

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN
March 14, 1972

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

WELCOME TO STUDENTS

Hon. J.E. Brockelbank (Saskatoon-Mayfair): — Mr. Speaker, I should like to introduce to you and through you to the Members of the Chamber a group of 37 students from St. Michaels School in Saskatoon-Mayfair constituency. I understand they are sitting in the west gallery. They are accompanied by two of their teachers, Mr. Mansfield and Mr. Boechler. I am sure that all Members of the Assembly will join with me and wish them an interesting day in the Legislative Chamber and safe journey back to Saskatoon-Mayfair.

Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. W.W. Robbins (Saskatoon Nutana Centre): — Mr. Speaker, I should like through you to introduce a group of 37 Albert School students from Saskatoon in my constituency of Nutana Centre. They are accompanied by their Principal, Mr. Bartel, I am sure that all the Members of the Assembly wish for them an educational day in the Assembly. I am particularly pleased to introduce this group, Mr. Speaker, because it happens to be my home school and my three children went through that public school. I hope their day is interesting and I hope they are interested very much in the legislative proceedings and that it will be helpful in terms of Social Studies to them. I wish them a safe journey home.

Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. J. A. Pepper (Weyburn): — Mr. Speaker, I should like to introduce to you and through you to the Members of the Assembly another group of Grade Eight students from Weyburn Junior High School. I believe that there are some 80 in number and they are sitting in the east gallery. They are accompanied here this afternoon by their teachers, Jim Nedalcov and Mr. Bill Fletcher. Their bus drivers are Mr. Ernie Obst and Mr. Henry Bell. I am sure, Mr. Speaker, that I am speaking for all the Members when I express our words of welcome again to them and that it is our wish that this visit to the Legislature to another day of worthwhile education for these students and that it will give them a little insight into the working of the Provincial Legislature. I join with the rest of the Members in wishing them a safe journey home.

Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. J. C. Richards (Saskatoon University): — Mr. Speaker, there are a group of students here from College Park School accompanied by Mr. Cross and Mr. Right, their teachers. I hope when they reach my ancient age of 27 that there will be a more socialist society and barring that

March 14, 1972

there will at least be a Legislature in some form of parliamentary democracy. I see also that we have with us the former Hon. Member Mr. Leith whose interest in the Liberal Party is perhaps in some way correspondent to my own in the New Democratic Party and that his 171 and our Waffle can make their contribution to the improvement and the saving of parliamentary democracy.

Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

QUESTIONS

PRELIMINARY ESTIMATE OF GRANTS TO INDIVIDUAL SCHOOL BOARDS

Mr. J.C. McIsaac (Wilkie): — Before the Orders of the Day I should like to direct a question to the Minister of Education (Mr. MacMurchy). I wonder if the Minister could give us an indication when a preliminary estimate of grants to individual school boards will be made available to Members of the House?

Hon. G. MacMurchy (Minister of Education): — The work is taking place on the grants at the present time, Mr. Speaker. Indications I have is that the work will be completed by Friday when all of the information will be available to the Members and, of course, to boards.

ADJOURNED DEBATES

BUDGET DEBATE

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of the Hon. Mr. Blakeney (Provincial Treasurer) that this Assembly do now resolve itself into a Committee of Finance.

Mr. H.H.P. Baker (Regina Wascana): — Mr. Speaker, last night when I concluded my remarks I didn't congratulate the two Members who were elected in the by-election and wish them well in this House. I know their contribution will be worthwhile over the next four years. I also congratulated the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Steuart) on assuming the Leadership of the Party across the way. I notice in the galleries that we also have another leader in our midst, Mr. Nasserden, the Leader of the Conservative Party and I think we should recognize him this afternoon.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Baker: — Mr. Leith was recognized as the leader of, I think Mr. Richards said the Waffle of the Liberal Party. I wish him well in his endeavours. I don't think in 1975 there will be a party left at all anyway so I suggest he do some soul searching and come across here.

Our short session last summer produced some far-reaching legislation which fulfilled a sufficient number of our promises. And with funds provided in this Budget as I referred to last night, we abolished the cursed deterrent fees, we changed the legislation affecting and protecting our helpless mentally ill and their family estates. We established a proper minimum wage of \$1.70 as of January 1st and \$1.75 as of July 1st. A 40-hour week for the province went into effect. We repealed Bill 2

March 14, 1972

using collective bargaining as a free instrument to resolve our labour and wage difficulties. We instituted a new bursary program for several thousand students who made use of these for higher education. We removed the pupil-teacher ratio stigma. Oh, yes, we gave free Medicare and hospitalization cards to all those over the age of 65. A compassionate piece of legislation on recognizing our pioneers.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Baker: — In this we brought back the measures the CCF legislated from 1944 to 1964 with some extensions. Yes, we had a glorious 20-year record from 1944 to 1964. I love to remind our anti-democratic socialists across the way about these, many of which they deliberately tried to erode during these past seven years, particularly to ruin our Medicare and hospitalization plan through deterrent fees. They tried to ruin our Trade Union Act with Bill 2. They kept minimum wages down to very subsistence levels as compared to other jurisdiction.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I should like to turn to participation in the Budget Debate. First of all I want to say how proud I am to be able to represent some 10,000 voters or 15,000 citizens in Regina Wascana as well as a bird sanctuary representing some 700 geese.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Baker: — Yes, on June 23rd, Mr. Speaker, last, they got a pretty good gander.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Baker: — Regina Wascana was the gerrymandered seat of the century. The Thatcher Government sure tried to get rid of me but the good people of Regina Wascana stayed by me while great odds were against them.

The Wascana Centre Authority is in my constituency containing 2,000 acres of land and 300 acres of water, encompassing our parliamentary area, our Regina University, the Centre of the Arts and the Saskatchewan Base Hospital. Wascana Centre Authority is a unique complex, owned and operated by the Provincial Government, the city, and our Regina University. It is an area of numerous well-groomed parks and recreation grounds with many outdoor skating and barbecue facilities. It is here, first of all, for Saskatchewan people to enjoy and it is now considered a North American and part of a world-renowned tourist centre and attraction.

I express appreciation to the Premier (Mr. Blakeney) and the Minister of Natural Resources (Mr. Kramer) in providing \$100,000 to promote Boggy Creek in King's Park and as a start of the Regina Woods approved by us in Regina City Council in 1970.

Over the years our CCF and NDP Governments have laid the groundwork all over Saskatchewan for the development of many fine parks and recreation and resources sites for our people. Our CCF-NDP conservation programs in years gone by have been the

March 14, 1972

best in this country. Our natural wildlife multiplied so well that Saskatchewan has become a great hunters' and fisherman's paradise with modern resorts with swimming and camping sites. I suggest large areas of our northern part of Saskatchewan be set aside now as parkland to stop the erosion of this last sanctuary for wildlife, resort areas and also for our native people, the Indian and Métis.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Baker: — The Budget provides funds to help create employment and provides monies to promote industries and smaller businesses. It gives tax relief to homeowners, small businesses and farmer through a property tax reduction of some 13 mills to the Saskatchewan people. The money from these tax reductions will put an added \$23.4 million worth of purchasing power into the hands of our citizens which will certainly benefit all of our business communities. Over the past seven years in this Legislature I have prodded the Government to give unconditional or conditional grants to cities, towns, villages and rural municipalities in the amount of \$10 to \$12 per person. This \$23.4 million property improvement grant actually means \$24 per capita for every man, woman and child in Saskatchewan. We have completed the full part of our program as promised — to reduce the mill rate by 25 mills — our per capita grants to people in municipalities will be higher than any other province in this country. The full impact of this tax reduction will be felt over the next year or two. May I suggest also that over the next while we explore the possibility of exempting people over 65 on pension from paying education and school property taxes. Those who rent suites in apartments who really pay taxes indirectly will have to be considered in the future to share in this find new property improvement grant as well as apartment owners.

I said last evening it is most unfortunate that \$6.3 million has to be provided to cover debts incurred on the Athabasca Pulp Mill Project. The Provincial Treasurer should send the bill with a mortgage to the — lo and his colleagues for signing the document nine days before the election. They really had no right to sign a document of that magnitude while they were only acting as a care-taking government. This is your debt and that of your party. If you default by not admitting owing this debt then you will be forfeiting the remaining seats as I said in the year 1975.

In my remarks last year I said the two main issues confronting us were unemployment and problems of agriculture. They are both still with us. Today some 660,000 Canadians are unemployed; 7.6 per cent of our total work force. Job opportunities are diminishing in our professional and technical groups. In other words some 2 million Canadian workers were affected with a period of unemployment at one time or another during the year 1971. A heart-breaking revelation. Because of this large scale of unemployment at present, Canada is losing \$80 million work of production each week. What a waste of material and human resources.

Mr. Speaker, to create employment is to promote new and expanded industries. This in the main will stabilize provincial growth as a supplement to our primary industry, namely agriculture, which creates most of our real wealth. Good investment and risk capital must be encouraged to come here. I have

March 14, 1972

always said that we need private, public, co-operative and joint private and public investment to achieve our industrial and agricultural goals. Threats must be avoided against sound investors if we are to establish the proper climate for people to come here

Inflation with all its by-products created by the Federal Government was also one of the root causes for high unemployment. Imagine deliberately creating unemployment to stop inflation. We all know that the chief and main cause of unemployment was high interest rates. They are still high and this is still causing in the main increases in the cost of living. An increased money supply would also drive interest rates down. If economy would once more regain the confidence necessary to have it flourish. If permitted to fluctuate the way they are, investment will be slow and we are in for an over cautious economy standards of living with the continuance of rising costs, ultimately leading not only to recessions but a serious depression lurks in our midst.

Yes, agricultural problems are in the main still with us. While there have been marked improvements in livestock prices, the grain farmer and the security of the small farmer or the family farm is still in jeopardy. Poverty has become a way of life for many Saskatchewan farmers as well as urban dwellers. Quoting from Wylie Simmons on poverty in Canada he says:

35 to 50 per cent of all Saskatchewan farm families are listed as poor. This is caused by the fluctuation of yearly incomes. They are traditionally dependent on world wheat sales and a mishmash of Government programs. From 1931 to 1971 we have seen a mass exodus of family farmers and an exodus which shows no sign of slowing up or stopping.

I am pleased to see that our New Democratic Government is taking some immediate steps to stop this erosion by giving a measure of security in providing funds to set up the Land Bank Commission. Beside stabilization we have orderly marketing in our well-organized public enterprise of the Wheat Board. The Wheat Board has initiated excellent sales of farm wheat over the years. The sale of all grains should be placed in the hands of this Board for the salvation of the Western farmer.

New life must be injected into the transportation of grain as well as providing new and expanded terminals at seaports and inland. Much has been said about too few boxcars, impassable rail lines, no co-ordination in getting shipments of grain to our ports. I want to tell the House that I attribute the cause of this squarely upon our Ottawa Government as they are in complete charge. Why are they doing this? Chiefly to create the impression that the Wheat Board is at fault. With Trudeau in Ottawa, Richardson in Manitoba, Lang in Saskatchewan, they want to get the marketing back in the hands of private concerns such as the Winnipeg Grain Exchange. And you know who owns that. We are short of boxcars, let's build more and give them to the railroads, we give them millions in subsidies each year anyway. Let's double the capacity of our Hudson Bay Port at Churchill. Let's double our capacity of terminals at the Vancouver Port. Let's build large inland terminals on the Prairies for wheat where main railways converge. What would be wrong with

March 14, 1972

a 25 million bushel terminal right here near Regina. How can this be accomplished? The so-called two-price system for wheat announced giving \$3 a bushel on some 60 million bushels really gives the farmer only 13 cents a bushel. Applying it to average payment each farmer will probably realize around \$300. Mr. Turner, the Wheat pool president said, I quote:

This poor image of a two-price system is not what I visualize the two-price system to be. The method of payment chosen by the Federal Government makes it appear as a subsidy to farmers rather than consumer assistance. It doesn't recognize the principle of a two-price system for wheat. It doesn't make sense to make payments to producers of other grains and call it a wheat payment.

Mr. Turner said:

If a supplementary income is needed for other grains then it should come from other programs.

The kind of two-price system I have advocated over this past seven years is the only answer, Mr. Speaker, to giving stability and a steady income year by year to the farmer. \$3 per bushel, yes, but it should be given to the first 2,500 bushels of every farmer. This would immediately provide farmers with \$7,500 annually from their first bushels sold. Sell other wheat at the present price up to a certain number of bushels and use a diminishing sliding scale for grains sold over and above other amounts. This will keep farmers on the land this will create means for our young people to go farming. This plan would be the key in giving the whole of Canada a continual measure of prosperity. We as a House should promote and adopt this plan. The programs approved over the past year such as LIFT and now this token of a two-price wheat program are mere chicken feed, and will continue to keep the Saskatchewan farmers slightly below or slightly above the poverty line.

I also challenge the Ottawa Government to buy \$250 million worth of grain and distribute it amongst the hungry of the world. I also suggest that those provinces that grow grain in Canada be asked to help share some of the cost. This would help the farmers of Western Canada and distribute much needed wheat and flour to the starving people. When you watch the streaming millions starving and dying daily surely we as Canadian citizens should have some compassion and make our rightful contribution.

I had hoped the Minister of Agriculture would have reported what steps he had taken to work out plans as I had recommended last summer to see that our farmers were provided with holidays with pay just as the city workers, I hope to see that pretty soon.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Baker: — I was pleased to see that the Provincial Treasurer placed moneys in the Budget to include free chiropractic treatment under our Medicare Insurance Program. While I am not the one to gloat in personal aggrandizement however I do say with some pride that my efforts in taking the lead to get this through the Legislature since the year 1965 have not been in vain. When approval was given in principle at that time it took a seven-year wait until the final results have been realized. It took a New Democratic Government to approve my request and have this

March 14, 1972

come to fruition.

Now that this has been accomplished my next priority as part of our New Deal will be to promote with vigour a free dental care program for our children.

The 15 per cent increase on food for welfare recipients is appreciated. But we must admit much more money is needed to bring them above the poverty line. Ottawa must also be prodded to provide more welfare assistance in this regard. We should press Ottawa to change the Old Age Security Act and the Canada Pension Plan so that men in Canada can retire at age 60 and women at age 58 if they wish. This would make way for jobs for our younger people and for thousands now unemployed. I look forward to many changes over the next four years as well as rectifying the damage done during the last seven.

Those things I am concerned with in my constituency and close to home include: the establishment of our own board of governors for the Regina campus. Complete autonomy is needed now for our Regina University, if we are to get maximum results for higher education and proper acceptance and sociability within our community of staff and students as well as giving proper status to our faculty members and our administrative body. I look forward to this being planned and done hopefully before the next semester. I strongly recommend that the cut of \$3 million to \$8.5 million for university construction should not apply to Regina campus. Between 10,000 to 12,000 students were to be here by 1976. Regina campus has been held back continuously because of more needed construction and also by the attitude of some of the board of governors and the president of the university. I would certainly request that the Premier have a good look at this and not cut back in university construction here but that it be accelerated. The space will certainly be needed. We must relocate and construct a new powerhouse to be located I would suggest near our lagoons northwest of the city as dual plant for steam and gas turbines. I shall press for this as it is needed and the relocation of our present plant is long overdue. A complete underground wiring system for Regina must be accelerated, according to the agreement when our city was forced to sell our power system which you all know I objected to most strenuously.

I would ask the Government to have a feasibility study as to building a bridge between Winnipeg Street and Park Street as a connecting road to our University campus and the South Saskatchewan Hospital. I recommend that the Government restore the Territorial Government Administration building at 3304 Dewdney Avenue, Regina, to its original structure and to be used as a public museum. This was the site of our territorial government as Regina was the capital of the Northwest Territories from 1882 to 1905.

Other recommendations I would suggest are outside the city. First of all I would like to recommend that the Fort Sanatorium be retained as a home for senior citizens or as a nursing or special care establishment. I would suggest we embark upon a full-scale exploration program for natural gas and drill for it ourselves so that we become self-sufficient. A fully insured nursing home care plan should be initiated so those who need this care where we do not ask for more than their pension moneys. It is wrong to force them to sell and give up estates which were also helped and built up by other members of the family. A program

March 14, 1972

of meals-on-wheels is a good plan to investigate and help those who want to remain in their homes. This should receive immediate investigation. We should prod our Federal Government to raise exemptions on income tax to \$2,500 for single people and about \$5,000 for married couples. Tax cuts in this category would tangibly assist in encouraging expansion and would put more purchasing power in the hands of the workers. A \$500 grant is given at present by the Provincial Government for new homes built in this Province. Hopefully this will be increased. I support an advanced program to provide money on a similar basis as grants on new homes for the repair and renovation of older homes in cities, towns and villages and farms throughout our province. This together with grants for new homes would be a great incentive to housing construction and repair and would create much needed employment. My time is running out, Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to say that this is a sound Budget, a functional Budget and a Budget of security for many. I am sure that it will start getting our economy back on the rails. I support it.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. M. Kwasnica (Cut Knife): — Mr. Speaker, just as the election of the New Democratic Government on June 23rd last was like a breath of fresh air so is this Budget brought in by our Premier, Allan Blakeney.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Kwasnica: — Before I get into the main comments of my Budget speech I want to take this opportunity to thank the people of Cut Knife constituency for showing their confidence in the New Democratic Party and re-electing me with an even larger majority than ever before. And, Mr. Speaker, on behalf of my constituents, I want to thank the Government for all the work it has done in my riding as well. The oiling of Highway No. 40 has been a tremendous boost to the towns of Cut Knife, Neilburg and Marsden and all the people who live along that route. Thanks also for all the Homecoming grants, the winter works grants, the grants to museums, particular thanks for the auditorium-gymnasium in the Maidstone high school which will be open soon and for the one now under construction in Neilburg. The ratepayers, teachers and students in the Lloydminster school unit have waited a long time for these vital educational facilities. Mr. Speaker, I know my constituents would also want me to thank this Government for removing the deterrent fees and for paying the Medicare premiums for those 65 and over.

Mr. Speaker, this Budget now before us carries forth our major election promise to help stabilize the agriculture economy and to maintain the family farm as a way of life to be protected and cherished in rural Saskatchewan. Now, members of the Opposition have been condemning this Budget without offering any reasonable alternatives. The Opposition's financial critic complained that we were spending only \$1.9 million more on agriculture than last year but he very slyly failed to mention the \$10 million set aside for the Land Bank program.

Mr. MacLeod: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Kwasnica: — Mr. Speaker, if any program is strongly supported by the farmers of Cut Knife constituency, and no doubt all farmers in

March 14, 1972

Saskatchewan, it is the Land Bank because the Land Bank brings with it a totally new and refreshing approach to land transfer and tenure. When the Liberal Opposition condemn this program they condemn the family far, they condemn father to son transfers and they condemn the smaller farmer to living in the big city and going on welfare and unemployment insurance.

