents. It is a sad day for Saskatchewan people, Mr. Speaker, when they are subjected to this type of vicious and Gestapo-like retaliation.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. KWASNICA: — As for the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Guy) and his speech this afternoon, I will have a little more to say about that later and we will reveal the true character of this Minister of Public Works and this Government.

MR. GUY: — I can hardly wait!

MR. KWASNICA: — I am pleased to have an opportunity to take part in this Budget Debate because I am fully convinced that the Budget will lead to complete destruction of one of the finest educational systems on the North American continent.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. KWASNICA: — I would like to comment for a while on the new imposed teacher-pupil ratio. This Government after mismanaging and misappropriating Provincial funds and revenues for six years now chooses to put the squeeze on education to save face with the people of Saskatchewan. So the Minister of Education (Mr. McIsaac) says that school boards must pack in two more students per teacher in the classrooms across the Province to bring the teacher-pupil ratio up to 25 to 1, and, if school boards don't comply with the request, their grants will be cut to a level set by the Department of Education and its computers.

Now everybody knows that packing more students in the classrooms spells disaster for students and teachers. In order to meet the 25 to 1 ratio, hundreds of rooms across the Province will contain many more students per classroom than is educationally sound.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. KWASNICA: — Many of our slow learners will suffer from this policy. I am not worried about the classrooms that have 20 to 25 students; a competent teacher can handle that number easily and get excellent results. And really I am not worried about the teacher who has 40 students in the room because I know our teachers will do a good job in spite of 40 students in the room.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. KWASNICA: — But even though our teachers do their best, those who stay in the Province, in today's highly technical society that's just not good enough when you've got 40 students in the room. Setting this new ratio at 25 to 1 will bring about the closure of hundreds of classrooms across the Province because in many school units grades will now be lumped together. And this is exactly what is happening. Take the case of Marshall in my constituency which the Minister (Mr. McIsaac) has sorted out for comment in this debate. When one examines the situation, there it would appear superficially that this school probably is

March 12, 1970

overstaffed. There are five classrooms there now. Grade 1 and 2 room has 16 students in it. Now that teacher has to prepare 16 subject lessons. Obviously when one class is being taught the other one has to work on its own. This is hardly a desirable situation. How can the teacher show a film to one grade, for example, or listen to the radio or television broadcast or carry on exciting discussions with the one class and expect the other grade to work? It is just impractical. How much attention can the teacher give a student under these circumstances? Individual attention none. None during the school day unless the student wants to stay after four.

The new ratio imposed by the Minister (Mr. McIsaac) just compounds the problem some more. By cutting two teachers from the town of Marshall say, the grouping will have to be now three grades per room. Now the teacher will have 24 subjects to prepare and 26 students in the class. As one school board member put it to me last weekend when I was home he said, "I wouldn't take that job for \$20,000 a year."

Not only that, two classrooms will be closed down in the town of Marshall and the next step will be the closure of that school, and the continued decimation of rural life — all this aided and abetted by this Liberal Government. But the big issue regarding the closure of classrooms at Marshall or Marsden or any school across the province, the big question is: who has the right to make that decision — that these rooms have to be closed? The Minister of Education? Or the local school board and the ratepayers? That's the question.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. KWASNICA: — As far as we on this side of the House are concerned the Minister must stop meddling in local decision-making and let the people of the community concerned make up their own minds.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. KWASNICA: There is far too much bureaucracy, far too many computerized decisions being made by the Department of Education without any concern for human values. Surely, Mr. Speaker, this smells of dictatorship and is the ultimate death of local decision-making and the local school board. Far too many decisions made in education today are being made for political reasons rather than for educational reasons.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. KWASNICA: — I invite the Minister of Education (Mr. McIsaac) to come to my constituency — and I hope he has better luck than the last time he came — to explain to the people of Marshall and Marsden why they have to close their classrooms.

AN HON. MEMBER: — They've got a barrel of tar waiting for you!

MR. KWASNICA: — I think the Minister would be well advised to leave his ivory tower in Avord Towers in Regina and visit the schools in Saskatchewan where hundreds of community-minded people are

really concerned about what he is doing to our education system.

