

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN
Fifth Session — Sixteenth Legislature
10th Day

Monday, March 1, 1971.

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

WELCOME TO STUDENTS

MR. SPEAKER: — I wish to introduce to the Members of this Legislature the following groups of students situated in the galleries: from the constituency of Saskatoon Nutana South represented by Dr. Forsyth, 43 students from St. James School under the direction of Mr. Oswiy and Mr. E.S. Bryski; from the constituency of Saskatoon Nutana Centre represented by Mr. Estey, 70 students from Halliston School under the direction of their school teacher, Mr. Lazecki; from the constituency of Melville represented by its Member, Mr. Kowalchuk, 28 students from the Davison School under the direction of their school teacher, Mr. Starbuck; from the constituency of Notukeu-Willowbunch represented by Mr. Hooker, 35 students from the Kildeer School under the direction of their teacher, Mr. Kindrachuk; from the constituency of Regina South East represented by Mr. Baker, 57 students from St. Augustine School under the direction of Mr. Frolich. A particular welcome to them because their school was named for my patron saint. From the constituency of Maple Creek represented by Mr. Cameron, 17 students from the Mendham School under the direction of their teacher, Mr. E.F. Flasch; and from Regina South West constituency represented by Mr. McPherson, 30 students from Sheldon Williams School under the direction of their school teacher, Mr. McDonald.

I am sure all Hon. Members wish to extend to all of these children in the galleries, their teachers, their bus drivers and other people who are accompanying them, a very warm welcome to the Legislative Assembly of the Province of Saskatchewan and to express the very sincere wish that they will enjoy themselves, that they will find their stay educational and wish to all of them a safe trip home.

HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

STATEMENT

INTERCONTINENTAL PACKERS

HON. C.L.B. ESTEY (Minister of Industry and Commerce): — Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day I wish to make a statement. The Government has been advised by Mr. Fred Mendel and Mrs. Joanna Mitchell, the chairman of the Board and President of Intercontinental Packers, respectively, that Intercontinental Packers will immediately inaugurate a \$4.5 million capital expansion to take place at their plants in Regina and Saskatoon. This expenditure will enlarge their meat processing facilities at both plants. I need hardly point out to this Assembly the position which this Company occupies in our province. Mr. Speaker, suffice it to say that since 1967 Intercontinental Packers has spent approximately \$7 million on capital expenditure. In addition to providing a cash outlet for our

livestock industry, these modern packing plants are a major factor in providing employment and maintaining the industrial section of the Saskatchewan economy. The Company's nationwide distribution system has developed a ready market for Saskatchewan meat products across the country. I should also like to point out that at the present time Intercontinental Packers has in its employ approximately 900 people with an annual payroll of nearly \$7 million.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. A.E. BLAKENEY (Leader of the Opposition): — Mr. Speaker, I just want to say how much we on this side welcome the announcement made by the Minister of Industry. This is a very welcome reversal from the trend which has been so evident in the last, is it five or six years . . .

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. BLAKENEY: — . . . with respect to the closing of packing plants. We have seen closures or contractions at Saskatoon, Moose Jaw and Regina . . .

MR. THATCHER: — Pulp mills, uranium mines . . .

MR. BLAKENEY: — Pulp mills and uranium mines, perhaps so but singularly not packing plants. Ask the people in Saskatoon, Moose Jaw and Regina who have been the victims of previous closures and we now welcome, as I say, this reversal of fortune.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

REGINA CURLERS WIN

MR. F.K. RADLOFF (Nipawin): — Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day I should like to make a couple of announcements that I know would be of great interest to all Members of the Legislature. Yesterday in Nipawin a fine group of Regina curlers, skipped by Jim Ferguson, with Howie Ferguson third, C.C. Hardy second, Verne Stevenson lead, won the Saskatchewan Legion curling playoffs and will go to Prince Edward Island for the finals.

MOOSE JAW VANIER HIGH SCHOOL

MR. RADLOFF: — The other announcement is about the winner of the Canadian high school playoffs at Kamloops last week. Mr. Collette of Nipawin, chairman of the high school curling committee of the Saskatchewan Curling Association has advised me that the winning rink of the high school curlers are from the Moose Jaw Vanier High School. The rink, skipped by Greg Montgomery, Don Despenins third, Jeff Montgomery second, and Rocky Verboom lead, was coached by the father of the skip, Mr. Stan Montgomery. Mr. Collette stated that this group of boys are one of the finest group of boys that he has been associated with.

HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MOOSE JAW RIVERVIEW COLLEGIATE

MR. G.T. SNYDER (Moose Jaw North): — Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the Hon. Member for Nipawin for making an announcement concerning the accomplishments of a group of young Moose Jaw curlers. I stood in my place, I believe last week, and announced that the Greg Montgomery rink of Vanier Collegiate of Moose Jaw had won the provincial High School Boys' curling championship and I am pleased to join with him in congratulating them for having won the Dominion school boys' curling championship in Kamloops over the weekend. I wonder that he didn't hasten to join with me in congratulating also the Lisa Lys rink from Moose Jaw from Riverview Collegiate who won the High School Girls' championship in Saskatoon over the weekend. I know that all Members will want to join with us in congratulating both of these rinks — the High School Boys' Curling Champions and the Girls, both from the constituency of Moose Jaw City.

HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

NATIONAL WOMEN'S CHAMPIONSHIP - SASKATOON

MR. J.J. CHARLEBOIS (Saskatoon City Park University): — In regard to curling Saskatoon once again has won the National Women's championship represented by Miss Vera Pezer and her team of curlers. This is the fourth time, I think, that the Dominion championship has come to Saskatoon.

HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. J.E. BROCKELBANK (Saskatoon Mayfair): — Before the Orders of the Day I want to join with the Member from Saskatoon on the other side of the House in extending the feeling of elated success for the women curlers and wishing them continued success in the future in women's curling from Saskatoon.

HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

QUESTIONS

ST. DAVID'S DAY

MR. A.E. BLAKENEY (Leader of the Opposition): — Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day I want to address a question and in the course of so doing make a brief comment to the Minister in charge of the Wascana Centre Authority. I have noticed a singular lack of any leeks or daffodils on the desks of Members. It must have been overlooked that today is St. David's Day and it has been customary in this House to honor those of our people who are of Welsh descent on St. David's Day or that day when we sit closest to St. David's Day. I know that all Hon. Members would want to join with me in paying tribute to those citizens of Saskatchewan who are of Welsh ancestry. All of us I think know that Welsh people are singularly peaceful and quiet in their demeanor, honest . . .

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. BLAKENEY: — . . . given to poetry and song, given to the graceful arts

which add so much to the quality of life. They have done just that to the quality of life in Saskatchewan. I know all Hon. Members join with me in paying tribute to our Saskatchewan people of Welsh ancestry.

HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

HON. D.V. HEALD (Attorney General): — Mr. Speaker, as Minister and Chairman of the Board of Wascana Centre Authority I shall be glad to relay those observations on to the Executive Director. I am sure that I can't give as an excuse the fact that it may be a bad year for daffodils, it may be a bad year for some Welshmen but I am sure it won't be a bad year for all Welshmen and I'll see that perhaps we get the daffodils a week or so late.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: — I wish to draw the attention of all Hon. Members to the fact that due to the very severe winter it has been a bad year for the production of leeks. I consider this most unfortunate and I am very sorry to see that we have not had daffodils on our desks at the customary time of the year to honor St. David's Day particularly when I think of that brave group of Welsh people who many years ago emigrated to South America, settled at Port Madryn in Patagonia and brought civilization to that uninhabited area of what is now the Argentine. They made a great contribution to civilization in that area and later left South America because the Argentine Government had moved in upon them and imposed upon them what they considered to be undemocratic dictatorial controls which they weren't prepared to accept. As a result of this they took ship from Port Madryn, sailed all the way back to England and then re-embarked for Canada, where upon arrival they settled in the area of Bangor and the school districts of Glyndwr and Llewellyn. Then throughout the years they have made a great contribution to this country in the field of agriculture and particularly in the realm of human liberty and human rights. I suggest that we should honor the memory of their epic voyage to this land and this coming to Canada on all proper occasions and none is more appropriate than the day of the patron Saint of Wales.