Mr. Speaker, ownership of land is really a myth, when one looks at what has really happened to our farmers in Saskatchewan over the years. Many of our farmers came from foreign lands to homestead in Saskatchewan because there was land available at reasonable rates. The main goal of many of them was to own land as time went on with the continual reduction of the price the farmer received for his products and the continual increase in the cost of production, some economists suggested that farmers were inefficient and urged them to buy more land and bigger machines in order to make ends meet. This, Mr. Speaker, many farmers did by borrowing huge sums from the Farm Credit Corporation and other lending institutions and this caused inflated land prices. As a result, one generation of hard work found hundreds of farmers perhaps owning that homestead quarter but heavily in debt trying to pay off the other quarters. And so we have the father in the predicament of having to get enough cash out of his farm on which to retire in decency and his son waiting in the wings wondering how he can raise the necessary capital to pay his dad and then wondering how in the world he would ever be able to pay off his huge debts within his life-time. Mr. Speaker, our land tenure system became archaic and the debt of one generation was passed on to the next generation with no hope of every paying it off. This system works well for the lending institutions. The benefit to the farmer is questionable.

So, Mr. Speaker, our Government is bringing forth the Land Bank to help solve some of these problems. This program guarantees security of tenure without ownership. It will allow the father to be paid out at an negotiated price. The son will get first priority to lease the land without having to go to a lending institution to borrow large sums to pay off his father. The son will have the option to buy at a later date. Mr. Speaker, the farmers in my constituency are extremely optimistic and many keep asking if the legislation is already passed. And I have had people of all political beliefs admit that the Land Bank is a good idea.

Members of the Opposition are saying that there is nothing in this Budget for the farmer and they will vote against it. Are they saying, Mr. Speaker, that they will vote against the \$10 million for the Land Bank? Are they saying, Mr. Speaker, they will vote against the \$150,000 to explore and develop new market techniques for our farm products? Are they saying they will vote against our program to detect crop insect outbreaks, so we don't have another situation like the Bertha armyworm? Are they going to vote against the \$400,000 assistance to milk producers in the province? Are they going to vote against doubling farm business management courses, the courses that are so popular among the farmers? Are they going to vote against an expanded crop insurance program which will add rapeseed and flax? Mr. Speaker, the Opposition have already indicated plainly that they are against all these vital programs and that they will be voting against them.

March 14, 1972

Mr. Speaker, I am absolutely amazed and happily amazed at the way the Premier who is also Provincial Treasurer has managed the financial affairs of our province to date. He has brought in major tax reductions. A total of \$23.4 million will be paid out in property improvement grants for homes, farms and small businesses.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Kwasnica: — In no case will the grants be less than the previous homeowner grant. For many the grant will be an amount equal to 13 mills of assessed value up to a maximum assessed value of \$6,000 for a home, \$10,000 for small business and \$15,000 for farms. Now let's take a quick look at what this would mean to an average one section farmer. If the assessed value of land quarter was \$2,500, total assessed value for a section \$10,000. Take off 13 mills and you get a tax saving of \$130 for that farmer. Mr. Speaker, this is twice as much as the Liberal Homeowner grant and, Mr. Speaker, if a small business was assessed at \$10,000, of course, he too would receive \$130 a year tax reduction.

Now one of the reasons our New NDP Government is able to bring about this fantastic reduction in property taxes is because we will be revising the tax and royalty rates on our mineral resources and we shall net some \$6 million in new revenues. This is just another example of NDP action when it comes to getting more from our resources which duly belong to the people of Saskatchewan.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Kwasnica: — And, Mr. Speaker, this is an area of taxation that the previous Liberal Government wouldn't dare touch because most of their campaign funds come from the huge international companies who really rule the old line Liberal and conservatives anyway.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased that our Government will be establishing a new Department of the Environment. The need to protect our land, air and water is being more obvious every day. We have gone through the mercury pollution of our Saskatchewan River system and you all recall the notices on fishing licences saying that fish from the Saskatchewan River system should not be eaten. We all know that DDT, that marvellous insect killer approved as harmless by world organizations such as WHO, has entered all the waters on this earth and we know that DDT has been found in fairly high concentration in penguins in the Antarctic and in livers in polar bears in the far North. We know that DDT slows down or kills the tiny microorganisms called plankton which releases about 70 per cent of the earth's supply of oxygen from our oceans of the world. And we can see where that will lead. And what about adding, for example, such poisons as fluoride to our water system. Do we need any more, more pollution of our water systems? We have all heard of the Regina air pollution survey just completed last month which has determined that 70 per cent of the pollution in Regina's atmosphere stems from motor vehicle exhausts. Most of us are familiar with detergents that contain high levels of phosphates that are dumped into our lakes. This leads to massive growth of algae and waterweeds. Beaches are fouled by rotting plant material. Desirable fish species die from lack of oxygen because decaying

March 14, 1972

algae has removed oxygen from the water. The end result, stagnant lakes and streams and eventual death of man.

We are also aware that industry is a major polluter of air and water. Pulp mills and chemical plants are our major industrial polluters. But, Mr. Speaker, I am concerned that our farmers too have become one of our major polluters, some knowingly, others are totally unaware. Pushed by fancy advertisements and chemical companies they use mercury to treat their seed. They spray with 2-4-D and other chemicals and these chemicals do not decompose and are simply washed into the land and into our major water systems. And we know that 2-4-D has an active killing effect of from five to eight years. Chemicals like stilbestral are being injected into beef to stimulate hormones and produce extensive weight gain. But do we really know what effect this chemical has on us humans who eat that meat? And one could go on and on. I am not blaming the farmers. I am just saying we need research and we've got to inform them and get our farmers to see that all of these techniques may mean a quick buck but at what cost in horrendous and in unknown side effects on mankind.

Pollution controls must be improved in our oil industry as well. I have had the opportunity to witness an oil spill from a wildcat well in my constituency in the Battle River valley. A most unbelievable experience. I have seen a pipeline break and flood most of a quarter section with heavy, gummy crude. I have witnessed huge black clouds emitted from open pit burning of slag near the outskirts of Lloydminster. I have witnessed the result of a tank load of salt water being dumped from a truck that was stuck in a farmer's field and nothing now is growing for an acre around that sterilized area.

All these things are going on in Saskatchewan today. When the Saskatchewan Department of the Environment is set up it will have a terribly important job to do. It will need the support of every citizen in Saskatchewan if it is to do an effective job.

Mr. Speaker, I know that many small businessmen are looking forward to our program for them. I am pleased that a Business Assistance Branch will be set up to provide management advice and direct grants and loans to our small town businesses. In many aspects the small independent business is the only true free enterpriser left in the world today. He really has to compete for his business dollar and does not hold the monopoly of price fixing as the major chain stores do.

Mr. Speaker, I should like to take a minute to compare the Liberal Budget of 1968 just after an election year with our Budget today just after an election year.

Mr. Romanow: — Black Friday...

Mr. Kwasnica: — Let's take a look at that Budget. Receipts from mineral resources declined in 1968 by \$1.4 million. In 1972 under a new Government up \$6 million.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Kwasnica: — In 1968 the Liberal Budget raised the Education and Health tax from 4 to 5 per cent and that included hotel rooms,

March 14, 1972

meals of \$2 or more, all forms of telecommunications, total tax increase in that alone was \$12,250,000.

An Hon. Member: — Shame!

Mr. Kwasnica: — In 1972 and an NDP Government and no increase.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Kwasnica: — In 1968 the Liberal Government introduced deterrent fees of \$2.50 a day for hospital and \$1.50 for a doctor, increase \$7.4 million. August 1972, NDP Government fees and deterrent fees abolished.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Kwasnica: — The 1968 Budget of the Liberals, gasoline tax up two cents, increase \$8 million taxation. In 1972, this Budget no increase.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Kwasnica: — Increased fees for operators' licences, registration of passenger vehicles, school buses and farm trucks in the 1968 Liberal Budget, total increase \$2.3 million. Mr. Speaker, the total increase in the taxation by the Liberals in 1968 was about \$35 million. All in all, Mr. Speaker, the Liberals in seven years increased or added some 1,400 fees and taxes. Compared with our Budget, Mr. Speaker, we have given the people of Saskatchewan a reduction of approximately \$35 million. Now, that's performance and I am proud of it.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Kwasnica: — Mr. Speaker, because this Budget brought in by Mr. Blakeney offers so much to the people of Saskatchewan in meaningful programs, like \$11.4 million for public works to create jobs, increased spending in tourism, a sound agricultural program, a major breakthrough in reduction of property taxes to 13 mills, in education a \$166 million budget, room for 850 more students in technical institutes in Moose Jaw, Saskatoon and Regina, the abolition of the Grade Twelve departmental examination fees saving Grade Twelve students \$100,000, 11.7 per cent increase in university spending, \$12 million more for operating grants to school boards, almost \$1 million for loans and bursaries to include technical students, and in the field of health inclusion of chiropractic care, and in other areas the elimination of the tax on meals of \$2.50 or less better know as the Hotdog tax, and many, any more programs. Mr. Speaker, I am confident that this Budget will set Saskatchewan back on the road to economic recovery. I am proud to be part of this dynamic Government, a government that truly believes in carrying out its program and a New Deal for people.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Kwasnica: — Mr. Speaker, as you can readily tell from my remarks,

I will be supporting this Budget with enthusiasm and with confidence.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. D.L. Faris (Arm River): — Mr. Speaker, I wish to begin by extending my best wishes to those Members elected to this House since we last met. And my best wishes for the speedy recovery of Mr. Steuart, the Leader of the Opposition.

Mr. Speaker, the Opposition will be pleased to know that I do not intend to quote from the Bible this Session. They apparently find the language of St. Peter offensive. A Liberal friend in Davidson said, "Don the next time you quote from the Bible, you'd better tell them." I think this person was right. Otherwise, it is very difficult to explain why the Member for Moose Jaw North (Mr. MacDonald) should misquote and distort my words in the Liberal newspaper. I don't get angry too often but when I hear of the taxation of the sick, the taxation of cancer patients, the taxation of mental patients' estates defended and excused by Members opposite, it makes me angry.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Faris: — Mr. Speaker, I make no apology for being among those who express my anger through the words of the Bible. If it's good enough for St. Peter, it is good enough for Don Faris.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Faris: — Mr. Speaker, I want to take this opportunity to thank the people of Arm River for electing me. 90 per cent of the voters in Arm River turned out to vote, the highest turnout in history, and when they all turned out they elected the first New Democrat in the history of Arm River.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Faris: — It is a privilege to represent this important area of the province which lies as it does between Diefenbaker Lake and Long Lake. It is in the centre of the agricultural portion of Saskatchewan. The people are friendly and hardworking. Many ancestries are represented, with Scandinavians in the West, Croatians in the North, Anglo-Saxons in the centre and Germans in the south, Arm River is a rich mosaic of cultural traditions. But Arm River has many problems. Lying as it does between Regina and Saskatoon, there is a tendency for these larger centres to drain the lifeblood out of our rural service centres. I consider it my duty as MLA for Arm River to see that this central region of the province gets a new deal and a fair deal. I have told the elected leaders of all of the communities of my area that if they have a reasonable request to ask of the Government I will support them.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Faris: — Mr. Speaker, I know that the people of Davidson feel that they have received a new and a fair deal. The people of

March 14, 1972

Davidson were very upset to see that their town was being by-passed by the former Government without any adequate provisions for proper entrances. The Liberal plan was for one entrance to Davidson. Davidson is a town that has established itself uniquely as the halfway house, a historic coffee stop half way between Regina and Saskatoon. That one entrance would have meant the loss of up to 30 jobs which depended on highway traffic. What upset the people of Davidson even more was that they had a promise from the Liberal Government that the highway would continue through Davidson until there were four lanes. This promise was contained in a letter sent by the Minister of Highways to the former mayor of Davidson and dated July 26, 1966. the letter reads and I quote:

Attorney General Heald has brought to my attention representations made to him by the citizens of Davidson and area to delay the bypassing of Davidson when we rebuilt No. 11 Highway. In view of the fact that the four-laning of No. 11 Highway in the Davidson area appears to be some years in the future, I am pleased to advise that we are now prepared to locate the new road on the present site through Davidson. Ultimately, as you can appreciate, it will be necessary to bypass Davidson when the four-lane program is carried out.

Mr. Speaker, the people of Davidson could understand an eventual bypassing. They could understand it if all the option has been fairly studied. They could understand it if they were assured of adequate entrances. They could understand it if the promise to keep the route through Davidson had been kept. Mr. Speaker, none of these things were done. I want publicly to thank the new Minister of Highways (Mr. Byers) for taking action to correct the situation as best he could by providing proper entrances.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Faris: — And I want to express my appreciation to the mayor of Davidson, Harry Edom and Dr. Hildebrand and the Chamber of Commerce for their co-operation. They played a major role in presenting the needs of the community. I should also like to thank Mayor Parks of Craik and Lou Dupuis, president of their revitalized Chamber of Commerce for their work in outlining improvements to the entrances to Craik. And I must add that I was very pleased to see the improved entrance to Aylesbury. Community groups and locally elected officials have been of great assistance in determining these communities' needs and desires.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Faris: — Mr. Speaker, lest the Hon. Members opposite doubt that this is a New and better Deal for the people of Arm River – just an isolated incident – I refer them to events just one year ago. At that time just before the Winter Games the former Government callously bypassed the towns of Aylesbury, Craik and Girvin at least six months before necessary. In January 1971 I wrote a letter to the then Minister of highways. My letter stated and I quote:

This decision to bypass the towns has harmed all the

small businesses in these communities. These businessmen have served their communities and the travelling public faithfully for years and should have been able to look forward to some trade from travellers to the Winter Games in February. The old highway would have served very well this winter. What we have now is a half finished highway with inadequate entrances to these towns. These communities deserve more consideration than this.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Faris: — What reply did I receive from the former Minister of Highways? No reply. No reply until the last session when he described my letter as impudent.

An Hon. Member: — Oh, oh.

Mr. Faris: — The Member from Rosthern (Mr. Boldt) considered it impudent to be reminded of the damage that he was doing to small businessmen of Aylesbury and Craik and Girvin. It is difficult enough to keep a small business going without having to fight a Highways Minister who brands any protest as impudent.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Faris: — Mr. Speaker, the people of these towns have told me that they appreciate a Minister of Highways who will at least listen to their point of view.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Faris: — Mr. Speaker, we haven't solved all the problems in Arm River. I wish to draw the attention of this Assembly to the great need of the rebuilding and hard surfacing of Highway No. 15 from Kenaston to Simpson. This road which is called a highway was built to the earliest grid road standards in the early fifties. It is narrow and dangerous as it was built to 40 mile an hour standards of that time. This stretch of road is 36 miles long, hard-surfaced roads needed on both sides. For seven years there were surveys. For seven years the dust flew. If surveys and promises were pavement then all 36 miles would be hard surfaced by now. How many miles do you think were rebuilt and hard surfaced in those seven years? Well, it wasn't 36 miles, it wasn't 36 inches. It was zero, zero miles, zero inches.

An Hon. Member: — Oh, shame!

Mr. Faris: — I urge the Members of this House sometime to look at the provincial highway map. They will find Highway No. 15 hard surfaced across the province except for this 36-mile strip of gravel. I am pleased that this year will see the completion of the first eight and a half miles being rebuilt, a contract Mr. Byers, the new Minister of Highways let soon after the election. Apart from that there will be a year's delay for legal and financial arrangements to be made as the former Government I have been assured did not have any of this road in their highway program until 1973. I am urging an acceleration of this program

March 14, 1972

and I to report progress on Highway No. 15 to this Legislature next year. I am also arranging to have John McJannett and Pete Sagen, two of the community leaders in the area provide the Minister of Highways with a ceremonial wheelbarrow ride upon completion of this highway.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Faris: — Mr. Speaker, until this moment Mr. McJannett and Mr. Sagen were not aware of this coming historic event and upon completion of the Session today I intend to contact them to negotiate whose wheelbarrow will be used and for what distance. I have specified a wheelbarrow because if Highway No. 15 isn't fixed soon they may come down to Regina with a front-end loader.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Faris: — Mr. Speaker, I want to thank this Government for the jobs they have created in Arm River this winter and the few facilities that will result. As the Premier mentioned in the Budget speech winter works grants towards a new \$100,000 gymnasium at Imperial, a \$200,000 civic centre at Davidson, museum renovations at Craik, a repair depot for the R.M. of Loreburn are just a few examples of a new and better deal for Arm River.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Faris: — The Budget Speech mentioned another item with which the people of Arm River will be pleased. This is the announcement of the establishment of camping and picnic facilities at Lovering Lake. During the election we raised the issue of guaranteeing public access to this beautiful, crystal clear lake. This objective will be achieved and in addition this Government is prepared to spend some \$35,000 this year along to develop the facilities at this lake. In addition there will be greatly increased tourist facilities along Diefenbaker Lake. Over \$55,000 will be spent in Danielson and Douglas Parks, an increase of over \$40,000 from last year's budget. This will particularly help the towns of Elbow and Loreburn.

Mr. Speaker, there are several areas of my riding which I should like to see given the opportunity to have natural gas. I realize that the more heavily populated areas must be served first. Therefore, I propose firstly to ask the Minister-in-Charge of the Power Corporation to give serious thought to including the towns from Simpson to Bethune in the areas served by natural gas. I am sure this matter requires some study but I should like to see it in the program for 1973.

A further area of concern is the fate of the irrigation area. I have met on many occasions with the irrigation farmers. They have condemned the former Government for the band-aid approach to their problem. We need a clear-cut irrigation policy. I was pleased to see that the Budget included provision for onion storage facilities at Outlook. This area will only find its proper economic base when it is involved in intensive specialized uses. I await with interest the report of the irrigation committee.

Mr. Speaker, another item that I wish to bring to the attention of the House is a problem related to the public health

March 14, 1972

programs. A family in my riding has been faced with enormous expenses, some \$80 per month due to the fact that their newborn baby had internal deformities. Now if this baby had external deformities there would be a program of financial assistance to help them. I would like to see this program changed as the distinction between these deformities seems to me to be unfair and works in some cases great hardship. Mrs. Berne Schmidt, our very excellent public health nurse in the area was able to find another way to help in this instance. But such cases are more common than we think and such help is limited.

I have shown that this is a good Budget for Arm River. It is also a good Budget for the taxpayer. I want to give you an example of what the Property Improvement Grant will mean to a few families in my area. In Hawarden it will mean this. The grant on his house in town assessed at \$4,500 will mean \$70. The grant on his farm \$125, a total grant of \$195. To a small businessman in Imperial it will mean this: The grant on his home will be \$78 and the grant on his business \$117, a total grant of \$195.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Faris: — In eight months of action the new Government has done the following for one retired couple in my area. They are retired in town. They rent out the farm. The man has cancer. The grant on the home will be \$70. The grant on the farm will be \$125, the savings on the Medicare premiums will be \$72. Their savings on deterrent fees will be \$180. The total savings will be \$447, Mr. Speaker.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Faris: — Mr. Speaker, these eight months have meant a New Deal and a good deal for them.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Faris: — Mr. Speaker, the Opposition financial critic has called the Budget a poor cousin Budget. He complains because our Premier is tough and smart enough to get more money out of Ottawa.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Faris: — I want to ask the Members opposite a question and it is this: Where do their loyalties lie? The people of Saskatchewan know that for generations they have been like a cow that got its feed in Saskatchewan and is milked in Ontario. They know that for generations they have had to pay high prices for goods produced behind the high tariff protection that we all give Ontario industry. The people of Saskatchewan know this. They have known it for generations. How is it that the Liberal Members don't know it? They must know it. Then I must ask them again: where do their loyalties lie? The answer is clear. They lie with Ottawa Liberal Party.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

March 14, 1972

An Hon. Member: — . . . Otto Lang.