I would like to read a letter to the Hon. Members of this House, place it on the record — I take full responsibility for it. The Minister has a copy of it anyway because it was addressed to him. I quote:

Dear Sir:

My husband and I have just attended a ratepayer's meeting of the Radville School Unit in Lyndale school regarding the cutback in education for our children. I would like to suggest you take a further look into the cutback in teachers. We have waited many years for a good education and now when it is improving you are lowering the standard of education in the rural areas. In theory 25 students to one teacher is a sound idea but where our population is so spread out this does not work in practice. A suggestion to you as our chief educator I issue you an invitation to come to our school where we are to lose two teachers, four subjects and the closure of three rooms. We have no recreation room and if we are to crowd more students into our eight-room school you can imagine what it is like in the winter when most of our schooling is carried out. Between 175 and 200 students in the hall, also the fire hazard this brings to mind. Oh yes, the physical education teachers could no doubt teach music and the biology teacher could teach art. Education is more important than a new football field at this particular time. There are other aspects I could write about, but I do sincerely hope you accept the invitation to our school as I have never heard of your visiting any school and getting facts first hand. Yours truly
...

And so it was. This, Hon. Members is an example of the serious concern shown by common people in small communities. But he doesn't listen.

Mr. Speaker, has this Government done any studies on the effects of larger classes in education? Can the Minister be sure that his new ratio will not be damaging to thousands of our students? Does he know if larger classes will lead to hundreds of drop-outs, for example? Does he know if teachers can reasonably take the added strain? Or will this new ratio be the last straw for hundreds of our teachers? Does the Minister know what larger classes will do to the morale of teachers? Mr. Speaker, there have been hundreds of studies carried out regarding sensible teacher-pupil ratios. Some of them are inconclusive but the majority of them are definite. The National Educational Association and the Canadian School Trustees have carried out numerous studies.

I would like to bring to the attention of Hon. Members and the Minister the results of at least a few of these studies so that they can consider them. Ross and McKenna, for example, in a study called 'Class size: the multi-million dollar question' concluded their study by stating that,

given a generally competent staff, the smaller the classes, the greater the chances for inventions and early adoption of newer and better educational practices.

And certainly what Saskatchewan needs is newer and better

educational practices.

In a study involving 60 large classes (over 33) and 60 smaller classes (under 24 in a high school) a researcher by the name of Whitsitt found that classes that are small by design tend to have more variety in instructional methods than do large classes. And surely our students deserve variety when they sit in the classroom from nine to four for five days a week.

There have been many studies made regarding individual attention and size of classes. The National Education Bulletin has documented several studies. Richman found that teachers of small classes not only knew their pupils better but also used that knowledge as a basis for action. Pertsch found that individualized instruction in reading and arithmetic was used much more frequently in small than in large classes. And we all know how important a good foundation in reading and arithmetic is for everyday life.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. KWASNICA: — Another study by Ross and McKenna of New York reported from their studies that teachers in small class elementary schools were more often found observing children at work and making a record of their individual interests. In these systems cumulative records more often contained statements of outstanding accomplishments and successes of each pupil, and more teachers discussed special interest and aptitudes of children during parent interviews. In conclusion of this study, greater home-school community interaction occurred to provide the best help, guidance and service for individual children.

Bernard H. McKenna and James P. Pugh, Jr. have completed a study called, "Performance of pupils and teachers in large classes compared to small classes." The most important conclusion from this study, I found, is that according to most carefully controlled observational evidence, individual differences of pupils can be better served in classes numbering 20 or fewer than in classes of 30 or more. The evidence also shows that class size itself makes a difference in the quantity and variety of learning activities which take place. Perhaps the most striking conclusion found by a study by Prymier in 1961 was that pupils of average or below average ability seemed to suffer the greatest disadvantage from being in a large class group. And this bears out what I said earlier about slow learners.

And I ask the Hon. Minister of Education (Mr. McIsaac) has he done any study on the matter? Has he read and considered controlled and scientific studies on teacher-pupil ratios? Is he sincerely concerned about our children and what is going to happen to them?

Mr. Speaker, I questioned earlier the effects larger classes will have on teacher morale. Harap, an American researcher, summarized the results of a 10-year study to discover what factors affect teacher morale. He concluded that class size was one of the most important factors that shape the teacher's attitude toward his work and that a large class does more to destroy the teacher's confidence than any other single factor. Is this Government concerned about having competent, confident teachers with high morale?

Mr. Speaker, I caution this Government now that this increased teacher-pupil ratio will be the ruination of thousands of students and teachers in Saskatchewan.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. KWASNICA: — Our average and our slow-learner students will suffer from the lack of individual attention. Hundreds of students will become drop-outs, the morale of our teachers will deteriorate, the standard of education in Saskatchewan will slip to an all-time low.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. KWASNICA: — Hundreds of classrooms will be closed — it is happening day in and day out — and our communities will suffer further deterioration.

