

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN
Third Session — Sixteenth Legislature
20th Day

Friday, March 13, 1970.

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

WELCOME TO STUDENTS

Mr. Speaker: — I wish to introduce to the Members of this Assembly the following groups of students situated in the galleries of the House: 62 students from Haultain school in the constituency of Saskatoon Nutana Centre represented by the Hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Estey), under the direction of their teachers, Mr. Street and Mrs. Haug; 30 students from the Wakaw school in the constituency of Kinistino represented by its Member, Mr. Thibault, under the direction of their teacher, Mrs. Miller; 30 students from the Milestone high school in the constituency of milestone represented by the Hon. Minister of Welfare (Mr. MacDonald); 170 students from the Melfort regional division III in the constituency of Melfort-Tisdale represented by their Member, the Member for Melfort-Tisdale (Mr. Willis). I am sure all Members of the Legislative Assembly will wish to accord to all of these students an extremely warm welcome, to express the wish that they will find their stay here educational and enjoyable and wish to each and every one of them a safe trip home.

Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

STATEMENT

REQUEST FOR REPEAL OF BILL NO. 2

Hon. W.R. Thatcher (Premier): — Mr. Speaker, a few days ago I received a request from the Saskatchewan Federation of Labour inviting me to meet with them one week from tomorrow to receive a petition requesting the repeal of Bill 2. I want to make the position of the Government very clear. I told Mr. Gilbey I would see him any day next week from Monday to Friday or any day the following Monday to Friday. However, I can't be with them on Saturday. If the Labour officials do not wish to change the date, the Minister of Labour (Mr. Coderre) will be very pleased to meet with them one week from Saturday.

NEWS ITEM — STAFF SHORTAGE HALTS APPEAL

Hon. D.V. Heald (Attorney General): — Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, I would like to make a statement concerning a news item which appeared in The Regina Leader Post last evening, on page three, entitled: "Staff shortage halts appeal." I was naturally very concerned about this article so I asked for a report from my Director of Prosecutions, Mr. Kujawa, and with Members' permission I would like to read his memorandum which I propose to table. His memorandum is dated today and it goes as follows. It is a memorandum from the Director of Prosecutions for me:

The above article appeared in last night's paper and the headline itself suggest very serious default in

our duties. Since in the usual practice this allegation of default must be my responsibility I am all the more anxious to report to you on this matter. It is true that we have decided not to appeal Craig Melnyk's sentence but that decision was not in any way influenced by the number of staff members available. I have been working on the assumption that the administration of justice does not permit us to leave necessary matters undone on the basis of shortage of time. If the permanent staff in this office is not able to cope with the cases and problems, I take advantage of your authorization to refer cases to private lawyers for prosecution. My understanding is that in peak periods or in cases of emergency we are to use private solicitors to ensure that cases are handled according to law. The decision not to take the appeal in the Melnyk case was made by myself after discussion with the other prosecutors in this Department and that includes the prosecutor who had the case initially. The decision was made after a consideration of all the circumstances, especially his degree of participation in the offence and of circumstances of Craig Melnyk himself. In the court below our prosecutor expressed the opinion that a lesser sentence for Melnyk was definitely in order and suggested that perhaps a more important part of the sentence would be a lengthy period of supervision under a probation order. I expect we can achieve this purpose on the breach of probation application. The comparisons of robbery sentences in the newspaper article failed to point out that most of the quoted sentences were handed out by the trial courts and not the court of appeal. In any event it is well settled that on a sentence appeal the court of appeal does not substitute its discretion for that of the trial judge, and a sentence will not be increased unless there is a misdirection in law established. I am informed by Mr. Piragoff, who appeared in this initially that he never stated that an appeal would be taken. Of course if he had he would be exceeding his jurisdiction because appeals are not taken without my approval, although the recommendations of the various prosecutors are to me an important consideration. I did not say that this sentence would be appealed although in response to questions I did say the matter would be seriously considered.

(Signed)

Mr. Serge Kujawa

Director of Prosecutions.

Mr. R. Romanow (Saskatoon Riversdale): — Mr. Speaker, may I just very briefly speak to the statement by the Attorney General (Mr. Heald). I think it is safe to say that we on this side welcome the assurance by the Attorney General that staff shortages are not a factor of consideration in respect to appeals, because we agree with the Attorney General and the government that, in matters of this nature, criminal matters at any rate, we must act with utmost of dispatch. I would just like to conclude by saying that perhaps in Estimates we can enter into some discussion generally, Mr. Attorney General, about the feasibility and desirability of improving the number of stenographers and generally the court facilities to expedite preliminary hearings, appeals all the way through and I will be having more to say at that time.

QUESTIONS

EARLY DELIVERY AND EXPLANATION OF BILLS

Mr. W.S. Lloyd (Leader of the Opposition): — Mr. Speaker, I want to direct a question to the Attorney General (Mr. Heald) in his capacity as Government House Leader. It has to do with the explanatory notes to the Bills. Since the Bills are coming rather rapidly the explanatory notes and their early availability become highly desirable for the use of all Members of the House. Can the Attorney General look into the matter of speeding up the time in which these are delivered? I have one in my hand, Sir, which is dated November 1969, but which was only given to Members of the House about two days ago.

Mr. Heald: — I will be glad to look into it, Mr. Speaker. Perhaps I could have a word with the Leader of the Opposition later to home in on the ones which you don't have. I haven't kept a running total. Perhaps I could get from you the ones which you don't have and we will see what we can do about it.

Mr. Lloyd: — A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker, is there any accuracy in the rumour that is going around that these are being withheld until after the Bill has had a second reading? Because if this is right, it is obviously very wrong.

Mr. Heald: — It is certainly not as a result of any instructions that I have given and I will be glad to look into that as well.

RESIGNATION OF GENERAL MANAGER OF SASKATCHEWAN POWER

Mr. A.E. Blakeney (Regina Centre): — Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I might direct a question to the Government, more particularly to the Minister in charge of the Saskatchewan Power Corporation. In view of the announcement of the resignation of the general manager of the Power Corporation, I wonder if the Minister (Mr. Grant) is prepared to disclose to the House the reasons for the resignation of Mr. Furlong and whether he will be leaving the Corporation in the near future — I'm not referring to when the resignation will be effective but whether he will in fact be relinquishing his actual duties and if so, who will replace him?

Hon. G.B. Grant (Minister of Health): — Mr. Speaker, there is a press release and I believe all of that information will be available in the Press today.

Mr. Blakeney: — Would the minister consider advising the House or are we to read it in the Press?

Mr. Grant: — I don't think there is any harm in advising the House, Mr. Speaker. I didn't follow the order of the questions that closely. I wonder if the Member would repeat them specifically and then I will answer them.

Mr. Blakeney: — Would he disclose to the House the reasons for the resignation, whether Mr. Furlong will be leaving his duties immediately — and I'm not talking about the effective date of the resignation — and if so, who will be replacing him?

Mr. Grant: — The effective date will be, we think, May 15 and Mr. Keith will be appointed as acting Manager. The reasons for leaving were personal reasons of his own and the completion of his original undertaking to stay with us five years.

Mr. Blakeney: — A supplementary question — I don't know whether I understood the minister but I will ask precisely: will Mr. Furlong still be in his office a month from now, meaning in April? Is he leaving now to be replaced or is he not leaving until May 15?

Mr. Grant: — I thought I answered that, Mr. Speaker. I said, hopefully May 15. He will be in his office for the next month or month and a half.

Mr. Speaker: — Before we proceed any further with oral questions, I draw the attention of all Hon. Members to the fact that a question or a supplementary question should contain one specific question. Now the question just asked by the member for Regina Centre (Mr. Blakeney) contained what I considered to be three distinct questions. It was an omnibus question and would have been better asked as one question and two supplementary questions.

AIR FORCE STATION IN SASKATCHEWAN

Mr. E. Kramer (The Battlefords): — I would like to ask the Premier if he has any communication with the Federal Government or the American Government regarding proposed Air Force stations in Saskatchewan at places such as, North Battleford, Prince Albert, and various other points as training in monitoring centres within the next coming year.

Mr. Thatcher: — As Hon. Members know, last year the Strategic Air Command did have a train at the town of Naicam. We have been informed by the Canadian Government that this year Strategic Air Command again will have a point in Saskatchewan where they will be directing similar missions. In the letter — I forget the town that he mentioned — we were informed there will be another similar mission in Saskatchewan this year.

ADJOURNED DEBATES

BUDGET DEBATE

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

Mr. M. Kwasnica (Cut Knife): — Mr. Speaker, when we adjourned last night I was dealing with

this Budget as it related to education. Regarding the proposed teacher-pupil ratio of 25 to 1, I said that there were hundreds of studies that showed conclusively that large classes were detrimental to the average student and to the slow learner. I also pointed out that according to a ten-year study the thing also pointed out that according to a ten-year study the thing that reduces teacher morale and confidence most was large classes. I asked the minister of Education (Mr. McIsaac) if he had carried out any studies regarding his policy of increasing the teacher-pupil ratio 25 to 1 and the effects that it would have on students and teachers. I charged that the minister of Education was meddling in local decision-making by calling in the school boards to scrutinize their budgets and then telling them how many teachers to cut and from what schools. I stated also that hundreds of classrooms would be closed across the province by the minister, that his budgetary policies would severely damage the quality of education in Saskatchewan and that he has ruined one of the finest systems of education on the statements made by the member for Moosomin (Mr. Gardiner) who said that no government had done more for education than Liberals and I produced evidence showing that the Liberal record in Saskatchewan was the worst when compared to that of other provinces in Canada. And I completely disproved the Minister of Mineral Resources' (Mr. Cameron) statement which was: "Education was the fair-haired baby of this Budget." I documented the facts. I pointed out that Saskatchewan was eighth in the number of students it had in kindergarten; that 17,000 educable retarded children in Saskatchewan have no training facilities; that Saskatchewan is fifth in the percentage of the Provincial budgets spent on education; that Saskatchewan under the Liberals is seventh in its per capita expenditures on education. I challenge the Minister of Education to dispute that fact. Saskatchewan Liberals have increased more fees and decreased more grants for special purposes than any other government across Canada. Finally, Mr. Speaker, I proved that Saskatchewan's teacher-pupil ratio of 25 to 1 under this backwoods Liberal Government is the highest in Canada with the Canadian average being 22.6 to 1, while other provinces were concentrating on reducing class sizes. Can you discredit this fact, Mr. Minister of Education (Mr. McIsaac)?

Mr. Speaker, when we adjourned last night I was right in the middle of my comments regarding scholarships and loans to students. I pointed out that I couldn't support this Budget because it was absolutely oblivious to the desperate financial plight of the hundreds of our university students. In 1964 when the CCF was in office, Saskatchewan's students enjoyed one of the finest programs of scholarships and loans in all of Canada. The last year that we were the Government, one out of every 10 grade twelve graduates got a scholarship. And here is the present Liberal record, Mr. Speaker. The present Liberal record is one in every 27 gets a scholarship from this Government. I pointed out also that according to a survey carried out last year by the Dominion bureau that a greater percentage of students are forced to drop out of university due to lack of students are forced to drop out of university due to lack of finances in Saskatchewan than anywhere else in Canada.

At the present time, Saskatchewan offers very little in the way of aid to students. The Saskatchewan Student Aid Fund has all but been forgotten and the Provincial scholarship program offers aid only to exceptional high school graduates. The scholarships that used to be \$700 and \$500 respectively previously were cut to \$500 and \$300 respectively by this Liberal government.

The \$1,000 scholarship for students needing one more year to finish their degrees has been all but wiped out. And the Minister's oft-repeated reply is: "There is no need for a Provincial loan plan because there is a Federal loan plan." Let me bring to his attention some of these facts. 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 less than what they applied for. That means that \$845,660 was denied Saskatchewan students on that account alone. Furthermore, those 533 students who were refused loans were denied a further \$472,296 because they didn't get the amount they wanted. And when you add these two figures together that means that Saskatchewan students were denied the staggering sum of \$1,317,957. Do we ever hear these facts from the Minister or from the Government opposite? But, Mr. Speaker, while thousands of needy students have been refused loans by this Government since 1964, one student — a certain Guy, had no trouble getting a loan from this Government in 1966-67 even while his income was well over \$8,000 that year and according to the regulations, the loans are to be given on the basis of need. According to the regulations, students who qualify much be full-time students. Was this Guy a full-time student, Mr. Speaker? According to the University records this Guy was registered in three classes; history 337, 402 and 406 . . .

Hon. A.R. Guy (Minister of Public Works): — On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, I would suggest that he goes to better records than the university. All he has to do is get away from the Carillon, go to the University office where I enrolled and he would find that I was a full-time student in all regards.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Kwasnica: — Mr. Speaker, who was this student? It is now obvious who the student was. None other than the present Minister of Public Works (Mr. Guy), who is Minister in charge of pollution as well, who spends all his time wallowing in the gutter and strewing this Chamber with the foulest garbage ever witnessed by people anywhere on the North American continent.

Mr. Speaker: — Order, order! Now this House is slipping into very bad, bad, bad manners and habits. This went on yesterday; it should have been stopped then. I am going to stop it now, I hope and particularly with the backbench Member who has been one of the best behaved Members of the House up until now. Surely talking about garbage, gutter, corruption, pollution is out of order. I ask that it be stopped for the rest of this Session. Now I don't particularly blame the backbench Member because he got some bad advice or bad examples.

An Hon. Member: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Speaker: — I don't need you to point a finger. Let's have no more finger pointing in this House. Let's just have a little better behaviour. The Member for Cut Knife.

