

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN
Fifth Session - Sixteenth Legislature
29th Day

Friday, March 26, 1971.

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

WELCOME TO STUDENTS

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: — I believe we have in the galleries today a group of students from the Kinistino School, represented by Mr. Thibault from the Kinistino constituency. We also are supposed to have a group from the Red Cross Youth Conference, but I don't believe they are here. On behalf of the Assembly I should like to welcome these students to this Assembly. I hope they find their stay here enjoyable and educational and we wish them a safe trip home. I don't know whether they will get home tonight but we wish them a safe trip home when they can go.

HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

ERROR IN LEADER-POST - VOTING ON ATHABASCA MILL BILL

MR. W. McIVOR (Arm River): — Before the Orders of the Day I should just like to draw your attention to an error in the Leader-Post which states I did not take part in the vote last night on this Mill Bill. I certainly did vote for it which I feel is a very good Bill.

STATEMENT

SCHOOL GRANT ESTIMATES

HON. J. C. McISAAC (Minister of Education): — Before the Orders of the Day I should just like to make a comment in general on School Grant Estimates which some Members have been inquiring about. Yesterday the Department sent a telegram to School Boards in the province advising them that preliminary estimates on grants were being mailed this weekend, at the latest this afternoon. The purpose of this, Mr. Deputy Speaker, was very simple because the majority of School Boards will be able to make real mill rate deductions once again if they adhere to the approved budgets agreed to by the vast majority of Boards in the course of budget review processes. Mill rate reductions of two, three and perhaps four mills should be possible in most rural units this year. The exceptions are a handful of units where the mill rate is already very low, 35 or lower, or where considerable recent expansion in program opportunity has been made available. I might say too that many of the Urban Boards should also be able to consider mill rate reductions next year.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

ANNOUNCEMENT

WHEAT POOL INCREASING RAPE SEED PROCESSING PLANT IN SASKATOON

HON. C. L. B. ESTEY (Minister of Industry): — Mr. Deputy Speaker, before the Orders of the Day I am sure all Member of the House would join with me in congratulating the Wheat Pool on its recent announcement whereby it will in 1971 under a \$3 million construction program increase its Rape Seed Processing Plant in Saskatoon from 100 tons per day capacity to 300 tons per day capacity. This extension will involve approximately 2,700 carloads of product which will be shipped from the plant each year to domestic markets in Eastern Canada and export markets including Europe and South America.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. J. MESSER (Kelsey): — Mr. Deputy Speaker, we on this side of the House certainly welcome the announcement in regard to the Wheat Pool's expansion program of their Oil Seed Processing Plant in Saskatoon. This is the type of industry we like to see taking place in the province and we hope that the Government will endeavor to encourage other such industries involving our primary industry, agriculture, in other areas of the province.

MR. F. A. DEWHURST (Wadena): — I wish to ask the Minister is the Government putting any money toward the expansion and what additional employment do they expect it will give?

MR. ESTEY: — They anticipate employing around 60 workers at peak periods in the plant and this expansion will create about 20 permanent new positions in the plant.

HON. W. R. THATCHER (Premier): — I shall answer the supplementary question. The company did express interest in a major SEDCO loan. Whether they will proceed with it or not we cannot be certain. However, we are prepared to put up a major share of the loan if they request it officially.

RESOLUTIONS

RESOLUTION NO. 7 - INDEPENDENT ELECTORAL BOUNDARIES COMMISSION

Mr. J. E. Brockelbank (Saskatoon Mayfair) moved, seconded by Mr. N. E. Byers (Kelvington):

That this Assembly, recognizing that the most recent redistribution of legislative representations is in many cases grossly unfair, recommends to the Government immediate establishment of an independent electoral boundaries commission, such commission to present its

completed report to the Legislature for implementation before the next provincial general election.

He said: Our party, Mr. Deputy Speaker, has made a number of attempts to show the Government that an enlightened approach to electoral reform specifically an independent electoral boundaries commission would have long-term benefits for the people of Saskatchewan and our democratic system. I have been involved in past futile attempts to reason with the Members opposite, Mr. Deputy Speaker, and I have attempted to be patient but resolute. My patience has evaporated, Mr. Speaker, but I am more resolved now than ever to convince the people who really matter, the electors, of the worth of our cause.

In 1965 we said in this Legislature that we were prepared to accept the Federal Government's electoral boundaries commission as our Saskatchewan electoral boundaries commission. The Government Members opposite, Mr. Speaker, voted us down. In 1968, a resolution was put forward asking for agreement on the matter of an independent electoral boundaries commission. The Government Members rejected that resolution.

It is interesting to note that the Member from Hanley (Mr. Heggie) who fancies himself to be some kind of judge and therefore able to take us by the hand through the pages of history, did just that. He recited all the abuses that have taken place in the past when politicians carried out redistribution. When he brought himself back to the present his comments revealed either a deliberate ignorance of recent electoral reform in other parts of Canada or an extremely shallow depth of research on his subject matter. It was quite clear to all Members on this side of the House that the Member from Hanley didn't know who all the Members of the Federal Redistribution Commission for Saskatchewan were, even though one of them was sitting right in front of him. I can only hope, Mr. Speaker, that if the Hon. Member from Hanley intends to take part in this debate he will spare us those irrelevant ramblings as he did in other years. If he feels compelled to speak in this debate perhaps he could explain why he voted to put many Saskatoon City constituents into the rural constituency of Hanley.

I recall only about eight short years ago, Mr. Deputy Speaker, when the Speaker was a Member of this Legislature and sat down on the floor with the rest of us, that he put forward a motion which opposed that very practice which I have now mentioned. The motion at that time was seconded by the now Senator, A. H. McDonald. Interestingly, Mr. Speaker was supported in the motion at that time by the present Minister of Highways (Mr. Boldt), the Member for Rosthern, who said that people living in Saskatoon were forced to vote in Hanley constituency and "protested most violently". The present Minister of Agriculture (Mr. McFarlane) the Member for Qu'Appelle-Wolseley said: "I think the point expressed by the Member for Rosthern, Mr. Boldt,

was well taken." Mr. D. Steuart, the Treasurer and Deputy Leader of the Liberal Party said: "I see no reason why the people who live in some parts of Saskatoon City should be forced out of Saskatoon just to give the Hanley Member a safe seat. I will support the amendment." Those hollow, insincere words were spoken by the present Member of Prince Albert West who was the architect of the infamous 1970 gerrymander. They were supported by their Leader, the present Member for Morse, Mr. Thatcher, whose facade of words, in hindsight, never masked a more deceitful intent. He said: "We want this amendment passed for one reason, because we know the citizens of Saskatoon who live in Saskatoon want to vote in the constituency of Saskatoon and not in the constituency of Hanley." He was ardently supported by Mr. J. W. (Wilf) Gardiner, former Member for Melville, who among other things said: "I think it is only reasonable to expect that the residents of the city of Saskatoon would sooner be represented by Members from the city of Saskatoon than to be part of another constituency." I am not so sure, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that Mr. Gardiner would so ardently support his Leader today. I might even venture to guess that if Mr. Gardiner were allowed to enter this Chamber now he would clearly identify the Premier as a meddling dictator, ruthlessly consolidating power to himself by destroying those who oppose him and by undermining the democratic system too.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, in your present position, you are barred from taking part in this debate and if Mr. Speaker were here he would be barred from taking part in this debate. I must say with regard to Mr. Speaker, who unfortunately is not here today, that I believe he really and truly portrayed his own personal feelings in 1963 when he moved the motion that I have referred to. I say that, Mr. Speaker, at this time, because he honestly believes in our democratic institutions, would prove me correct if he had a vote on this particular Resolution. I have listened to some of his observations about the democratic parliamentary system and I read with respect the news report of his proposals for Senate reform. I regret that his influence and guidance will not be felt as we conclude this debate on this Resolution at a later time.

Last year in the 1970 session, I put forward a resolution asking for an independent boundaries commission similar to ones that have already been accepted in our sister provinces of Manitoba and Alberta. The indication from across the way was obviously the same as previous opposition to fundamental political change to enhance the democratic system and make it more responsive to the wishes of our people. At that point New Democratic members purposely offered an amendment to a Bill before the House which would have essentially had the same effect. That amendment also met defeat at the hands of the anti-democratic forces across the way, Mr. Deputy Speaker. The voters are beginning to realize that the Liberal blind opposition to electoral reform has behind it an insidious political purpose. That purpose is to prevent an increasing number of dissatisfied voters from expressing their true feelings about Liberal Government failure.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. BROCKELBANK: — What are those failures, Mr. Speaker, about which the people are going to have trouble expressing their true feelings?

Well one of them is the drastic drop in farm income. The proposed final solution of the Liberal farm failure is the adoption of the Task Force on agriculture report which will remove two out of three farmers and will destroy the family farm as we know it in Saskatchewan today.

The second item that the voters of Saskatchewan would like to register their decision on, is the fact that the Liberal Government has failed to lower taxes. As a matter of fact, Mr. Deputy Speaker, taxes have risen sharply since this Liberal Government took over. The people will have difficulty registering their protest in that particular area.

Another area where the voters of Saskatchewan will have trouble accurately expressing their total disgust is the Liberal Government's attempt to trick and deceive the voters and the people of Saskatchewan with regard to the matter of environmental protection controls in new industry that was introduced into the province. The people of Saskatchewan will have trouble registering their protest in that area.