Mr. Faris: — Yes, we all remember Mr. Steuart saying that they were all going to get behind Mr. Lang and this is how they got behind him. I can hardly believe that anyone who puts loyalty to Saskatchewan first could attack the Saskatchewan Government for getting too much money from Ottawa! But that is what they have done. They call it a poor cousin Budget. I call their reply a crybaby criticism.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Faris: — They are complaining because Mr. Blakeney is tough and smart enough to do what he said he would do, get a better deal, a New Deal for Saskatchewan.

Mr. Speaker, when I left my home at Davidson this weekend to come down for another week, as I backed out the driveway I looked up at our front window. In that window there were three heads with wide eyes. There was Tinker the cat and Paul and March my two sons. I couldn't help but ask myself why I was coming down here. If I had my preference I'd rather be at home with them. I would rather take them skating. I would rather sit down each night and talk to them about the things that bewilder or frighten a six or two-year old. But I know why I am here.

It is because there are things in our society that bewilder and frighten me. There are things in our society that I don't want to be there in my sons' world. I don't want to tax mental patients and I don't want farmers driven off the land. And there are things that I want for myself and my sons. I want an economic system that gives the little guy a break. I want a Saskatchewan where a man can make a decent living for a decent day's work. I want our rural life, which is perhaps the most fully human existence on the face of this earth, preserved and strengthened. I want a society where men are free and equal.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Faris: — Mr. Speaker, because this Budget takes steps in that direction I am proud to be here and I am proud to support this Budget.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. E.L. Cowley (Biggar): — Mr. Speaker, it is with a great deal of pleasure that I rise to take part in this Debate.

I should like first of all to take this occasion to thank the people in the Biggar constituency for the confidence which they placed in my being elected last June 23rd.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Cowley: — On that historic day for Saskatchewan, I along with the other Members on this side of the House, were elected to get a job done. That job was to make our program outlined in the New Deal for People a reality.

Mr. Speaker, this Budget represents a giant step in that direction, and I am proud to have a part in its implementation.

Before turning to some of the specific proposals contained in the Budget I should like to comment on a couple of statements made by the Liberal Opposition Budget critic, the Member for Albert Park (Mr. MacLeod).

Mr. Romanow: — Where is it?

Mr. Cowley: — I don't know it is pretty small and it is hard to find.

Mr. MacLeod: — I got more votes than the guy from Arm River.

Mr. Cowley: — Mr. Speaker, in yesterday's debate near the end of his address he stated that he was not proud to have our province reduced to the status of a beggar. Earlier in his address he had suggested that the NDP will continue to ask for welfare payments from other governments. They are his words, not mine.

I was most surprised, I shouldn't have been I suppose, and angered by his statements. I was surprised because I didn't believe that any Member of this Liberal Legislature would be so ill informed. I was angered because nothing could be further from the truth. If the Member was in possession of the facts, and he should have been, then one can only deduce that he ignored reality in search of political gain.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Cowley: — Mr. Speaker, the people of Saskatchewan have paid through the nose since this Province came into being because of tariffs designed to protect Eastern Canadian industrialists. I ask the Member for Albert Park (Mr. MacLeod) if he calls them beggars. Does he refer to them as being on welfare?

Mr. Speaker, farmers in Saskatchewan have paid through the nose because of the Federal Government's cheap food policy. They have been forced to buy in a protected market and they have been forced to sell in Canada and on the world market at depressed world market prices. It is only recently that we have seen the introduction of something called, but only vaguely resembling, a two-price system. Was this passed on to the consumer? No. It was passed off as a subsidy to farmers.

Mr. Speaker, in reality it is a subsidy to consumers. But does the Member opposite call consumers beggars? Does he refer to them as being on welfare?

Mr. Speaker, the people of Saskatchewan have paid through the nose in the form of high freight rates which are patently unfair to Saskatchewan. We have paid because of concessions to the railways and in particular, to the CPR. We have helped to pay off the debts incurred by the Federal Government financing that railway. Does the Member opposite refer to the CPR as a beggar? Does he refer to the CPR as being on welfare? Mind you, if you take a look at their record in grain handling they should maybe be fired and placed on it.

March 14, 1972

The Member for Albert Park referred to the Premier of British Columbia as screaming about equalization payments going to other provinces. I would remind the Member opposite that this is not an unusual activity for British Columbia's Premier. I would also remind him that Premier Bennett shouldn't scream too loud. A good part of the reason for his province's prosperity is business generated there because of Saskatchewan purchases and Saskatchewan products passing through it.

"Saskatchewan, a beggar province." That is an odd way for the Member from Albert Park to put it. His colleague, the Member for Wilkie (Mr. McIsaac) followed him yesterday and he stated that the increased equalization payments were the result of the hard work done by the former Premier, Ross Thatcher, and one Mr. Dave Steuart. And if that is true, and if they agree with one another then I can only conclude that the Members opposite consider their new Leader, the former Treasurer Mr. Steuart as the greatest beggar of them all.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Cowley: — Mr. Speaker, I support the principle of equalization payments. They are a necessary part of our federal system of government. They serve two purposes. On the one hand they help to equalize opportunities, and on the other hand they help to make up inequities which arise because of other government policies such as tariffs. They also serve to help regions which are faced with short-term recessions like seven years of Liberal Government.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Cowley: — Mr. Speaker, I want to speak in this debate about the Property Improvement Grants mentioned in this Budget.

During the election last June we as a Party, and I in my constituency promised to reduce the mill rate for school purposes to an average of 25 mills across Saskatchewan, based on an equalized assessment. The Liberals said that it could not be done. It would bankrupt the province, it would mean increased taxes and all sorts of glom and doom was predicted. The average mill rate in Saskatchewan was 43 mills. So we were talking about a reduction of 18 mills. Mr. Speaker, in our first year of office we have reduced the mill rate by 13 mills as a result of the Property Improvement Grant and the very substantial increase in school grants which will allow the average mill rate to remain at 43 mills in Saskatchewan.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Cowley: — And where are the tax increases that the Members opposite talked about? Well, there is an increase in taxes on the potash companies. I wonder if they are objecting to that? There is an increase in royalty revenues from the oil industry. I wonder if they object to that? There is a reduction in taxes - the hotdog tax goes. Mr. Speaker, what has happened is that we have gone 13 mills of the 18 mills which we promised and there are no tax increases.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Cowley: — In my constituency most of the ratepayers will be paying 25 mills or less for education as a result of these two programs in the Budget.

I want to give you three examples of what I class as typical constituents. In the first case — a farmer with six quarters of land assessed at \$18,000 and with the school mill rate at 38 mills. In 1971 he paid \$684 in school taxes, less the \$70 Homeowner Grant for a net tax for school purposes of \$614. In 1972 he will pay the same school taxes in all likelihood, receive a Property Improvement Grant of \$195 for a net of \$489. that is a 20.4 per cent reduction net taxes paid.

Another farmer with four quarters of land and a house in town with a total assessment of \$11,000. His net school taxes are reduced from \$348 to \$275, a 21 per cent reduction in net taxes paid for school purposes via the mill rate.

A businessman with a home assessed at \$2,000, his business at \$10,000, his net school taxes are reduced from \$386 to \$300, a reduction, Mr. Speaker, of 22.3 per cent. No tax increases, reductions in the mill rate like this.

Mr. Speaker, the Property Improvement Grant represents a giant step forward in reducing school taxes on property. A promise made and a promise kept.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Cowley: — I want to turn to another area, Mr. Speaker, which affects particularly my constituency and that is the Department of Highways.

I noted with interest, the Opposition complaining bitterly that the capital expenditures for Highways is being held at last year's figure of \$45 million. I am confident, however, that under the present Government we shall see more miles of highways built this year than last with the same budget, because of good management.

You know, Mr. Speaker, they were great planners. Highway No. 14 from Perdue to Biggar was planned every year from 1965 to 1971. If the stakes that their surveyors planted had roots we would have a forest worthy of a pulp mill on either side of the highway.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Cowley: — They put on a great show, but their crews were so busy leaving the constituency after the 1964 election that they never even bothered to finish the stretch of highway between Perdue and Hawoods Corner on Highway 14. Mr. Speaker, I am confident that we can do better dollar for dollar than they ever did.

Mr. Speaker, I want to turn to the budget for the Department of Agriculture which is arrangements important to my constituency. The Opposition Budget critic complained yesterday that it was too small. Well, Mr. Speaker, I can agree that I should like to have seen a larger budget for Agriculture. I

March 14, 1972

don't think that any of the Members here would disagree that there are many fields in which we could have spent more money. But I want to remind the Members opposite that it represents a 10.5 per cent increase over last year. And it has associated with it an item of \$10 million in capital for the Land Bank.

Now if money is to be usefully spent then the plans for the spending of that money must be laid well in advance. I believe that the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Messer) and the Cabinet have acted wisely in not bringing forward programs for which adequate planning had not been done. I look forward in future years to further substantial increases in the Budget for the Department of Agriculture.

I want to point out, Mr. Speaker, that not all financial benefits to Agriculture attributable to this Government show up directly in the Budget. The Members opposite continue to accuse us of having killed the Federal Liberals' Grain Stabilization Bill. We accept the credit.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Cowley: — I noticed, with interest, one or two of the Members over there cheering when the LIFT Program was mentioned by a Member on this side of the House yesterday. I can only conclude from that that they must have been city Members. Anyone out in the country would know better.

I would like the Members to look at the facts regarding the Grain Stabilization Income Bill. Farmers would have received a one-shot payment of \$100 million and a Stabilization Plan which would have cost them 2 per cent of their gross sales and likely returned them nothing for several years at least. Along with this, the Temporary Wheat Reserve Act would have been wiped out, and wiped out retroactively. Farmers lost \$100 million and the Members opposite continually remind us of that. But they saved 2 per cent of their gross grain sales. They received \$62,116,018.42 from the Temporary Wheat Reserves Act for the 1970-71-crop year. The \$73 million final payment was in no small way attributable to the retention of the Temporary Wheat Reserves Act.

Recently a so-called two-price system was announced which will pay out some \$60 million. There is no one on that side of the House who will convince me that it would have come along if the Stabilization Bill had passed.

Mr. Speaker, we are told – and I hope we can believe, and I am sure the farmers of Saskatchewan hope they can believe – that this isn't a one-shot program, but a permanent program on the part of the Federal Government.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Cowley: — Add up the figures – lost \$100 million, gained \$62 million, part of \$73 million, \$60 million and the Temporary Wheat Reserves Act and the two-price system should return benefits to farmers year after year, after year. Not a bad deal for farmers!

Mr. Speaker, I think from those figures one can deduce why

March 14, 1972

the Party on this side of the House opposed the Grain Stabilization Bill and why we feel there have been some financial benefits to farmers from that act on our part.

Mr. Speaker, I want to turn to another area in the field of agriculture, the Land Bank. The Land Bank is not a solution to all the problems faced by Saskatchewan farmers. It is, however, a sincere attempt to provide farmers of Saskatchewan with an alternative method of acquiring land to farm. I don't see any great financial advantage to being a farmer leasing land. Neither do I see any financial penalty. The land payments for the farmer purchasing land will necessarily be greater than the lease payments because the farmer will have to pay the principal if he is paying for the land. I grant he ends up owning the land, but if the lease operator puts the difference in the bank at the same interest rates, the two would end up with the same amount of money in ten years, 20 years or 40 years, as long as land prices remained constant, and they might go up and they might go down. So, Mr. Speaker, what I am trying to say is I don't see any great disadvantages financially or any particular great advantages financially from the Land Bank. Why then do we have a Land Bank?

Let me give you an example. We have a young man whose father is 45 year old, he saves some money and he can purchase a line of equipment. However, his father has his own land tied up and the young man has no collateral to allow him to borrow enough to purchase the land through the Farm Credit Corporation. The Land Bank is his opportunity to start farming on his own. Mr. Speaker, that's whom the Land Bank is designed to assist, not particularly the farmer who at present would have no trouble in buying the land through the Farm Credit Corporation.

Mr. Speaker, the rents have been criticized as being too high. They are supposed, as I understand it, to reflect fairly the cost of purchasing the land. If the rents are too high it will either be because the land prices are inflated or because farm incomes are too low. I repeat, however, if a farmer can afford to buy the land he can afford to lease it. Not even a Liberal mathematician can make the lease payment larger than the land payment. The approach taken by the Liberal Party to the Land Bank will not help to create an agency to serve Saskatchewan farmers, nor might I add, will it help to establish the Liberal Party as a credible alternative to this Government.

Mr. Speaker, I should not like to turn to the field of Education. Yesterday, the former Minister of Education (Mr. McIsaac), the Member from Wilkie, criticized this Government for its failure to provide for more capital construction on the University Campus. There are two reasons for this, Mr. Speaker. On the one hand it is necessary that we know a great deal more about what the costs will be once these buildings are constructed. You don't just erect buildings you also have to staff them and put programs in them year after year. Secondly, we cannot afford expensive duplication of facilities and I am sure that even the Members opposite, in the light of their comments, would agree with this. We need to have a plan of what our two campuses should look like 10 years from now. Unfortunately the Members opposite didn't leave us one. Either they didn't have the courage to make the decision or else they didn't have the initiative to draw one up. We simply can't continue to fly by the seat of our pants. Until the planning is done it is absolutely necessary that there be a go-slow policy or we should be doing a disservice to the taxpayers of this Province.

March 14, 1972

Mr. Speaker, I should like to spend a few minutes also on grants to school boards. You will note, and I noted with pleasure, and I am sure the public will be pleased with it, that there was a substantial increase in grants to school boards from under \$80 million to over \$90 million. I am firmly convinced that this will be enough to prevent the average mill rate in the province from rising and it may, in effect, bring about a decrease. I am also pleased to note that there will be a formula under which the grants will be paid out. What this means, of course, is the restoration of autonomy to school boards. The former Minister didn't use a formula, maybe he wasn't a chemist, I don't know. He and his Government used the grants to force school board into line.

If a board hired more teachers than the Minister thought appropriate, they were threatened with a substantial decrease in their grants. The new formula removes the pupil-teacher ratio. School boards will know how much money they will receive from the Provincial Government and from local taxes. They can decide their spending priorities, how many teachers they can afford and, if necessary, they can vary their mill rate accordingly. The Department of Education will no longer restrict the number of teachers they hire. How boards spend their money will be their decision. There will not be, nor should there be, Mr. Speaker, the heavy-handed approach used by the previous Government.

Mr. Speaker, I should like to spend a couple of minutes reviewing the proposed community College development in Saskatchewan. A community college should be a place where you can improve your skills in work and in doing things you would like to be able to do well. It should be a place where you can learn to be more effective in all the roles you play such as a family member, an organization member and a concerned citizen. There is an increasing need and desire for continued learning under the conditions of modern life. Also local communities are more than ever affected by events and decisions at provincial, national and international levels. If people of such communities are to influence decisions affecting them they must understand the forces at work and know the means by which they can make their voices heard.

Traditionally the greater part of the educational system has been focused on the young, from primary school through university. This emphasis has tended to overlook the fact that learning continues throughout life. The need for learning may indeed even become greater as one advances into and through adult life. Learning does take place through experience, reading, listening, viewing, discussions and through participation in various organized activities. The opportunity for adult learning in a systematic way has not been great, particularly outside of the larger centres. The need for adults to gain additional information and skills from time to time has largely been overlooked, particularly in rural Saskatchewan. It is this gap in the educational system which community colleges are designed to fill.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to see this development in Saskatchewan and I am pleased to see that under the leadership of Mr. Gordon MacMurchy, it is well underway. Mr. Speaker, I am also extremely pleased to see that under his leadership there has been a very definite emphasis placed on the role of community colleges in rural Saskatchewan. Because, Mr. Speaker, unless we can take the community colleges to rural Saskatchewan

March 14, 1972

they are not going to play the role which I am sure all Members of this Assembly hope community colleges will play in this Province.

Mr. Speaker, I should like to deal very briefly with one other item and that is the Winter Works Program or the Local Initiatives Program which was carried on this past winter by the Federal Government and which was supplemented by a program of the Provincial Government. Now the Members opposite have berated the Provincial Government's program, but I should just like to point out that in my constituency if it hadn't been for the provincial program there wouldn't have been any Winter Works Program. All of the programs in my constituency were turned down by the Federal Government, but fortunately three or four of those programs were picked up by the Provincial Government. Without the provincial program there wouldn't have been any Winter Works in the constituency of Biggar.

Mr. Speaker, before I sit down I should like to comment on a couple of statements which emanated from the Members opposite in this debate yesterday. The Budget critic (Mr. MacLeod) yesterday commented that the industrial sector of the economy should subsidize other parts of the economy, I presume through the provision of government services. I could wholeheartedly agree with that. But he went on to say that an industrial sector does not exist in Saskatchewan. I repeat that the Member said an industrial sector does not exist in Saskatchewan. That's a sad commentary on seven years of Liberal Government. I wonder if his colleagues agree with him. Unfortunately, under the previous government the rest of the economy subsidized the new industries. One only has to examine the proposed pulp mill and the agreement involving it to see this. Perhaps the Budget critic should not have been so quick to disavow being a Conservative. He doesn't sound as if he is too closely akin to the former Liberal Government.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, I should like to add my congratulations to those of the other Members to the new Members sitting with us, the Member from Souris-Estevan (Mr. Thorson) and the Member for Morse (Mr. Wiebe). I should also like to congratulate the new Ministers on their appointments, Mr. Thorson appointed as Minister of Industry and Commerce, where I am sure he will do an excellent job for the Province of Saskatchewan, and Mr. Brockelbank, whose constituency borders mine, and who will be working with us in Saskatoon-Biggar to re-elect Alf Gleave, who will I am sure be a credit to the Government of Saskatchewan in the new Government Services Department.

I should also like to congratulate the Member for Prince Albert West (Mr. Steuart) on his election as Liberal Leader and Leader of the Opposition. I hope that some of the Members opposite will carry my congratulations to him. I tried to sit down last night and graph out the fortunes of the Liberal Leader from last June 23rd to the next election. You know when you draw a graph you get a curve and this one turned out to look something like a slide on a playground. The high point was his point as Provincial Treasurer. On June 23rd he went down and then came the leadership race and you know there is a little turn up at the bottom of the slide and up he went. Still up in the air. I want to remind him that the last part of the ride is the hardest part and it comes in June 1975.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

March 14, 1972

Mr. Cowley: — Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to be a part of the Government which brought in this Budget. I want to commend the Provincial Treasurer and the Premier, the Hon. Allan Blakeney, for the excellent job which he has done.