Mr. Kwasnica: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Now returning to the Provincial

scene, there is no aid based on financial need and in the last Dominion Bureau survey on the matter, Saskatchewan universities had the second lowest record for scholarship expenditure of the percentage of the operating budget. Saskatchewan under a Liberal Government has the dubious distinction of being the only provincial government not to have a provincial bursary scheme, either in operation or planned for 1970. In Manitoba and Alberta, the amount spent on scholarships and bursaries per student is two to three times as much as in Saskatchewan. There is no doubt that Saskatchewan desperately needs a new approach to scholarships and loans. Therefore, I propose that the Government restore this scholarship level to at least one in every ten grade 12 graduates, the level it used to be back in 1964.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Kwasnica: — Secondly, Mr. Speaker, I propose that the maximum student loan per year be increased to \$1,700 with the Provincial Government picking up the \$700 tab above the Federal Government maximum. I suggest that the loans depend on three criteria only — financial needs, capability of the student and the progress of the students, that the maximum loans be raised from the \$5,000 being allowed to date to a more realistic maximum of \$8,500 per student. I propose that loans be extended to students entering technical or vocational training, business college or entering technical or vocational training, business college or any other training institution enabling a student to get a job.

Mr. Speaker, I ask Members opposite to think seriously before voting in favour of this Budget. Personally, I cannot support a Budget that so blatantly overlooks the plight of our University students. In all sincerity I cannot support a Budget that will close hundreds of classrooms across our province and that will bring the standard of education to the lowest level in the history of our province.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. C.P. MacDonald (Minister of Welfare): — Mr. Speaker, first of all I want to reply very briefly to the accusations of the Member for Cut Knife (Mr. Kwasnica) relating to a colleague to mine on this side of the House. Without stooping as low as he did I want to say that perhaps the NDP should remove the halo, take off their wings and quit being so hypocritical. I've been in this House for five years, I have never yet, until yesterday heard a Member's family brought to the floor of this House and as far as I am concerned, it is very fortunate there wasn't violence in here.

Secondly, Mr. Speaker, I want to make a couple of general comments about the Budget as a whole. You know, Mr. Speaker, we've been sitting in this House, in this Legislature for one month. In that time — this is the last day of the Budget — we have completed the Throne Speech and, Mr. Speaker, this has been the dullest, most boring, most uninteresting Session of the Legislature that I have every attended. The NDP has not been able to generate one single, solitary issue. If you walk down the streets of Regina, the streets of Saskatoon, or the country, the people of this province cannot even tell you what the issue in this House is. Mr. Speaker, it is a compliment to the Throne Speech and secondly, to the Budget. But I think it goes much

deeper. Mr. Speaker, it is an indication of the tremendous weakness of the Opposition opposite.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. MacDonald: — The unfortunate part of it is, Mr. Speaker, it isn't the responsibility or the fault of the old guard. I think the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Lloyd) always does a commendable job. Presenting a very weak case, the financial critic (Mr. Blakeney) did his usual good job even though it seemed his heart was somewhere else. The real responsibility was the great leap forward. The young, the new vigorous Members were supposed to provide the dynamic leadership, the heavy artillery. Let's take a look at them. First of all, the Member for Kelsey (Mr. Messer) on the right of the Leader of the Opposition. He is becoming known right across this province as the trained seal — Mr. Flip-Flop himself. The first time he spoke in this House he took 15 minutes in attempting to justify the change of opinion relating to his stand on cash injection. The second time, Mr. Speaker, he got up and supported the acreage payment plan. Then he heard from Mr. Gleave and the members from Ottawa and the next day he got up and repudiated his stand on the program LIFT.

Let's look on the other side. On the left, we have the Member for Riversdale (Mr. Romanow), the other supposed bright light. Well, Mr. Speaker, have you ever heard in this House in the midst of a Budget Debate an individual who never brought one single solitary issue to the forefront? I think we are going to start calling him "Miss Powder Puff." You know why? It seems that any politician in Canada that is stuck for something to say immediately appoints a Royal Commission. He immediately suggests an independent survey. He immediately wants a study group. You know, Mr. Speaker, the last time he spoke he asked us for a new tier of government. First we have Members of Parliament in Saskatchewan, we have MLAs, we have mayors, we have reeves and so forth. We have hospital boards, school boards, local governments of every kind and type; we have urban and municipal associations who are attempting to centralize and bring their local governments together. And here in the midst of a Budget Speech, this was his keynote speech. On one side we have the Powder Puff and on the other side we have the Flip-flop, and, Mr. Speaker, we leave the poor Leader of the Opposition without any support.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we have just listened to the Member for Cut Knife (Mr. Kwasnica). I don't know if he represents the teaching profession or if he represents himself. But I listened at his attempt to criticize education in this Budget and I certainly hope he doesn't represent the educators. He cried long and hard about the pupil-teacher ratio. Last night I went home and dug up some figures. Do you know, Mr. Speaker, here is an example; the Humboldt School Unit No. 147. Do you know what the pupil-teacher ratio was in 1960? — 22.41. What was it in 1964 or 1962 — 24.24. What is it in 1969? — 20.64. Mr. Speaker, what about the grants? — 22.

Mr. R. Romanow (Saskatoon-Riversdale): — What will it be in 1970?

Mr. MacDonald: — In 1970, 22. How about the grants, Mr. Speaker?

\$407,000 in 1960; \$915,000 in 1969.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. MacDonald: — Hear is another one — Moosomin. Do you know what the pupil-teacher ratio was there in 1964? — 26.54. What is it today? 23.95.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. MacDonald: — How about Oxbow? — 23.95 in 1964; 21.1 in 1969. How about Estevan? — 21.2 in 1964; 17.9 in 1969. Mr. Speaker, in every school unit in the Province of Saskatchewan, the pupil-teacher ratio was higher in 1964, not in the early 1950s but in the 1960s. The second thing the member for Cut Knife did was to accuse this Government of eroding the local autonomy of school units and school boards, by scrutinizing budgets and paying grants on approved expenditures. Mr. Speaker, what a short memory the Member has. Does he know that his is the party that destroyed the authority of every local school board in the Province of Saskatchewan? Mr. Speaker, does he know also that his is the party that imposed legislation that arbitrarily closed hundreds of classrooms across this province? Mr. Speaker, he is also a member of the party that lost the 1964 election on trying to force local governments to reorganize. Look at the Province of Manitoba: this is interesting. Here is a clipping from The Leader Post, March 9, 1970:

Education Minister, Saul Miller, appears determined to curb the rate of expenditures for school facilities in Manitoba. Mr. Miller says buildings will be restricted to those necessary for increasing enrolments, building projects which largely provide expanded or more sophisticated education services will be restricted.

It goes on:

Mr. Miller has promised that studies on the tighter-controls' policy will continue and the Department will seek more specific ways to reduce costs. The Minister suggested his department will make decisions unilaterally.

Isn't it too bad, Mr. Speaker, that they can't have a little sense of responsibility when they are out of office as the NDP do in Manitoba when they are in office. Mr. Speaker, he also talked about the Student Loan Plan. The number of students receiving assistance to go to university has dramatically increased. The Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Lloyd) last night stated that one of the reasons that the Liberal Government was able to balance its Budget in the last few years was that it was taking dividends from the Saskatchewan Power Corporation. Mr. Speaker, what a terrible admission of guilt. I remember Tommy Douglas, Mr. Speaker, for years in the Province of Saskatchewan, saying that the Socialist enterprise, the box factory, the cannery and all the others were going to provide the wherewithal, to build our roads and build our schools. This is the party that dissipated millions of dollars of the taxpayers' money. Nine Crown corporations went bankrupt had to be dissolved. Everybody remembers the box factory, the shoe factory, the tannery, the fish board, the lumber mill. This is only part of the story. Everybody remembers the terrible tragedy of the Guarantee Fidelity Company . . .

Mr. A.S. Blakeney (Regina Centre): — Which one?

Mr. MacDonald: — The one under the Socialists. Yours. Let's look at the Power Corporation this year. In 1964, Mr. Speaker, it made just over \$5 million. Today it earns \$16 million with less staff, expanded services, no increase in consumer rates. Mr. Speaker, this is an example of what free enterprise can do with the Power Corporation.

I also want to say a word about the fact that the Leader of the Opposition last night tried to defend the comparisons of the Provincial Treasure (Mr. Steuart) when he compared the Budget of 1962 with that of 1969. He came up with a long dissertation about the wonderful things that went on in 1962. But he forgot, Mr. Speaker, to mention that he called a special session in the fall of 1961, two months before the 1962 session. And in it the most dramatic and the most impossible tax increases in the history of this province were imposed on the people of Saskatchewan. Education and Hospital tax - \$14 million; hospital premiums - \$3.5 million; Medicare premiums \$6 million; gasoline - \$3.8; income tax - \$3.6; corporation \$1 million. A total of \$31.9 million, 21.6 per cent of the entire Budget.

Mr. Speaker, I want to say a word about the subject that the Leader of the Opposition brought up last night relating to the Indian and Métis people of Northern Saskatchewan. I do want to say that I appreciate the positive aspects of his comments. It is unfortunate that too often we don't have the opportunity to discuss intelligently in this House some of the problems that face the people of Saskatchewan. I think that all of us agree that welfare is not the answer in Northern Saskatchewan. I think that when we look at the situation in Northern Saskatchewan we find that the only employment possibilities are short-term trapping, fishing and hunting. We all agree that welfare policies must not destroy incentives, they must not destroy motivation. Everything possible must be done to try and indicate to the native people that they must take advantage of every employment possibility. I would like to suggest, Mr. Speaker, that we are doing that. Some statistics indicate that the native people are taking advantage of employment. For example, last year in the Primrose Lake area in Northern Saskatchewan, a quarter of a million dollars was realized through fishing, 265 licences were issued. Sixty-five helpers were hired at \$30 a day. The lowest operator obtained \$2,000, the highest \$11,000. This was a result of the new Fresh Fish Marketing Board. It is also interesting that in La Loche last year \$76,000 worth of furs were trapped compared to \$63,000 the year before. It would appear that welfare policies in the North are providing incentive and motivation. They are doing the job that we want them to do. Mr. Speaker, I hope that we can get more native involvement. In the area of Meadow Lake we now have 12 native people actively working within the Department of Welfare. We have hired people who are of native origin not only as regular workers but as Welfare field men. I think I can assure the Leader of the Opposition that we will listen to the suggestions that he has made and we will try and put them into practice. However, Mr. Speaker, I do take exception to the statements made by the Member for Shellbrook (Mr. Bowerman) when he said that welfare recipients were repressed. "I charge the Minister and the Government with current actions of suppression and harassment of welfare applicants that have legitimate claims for welfare assistance."

Mr. Speaker, it is rather interesting that this is the other side of the argument. The only complaints that I ever got on welfare is that it is too generous. The only complaints that I ever get is that there are too many abuses and now at least the people of Saskatchewan will get the other side of the story. I want to say, too, that this is the same Member that one year ago accused the Department of Highways of being one of the greatest pork barrels in the history of this province, operating under the pious disguise. He referred to it as the Saskatchewan high wages division. Mr. Bowerman told the Legislature that the highway construction costs exceeded by 29.7 per cent the next highest construction costs in Canada. A few days later he received strong objections, from first of all the construction industry of this province. When the facts were known it was found that highway construction costs in 1968 were less than they were in 1957. I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that this is exactly the same kind of accusation and this has exactly the same kind of facts behind it.

I also want to suggest, Mr. Speaker, that welfare workers have a very difficult job. They deal with individuals, they deal with people and, Mr. Speaker, very often welfare recipients will not agree with the decisions that they make. This Province has spent hundreds of thousands of dollars in educating social workers for the Department of Health and the Department of Welfare. These are trained personnel, people who have been asked to do a very difficult job. What is required is understanding not animosity.

Mr. Speaker, I haven't very much time and I have a couple of very important announcements to make. One of the announcements in the Budget Speech indicated that the Department of Welfare would provide assistance for the establishment and operation of Day Care Centres in Saskatchewan. Our objective is to promote the growth and development of these services for children and to license existing and future centres to develop standards in the field of day care in Saskatchewan.

What will these services be, Mr. Speaker? First, the Minister may upon approval of an application for a license to operate a day care centre provide a grant of a minimum of \$10 to a maximum of \$40 per day for space provided. This will be paid directly to the Day Care Centre to be applied against the costs incurred in starting the centre. This would assist in the purchase of equipment etc. The amount of the grant shall depend upon the financial means and resources of the centre. These will be determined by its location and the availability of other resources to the Day Care Centre. We have left a spread there, Mr. Speaker, case areas like Buffalo Narrows, that have a fish plant with the majority of the people being women, would receive more assistance, perhaps, than the city of Regina, Saskatoon or one of our larger urban centres. This will make it possible to provide greater assistance to our northern communities.

There are presently approximately 20 fully licensed Day Care Centres in Saskatchewan accommodating approximately 400 children. We have set as a target during the next fiscal year the promotion or growth of an additional 300 spaces. 1. We propose that these starting grants be made available only to those Day Care Centres that obtain their licence after April 1. 2. The costs of day-care services shall be provided as an item of need to those eligible for benefits under the Saskatchewan

Assistance Plan, so that it will be available for all the people in Saskatchewan, the rich and the poor. 3. The Minister may provide to all fully licensed Day Care Centres a universal monthly operating grant of \$5 per day care space provided. By offering the universal grant upon licensing, it will encourage all Day Care operators to seek licences and allow us to supervise them as to standards and adequacy of service. This universal grant of \$5 will be conditional upon the Day Care Centre lowering its fee by the amount of the grant given. In addition we will provide further assistance to individuals who qualify, to help defray the costs of the day-care services for these families. This assistance, although calculated on an individual basis, would be paid to the Day Care Centre and reflected to the client in a lower fee charged to that individual by the Day Care Centre. In no case would this assistance exceed 50 per cent of the total cost of providing that day-care space. This additional assistance to families will be determined by a simple declaration of their needs and resources. It will be provided at the Day Care Centre which will in turn forward it to us. 4. The administration of this program will be the responsibility of the Housing and Special-Care Homes Branch. This Branch of the Department of Welfare will be responsible for reviewing applications for licensing, issuing licences for approved Day Care Centres, determining the amount of the starting grant to be issued and for promoting the development of standards of day-care services in Saskatchewan.