Another area the people of Saskatchewan would like, I think, to register their protests about is the manner in which the Government has performed in providing 80,000 new jobs to Saskatchewan people. The Liberal Government has dismally failed in that promise. They have failed to maintain decent minimum standards in wages. They have failed to provide adequate workmen's compensation. The Liberals, Mr. Deputy Speaker, don't want the electorate to have an opportunity to register their disapproval of the actions of this Government.

The voters now know that there is a wide variance between the number of voters in one rural constituency compared to another rural constituency. Compare, for example, Mr. Deputy Speaker, Touchwood constituency and Last Mountain constituency. Touchwood constituency has 10,230 voters approximately, Last Mountain constituency has about half at 5,760 voters. Compare Kinistino-Melfort constituency and Watrous constituency. Kinistino-Melfort constituency has 13,000 voters, Watrous constituency about 7,100 voters. Compare Wadena constituency with Kelvington constituency. Wadena constituency has 10,230 voters, Kelvington constituency 6,860 voters. Compare, if you will, Mr. Deputy Speaker, Tisdale-Kelsey constituency and Pelly constituency. Tisdale-Kelsey has 10,500 voters, Pelly constituency 6,570 voters. The voters know, the people know, that there has been a mass exodus of about 32,000 people from Saskatchewan just since the most recent gerrymander took place. That major disruption in our population is in itself a reason to re-examine the redistribution done in 1970. If we must make

March 26, 1971

further changes, Mr. Deputy Speaker, let's do the right thing for our citizens and give them an Independent Electoral Boundaries Commission.

In the urban areas the redistribution of electoral boundaries done by the Liberals is scandalous in its malevolent purpose. Mr. Speaker, I ask you to compare from your unbiased position in this House, Moose Jaw South with 13,470 voters to Moose Jaw North with 6,200 voters. Compare Saskatoon Mayfair, Mr. Speaker, with 16,500 voters to Saskatoon City Park-University with 5,560 voters. Compare Regina Centre 18,000 voters to Regina Park with 4,400 voters, Mr. Speaker. Compare Regina Centre again with its 18,000 voters to Whitmore Park 5,900 voters. I suppose you have noticed, Mr. Speaker, that those last three examples have contained the word 'Park' in the name of the constituency. Knowing something of the characters of the purveyors of that redistribution I can only assume that 'Park' added to the names must have been a humorous way for Liberals to indicate that a Liberal could park there undisturbed by the democratic system.

I can assure, Mr. Speaker, that Saskatchewan voters consider it to be sick, sick humor. If you had to rule, Mr. Speaker, from your impartial position that you occupy, you would rule the Liberal gerrymander "out of order."

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. BROCKELBANK: — You would rule it "out of order", Mr. Speaker. First, because of the principle of representation by population has been shattered. Consequently, our system will lose its responsiveness. Secondly, you would rule the gerrymander out of order because this redistribution in urban areas actually represents class legislation, even as superficial examination will show that the gerrymandered boundaries do not derive their existence because of geographic considerations. They do not derive their existence because of trading areas, or because of weight of population. Those boundaries derive their existence first and foremost from a consideration of the economic class level of the voters. Generally speaking the electoral gerrymander along class lines is a mirror of the voting patterns as well.

There has been some newspaper editorial comment recommending the position we have taken with regard to an independent electoral boundaries commission. On April 9, 1966, the Star-Phoenix said:

Saskatchewan ridings should be mapped by an independent commission similar in personnel to the Federal Commission in Saskatchewan.

On March 26, 1968, two years later, the Star-Phoenix said again:

Since it is in the voters' interest to have an independent commission, many of them would react favorably to

the adoption of such a program, such as the Opposition now advocates. Conversely, they should show their displeasure with any government which stubbornly continues the inequitable practices of the past.

Again on April 17, 1970, last year, the Star-Phoenix said:

Saskatchewan in the area of constituency construction seems to shy away from obvious reforms. It is time that this province set up an electoral commission non-partisan in personnel, such as the government of former Douglas Campbell (a Liberal) of Manitoba established in 1956.

I see the Members across the way applauding Premier Campbell's example. It is unfortunate that they can't grasp the situation sufficiently enough to follow his example.

On April 25, 1970, the Star-Phoenix said again:

It claimed the latest shuffling of constituency boundaries works to the distinct advantage of the Liberals. The claim is not without validity, all other things being equal. Many people believe that Saskatchewan, like Manitoba, should appoint an independent redistribution commission to fix boundaries with some permanency.

While Saskatchewan people are probably thankful, as I am thankful, for any editorial support of a fair representative system, they cannot help but feel dismayed that the editors do not pursue the matter with more vigor and imagination than shown in the past. After all, the Star-Phoenix carries an inscription on its editorial page every day, which should obligate them to champion the cause of democratic representation. That inscription reads:

Democracy cannot be maintained without its foundations in free public opinion and free discussion throughout the nation on all matters affecting the state within the limits of the Criminal Code and common law.

On March 5, 1970, the Leader-Post editorial commented on the report of the Special Legislative Committee, and had this to say:

A useful suggestion from the minority report is the recommendation that redistribution of seats be removed from politics.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. BROCKELBANK:

Governments should recognize the right of electors to be fairly represented in the Legislature. A right which an independent and permanent electoral boundaries commission is more likely to respect than a partisan legislative body.

March 26, 1971

On March 25, 1970, the Saskatoon Commentator in its "Talk of the Town" column - and I must say at this time that that column is a very popular column because everybody turns to the Talk of the Town column to get the latest news from the Commentator - commented on the 1970 resolution that I moved about an independent electoral boundaries commission by saying: "Possibly it is time we did that here." Again on April 27th, 1970, the Commentator had this to say about the infamous gerrymander of 1970:

We have been looking at an old constituency map of Saskatoon and see that if we draw the lines as proposed by Bill 86 a portion of Nutana South will be plunked into Hanley. This is strange, for it is a complete reversal of the stand Mr. Thatcher took in 1963. 'We say that an impartial group set out these lines once and for all.'

I must say, Mr. Speaker, it has come to my attention recently that the Star-Phoenix has written another editorial and this was March 25, 1971. While I can't say that the Star-Phoenix pursues the matter with any more imagination or vigor than it has in the past, it is at least noticing that the matter is still a matter of concern for the people of Saskatchewan. In this editorial entitled, "Electoral reform", the editor comments on a number of things, The Controverted Elections Act, the matter of paying election expenses. In his concluding two paragraphs, he comments on the matter of electoral boundaries. I think it is worthy of reading into the record these final two paragraphs of this editorial:

If the Government is re-elected, it could go a long way toward appeasing the public criticism of the new constituency map. All it has to do is turn over the business to an independent electoral commission such as has been in existence in Manitoba for 15 years or so.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. BROCKELBANK:

Such a commission's first job would be to see the elimination of postage stamp ridings of which City Park Saskatoon and Regina Albert Park are glaring examples.

It has been calculated, Mr. Speaker, that with the infamous 1970 gerrymander, it is possible for a minority political party to elect 53 per cent of the MLAs with 33 per cent of the vote. If that situation is allowed to exist undisturbed the will of the electors will have been frustrated. Before the next election a change must be made.

I might add that Mr. Speaker takes a great pride in talking to students about this Assembly and he takes a great personal pride in this Assembly and I thank him for that. However, I

think it would be hypocritical for the Speaker, or me or any Member of this House to continue to hand out this little colorful card which is available to all Members, because inscribed in this card, Mr. Speaker, are the words, "In a free country none govern except by consent of the governed."

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. BROCKELBANK: — I must say, Mr. Speaker, that if we pass this Resolution in this House and I am doubtful about the passage of this Resolution, that we should be able to continue handing out this card. We should be able to update our electoral reform in the Province of Saskatchewan. We should again possibly lead in these areas which are very important to the democratic system. I think that we should adopt this Resolution and I do so move this Resolution.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. N. E. BYERS (Kelvington): — Mr. Speaker, there are a few comments I should like to make about this very timely topic in the House. However, I shall at this time beg leave to adjourn the debate, so that I may pursue it later.

Adjournment negatived on the following recorded division:

YEAS - 23
Messieurs

Blakeney	Kramer	Messer
Wood	Romanow	Lloyd
Davies	Dewhurst	Meakes
Berezowsky	Smishek	Thibault
Whelan	Snyder	Michayluk
Brockelbank	Baker	Pepper
Matsalla	Wooff	Kwasnica
Kowalchuk	Byers	

NAYS - 27
Messieurs

Thatcher	Howes	Boldt
Cameron	Heald	McIsaac
Guy	Loken	MacDougall
Coderre	Larochelle	MacDonald
Estey	MacLennan	Gallagher
Hooker	Breker	Leith
Radloff	Weatherald	Mitchell
Gardner	Coupland	McPherson
Forsyth	McIvor	Schmeiser

March 26, 1971

The debate continues on the motion.

MR. BYERS: — Mr. Speaker, now that the Government seems to be sharing more interest in this question now before the House, I hope that Government Members will stay around. Perhaps we can hear from them today, perhaps an announcement that they are beginning to see the errors of their ways in the past, and that they may now be considering backing away from their original position of the very severe gerrymander Bill which we are being faced with. They might be considering our proposals for an independent review of constituency boundaries.

I think that one of the more important questions that the Provincial Parliaments in Canada must face up to is the question of turning the drawing of constituency boundaries over to an independent commission. I know that Members of this House realize that there are, I think, three other provinces in Canada where this practice has been introduced in more recent years. The Federal Government, prior to the last Federal election, established an independent commission to draw the Federal boundaries for the Federal ridings.