Mr. Cowley: — I am sure that my constituents are pleased with the effort that has been made to improve Government services and at the same time the hard work on the part of the Provincial Treasurer to keep taxes down and provide a level of tax reduction on the mill rates for school purposes.

Mr. Speaker, as you may have gathered from my remarks, I will be supporting the motion.

Mr. D. Boldt (Rosthern): — Mr. Speaker, I would suggest to the Member who just sat down he should take a little more time in writing out his speech so that he would be able to fill the radio time and not repeat the last five minutes of what he said the first five minutes.

It is indeed surprising, Mr. Speaker, that the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Messer) still hasn't told us what the Land Bank is and he has left it up to the teachers to tell us what the Land Bank represents. The Member from Cut Knife (Mr. Kwasnica) and the Member from Biggar (Mr. Cowley), both teachers, spent practically all their time telling us what the Land Bank represented...

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Boldt: — . . . and the concern about the farmer. I want to tell this House and particularly these two teacher Members that the farmers aren't very much concerned today. The wheat is moving, barley is moving, beef and port prices are good. The concern of the province today is teacher-salary negotiations and at no time did they even mention the teacher-salary negotiations. When they were the Members on this side of the House they had all kinds of recommendations to make about how the Government should run the Department of Education but the teachers today have not even mentioned the problems that the boards and your Government is facing.

Now in regard to the Home Improvement Grant, the Member from Biggar says, "We have already reduced the mill rate by 13 mills." Now according to the Premier this is a falsehood, absolutely false, almost a deliberate lie when you look at the Budget Speech by the Premier on page 24 he says this, and he is honest about it. "A total of \$23.4 million will be paid out of the program during the year 1972-73, almost double that paid under the Homeowner Grant of the Liberal Government." So if this is a reduction of 13 mills these two programs, the Homeowner Grant represents more than 50 per cent of that reduction but they would like to tell the farmers of this Province, the taxpayers of this Province, that they have reduced the mill rate by 13 mills.

March 14, 1972

The Member from Biggar also said that teacher-student ratios have been done away with. I find that hard to believe when you look at the Estimates of 1973, and on page 67 University of Saskatchewan – operation. Here is a reduction of staff of 35. Why the reduction at the University?

The Member from Arm River (Mr. Faris) mentioned a few things about Highway No. 15. He should go to the Minister of Highways and he will find that Highway No. 15 was included in the program of the Liberal Government before June 23rd. But he doesn't know this, he hasn't consulted. He mentioned about the letter that he wrote to me regarding the bypassing of the smaller communities in the year of our Homecoming. Well you know that it wasn't very long before that that there was a very severe accident around Craik very close to his home where a family was killed. People in that area were anxiously awaiting for us to open up the new highway. I suppose the Member for Arm River didn't consider the danger of the old highway. But when I received the letter it was signed by Dr. Faris. I didn't know who Dr. Faris was. It was a very arrogant letter and I didn't feel that it deserved answering nor did the officials of the Highway Department.

The Cut Knife Member (Mr. Kwasnica) also mentioned, and he went back to 1968, on tax increases. The number of tax increases and he had to had to go back to 1968. Well, Mr. Speaker, I just want to come forward to 1972 and talk about the tax increase that this Government is imposing upon the people of Saskatchewan. And when I look at page 6, education and tax increases will be roughly \$4 million; gasoline tax will be \$5 million; mineral tax from \$2.8 million to \$6.5 million; and increase in liquor profits of over \$3 million. I imagine that they are hoping to get that from the 18 year olds who will not have the privilege of entering liquor stores and beer parlours when the Bill has been passed.

I want to make a comment on the former mayor from Regina. I believe he represents the Wascana seat. He again came out with his 13-point welfare program. Only this time I think it was 13 times 13. All Henry wants is a good pension plan and an early retirement and I hope the people of Regina will give that to him very shortly.

I should like to say a word to the Minister of Education (Mr. MacMurchy). The day before the Budget was presented the question was asked by the Hon. Member for Milestone (Mr. MacDonald) what about the 175 teachers who face dismissal from the University faculty and the cancellation of some of the new buildings on the drawing board which were cancelled only a few days ago. The answer he gave then was that the Budget would provide ample funds for the university. We will just have to wait until next day.

Well, for the benefit of the Minister of Education, budgets are being discussed long before the day the Premier, in this occasion, presents them to this House. And the University knew what kind of budget they were getting. But the Minister said everything will take shape after March 10th.

I have a news release here from the Saskatoon Star-Phoenix, issued on the day the Budget was brought in and on the third page it says:

March 14, 1972

Faculty furious with Budget.

The University Faculty Association, Thursday, blasted the Provincial Government and the University Board of Governors in the current Budget crisis.

It goes on to say:

The Association almost unanimously criticized the Government and the Board of Governors for not negotiating early enough to prevent the great and unnecessary hardships now facing a considerable portion of the faculty.

But the Minister of Education said after the Budget all things will become well again, all the teachers are going to be hired and the buildings that were on the planning board are going to be started with. This is not the case according to the Premier.

Mr. Speaker, I consider the Budget, the 1972 Budget, the greatest welfare Budget in the history of Saskatchewan. When we look at the increase in staff in most departments we come up with a grand total increase of around 500, and I use that figure loosely. It could be closer to 800, of new permanent positions as compared to last year's estimate. Oh, the Premier mentioned that a few temporary positions had now moved to permanent positions, but this in no way guarantees that they will not appoint or hire a whole rash of people to fill temporary positions. The increase in the Civil Service must be the greatest job creating industry this Government can muster. Yet the increase in staff is not nearly the total picture. What about all the additional staff required for the dozens of commissions and boards the Government intends and has announced and will announce it will set up.

The Land Bank is an example. We shall be asked to approve a grant to the Commission of \$640,000 in this Budget, but we are not told how many positions will be required. By my guess it would be that there would be in the neighbourhood of 40 to 50 people employed in this branch alone. All these Commissions and Boards could easily add up to another 400 or 500 additional staff, increasing the public service personnel by 15 per cent in the first year of the NDP New Deal and I am not including any Crown corporations in this percentage.

Let us take a look at some of the departments with major increases. Agriculture 22. The outspoken, ill-advised Attorney General, his Department will be increased by 33; the Education Department, headed by a dirt farmer, needs an increase of 97; Government Services, formerly the Department of Public Works will have 65 new positions, to inform I suppose, the public why there are no capital expenditures in his Department. Industry and Commerce will have 49 more people added to its staff. I suppose they will be needed to figure out how to tax existing industry out of the Province. The Treasury Department will add 37 to its staff. The three lawyers have done quite well for themselves. With rather small Departments they have received the lion's share of staff percentage increases. Then, of course, Welfare tops them all with a total of 196 new positions. I had always thought that this Province was over-governed, but this Government is out to police every single individual and control him in thought, speech and deed.

One of the very few pleasant surprises of the Budget to us is the fact that the highway budget was not cut by \$20 million

as you have stated so often in this Chamber you would do if you formed the Government. The Highway Department was the most severely criticized Department from Members opposite when we were the Government. All kinds of deliberate falsehoods were spread around the country where you questioned the integrity of the highway officials, the Minister and every contractor. I watched the tenders advertised and I want to commend the Department officials for having convinced the new Minister in the Government that the Department's long-range program adopted over a period of four years is a good one, as you are proceeding with it fairly closely.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Boldt: — As the Wafflers have stated there is no change in the Highway Department except that you've got a new sign. The Highway budget, the capital budget is in fact reduced although it does not show so in the Estimates. Your maintenance costs will increase by \$2 million, mainly to offset rising wages and to maintain more high quality miles of road, but a \$45 million capital Highway program will not go as far this year as will previous year because of increased costs so the contractors will have less work. Because of your pre-election utterings a good number of contractors have sold out and a number have left the province. The highway contractor, in my opinion, is a tremendous asset to the province and I hope that confidence will be restored with that industry.

Now for the benefit of the teachers in the Government I should like to turn for a moment to the Land Bank Commission. \$640,000 is earmarked for administration. \$10 million will be advanced to purchase land. If this program is to put young people on the farm the Minister cannot expect to purchase a viable unit for less than \$50,000, more likely such a unit would cost \$75,000. Even at \$50,000 the Minister is looking at about 200 farmers, or an average of about five farmers for every rural constituency.

But let's look at the administration. The administration of this commission is just so top-heavy that it scares me. If we were indeed able to buy out and resettle 200 farmers, by your own figures, Mr. Minister, you are estimating the cost of such a transaction of about \$3,000 per unit. That's about \$2,800 more than the mean old, some dirty old lawyers would charge for an agreement of sale and a transfer of title. This is what you call efficiency. \$3,000 for one transaction.

An Hon. Member: — . . . you said it.

Mr. Boldt: — Well you got \$640,000 for administration.

An Hon. Member: — . . . we got more money . . .

Mr. Boldt: — You have, you have time to speak and to tell us how you are going to spend that \$640,000. You still don't know. If land allocations are to be made, as was the case under the old CCF Government, particularly under Tobie Nollet, you will then have about 20 land commissars buying out the efficient socialist and resettling socialists, if that is possible. The CCF-NDP Land Branch of pre-Liberal Government years was nothing more than a political propaganda machine for the NDP.

March 14, 1972

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Boldt: — And the conduct of this Government since June 23rd does not seem to have changed its philosophy. Politics still is a very important role with the present Cabinet.

The Property Improvement Grant is nothing more than a continuation of the Homeowners' Grant. The Liberal Government initiated this program, with the NDP Member opposing the legislation. The rural municipal associations endorsed this program only a few days ago at their convention. The Liberals promised to increase the Homeowners' Grant to a minimum of \$100 per year. The farmer who needs the assistance most is the three-quarter section farmer, he in most cases will have less than a \$6,000 assessment so the Premier has promised that he will receive no less than \$70 but under the program as announced by the Premier he will not receive \$80, \$90 or \$100 as would be the case under the former Liberal program.

This province is also intended to give the small businessman a real shot in the arm. Well, Mr. Speaker, he needs a lot bigger shot in the arm than a mere \$130 maximum he might receive under the Property Improvement Plan. This might repay two or three per cent of the cost forced upon him by this Government under the hours of work and the minimum wage regulations. Small businesses, particularly in rural Saskatchewan, would far rather forego this measly grant of \$130 in exchange for the privileges they enjoyed before the Government dictated to him as to when he may open and close his shop. This grant is peanuts to the businessman and in no way do I see this grant making the individual business a success.

It appears now under this high cost Government, or the Welfare State, every sector of the economy must be assisted by government. Nowhere do I see in this Budget, any encouragement whatsoever for industry to come to Saskatchewan. Nowhere do I see in the Budget that the Government is to embark on a wide range of smaller industries. All you hear about is setting up commissions to study the problem. What is even more discouraging about this Budget and capital programs are away down from previous years. Not one new building for construction on the University campuses. Had the former Government not proceeded with its high capital works program at these campuses before you took office you would not even have jobs to complete the work that has been started.

Government capital expenditures will be down by \$4 million. The Saskatchewan Economic Development Corporation advances are down by \$ million. And it is highly unlikely that the \$8 million to be advanced will be needed. The Saskatchewan Municipal Financing Corporation is down by \$5 million. These four corporations' reductions are down by \$15 million, making it possible to shift \$10 million to finance the Land Bank Commission. However, the Land Bank Commission is not intended to create new jobs, except for the commissars who will be administering the program.

It is also interesting to note that the NDP interest in the construction of homes on a massive scale for our native people faded away after they became the Government. How they used to sob and cry for the poor Indian and the Métis in his hut when they were in the Opposition, particularly the Member

March 14, 1972

for Touchwood (Mr. Meakes). He had a great heart for the welfare of the Indian. Look at this Government which claims to have such a sympathetic heart for our native people. When last year the Liberal Government spent \$480,000 for the construction of houses for sale or rental to people of Indian ancestry, that Budget this year is exactly \$480,000, not one-cent increase. You fellows out there are just a bunch of saintly hypocrites when it comes to Indians.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Boldt: — One of the most extraordinary admissions of this Government's failure is the size and magnitude of the Welfare Department's budget. It feels, it is necessary to cope with the increasing number of people added to the welfare rolls, the alcoholics, the drug addicts and the NDPs wanting handouts.

The expenditure of this Department will increase from \$50 million to \$66 million for an increase of \$16 million. If you deduct a federal contribution the increase to the Province cost is from \$29 million to \$39 million or an increase of 25 per cent in welfare. I know what is happening in the Welfare Department. This Government and its predecessors have preached since 1944 that the state owes everybody a living, well or sick.

When I became the Minister of Welfare in 1964 I found out that it was not the Department's officials' fault for the many abuses that had been going on for years, but rather the Ministers and the Government in power. No votes were to be lost for the sake of issuing a welfare cheque was the slogan in those days. Inside of two years with the support and approval of the staff when I became the Minister in 1964, by 1966 the welfare rolls were reduced by 25 per cent. The Premier stated in his address the other day that the welfare rolls had increased by 35 per cent. The Government has no alternative but to increase the staff of the Welfare Department because 30 to 40 and maybe 50 thousand people, not including the natives on reserves, are committed to remain on welfare for life in the Province of Saskatchewan under the socialists.

Surely, if you had confidence that your philosophy and political would create jobs your welfare budget should in fact be reduced. But no, it is increased.

No one in his right mind in Canada will deny assistance to those in need. All people are concerned about the unfortunate, not just the NDP, but let me tell this Government and the Federals that more and more people are getting fed up with the able bodied free loader who has no intention of working nor supporting his family. The Federal and the Provincial Government must share equal responsibility. Unemployment insurance benefits and welfare cheques are metered out in multi millions of dollars as if money has gone completely out of style, while farmers and industry cannot hire help and are forced to buy bigger implements and mechanize the industry cutting off more and more jobs that will never be replaced.

These slogans of free education, free health, free dental care, free rides and free meals must surely and sanely only apply to those in need. Unemployment Insurance is not for those who decide to take time off from their jobs in winter to have a holiday. Unemployment insurance benefits and welfare cheques are becoming larger every year, so that wages in many

March 14, 1972

instances, cannot compete with these schemes.

I must agree with the Minister of Welfare in British Columbia, the Hon. Phil Gagliardi who reported in the Western Producer on March 9, 1972 and I read from the article – it has quoted Mr. Gagliardi as saying in the past Mr. Gagliardi has complained about the number of dead-beats, those who he considers too lazy to go and get jobs and the transients, especially the long-haired type who are on BC's welfare rolls. Now some of our longhaired fellows in this Chamber here are not welcome, according to Gagliardi in British Columbia.

Let me say a word about the farm economy, Mr. Speaker. The financial position of the farmer is much better today than it was a year ago.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Boldt: — but there is no way that, there is just no way how the socialists in Saskatchewan can take credit for that. Not one red penny of the farmers' income has come from the NDP, not one cent. Indeed if the socialists were not around the farmers would be much better off.

The hours of work and the minimum wage have added costs to the farmer, directly and indirectly. The farmer's source of income is directly related to the success and the efficiency of the Canadian Wheat Board. If they can sell grain the farmer benefits and if grain sells usually the price of beef and pork is also good.

I want to give credit today to the Minister in Charge of the Wheat Board for selling more grain than the railways can handle.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Boldt: — I have always maintained that subsidies, rents or even a two-price system doesn't mean as much to the wheat farmer as an extra two-bushel quota. Otto Lang has finally got some bugs out of the Wheat Board officials. Had the Federal Liberals fired Wheat Board Commissioner McNamara five years ago we would have very few grain surpluses today. There are still some problems with storage and the railways to our Western ports. Constructing another railway will not solve the problem when nature controls many factors in the movement of grain. The answer I believe is a storage problem. If storage were increased at the West Coast railways could operate at full capacity when hazards of nature are not threatening. These problems will be tackled and solved hopefully very shortly.

I hope when the Prime Minister calls an election, Saskatchewan will send a good number of Liberals to Ottawa to represent Saskatchewan on the Government side. God forbid that we send incompetent arrogant socialists from Saskatchewan to Ottawa.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Boldt: — This Government has shown that they can spend money all right, if it is given to them by seven years of good

March 14, 1972

Provincial Liberal Government and from the Federal Government. We have enough of the welfare state. Mr. Speaker, I am sure it is obvious to you that I will not support the main motion. I therefore move, seconded by my colleague from Milestone, Mr. MacDonald:

That all the words after “That” be deleted and the following substituted therefore:

This Assembly deeply regrets that this government has completely ignored the need for industrial growth and development to eliminate high unemployment and has sought solution to this problem by massive increases in welfare spending.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

The debate continues on the motion and the amendment.

Mr. J.A. Pepper (Weyburn): — Mr. Speaker, last Friday afternoon our Premier and Treasurer of the Province introduced the Budget for 1972. The largest Budget in the history of the province and a balanced Budget. A because which has been very carefully planned and thought out with one main object in mind, and that is to implement our election policies and province which in turn will introduce a New Deal for the people of Saskatchewan.

I am sure, Mr. Speaker, it is only natural that all Members look at a budget in the terms of just what does it contain that will be of benefit to their own constituency. As an individual I am very interested in my own constituency and its progress. But as a Member of Government one also has to realize that you are working as a team or group to formulate and introduce legislation, setting aside sums of money to be used for the betterment of the province in general. I am sure that this Budget will change the slump that we have fallen into in the past few years and will once again start the wheels of our economy rolling.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Pepper: — My concern, Mr. Speaker, is that each constituency shares equally in the economy of our province and that every citizen has an equal opportunity with its advancement or its improvements regardless of their religion, their profession, their nationality, their colour or their creed. And this Budget, Mr. Speaker, is one that is based on the needs of all its people and I believe will give our people this opportunity.

Mr. Speaker, I have decided to gear my remarks to and how this Budget is going to have its effect on the economy of our province, chiefly in the field of agriculture. Because I believe, Mr. Speaker, if agriculture is not given its rightful place as top priority, the wheels of progress will grind very slowly.

At the current Legislature Session many important pieces of legislation relating to the agricultural industry will be and have been introduced. At the top of the list is the Land Bank Commission. We are convinced, Mr. Speaker, that a Land Bank will be a major asset to the family farm in Saskatchewan. We

March 14, 1972

are at the same time providing much needed assistance to younger farmers and to allow them to develop an economically viable family farm unit. It will be arrangements advantageous to farmers who wish to pass on their farm from father to son. But, Mr. Speaker, I can assure you that it won't be of any advantage to the large corporate farm.