Next, Mr. Speaker, I want to talk very briefly about the Child Welfare Conference held last November in the city of Regina and what recommendations we are going to implement following that conference. As Members are aware in November of last year the Department of Welfare called a Child Welfare Clients' Conference to assess child welfare practices and services. The Conference was unusual in that it was not a conference of professionals, but of clients. It was made up of people, adoptive parents, foster parents, adults who were adopted in their childhood and former wards of the foster home program.

It was an interesting and exciting conference, the first of its kind in Saskatchewan and perhaps in Canada. It gave to the Department many positive recommendations. Many of these recommendations of the Child Welfare Clients' Conference will be adopted by my Department. Others will be studied on the basis of a test project. The majority pertain to changes in policy and procedures, but all are designed to better protect the rights of children and parents and to provide a more effective service.

Some of the recommendations require legislative change and my Department is now actively working on rewriting The Child Welfare Act to be presented to the session of 1971. However, many of these changes are related to policy and procedure which will be implemented at once.

First of all in the field of adoption. We will implement a policy whereby it would be possible that a child could be placed directly in a home from the hospital. For both the child and the family this will eliminate the four-six-week wait that has existed in the past and provide the adopting family with the joy and responsibility that natural parents have with a new addition. An unmarried mother would relinquish the rights to the child without being subject to the disturbing and upsetting experience of appearing at a court hearing.

2. We will accept applications for adoption from single persons. Keeping in mind that wherever possible a child is entitled to a home with two parents, we recognize that many divorced, widowed or unwed parents have successfully or could successfully provide a normal home for children. I think that all of us are aware that we have no problem in adopting infants, a normal white Caucasian child and there is usually a long waiting list. But we also have well over 3,000 wards in the Province of Saskatchewan that are considered unadoptable. They are children that are usually over the age of seven. We believe that accepting applications from single parents would provide more opportunity for these wards to find a home where parents can accept the legal and moral responsibility.
3. In the case of a stepparent adoption, we will recognize that the family is intact and that the child is in the custody of one of its natural parents. We will eliminate the home study and provide a mechanical or legal service only, unless requested to do otherwise or a case of protection is involved.
4. We plan a centralized placement service which will provide a complete listing of all children available for adoption regardless of the region in which they reside. This would replace the adoption conference system and speed-up placement practice.
5. We will change the present medical form required of adopting parents. A new form will simply request a statement from the physician indicating whether or not the parents are in sufficiently good health to assume the responsibilities of parenthood. Some of you may be familiar with the old form. It even has the old fertility test on it.
6. Once a couple has successfully adopted a child, second and third adoptions will be facilitated by providing Xeroxed certified copies of such previously submitted documents as birth certificates, medical reports and so on.
7. The success of the Adopt Indian Métis Program has been so outstanding that we plan to start the same type of Making Needs Known Program to find adopting homes for other hard-to-place children. I am thinking of children who are retarded, children who are physically handicapped, children we have found that in AIM, when the problem was made known to people in Saskatchewan, when the circumstances were made known, there was a tremendous response from parents within the Province of Saskatchewan. Therefore, we have set aside money for the same kind of a program for other hard-to-place children. Since AIM commenced in the southern project area, some 200 homes have been found. In the year prior to the project, only 16 Indian and Métis children were adopted in that area. My Department will start a new program that will provide this type of service where needed. Additional funds will be included in the Child Welfare budget for this program.
8. We are modifying our practices so that the time-span between an application for adoption and the approval and placement of a child in the home will be shortened.
9. As part of our policy, we plan to accept the assistance of some couples who have previously adopted children to act as volunteers and bring prospective adopting parents a first-hand knowledge of adopting experience.

In our foster home program, the program of foster homes for children in care is the backbone of services provided for children. Here are changes in policy proposed for this program: 1. We intend to adopt the policy of giving the foster parent the first opportunity to adopt a child after that child has been in the foster home for a given length of time and the foster home has been approved as a good home. 2. We will define the rights of foster parents and will be willing to enter into an agreement of mutual guarantee to ensure a permanent placement of a foster child if this is best for the child. This will be done only after efforts at adoption have failed and after a home study has been completed. 3. Temporary ward ship will not be extended over a period of more than two years in order that a permanent plan can be worked out for the child. In other words, we hope that we can prevent children from moving from foster home to foster home. 4. Staff of the Department will aid foster parents to better care for their foster children and aid the Department with suggestions and recommendations. At this time we have two active Foster Parent Associations in Saskatchewan. 5. When a child in a foster home is adopted, we will permit the foster parents and adoptive parents to meet prior to the adoption if mutually desired. This has not been the practice in the past. 6. When possible, we will provide a more complete historical background of the foster children to foster parents.

In the area of family services, with a changing society, needs that did not exist a mere ten years ago, are now most pressing. The Department will assist communities in establishing Day Care Centres. 2. We will explore additional support services that would assist unwed mothers to keep their child. More unwed mothers today are interested in raising their own children and support services must be provided. This is a relatively new phenomena. More unwed mothers have been encouraged in the past to give up their children. There is a growing number of them who have the desire to retain their child. Experimental and test projects have gone on in other parts of the country and support services will certainly be needed in this area. 3. We will make it possible to provide a homemaker service where a couple could enter a home where children are abandoned or left unsupervised and provide the care needed by children in their own home rather than taking the children into care in an institution. With counselling for the parents, we may be able to prevent apprehension and keep the family together. I do want to say that one of the things that disturbs me most is the fact that the number of apprehensions is increasing each year. The number of children taken into care is increasing this year and I think that preventative services in this regard are the things that we should be working on and we hope that these proposals in family service will be tested to assess the practicality and the results. Various regions of the province will conduct special projects in these areas. It is our hope that we can thereby reduce the number of apprehensions and keep families together.

In the area of childcare, it has been found that it is difficult to find foster homes for teenagers. It required exceptional foster parents to take teenagers into their homes and be able to cope with them adequately. 1. A review of existing resources will be made to ascertain the needs of this group and to provide suitable resources to meet their needs. 2. We will consider the returning of a permanent ward to his or her natural parents where their situation has improved to the point where they are able to provide suitable care. 3. A ward in a foster

home will be allowed to assume the last name of the foster parent. This has not been actively encouraged in the past. Many other areas of service are being reviewed by the Department. However, a large number of these require legislative change and will not be possible until The Child Welfare Act is presented to the Legislature.

I hope, Mr. Speaker, in Estimates, that some of these recommendations will generate some questions and some discussion.

I also want very briefly to outline two program extensions in the Saskatchewan Youth Agency. Mr. Speaker, the first is the Opportunity Caravan. A province-wide program of vocational counselling will be undertaken cooperatively by the Provincial Youth Agency and Canada Manpower Centres. The Opportunity Caravan, as you recall, three years ago was a pilot research project begun in 1967 under the auspices of Canada Manpower, ARDA and the Saskatchewan Youth Agency. Its purpose was to ascertain the need for vocational counselling among residents in rural Saskatchewan. It was a mobile counselling and job placement service designed to serve young adults, the under-employed and those interested in full time employment or training. It was also to evaluate the feasibility of a province-wide mobile counselling service.

According to the study made by Hickling-Johnston Limited, some 4,450 people availed themselves of this service. These included 2,500 counselling interviews and 1,453 general aptitude tests. The areas of the province serviced included Humboldt, Tisdale, Maple Creek, Churchbridge, Moosomin, Whitewood, Wadena, Kelvington, Quill Lake, Foam Lake and the Meadow Lake area.

During the program the Federal Department of Manpower provided two manpower counsellors to staff the Caravan. They provided information to young adults about careers, the potentials and the academic requirements. This enabled older students and some who had left school to return with a more clearly defined career path. Labour information was provided to increase awareness of employment opportunities in other areas.

Findings of the study pointed out that clients of the Caravan service were predominately teenagers interested in training and future jobs. Adult clients predominated in the northern areas where an additional counsellor of Indian ancestry was added to aid in establishing a rapport with the native people. It was found that to be useful the service should visit the client's community and provide counsellors from the urban work local who could offer a general orientation and specific vocational information.

The study also pointed out that the counselling needs of rural youth are greater than those of their urban counterparts, who have grown up in a more industrial atmosphere and because there was generally more counselling services offered in urban centres.

As a result of the two-year pilot research project effective April 1, 1970, the Opportunity Caravan begins operations under the following terms of reference. A cooperative program on a provincial basis will be undertaken by Canada Manpower Centre and the Saskatchewan Youth Agency. Canada Manpower has agreed to operate a twelve-month area service to rural communities in the province. They will be responsible for organization

and counselling services. The Saskatchewan Youth Agency will provide to Canada Manpower a mobile office, a truck and an operator scheduled so that each of the 11 Canada Manpower Centres in Saskatchewan can use the mobile unit for one month throughout their areas to support their area service.

The Youth Agency Regional coordinators in each region would work with the local Manpower Office in publicity and information through individuals, community structures such as recreation boards and schools. Canada Manpower Centres itinerant service, working with the appropriate Provincial and Federal Departments on a regional and community basis, would add significantly to the mobility of counselling services now offered. It is also the intention of the Department of manpower and the Youth Agency that where possible to combine the mobile service with the youth placement service, Teenpower, during the summer months. One of the major functions of the Saskatchewan Youth Agency is to determine the needs of our young people. This project has resulted in a positive program to bring vocational counselling to rural Saskatchewan. I want to express my appreciation to Canada Manpower in their decision to extend this service.

I want to speak very briefly about Teenpower. Teenpower is the Student Job Placement Program operated in cooperation with the Department of Manpower and Immigration and the Saskatchewan Youth Agency. It will be expanded to three new centres during the coming summer. Last year, the third year of operation in Regina, the program was expanded to include for the first time the cities of Saskatoon, Moose Jaw and North Battleford.

In 1970 the program will be expanded to include Yorkton, Prince Albert and Estevan. The program is designed to employ students to assist other students in obtaining summer employment. The costs are shared 50-50 between manpower and the Youth Agency. Manpower provides the live supervision and office space for the project and the Youth Agency conducts the advertising. The students employed in Teenpower while emphasizing job placement were also assuming to a lesser degree the role of counsellors to other students.

The Teenpower counsellors also were highly successful in convincing industry to employ students. They not only made job placements but actively recruited the jobs themselves. And you know when we talk about youth participation, here is one program where young people not only actively took the applications, actively made the job placements, but went out and canvassed industry on their own and even obtained the jobs themselves. The success of the program is indicated in the record of placements compared to other cities in Western Canada. Regina placed 990 students last year, Saskatoon placed 1,163.

The Canadian Chamber of Commerce has undertaken a coordinated national campaign in an effort to ensure that no job vacancy goes unfilled during the summer months. A provincial committee has been appointed to coordinate the work of local Chambers with the Teenpower offices in obtaining jobs for students. In what could be a difficult year for student employment, the coordinated efforts of the Chamber of Commerce and Teenpower promise to leave no stone unturned to assist students in obtaining summer employment .

Mr. Speaker, I am past my time. I will certainly support the Budget.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. W.G. Davies (Moose Jaw South): — Mr. Speaker, I want first of all to congratulate my friend the Minister of Welfare (Mr. MacDonald) especially for the last 15 minutes or so of his speech. I can't say that I can really congratulate him for the first 20 or 25 minutes he spoke, however. I must say that I do have a grudging admiration for the way in which he misuses the facts. He talks nonsense so convincingly that he has some people almost believing it. The Minister of Welfare has talked about how dull the Debate has been and I suppose this much be because of a dull Budget; that is to say not very exciting to talk about. I think I wouldn't choose that language though, Mr. Speaker. I feel that the effect was more stunning than dull for most of the people of this province. Then the Member went on to say that the New Democratic Party members in this House haven't got the people talking about the issues the Budget has raised. Well, Mr. Speaker, I think that the Minister of Welfare has been listening too long to too many Liberals. I think that he should get outside this narrow circle.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Davies: — He wants to talk to the farmers. He wants to talk to the building trade workers, to the hospital workers, to the old age pensioners, to the housewives. He will find that these people are re-echoing what the New Democrats have been saying in the House since this Session started.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Davies: — It was rather regrettable that the minister should have said what he did about the Members for Kelsey (Mr. Messer) and Riversdale (Mr. Romanow). I wonder whether he made these remarks because he feared that these two very bright people on our side of the House are eclipsing his own image. After all, I can remember, Mr. Speaker, the time when the Minister (Mr. MacDonald) was regarded as a promising MLA, when he too had a youth image. Is it because the two Members on our side of the House, the Members for Kelsey and Riversdale, are eclipsing his own image that he has been so sensitive this afternoon. After all, Mr. Speaker, I want to remind the Minister that our two Members are in the front row.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Davies: — And I want to say, Mr. Speaker, that we are awfully glad to have them here. They have got bright ideas. They are lively personalities. They have added something to this House. We like new ideas and we like the two Members.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Davies: — I want to say that I have personally heard more good comments from people under 35 years of age about these two Members than I can remember hearing about any other Member of the House during the time I have been in the House. They are effective. I think they are hurting and that is the reason for the scornful and patronizing remarks of the minister of Welfare this afternoon.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Davies: — Mr. Speaker, I want the House to recall that the constant theme of the present Saskatchewan Liberal Government leaders when in the Opposition, prior to their election in 1964, was the charge that Saskatchewan bore a crushing burden of taxes. Mr. Speaker, as my friend the financial critic (Mr. Blakeney) for our side has so ably and tellingly pointed out, present Liberal taxes make the revenues secured by CCF taxation look minute by comparison.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Davies: — Even this year, Mr. Speaker, when urban and rural sections of the province are stricken by problems in agriculture and of unemployment, new taxes have been imposed. The Provincial Treasury's (Mr. Steuart) Budget shows that he plans to collect an additional \$40 million this year over the total collected last year from Saskatchewan taxpayers.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, the Liberal pledge to reduce taxes and to increase efficiency was a keystone in their political program. The overwhelming volume of new taxes and total taxes secured during some six years of Liberals in office is by itself damning evidence of incapacity in either keeping their promises or in providing efficient government. The steady exodus of dozens of talented and devoted public employees from the Province has almost certainly contributed to this general trend.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Davies: — Mr. Speaker, this is depressingly consistent with general Liberal labour policy which has driven, and is driving, thousands of able employees from the province by failure to provide work and opportunity, by hostile expressions which blame workers for inflation, by policies which cripple their legitimate collective bargaining activities, and by either a complete lack of action or movement at a snail's pace, in the vital field of labour standards and protection.