Might I remind the Members of this House that the problem of setting up the framework and the rules for the drawing of Federal boundaries, is a much more complicated process than this Legislature would have to deal with if it did the same in Saskatchewan. Let me just say one or two things that the Federal commission has to consider. There are provisions in the BNA Act that a province with a small population such as Prince Edward Island cannot have fewer MPs than it has Senators. That's simply one of them. We have a resolution passed by this Chamber back in 1952 or 1953, that the number of seats that a province would lose as a result of redistribution cannot fall below a certain level.

A Federal commission has all of these factors to deal with. But I think that one of the underlying reasons why we have seen such a strong opposition by this Government to our proposal for an independent commission, is one of the criteria laid down by the Federal Commission, when the Federal boundaries were drawn up. Following politics in Saskatchewan for some years, I have always noted this characteristic twist to politics that there was one appeal to the urban people and another appeal to rural people.

The Federal Commission agreed that there is a common interest between the urban and the rural people in this province and in this country. And that principle was taken into account in the drawing of the Federal ridings.

I think we are moving in the direction, when Parliaments will be forced by people regardless of gerrymanders to accept the principle at least of an independent commission. Why can't we do this in Saskatchewan? I have said in this House, and I shall repeat again today, this Government can bring in

legislation whereby the school boards of Saskatchewan are required to apply 25 to 1 pupil ratio, in ten thousand classrooms, but yet we can't work out a formula to apply a similar uniform ratio to 60 constituencies in the province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. BYERS: — This issue itself is more than that. It is as I look at it, another battle in the long struggle of man for greater political justice. Let me say to you, that those of us who work in and who understand and who believe in the British Parliamentary system of government, which we operate under in this country, really believe that the major battles for political justice were won in the last century and we should not have to be fighting for the kind of thing that we are asking for in 1971 in this particular Resolution.

You can go back, and the Member for Regina South West (Mr. McPherson) knows full well and he has said so at times in this House, that the battle to win political justice goes back well into the 19th century. We have had some students in the House today from our high schools who know that story very well. I said in one of the other debates that one of the fights for political justice in the 19th century really came from the capitalist class in 1832, which you people represent, where they had to appeal strongly to the aristocrats, the landed aristocracy in England to gain representation in Parliament. It is certainly unfortunate that we must be so slow to learn that there is a better way to draw up these particular boundaries.

Well, Mr. Speaker, the battle for political justice has gone on over the years. The struggle first of all to give the vote to elect Members of Parliament to people who weren't property owners. And that battle went on loud and long and that was a hurdle that had to be overcome. Finally it was agreed that one doesn't necessarily need to have the title to some property to be elected Member to Parliament. The struggle went on later for the right for women to vote and for the lower voting age.

We are now faced with a gerrymander Bill that really did a job of drawing up the constituency boundaries in this country. I think that it is fair to say that this is perhaps one of the most vicious pieces of legislation that has ever been put through this particular Legislature.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. BYERS: — The Member for Saskatoon Mayfair (Mr. Brockelbank) has drawn some comparisons as to population. I might point out that if you were to take a map of the present boundaries of Saskatchewan constituencies, that you would not have much trouble finding instances where three Liberal MLAs in this Chamber, represent about the same number of people as one New Democratic

March 26, 1971

Party MLA in terms of actual voters.

One of the arguments that our friends have used to justify the gerrymander bill, is the "you did it too" argument. I want to put on the records of this House the situation in 1951, and you shouldn't mind that as some of you who have been here longer than I went back to 1961. I know that if Liberals ever get around to explaining the gerrymander bill they will likely be using the, "you did it too" story in reference to the 1951 redistribution.

Let me just point out that in 1951 there hadn't been any redistribution in the province for 13 years. The last was in 1938. However, this present Government has seen fit to bring in three redistribution bills in something less than six years. Large disparities in population had developed prior to 1951, but there were some rules laid down. The rules laid down at that time were understood by the Legislature and by the Saskatchewan people. It was decided at that time that there ought to be 45 rural seats for a total of 53 in the province and the standard unit of representation for these 45 seats, was set at 9,100 voters. For urban voter seats the standard was set somewhere in the neighborhood of 13,000 or 14,000 voters. But in drawing up the boundaries at that time, no rural seat was allowed to vary from the standard of 9,100 voters by more than 25 per cent, and no urban seat by more than 40 per cent.

Well that is a far cry from the situation that we have today where if you take the combined totals, of let us say Watrous of 7,100, represented by the Hon. Member, Mr. Schmeiser, and the constituency of Last Mountain with 5,150 people, for a total of just over 12,000, there we have - if you take all the people by combining those two ridings represented by those two Members on the basis of the new constituency boundaries - fewer people in those two ridings than in the entire constituency of Melfort-Kinistino. Now that is some kind of new arithmetic.

MR. GALLAGHER: — Take Yorkton.

MR. BYERS: — Well, all right, if you want to take Yorkton, what has happened to Yorkton? You have a growing city, but might I point out to you that just to the north of Yorkton - if you wanted to fix up Yorkton's boundaries you could have fixed them up last year. If you look at the map of the Province of Saskatchewan, you could have transferred a portion of Pelly, which has only 6,282 voters against your 11,968 - and there is a large urban population that could have gone into Pelly. Canora riding now has 8,770 voters as you are well aware; Pelly 6,282, and yet there was a large portion of the Pelly constituency transferred into the Canora riding, and I just wonder where the voice for the Member for Yorkton was when the Committee was doing the pencil work. There is no need for this great discrepancy to exist in the case of Yorkton constituency.

I am very pleased to hear that the Member for Yorkton feels

that the people of Yorkton have been done a great disservice by this redistribution . . .

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. BYERS: — . . . because I am sure that the people of Yorkton also feel there have been other great disservices by this Government and we shall hopefully be represented by one of our Members after the next election.

Well those are some of the comments that I wanted to make about this particular Bill. This Bill is a very dangerous Bill, on the grounds that it has really shattered, as the Member from Saskatoon Mayfair (Mr. Brockelbank) has said, the principle of representation by population. And I want to again say to the Members of the Government, that representation by population was one of the flags that the Clear Grits of Upper Canada raised 150 years ago when they formed what was once the great Liberal Party in this country. But this particular party has laid to rest, by this gerrymander bill, one of the great principles upon which "liberal" democracy in this country is noted.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. BYERS: — As the Member here has said, the provisions of this Bill are so severe that it is now possible for 33 per cent of the voters to elect 53 per cent of the Members of this particular Chamber. As the Member for Saskatoon Mayfair said, we, who are citizens of this country and go about our constituencies and about this province, we who speak and know and work with people, and we who try to inculcate in our young people, an admiration of the British Parliamentary System, certainly point out to them repeatedly that in a democracy people are governed by consent. As Robby Burns said in this poem: "A man's a man for a' that, and a' that", unless you live in Saskatchewan.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. BYERS: — The very basis of democracy was enunciated by the Scottish poet when he said that. We, as Members of this Legislature, cannot say that democracy in this country is by consent on the basis of a man is a man, is a man, because that is no longer true.

What are some other figures that we could put on the record with respect to this, Mr. Speaker. Let us take the 1967 election results and let's apply them to the constituencies, the new constituencies in Saskatchewan, and let us suppose all of us decided to run again and we returned with exactly the same number of Members after the next election - let's just go into a flight of imagination for a minute - the count would be this. The average Liberal MLA in this House would represent about 7,700 people while the average New Democrat would represent

March 26, 1971

about 12,200 people. I say there has been no time in the history of Saskatchewan or Canada when there has been a more flagrant gerrymander than that. The Member for Mayfair (Mr. Brockelbank) has laid down some of the reasons why the Government will not likely pick up the cudgel and move support for this particular Resolution.

I am very pleased to see that the Member for Shaunavon (Mr. Larochelle) has a few words to say about this. I should be very interested to hear what he has to say. I am going down to his constituency tomorrow . . .

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. BYERS: — . . . I know that he hasn't been in the House this winter. He has been ill, but I am glad to see that he is back and we shall hopefully hear from him this afternoon. I know that his constituency wasn't affected by the redistribution. Perhaps he is one of those in the Government who has a little greater sense of justice than has been exhibited by some of the other Members. I should be very pleased to hear what he says. There are many more things one could say about this Resolution. However, I will conclude my comments at this point.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. F. LAROCHELLE (Shaunavon): — Mr. Speaker, firstly, I didn't think it was such a difficult problem to speak in this House. Due to circumstances beyond my control I have not been able to express myself in this House this year yet, and lo and behold we have got to have a vote before I can speak in this House.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. LAROCHELLE: — Actually I feel very, very important, gentlemen.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. LAROCHELLE: — I couldn't believe that this could happen.

AN HON. MEMBER: — Only in Saskatchewan!

MR. LAROCHELLE: — Only in Saskatchewan.

Mr. Speaker, after listening to the Member from Saskatoon Mayfair, I think I shall have a few comments to make, if I may.

AN HON. MEMBER: — Go ahead!

MR. LAROCHELLE: — Are you sure I can speak.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. LAROCHELLE: — First I think the Member for Saskatoon Mayfair (Mr. Brockelbank) was very unjust when he spoke about the Member for Hanley (Mr. Heggie) when he said, "He fancies himself as being some kind of judge." The Hon. Member I am sure could have referred to the Member from Hanley in a different way than that. I am sure you could have! This was not one of the best ways to refer to a member of the judiciary. I don't think this was a very kind way of doing it.