I ask this Government to stop this suicidal policy before it is too late . . .

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. KWASNICA: — . . . before there is a complete breakdown in the system, as I said earlier, one which was the best in North America.

Mr. Speaker, what are our educators across the province saying about this increased teacher-pupil ratio? Well, the Saskatchewan Teachers' Federation says it will have disastrous effects on Saskatchewan education. Many electives at the high school level will be eliminated, especially in the school units across the province. The tendency will be to dispense with services such as librarians, audio-visual coordinators, guidance counsellors and others. Many local teacher groups have voiced their concern. Medstead unit teachers, Outlook superintendency, Lloydminster superintendency have passed resolutions protesting this new ratio. Yes, and even in Wilkie school unit, the teachers in the Minister's own riding, sent a resolution protesting the increased ratio. And does the Government listen? No. It plods right along like a mechanical robot and heeds no one.

In November last year the Saskatchewan School Trustees asked the Provincial Cabinet to reconsider its policy of increased teacher-pupil ratio. They said that school boards were not given enough notice of the Government's plans. They fear, like the teachers do, that the new ratios will result in decreased school programs. Their brief expressed deepest concern in regard to the effect of the new teacher-pupil ratios on operating grants. Their brief continued that they were afraid that the implementation of these ratios will have the most disastrous effect on educational programs and on local taxation. "In effect," the School Trustees went on to say, "there will be no saving in total expenditure. The burden will merely be shifted from the provincial tax-base to the local tax-base."

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. KWASNICA: — You know in speaking of saving money they say that

March 12, 1970

for every extra student you pack into the classroom you've got \$3 million bucks in your pocket. Well, when you take a look at this and average it across the province that is something like \$3 per person that you are trying to save by instituting this type of ratio. I don't think it is worth it.

The School Trustees say that the easiest way for school boards to increase teacher-pupil ratios will be to reduce programs in larger centres. This will mean fewer options and only partial utilization of multi-million dollar complexes. And in conclusion the Saskatchewan School Trustees said that in rural areas there will be a reversion to the single academic offering for students, a practice which is contrary to the present acceptable developments in education.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. KWASNICA: — This Government plods on its merry way.

Mr. Speaker, I cannot support a budget which is positively detrimental to our students, to our youth, our citizens of tomorrow.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. KWASNICA: — I cannot support a budget that is being opposed by the teachers in the province. I will not support a budget that sentences our youth to boredom, overcrowded facilities, lack of individual attention and guidance and the personal touch of a contented teacher; a budget that sentences our youth to mental confusion, to unemployment, to drop-outs, to escapism and LSD and drugs in order to escape the clutches of an obsolete and meaningless and backward educational system, strangled by an obsolete and meaningless and backward Liberal party in Regina.

I will not support a budget that makes educational decisions for political reasons. I will not support an educational budget brought in by a Minister who said in this debate that he is increasing the student-teacher ratio by two because he is afraid that the future might bring 50 per cent of the population sitting in the classroom and the other 50 per cent standing in front. How silly! How pea-brained can you get? And he is doing it because he wants to prevent this from happening.

Education is the most important investment a government can make, for without education the people are unable to earn a decent living; and as automation and cybernation progress, we will need to retrain many times in our lives. We will need to educate ourselves perhaps in the future, Mr. Minister, for leisure, so that we will learn how to spend our leisure time wisely and constructively.

Well, there is one more bit of information in an essential research regarding teacher-pupil ratios that I wish to bring to the attention of Members opposite. William G. Hollister, psychiatrist with the National Institute of Mental Health in Maryland, United States proved that the number of face-to-face relationships which pupils must cope with is another important factor regarding class size. We all know that besides teaching, every teacher is faced with the responsibility and guidance and often control of the interpersonal relationships between the

children in his class. According to Dr. Hollister's calculations, in a class of 10 pupils there are 45 different patterns of relationship between students and their teacher, 45 different possibilities of crossfire and possible friction.

In a class of 30, the number of relationships jumps geometrically to 435. In a class of 40 the number of relationships jumps to 778 — 778 chances of friction and conflict that a teacher must be in control of at all times. But I guess, Mr. Speaker, that is a little too deep for the Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Steuart). He just can't seem to figure that one out.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, increasing the teacher-pupil by two per classroom increases by approximately 64 the number of interpersonal relationships within a class of 30. Dr. Hollister concluded in a long-term study that the teacher's discipline and guidance problems are compounded geometrically (not arithmetically) when just one more child is added to the class. So this means that discipline problems in Saskatchewan schools shall be increased tremendously by this increase in the number of pupils per class.