Let's remember, Mr. Speaker, that the first objective of this Budget, according to the Provincial Treasurer is more help to the farmer, the workingman and the small businessman. My fellow Members on this side of the house have already pointed out the grave limitations in the Budget concerning aid to the hard-pressed farmer. The Budget is equally abysmally deficient in extending any real assistance to the worker and the small businessman.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Davies: — Mr. Speaker, the small businessman benefits when grain prices and sales are good, when full employment at decent wages prevails. We know well what Liberal policies have done to the farmers' sales and prices. We know that Liberal policies in the province have caused a total loss by unemployment, lost production and lower wages of an estimated \$390 million in 1969. What have Liberals done in this Government in this Provincial Budget as a last minute effort to undo some of the damage they have inflicted on labour through biased thinking and action?

The Federal Minister of Finance (Mr. Benson) I interject here, Mr. Speaker, yesterday produced a budget which calls for credit restrictions but no real control on inflation. If anybody hoped to take comfort from some new Ottawa policy he was sadly mistaken. A selective attack on dangerous credit practices has a sound basis, if it is selective, but the Trudeau Government's approach hits everyone from the young newlyweds who want to buy some home furniture, to the retired couple who find they have to buy a new washing machine.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Davies: — Mr. Benson says his restrictions will lower prices. How? When volume sales get less, is there any guarantee that prices will decline? The only thing that is certain is that employment is going to decline. The inept Federal Liberal policy won't roll back prices. It may well push us into a deepening recession. For Saskatchewan the policy is just fantastically out of step. If there is anything we don't have, Mr. Speaker, it's too much buying. Retail merchants and dealers everywhere are now suffering from lack of sales in the midst of plenty of credit.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Davies: — The Benson touch is like the bite of an economic tarantula. It will further cripple and paralyse Saskatchewan business, make more unemployment and impede and obstruct any movement to recovery.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Davies: — The Benson formula for halting and rolling back inflation is harmful first of all to Canada as a whole, but for Saskatchewan it is a disaster, complete and entire.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Davies: — To turn to the Budget, Mr. Speaker, let's look at the \$500 grant for winter construction of homes. Initially of course, it was a tardy gesture. With home construction down last year by 19 per cent or more the action should have been taken earlier. But, further, it is already too late to be of much use during the present winter months so that any real benefits that may flow from the grant in stimulating building won't really come about, if at all, until next winter. This won't help to reduce the jobless total in Saskatchewan now when it is the highest on the Prairies and when jobs are desperately needed.

Nor, I suggest, will the \$500 grant by itself have any real marked effect on getting home construction moving in a really vigorous way. As the Treasurer admits, the high interest rates and tight money policy of his own political party at Ottawa have badly slowed construction in this and other social areas. The Provincial Treasurer, in trying to extricate himself from an unenviable position caused by the wilful and mistaken direction taken by him and his colleagues, has railed against the New Democratic party as the cause of his troubles. Mr. Speaker, I say that this is the outcry of a peevish child. Liberals are in power in Saskatchewan. They are in power at Ottawa where the

national fiscal policies are devised and expedited. Let them take their proper responsibility.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Davies: — What voter can take seriously, weak outbursts blaming the party in Opposition for failures of the Government in power? It is an ironic commentary on the carping voice of the Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Steuart) that he has been able to short up his shaky financial timbers by dipping deep into the surplus of Socialist enterprises, because, were it not for the publicly-owned enterprises like the SPC, Sask Tel and five other companies, which will provide \$14 ½ million to Provincial revenues this year, he would have a deficit not of \$10 million, but a deficit of \$25 million, 2 ½ times as large as he anticipates.

The Minister for Public Works (Mr. Guy) spoke yesterday and Mr. Speaker, he didn't tell us that his 1969-70 budget provided \$9.5 million for capital expenditures; that this year his budget item is lower, \$8.3 million. Surely, in a year like this with the Government's avowal to produce measures that would reduce the number of jobless employees, we should have seen a significantly higher Public Works budget. Even in the 1968-69 Budget, Public Works capital spending was estimated at \$9.9 million and this was a year of relatively light unemployment.

In fact, Mr. Speaker, the more one reflects on the Government's alleged \$20 million program to generate work, the more unreal, uncertain and unsatisfactory it becomes. It was announced only at the eleventh hour, under the extreme pressure of the impending Legislative session. Its effects, taking the most generous view, bust arrive so late that even a paraphrase of the well-known slogan, "Why wait for spring? Do it now," would become, "Why do it now? Let's wait for spring." And this would be wildly optimistic. The truth is that the Government's work program is a hastily erected façade intended to conceal the wholly inadequate, jerrybuilt nature of the Government's deceptive program.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Davies: — The Provincial Treasurer has told us in his Budget message that capital expenditures for Provincial parks and recreational areas will exceed those of 1969-70 by more than 30 per cent. What he didn't say and what he should have said is that last year's budget for Parks capital spending was cut badly, over the objections of the New Democrat party opposite, by about \$1 million from the two previous years. If this money had been available, we could have had a very substantial capital program for parks and recreation and this would have eased unemployment considerably this very winter.

The Provincial Treasurer with characteristic audacity now tells us the capital spending in parks is to increase 30 per cent and that there will be a winter works program in this Department. Mr. Speaker, even with this 30 per cent increase over last year's wretched allotment, it is \$792,000 below the 1968-79 Budget and \$760,000 down from the 1967-68 Budget. The Government's works program in Natural Resources is a regrettable sham in a year when urgently needed new facilities for tourist expansion and our own citizens could have provided desperately

needed employment.

Mr. Speaker, all of us like to see highways construction proceed as rapidly as possible under given circumstances. The Government, however, poses the highway program for this year as a prime means for creating jobs. The Treasurer claims that 286,000 man-days of direct employment would result. This estimate sounds high to me, but if one takes it at face value it means that there would be work for 1,167 men in a year's time. But even if we did accept this figure only about \$6.7 million in wage payments would be made out of a total capital allotment in the highways program of \$64 million; that is 10.5 per cent on the basis of a \$5,720 average wage per year per Saskatchewan employee.

Moreover, the impression that has been left by the Provincial Treasurer that the amount of work, 286,000 man-days to be provided by the highways program is new and additional is, of course, wishful thinking. The current fiscal year spending on highways capital is \$3.6 million less than for this next year. Thus, even by the most optimistic calculations, the estimated extra \$378,000 that would be spent on direct labour would hire only another 66 men in the coming year.

Also, Mr. Speaker, if this Government is proceeding with arbitrary staff cutting, such as the Trudeau Government has done, and there is some evidence I suggest that this is so, many times more than 66 employees will be shorn from the Government payrolls in this province. As I have said, Mr. Speaker, we all want to see highway construction growth, but the Provincial Treasurer cannot use this as an example of a government providing jobs for workers in this difficult year.

But, Mr. Speaker, all of these illustrations are but component parts of an entire twisted and psychotic viewpoint on labour. I do not think this is other than a precise description, by the way. The utterances of some Liberal spokesmen amply bear it out.

Liberal labour policy in Saskatchewan is not sincerely intended to improve management-labour relationships, to facilitate employee organization and bargaining, to augment earnings and to make employment. The kernel of Saskatchewan Liberal policy is not to harmonize relations and to smooth the way to better understanding between rural and urban sections of the population. Liberal policy does not attack the causes of management-labour disputes; it attacks unions and their leaders.

In this context, Mr. Speaker, the remarks of the Member for Nipawin (Mr. Radloff) in this Debate last Friday hit the bottom of the barrel. Leaving aside the lamentable prose, the venomous style left no doubt about what the Liberal party thinks of Saskatchewan's 62,000 trade unionists. More significant were the grossly exaggerated, distorted and often downright untrue statements he made at that time. I cannot conceive why they were made, unless with the intent of promoting the prejudice and division which has characterized the stand of the Saskatchewan Liberal party on labour.

There is not a scrap of truth to the statement that American unions have caused strikes among Canadian grain handlers for their own financial advantage. Indeed, some of the unions involved in these disputes during past years are wholly Canadian.

The long history of the labour centres — the AFL-CIO in the United States and the CLC in Canada — is one of attacking and isolating dishonesty and corruption wherever and whenever it arose in the labour movement. I doubt, Mr. Speaker, if the Chamber of Commerce in both countries has been as vigorous and as successful in fighting wrongdoing — including the Mafia — in business circles, as has the labour movement in North America.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Davies: — And as a symbol of the complete ignorance of the Member in raising this point, I want to tell him that the UMWA on which he spent quite a bit of time, is not even an affiliated organization of the AFL-CIO in the United States or the CLC in Canada.

Mr. Speaker, the mean and shabby charges that were made by the Member for Nipawin (Mr. Radloff) are a detestable affront to 62,000 Saskatchewan citizens and their families who make up the province's labour movement. It is high time that some of the Members on the Government side gave credit to the province's wage earners. If you don't know about the reputation of the Saskatchewan labour force for advanced productivity and good labour relations, you'd better discover and recognize it.

Take a look at civic boards and committees, at provincial bodies in all fields, the local United Appeal committees, at almost any worthy field of community endeavour, and note the large contribution made by organized labour. Ask any knowledgeable executive about where he recruits his supervision and often his upper levels of management, if it is not from the officers and shop stewards of the trade union in his plant.

Every Member in this House, Mr. Speaker, knows in his heart that the efforts of the labour movement in promoting a long list of good causes over the years paved the way for not only labour and social security legislation, but for laws for education and a long, long list of reforms and benefits.

I say that it is time for Liberal Ministers and backbenchers alike to put a stop to a labour approach which must be condemned not just because it is wrong, but because it is pursued for narrow political ends of those who know it is wrong.

The Liberal party often takes refuge in the excuse, "we don't attack the union members, it's their leaders." This is another gratuitous insult to the members. There is as much as, and often more democracy and democratic practice among unionists than in any other membership group in this province. Good, worthy, mediocre and sometimes bad leadership results from the democratic process in unions, as it does elsewhere. But union members are not sheep, they are vocal, thinking individuals, who rightly resent the slanders they so frequently hear from spokesmen of the Liberal party.

The Minister of Labour, Mr. Coderre, when he entered the Debate, gave yet another of his strange, garbled, contradictory and sometimes reprehensible renditions. Last year, and this year, in the Budget Debate, Mr. Speaker, the Minister inveighed against the amount of time lost in labour disputes. He said last year that in spite of this he didn't want to see strikes abolished altogether. This, however, he said he was prepared to recommend drastic laws and take harsh measures to

curtail work stoppages. Almost in the same breath, he talked about the need for improvements in collective bargaining and the need for multi-trade bargaining. Really, Mr. Speaker, the Minister gave one of the most chaotic and confusing speeches that I have ever heard from him and, if I can be pardoned for saying so, I have suffered through quite a few.

The Minister darkly hinted that some union representatives might have “encouraged walkouts for their own purposes.” To quote him. He made similar charges in a speech in this city last year, and at that time he had to take refuge in the claim that he had been misquoted when he was called to account by a number of unionists.

But the question now has arisen: has not this Saskatchewan Liberal Government provoked labour disputes and strike action and worst of all, not in industry, but in hospitals where labour peace is of the essence and where the government is the actual paymaster? Consider the case of the St. Joseph’s hospital. Employees there who had infinite patience had been trying to get an agreement for over a year. When a Conciliation Board was finally created, the Government named as the chairman to the Board, Mr. John Egnatoff, a respected and well-known Saskatchewan citizen, who I am sure, couldn’t be considered as unsympathetic to this Liberal Government. Mr. Speaker, the Board met. The Board made a unanimous recommendation. The Union accepted it. Did the government enable the hospital authorities to effect the recommendations, including modest wage payments, to people who earn in most instances less than half the wages of the average Saskatchewan employee? It did not. The workers in the hospital were finally forced to strike. I won’t take time to relate the harrowing story of the next three months, including the imposition of Bill No. 2 in the Prince Albert dispute, and the eventual settlement at both Prince Albert and Estevan which has been so strongly criticized by hospital employees.