Now, he spoke at length about the changing of boundaries. Don't tell me that the CCF while they were in power, didn't change boundaries. Maybe a fellow like the Member from Riversdale (Mr. Romanow) was in short pants at that time and doesn't remember. But people like the Member from Moose Jaw South (Mr. Davies), the Member from Wadena (Mr. Dewhurst), I am sure those people remember what the CCF did in their time. They were electing a majority of this House with 37 per cent of the vote of this province.

MR. ROMANOW: — Never!

MR. LAROCHELLE: — Oh, yes you were! With 37 per cent of the votes of the province you were elected as a majority of this House.

AN HON. MEMBER: — 63 per cent against you!

MR. MESSER: — What year?

MR. LAROCHELLE: — In 1956 and those years!

MR. ROMANOW: — We have never been below 44 per cent!

MR. LAROCHELLE: — May I have the floor for a minute, you had it for an hour last night.

Now let's look at Regina, for instance. If we had left Regina the way the CCF had it in their time, I certainly do not believe that today, if we hadn't changed it, I don't think you would have one single Member from the city of Regina sitting in this House today. I don't think you would have one single Member. We saw fit to change it. Today Regina has representation from the Opposition as well as from this side.

Now you talk about an independent commission on this thing. Well, why didn't you do it when you were in power, you had 20 years to do it? 20 years of CCF rule to change it! Oh no, you had no independent commissions at that time, because you were sitting on this side of the House. But now the sanctimonious NDP sitting on the far side of the House are begging for independent commissions in every sector that we can find today.

March 26, 1971

Anything that this Government wants to do, you ask for an independent commission. We asked for them during the time that we were sitting in the Opposition, we never got it! Now today that they are sitting on the far side, it is sour grapes. It is sour grapes today because we are not setting up independent commissions for one thing and for the other. Sour grapes, nothing but! My own constituency has not been changed, now it could have been changed, I could have bettered my position. There is no reason for it as far as I am concerned. There are many constituencies in this province that weren't changed. Maple Creek was not changed. One day you speak one way, the next day you speak the other. No better example was done to that, Mr. Speaker, - I am probably going to change the subject right now but the Member from Saskatoon changed it when he was speaking. One day you speak about promoting jobs but just to show you how inconsistent you people are, the next day which was yesterday, you gave us strong criticism because we are trying to produce jobs.

MR. MESSER: — No jobs there!

MR. LAROCHELLE: — No jobs, now come on, the Member from Kelsey knows better than that! Maybe there are not 4,000 jobs, maybe there are not 2,000 jobs, but there are jobs there. This is what we are trying to do. The Member from Moose Jaw South (Mr. Davies) knows this. You are talking to us every day about creating jobs. This is what a government should be doing, creating jobs. I agree with you on that, but why did you stand in this House last night and vote against a project that will probably create thousands of jobs.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. LAROCHELLE: — That's to show how inconsistent you people are. You never follow a straight line.

AN HON. MEMBER: — Why . . .

MR. LAROCHELLE: — It's your idea . . .

MR. F. MEAKES (Touchwood): — Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. I hate to interrupt my hon. friend, especially when he is making his first speech. I don't see why he didn't rise yesterday to speak on that Bill, and he is out of order. I am sure, Mr. Speaker, you will rule that.

HON. D. V. HEALD (Attorney General): — On the point of order, I have to agree with the Member for Touchwood, but I think in the interests of consistency that we shall from now on ask that all Members stay on the subject. The Member for Mayfair was out of order about half the time.

MR. BROCKELBANK: — Could I speak on the point

of order? I related my remarks directly to the fact that the Members are representative in this House and their responsiveness was challenged by this Bill. I related it directly to the comment of the Resolution.

MR. SPEAKER: — Well, I think that everybody should stick to the rules.

MR. LAROCHELLE: — I am sorry if I varied a little bit and went away from the subject, but this is the subject that the Member from Mayfair spoke on. During his speech he spoke about this thing, this is why I am bringing it in, and why shouldn't I answer him. Same debate, same way, no difference.

I can't see any reason why you people are so disturbed about this redistribution. You did it when you were in power.

AN HON. MEMBER: — We never did it.

MR. LAROCHELLE: — Come on! We do it when we are in power. Why is it so bad that when the CCF are in power you can do it, oh, this is all very fine. But when the Liberals are in power, it is dirty pool.

MR. WEATHERALD: — You should have given that speech you gave to your father 10 years ago, John.

MR. BROCKELBANK: — What about Albert Park?

MR. LAROCHELLE: — Oh yes. I shouldn't do that. It is too bad that you didn't read some of his speeches. Oh no, you never want to bring back 20 years ago, you were in short pants at that time. We remember, and I've got a good memory. I don't intend to forget about it either.

Mr. Speaker, I am not too well prepared, I'll have more to say on this Resolution and I beg leave to adjourn debate.

Debate adjourned.

ADJOURNED DEBATES

RESOLUTIONS

RESOLUTION NO. 5 - PRAIRIE GRAINS CASH RECEIPTS STABILIZATION PROGRAM.

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion by Mr. J. Messer (Kelsey):

That this Assembly is of the opinion that the proposed

March 26, 1971

Prairie Grains Cash Receipts Stabilization Program does not provide Saskatchewan farmers with a minimum acceptable net income that would have continuing relation to cost of production;

And that this Assembly favors a program, based on a minimum guarantee of net income, that is flexible enough to provide for sound land practices and that gives incentives to the Federal Government to reduce costs of farm inputs for Western grain producers.

MR. G. G. LEITH (Elrose): — Mr. Deputy Speaker, I have some remarks that I wish to address to the House. I am quite well prepared, except for one thing, that I am not able to say them very well. I beg leave to adjourn the debate.

MR. F. A. DEWHURST (Wadena): — Mr. Deputy speaker, I think the House Leaders should attend to these matters. The Member whose name it stood under asked to stand it. If a Member gets up and adjourns the debate, I don't see where this is playing ball with us at all.

MR. HEALD: — Mr. Deputy Speaker, I deliberately waited before I stood, and as I understand the rules, if anybody wants to get up to speak, they are quite at liberty to do so. I didn't jump up and stand.

MR. DEWHURST: — I am not objecting, Mr. Deputy Speaker, to the motion stood by the Attorney General but on Motion No. 5, the Member for Cut Knife (Mr. Kwasnica) asked leave to stand it. I realize that the House can make it proceed, but then the Member for Elrose just gets up and asks leave to adjourn it, when he had asked leave to have it stand.

MR. HEALD: — I didn't hear him, I didn't . . .

MR. DEWHURST: — He did, he rose in his seat and asked it to stand.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: — Order. I heard the Member for Cut Knife ask to have it stand, but it is my understanding of the rules of the House that if a Member asks to have a debate stand, and another Member wishes to speak that he has the right to speak.

MR. DEWHURST: — Mr. Deputy Speaker, he has the right to speak, but he didn't speak, he just asked leave to adjourn the debate.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: — I certainly think that he didn't speak at any length,

but there were words that came out of his mouth.

MR. G. T. SNYDER (Moose Jaw North): — On the point of order, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I think you will have to agree that there has been some element of co-operation between Members on that side of the House and this side of the House with reference to speaking arrangements. I think that some evidence of good faith has to be recognized from time to time. It was our understanding that Mr. Leith was going to speak, and under those circumstances we were prepared to allow the matter to come before this House. I think under the circumstances, the Member is attempting to do nothing more than to have the resolutions in this House stand in the name of Government Members, in order that we must proceed with Government business. This happens to be Private Members' day, Mr. Deputy Speaker, and our position is that we should like to co-operate in expediting the work of this House. However, it is evident that the Government is attempting to do nothing more than to hold the resolutions on Private Members' day in their name in order that they may proceed on Private Members' day to Government business. This is just extending the authority of the Government a little too far. Government Members opposite should recognize that we have a few privileges and a few rights and I hope it will be remembered. If the Member for Elrose had wished to speak on the debate we were quite prepared to let him speak. Apparently he wants to do nothing more than to stand this Resolution in the name of a Government Member.

MR. HEALD: — Mr. Deputy Speaker, on the point of order, dealing with the matter of the last motion. In so far as the Member for Elrose is concerned, he is prepared to speak, but he has one difficulty, he hasn't got any voice today. I think you heard him say what he said, that's the reason why he is adjourning it.

On the point of order so far as the other motions are concerned, I stood two or three of those motions, but I think Hon. Members will agree that I waited and if any Member opposite had got up and started to speak, well then the debate is away. That is the way it should be. There is no attempt on the part of the Government to grab the motions, but the particular situation here with respect to Item No. 4, Mr. Deputy Speaker, is that the Member for Elrose can't speak today, he is prepared, but he has lost his voice.

MR. DEWHURST: — The point of order I made, Mr. Deputy Speaker, was not that the Attorney General had asked the others to stand, we don't object. The point I rose on was that the Member for Cut Knife has asked to have his motion stand. The House has not rejected his motion, it wasn't put, but the Member for Elrose rose and asked to adjourn it. The Member for Cut Knife asked to stand it, it wasn't refused by the House, but the other Member just rose.

March 26, 1971

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: — I think that in order to clarify this matter, that it is the ruling of the Chair that the Member spoke, he asked leave to adjourn the debate, and unless there is a vote called, the debate is adjourned. I think that it would be well at this time to point out to both the Government and the Opposition, and I think that they should understand this quite clearly, I don't know whether the Government is trying to get motions in their name and that is the Government's business, not the Chair's business. It is not the responsibility of this Chair to recognize agreements made through what are called the usual channels. And it is not up to the Chair to see that those agreements, if such, are carried out. I think that Mr. Speaker would back that ruling.