The Hon. Minister of agricultural (Mr. Messer) was met with an overwhelming response from the public as he travelled around the province in January, holding public meetings dealing with the proposed program. I believe in all there were 11,000 people who attended the 13 meetings. The meetings enabled the Minister to get a first-hand assessment of his proposals and at the same time involve the public in building the legislation to best serve the needs of the agricultural community. But despite this, the Liberals went boldly ahead and announced that they would vigorously oppose its implementation. You would think they would learn something after their defeat in last June's provincial election. Obviously they haven't because they are still convinced that behind the Land Bank lies a dark and sinister plot to take away the land from the farmer. Even the Federal Liberals have endorsed the principle of a Land Bank. I think someone should give the message to the Hon. Member from Prince Albert West and his colleagues sitting in this Provincial Legislature.

Price stability in feed grains is another issue of major importance to both livestock and grain producers. In the last few years both farmers and operators of feedlots have been hampered by the uncertainty produced by major price fluctuations in feed grains. For this reason we are introducing legislation to add greater price stability in the marketing of feed grains.

We are planning to construct veterinary clinics and also provide for inspection of all feeder cattle and hogs sold at auctions. This will help maintain the high quality of beef and pork produced in the province of Saskatchewan and I am sure it will also give added protection to the consumer.

In this Budget there are provisions drawn up in legislation to help the dairy industry by providing grants to encourage the production of manufactured milk. We hope to provide greater stability to the incomes of dairy producers and keep the smaller producer in business. In some areas of our province this industry is very important and I am pleased to see this Government is giving dairy producers consideration.

Surface rights legislation is another area in need of revision. The Weyburn area is a major oil producer, but as you will know, Mr. Speaker, very little of the wealth remains here or even in the province. Higher provincial revenues are definitely needed to compensate for the loss of this non-renewable resource. Legislation to provide a fair method of compensating farmers for their surface rights will also be implemented. Perhaps at a later debate I may have more to say on this legislation.

I have mentioned a half dozen aspects of Saskatchewan agriculture which will be covered in the current Legislative Session and which have been covered in the Budget. However, we still need to go further, Mr. Speaker. While the Land Bank Commission will be a necessary first step to improve the economic and social structure of rural Saskatchewan there is still a need for Federal assistance in order to check the

March 14, 1972

decline of our rural communities, to stop the exodus of citizens from this Province and to ensure that our family farms achieve economic viability.

I would have to say, Mr. Speaker, that our task would be much easier if agriculture were purely a provincial responsibility. Unfortunately the Liberal Government is doing almost nothing to help western agriculture. When they do come forward with programs aimed at the agricultural industry they find that almost in each instance, their proposals are inadequate and unacceptable to Western Canadian farmers. One only has to look at such programs as the LIFT program, Stabilization Bill, the Task Force Report and the Federal Land Bank scheme. I would have to say that the later is a perfect example of Liberal shortsightedness. While the Province Land Bank will limit the expansion of farm assets covered by the Bill to some "\$60,000, the Federal scheme has no such provision. The effect of the Liberal plan can only add to rural depopulation and increased corporate farming. Though they deny it, Mr. Speaker, this is another proof that the Liberals are determined to eliminate two-thirds of our farmers off the land. I can only say, with friends like this, who needs enemies.

One of the most pressing problems being encountered by prairie farmers centres on the movement of prairie grain to West Coast ports. While Otto Lang's projection that the Canadian Wheat Board will sell some 800 million bushels of grain this year is good news, he doesn't like being reminded that we are already 25 million bushels behind meeting our current obligations. The Wheat Board just signed an agreement last week, I believe, with Russia to supply up to 185 million bushels of wheat and flour over the next 18 months. Since 40 per cent of all wheat that was exported in the last crop year was shipped through West Coast ports the next year will probably see the greatest bottleneck of wheat in Canadian history. Then I believe it was just the other day a further omen surfaced with the announcement from Lang that shipping problems to the West Coast will probably mean a cutback in meeting our current commitments. I can only say, Mr. Speaker, that this is not much encouragement from a Federal Government which has repeatedly done nothing to improve the handling system, despite suggestions and pleas from Western Canadian farmers. To show where Province Liberals stand on this critical situation, Mr. Speaker, one is only reminded of the various occasions when emergency debates are launched by our New Democratic Members to press Ottawa for greater action and to alleviate some of these shipping problems, rather than sharing our concerns, the Members sitting to your left, Mr. Speaker, prefer to either criticize our action or they introduce amendments giving praise to the Federal Liberal Government for its neglect, its lack of interest and lack of planning that the Government demonstrates towards our Western farmers. So you see, as I have heard the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Steuart) say before, a Liberal is a Liberal is a Liberal!

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Pepper: — Their persistent arrogance when it comes to discussing agriculture, Mr. Speaker, continues to amaze me.

I should like to briefly highlight some other aspects of the Budget Speech delivered in the Legislature Friday afternoon

March 14, 1972

by Premier Blakeney. Replacement of the Homeowner Grant program, one which doubles the amount of money to be paid out in grants to property owners and includes small businesses for the first time, along with a heavy emphasis on agriculture, I think these must be considered as highlights.

This, the first Budget of New Democratic Government since assuming office last June, is balance as I said earlier and the largest in Saskatchewan's history. The speech is optimistic about the economy of the province which showed a marked upturn in 1971. Total estimated revenues are some \$514 million, while expenditures are estimated at \$513.2 million. Realized net farm income increased 876 per cent over the previous year. Livestock marketing of cattle, calves, sheep and hogs were all up. The gross value of mineral production rose \$421 million over that of 1970. Retail sales, Mr. Speaker, of some \$1,121,000 were 10 per cent above the previous year.

The combined ordinary and capital budget of the Department of Agriculture amounts to some \$18 million an increase of 11 per cent over the estimate of last year under the former Liberal Government. The because Budget sets aside \$10 million for the purchase of land and some \$600,000 for a 'start up;' and operating expenses for the Land Bank Commission. Approximately \$2.3 million will be spent on further development of irrigation works on the west side of the South Saskatchewan River project.

Somewhere over \$150,000 is provided to explore new approaches and develop new techniques to increase marketing opportunity. \$400,000 is provided to assist in the development of an industrial milk processing industry. Grants amounting to 40 per cent of the estimated cost for construction of veterinary clinics, which I mentioned earlier, will be provided. Another \$300,00 is allocated for expansion of the community pastures program.

The crop insurance program is to be expanded to include all crop production areas of the province and will include the additional crops of rapeseed and flax.

Now just let me mention, Mr. Speaker, at this time how pleased I am and I am sure that many of our citizens will be, when on April 1st the sales tax or the Education and Health tax will be removed on meals costing \$2.50 and under. This tax, Mr. Speaker, was a tax implemented by the former government, a tax which again in most cases affected those least able to pay. I should like at some time to see it completely removed on all meals. But I have to say that if one can afford a steak dinner or whatever it might be in the area of \$ to \$7 range, I say he can afford to pay that extra tax as well. But, there are many of our pensioners and lower income families, our young students and our civil servants who have the occasion to eat out where their financial resources are very limited. These are the people, Mr. Speaker, who will reap benefit from this removal of the tax, and I am proud that our Government has seen fit to recognize them.

When the history of our province, Mr. Speaker, is being prepared and noted achievements are being listed, I am sure that one of Saskatchewan's greatest accomplishments will be the development and pioneering of hospital and medical care programs in Canada which took place under the former CCF Government. And from this Budget, Mr. Speaker, the Premier introduced it in

March 14, 1972

this House on Friday, it will prove to me that our New Democratic Party intends to continue that tradition and will not be satisfied until this right of every citizen is provided for them and strongly endorsed.

I was very pleased, Mr. Speaker, to see the Alcoholism Commission is being given a greater assistance to provide the much needed treatment for those patients who require it. I am sure the opening of the new in-patient treatment centre in St. Paul's Hospital in Saskatoon will prove to be of vast importance and will increase the facilities to be provided for the use of the Alcoholism Commission and the treatment of those unfortunate people.

You know, Mr. Speaker, so often as governments and as Members we place such strong emphasis on the standard of living that we should provide for our people in this province. This is very important, I grant you, but very seldom – and I emphasize this – very seldom, do we consider the standard of life itself, and I think this is equally important. By increasing our contributions substantially to this Alcoholism Commission and introducing a new program to assist the Native Alcoholism Council with its work is to be a very important step to improving the standard of life for many people and I am sure credit will be given to the Premier for this very commendable inclusion of it in his Budget.

Well, Mr. Speaker, there are other things I suppose I could touch on at this time, but I think you will gather from my remarks that I am wholeheartedly supporting the Budget. I cannot support the amendment.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. E.L. Tchorzewski (Humboldt): — Mr. Speaker, I was thinking here a minute ago as I was watching the opposite side of the House that I was going to compliment the Members opposite on returning to the Chamber because I noted that during the last one hour or so there has been a maximum of four out of 15 in their seats at any one time. I note that that has even got down to three out of 15. It seems that the Members opposite refused to listen to the people of Saskatchewan in June and they continue that kind of a policy today as well.

Mr. Speaker, after listening to the Member from Arm River (Mr. Faris) in this debate I now know better than every before why so much work done by the former Government was so haphazard and confused and I should like to congratulate the Members from Arm River and Cut Knife (Mr. Kwasnica), Regina Wascana (Mr. Baker), Biggar (Mr. Cowley) and Weyburn (Mr. Pepper), on the excellent job they did in presenting their addresses today. Their words were a valuable contribution to this Legislature and are a pleasant and welcome contrast to the negative approach taken by the Members opposite.

Now the Member from Rosthern (Mr. Boldt) spoke of not answering letters written to him when he was Minister of Highways. I would suggest that he should search deep down within this conscience, Mr. Speaker, and re-assess his thinking and he may conclude that his very neglect was a display of the kind of arrogance that he spoke about. The Member from Rosthern also referred to the Welfare Budget. He spoke of an increase in

March 14, 1972

staff in the Department of Welfare. Well let me remind him that it was the Leader of his political Party in Ottawa, Prime Minister Trudeau, who has forced people to go on welfare by intentionally creating unemployment in his lame-duck effort to stop inflation. And it is his Federal Leader who is responsibility for increasing welfare costs. He and his colleagues opposite have supported this kind of ruthless policy to the last letter.

Mr. Speaker, as a new Member of this House I have listened and watched with anticipation the proceedings. I must say that yesterday I listened with some degree of amazement as I heard the comments by the Members from the opposite side of the House as they struggled desperately in their attempts to find something in the Budget to criticize.

Last Friday the financial critic closed off his remarks with the bold enunciation that the Budget was a poor cousin Budget, whatever that means. And I believe that the Member from Arm River explained only too well. Clearly the Liberal Members opposite are only interested in the Liberal Party and not in Saskatchewan. And after a whole weekend of research and toil at this speech, he began and closed on Monday with the same statements.

And not to be left out, Mr. Speaker, even the Member from Milestone (Mr. MacDonald) got into the act, and I stress the word 'act'. He is quoted in the Leader-Post as saying that Saskatchewan is destined to become the highest taxed province in Canada within the next four years. He would have preferred to be able to say so during the Provincial Treasurer's Budget speech but the best that he could muster at that time was some comment about the distribution of the Budget to Members. Mr. Speaker, either he has a very short memory about the usual procedure of the former Government, of which he was a Minister, or he is trying to take advantage of radio time to distort the facts and mislead the public in the usual manner of the former Government.

Now Saskatchewan people, Mr. Speaker, proved last June that they were not so easily fooled but evidently the Member from Albert Park (Mr. MacLeod) is easier prey because it seems that he was convinced by his colleague on the Opposition front bench to the extent that he had to try and defend the actions of the former Minister of Welfare when he interrupted the Premier during the Budget Speech.

The Member from Albert Park should read the Debates and Proceedings of the last seven years from time to time and see for himself how badly he was misinformed. To give one mild example, Mr. Speaker, the financial critic had all weekend to prepare his statement on the Budget this year, in 1970 the present Provincial Treasurer who was the financial critic in that year had one day to prepare his reply.

Now, Mr. Speaker, Members opposite speak of increased taxes. Well I wonder why they don't talk about the taxes which have been reduced or even abolished. They talk about increased taxes but they make no mention of deterrent fees which this Government abolished last summer and reduced taxes to the sick by \$7.5 million.

I wonder why they don't speak of Medicare for our senior citizens provided to people over 65 years of age without payment

March 14, 1972

of premiums. I wonder why they don't talk of reduced taxes to those senior citizens who built this Province. A tax reduction of \$3.5 million. And why do they choose to ignore the tax that they had imposed on the estates of mental patients which this Government removed last summer. A saving of \$355,000.

Now the Member from Milestone (Mr. MacDonald) and the Member from Regina Albert Park (Mr. MacLeod) talk of increasing taxes. Well, Mr. Speaker, talk is talk, and I never hesitate to give credit where credit is due and I must say that they are very good at talking, but it is this Government that is removing the hot dog tax on meals of up to \$2.50.

The financial critic talks about robbing from Peter to pay Paul. He bewails the fact that this Government will be getting increased revenue from our natural resources. He doesn't like it because he still believes, as all the Members opposite believe, as the former Government believed, that the old, the sick and the mentally ill and those who because of the nature of their work must eat in cafes, should be taxed so that the corporate friends of the Members opposite could be paid to come into Saskatchewan to exploit our resources. They believe that those least able to pay should be taxed so that our resources can be part of a big giveaway to corporate magnates of New York and New Mexico. I submit, Mr. Speaker, that the resources of this Province should benefit all the people of Saskatchewan. The stress on increased revenues from resources are welcome and I must say, it's about time.

Members opposite may talk of increasing taxes. They may turn and distort the figures but their own record is still there and it is a dismal one. In 1968 along, despite the promises in the 1967 election to reduce taxes and hold the line, the former Government created the most massive tax increases in history. An increase in taxes which was a total cost to taxpayers of \$38,000,000 in 1968 was announced on that Black Friday: 1. Sales tax was raised from 4 per cent to 5 per cent and expanded to include other areas. 2. Deterrent fees were imposed on the ill. 3. Gasoline tax went up 2 cents a gallon. 4. Driver's license doubled. 5. Car and school bus licenses went up 50 per cent. 6. Farm truck licenses doubled. And that is only a partial list, Mr. Speaker.

I am amazed, Mr. Speaker, when I hear Members opposite speak of increasing taxes. They still seem to be unable to accept the fact that the voters of Saskatchewan cannot be fooled. Unwilling to realize that last June the voters listened and acted on that Liberal record. Mr. Speaker, had the financial critic studied the financial statements of the Province of Saskatchewan covering the period of time from 1964 when the Liberals took office to October 14, 1970, he might have decided to follow in the footsteps of Mr. Rock who the other day left the Trudeau party. Unfortunately he jumped out of the frying pan into the fire because I noticed he has joined the Conservative Party.

Those records, Mr. Speaker, show the provincial taxes, fees and license charges which were increased or invented by the Liberal Government of Saskatchewan since 1964. During those dismal years the number of fees and taxes affected, Mr. Speaker, counts up to a total of 1,147 increases.

And while they were doing this to the taxpayers of Saskatchewan they were giving away our resources with every kind of

March 14, 1972

concession to corporations that they could find. I invite the Members on your left, Mr. Speaker, to compare that record to the record of this Government in the last eight months.

Mr. Speaker, the burden of taxation on property owners is a heavy one. Great inequities exist and action needs to be taken to correct them. In the fiscal year of 1969-70 Saskatchewan farmers paid \$59,883,000 in property taxes. Of this amount over \$34 million was used to finance elementary and secondary education. The average total per capital property tax levied was \$232 for farmers, \$106 for village residents, and \$165 for city residents. The education portion of a family of five was approximately \$600 for a farm family, \$300 for a family residing in a village and \$350 for those in cities.

When farm income fell to bankruptcy levels, the property taxes still had to be paid. When the city or village or town resident was forced into the unemployment list because Prime Minister Trudeau, supported by the former Province Government, decided that the way to fight inflation was to create unemployment, he still had to pay his property taxes. This system of financing education is unjust. Education is a benefit to the entire province and nation and should be financed on the basis of ability to pay.

Well, Mr. Speaker, let's examine the record of the former Government in this area of taxation. Let's examine the record of those who seem to indicate such enlightened knowledge about increased taxation. Let's look for example at the Yorkton Unit: 1965, 35 mills; 1968 up to 45 mills – 10 mills in three years. Let's look at the Melville Unit: 1965, 34 mills; 1968 up to 45 mills – up 11 mills in three years. These are moderate examples. Let's look at Yorkton City where between 1964 and 1967 the mill rate increased by 20 mills in three years or let's look at the town of Lemberg where the mill rate increased by 22 mills in three years.

Now the financial critic opposite suggested that this Government was passing the buck in education. Well, Mr. Speaker, I agree. I agree that this Government is passing the bucks to school boards in the form of an 11.7 per cent increase in grants over the last year and an increase of 13.5 per cent if calculated on a student basis. I agree that this Government is increasing operating grants to school board by \$12 million over the grant levels approved by the previous Government. The costs of education have increased and the increased grants presented in this year's Budget will be welcomed by the taxpayers and school boards of this Province.

Mr. Speaker, the Premier's announcement in his Budget speech of the massive new program to provide grants for homes, farms and small businesses, the Property improvement Grants, will help ease some of the burden of taxation on the property owner. It will help some of the burden of taxation whether he be a homeowner, a farmer or a small businessman. No doubt the Members opposite, who pretend to be the friend of the farmer, pretend to be the friend of the small businessman, are going to vote against this – Property Improvement Grant because there is no doubt about it that they will be opposing the Budget.

The average mill rate for education in Saskatchewan for education purposes is 43 mills. The grant of amounts of money equal to 13 mills of assessment indirectly means a reduction to

an average of 30 mills and is a major step in reducing the mill rate for education to an average of 25 mills.

Mr. Speaker, the Liberals promised to reduce taxes in 1967, they raised taxes in 1968. The New Democratic Party promised to help the property owner and action is being taken on that promise.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Tchorzewski: — The financial critic, Mr. Speaker, spent some time expressing his concern about the fact that construction at the University of Saskatchewan is down. He was strong and repetitive in his suggestion that some 100 university teachers will not be rehired this year. It is amazing how he and his colleagues to your left are able to make a political about face unmatched by any military drill on the parade ground.

It was only two short years ago when the Members opposite were complaining about the varsity pupil ratio. I have here a news article from the December 22, 1970 edition of the Star-Phoenix where the headline reads as follows: "Varsity pupil ratio must rise. Thatcher."

The former Premier was quoted as saying:

The University of Saskatchewan will have to sharply increase its student-teacher ratio next year if it hopes to get the normal grant.

Now I am not suggesting that I agree with this, Mr. Speaker, but I do want to point out the inconsistency and the confusion of the Members opposite.

Yesterday, Mr. Speaker, the Members opposite had already forgotten their stand in 1970. The day when it was expected that all high school students had to get a university degree before they could be considered educated are gone. Education has taken on a far wider sphere. Young people are needed in greater numbers in the technical field.