Mr. Speaker, I am amazed at the prejudice and the abuse of the facts shown by the Member for Souris-Estevan (Mr. MacDougall) when he spoke in this Debate. He said the strike of the Estevan hospital workers was, to quote him, “A political strike if he ever saw one.” Mr. Speaker, the employees at Estevan had a just cause. They were in truth trying to peacefully secure a living wage. That was their issue. If the strike at Estevan was caused by politics, it was politics in the Cabinet. Government policy forced the hospital workers’ union on strike because it was the Government who callously refused to implement that very modest report recommended by its own Board of Conciliation. The Member for Souris-Estevan cries crocodile tears for the poor people who suffered the most and who could least afford it, the hospital workers. Mr. Speaker, he should have publicly demanded that his Liberal Government act to effect the moderate increases recommended. This would have prevented a strike. This would have improved the lot of the hospital employees. The demonstration that the Member gave in this Debate is a reflection of his lack of concern and of his bias against labour.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. Minister of Labour (Mr. Coderre), here was a group of low-paid employees, some of whom might be better off on social aid. Here was a group that did everything it could to keep labour-management peace. Here was a union that accepted a conciliation board report set up by your own

department. Mr. Minister, with a chairman of your own choice. Mr. Minister, the cold and the unfeeling actions of you and your colleagues denied these employees the modest conditions that were arrived at by the peaceful methods of settlement in conciliation. You denied them these benefits, even as you rejected the spirit of the Saskatchewan legislation that uses conciliation to avoid strikes. Mr. Minister of Labour the record of the St. Joseph's hospital dispute stands clear for everyone to see. The Government's actions directly caused this labour dispute. They gave the union concerned no alternative but to strike.

Mr. Speaker, the Provincial Treasurer, (Mr. Steuart) boasted that the Government has held down wage increases where it had control. He said he fought these twin monsters, inflation and recession by a policy which obstructed non-professional hospital workers' legitimate efforts to raise their pay from depressed levels. What a way to fight inflation! What a feeble excuse for a fair incomes policy, Mr. Speaker!

On one hand, the Government acts in the case of the big potash companies to enforce a higher price than would be realized on the free market. This may or may not be desirable in the long run. But what a contrast with its treatment of hospital workers, who end up through the forced arbitration process provided by Bill 2, in a worse position than the point of agreement in their previous collective bargaining discussions.

Mr. Speaker, you don't fight inflation by forcing people, who earn far less than the average wage to continue to work at those rates any more than you can settle the present desperate wheat situation by forcing farmers to take \$1 a bushel for number one wheat. All you do is to perpetuate low-buying power and more hardship for people. This does absolutely nothing to curb inflation and as has been reliably established, it actually encourages it.

I want to return to the Minister of Labour's address in this Debate. I refer to those parts where in one breath he spoke of the need for improved methods to settle disputes and in another he threatened more repressive labour law. I remind the Minister that in his Budget Speech last year he also alluded to such possible developments. Then, as now, any rational person who believes in a search for genuine improvements in methods to facilitate collective bargaining and labour peace, must ask: 'For heaven's sake, why?' the Minister has told us that the rate of time-loss due to strikes for each Saskatchewan worker from 1963 to 1967 was only one-twelfth that of the Canada-wide average. Relatively, it is doubtful if the ratio has changed very much since that four-year period. But if it has, it is because of the irresponsible bungling and the harsh attitudes of a Saskatchewan Liberal Government.

The Minister (Mr. Coderre) told the House in 1969 that of the total number of disputes reaching the conciliation stage in the province only one of five ever reaches the strike stage. The Minister said that each year, over 500 Saskatchewan collective agreements are signed, but that only 17 strikes occur on average for this entire number. The Minister said that only 23 unions out of 1,200 unions in Saskatchewan had been involved in any strikes since 1960.

Comparative management-labour peace still exists in the province because of good habits that have not yet been destroyed

by the changes made to The Trade Union Act by this Government. Nothing, however, would be more likely to destroy this excellent record than for the Minister to carry out his threat to institute harsher anti-labour laws. Workers won't react in a docile way to repressive measures; they will fight as they have always fought throughout history. It would surely, Mr. Minister, in any case, be the height of folly to risk the certain reaction of employees by inflicting the drastic laws the Minister appears to have in mind, in the presence of the very positive facts that he himself has related.

Any reasonable observer looking at the Saskatchewan labour scene will conclude that there can be only one reason for the Government to make threats at this time. And that is to engender conflict where conflict is presently at a minimum, to manufacture a paper dragon for the Government to slay, to weaken labour and to distract attention from real problems for which the Government has no solution.

The other day the Minister talked approvingly of the need for 'multi-trade bargaining'. Surely he knows that amendments that he made to this Trade Union Act just a few years earlier removed the possibility of a union being confirmed in a master certification, so that universal bargaining could be carried on in a chain of one-company operations. I think that central bargaining in the cases of the branches of large companies is undoubtedly sensible and desirable. The Minister could act to restore The Trade Union Act section that he removed. This expedited the very principles that he says he endorses. So why, in the light of his remarks, did he remove this Section in the first place? If the Minister is serious about doing something tangible and meaningful to assist the Saskatchewan labour scene (last year he told us, Mr. Speaker, in the Budget Debate again that the Saskatchewan labour force was the best labour force in the country) then I say that he should stop playing word games in this House.

There is plenty of evidence to show that we can substantially improve both collective-bargaining methods and management-labour relations. The Minister will shortly have, I suppose, the report of the Saskatchewan Management-Labour Committee on Regulations in the Construction Industry. I understand that this may make proposals in a broad purview. The Woods Task Force on Labour Relations, the most extensive investigation ever conducted in Canada, is also familiar to the Minister. He, or his Department attended a National conference to review the Woods' recommendations. Now these investigations, I suggest, Mr. Minister, point the way to possible improvements. Threats of harsh and drastic action in the general management-labour environment in Saskatchewan sound more like some despotic feudal lord imposing underserved sanctions on his hard-working, long-suffering peasantry than the responsible attitude that could be expected, and should be expected, of a Minister in a democratic government.

I repeat, Mr. Speaker, what I have tried to make plain here on other occasions. What is at stake is not just the welfare of over 60,000 trade unionists and 250,000 wage and salary earners in Saskatchewan -although this is a serious issue — what is finally at stake is the welfare of the people of Saskatchewan and the province itself.

When the Minister of Labour (Mr. Coderre) spoke in this Debate he was shocked by the fact that there was \$500,000 of workers' wages lost because of strikes in 1967. Well, Mr. Speaker, I won't say that this isn't a good round sum, but it's a bagatelle beside the \$63 million lost wages due to unemployment last year in Saskatchewan and the additional \$180 million lost in production because those workers were jobless. The lost-wages figure alone is 126 times the amount of workers' earnings lost due to strikes. Perhaps I haven't made that plain, Mr. Speaker, I will say it again. The lost-wage figure due to unemployment last year by itself, is 126 times the amount of workers' earnings that was lost due to strikes in this province. It's a shocking indictment that the Minister should spend so much of his time belabouring unions for strikes and say nothing about the real villain in the piece — unemployment — which has grown into a leviathan, nurtured by the policies of his Government.

I also want to protest to the House the fact that this Government is hiding information that should be made available to the public. On Return No. 31, in which I asked for the total number of estimated man-days lost per wage and salary earner in the province in 1969 due to (a) unemployment; (b) sickness; (c) accidents, the Minister of Labour answered flatly in each case that this information was not available. Mr. Speaker, it has been available up to this year in tables published in the Department of Labour Annual Reports. The Department of Labour Report for the year-ending March 31, 1968, included it, but the latest report, tabled by the Minister just two weeks ago, does not. It has been cut right out of the report. I say that this was deleted to suppress information. Further, I say that the answer in Return No. 31 is patently untrue, for the obvious reason that the Department has access to the information and in fact has included it in its Annual Reports up to this year. We can only conclude that the Government did not want the table to appear in the Annual Report and did not want to answer the question that I put in this House, because it would embarrass the Government and expose the nature of the propaganda so often repeated by Liberals in this House.

I want briefly, Mr. Speaker, to say something about Workmen's Compensation Board's policy in the Province. I am becoming more and more concerned to see needed changes in the existing legislation to establish procedures that would, in some way, provide for a review of Compensation Board decisions. The plain fact is that there are many cases which come to the attention of all MLAs, of many unionists, and others in the population, which to say the least point to a significant element of injustice.

I don't want to be unfair in the way of criticism. The members of the board have an exacting task. But I am not satisfied that our present procedures are adequate and I am now proposing that a type of review be provided or an Ombudsman for the Board be named, empowered to review cases of Board decision where workmen feel that they have not received due and proper consideration and remedy.

I have waited patiently for the Government to act in respect of some of the recommendations of the Committee of Review of the Compensation Board and Regulations, Mr. Speaker. This report came to the Minister of Labour in the fall of 1968. The Government has taken no action where it could have and should have proceeded immediately. For example, the Committee recommended a cost-of-living bonus on compensation pensions. It

recommended a Compensation Counsellor to assist workmen in their dealings with the Board. These are just two of the questions on which the Government could have acted with dispatch. But the Government did not act last year and the Speech from the Throne gave no hint that it would do so this year. This failure to take any steps is thoroughly irresponsible and indicative of the nature of Government inefficiency, indifference and unconcern in a very, very important area. Two more years of Liberal inflation after the Committee Report, but still no aid for hard-pressed compensation pensioners. Mr. Speaker, I will certainly look, as the minister suggested on Monday, to see what is offered. I hope I will not be mistaken. However, if past performance means anything, I'm afraid I'm due for a disappointment.

Mr. Speaker, I should draw my remarks to a close because other speakers want to take part in the Debate. I say, Mr. Speaker, that a government would be blind if it did not recognize that the largest part of its population deserves more than a deceitful and bankrupt program. It would be perverse if it did not retreat from a course which maintains low incomes, aggravates the problems and obstructs the solutions to the problems of the great wage and salary group. It would be purblind if it did not recognize that a fair, dynamic and progressive policy for labour is the only one suitable to the long-term growth of the province and its institutions. Mr. Speaker, this Budget does not decisively attack unemployment; it does not propose a good labour policy; it advocates and pursues a theme which cannot produce one. I must, therefore, oppose it.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. R. Heggie (Hanley): — Mr. Speaker, last session I had the pleasure of following the Opposition financial critic (Mr. Blakeney). This Session due to the honour accorded me in moving the Address-in-Reply I deferred to my other colleagues to speak ahead of me. However, I consider the Budget Debate to be of such importance to the Province that I do not wish to miss the opportunity of taking some part in it.

Referring briefly to the Opposition financial critic's address last Wednesday, I want to state that time is eroding his effectiveness as a critic of Government Budgets. Most of you will recall that in 1968 the Opposition financial critic took two hours and fifteen minutes to zero in on utilization fees. No doubt he felt that year he had a hot political issue. His colleagues, you will recall, pounded their desks and gave enthusiastic applause and spurred him on to new oratorical heights.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. R. Heggie: — This year he never mentioned utilization fees, a pretty fair yardstick that as a political issue it is dead. Last year down to one hour and forty minutes. I presume he found last year's Budget pretty hard to disagree with. Could he really find fault with The Municipal Loan Fund Act and the partial rebate of the estate tax legislation. As a practising lawyer I find this piece of legislation particularly pleasing to beneficiaries of farm estates. The proof of the pudding is in the

eating. This year he spoke for one hour and thirty minutes. One can only assume that there is less and less in a substantive way that he can really disagree with. I dare say this declining progression in time will continue and, if the Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Steuart) comes up with a presentable Budget next year, the Government's record of performance in this area will not be a serious election issue.

Most Opposition speakers in this Budget Debate are critical of homeowner grants not being universally open to everyone. I wish to emphasize that homeowner grants are not designed as an overall social welfare program. The Government has other departments and other agencies to take care of that. Homeowner grants are designed to assist and give relief to the payers of property taxes. It has been well demonstrated that wherever they have been adopted these grants assist struggling property tax payers whose burden has been increasing almost yearly since 1950. Homeowner grants meet four board objectives: 1. They give a measure of relief to the overburdened ratepayers. 2. They indirectly assist local government by transferring part of the financial load to the Provincial Government. 3. They encourage ratepayers to keep taxes paid up and in a current condition. 4. They encourage home ownership in the long run. About all that is left for the Opposition to criticize is the method of payment; whether homeowner grants are to be given as a deduction when taxes are paid, or paid out separately is merely an administrative matter. It takes time and manpower to handle it either way. Such criticisms are nonsense and will get them little support from the public.