ADJOURNED DEBATES

BUDGET DEBATE

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

MR. R. ROMANOW (Saskatoon-Riversdale): — Mr. Speaker, my first words in taking up this debate again must be those of congratulations to the new leader of the New Democratic party in Saskatchewan, my leader, Mr. Allan Blakeney.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. ROMANOW: — Mr. Blakeney is, as most people know, a distinguished lawyer who has had long and outstanding experience in service to the people of Saskatchewan. He brings to this Legislature new

March 1, 1971

ideas. With his dynamic leadership, I am sure that it will be only a matter of months before he is sitting now in the seat that the Premier (Mr. Thatcher) has just vacated.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. ROMANOW: — In fact, Mr. Speaker, it looks as though the opinion that I have just said about the Leader is shared by most editorial writers and the people throughout Canada. I know that it is among farming people in Saskatchewan from my travels. I have in front of me here a clipping from the Montreal Gazette talking about the election of Mr. Blakeney. The clipping says this, Mr. Speaker:

At the moment the NDP's prospects in Saskatchewan look far better than Mr. Schreyer's did at any time before his stunning election victory. As Saskatchewan sinks into economic stagnation, Premier Ross Thatcher's Liberal administration begins to look more like a group of helpless bystanders and less like a Government.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. ROMANOW: — Mr. Speaker, I should also like to extend congratulations to all of the thousands of volunteers who operated and made successful the Canada Winter Games. In particular, a word of congratulations publicly to the Member from Saskatoon City Park-University, Mr. Charlebois, who was the president of the Games and worked very hard and to a large measure contributed to that success. I was at the Games and had the good fortune of being asked to present the badminton medals which I did. I had the good fortune of meeting many young athletes and found them to be, of course, bright and very interesting young people.

Mr. Speaker, I should also like to depart from the usual for just a few minutes this afternoon to pay public tribute to Mr. Julius Stechishin, Q.C., who passed away last week at Saskatoon. Mr. Stechishin was a well known Saskatoon barrister and solicitor. Although he was highly regarded and successful in his chosen profession, I think it will be his work with Ukrainians across Canada for which he will be best remembered. In Ukrainian community circles in this province and in Western Canada, the late Mr. Stechishin was a giant, holding most important offices at one time or another. He gave inspired leadership. He was a prolific writer. Up to the time of his death, he was involved in writing yet another major work on one other aspect of Ukrainian life in Canada. Every person in Saskatchewan of Ukrainian background knew of Julius Stechishin. I knew him personally. Although he was not of the same political persuasion, he gave younger men and women like myself confidence, encouragement and support. He will indeed be missed by all people and I am sure this House joins me in extending sincere sympathies to his widow and to the family.

HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. ROMANOW: — Mr. Speaker, Friday I said that the Budget Speech 1971 could be more correctly described as the bogus Budget Speech 1971. Now that I have had the opportunity to study the Budget over the weekend, it's even a bigger bogus than I thought it was

on Friday. This Budget is riddled with inaccuracies, half-truths and misleading statements about Saskatchewan's economy. By every economic indicator, Saskatchewan has never been as stagnant as it is now under the Liberal party that sits opposite as the Government. I shouldn't say never. Never since the Dirty Thirties, the last time the Liberals were in power and the last time the people of Saskatchewan kicked them out before this coming election. By the Government's own figures, investment in Saskatchewan is on a steady and sharp decline. In housing, the new-home starts are less than 900, compared to 6,000 new-start homes in 1964 under the CCF. In population, the so-called 'acid test' of the Premier's, the Dominion Bureau of Statistics says that Saskatchewan's actual population loss, taking the natural increase and those who have left, is well over 100,000 people, thanks to Liberal budgets just like the one that was brought down on Friday last. Retail trade falls another 11 per cent this year. Farm machinery sales, the volume of them, is at the lowest level of all the years reported in the economic white paper tabled by this Government. And what of oil and mining? Using the revenue figures for the coming year tabled Friday by the Treasurer (Mr. Steuart) himself we see the following: petroleum and natural gas — next year down nearly \$2 million; metal revenues — next year down over \$200,000; all other metals — next year down \$1,000; revenues from forest, game revenue and the like — next year down over \$1 million. Mr. Speaker, by the Treasurer's own estimates — down is the economy and the revenue for the province, down by over \$2 million.