Debate adjourned on the motion of G. G. Leith (Elrose).

RESOLUTION NO. 9 - ABOLISHMENT OF DETERRENT FEES

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Mr. W. E. Smishek (Regina North East):

That this Assembly calls upon the Government to immediately abolish hospital and medical care deterrent fees, because deterrent fees place an unfair burden on many citizens requiring health care, especially those least able to pay.

MR. G. T. SNYDER (Moose Jaw North): — Mr. Speaker, this Resolution calls upon the Government to immediately abolish hospital and medical care deterrent fees because deterrent fees place an unfair burden on many citizens requiring health care, especially those least able to pay.

Mr. Speaker, I think that you will agree with me that volumes have been written and spoken on the matter of deterrent charges since this Government imposed these charges on the users of hospital and medical services about three years ago. The argument against the application of this tax was valid then, the arguments are equally valid today. When this Liberal Government introduced utilization fees or deterrent charges, if you wish, it will be recalled that there was a public outcry in opposition to this tax on the sick. The opposition to these unfair and inhuman charges is just as real and as equally widespread as was the case three years ago.

Saskatchewan people are not convinced, of the arguments presented by the Minister of Health (Mr. Grant) that people somehow feel better if they contribute financially to their own recovery.

An editorial in the Moose Jaw Times Herald several months ago reminded the Government that this is still very much a live issue. The editorial warned that the Government should not delude itself into believing that because of a diminishing amount

of public opposition, that this represented an acceptance of the principle that the sick should be taxed. The editorial says that it is something like father being in jail. The family ceases to mention the matter but it doesn't necessarily mean that they have grown to like the idea.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SNYDER: — There are a large number of Saskatchewan people, Mr. Speaker, who have been placed in a position of financial embarrassment because of the obligation to find \$2.50 for each day spent in hospital. To many of Saskatchewan pensioners, Mr. Speaker, and to large low-income families, these deterrent charges have been an abomination and a disgrace in this country in 1971, at a time in our history when we boast of the fact that we enjoy the second highest standard of living in the whole of the world.

I have intimate knowledge, Mr. Speaker, of a large family in my own constituency, who had four children hospitalized with infectious hepatitis for an extended period of time during 1969. The same family suffered a similar experience during 1970 with the same number of children being hospitalized for several weeks during that 12 months. This family has honored their obligation, Mr. Speaker. They have paid their deterrent charges, but they have been obliged to borrow money for that purpose. If they are fortunate, Mr. Speaker, they will retire that debt during 1971, providing they encounter no more medical misfortunes.

This family, through no fault of their own, have had a burden placed upon them that will take another seven or eight months to liquidate. The net family income for this particular family of seven, is less than \$400 per month. This kind of misfortune which they have suffered has placed an economic strain upon this family.

I suspect, Mr. Speaker, that there is no one sitting in this Legislature, in this Chamber, who would suffer to any great extent as a result of a fairly prolonged stay in hospital. However, I hope that our own security doesn't blind us to the problems of others who are in somewhat less fortunate circumstances.

On another occasion, Mr. Speaker, I drew to the attention of the House, the problem of a senior citizen whom I visited in Moose Jaw on occasions. I think the story bears repeating to this Assembly again.

This old gentleman is in his mid-70s. He has had a severe stroke which has left him paralyzed on one side. He is obliged, on his doctor's orders, to visit a psychotherapist five times a week at \$1.50 per visit, \$7.50 per week, \$30 per month. He pays this out of his Old Age Pension cheque, which is his only source of income. He refused, after me advising him to apply

March 26, 1971

to accept any supplementary assistance, and his words in this connection, were firm and they were proud. He said that he was on relief in 1936 and 1937 and he would never be beholden to anyone again. He did, however, ask me to draw to the Government's attention misleading advertising which appears in Saskatchewan newspapers on a regular basis.

This particular piece of literature, Mr. Speaker, is one which was clipped from a daily newspaper and which says:

In 1970 the cost of family health protection in Saskatchewan was \$72. In 1971 the cost of family health protection in Saskatchewan will still be \$72.

The Department of Public Health, the Government of Saskatchewan, has again held the line on health care premiums for residents of Saskatchewan. For the fifth year in a row premiums for families will still be \$72, while premiums for single persons remain at \$36.

I think it was interesting, Mr. Speaker, to see the answer which was provided by the Government with respect to this advertising that appeared in a number of Saskatchewan daily newspapers. In answer to a question asked by one of the Members on this side of the House, Return No. 119, indicated that there had been 29 insertions of this particular advertisement or an advertisement similar to it, at a total cost, Mr. Speaker, of some \$4,099.80.

Just let me suggest to you today, without belaboring the matter, that this represents an extravagant use of public funds on questionable material, material of very doubtful value. I suggest that this is a piece of information which ranges very close to dishonest advertising.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SNYDER: — This Government's expensive advertising campaign has failed to impress this old gentleman whom I mentioned a moment ago, in the same way as it has failed to impress many Saskatchewan families who, in the words of the Minister of Health, have contributed to their own recovery. They know, Mr. Speaker, as do many other Saskatchewan people, that they are paying more for services under this Government than at any time in the past.

Certainly, Mr. Speaker, there can be no logical excuse for applying deterrent charges on psychotherapy treatments. Like hospital services they are authorized by a medical doctor and it is that same person who determines when such services will be withdrawn. The Minister knows that there is a minimum of opportunity for patients to over-utilize this service and representations have been made by Home Care and other organized groups who see a very definite hardship and a danger in imposing these charges on this unfortunate category of patients. Those

pleas have been ignored by this Government and the needs of Saskatchewan people have been ignored equally.

I would think it unlikely, Mr. Speaker, that the Minister of Health (Mr. Grant), and I am sorry he is not in his seat, or any of his associates will venture to provide any assurance that deterrent charges have reduced hospital admissions or influenced the length of stay of patients in hospital. There simply appears to be no evidence to indicate that deterrent charges have done anything except to extract payment from the patient as a penalty for becoming sick and being admitted to the hospital by his doctor. This simply represents the Liberal method of providing funds for operating the Saskatchewan Hospital Services Plan. And a dreadful and inefficient way of tax collection, it is, Mr. Speaker.

By the very nature of this tax on the sick, we sacrifice \$92,000 a month according to the Government's own figures some months ago, in tax-sharing revenue from Ottawa, because the Federal Government, as Members will acknowledge, does not share the \$2.50 a day levy that the Thatcher Government has placed on a hospital patient in our province.

While it may not be possible, Mr. Speaker, to determine what effect deterrent charges have had on the utilization of hospital beds, I believe there seems to be little doubt of the effectiveness of deterrent charges in persuading people to refrain from visiting their doctor. The general practitioner who cares for the medical needs of my family, has told me that many of his elderly patients refrain from making those return visits to his office as he directs. Elderly patients, with chronic complaints, he says, neglect their health in this way and the only conclusion that can be drawn from this fact, is that many of these people are hard-pressed financially and economize to the possible detriment of their own physical well being.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SNYDER: — I know for a fact that in a number of cases my own doctor refrains from collecting these fees and he bears the financial loss himself. It is unfortunate that some of that milk of human kindness is not to be found among Members who sit opposite in this House. It is unfortunate also, Mr. Speaker, that my doctor and I imagine a number of other doctors, find it necessary to apply their own means test and apply it in case of severe need.

I don't believe that it should go unnoticed, Mr. Speaker, that here again in the application of deterrent charges for doctor services, this Government sacrifices another \$46,000 a month in the cost-sharing from the Federal Government. Here again the Federal Government does not share in that portion of the fee charged directly to the patient. In total, Mr. Speaker, this represents \$138,000 each month that this Government

March 26, 1971

sacrifices in tax sharing from Ottawa because of their dogmatic and inhuman approach to this matter of meeting health care costs. It seems incredible to me that this Government in attempting to meet and control the cost of health care, should ignore some very evident facts. It is widely recognized that early diagnosis and treatment is an important factor in caring for the sick and preventing chronic illness which requires long and costly hospital care.

Across the entire world there is evidence to indicate that more emphasis must be placed on preventive medicine. To deter or to discourage people from seeing their doctor is tantamount to encouraging the more extensive use of more expensive hospital services.

I believe, Mr. Speaker, that this point is demonstrated quite clearly in the Government's annual report of the Department of Health for the year 1969-70. On page 48, under the heading "Northern Health District Outpost Hospitals" the Government's own annual report says and I quote:

As physicians visits to this area increase, the expected decrease is occurring in hospital services provided. The total number of hospital days decreased from 559 to 356, and office visits declined from 12,493 to 11,665.

Now certainly, Mr. Speaker, there seems to be one explanation and one explanation only for this chain of events. It would, I believe, point out that early and regular diagnostic treatment and physician services being readily available has resulted in the reduction of hospital admissions at these points. If this is so, then it seems clear that deterrent charges on doctor service is a cruel and costly error of this Government.

I think perhaps in total, reviewing the whole picture, Mr. Speaker, the most objectionable feature of all relates to the application of deterrent charges on cancer patients. In recent years I have been in close contact with a number of terminal cancer patients who during the last 12 months of their lives were discharged and readmitted to hospital as many as eight times during a 12-month period. Each readmittance represents a new in-patient record begun at the hospital and a new start on the \$2.50 a day schedule for the first 30 days. It would be difficult, I believe, to argue with very much conviction, that the terminal cancer patient is somehow better off, or somehow feels better because he has contributed financially to his own recovery by paying these deterrent charges which have been foisted upon cancer patients by a Liberal Government opposite.