Now, Mr. Speaker, after eight days of debate on the Budget there are not very many phases of it in which there is anything new or fresh to say. Although I normally do not speak on welfare matters, I would like to draw this House's attention to the plight of a large broad segment of our society. They deserve a good deal more attention than they are presently getting. I am talking about the working poor. These people are proud, independent, self-reliant and self-sustaining. They ask for nothing more than a job and they usually have a job although not always a very good one. They might be called the silent minority within the broad, lower middle-class strata of our society. They are not in any way organized; they do not belong to a union; there is no farm-lobby working on their behalf; there is no union group speaking for them; they are not represented by professional societies, or trade associations, but resented by professional societies, or trade associations, but they are definitely not the welfare sector whose interests are continually being watched over and cared for by the Department of Welfare, either Federal or Provincial. Who are these people? What kind of work do they perform? Mr. Speaker, the working poor are pushing laundry carts in hotels, they are gas-pump attendants, they hold low-paid jobs in department stores and in small retail establishments. They perform all sorts of menial jobs and are poorly paid for their services. Sometimes unions try to organize but these people often find that unions do them more harm than good. By the time the union has called a strike and got them an across-the-board raise they have lost more in total earnings than they gained by the raise. The Federal Government's Commission on Poverty has found that many welfare recipients, considering all their allowances, get a bigger net take-home cheque than one of the working poor who holds a steady but poor-paying job. Not much encouragement to the head of a working-poor family to keep working. One of the inevitable by-products of the working poor's economic condition is that

the father simply cannot make enough to support his family decently so the mother goes out to work. With both parents away the children are left to shift for themselves. In some families it works out alright. Older children take care of the younger ones. In other families it does not work out at all; children run loose in the streets and do not get adequate meals. They are open to juvenile delinquency, to the liquor and drug traffic and all those things which lead to poor citizenship. Thankfully, the schools do much to organize the youngsters. The churches and other groups absorb some of their time and the community sporting organizations get many of them into healthy organized sports. Mr. Speaker, I am not advocating welfare for these people, in fact I'm advocating the very opposite. I believe with the Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Steuart) that able-bodied people ought to look after themselves in the first instance, but I believe this silent minority should have a good deal more attention paid to them in retraining, re-education and income supplements. Not everyone can be a company president, a corporate executive or a member of a profession. There will always be menial work to do and someone has to do it, but I think the returns could be more, the initiative sharpened, the security broadened and the social conditions for the families improved. Let us keep the breadwinner encouraged and working.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Heggie: — If he gives up or fails to try hard enough he will end up on the welfare rolls, and economically there is much in the present system to encourage him to do so. Once on welfare the initiative to get off decreases rapidly as epitomized in the current hit song — The Welfare Cadillac. Now this would go better to the accompaniment of a guitar but I will read you the words:

Well I've never worked much, in fact I've been poor all my life. I guess all I really own is ten kids and a wife. This house I live in ain't much, it's really a shack, but somehow I always manage to drive me a brand new Cadillac.

Back doorsteps they have done plumb fell down, screen doors off and laying somewhere out on the ground. Wind's just now ripped another piece of the tar roof off out back. Sure hope it don't skin up that new Cadillac.

Front porch posts, they're all loose at the bottom, it don't make much sense to fix 'em cause the floor is just too darn rotten. Wintertime we sometimes have some snow that blows in through the cracks. If it gets too bad we just pile up and sleep out there in the new Cadillac.

Now I know the place ain't much but I sure don't pay no rent. I get a cheque the first of every month from this here Federal Government. Every Wednesday I get commodities, sometimes four or five sacks. Pick 'em up down at the Welfare Office driving that new Cadillac.

Now some folks say I'm crazy, I've even been called a fool. My kids get free textbooks, all of them free lunches at school. We get peanut butter and cheese and man — they give us flour by the sack. Of course, them Welfare payments they meet the payments on the new Cadillac.

Now the way I see it these other folks are fools. They are just working and paying taxes to send my young 'uns through school. Salvation Army cuts their hair and gives them clothes they wear on their backs so we can dress up and ride around and show off this new Cadillac.

But things still going to get better yet, at least that's what I understand. They tell me this new President put in a whole new poverty plan. Why, he's going to send us poor folks money. They say we're going to get it out here in stacks. In fact my wife is already shopping around for her new Cadillac.

If this ditty somewhat overstates the case it goes to show up the situation in all its ugliness. Once on welfare it becomes a kind of a game to stay on and see how well one can make out. My concern is the status of the working poor. How do we keep them free, independent and self-sustaining? Certainly inflation, high prices and monopolistic wages for highly organized union labour is going to cut the ground from under the steady and independent working-poor. It is for these people I am really concerned.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I'm cognizant of the fact that welfare programs are being reworked and updated from year to year. A little income supplement to the working poor is a far better social investment than the family totally on welfare. A guaranteed income supplement along the lines of the Federal old-age supplement to pensioners would seem to be a fairer and more economic system. Retraining and re-education have to go hand and hand with such a scheme. Investment by Government in day-care centres for children, as outlined in this Budget, is a step in the right direction. This is a sensible, social economic measure.

Mr. Speaker, may I conclude by saying this is a good Budget. It is a fair Budget and a Budget that is designed to bolster programs for people. This Budget could have been balanced but the Government asked itself, "Is this the year to balance budgets in the light of all the circumstances?" All those departments requiring extra help are getting it from the Budget: agriculture, education, health, highways and local government. Only the necessity to pump some Government funds into the construction industry has called for deficit budgeting. How can our friends opposite disagree with that. Let them stand up and be counted in support of this progressive Budget. I will lend my support to the Budget and vote against the amendments.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. W.E. Smishek (Regina North East): — Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Member for Hanley (Mr. Heggie) who has just taken his seat read to us a ditty which implied that the welfare people are well-off and looking toward the driving of Cadillacs. Mr. Speaker, I invite him to come to Regina North East. I invite him to come and see the dozens of people who are living on welfare and I can show him that the welfare people have an extremely difficult time of providing three meals for themselves and for their youngsters. I will show him the kind of conditions that they live under because the welfare benefits provided are inadequate. Mr. Speaker, I will agree with the Hon. Member that there are many working poor, whose wages and conditions are so bad that welfare payments are greater than

wages. It was exemplified in the Estevan hospital, it was exemplified in the Prince Albert hospital. This is why the workers fought for a better wage condition. But what did this Government do? It invoked Bill 2. Mr. Speaker, this Government can do something about the low-level wages for the working poor and I invite the Hon. Member for Hanley (Mr. Heggie) to give advice to the Minister of Labour (Mr. Coderre) to immediately increase the minimum wage to a decent level. This would be an indication of good faith.

Mr. Speaker, you know last night when I got home after the Session adjourned, I read a couple of articles in a newspaper over which I was extremely disturbed and depressed. I refer to an article under the heading "Request refused again." The story reads like this:

The Board of Education Wednesday refused to reconsider a request for construction of a high school in Regina North East.

Then it went on:

In a letter to the petitioners it was pointed out there would not be sufficient students in the area to warrant construction of the college.

Mr. Speaker, I disagree with that statement. The facts prove otherwise and it depends on the kind of a survey that was made and particularly whether that survey took into consideration not only the public school supporters but also the separate school supporters. The story went on to say:

It was also noted that the project would not be economically feasible under present financial conditions.

Mr. Speaker, on the front page appeared a story, "1970 Highway plans unveiled." And it appears that there is sufficient money for other projects. It says:

In Regina, the Trans-Canada bypass will be increased to four lanes and will involve relocation of the road east of the city to tie in with Regina's planned ring road.

Mr. Speaker, I submit this bypass is going to cost much more money than would a high school in Regina North East. I submit, if the people of Regina had a choice to make a decision, I am sure — and I have confidence in the people of Regina — they would choose a school in Regina North East. Mr. Speaker, I note that the Member for Regina South West (Mr. McPherson) is here, he apparently has a great deal of influence with this Government. We have the Minister of Health (Mr. Grant) who is with us here. I invite them to join us in a campaign for a high school in Regina North East. The bypass can wait for another year, Mr. Speaker.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Smishek: — The education of our children is much more important.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Smishek: — Mr. Speaker, during this Debate, Government Members

one after another have risen in their places and have heaped commendations on the Provincial Treasurer's Budget Address and his personal skills. I am glad that the Provincial Treasurer is here. I wonder how many of them have taken the trouble to study the Budget Address and compare it with the Estimates of revenues and expenditures? How many of them have noted the glaring inconsistencies and confusion? Mr. Speaker, it would appear that what the Provincial Treasurer did is: firstly, he calculated the Departmental expenditures; then he wrote his speech and threw some figures together; and lastly, recognizing that it is the requirement of the Budget to provide the Legislature with estimated revenues, he pulled some figures out of the hat, with one set of figures having no resemblance to the other. He forgot to rationalize the figures, so that one corresponds with the other. Mr. Speaker, I shall deal with this in some detail a little later to show the fallacy and the inaccuracy and the confusion of this Budget.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Smishek: — Mr. Speaker, Members will recall that the original date set for the introduction of the Budget was March 3. Well on February 21, the Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Steuart) announced that he might be changing the date because Mr. Benson would be introducing the Federal Budget on the same day. Well, a few days later, Mr. Speaker, the Provincial Treasurer said with certainty that the Saskatchewan Budget date would be moved to March 2 because he could not persuade Mr. Benson to change the Federal Budget date of March 3. The Provincial Treasurer went on to say, "It was important to make this change so that the public is not confused." He emphasized that the Provincial Budget would contain some significant changes and startling programs for the people of Saskatchewan. Well, Sir, no sooner had the Provincial Treasurer announced a change in his date — apparently the Federal Minister, Mr. Benson said, "Me too, I had better stay away from that man, Steuart, as far as I can." So he moved his date to March 12. We have now seen both Budgets. Saskatchewan's mountain roared and produced a mouse and the Ottawa mountain roared and produced nothing. Here is a great example of Federal-Provincial cooperation and communication, an example of Saskatchewan's influence over Ottawa. They can't even agree on a date. How can they possibly be expected to agree on some major issue like the farm crisis, or unemployment, or inflation? Well, one thing they do agree on is that they are Liberals whose purpose as a political party is to protect the interests of corporate capitalism and not the little people.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Smishek: — So on March 2, the Provincial Treasurer stuck it to the people of Saskatchewan and last night the Federal Finance Treasurer said he was changing the date so the people are not confused. Well I don't believe that the Hon. Provincial Treasurer can confuse the people of Saskatchewan any longer. They know who has created the economic problems of Saskatchewan. It is the handy work of the Liberals in the Province of Saskatchewan and in Ottawa.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Smishek: — But let me tell you who is confused. It is the Provincial Treasurer and the Premier. They are men of confusion, contradiction and deception. The Budget and their purported programs clearly showed this. Mr. Speaker, on February 21, The Leader Post carried a story on the Premier's mini-Budget or a prelude to the Budget. The headline read: "Crash public works programs details given." He said it was a \$20 million program and would generate an additional \$15 million spending on the same program by Federal and local governments. I invite the Members to check the Press. He used such words as, "more millions here", "added millions there", "extra millions in another place", "additional millions somewhere else." One would conclude from reading the report that money was going out of style in the way the Premier was spending it that day. More compared to what, Mr. Speaker? More than the Liberals spent in 1943. Well I would hope so. More than they intended to spend originally? Well I would hope so. Mr. Speaker, ten days later the Provincial Treasurer tabled the Estimates. So I checked. It would appear that in the majority of cases the Treasurer did not provide the funds for the Thatcher shopping spree of February 20. Let us take a look at agriculture. I invite the Provincial Treasurer to take his Budget Address in hand and compare it with the Estimates. What does it say?

The Premier said, "The Government will put \$1 million extra into capital projects for agriculture." Look at page 12 of the Estimates and what do you find? \$381,000 less money than last year and not a penny, and not a penny for agriculture capital expenditure, under the Public Works Department.

Mr. Speaker, let us take a look at education. The Premier said, \$1 million more will be provided in school building grants." Check the Estimates on page 19, and you will find \$703,000 less money than last year. Mr. Speaker, even if you credit the additional \$260,000 under the Public Works Northern School program, which you can't because it is not a grant, you are still short \$440,000. Mr. Speaker, let us dig a little deeper into this school construction. I invite the Members to check page 65 of the Estimates, under the heading. "Loans, Advances and Investments," for education to authorize loans to school districts, boards and school unit boards for the purpose of financing capital expenditure on school buildings and equipment. What do you find? Well let us take a look at the record. Let us take a look at the 1968-69 Budget. This Legislature approved a vote of \$750,000. I invite the Members to check the Public Accounts that were tabled. You will find that \$675,000 was unexpended. Let us look at last year's Budget. We've approved a vote of \$650,000 — likely not spent because the Government put a freeze on school construction last year. Let us check this year: 1970-71, \$550,000 to be voted, down \$100,000 from last year; down \$200,000 from two years ago, Mr. Speaker. Well the Premier may be forgiven. His counting has never amounted to much. Further he is more preoccupied these days with counting the number of seats he will lose if he calls an election. He is working on his new gerrymander which I understand is going to be coming up sometime later this Session.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Smishek: — But one cannot forgive the Provincial Treasurer for

his sins of commission and omission. In his Budget Speech, on page 45, he said, and let me quote: "Additional grants for an accelerated school construction program of \$3.5 million." Additional to what? His own Estimates on page 19 state that grants for school construction will be \$700,000 less than last year. Mr. Treasurer, you are \$4.2 million out.

Hon. L.P. Coderre (Minister of Labour): — Can't be. You must be wrong!

Mr. Smishek: — Oh, I invite the Minister of Labour to check the Estimates. I would hope that the Treasurer provided him with a copy.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Smishek: — May I also make a prediction on the whole question of school construction that not more than \$10 million will be spent on school construction out of the \$12.7 million appropriation asked for. Simply because there are no immediate plans or projects on the drawing board beyond \$10 million. Incidentally, Mr. Speaker, approximately half that amount will come from Ottawa pursuant to the post-secondary education agreement.