I am pleased that the Budget makes provision for a new Department of Continuing Education and I welcome the announcement of the provision of some 950 additional placements in our Institutes of Applied Arts and Sciences.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to see that our Government is taking major action to revitalize our rural communities. Over the past several years, rural communities have undergone very serious setbacks. Rural depopulation has contributed to the loss of business in our small towns. A serious loss of farm income has been a contributor to the closing of many businesses in small towns and villages. The more attractive opportunities and facilities in the city have been attracting our young people away from rural communities. Our Government recognizes these problems and major programs are being developed to meet them.

The Land Bank will not only provide an opportunity for our older farmers to retire with dignity and comfort, it will provide an opportunity for young farmers to get started in farming and thus slow down and maybe even stop rural depopulation.

March 14, 1972

\$10 million has been allotted in this Budget for purchase of farm and offered for sale.

People in our rural communities will welcome the announced \$2 million to continue the program of extending telephone service to previously unserved areas. People in our rural communities will welcome a new program in this Budget to enable towns and villages to apply dust-free surfacing to their streets. We must develop our rural communities and make them more pleasant places in which to live.

This Government's Winter Works Program to complement the program introduced by the Federal Government has helped create employment. It has also helped to provide much needed facilities for local communities - facilities which people today have a right to expect.

The program has helped provide facilities for recreation, facilities to improve needed services such as hospitals, fire protection and community centres and facilities to promote cultural activity.

Mr. Speaker, the New Democratic Party promised to help small business people and programs will be provided to fulfil this promise. Small businesses have been included under the Property Improvement Grants along with homes and farms. This will help ease the tax burden which multiplied itself under the seven years of Liberal Government.

Whereas the former Government concerned itself only with large corporate enterprises such as Parsons and Whittemore, our Government recognizes the importance of the small businessman and will be providing direct assistance within the Department of Industry and Commerce through the Business Assistance Branch.

Our rural communities and the small businessman in those communities are essential to provide the services necessary to rural Saskatchewan. We must make very effort available to prevent Saskatchewan from becoming a province of a few large cities with vast empty stretches of land in between. This Province, Mr. Speaker, has a resource which is envied by almost every nation on this earth. We have some of the most beautiful expanses of land that can be found anywhere. Our waters are to a large extent not yet polluted as they are in most other parts of this continent.

There is a potential in Saskatchewan for one of the most important industries in Canada. People across North America are begging for the opportunity to get away from the smog and begging for the opportunity to get away from the pollution in the overcrowded cities.

The former Government seemed determined to destroy this natural beauty and this potential industry. I am pleased that our Government will be putting a great deal of importance in the development of our tourist industry. The provision of tourist facilities and the promotion of our province's tourist attractions will make Saskatchewan a Mecca for millions of not only Canadians, but North Americans in their search for some relief from the over-organized, overcrowded, polluted cities of this continent.

March 14, 1972

Mr. Speaker, the Budget presented on Friday is a blueprint for the prosperity of Saskatchewan. It is once again a Budget which will begin to put our province in the lead in every facet of government across this country and I submit that in years to come other provinces will once again follow our example as they once did before the Liberal Party took office in 1964.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Tchorzewski: — Individual rights and human development will once again take on some importance. Our working people will no longer be abused and progress in labour relations will be made. Agriculture will be recognized for its importance not only to Saskatchewan, but to all of Canada. The property owner will be given a New Deal. Education and health are being given high priority.

Mr. Speaker, after seven years of Liberal mismanagement and stagnation, after seven years of social and economic drought, after seven years of cold-hearted neglect of the basic problems of society, Saskatchewan is once again on the move.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, may I say that I am most impressed with the Budget and in the way that it was presented by the Premier and Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Blakeney). I can recall listening to Budget speeches of the past seven years which spent more time on petty politics and less time on the programs. No doubt, Mr. Speaker, this was the case because there were few programs to talk about.

This Budget, as presented last Friday, is truly a people's Budget and I congratulate Mr. Blakeney on an excellent job of preparing it and presenting it.

Mr. Speaker, I oppose the amendment and will most emphatically support the motion.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. A. Taylor (Kerrobot-Kindersley): — Mr. Speaker, I don't intend to take much of the time of the House in this debate. I know that will please some of the Members opposite who are always afraid to listen to the truth at any rate.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Taylor: — I should like to take the opportunity of commending the Treasurer and Premier (Mr. Blakeney) on a Budget which has been designed to serve the needs and aspirations of all the people of Saskatchewan.

In our local area of Kerrobot-Kindersley constituency there has been a good deal of pleasure already expressed about the Budget after it was revealed on Friday. They know that they are grateful that it appears that this New Deal will continue for some time. Just yesterday the Industry and Commerce Minister (Mr. Thorson) announced that a museum grant had been approved for the Kindersley Plains Museum, a museum which is an effort of people in the local area concerned with preserving their heritage. Concerned with preserving a way of life that

March 14, 1972

is important to each and every one of us. A way of life that we will not sell out to big business or foreign countries.

I should like to look at a few of the programs in the Budget itself. One can hardly start without mentioning first the Land Bank. Now it was said a little while ago, across the floor, that no one was interested. Well that is a rather amazing statement in view of the turnout and the attendance at meetings held throughout the province. I attended the meeting at Rosetown a few weeks ago, when the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Messer) was there. Although I was about ten minutes early for the meeting I had trouble getting in the door. The hall couldn't hold everyone that wanted to be there.

Just about four weeks ago we conducted four Land Bank workshops throughout our constituency to get the feelings of our own people, for we want to be a representative government. In one of the constituencies that isn't that large we have over 200 people attending.

Now the Budget has set out \$10 million for land purchase and \$600,000 for operating expenses. Maybe if the Members opposite are not particularly interested, this should indicate that we at least take this program seriously. But there has been a good deal of confusion. I am not sure where it all comes from but one of my friends in the area who happens to be a good Liberal came up to me concerned about the Land Bank proposal. He was concerned about the proposal and he said, "The only thing that bothers me is the option to buy." And I said, "Well what is wrong with the option to buy clause?" He said, "Well that means that the Government will own all the land." It seems to me that this was good Liberal thinking.

Now there is also in the Budget, a general increase which will be available for agricultural purposes, an increase that will show up in many fields. We are pleased, in our area, to see the crop insurance being extended to cover the whole province and to include the two additional crops, something we feel is necessary. We are very happy particularly in the north end of the constituency around Kerrobert, which has a good many farmers interested in cattle, to see that the Provincial Government will assist in the establishment of veterinary clinics by paying 50 per cent of the estimated cost of construction.

I think the amount budgeted for Agriculture shows the importance to which this Government places in the agricultural industry itself.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Taylor: — This is why we considered the movement of grain, a good subject for an emergency debate in this House, because we think this is vital to the economy and welfare of our people. We feel this way particularly after the Government checked to see that there were alternatives available. And while Members opposite tell us there is no way to get from one track to another, the newspaper tells us that 100 cars when over that track.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear

March 14, 1972

Mr. Taylor: — Now the Member for Rosthern (Mr. Boldt) made a statement I thought I would never hear in this House. A statement I thought I would never hear any Member on any side of the House ever say. He said that farmers aren't concerned. I suggest that after the next Federal election he will see how concerned they are.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Taylor: —The Budget also promises assistance for small towns. In our constituency there are many small towns. Too many, almost, to consider individually in terms of listing them, but small towns that are literally fighting for survival, attempting to exist in a day of bigness and a day when men are being chased off their farms. It seems to me that the Budget is going to give them help. They will be happy to know that the amount being made available for dust-free surfacing of their roads will almost be tripled under the New Deal for people.

Now this does a number of things, not the least of which will be to help maintain population and provide services without a vast increase in property taxes. I say it will help to maintain population. We have many elderly citizens in these communities who have difficulty in getting around, particularly in the constituency where I come from where we have some pretty sticky mud. They sometimes leave and the only reason that many of them leave is because they are shut in all during the rainy season or spring and they can't get out. Most of them go to cities and when you talk to them afterwards you find they are anything but happy there.

The towns themselves have wanted to make these improvements but the cost has been astronomical. They will look forward, I am sure, to receiving this kind of assistance.

I mentioned during the Debate on the Speech from the Throne how happy I was to see that a small business branch would be established, and again I say this as it arises in the Budget. It is time that we considered more than just the large corporations which have all the borrowing power in the world at their fingertips, and give some consideration to the small man who is the only independent agent, who is the only real free enterpriser left in our society. This Government intends to assist him by providing management advice, direct grants and loans. This is all badly needed.

The Property Improvement Grants will also assist the small town and the rural community. Every segment of society will benefit from it. I am not going to say much about this as it has already been covered adequately by most of the speakers. But I do want to say something about Welfare or what will be the new Department of Social Services.

I am most happy to see that funds will be made available for an increase in staff. Mr. Speaker, it disturbs me when I hear Members in this House casting insinuations about the clients on the welfare rolls, suggesting that they are poor because they are lazy and they don't want to work. What actually happens is that the Senate Committee on Poverty, although it didn't do an awful lot it did set some facts straight. It says that three quarters of all poor families have at least one

March 14, 1972

full-time wage earner. More than 60 per cent of low-income family heads worked in 1967. It says in the Committee Report that all evidence demonstrates that they are poor, not because they do not want to work, but in spite of working.

The same Report also points out that 84 per cent of the people receiving welfare are incapable of working. That leaves only, in my subtraction, 16 per cent that are able to work. The Senators also said that the number of poor who try to beat the system is extremely small. They say that it is almost certainly less than 2 per cent. That is a pretty small failure rate. In my work I deal with people who are on welfare quite a bit of the time, people who need social assistance. One of the concerns that I have had is that under the previous Liberal administration the Department of Welfare was strangled literally to death. It wasn't able to do the job it was intended to do. The job it was intended to do was not just provide handouts but to provide assistance to the families. The only thing that this stranglehold, is to go into the house, sit down, fill out the form and leave. I suggest that with a larger staff they can do more in assisting the families to find alternatives, to find a new direction when it is needed, for life itself.

If I may say just a word about highways. The criticism has been levelled that it is stuck at \$45 million. I think we will get more miles out of the \$45 million than the previous administration. But I hope too that the new Minister will consider more the social need of the people in the area than simply the shortest route for long distance trucking. We have seen more farmland wrecked and destroyed by highway construction than by any other means.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Taylor: — I would be less than honest if I didn't admit that I hope in the Highway budget there will be some work for our constituency. We have been asking for it for a long time, for a good number of years for two highways, 44 and 330. We are looking forward to hearing the Minister's report and hoping that he has something worthwhile to offer us.

We are also happy about the removal of tax on meals under \$2.50. It was rather a nuisance when children went to the fair to have to pay tax on their hot dogs or on their hamburgers, or on anything else that they bought. It also created a number of difficulties for charitable organizations putting on banquets at \$1.50. but then everyone is taxed by the Liberals.

I think one of the things that can be said of this Government, and I think it is one of the most important things, it concerns its approachability, the way it is available to the people who want to reach it. The Member for Rosthern (Mr. Boldt) said that he did not reply to a letter from Dr. Faris because he thought the letter was arrogant and not work answering. In spite of the fact, he also admitted he didn't know who Dr. Faris was. The letters he doesn't like get thrown in file 13. Now, this isn't an isolated case. Our school board wrote to the previous Minister of Education (Mr. McIsaac) about two years ago and never received the courtesy of a reply. Now, this wasn't an individual, it was a school board. We didn't even get a reply. Never has Saskatchewan seen such arrogance

as was displayed during the seven years of wandering in the Liberal wilderness.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Taylor: — This is one of the reasons that I think in spite of the figure mentioned, it's good to see a hot line being established. I hope our Ministers will always show more courtesy than this.

In the Throne Speech Debate, Mr. Speaker, I said that it was encouraging to note that it expressed pride and confidence in our province and our people. It promised programs that emphasized social responsibility and human values. It is obvious, Sir, that this Budget provides the means for carrying out these programs and I am happy to support it.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

The Assembly recess until 7:00 o'clock p.m.

Mr. A. Thibault (Melfort-Kinistino): — Mr. Speaker, first of all I want to congratulate the Premier, the Treasurer for the wonderful Budget that has been presented to this Province. I am sure that it is a progressive Budget. I think that by the time the people get acquainted with the New Deal for this Province which is only a few months old, the truths will be pretty well proven to this Province at the end of four years. I also want to congratulate the Member for Souris-Estevan (Mr. Thorson) and the Member for Morse (Mr. Wiebe) for making their way into this House and also the Member for Prince Albert West (Mr. Steuart) for becoming the Leader of the Opposition. I am sure he is going to do his job the best he can. I must say I hope he soon gets back to the House. It will liven up the other side a little bit because he contributes quite well.

I haven't spoken in the debate of the Speech from the Throne so naturally I will continue a bit on congratulatory messages. I also want to congratulate the two Members in the Cabinet, the Member for Souris-Estevan (Mr. Thorson) and the Member for Saskatoon Mayfair (Mr. Brockelbank). Some might think Mr. Thorson is new in politics but I remember sitting with him in 1960. So he is not new to me. I am quite sure he will prove his ability to us before too long. I also want to congratulate the Member for Saskatoon Mayfair for being appointed as Minister of Public works. There again you have youth and ability. I want to congratulate the Premier for making such good choices for his Cabinet.

I also want to say a few words about what has happened in the last years. I want to say a few words about the introduction of students in this Legislature. I can remember a few years ago, the then Member for Souris-Estevan got up in this Legislature and brought in a resolution that he didn't want to be bothered introducing students any more, that it was a waste of time. I have been keeping time a little bit during this Session and it amounts to about two and a half minutes a day. If we cannot spend two and a half minutes a day to introduce a couple or three hundred students, the day that a Party starts to feel that it takes too much time to recognize these young people who sometimes travel 300 miles, I say you are in

March 14, 1972

trouble. I advise every Member of this Legislature to pay special attention to these young = because they are going to be the Government before too long. We are only here for a time. I should like to point out that there are very few Members left who were here when I first came. Time goes very fast. I also want to point out that I am the closest to the door. I don't know what that means. This could very well mean something, that I may not be back. But I have been told that I wouldn't be back every election that came along. The last time I was elected, I was elected to represent two constituencies.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Thibault: — Melfort and Kinistino. They said, "If we can't defeat him, we'll wear him out."

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Thibault: — So, anyway, they will have to find other means. I should like to say a few words about our students. I have visited teachers, and even this year, I was asked to go into the classroom to speak to the students. I want to advise every Member of this Legislature that that is a good thing. You try to keep it on a non-partisan basis. You would be surprised what these young people are asking, the questions they ask. Even the teachers were amazed. I got into the school at 1:30 and I was able to leave only after school was dismissed. Well, there is one thing it does, it creates an interest in Government and that helps. The students write letters, they want information. I might say that there is one thing that they ask for and I want to recommend it to the Government. They said that the statute books of this Province should be in every high school in the province. And what's wrong with that? I think it would be a very good idea because they are curious to know what's in there.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Thibault: — I brought along the statute books, the Votes and Proceedings, *Hansard*, Public Accounts, journals and explained these to them. They told me that is worth something. I left them with the school. But what would be wrong to send a copy of the Journal, a copy of Public Accounts and so on to every high school in the province? Nothing wrong with it. Someone told me if we let the MLAs come to the school, and I would go only on invitation, no other way. The school kids invited me in and I said I wouldn't go unless the teacher invited me. The teacher did invite me under pressure from the students. They said if we let you in then it will be the mayor of the town, the fire chief, the police chief. I said, "What's wrong with it?" There is nothing wrong with having the police chief come to the school to talk to the students on invitation. I think we should develop more respect for the law. I think it would go a long way. We should not ignore these young people. They want our attention. Let's give it to them.

Another think, I would appeal to the Members of this House, that when the galleries are filled with students we put on a better show than what we sometimes do. I think a little more decorum would certainly be a good example to our young people.

Mr. Cody: — Get rid of those Members.

Mr. Thibault: — I won't take any blood tests.

Now I want to say a few words about the Land Bank. I want to congratulate the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Messer) for the wonderful job he has done bringing the information . . .

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Thibault: — . . . to the people. I want to tell the Members of this House that the people who attended the Land Bank meetings were across the way that even people who are on your Executive told me that they were waiting a long time for this and they are going to support the question of the Land Bank. I don't say that they are going to change their political stripes but I think before the Members across the way want to condemn the Land Bank, they've got to be careful of just what they say. You complained that we were steam rolling. We didn't do that steam rolling. It's the voters of the province who did the steam rolling last June 23rd.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Thibault: — Any time that a political party whether it be on this side or that side is going to try to perpetuate itself in power against the will of the people, the people of Saskatchewan are going to use the steam roller.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Thibault: — There is another thing that we must look at in this Land Bank. I look at it in this light. The average age of our farmers to day is somewhere around 57 years of age. Given another ten years and what are you going to have? I do not buy the argument that our young people do not want to farm. They want to farm. Show them a way that it can be done. Show them where they can get the money. Show them how they can get the land. I know when I started farming I rented a couple of quarters of land. It is not everybody who has the same chance. I think that will the Land Bank we will give a chance to a lot of young farmers who want to farm.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Thibault: — I am quite prepared to look at the arguments providing they are done constructively and not with the purpose of trying to destroy the Land Bank.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Thibault: — Just look at what is actually happening. I've got charts showing the depletion of our farm population into the small towns and then from the small towns they've gone to the bigger towns and from the bigger towns they are going to the cities. If you project that for 20 years, you have a couple of ant hills of human beings with a couple of land barons holding

March 14, 1972

the land and social problems galore in the cities. It may be late, but let's try to do something about it. I am sure if you can show a way where young people can rent land and get established on farms, that they don't have to inherit a farm in order to farm a far, that you are going to have many farmers in this province who will go back to the farm. Many of the young people in the city would be glad to go back.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Thibault: — We know very well that the grass roots of our society is on the land. If you keep a fair amount of people back in the agricultural industry, even if we have to subsidize these people in agriculture, we would be doing a heck of a lot better than doing it in the city and calling it social welfare or what you like. I think that people do not all want social welfare. I don't buy that argument. I'll deal with that later on. I am sure that we would develop a better society by restocking our agricultural industry with more young people.

At this point, Mr. Speaker, I should like to say a few words for a group of people who cannot speak for themselves. A few days ago along with the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Messer) I attended a banquet at Tisdale put on by the Association for the Mentally Retarded. I have to say a few words about this today because I have been connected with the organization for the last ten years. The Association has 45 branch organization. In the town of Kinistino through the work of a handful of dedicated people and dedicated teachers we were able to have a classroom, a home for the retarded, and today a farm for the retarded people. I want to congratulate the former Government for having co-operated with the Association as well as they did. Give credit to where credit is due. Any community that wants to do work in that area would do very well to visit the set-up that we have at Kinistino. The home is called Haven of Hope, the farm is a 30-acre farm with a great big house with a middle-ages couple looking after about six retarded people and the name of it is the New Horizon Home.