It is a bleak commentary on this Government's order of priorities and to the Minister's dedication and to the Canadian Cancer Society - a very worthy organization - in which he claims to hold membership.

We, in the New Democratic Party and the CCF before us, have had as our objective to make available to all of our people the widest possible range of health services.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SNYDER: — It has been our goal, Mr. Speaker, to distribute the costs of these services in a way that would not create a burden on our citizens and particularly not create a burden on the aged and the economically disadvantaged.

This Government opposite chooses to travel in the opposite direction. The net result of seven years of Liberal rule has been the imposition of an increasing amount of health care costs on those who are sick. Liberals have rejected the principle that the cost of these services should be determined by the ability to each Saskatchewan citizen to contribute to the tax base of the province.

Saskatchewan citizens have long been in the vanguard of the battle to provide the best possible health services for Saskatchewan people. It has been a proud record, which this Government opposite by its very existence places in jeopardy. Our people know that there is an opportunity approaching for them to vote for the removal of deterrent charges. It is plain that this Government is insensitive to the basic social needs of our population generally, but more especially it has exhibited a cruel and careless attitude towards those who built this country and who are now living out their declining years in our province. A government, I suggest in closing, which cannot afford to care for the aged and infirm in the most excellent manner possible, is a sick government which has no right to govern. By this standard, Mr. Speaker, this Government has failed miserably and by accepting this Resolution and acting upon its recommendations, the Government may then give a belated indication of some sensitivity and concern for these people whom I have just mentioned.

Failing that, Mr. Speaker, Saskatchewan's people will be the final judge at an appropriate moment which I understand is not in the too distant future.

I shall be pleased to support the Resolution, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. B. D. GALLAGHER (Yorkton): — Mr. Speaker, may I first say that I am going to oppose this Resolution. I do so for many good reasons. I want, first of all, to comment on some of the remarks made by the Member for Regina North East (Mr. Smishek) the other day and the Member for Moose Jaw North (Mr. Snyder) today.

I recall the Member for Regina North East saying that the people who are hurt the most by utilization fees, or deterrent

March 26, 1971

fees as he called them are the low income groups. The Member for Moose Jaw North said this afternoon that they are the people who are economically disadvantaged. Mr. Speaker, if there is one Member of this House who represents a large group of people, probably one of the largest percentage of his constituents, who are having their utilization fees underwritten by the Government of Saskatchewan, it is the Member for Regina North East (Mr. Smishek). Surely, Mr. Speaker, he knows better than to peddle this line of garbage that he has been peddling for the last ten years. He knows, as well as every Member of this House knows, that utilization fees are paid by those people who can pay for them. I think, Mr. Speaker, that he represents a larger percentage of people living on welfare cheques in this city than any other Member. He knows, as well as all other Members know, that those people do not have to pay utilization fees. He said, Mr. Speaker, the other afternoon that his Government in 1963 reduced the head tax for hospitalization and medical care. Quite true. We know what his Government did from 1947 up until 1964 as far as the personal premiums were concerned for hospitalization and medical care. Then he mentioned the fact that as soon as we became the Government we increased the medical care premium to \$72. Mr. Speaker, that is exactly what it was in 1963, a year before his Government was defeated. He knows, Mr. Speaker, as well as all of us know that in 1963-64, the last year that they were the Government of this province that the \$72 represented about 27 per cent of the total cost of hospitalization and medical care in Saskatchewan. This year, that same figure of \$72 represents about 16 per cent of the total cost of hospitalization and medical care in Saskatchewan. Why didn't he tell this House and why didn't he tell the people of Saskatchewan the whole story.

The Member for Moose Jaw North (Mr. Snyder) this afternoon suggested that some friend of his had to pay \$7.50 per week - he was a 70-year-old man - and he left the impression with this House and with anybody who would listen to him that you would multiply 52 by \$7.50 so this man would pay actually \$390 per year. Now, Mr. Speaker, he knows different than this. He knows that there is a maximum of \$180. And if this man is living on nothing but his Old Age Pension, the Member for Moose Jaw North also knows that the Department of Welfare picks up that \$2.50 or the \$1.50 for a doctor's call. What is he trying to tell this House, Mr. Speaker? You know, Mr. Speaker, the Member for Regina North East (Mr. Smishek) and most Members in the Opposition, it wouldn't matter whether it was the pulp mill issue or a mine at Wollaston Lake or whether it was medical care or no matter what it was they would oppose it for one reason. They would do so thinking that they might be able to make votes. On the pulp mill issue they talk about pollution. When there is an industry coming into this province they talk about us giving everything to the Americans. When we are talking about utilization fees, they are opposed to it because they think they might make a vote.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. GALLAGHER: — Mr. Speaker, these people would suggest that Liberals and all the Members on this side of the House are heartless people, they are people without conscience, they are people who don't care for the people who elected them to office. I'm going to tell you, Mr. Speaker, that they have peddled this line until the majority of people in Saskatchewan don't believe them any longer. And do you know, Mr. Speaker, that the one place where the Liberal Party has failed in Regina is the fact that they haven't gone into the Regina North East seat and enlightened the minds of the people who elected Walter Smishek. I'm going to tell you, Mr. Speaker, that this type of a man is dangerous in this Government. This type of a man is poisoning the minds of the innocent. I hate to see, Mr. Speaker, the galleries full of young people, who are subjected to the type of poison that we listened to from him the other day. He knows better than this, Mr. Speaker. I should like to refresh his memory.

Back about 1961, before he was a Member of this House, we debated a Bill to set up the Medical Care Insurance Act. At that time, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to quote from his former leader, now the National Leader of the New Democratic Party, speaking on the matter of utilization fees. And of course at that time, Mr. Douglas didn't call it deterrent fees, they were utilization fees. I want to quote, Mr. Speaker, from that day in the House in 1961. Here is what Mr. Douglas said and I quote:

The matter of utilization fees is still under consideration. The Government would prefer to have the advice of the Medical Care Insurance Commission when the latter is appointed before making any final decision. In the event that utilization fees are charged then the cost will be \$1,800,000 less than the \$21.5 million estimated by the Advisory Planning Commission on Medical Care. I want to say again that the Government is not seeking to shelve its responsibility with reference to utilization fees. I think those who are going to administer the plan ought to have an opportunity to give us their opinion.

That, Mr. Speaker, is what their former leader, the former Premier of Saskatchewan, Tommy Douglas, said during the debate on the Bill in 1961. I continue to quote:

The first is, does a charge of \$1 for an office call or \$2 for a house call or \$3 for a night call actually act as a deterrent at all? Does it reduce abuse?

Now, Mr. Speaker, the former Premier of Saskatchewan left this province to get to Ottawa to lead the New Democratic Party. I think there were suspicions in the mind of the former Premier and the now National New Democratic Party Leader that if the plan was to be made workable and if costs were to be kept anywhere in line, if the plan was to remain solvent, that we had to think about utilization fees. I remember at that time,

March 26, 1971

Mr. Speaker, saying in this House, that I was in favor of a utilization fee for a medical care and hospital plan because we know and all Members of this House know that hospitalization and medical care costs - the costs of these two plans have risen at a tremendous rate in the last 10 or 15 years. The more involvement that Government has in plans like this the costlier they become.

Mr. Speaker, when you look at what's happened in the rest of the world, in the countries that pioneered hospitalization and medical care, those countries have a utilization fee. I want to quote, Mr. Speaker, for a minute from an article that appeared in a medical journal in 1962, the Canadian Medical Journal, an article that was supplied by a good friend of mine, Dr. C. J. Houston. Most of the Members on the other side of the House will recall that even they had the greatest respect for Dr. C. J. Houston. He was one of the Members who was on the Thompson Planning Commission for medical care. Dr. Houston had just spent a month - or more than a month I believe - over in Norway. Norway was one of the first countries in the world that instituted a medical care and hospital plan. Dr. Houston's visit over there brought him in contact with the key people in the plan, the key medical men in Norway. After he came back, Mr. Speaker, he had a few things to say. I want to quote from the medical journal of 1962 in which he supplied this article. I quote:

What is suitable in one country is not necessarily desirable in another. One must acknowledge that Norway's method of accomplishing a particular objective may be the way of meeting the needs of the country and yet may not be suitable in many other countries. In some instances the Norwegian methods work only because of the higher level of native intelligence and co-operation. This might be impossible to obtain in Canada. If some of my comments seem critical of Norway's health care plan, I trust the reader will understand that such criticism is offered only on the basis of its suitability to the Canadian scene. However, I do feel that the experience of other countries can teach us a good deal. For this reason I consider that it is worthwhile to give some personal conclusions about the lessons that we in Canada can learn from Norway. We can learn that first, flexibility is necessary in order to make a health care plan serve both urban and scattered rural populations. Secondly, genuine local controls, interest and participation have great value. They are vital in keeping costs at a reasonable level; in emphasizing special local needs and maintaining the public's concern and interest in preserving the democratic approach and in avoiding the potential of abuses and evils of centralized state control. Third, methods based on local control are workable. Fourth, a fee for service method of payment for physician services is acceptable to the people served by such a plan. Fifth, partial payment by the patient for the services he gets.

Administrators, doctors and professors all volunteered that this feature of participation by the patient is essential. Surprisingly, patients agreed and used the same arguments when questioned on this point. The emphasis of this feature as essential by the countries who have experience with it, should do much to relieve the doubts of Canadians who are unfamiliar with the ideas.