Mr. Speaker, let us take a look at the University. The Premier is reported in the Press on the 21st of February to have said, "\$1 million extra for University of Saskatchewan construction projects." Extra to what? And where is it: Mr. Premier, check the Estimates — I guess he is not with us today — the Treasurer crossed you up again — the fact is that university construction is being shorted by \$2 million compared to last year. Surely you can't take \$1.8 million appropriated for debt servicing as new construction. That amount will not turn a shovel of dirt. That money is to retire an old debt created by this Liberal Government, Mr. Speaker.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Smishek: — The Premier reached far into the sky, pulled a \$4 million figure out of the air and gave it to the Public Works Minister. It will take much more than \$4 million to make that Guy look good. Here is what the Premier said, "\$4 million extra into Public Works Capital Projects." Let's examine the Estimates, pages 52 and 53. In 1969-70, we appropriated \$9.5 million. This year, \$8.3 million. We are \$1.2 million short less than last year. Yet the Premier says, "An extra \$4 million." Who is he trying to fool, Mr. Speaker? If the Premier was talking about Provincial funds only, since no reimbursement is to be received from Ottawa this year, then the figures are like this: \$1970-71, \$8.3 million; 1969-70, \$7.8 million. This would amount to \$477,000 more. That's a long way from \$4 million, Mr. Speaker. The Premier and his Guy have been crossed up again by the Provincial Treasurer. The total Public Works program announced by the Premier and re-stated by the Provincial Treasurer is not reconciled with the Estimates and the appropriation. In fact, they are in complete contradiction, one with the other.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Smishek: — Mr. Speaker, perhaps the Provincial Treasurer is a genius in pulling the wool over the eyes of the Liberal back benchers and the Cabinet Ministers and even the Premier. But he is not fooling us on this side one bit.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Smishek: — And he is not fooling the people of Saskatchewan one bit.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I am reminded of the words C.D. Howe, the former Federal Minister of Trade and Commerce, in 1957 said, “What’s a million?” Our Provincial Treasurer applied the same rule except he stretched it a long way. He said, “What’s a million? What’s two million, what’s five million?” well, Mr. Speaker, let us now take a look a little closer at the Budget. The Hon. Member for Nipawin (Mr. Radloff), the student of the mafia, described the Provincial Treasurer as a financial genius.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Smishek: — Mr. Speaker, let us examine the art and the skills of this master of finance. Join me in examining his speech on page 19 — I trust everybody has a copy of it, he provided everyone with one — I invite the Provincial Treasurer to check his own masterpiece. I refer to pages 19 and 20, under the heading “Fiscal Forecast 1970-71.” Compare it with the Estimates that he tabled that same day, page 6. Look at the budgetary revenues. Well, Mr. Speaker, let us look at the first one. In his speech he tells us that the education and health tax is expected to yield \$64.3 million. In his estimates, Mr. Speaker, he says \$65.3 million. Mr. Speaker, what’s a million?

Let us go a little further in his speech. He tells us that gasoline taxes are expected to increase to \$49 million. In the Estimates he tells us that it is going to be \$51 million. What’s two million, Mr. Speaker? And he goes on, Mr. Speaker, and he said — I’m quoting the Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Steuart) — these are the figures he provided us in this House. Let me quote:

In total we expect consumption taxes to recover from the downward trend of the current year and yield \$145 million in 1970-71.

But in the Estimates, Mr. Speaker, these four consumption taxes total \$148 million. What’s \$3 million, Mr. Speaker, what’s \$3 million? Mr. Speaker, while I lack confidence in both sets of figures, the figures used in the speech are perhaps a little closer to the truth than the ones in the Estimates. But I invite the Members to particularly refer to page 9 of the Provincial Treasurers Speech, and pages 24 and 38 — the figures are all there and I’m not going to repeat them — this is on the gasoline tax. In regard to the sales tax, check page 9 of his speech and page 38 and compare them with page 6 of the Estimates. There has never been a phonier presentation of the Budget in this Legislature ever.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Smishek: — Let us carry on, Mr. Speaker, let us carry on to see the skills of this financial genius, of this master. Let us look at the individual income tax and corporation tax. In his Speech he said and let me quote it again, “Individual income tax will yield \$59.3 million with \$20 million being paid by corporations,” for a total of \$79.3 million. In the Estimates he gives us these figures: individual income tax, \$69.5 million; corporation \$22 million, that comes to a total of \$91.5 million, a difference, Mr. Speaker, of \$12.2 million. What’s \$12 million, Mr. Speaker, what’s \$12 million? But, Mr. Speaker, the Provincial Treasurer may search for a comeback. He will likely try for a comeback by saying, there are the four points of individual income tax and one point of corporation income tax for post-secondary education, and you see I try to explain this in the fourth paragraph on page 20. but, Mr. Speaker, the figure comes out to \$14.3 million. Yes, \$14.3 million, not \$12.2 so the Provincial Treasurer is still \$2.1 million out. No matter which way you take it, Davey, you are caught red-handed this time.

Mr. Speaker, you know on Wednesday, six or seven Liberal Members brought adding machines into this House. Perhaps they should have taken them to the Provincial Treasurer’s office, him a financial genius. Earlier I said this was a confused, contradictory and deceptive Budget. Perhaps I was too kind. It’s a phoney and misleading Budget.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Smishek: — What it means is a deficit of not \$10.4 million, it will be a deficit of \$15.5 or \$26.6 million, and if that’s the case, he should say so. Otherwise the Government does not propose to spend the money it is asking this Legislature to approve, and I have grave doubts that it proposes to spend that money.

I also invite the Members to check the Public Accounts and you will find that back in 1968-69, it pulled the same trick. You will find that \$5 million appropriated by this Legislature was never spent. It means that there is no crash Public Works program the Premier talked about on the 20th and the Treasurer bragged about on television on March 2. Remember what he said when he appeared on television, “If it is not enough, we will get more from where this came.” Those were his words. I’m sure he can. The farmers haul it out by the wagonloads everyday and use manure spreaders on it. The Provincial Treasurer doesn’t even need a power-spreader He is self-propelled, Mr. Speaker.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Smishek: — Well, Mr. Speaker, I would like to refer for a minute or so to another budget that was presented to us yesterday. It has, I think, some deep implications for Saskatchewan. I understand that the Provincial Treasurer in this Government was involved in the making up of that budget. The Federal Minister said that he had consulted with provinces. You know the greatest hoax ever created in this country is that Canada’s chief enemy is inflation and the Liberals propose to do something about it. Mr. Speaker, as sure as I am standing here I am

convinced that the Federal Liberals are not prepared to fight inflation. If they did Mr. Benson had a chance yesterday. He could have announced a plan of selective price controls as a first measure. But what did he do? What did Mr. Benson do? He brought in a 1913 Budget. This is 1970, men are going to the moon. He did not bring a model-T budget, not even a horse-and-buggy budget. He brought in an oxen-cart budget for us. He said, "1913 budget." He bragged about it. "This budget," he said, "will get the economy moving at the slower speed" — as if it were burning itself out of control — Mr. Speaker. It will go slower all right. He said he now "sees a slower trend" back to 1913. Perhaps he should have called it a budget with a reverse-upward trend. This is the sort of economics that Liberals normally apply. Mr. Benson did not bring in a financial Budget designed for economic growth and social priorities. He brought in a budget of unemployment. He budgeted for more unemployment and nothing else, Mr. Speaker. It is hardly believable that in 1970 a government elected on a pledge to build a just society that the Minister would deliberately plan for a recession. It can only come from the Liberals, Mr. Speaker, only from the Liberals.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Smishek: — In December, the Prime Minister said he was prepared to accept 6 per cent unemployment as a means to fight inflation. Last night Mr. Benson in his Budget Address announced a plan for 1 per cent more unemployment. We must assume that the Federal Government is deliberately planning and budgeting for 7 per cent unemployment. What does this mean economically? Well, each 1 per cent of Canada's work force produces about \$4 billion worth of goods and services. This means a \$28 billion loss of production. It means a \$7 million loss in taxes. It means more than that, Mr. Speaker. Unemployment means poverty. It means privation for millions of Canadian people.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Smishek: — Will these 6 or 7 per cent of unemployed stop inflation? I doubt it. I have a news report from a news article which appeared in the Globe and Mail on Saturday last week, reporting Dr. Benjamin Higgins, professor of economics of the University of Montreal, he said this. Let me quote:

This country Canada turns out to be one where even a 9 per cent level of national unemployment does not prevent the upward drift of the cost of living.

Who in Saskatchewan wants or needs a brake on the economy? We need an infusion of new capital, more purchasing power, a plan for economic growth, Mr. Speaker. Who in Saskatchewan needs a control on consumer credit? Retail sales in Saskatchewan last year were down 8.3 per cent over the year before. Let us look at the specific items on which consumer credit controls are to be imposed. Let us look at a drop in sales last year. Motorcar dealers, sales last year down 12.5 per cent. Furniture and appliance dealers, sales down 10.4 per cent. Lumber and building, sales last year down 8.9 per cent. Mr. Benson is going to impose consumer control on these people. Do Saskatchewan farmers need consumer control? Not one bit, Mr. Speaker. That's the last thing that the Saskatchewan farmers want and

need. They need cash and credit if they are to continue to exist.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Smishek: — Consumer controls are only going to drive hundreds more small businessmen of Saskatchewan out of business and farmers to completely go under, and more workers to become unemployed.

Mr. Benson also told us last night that this matter was discussed at the Federal-Provincial Conference on February 16, and 17, when they discussed inflation. I would like to know where the Premier stands on this issue. The Provincial Treasurer said, “We continue to cooperate with the Federal and Provincial Governments in exchanging on a confidential basis our expanding and borrowing plans” and so on. Mr. Speaker, when the Provincial Premier came back from Ottawa he did not tell us where he specifically stood on this question of consumer credit, and its implications for Saskatchewan. He supports Ottawa’s plan to fight inflation. We must assume, Mr. Speaker, that he supports the idea of consume credit controls and we must assume that he supports the Ottawa plan for budgeted unemployment. The Benson Budget has been described as bad news, cold-blooded, a schizophrenic budget. Some have said it is a nothing budget. Mr. Speaker, it is much worse, it offers no help to the old budget for planned unemployment, no cash, except consumer credit for farmers. It is a budget for thousands of bankruptcies for small business people. Mr. Speaker, like the Steuart Budget, the Benson Budget is designed to drive this province and this country into economic recession, stagnation, Mr. Speaker, I can’t support the Budget.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. D.G. Steuart (Provincial Treasurer): — Mr. Speaker, the Member from Regina North East, Mr. Smishek, who just took his seat suggested that I need an adding machine. He watched dramatically, he smiled and he smirked at his colleagues and they giggled and they laughed as this great financial genius proved his stupidity and his ignorance in a most unbelievable way.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Steuart: — They smirked and they giggled while he proved what a total buffoon he was in all matters of reading, arithmetic or budgeting. I have never seen one man in this House make such a complete idiot of himself and do it at the same time as he was giggling and laughing and convinced he was putting on a great dramatic performance. But what really baffled me, Mr. Speaker, is that the rest of them giggled and laughed right along and applauded him. They must have agreed with him.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Steuart: — I have a feeling that the financial critic (Mr. Blakeney) — and I would suggest to the Leader of the

Opposition that you shouldn't consider making the Member for Regina North East the financial critic for at least a year or two — I have a feeling that the financial critic was at least squirming in his seat a little and feeling a little uncomfortable. Let's look at the facts, let's give this great enlightened labour leader a little financial lesson, see if we can wipe the smirk off his face, see if we can give him a little lesson in arithmetic. If I need an adding machine, this man really needs a lesson in reading and anything to do with the Budget and with the Estimates. Let's start and see what he talked about on page 19. Let me read page 19, what I said:

In this period of adjustment, our future forecast for the forthcoming fiscal year is based on prospects of a moderate increase in the sale of farm products and some improvement in the non-agricultural sector.

On this basis, and given our present tax base and rates we expect the revenues in 1970-71 to be \$389 million.

Then I went to consumption taxes based on our old rates, I said that they would come to about \$145 million. Then the great genius took this \$145 million, that I said that I pointed out clearly was at the old rate, he went over to the Estimates on page 6, and found that we had \$146 million, and said, "What's a million?" He forgot a slight detail.

Mr. Smishek: — Page 9!

Mr. Steuart: — In spite of their opposition, we have lowered the rate on the education and hospital tax to 14 cents, we expect this will take \$700,000. Other administrative changes we have made will bring in another \$300,000. This accounts for the \$1 million. It is all there for him to see, all there for anybody to see.

An Hon. Member: — Oh, Walter!

Mr. Steuart: — The next statement I said,

Receipts from personal and corporate income taxes, excluding the transfer pursuant to the Post-Secondary Education Agreement, will come to \$79.3 million.

Then he really crowed, he really thought he had something. So he went over to the Estimates — he got some help I am sure — he added up what we had estimated would be the revenue from individual income tax and corporation income tax, and found it came to \$91.4 million, a difference of \$12 million. He said, "Now I've really got something." Again he forgot, or was too stupid to read it in there, or didn't know the facts, that we have raised, as I point out later in the Budget, the income tax by 1 percentage point to yield about \$2 million. Again he forgot the facts obviously that the four points of individual income tax and one point of corporation tax which is the equalization, will yield \$10 million.

Mr. Smishek: — No, I didn't!

Mr. Steuart: — If you didn't forget it, you're even stupider than I thought you were.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Steuart: — If that will yield \$10 million, the increase in the income tax will mean \$2 million, that added on to \$79 will make \$91 million. Walter, even you should have been able to add that up. If you couldn't you should have checked with somebody.

This is the man, he is not only one of our labour leaders, but he sits on the Public Accounts, and I am told he puts himself down as a great expert in public financing. What an expert he would be on a balance sheet, I don't think he would know a balance sheet from a bed sheet. Mr. Speaker, this is a sad example of why our labour movement is in such trouble. It is a sad example why the NDP Socialists, once a great party, are in trouble.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Steuart: — You know, we pick on the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Lloyd). Well even Moses couldn't lead those unenlightened uninformed people into the promised land.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. A.E. Blakeney (Regina Centre): — Not that Moses anyway. I'll tell you that.

Mr. Steuart: — And not that Moses over there or the little Moses sitting beside him. Although he's going to try I think.