I would also recommend to the people of the House to read the article in Time Magazine February 14, 1972. They call it a human warehouse where you have 3,000 retards in the Home of Willowbrook, understaffed. People are tied to chairs and wagons, the picture is right here. Anybody who is interested should read this article. I hope that we are not working in that direction if we work in the direction of providing for these people something more of a home life where they can come in and say dad and mom to the people that are looking after them. Where they can tell their little story and be listened to rather than have a large institution that I call the home of the forgotten people. I want to advise the Minister of Education (Mr. MacMurchy), the Minister of Social Welfare and Labour (Mr. Snyder) and the Minister of Health (Mr. Smishek) that when the Retarded Association makes representation in behalf of these people who cannot speak for themselves, that they listen to what they have to say, because we cannot always depend on the bureaucracy for information. I strongly recommend to the Government that you listen to the Association for the Mentally Retarded.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Thibault: — Now they did not set any limit on the time I should put in but I want to say a few words about social welfare.

I can remember a few years ago when I defended the Minister of Social Welfare who not sits in the Opposition when he came up with a new program, I said I would not make any politics out of social welfare, it's about the poorest place to make politics. But in the last years I could not agree with him. At first I did, I said, "Let him try his new plan." Now today we are changing the name of the Department of Social Welfare. It reminds me of a story, it's not a story, it actually happened when I was working with horses. We had one that was kind of balky and dad came to the field and I said, you know I called that horse all kinds of names and it doesn't help. He said you cannot change the horse by changing the name, the only way you change him is to change the horse. That's what we have done in Social Welfare...

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Thibault: — ...we have changed the horse. Now there is one piece of advice that I want to give to the new Minister of Social Welfare that there are several local governments in this Province and I strongly advised the former Minister to involve local government in the programs of social welfare and if our Minister takes the path of the old one, well he shall wind up in the same rut. If he wants to take advantage of the help that is available by local governments in drawing up programs and so on, I would say that he would be much more successful. The names that Social Welfare is being called will disappear. The derogatory terms of social welfare will disappear if we can get the people out in the country to understand and with the help of local government I am sure that the people will understand the question.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Thibault: — Now there are a few more areas I should like to deal with and that is the question of roads. As a former reeve I couldn't get up here and speak without saying anything about roads. The circumstances concerning roads is changing at a rapid pace. There are many areas and many roads that need re-evaluation, whether they should go in the highway system or be taken out of the highway system. We cannot sit back and say we are not putting any more roads in the highway system or vice versa. We cannot go ahead and take roads into the highway system without any assessment and I hope in the four years of the New Deal that we will have a reassessment of some of the roads and if we need to put them in the highway system, fine. I am sure the time is here when municipalities should be able to oil and dust-free some of these grid roads that are carrying a heavy load. And this I will say to the Minister of Municipal Affairs, the Minister of Highways, that I have full confidence in them that they will do exactly what I am saying right now.

Now a few words about our Indian people. We have a new Department of Indian Affairs or a new Department of Northern Affairs, call it way you may but it certainly pertains to our Indian and Métis people. I certainly would advise the Government not to proceed with programs without involving again the native people. I think we have been deciding for them too long.

March 14, 1972

They want a word in what should be done and if they do make mistakes, and who doesn't make mistakes. I think we are all entitled to some mistakes but I hope by all means that the Minister will involve the native people in the decision making of this Department.

Now a few more words – well I've got about 22 minutes in now – that's not too bad and I am only have way through.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Thibault: — I should like to say a few words about highway safety. In 1960 I brought in a resolution that we have more driver training in this Province on account of the death rate. At that time we were killing only 160 people a year in this Province so we did bring in a resolution to encourage driver training but that wasn't good enough for me. We demanded a highway safety committee, a legislative committee, where you could involve the Opposition as well as the Government side for a study of the cause of accidents in this Province.

After two years of study we made our recommendations. The Attorney General at that time really did a job in trying to enforce the recommendations that we made, but in that recommendation we also said that there should be a continuing committee to study traffic problems as they keep piling up. But the Government of the day said, "No we are going to discontinue the traffic safety committee." Now I am going to give you the figures of what has actually happened. You start back in 1960 where we killed about 165 a year. The figure kept increasing. In 1962 192; 1963 200; 1964 229; 1965 223; 1966 279; 1967 287. Then when the committee reported and new legislation was brought in there was a drop from 287 in 1967 to 264 in 1968. In 1969 down to 223, in 1970 down to 207. Now we are back in 218 and the line is going up again. I will blame it on the dropping of the legislative committee who should spend their time studying the problems of traffic.

Now I think there is no better place to spend your time as an MLA as on a legislative committee. Where we can lay our politics aside and study a problem and bring recommendations to the Legislature and do something about it with a non-artisan approach. I am sure that we could deal with many other problems in the same way. Take the problem to the people and then come back with our recommendations and I hope that this Government in their Deal for people will take that path and I am confident that they will.

Now when you kill almost 300 a year you never notice it too much until you start attending the funerals. I attended a funeral at Wakaw a few years ago, there were 11 new graves. I asked a question, why so many new ones? Well, they said, six traffic accidents. I think you could have gone to many graveyards with the same story, traffic accidents. I should like to see a study made of our traffic safety. I should like to see an evaluation of our driver teachers. Right now we have a training program but who knows whether we have a good teaching program or not and I think an evaluation of our trainers can easily be done and then bring the best teachers to the top to teach the teachers, we'll put it this way. I don't think it would be a very big problem to computerize the accidents and who was the driver trainer and so on. When we made our study the many places throughout the world where they had driver

March 14, 1972

training there was a definite low rate of accidents. I think the courtroom and the jail and the heavy fines is not an answer to safety on our highways. I think a better driver training education should go a long ways towards providing this.

Now as I have a few more things to say about the conduct of the House, the first few days there was a letter, perhaps it is a little bit out of date, because it was written on March 4th. I had a visitor from my constituency who sat in the galleries and watched the performance. After he got home he wrote me a letter. I think I will read this letter because it expresses much better than the words that I can find to say what can he said about it. It is address from Weldon, Saskatchewan, March 4, and I will table the letter, by the way.

Mr. Art Thibault, MLA
Room 207, Legislative Building,
Regina, Saskatchewan.

Dear Art:

Friday, of last week, must have inevitably have been branded by those that listened to the Legislature either from the galleries of this House or from the radio in their own homes as Black Friday. The performance of the House was a deplorable disgrace and it did irreparable damage to the public image of the democratic parliament. The Government must do everything in their power to see that this does not occur again. I feel however, unless a new method is found to deal with this problem we can expect more of the same today. I therefore suggest that the Government recognize two things. Number one, that the Opposition consist of the remnants of the once powerful Government who were drunk with power, rode roughshod over everything and everyone.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Thibault: —

The few seats now occupied by the Opposition Members is clear evidence of the public condemnation handed down by the people of Saskatchewan on the tactics employed. Number two, that we also recognize that anyone that has become accustomed to proceedings in this manner cannot be expected to return to sanity in just a few days and must be dealt with on the same basis as wise mothers deal with their neighbours. Unruly children are not punished in public. If the Opposition is bent on political suicide and determined to further reducing their number I see no reason why we should stand in their way.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Thibault: —

I recommend that you reverse your ruling of last Friday and grant the Opposition equal radio time in which to do their screaming over the Saskatchewan network. The Government has yet four years in which to implement programs that will do far more than drown out any silly noises of a handful of Opposition Members can make in a few hours of free radio time.

Signed: Mr. Sam Apesland.

March 14, 1972

Those are not my words but it was one way that . . .

Mr. MacDonald (Milestone): — Is he a president . . .

Mr. Thibault: — No, he is not a president, not even his zone manager.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Thibault: — He is just a taxpayer like you and everybody else. Now, Mr. Speaker, I think that you can see by the few remarks that I have made that I will not support the amendment, that I will be supporting the Budget.

Mr. H.H. Rolfes (Saskatoon Nutana South): — Mr. Speaker, when I spoke in the Throne Speech Debate, I referred to it as the people's Throne Speech and I believe that that is what it really is. I said that it was a good start for this Government in implementing its promises that it made to people of Saskatchewan and I think that it really did. It is equally true, Mr. Speaker, that one can call this Budget a People's Budget. It brings to fruition, Mr. Speaker, in a real practical sense many of the promises that we made in the June election. The financial critic of the Opposition has labelled this Budget a "poor cousin budget." He has labelled it a "windfall Budget." And he has labelled it a "quitter's Budget."

If I recollect accurately, Mr. Speaker, he said last Monday, some have called this a poor cousin Budget, some have called this a windfall Budget but it just so happened that when I was driving home last Friday with my colleague back to Saskatoon who should they be interviewing on the radio but the financial critic. In his talk he said this is a poor cousin Budget, this is a windfall Budget he said later on. I listened all weekend to find out if other people had labelled this Budget in these three terms. Now, Mr. Speaker, I really don't care what they call this Budget, names don't really mean anything, it is what is in the Budget that really counts.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Rolfes: — Mr. Speaker, I believe this is a good Budget. Not only is it a good Budget but it is a sound and a practical Budget. A practical Budget that comes to grip with some of the very basic issues that are facing the people and the ordinary citizen of Saskatchewan. Mr. Speaker, all one has to do is peruse the Budget and you will find that there are many good things for many people of Saskatchewan. There are benefits for the farmer, there are benefits for the labourer, there are benefits for the small businessman. Even, Mr. Speaker, teachers will find some benefits. I will, a little later, elaborate on that. We shall find benefits for the disadvantaged groups and, Mr. Speaker, not to be forgotten, we shall find benefits for the students of Saskatchewan.

From the considerable time, Mr. Speaker, that the financial critic spent on matters not pertaining to the Budget, one must come to the conclusion that he found it very difficult to find things that he could criticize in the Budget. Saskatchewan's

March 14, 1972

economy, Mr. Speaker, is still largely dependent on agriculture. I don't think anyone will deny that. I, at this time, want to commend this Government for making this the first priority in this Budget. The people in Nutana South, which is my constituency, recognize that their livelihood is certainly dependent upon what happens in agriculture. They realize that we must have a sound and viable agricultural economy. I know, Mr. Speaker, that they would want me at this time to congratulate the Hon. Minister of Agriculture for recognizing the serious plight of some of our farmers. His proposed pieces of legislation, and I don't intend to mention all of them because we are aware of what they are, but especially the Land Bank, will be most welcome by many farmers. We know that it is not the panacea, Mr. Speaker, for solving all the agricultural problems. No Member on this side of the House has ever claimed that, but we have said that it will in some way help out the farmers in the 1970s.

Mr. Speaker, the Land Bank, I think, personally speaking, will certainly help poverty stricken farmers, it will help the young farmer. I know that many, many of our big farmers will probably not be too happy with it.

Mr. Speaker, as I did in the Throne Speech Debate and as I should like to do for a little time now, I should like to turn to the youth of our province. I worked with many of our youth and I have for the last 10 or 12 years. Mr. Speaker, I don't think that I shall insult this House when I say again that the youth of this Province are the most important natural resource that we have. The Members of this House should let the youth know that we believe they are important. Let us, for example, support the Age of Majority Bill, let us, Mr. Speaker, give credit to this Government for recognizing the importance of youth as they have done by establishing the new Department of Culture and Youth and also for bringing in a bursary – pro for our youth. Mr. Speaker, I should like to commend this Government for the money, the large amounts of money it has allotted to the establishment of a Department of Youth and Culture.

I should also, Mr. Speaker, like to commend this Government for legislation that will allocate \$900,000 for a bursary program. Here, Mr. Speaker, I want to say, that for many years I have advocated that we substitute bursaries instead of scholarships. I beg the indulgence of the House if I might just briefly for those people who do not know the difference explain why I would advocate bursaries. Scholarships, Mr. Speaker, recognize only academic excellence, usually speaking. Most Bursaries, however, not only recognize academic excellence, but they also recognize financial needs of students. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased that bursaries are going to receive more importance from this Government.

Mr. Speaker, in the past when it came to scholarships, there were many students who had 95 and 96 averages and certainly I think one should recognize this particular accomplishment. These students walked away with not just \$2,000, but very often these students walked away with \$5,000, \$6,000 or \$7,000 with absolutely no regard to whether they needed it or not. The next student who had a 94 average was lucky if he got \$1,000 could not carry him through university, or post-secondary education. I hope that this

March 14, 1972

Government will continue to de-emphasize scholarships and emphasize bursaries, even to a greater extent than what we have done in this Budget.

Mr. Rolfes: — Mr. Speaker, I should like to return to the Department of Culture and Youth. If this particular Department developed I think it could be a real avenue, a real source, or a real vehicle whereby we could make use of the ideas of our youth. Our youth want to participate, I wish the Member from Rosthern were here, even though I respect his views on youth, I think he has got to come to realize and people like him have got to come to realize that much of the frustration in our youth today is because half of the adult population is telling them to shut up and the other half is telling them to mind their own business. Yet, time and time again, we tell them they have got to take their responsibilities seriously. But we will not let them participate. I should hope, Mr. Speaker, that through this new department this Government is going to make it absolutely clear that we will not dictate to them, but we will consult with them we will ask them for their ideas, that we will ask them to fully participate and to criticize this Government when they feel that we are on the wrong path.

Criticism, I think, Mr. Speaker, is good. I hope the Members opposite will not take it as an insult when I say that one of the main reasons they lost on June 23rd last was because they shut themselves off from the people. It came through time and time again, Mr. Speaker, in the area of welfare, education and almost any other area you want to go into, that the previous Government was telling the people what was good for them. Finally, the people just simply said, No. We are going to determine our own lives, our own destiny, we need a new group of people to do this. I hope, Mr. Speaker, that we will not in our term, at least in the first term, disappoint these people. If we do, Mr. Speaker, I know our doom will be similar to the doom that the people opposite experienced last June. But if the past is any indication, we have at least another 19 years ahead of us.

Mr. Speaker, through this Department of Youth and Culture, I think the youth of this Province — after all the '70s and '80s are going to be their future — I think they can help us to build a truly democratic, peaceful and co-operative society.

Mr. Speaker, if I could now revert a little bit to scholarships and bursaries. I should hope that in the future this Government is going to make absolutely clear to the people that we will let the decisions of who the recipients of bursaries and scholarships should be decided by other sources than the Department of Education or the Government. I should like to advise our Minister if he has not already done so, that we give this power back to the universities where it belongs.

Before I leave this particular topic I want to spend some time in other areas of education. Both Members of the Opposition to whom I should like to say a few words are not here. This afternoon in the House the Member from Rosthern (Mr. Boldt) quoted from an article in the Star-Phoenix. I thought I had

March 14, 1972

read the article last weekend, and what he said and what I read just didn't seem to correspond, Mr. Speaker. So I went to the library and got that particular issue of the Star-Phoenix. He is correct when he says that, "Faculty Furious with Budget." The particular paragraph that he read said this – he read it I believe:

The crisis surfaced February 29th, when 175 non-tenure faculty members received letters from the administration saying at least tentatively they had not been recommended for tenure or renewal appointment.

However, if he had read one paragraph further, this is what it said.

The letters were sent as a legal precaution, as university contracts stipulate that faculty members must be notified by the end of February as to the status of their employment.

And the next paragraph is the key one, take this message to him, the Member from Lumsden (Mr. Lane), will you?

It is estimated that between 20 and 40 faculty may be dismissed.

Not the impression that the Member left in the House that 175 faculty members were in danger of losing their jobs.

Mr. Speaker, this is not new from what I have experienced from Members opposite. They have a tendency to misinform the House, but it seems that way to me when you hear people quoting from articles like this.

Mr. Speaker, I regret the fact that any person might lose his job at the university. However, I think we must face the fact that the enrolments at the university are not what we had thought they would be. To simply build buildings for the sake of building buildings does not make sense to me, if you do not have students to fill these buildings. I should like to commend this Government in taking this step which I think in the future will be appreciated by the people of Saskatchewan.

Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Member from Melfort-Tisdale – I was going to say I think that was the old riding – Melfort-Kinistino (Mr. Thibault) referred to or spoke for a few minutes on a topic with which I have been very much concerned and that is the mentally retarded of the Province of Saskatchewan. In this regard, Mr. Speaker, I should simply like to say that I was very sorry to hear the announcement made by the Federal Government that they would discontinue their funds for the Alvin Buckwold Unit in Saskatoon. The Alvin Buckwold unit previously known as the Alvin Buckwold Mental Retardation Unit works with about 500 families with mentally retarded children. If this particular unit is closed, Mr. Speaker, these families will have absolutely nowhere else to go. All other facilities in Saskatchewan are taxed to the maximum. They tell me that as of April 1st, the Federal Government will cease to forward any funds. When we heard about this some of the Members of Saskatoon met with the Minister of Health (Mr. Smishek) and persuaded him to do some interim financing for three months in order to keep the unit open in Saskatoon. Mr. Speaker, I must

March 14, 1972

commend the Federal Government for carrying out this experimental program for five years; we found out that it is a good program. This program will keep some of the mentally retarded people out of our training institutions, very, very expensive operations. It will also keep these people with their families. It is not only a service to the city of Saskatoon but to the area surrounding Saskatoon and probably all of Northern Saskatchewan. I should ask in this regard that all Members of the House, both sides of the House, contact Senator Buckwold, Senator Argue and the Hon. Otto Lang to try to get them to persuade their Minister to continue this particular project. I think it would be a shame, Mr. Speaker, if these children and these families would be cut off from this service.

In the same line, Mr. Speaker, I received a telephone call a few weeks ago from a constituent in Nutana South who informed me that the Federal Government also was cutting off funds for a developmental class at the John Dolan School. This again, Mr. Speaker, is what they call an experimental project, its five-year term is coming to an end and these 18 children have just no place to go. We know that good work is being done, we know that it requires about \$40,000 to \$50,000 a year to keep this program going. Again, Members of this House must convince people in the Federal Government to continue these grants. I think for the sake of the mentally retarded we have just got to do something about it, it is our responsibility. I hope, Mr. Speaker, that after the three month period some other arrangement can be made in this regard.

Mr. Speaker, I want to spend the rest of my time on education, but in some other areas. Before I do so, Mr. Speaker, I should like to say that to me education is a life-long process. It starts when one is born and it ends when one dies. I would hope that education will take on this meaning under this Government. I was therefore very happy and very pleased that our Minister of Education announced that there would be studies on kindergarten and there would be studies on community colleges. Furthermore, Mr. Speaker, in this regard, I was also pleased to hear that the Minister announced that we will try to give back much more autonomy to local school boards. I believe, Mr. Speaker, that our schools must become community schools. Our schools must adopt their curriculum from their community. It is absolutely senseless in my opinion to have a Department of Education formulate a curriculum and ask the schools to adopt it. I know that in the past there has been considerable leeway, however, I should like to see community schools, where a school staff and school board, could decide what they think is important and that is the program that would be adopted in those schools.

In this way, Mr. Speaker, the schools would become a focal point of the community. Some day maybe we can have this where the community revolves around the school. Not just open from 9 until 3, learning doesn't just take place from 9 until 3, and the people could feel free to use these schools or use the resources...

Mr. Lane: — Lighted schoolhouse?