In summing up, Mr. Speaker, this Government having already damaged the quality of education in Saskatchewan is wrong to continue to increase the teacher-pupil ratio by two more in an effort to reach 25 to 1. Two years ago that ratio was at about 22 to 1, which was a workable and acceptable ratio when one considers that quality of education is a major concern. The fact that librarians, guidance personnel, audio-visual personnel, principals and vice-principals and music teachers are all included in this ratio compounds the problem. Librarians seldom do classroom teaching, therefore, if a school has one, that automatically means each classroom teacher must take one more student per classroom to take up the slack of 25 students there. If a school has a guidance counsellor, who also does little classroom teaching, then the rest of the staff must add another student to their classes to take up that slack. The fact that many principals spend no time in the classroom adds another student to the regular classroom teacher. If the school has two vice-principals — one vocational and one academic — who teach half time, this means still another student added to a regular staff teacher. So we see that asking for an increase of two students per teacher and taking in all the personnel as well is in effect asking for an increase of four more per class in these cases. All this in one quick move. This is practically impossible mathematically speaking, therefore, I suggest to the Minister that librarians, audio-visual personnel and other supportive personnel within a school system be not included into teacher-pupil ratio.

Mr. Speaker, the Liberal Member for Moosomin (Mr. Gardner) — and I am glad he is in his seat — taking part in the debate last Wednesday said that no government has ever done more for education than the Liberals. This statement is absolutely false when we check on the facts. What are the facts regarding the Liberal record in education?

Well, Mr. Speaker, I did a lot of research on the record on this Government and I would like to place my findings before this Assembly. Regarding kindergartens in Saskatchewan — and we all know the importance of kindergartens, everyone agrees that when the child is ready he must learn or else he is going to lose and not gain. Well what is the record? In Saskatchewan

March 12, 1970

there are 4,500 students in kindergarten. If you look at that rating according to population figures it is pretty sad. Saskatchewan is sixth in population across Canada but the number of students it has isn't sixth in rank, or even seventh, it is eighth. What did the Government do last year regarding kindergarten? It passed an amendment to The School Act removing the \$1 per month per child that can be charged for kindergartens in the public school system. So now the taxpayer again if he wants to send his child to kindergarten in the public school will have to pay whatever the board tells him to. Yes, that is really something that the Liberals have done for Saskatchewan.

Let's look at the retarded children problem in Saskatchewan. There are about 28,000 of them. About 1,600 of them are actually at school or learning something. That is less than 20 per cent of the total number that are getting any education at all. About 17,000 of them are not receiving the kind of training that they need. 17,000 retarded in this province without any training.

What about Saskatchewan's record regarding the percentage of the Budget that it spends on education as compared to other provinces across Canada? This is very revealing, Mr. Speaker. We find when we compare — and these are 1969-70 figures that I have here taken from direct phone calls to the Departments of Education across Canada in compiling the statistics — that the Province that spends the most of the Provincial Budget for education is New Brunswick — 37.7 per cent, Manitoba is next with 37.6 per cent. Oh, yes, that is Schreyer's Socialist province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. KWASNICA: — He realizes where the money ought to go. Do you think Saskatchewan maybe would be third? Ontario is third, Mr. Speaker. Is Saskatchewan in fourth place? No, Mr. Speaker, Alberta is in fourth place. Here comes Saskatchewan in fifth place spending 33.4 per cent of the Budget in 1970-71. This is quite a record. They did more for education than anybody else! What about Saskatchewan's record of general expenditure devoted to education per capita and compared to that of other provinces across Canada? This is very interesting. Alberta is in top spot spending \$237.42 for every man, woman and child in that province. Ontario is next. You'd think that maybe Saskatchewan would be third. No, Quebec is third. Is Saskatchewan fourth? No, British Columbia is fourth. Is Saskatchewan fifth? No, Newfoundland is fifth. Little Newfoundland, spending \$156.60 per person. Do you think maybe Saskatchewan is sixth at least? No, Manitoba stole sixth place with \$152.91 per capita. Here comes Saskatchewan in seventh place with \$142, and Mr. Minister, I took the reduced population figure of 948,000 so you wouldn't be confused there.