Mr. Speaker, that is what they have done in Norway since 1936, one of the first medical care and hospitalization plans in the world.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. GALLAGHER: — Yes, Mr. Speaker, if you listen to the Member for Regina North East (Mr. Smishek) and swallow all the poison that poured forth from his mouth, you would think we were a heartless group of people over here.

What about his friends over in Manitoba? They made an election promise before the Weir Government was defeated two years ago that they were going to reduce the costs of medical care and hospitalization in Manitoba. So they had to meet this election promise and they reduced the medical care and hospitalization premium over in our neighboring Socialist province to the east. They reduced it to the point where it is still 40 per cent higher than in Saskatchewan. And in reducing it, Mr. Speaker, in order to keep their plan solvent, they had to increase the corporation tax and the income tax and the liquor tax, and I don't know how many other taxes. You know, Mr. Speaker, we have the cheapest operating plan of any medical care and hospitalization plan in this country. I think that the Members on the other side of the House are presenting a Resolution like this for one reason and one reason only, they think that some of the people who are uninformed, like many of the people I'm sure who live in Regina North East and Moose Jaw South, might buy this load of propaganda and they may get some more votes at the polls. I'm going to tell you, Mr. Speaker, whether we should lose votes on this issue or not, I would oppose eliminating utilization fees. I believe that they are a necessity to keep these plans working.

Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to adjourn the debate.

Debate adjourned.

ADJOURNED DEBATES

SECOND READINGS

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion by the Hon. A. R. Guy (Minister of Municipal Affairs) that Bill No. 47 - An Act to amend The Urban Municipality Act, 1970 be now read a second time.

MR. H. H. P. BAKER (Regina South East): — Mr. Speaker, I believe I outlined some of the points that I was interested in in Bill 47 the other day. It involved the date of the election and I can only say I hope that the Minister will give consideration to promote municipal democracy in our municipalities when it comes to an election and get the voters out. I am hoping that he would give consideration to changing the date. I haven't anything further to add at this time and I shall go along with the Bill until we get into Committee where we can discuss it item by item.

MR. E. WHELAN (Regina North West): — Mr. Deputy Speaker, this Bill has in its contents a principle that I seriously question. It is one that I think all Members of the House should view with alarm and this is in Section 5, the Section where (b) part provides that the Minister may appoint people to fill vacancies where the number of members of a council is reduced by death, resignation, invalidation of election or otherwise. Mr. Deputy Speaker, I think this is a very bad principle. I believe that a senior government becomes quite involved in a local civic administration. At one time this type of legislation was on our books but I think all Members of the House will recall at that particular stage, civic elections were held once every year, now a civic election is held every three years. This means that a person so appointed could hold office for three years and over a period of three years there could be quite a number of people so appointed. In my estimation the principle we should maintain is that the council themselves as a group should appoint a replacement or there should be a by-election as the Bill suggests. Any other approach is, in my estimation, moving into a jurisdiction, a lesser jurisdiction by the senior government and it is a procedure that we should view with alarm. It seems evident to all of us that - and I'm sure every Member of the House once they begin to realize this and think about it will agree - there could be as many as three or four councillors appointed by the Minister over a period of three years. I don't think this is what we want. I realize that there is a choice given but I'm not suggesting or not casting any reflections on the councillor, or in this particular instance on the Minister. I think the principle itself is bad regardless of what Government introduced it, that the Minister could appoint people as this Section sets out - in Section 5. And because of this, I'm going to vote against the Bill 47. I'm opposed to the principle that is contained in this particular aspect of the Bill. I certainly hope that when we get it in Committee that the Minister will withdraw the (b) part of it.

MR. W. E. SMISHEK (Regina North East): — Mr. Deputy Speaker, I want to rise also to express my objection to Section 5 and ask the Minister how come this kind of a provision is being included. I have not heard urban municipalities advocating this kind of a change. In my communication with some of the people who are associated with city councils, they tell me that they have never made representation to the Government to include this kind of a provision. Surely

if we have faith in our democratic process then the senior government should not have a right to be appointing city council members. I think this is an extremely dangerous provision, Mr. Deputy Speaker. We certainly wouldn't welcome the idea if a vacancy occurred in the Provincial Legislature that Ottawa, the Federal Government, would give itself the authority to appoint a Member of this Legislature. I should hope that when the Minister closes debate he would give us an explanation why this amendment is being introduced. I understand that at one time, it may still be the case, in rural municipalities that that kind of a provision did exist but I see no justification for this in the case of urban municipalities. There might be some reason for it in rural municipalities, but I just don't see any reason at all in the case of towns and cities, and particularly when last year we extended the period of office from two to three years. It's possible that several vacancies could occur and then what we should have is an appointed council, a council appointed by a senior government. I'm not saying that this will be practised but certainly the authority is there and I don't think there needs to be that authority and I should hope that the Minister withdraws that Section from the Bill.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I also wish to commend the Minister for bringing one other provision and that is in respect of Section 186 where he is raising the level of fines that could be imposed where shops are violating the local bylaws. I think this is a good provision. Perhaps the minimum fines may be too low, however, it does provide for up to a \$2,000 fine where a shopkeeper violates the local bylaws in respect of closing stores and shops. So I do commend the Minister in this regard. We've had a number of infractions of local bylaws over the years and let's hope that by increasing the penalty that the merchants will see to it that they do obey the local bylaws.

Mr. Speaker, because of Section 5 and its dangerous provision I find it necessary to oppose the Bill.

MR. W. J. BEREZOWSKY (Prince Albert-East Cumberland): — Mr. Speaker, I too want to express my unhappiness about this Section. I recognize, of course, that the municipalities whether they be city or rural, are the creations of the province and of course the province has the right to bring in any legislation which they think may fit these circumstances. In this particular case I think there is an interference with responsible government which we believe in, in this Legislature as has been pointed out by my colleague, and we also like to have this kind of system in our cities and our municipalities. Now, there could be a situation where it may not be convenient for say a month or two without representation. Maybe there should be somebody sitting on council whom you could have appointed. But even in such a case I think it might be better to leave it to the people who live in the cities and urban communities to decide for themselves whom they want on council rather than a Minister doing so.

I recall in the past that about the only time a Minister used his prerogative was when official trustees were appointed in case there was something wrong in the administration of a municipality. However, to have this kind of legislation in what we call a free democratic government or representative government, I think is wrong and unless the Minister can satisfy us with some good explanation, I have to vote against this Bill because of this particular Section.

MR. BAKER: — Mr. Speaker, if I may on a point of order, this is why I said that in Committee some sections could be questions, and if there would be House amendments they could be moved then. This is the only reason why I went along with it to go into Committee, perhaps the Minister would explain it further. We know that this Section is a problem, and I thought that in Committee we should resolve it.

MR. GUY: — Mr. Speaker, in regard to Section 5, I can advise that the idea of bringing in this amendment was not the Government's particularly. We had a request and we had a situation brought to mind. It in no way is the intention of the Government to interfere with local government, responsible government, or whatever you call it. But we had a situation that fortunately did not develop this fall but could have developed and this is what brought about the consideration of this particular Section.

As you know, in the city of Regina the validity of the municipal election this fall was questioned, or was going to be questioned in the courts, and if for some reason or other the courts had upheld that the election was invalid, there would have been no council. There would be no council to call an election. There would be no council to administer any emergency or day to day problems and we felt that this was a situation that could not be allowed to exist, that someone would have to appoint a council for the period of time that it would be necessary to call another municipal election. This is what created a situation where we considered this type of legislation. It had nothing to do with one vacancy on a council or two vacancies or three. They would be filled normally through a by-election, but if in a case where the whole council was no longer in office as a result of what I mentioned, or the courts found that an election was invalid, someone then must have the power to appoint a council for a period of time so that they can get the election machinery set up for a by-election.

I hope that perhaps when my officials are here they might be able to shed a little more light on it and it could go to Committee and we can discuss it further at that time.

MR. SMISHEK: — Mr. Deputy Speaker, before the Minister takes his seat, I wonder whether he might answer a question. He has given us an explanation but this is not how the Section really reads.

Perhaps he might bring in a more appropriate amendment to cover this particular situation.

MR. GUY: — Well, we'd be pleased to look at the wording of it in Committee. It was my understanding that this was the only way that we could proceed to take into account the situation that I mentioned that possibly could have occurred. Now if there is better wording to cover that same situation, we'd be pleased to look at it, but this is the sole intent of it - to take care of a situation such as I mentioned.

Motion agreed to and Bill read a second time.

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate by the Hon. Mr. Guy that Bill No. 41 - An Act to amend The Summer Resort Village of Carlyle Lake Resort Act be now read a second time.

MR. H. H. P. BAKER (Regina South East): — I did some investigating with regard to the Bill and the situation in the Carlyle area. The questions that I want to bring up can be done in Committee when we go through it clause by clause. I understood there were some complaints from some people who have cottages living in our city. Others owning cottages from other areas may want to know more about it. I'll leave this until we get into Committee where we can go into detail.

Motion agreed to and Bill read a second time.

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion by the Hon. D. V. Heald (Attorney General) that Bill No. 51 - An Act respecting Controverted Elections be now read a second time.

MR. R. ROMANOW (Saskatoon-Riversdale): — Mr. Deputy Speaker, I've had an opportunity to review the remarks of the Attorney General on the Bill on second reading. There are two or three sections that we think could be troublesome but in principle the Bill we shall support.

Motion agreed to and Bill read a second time.