Mr. Rolfes: — Pardon me. Well, I don't know if you want to have it lit up physically that is not the point, although I suppose some people look at the physical aspects and say, that is the program. I hope that is not what you mean, Gary, but maybe you

do.

In regard to community colleges, Mr. Speaker, I think there are many people in today's society who would like to continue their education outside of the formal institutions, outside of the technical schools, outside of the university, certainly outside of our high schools. I think in this regard community colleges could become very effective, but again, let us make proposed legislation that the Liberals had prepared prior to June 23rd and we substituted our own.

That particular legislation, Mr. Speaker, I think indicated very clearly what they had in mind with community colleges. Community colleges in their minds are colleges that are set up and directed and dictated to from the Department of Education. The community has very little to say as to what should go into it, how it should be established, what kind of staff they should have. That would all be decided by the Department of Education. If the Members opposite don't believe me I am sure that you can still find copies available and read it. We have in the meantime come through with our own program and I think the autonomy, the control will be with the local people. They will decide if they need a community college and they will decide what the programs are going to be. They will decide how they should be run. That, Mr. Speaker, was one of our election promises and that, Mr. Speaker, I hope will be one that we will soon fulfil.

Mr. Speaker, I want to turn for a few minutes on the new grant formula. The new grant formula that we hope to have in effect very soon – the principle of this particular formula, Mr. Speaker, will give equity, I believe, in educational opportunity to all school boards in Saskatchewan.

Although, Mr. Speaker, I have some reservation about the formula, basically I would accept it. There are some kinks we have to iron out, but I think it does do the job it is supposed to do. 1. To give equity to school boards in the province as far as educational opportunity is concerned. 2. To restore to the local boards the autonomy that they need in deciding what kinds of programs they would like to carry out.

I think, Mr. Speaker, it does the job that we want it to do in decentralizing the Department of Education, in making out of the Department of Education an advisory department, a consultative department. It is very difficult to break up a bureaucracy once it is set up. I think our Minister, again, must be commended in streamlining the Department of Education. All right he took some flak on it as to why he did it, but those of us on this side of the House know why he did it. It was to streamline the Department of Education so that one particular Branch in the Department know what the other Branch was doing. And in this regard, Mr. Speaker, I should just like to refer back to what happened, I believe in 1970, and I stand to be corrected, when the Members opposite came through with their legislation on the mentally handicapped.

At that time, Mr. Speaker, I was at a meeting conducted by Mr. Bestvater, I believe his name was and I asked him at that time how much money would be available for the mentally handicapped. And he said to me at that time, "Look I am not in the Finance Branch. I am only in the Planning Branch and I don't know what the Finance has planned. I don't even know if they have any money available for it." Here, in the meantime,

March 14, 1972

Mr. Speaker, we have legislation passed, we tell the school boards that they were responsible to provide educational opportunities for the mentally handicapped and at the same, time, we found out later, that there was no money available to carry out these particular programs. I think the Minister of Education (Mr. MacMurphy) must be commended for taking the step in streamlining this particular Department.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Rolfes: — Mr. Speaker, we have taken some flak from the Members opposite on Area Bargaining. I should just like at this particular time to say that I think the cheap political tactics that have been used in this House by the Member from Milestone (Mr. MacDonald) is a disgrace.

Standing in the House last night, Mr. Speaker, as he has done on other occasions, he accused this Government of bringing in a Bill on the eve when there was a possibility of a stroke, when there was a possibility of school closures, when he himself knew that it was not us who proposed that this Bill be put on the agenda for the evening, but it was his side of the House who proposed that we bring it in. This type of thing, Mr. Speaker, cannot be condoned in this House and I would hope that he has learned his lesson. Now this is not the first time that he has done it. It has been done at least two, three or four times. But let me say this, Mr. Speaker, about Area Bargaining.

I think it has got to be amply clear that area bargaining difficulties rest on the shoulders of the Members opposite. It has nothing to do with this Government now. Had they not brought in the Teachers' Salary Agreements Act in 1968 we would not be in the difficulties that we are in today.

Anytime, Mr. Speaker, when you have compulsory arbitration and either side knows of it — and obviously they do — they have a way out. They do not have to bargain if they really do not want to. I will say that compulsory arbitration has been a hindrance to area bargaining at this time. I think the sooner it is removed the better off we will be as far as free collective bargaining is concerned.

Let me say, Mr. Speaker, in this regard when the Member from Milestone again referred to the Northern Affairs settlement he said to the House, and therefore said to me also, that we had a 2.7 per cent settlement. Let me say that I have been in contact with both the trustees and the teachers and they say to me, give us a settlement that the northern areas received of 7.72 per cent and we will take it. Regardless of whether you want to pay us \$500 to teach in Regina as an allowance, we are interested in the total amounts of money that will be allocated.

I would say, Mr. Speaker, that if Members of this House would maybe stay out of the area negotiations as they are progressing at the present time that we can possibly expect some settlement within the next week or so.

Now, Mr. Speaker, when it comes to area bargaining I would simply like to say that I believe in free collection bargaining. I don't see how anyone in this day and age can simply say that bargaining can really take place sincerely and honestly when you have compulsory arbitration. I will not elaborate on this

because I want to speak on this particular Bill when it comes up for second reading again.

Mr. Speaker, I want to say this about the Budget again. I want to commend this Government. I think it has done an admirable performance in bringing in this type of a Budget, a Budget that has many good things for the ordinary people of society. The ordinary person who has been so much neglected in the last seven years. Yes, I agree, that big business will not receive a big chunk out of this Budget, but the small businessman, will receive lots of benefits. I, therefore, Mr. Speaker, want to commend the Premier of this Province, the Provincial Treasurer, for bringing in this type of a Budget in our first year of a four-year term of office.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Rolfes: — From what I have said, Mr. Speaker, you will note that I will definitely oppose the amendment and support the budget.

Mr. D.W. Cody (Watrous): — Mr. Speaker, it seems that I don't have quite the problem today in rising to speak that I had last Friday, however, maybe it is because it is getting later on in the evening rather than in the afternoon.

Mr. Speaker, my colleague from Saskatoon just mentioned a few minutes ago that names don't really mean very much. Well I would say that I quite agree with him, however, some labels do tell us something. "A poor cousin Budget, a windfall Budget, and a quitter's Budget" as far as I am concerned mean very little, this is quite true. But, Mr. Speaker, last year our Budget critic labelled the Budget as a "Bogus Budget," and that label as far as I am concerned has a meaning and the meaning simply is "a bag of gimmicks under Steuart."

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to rise in this debate and it gives me a great deal of pride to be able to identify myself with this Budget. It is a great Budget. It is possibly the greatest Budget, as I said in a Press release the other night, we have seen the best Budget in all history of this Province. It is a record Budget for the province and it has many records in it. Maybe it has welfare records in it. That may be the way we have to deal with the rest of the defeated Liberals as time goes on.

Mr. Speaker, I want to deal with agriculture for a moment. We have record spending of \$18 million which is an increase of 11 per cent. This increase shows the concern our Government has for our farmers. It shows that we will not allow farmers to be moved from their lands and from their homes. It will show that we will not do the same kind of think the Federal Government is doing with their Task Force Report on Agriculture and move people off the land with reckless abandon.

Mr. Speaker, I of course, am speaking about the Land Bank Commission. The Budget, sets aside \$10 million for this program. This figure will not buy a great deal of land in its first year; however, the Opposition seems to think that we are going to buy up all the land. I am sure that with \$10 million by no stretch of the imagination shall we be buying up all of the land.

March 14, 1972

Well, Mr. Speaker, with \$10 million what can you purchase? You use an average of approximately \$40,000 per section and you would probably get something like 2,000 sections in the first year. With 2,000 sections in the first year, if we spent \$10 million each year, it would take 75 years before we would have all the land in this Province. Mr. Speaker, I submit that it is virtually impossible for us to purchase all the land in this Province and you will never see it come about in any case.

Mr. Speaker, you can see that the claim by the Liberals opposite, you can see that the claim is the same kind of claim that they had in 1946 when we were implementing the Saskatchewan Government Insurance office. It is the same kind of claim that they had when we were implementing Medicare in 1962. It is the same kind of claim that you hear from the Liberals at any time when a progressive piece of legislation comes about.

Mr. Speaker, the farmers of this Province were not scared off in 1946, they were not scared off in 1962, and they won't be scared off in 1972.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Cody: — Mr. Speaker, this program will go down in history as another first of social security and humanity and humanity first in its programs in which we certainly believe in.

Mr. Speaker, I also want to congratulate the Government for the massive new program for homes, farms, and small businessmen. It is a giant step forward in relieving the heavy load of taxation on the citizens of this Province. It took our Government only eight months to see that the cost of education had to be shifted from the property owner. \$23 million, Mr. Speaker, and Mr. Member from milestone (Mr. MacDonald) is massive in my mind. It certainly is.

Mr. Speaker, turning now for one moment to rural communities. We shall be expanding the Municipal Works Program and a new program of assistance to rural communities which I am certain will be appreciated by all. I am pleased to see that this Government is showing interest in small towns and villages which hasn't been shown for the last many, many years. As you know small towns and villages today are just like farmers, they are dying off. With this new program more new people will be attracted to small towns and villages! A further program which will aid them will be the expanded program of telephone services for unserved areas. Mr. Speaker, it may have come from the Liberals but it never hurts to expand.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Cody: — Mr. Speaker, this Budget in my mind has its priorities in the proper place for a change. It has its priorities in the places where we most need them which is something we haven't seen for the past seven years.

Mr. Speaker, probably one of the sad things in the Budget as one of my colleagues said this afternoon, was the \$6 million which we shall have to pay to opt out for the pulp mill deal. However, one consolation may be that it is \$6 million now rather than \$170 in several years from now.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Cody: — Mr. Speaker, let me turn for a moment to this pulp mill issue which has, of course, been raised from time to time by the Opposition. In fact, this afternoon, at one point the Hon. Member from Lumsden (Mr. Lane) said again, oh, let's have an inquiry. Well, as the Leader of the Opposition mentioned in the Throne Speech Debate one week ago, he requested or challenged the Government to have a judicial inquiry regarding his conduct in promoting and developing the Athabasca Pulp Mill. Mr. Speaker, why an inquiry?

Why do we need an inquiry? Tell me this, when all the facts that are going to come up in any inquiry are laid right here before the people and right before this Assembly and have been for quite some time. Why did they sign, as the Hon. Member for Riversdale (Mr. Romanow) says? Why did they sign? They only signed for one reason as far as I am concerned which I wouldn't want to say at this time. Mr. Speaker, there is no need for an inquiry as far as I am concerned. The Liberal Party placed the pulp mill issue before the people of Saskatchewan and they utterly and totally rejected your deal. Without having the facts that you people had and wouldn't deliver to them. The Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Steuart) seems to reject the voice of the people. He seems to reject the voice of the people and goes on in the same old arrogant manner.

Mr. Speaker, our Party intends to listen to the wishes of the people of Saskatchewan and it believes that it should involve them fully in development of programs. Mr. Speaker, we were elected on that basis and you'll see we'll be re-elected on that basis.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Cody: — Mr. Speaker, I wish to now turn for a few moments to health and social services. In this area we have come a long way in the past eight months – abolishing deterrent fees, removing of premiums for those over 65 and many other programs. The Budget again says that there is going to be large and extended programs – chiropractic care and what have you. Mr. Speaker, I want at this time to turn to what I term is a very grave situation in my constituency that which involves the promising of a nursing home by the former Liberal Government. Mr. Speaker, I want to point out the irresponsible way in which the former Liberal Government and particularly the then Minister of Welfare (Mr. MacDonald), the Hon. Member from Milestone carried out his duties. Mr. Speaker, I shall now turn to some excerpts of letters and correspondence between the town of Bruno, some citizens of that area and the Government of the day.

Mr. Speaker, this correspondence, of course, dates back a long ways, back as far as February 8th, 1957, and I want to read them into the record. The first piece of correspondence was February 8, 1957, a letter from Mr. Schulte, Chairman of the Health Committee, to the Director of Housing and Nursing Homes Branch, requesting information regarding a nurses' home, and that they had a building which could serve elderly citizens. Professor Baker of the University of Saskatchewan had conducted a survey of need in the area. February 27, 1957, a reply from

March 14, 1972

the Department to Mr. Schulte asking that the building be identified because it would have to pass fire and health standards. March 9th, 1957 a reply that the building was a brick school which was vacated and also that the committee was being supported by the whole community. April 17, 1957, the Department received a report from the Fire Commissioner advising that he could not permit the use of the school as a home for elderly. April 25, 1972, a letter to Mr. Schulte advising of the Fire Commissioner's findings but that the Department might explore with the Committee alternative building proposals. December 6, 1957, Mr. Keith Wiggins acknowledge the Department's letter of April 25th, 1957 and expressed continued interest in senior citizen housing. January 13, 1958, a Department letter suggesting January 21st as a date to meet (I guess I've mentioned that one). January 17th, 1958 meeting and timing agreed upon. January 24th, 1958, the Department wrote Mr. Wiggins and submitted literature about organizing and planning a home for elderly and also that the local Committee explore obtaining various paramedical services with in area. October 1st, 1964 here we go, here comes the merry-go-round. Mr. Schulte and 18 members of the Centennial Committee met with Department officials to being exploring the possibilities of a nursing home or a small hospital.

Arrangements were made for the Committee to meet health officials the following week. September 15, 1969 a letter from A.R. Meyer, who incidentally is the town clerk, to Minister C.P. MacDonald indicating interest in a senior citizens' home. Preliminary survey indicated a need for a 25-bed unit. October 6th, 1969, a reply by the Department advising fiscal arrangement criteria for the development of a special care home and indicating that Bruno could not likely meet the necessary conditions. March 23rd, 1970, a letter from Mr. Meyer to the Minister, restating the community's interest and hoping for approval to proceed. April 3, 1970, the Minister acknowledged and advised that the request would be considered with other priorities later in the year. February 6, 1971, a letter to the Minister from Mrs. Joe Rink asking for definite information regarding a senior citizens' home. February 17th, 1971, Minister acknowledged the letter and advised that the matter was still under consideration and that advice would be sent shortly. March 8th, 1971, Minister wrote Mr. Meyer advising that their request for 1971-72 would not be granted but that they could subsequently renew their application.

Mr. Speaker, this is March 8th, 1971, keep that date in mind, will you Mr. Member from milestone (Mr. MacDonald). Mr. Speaker, on April 1st, 1971 23 days later, the Humboldt Journal carried a large press release in big, bold letters stating: "\$300,000 Bruno Home for Elderly Citizens Announced." 23 days after the Minister said there would be no home built in Bruno. Mr. Speaker, within this press release it says"

Welfare Minister Cy MacDonald in announcing approval of the project Tuesday said the Government has ascertained that the facility was needed in Bruno and hopes work will start in the very near future.

Mr. Speaker, on April 12th, of course, the Minister then sent a communication to the town with the approval of a 30-bed special care home providing for levels I and II, plus a commitment providing a grant of 20 per cent of capital cost. He

March 14, 1972

also states in this Letter: 'Because Department staff were not aware of details the Minister asked the Committee to meet and outline their plans with his staff.

Mr. Speaker, the point I wish to make is that on March 8th, 1971 the Hon. Member from Milestone, then Minister of Welfare, stated the application would not be granted. There had been no feasibility study done, there was no feasibility study done between the period of March 8th and April 1st and in fact there has been no feasibility study done to this very day. Mr. Speaker, the only reason that I can put my finger on, that may have prompted the Hon. Minister to carry on in this way is, of course, that he knew there was an election in the offing. And, of course, they needed this particular issue if they wanted to get any votes in Bruno at all.

Mr. MacDonald: — How did we do in Bruno?

Mr. Cody: — You got a lot less votes than you ever did in the history of this Province before.

Mr. Speaker, I feel that using elderly people in this kind of way is completely irresponsible and shows callous, hard-heartedness on that Minister's part. Mr. Speaker, let me hasten to say that I don't know if it is feasible to build a home in Bruno and I also say that the Minister didn't know if it was feasible to build a home in Bruno. We have homes in Humboldt which is 15 miles away, we have a home in Middle Lake which is 15 miles away and we have a home in Cudworth which is 15 miles away. Mr. Speaker, Bruno will get a home if it is feasible, Bruno will not get a home if it is not feasible.

Mr. Speaker, I will reiterate again my stand, if a feasibility study is done and the citizens of Bruno will have to do it, of course, we are not going to do it. We have no right to do it. If a feasibility study is done and if the project is feasible I will be the first man to stand up in that town or this Legislature or anywhere else and press this Government and press them hard to build a senior citizens' home in that area.

Mr. Speaker, I can say that I am proud that this Government has now seen fit to work on policy rather than on political favouritism and political manoeuvring. I want to congratulate the Government on the way in which it is handling the situation, today with regard to the nursing homes, and also the study which is presently being done which I am sure will bring forth meaningful legislation. Legislation which will truly help the people which they are trying to help and that, of course, is the senior citizens.

Mr. Speaker, there are many things in this Budget that I should like to touch on and there are many things that the people in my constituency are happy about. The agricultural area in the Budget is terrific, the new bursary scheme is terrific. There are many areas in the Budget which a person could speak on, you could speak for four days. However, I am going to give way to some of my other colleagues and as you will have gathered, Mr. Speaker, I will not support the amendment, I will support the motion.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

March 14, 1972

Mr. A.W. Engel (Notukeu-Willow Bunch): — Mr. Speaker, it is a great privilege to take part in this Budget Debate. First off I should like to congratulate the Members for both Morse (Mr. Wiebe) and Souris-Estevan (Mr. Thorson) for winning the by-elections.

Special congratulations to the appointments to the Cabinet, the Member for Saskatoon Mayfair to Public Works and the Member for Souris-Estevan to the Department of Industry and Commerce. They are both proving very capable, Mr. Speaker, in the dealings I have had with these gentlemen. They display much energy and enthusiasm and I am sure these two men are very valuable in helping to ease the workload that these Members of Cabinet were sharing. I would like to congratulate the Premier on the Budget Speech he brought down and on the excellent delivery.

There are many aspects in this Budget speech that I would like to talk about. The one thing I think that is going to do very much good in Notukeu-Willow Bunch particularly is what the Land Bank is going to do for our farmers. I have many neighbours right around the areas where I am farming that are there because they have to stay on and farm a little longer. They would like to quit and yet they can't find an easy way to transfer their assets from themselves to their families. This Budget is a vehicle which will aid in this kind of a transfer, the benefits that are going to be shared by the residents of Saskatchewan because of this Land Bank is tremendous. The \$10 million will generate much enthusiasm and will generate much work besides making an easy transfer of land.

I intend to speak on several areas of this Budget Debate, Mr. Speaker. There are problems that have arisen in my constituency in the southern part of it with regard to rumours that the Federal Government is considering the creation of a national park there and I should like to speak about it. I think this type of an area maybe needs some coverage and for that reason I would beg leave to adjourn debate.

Debate adjourned.

The Assembly adjourned at 8:30 o'clock p.m.