It is quite a record! But the saddest picture, Mr. Speaker, of this Government's record in education comes when you examine the number of fees that have been increased and the number of grants that have been reduced. I want to take time out in this House to place on the records the record of this Government. Grade nine and ten correspondence courses fees under this Government were increased from \$3 to \$5 — a 67 per cent increase in six short years; grade 11 correspondence courses from \$4 to \$6.50, 62 per cent increase; grade 12 correspondence courses

\$4 to \$8, 100 per cent increase; adult correspondence courses up 44 to 60 per cent; high school examinations up 100 per cent; grade 12 supplementary examinations up from \$2 to \$4 — 100 per cent; duplicate teacher's certificate from \$2 to \$4 — 100 per cent; high school diploma up 100 per cent; duplicate statement of high school marks — 100 per cent; transcription of standing to outside agency — 100 per cent; transcription of grade 11 or 12 standing — 100 per cent; technical school fees, the diploma program from \$180 to \$220 — up 22 per cent; certificate program up from \$133 to \$190 — up 30 per cent; university fees from 1964 to 1969 increased 54 per cent. Not only that! Next it turns around and really gives education the boot. It removes the 25 per cent grant on the purchases of school buses. It cut off the grant to the Saskatchewan High School Athletic Associations. It doesn't want sports in the province either I guess. It added a 2 cent per gallon on fuel used in school buses. It didn't take that off, that is still there. It reduced the grants to the lighted school house program from \$500 maximum to \$100 maximum. Man, that's progress! Reduced grants to school libraries; reduced grants for science equipment; removed the \$1 limit for charging kindergarten as mentioned earlier; refused grants for building school auditoriums. But maybe this year we will be able to build one or two across the province.

What about the record regarding teacher-pupil ratio, Mr. Minister of Education (Mr. McIsaac)? You know you like to talk about Manitoba and how the ratio is over there. Well, again, phoning all the deputy ministers across Canada, I would like to bring you up to date on the most recent statistics for 1969-70 regarding teacher-pupil ratios across Canada. Now let's take a look at that.

Prince Edward Island has the best teacher-pupil ratio in Canada — 19.4 to 1; Alberta is next with 19.9 to 1. That is a 1970-71 calculation. Manitoba, when you take all the teachers and all the students their ratio is 21.3 to 1, not that 28 that was mentioned the other day. Then Ontario with 22.1. Well Saskatchewan is nowhere near here. We have to go clean down to ninth spot and give it a ratio of 25 to 1 for 1970-71, and only little old Newfoundland has 25.1 to 1, .1 more. So here is Saskatchewan at the bottom of the heap. Are you concerned about quality, the average across Canada — 22.6 to 1. You are getting up there. You are going for 25 to 1. And the Minister of Mineral Resources (Mr. Cameron) speaking in the debate on Tuesday said, "Education was the fair-haired baby of this Budget." Fair-haired baby, Mr. Speaker!

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. KWASNICA: Let me just review this Liberal record once again just to see how fair-haired this education baby really is. Saskatchewan is fifth in the amount of its total budget devoted to education compared to other provinces. Saskatchewan, under the Liberals, is seventh in the per capita expenditure on education. Saskatchewan has the worst record regarding increase in fees and the reduction or cancellation of grants to schools. Regarding the retarded children, there are some 17,000 in the province that aren't getting any training. That's their record! Kindergarten enrolments are the third lowest in Canada. Saskatchewan's teacher-pupil ratio is the highest in all of Canada.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

March 12, 1970

MR. KWASNICA: — Mr. Speaker, when all other provinces are advancing new and dynamic educational policies, like Ontario under the Hall-Dennis Report, recommending that greater stress on the student and greater individual attention, this Government chooses to go backward and institutes the highest teacher-pupil ratio in the Dominion of Canada.

Mr. Speaker, I see that the regular House time is just about due and with the permission of the House, if I could have about five more minutes to finish my debate today, because I still haven't dealt with the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Guy) yet. Mr. Speaker, I would like to turn now to one more area of concern and that is regarding scholarships and loans. Mr. Speaker, I cannot support this Budget because it makes absolutely no mention of scholarships and loans to students. Nothing new in this field at all. And in this very crucial area the Budget is entirely silent.