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion by the Hon. A. R. Guy (Minister of Municipal Affairs) that Bill No. 50 - An Act to amend The Homeowner Grants Act, 1966 be now read a second time.

MR. R. ROMANOW (Saskatoon-Riversdale): — Mr. Deputy Speaker, Bill No. 50 is, of course, the amendment to The Homeowner Grants which will increase the payment of the Homeowner Grant now to a total sum of \$70. There is one

March 26, 1971

other small amendment to the Act which I think can be best discussed in Committee.

I want to tell Members of this House that we on this side of the House will be supporting this Bill in second reading.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. ROMANOW: — We support this Bill on the proposition, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that any money that comes out of the hands of the Liberal Government opposite and into the hands of our farmers and our laborers who are already hard-pressed, will be long over-due and very much welcomed.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. ROMANOW: — We support this Bill because we know that under the Liberal Government in Saskatchewan taxation at the present time has never been as high in the entire history of the Province of Saskatchewan, as it is today.

HON. W. R. THATCHER (Premier): — Roy, you've already made that same speech.

MR. ROMANOW: — And I say to the Premier, who wasn't here to listen to my speech in the Session before, that when we become the government we'll continue to give tax relief to the homeowners of this province but we are going to do it on the overall scheme of taxation within the province. We're going to give the people of this province support in easing their education tax load, in easing the tax burden on the property owners by a new and exciting program that we've announced in the new deal for people.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. ROMANOW: — But I can tell the Premier one thing that we will not be doing. We will not be giving assistance to homeowners in this grant in the way that the Liberals do it, with a fancy and expensive propaganda sheet that comes out with every cheque.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. ROMANOW: — A propaganda sheet that I can say, Mr. Deputy Speaker, and Members of the House, is almost totally untrue when it says that the grant is as a result of great industrial development in the Province of Saskatchewan. I say totally untrue because in the last two or three years under the management of the Premier and the Government opposite, this Province has stagnated industrially to the point where 21,000 people are walking around unemployed . . .

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. ROMANOW: — . . . to a point where 33,000 people have left the Province of Saskatchewan, to the point where all the young people of our province simply don't have an opportunity to get a decent job. That propaganda sheet that comes out with the Homeowner Grant is untrue. I know that the people of Saskatchewan when they receive the \$60 or \$70 after this Bill is passed must smile to themselves when they read the little message that accompanies it. Rather than thanking industrial development under the Liberal Party for the \$70, we can thank the Ottawa Liberals for \$70 million in equalization payments to allow this Government to balance the Budget and to make payments like that.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. ROMANOW: — We can also thank, Mr. Deputy Speaker, not the Liberal Government's policy with respect to industrial growth and development but the CCF Crown corporations which they raid in order to balance the Budget so that they can put out these little payments.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. ROMANOW: — We are going to give the homeowners grants, the relief to the taxpayers, when we become the government very, very shortly. We're going to do it, though, by giving it to them right at source without the propaganda piece. We don't believe that we have to politic with the people's own money in order to get votes.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MacDOUGALL: — 20 years to do it . . .

MR. ROMANOW: — And I can tell you, Member from Souris Estevan, that your blatant politicking this way isn't going to bail this Government out either.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. ROMANOW: — You're not going to be bailed out because all the people of Saskatchewan know what you've done with respect to taxation in our province.

MR. MacDOUGALL: — 20 years of it. For 20 years you politicked with the people's money.

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

March 26, 1971

soon as the Hon. Member from Souris Estevan finishes making his speech for the year in the Legislature, I'll proceed.

I'll proceed to tell the Hon. Member from Souris and the Member from Athabasca (Mr. Guy) just how much this \$70 is going to help the property owner in the province. Anybody who has been reading the papers knows that in Regina, it looks as if we're going to have a seven mill increase . . .

MR. MacDOUGALL: — You can blame Henry!

MR. ROMANOW: — In my own city of Saskatoon we're going to have an increase - if you can blame Mayor Buckwold for this one - an increase coming in next year of over four mills, coupled together with an education tax load that is yet to be put on top of this. Four mill increase in Saskatoon and a seven mill increase in the city of Regina and this is consistent with the Liberal Party's taxation load. Some of us in other debates, primarily in the Budget, were telling the Members of this House that the Budget, even with the Homeowners Grant, wouldn't help to keep down property taxes that, typically under Liberal Government rule, they would go up and up and up like it's been going up.

In 1964, \$112 was the per capita property taxation in the last year of the CCF. In the 1969 it was \$170 under the Liberal Party. In the four years of the CCF government ending in 1964, the average mill rate in Saskatchewan was 62, Mr. Deputy Speaker. Under a Liberal year, the average mill rate is 74 or higher, thanks to the highest taxation load that the Liberal Government opposite has placed on the people of Saskatchewan.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. ROMANOW: — They rob the people with higher taxation on the one hand and then give \$70 back to them on the other hand. Then they expect the Opposition to vote against any tax relief given to the hard-pressed farmers and the laborers. We're not going to do it. We'll support this Bill. We support any return that the Liberal Governments give in taxation to the people of Saskatchewan and I can tell you when I support the Bill and before I sit down, that when we become the Government we're going to give tax relief that will amount to much, much more than the \$70 of the Homeowner Grant . . .

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. ROMANOW: — . . . because we're going to embark upon a taxation education program with increased services, something the Liberal Government has failed, and failed miserably to do in the seven years of its Government.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. A. R. GUY (Minister of Municipal Affairs): — Mr. Speaker, we heard the same speech today that we heard from Members opposite when we first introduced it in 1966. They got up and they said they were going to vote for it, because as he said today, any money from a Liberal Government is good money. We know it is good money. We can tell you this, there is a lot more money coming from a Liberal Government than there ever was from the NDP. His last statement, made before he sat down, has to be the most ludicrous and ridiculous when he stood up and said, "If we become the Government - I'm glad he said 'if' - we are going to give much, much more." I'll tell you he can give much, much more and he would still be giving a heck of a lot less than we're giving. I want to ask some of my colleagues again, how much money did they give for police protection when they were the government? For 20 years they were the government and they never gave one nickel for police protection grants. How much money did they give for snow removal? Not a plugged nickel! How much did they give us for homeowner grants? Zip! Did they ever give an 18 per cent increase in school grants when they were the government? Never, never did they give that kind of an increase!

MR. ROMANOW: — Never . . .

MR. GUY: — Then the Deputy Leader of the Opposition has the nerve to stand here in this House and try and tell the voters of this province, "Please put us back because we're going to give more than when we were in before." I'll tell you, Mr. Deputy Speaker, the reason they are going to support the Bill. It is not because they like Homeowner Grants, it is just like pulp mills, they know that pulp mills and homeowner grants are two of the reasons that they will never be back on this side of the House. It is one of the things that digs them right from the inside because they know that the homeowner grant is the greatest program that this Government introduced because it is putting money right into the taxpayers' pockets. No middle-man, nobody else, it is money that the taxpayers are getting directly from a benevolent Liberal Government.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. GUY: — They say they are going to have a new and exciting program. Well we saw their program. They are going to have an exciting program of setting up 19 new agencies - that's part of the exciting program. They are going to nationalize the farms through a land bank, this is another exciting program. These are so new and so exciting they were introduced by Carl Marx in the early 1800s, that's how new your program is. It is a program that has been tried in every Socialist and Communist country in the world and they have even given your program up, because it will never work! Socialism will never work.

MR. ROMANOW: — Even in Nova Scotia!

March 26, 1971

MR. GUY: — It has been proven to be the biggest failure of any political philosophy since the beginning of time. Then you have the nerve to stand up in here and say we are going to have a new program. A new program!

I think also that the mayors of Regina and Saskatoon will be very happy to have the Deputy Leader of the Opposition announce the mill rates for their cities.

MR. ROMANOW: — No . . .

MR. GUY: — You did, you said, "I know that there is going to be a seven mill . . .

MR. ROMANOW: — Mr. Deputy Speaker, on a point of order, I did not say, "I know". Mr. Deputy Speaker, the Hon. Member is misquoting me. I said, the newspapers say there will be a four-mill increase . . .

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: — Order! That's not a point of order.

MR. GUY: — We'll get the transcript. You get the transcript and you will find that he announced definitely that there was going to be a seven mill increase in Regina.

MR. ROMANOW: — Mr. Speaker, on a point of order!

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: — Order, order!

MR. ROMANOW: — Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, I am saying to this House and I have always believed that in parliamentary practice and procedure that gentlemen took the words of gentlemen, that I did not say that. I am saying that to the House. I said that according to the newspaper reports there will be a four mill increase in Saskatoon, a seven mill increase in Regina, thanks to a Liberal Party. I repeat that again, thanks to them there is going to be a mill rate increase!

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: — It is not up to the Chair to say what a Member said, or what a Member didn't say. I think Hansard will settle that in due course.

MR. MacDONALD: — I heard it all!

MR. GUY: — That is exactly what the Hansard will do. I think it is terrible for a man who a few minutes ago was on his feet

saying, "You are interfering with local government." Now here he is standing up and announcing mill rates for the cities of Saskatoon and Regina. But I can tell you, that the increased grants for education this year will mean a decrease in mill rates for many of our municipalities.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. GUY: — Mr. Speaker, I won't take any more time, because I know that the Members opposite want to stand up and be counted as voting for this Bill. He said, that we are going to vote for it on the supposition that we are getting money from the Liberal Government. I just want to say in conclusion, they are voting for it for one reason only. They are afraid to vote against it. I move second reading of this Bill.

Motion agreed to and Bill read a second time.

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