You know, Mr. Speaker, the performance of the Socialists in Opposition has been a pretty sad affair. The easiest thing is to blame the Leader of the Opposition, the Hon. Member from Biggar. Let's take a look at those sad sack NDPs he is trying to lead, the people he is trying to depend on to back him up. Mr. Speaker, some of them are so far back that he can hardly see them. The rest of them, he better keep up front or he'll never know what hit him. What an army he has got, they are going in five different directions at the same time. And no wonder, they have at least five would-be new leaders, all of them I say showing indecent haste to assume command. The socialists have more crown princes than the Russian army had before the Revolution, and they have more generals than the Mexican army after the Revolution, and they are about as effective as both.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Steuart: — Let's take a look at some of these great leaders. First they have Henry, recently dubbed Henry the XIVth by the Minister of Health (Mr. Grant) in honour of his 14-point leadership campaign. You know, Mr. Speaker, I can see Henry now, riding side-saddle down the road on a sack of flour leading the Socialists into financial cuckoo-land.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Steuart: — Our Members added up the cost of his latest offerings and they hit \$480 million before the adding machines over-heated and broke down.

Then we got that great Member, that great financial critic, the Member from Regina North East, our friend Walter, the white hope of the union kingmakers. I can only think that his bid to fame must be that he led — outside of his financial abilities — that he led the co-op workers here and in Prince Albert on a long and bitter strike. I suppose some Socialists figure that anybody who can really get the farm and the labour members of the co-op movement at each other's throats can't really be all bad.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. D.W. Michayluk (Redberry): — That's Radloff's speech!

Mr. Steuart: — But you know, Henry and Walter . . . Who wrote your speech, you could hardly pronounce the words!

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Steuart: — Henry and Walter, they're really the dark horses. The leading lights are up front where Woodrow can really keep his eye on them, and I don't blame him. These are the glamour candidates. There is Romeo Romanow, the unofficial leader of the Saskatoon Inter-party Caucus. There is Jack Messer the happy thresher . . .

An Hon. Member: — Flip-flop!

Mr. Steuart: — . . . He's becoming famous as the flip-flopper from Kelvington . . . Kelsey!

Then of course, there is Allan Blakeney, former heir-apparent and crown prince, who seems to be getting lost in the shuffle and he may just pick up his kiddie-cart and all diplomas and go back East where he came from. I have got some advice for you NDP, and I know you boys will cherish it and take it to heart. I am telling you those new boys couldn't lead you down Albert Street at high noon.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Steuart: — At least with Woodrow you are still in the Opposition. But remember what happened to the Tories when they changed leaders in 1935, they haven't been heard of since. Don't forget, fellows, one wrong move and you will be back out trying to make an honest living. For some of you, it could prove impossible.

Mr. Speaker, let's look at some of the nonsense Members opposite tried to pass off as criticism of this Budget. First, the financial critic, Mr. Blakeney called it a hoax. His ability to recognize a hoax hasn't improved any since he was head of Securities commission back in the 1950s, I tell you. Does he call giving the homeowners, including the pensioners, working people and the farmers \$11 million through homeowner grants a hoax?

An Hon. Members: — Shame, Allan!

Mr. Steuart: — Is the greatest school grant increase in our history \$11.5 million a hoax? Is the help for local government a hoax?

Is more millions to help our Indian and Métis a hoax? Is more financial assistance to help the needy, the alcoholics, the emotionally disturbed children, the mentally ill and the Cancer Commission, Mr. Blakeney's idea of a hoax? Maybe it is, maybe a look at his record will prove, when he was Treasurer, just the kind of priority that he gave these people. For the school boards, did he give them an \$11.5 million increase? Not likely! The financial critic when he was Treasurer gave them a measly \$2.8 million, less than a third of what he now calls a hoax. Let us see what this little hoax caller gave to the homeowners? Nothing! What did he give to the Indian and Métis? Nothing! What did he give to the emotionally disturbed children? Nothing! How about the increases in the alcoholic and the cancer programs? Next to nothing! How much did the Member for Regina Centre give to Regina for police protection, snow removal? Nothing again! How much did he put in his Budget to increase the health and the library grants for his own city of Regina? Nothing!

Mr. Blakeney: — Oh, you're wrong, 65 cents.

Mr. Steuart: — No increase at all. As far as the people of Regina and Saskatoon are concerned there is a hoax around here, the Member for Regina Centre, both as Treasurer and now as financial critic. There are a few things he can take credit for. during his term as Treasurer in 1962 the income tax went up, and the education and health sales tax went from 3 per cent to 5 per cent. Oh, yes it did! Woodrow snuck it in and you charged it.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Steuart: — Don't tell me. What did you charge us for a Medical Care Plan that you couldn't even produce, then what did they do with you. They made you Minister in charge of the Medical Care Plan and you led them into oblivion. It was during his term of office, licence fees, other taxes were increased from \$76 million to \$117 million, an increase of over 50 per cent. He also stole a few profits from the Crown corporations, \$4.7 million as a matter of fact, he took from Crown corporations, Telephones and other enterprises, \$4.7. Sure he did. Why didn't he take more? I'll tell you, because the Socialists were making such a mess of the public business, they weren't making any money in the Crown corporations.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Steuart: — You know, Mr. Speaker, in those days when the Socialists took money from the Crown corporations they made it sound like a virtue. If we do it, they call it robbing the piggy banks, taxing the utility users . . .

Mr. R. Romanow (Saskatoon-Riversdale): — Phoney!

Mr. Steuart: — I'll tell you, Mr. Romeo, this kind of hypocrisy is the real reason why most people will never, never, never trust the NDP Socialists again in the history of this province.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

An Hon. Member: — Call an election!

Mr. Steuart: — I'll just move along, I am sorry he is not there, I don't know how he got the energy. This is the Member from Shellbrook (Mr. Bowerman). This is the man who worries about the Northern Indians and people starving. Obviously he is not among them. Mr. Speaker, if there is anybody in this House who should be an expert on the troubles of our northern native people, it is the MLA from Shellbrook. For years, he worked for the Department of Natural Resources, and in those years under the CCF, the Northerners called many of the DNR officials the 'Commissars of the North', especially those officials connected with the Fisheries Branch, as was the Member from Shellbrook. One of the regulations that irked our northern natives was that they would often be forced to sell their fish to the Co-op when they were offered a better price by someone else. Oh, the DNR always claimed the fishermen had a free vote. Then the same officials would often show up, attend the meetings and get right in there and vote right along with them. In fact after a while, they made them take their uniforms off, but they could still tell those birds without a program. I can tell you that. If they dared break the law, the poor natives would be hauled into court, their nets and motors confiscated, all in the name of Socialist planning. Thousands of fishermen were treated that way. That is why the Socialists have never been able to hold a constituency in our far North, like Meadow Lake and Athabasca. Besides the fine upstanding Members we are able to elect from there, there are other reasons. The Indian people know those people too well to ever trust them.

An Hon. Member: — . . . Prince Albert East-Cumberland?

Mr. Steuart: — From Prince Albert East-Cumberland? He gets elected by the good people of Prince Albert. They know a good thing when they see it, just like me.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Steuart: — That is why the hypocritical tears of concern by the Member for Shellbrook about our northern natives is so phoney. He lived off the seat of their backs too long to convince anybody that he gives a tinker's damn about their welfare now.

I was interested in the comments of the Member from Regina North West, Mr. Whelan. He is well named because he is always wailin', but we usually don't pay too much attention to him. However, it is interesting how he bleeds for the poor now that he is in Opposition, but how silent he was as he sat on the Government side hoping to be tapped for the Front Bench. He is still waiting for that tap. Where was this fighter for the poor and the down-trodden in 1963, when his Government, the CCF, threw a poor young man from Bill Berezowsky's seat into jail for not having enough money to pay his hospital and medical care premium. That's right. Hard to believe. Some of you new NDP Members may not remember this, but it is a fact. Your great humanitarian Government actually jailed a man because he couldn't pay the medical care head-tax. What did the Member from Regina North West say about that? Nothing, silence, just like he was gagged! At least Bill said something. He said it was a dirty Liberal plot. He was wrong, but at least he was vocal. He was like the rest of the Socialists when they were

in power. They were going to save the poor people, even if they had to put them in jail to do it.

I read another interesting story in the paper. It quoted the NDP Member from Canora, Mr. Matsalla, as saying an NDP Government would assume 75 per cent of the cost of education in their first years of office. What a piker, a measly 75 per cent. If this new Member looked up the record he would find that the last time the Socialists were trying to claw their way into power, they promised to pay 100 per cent of the cost of education. That's right, 100 per cent of the cost of educations. Let's look at the record. In 1945, brand new clean, the white knights, ready to clean up the world, what did they pay, 100 per cent — 22 per cent. What did they do in 1946 — 25 per cent,. In 1947 — 23 per cent. In fact the most they ever paid was 36 per cent. A long way from the 100 per cent that they promised 20 years before.

Mr. W.S. Lloyd (Leader of the Opposition): — That's more than you're paying right now!

Mr. Steuart: — It is not more than we're paying right now. You must have been listening to Smishek, I don't think he can add either. I hope when you go back to teaching, which won't be long, they don't put you teaching arithmetic.

Mr. Speaker, under the unbelievable chance that the NDP might by some fluke ever grab power again, the people of this province could expect to see our grants cut in half.

Speaking of education, Mr. Speaker, I listened last night, and again today to the Hon. Member from Cut Knife, Mr. Kwasnica, as he heaped scorn on our request to school boards that they increase the student ration by two. As I listened I kept checking to find out if he was really a teacher. I found that he was, that anybody in this noble profession would play so fast and loose with the truth. I couldn't believe that a teacher could be so misinformed or deliberately try to misinform others. Then a strange thing happened. The more I listened to him, the more I came to believe him. He began to convince me about the teacher-pupil ratio. That's a fact. In fact I am now convinced that we should make some exceptions to this 25:1 pupil-teacher ratio. The reason I now feel this way, Mr. Speaker, is that when we have teachers as ignorant or as devious as the Member from Cut Knife, the fewer pupils we expose them to the better off we will all be.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Steuart: — Mr. Minister of Education, in his case could we make it one on one and that's too much?

Mr. Speaker, I said this Budget was designed to help the farmers, the workers, the businessmen and the taxpayer. I am pleased and proud to have public support from such people as: the president of the SARM, a farmer and a councillor; the executive director of SUMA representing over 50 per cent of our people living in urban centres.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Steuart: — The president of the Chamber of Commerce representing small businessmen all over this province.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Steuart: — The mayors of most Saskatchewan cities.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Steuart: — I am still waiting for Henry, but I am not holding my breath. The daily Press in our province and hundreds of ordinary men and women who have phoned and written to me and other members thanking us and expressing their appreciation of our efforts to help them.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Steuart: — The testimonials are rolling in. I dare Members opposite to show some real political courage and vote for this enlightened Budget.

An Hon. Member: — Henry will!

Mr. Steuart: — Welcome to the club.

I dare them to vote against: \$15 million to help agriculture; expanding the South Irrigation Project to South Saskatchewan; eliminating the tax on farm fuels to save the farmers \$4 million — vote against that one, Bill - \$500 grant toward the construction of new homes; a start on the Regina Base Hospital; new bridges at Leader and Nipawin; an expanded road building program on our reservations; \$20 million injection into the economy to produce \$35 million — whether you like it or not — new programs and construction. Vote against more grants for grid and farm access roads; snow clearance; police protection; city snow removal; reassessment grants; an \$11.5 million increase to school boards . . .

Mr. Blakeney: — . . . 80,000 new jobs?

Mr. Steuart: — We'll get the 80,000 new jobs, because we'll be here that long, believe me.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Steuart: — . . . but don't worry about it, we'll have them.

Vote against the homeowners grant of \$11 million; increased welfare rates; expanding Teenpower and the help for cancer treatment facilities. In fact, I dare you to vote against a Budget that spends over \$00 million to help people in every part of the province. I challenge those doom and gloom merchants to show the same faith that we have in our province. I challenge them to forget their petty politics and vote for this Budget.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

March 13, 1970

Amendment was negived on the following recorded division:

YEAS — 22

Lloyd
Messer
Blakeney
Davies
Romanow
Dewhurst
Meakes
Berezowsky

Smishek
Thibault
Whelan
Snyder
Michayluk
Brockelbank
Baker

Pepper
Matsalla
Wooff
Willis
Kwasnica
Kowalchuk
Byers

NAYS — 22

Thatcher
Howes
McFarlane
Boldt
Cameron
Steuart
Heald
Guy
Barrie
Loken
MacDougall

Grant
Coderre
Larochelle
MacDonald
Estey
Hooker
Gallagher
MacLennan
Heggie
Breker

Leith
Radloff
Weatherald
Gardner
Coupland
McPherson
Charlebois
Forsyth
McIvor
Schmeiser

The motion was agreed to on the following recorded division:

YEAS — 31

Thatcher
Howes
McFarlane
Boldt
Cameron
Steuart
Heald
Guy
Barrie
Loken
MacDougall

Grant
Coderre
Larochelle
MacDonald
Estey
Hooker
Gallagher
MacLennan
Heggie
Breker

Leith
Radloff
Weatherald
Gardner
Coupland
McPherson
Charlebois
Forsyth
McIvor
Schmeiser

NAYS — 22

Lloyd
Messer
Blakeney
Davies
Romanow
Dewhurst
Meakes
Berezowsky

Smishek
Thibault
Whelan
Snyder
Michayluk
Brockelbank
Baker

Pepper
Matsalla
Wooff
Willis
Kwasnica
Kowalchuk
Byers

The Assembly adjourned at 5:35 o'clock p.m.