When our party was in office, Saskatchewan students enjoyed one of the finest programs of scholarships and loans in all of Canada.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. KWASNICA: — The last year we were the Government in 1964, one out of every 10 grade 12 graduates got a scholarship from the Provincial Government. Today, in 1970, under this scroogy Liberal Government, has that number increased to one in every nine or one in every eight? No, Mr. Speaker, the present record of scholarships is now one in every 27. Tremendous record! I am talking about Provincial scholarships, Mr. Speaker, just to set the record straight. That's very sad and shameful. That is how this Government looks after its students. That is how much concern it has, absolutely callous. I want to remind Members opposite in case they have forgotten of the \$2 million that the Government took out of the Student Aid Fund in 1965 in order to balance its Budget: They robbed the Saskatchewan students of \$2 million and I am sure that thousands of our students since 1964 have suffered a serious lack of finances because of this robbery. I wonder how many students didn't ever get to university because of this theft. Or how many had to drop out? Mr. Speaker, there is no doubt that a lack of investment in scholarships and loans leads to serious economic, sociological and financial problems for university students.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. KWASNICA: — In Saskatchewan since 1965 tuition fees have increased by about 54 per cent. Cost of textbooks and equipment has risen some six per cent while the student's greatest expense, room and board, has gone up 22 per cent. During the last five years the general cost of living has gone up 18 per cent, reducing the buying power of the maximum \$1,000 loan to \$820 in real buying power.

In the summer of 1969, it was estimated an average of one-third of those students who sought work were unable to find it for the whole summer. There is little reason to believe that the summer of 1970 will bring an improvement. With fewer skills and a shorter summer holiday to work, the high school graduate faces a situation where his earnings are smaller and his

dependence is greater on a loan scheme, and this penalizes those who are unable to finance themselves.

It has been argued in the past that financing post-secondary learning poses no real problems and that the economic barriers to a full education are few. The Rabinovitch Survey for the Canadian University Students and the Dominion Bureau show that the yearly cost of \$1,700 per student does in fact present a serious deterrent to many families. This survey showed — get this, Mr. Speaker, and Members opposite — it showed that a greater percentage of students are forced to drop out of university due to lack of finances in Saskatchewan than anywhere else in Canada. Saskatchewan has the worst record in regard to students being forced to attend university only on a part-time basis because of a lack of financial resources.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. KWASNICA: — Saskatchewan also has the worst record of all the students who have to take extra-session courses for financial reasons. The province where the second smallest percentage of students planning to take graduate work was Saskatchewan. This is far from an enviable record. And this is positive proof that Liberal times are hard times for Saskatchewan university students.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. KWASNICA: — A recent survey of the Canadian University scene revealed that managerial and professional people comprised only 3 per cent of the Canadian population but that 47 per cent of university students came from this family background. It also revealed that 64 per cent of Canadians are blue-collar workers while only 35 per cent of the Canadian undergraduate population came from this blue-collar background. It seems evident, therefore, that the educated, the rich, and the well-situated in society are vastly over-represented in universities at the expense of the poor and the ill-trained. This situation is repugnant and indefensible. And I ask: what is this Government going to do about it? Has it done anything about the whole university student financial crisis? No, instead, for many in Saskatchewan there is neither opportunity nor education. And if the Minister of Education (Mr. McIsaac) replies that there is not need for a Provincial loan plan or a scholarship plan because there is a Federal plan, which he did last year and the year before, let me bring to his attention some facts about the Federal plan.

Last year, according to a Motion for Return tabled on March 21 in this Assembly, 533 students were refused loans. I want him to know that of the loans granted, students received an average of \$104.41 less than they applied for. That means that \$845,660.69 was denied Saskatchewan students on that account alone. Furthermore, those 533 students who . . .

HON. J.C. McISAAC: (Minister of Education) — On a point of order. We have listened to a real series of inaccuracies and misleading conclusions from this Member all evening. And to state because the criteria for awarding student loans were applied, to indicate this doesn't mean that they are

March 12, 1970

getting all the money that they need.

MR. LLOYD: — Mr. Speaker, surely this is an argument and not a point of order.

MR. McISAAC: — There is just no logic in what he is saying.

MR. SPEAKER: — Order, order! I called both of the Whips into my office today in connection with the problem of the House sitting overtime. I informed both of them, individually, and they agreed that, if this House was going to sit overtime, then there would have to be some indication given to the Speaker as to when Members had decided that they had sat long enough. I suggested that, if either Whip rose in his place — the Opposition Whip is there and the acting Government Whip is over there — I would ring down the curtain and it would not matter which one got up and called time. I am not so sure that this is such a good arrangement but it was the best one that I could think of at the moment and, because the House is slipping into the error of sitting overtime repeatedly I felt that something should be done. If this arrangement doesn't work then I will ring down the curtain promptly and on time every day from here on in.

MR. CHARLEBOIS: — I now ask that you call it 10:00 o'clock.

The Assembly adjourned at 10:00 o'clock p.m.