Mr. Speaker, in truth, this Government is about as broke as some of the 21,000 people who are walking around unemployed in Saskatchewan at the present time. In fact, this Budget would not have been balanced, could not have been balanced by the Treasurer, if it weren't for two things. First, the Federal Government is giving a handout to this Provincial Government totalling over \$70 million. That \$70 million is being given by Ottawa Liberals to help out their fellow Liberals here in Saskatchewan. Pierre Trudeau and Otto Lang of the Liberal party know that a defeat for the Liberals in the next provincial election would show all Canada that their farm and employment policies are being rejected by the people. And, the Liberal party can't afford that. Therefore, the Saskatchewan Liberals are going to get over \$70 million more from the Ottawa Liberals in order to balance this Budget. Second, this Budget is balanced because of another tax increase. Oh, the Treasurer, (Mr. Steuart) doesn't say it's a tax increase, but, Mr. Speaker, it's another tax increase. Over \$10 million in profits from the Saskatchewan Power Corporation will be transferred this year to the Treasury. From Sask-Tel, there will be a shift of over \$5 million, making a grand total of \$15 million to \$16 million, taken from those big CCF Crown corporations in order to save the bacon for the Liberal Government opposite.

Now, instead of using the profits of our publicly-owned corporations to lower costs, this Government is taking this \$16 million to balance the Budget. The Liberals yell against Crown corporations of the CCF but I say, Mr. Speaker, and tell this House, that if it weren't for those CCF Crown corporations, this Government and the Treasurer would be flat broke. Thus, if we combine the sums, over \$86 million will come to the Treasurer, Mr. Steuart, from outside sources this year. Yet, the Treasurer on Friday comes to this Legislature and asks Saskatchewan to believe that the budget will be balanced because our economy is healthy. In truth, without that \$86 million, as I have said,

March 1, 1971

the cupboard would be bare. The simple truth is that our economy cannot itself generate a balanced budget. The simple truth is that the Province is in the throes of a Liberal-produced depression.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. ROMANOW: — That is why precisely this Budget is a bogus budget. It portrays a bed of roses where there is nothing but thorns for our farmers and for our laborers.

But it is bogus for yet another reason. This type of Budget Speech is not new to the people of Saskatchewan. In 1967, the last time a Budget was given by the Liberals before an election, there were the same inaccurate and phony statements about the economy as there is in this Budget. Then, just as today, the Budget Speech predicted a booming economy, full employment, a healthy agriculture industry in the new Saskatchewan that was waiting for us around the corner. Yet, when the new Saskatchewan came right after the election, this Liberal Government placed more taxes on the province's people than any other government in any other year in our history.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. ROMANOW: — Let me remind this House about those tax increases in 1968 as compared to the statements before the election. In 1968, sales tax up 25 per cent. The sales tax was expanded to include hotels, motels, telecommunications, and meals over 14 cents. Tax on the sick for the first time in the history of the province. The deterrent tax, the tax placed by the Premier and the Treasurer, the worst tax of all, was put on by the Liberals. I heard part of the Harasen hot line this morning, the question and answer radio program that emanates from Regina from time to time. The Treasurer was on the radio program and he went on to say about the health costs and the deterrent fees. He says, you know the deterrent fees are the lowest in all Canada. He is right, because there is no other deterrent fee, but in the Province of Saskatchewan.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. ROMANOW: — Thanks to the Liberal Government.

That wasn't enough, taxes on cigarettes up to 60 per cent; pari-mutuel tax up 100 per cent; operator's license tax up 100 per cent. Mr. Speaker, the list goes on and on. Since this is my first speech as budget critic, I took the liberty of totalling the number of taxes that have been placed on the farmers of Saskatchewan, by this Liberal party since 1964. These taxes range from increases on exam fees to the students, to increases on honey production. Mr. Speaker, the total number of taxes put on the people of Saskatchewan since 1964 by the Liberals opposite is 1,477 new taxes. 1,477 new taxes placed by the Liberal party. Put in another way, the average increase of the tax load is about \$600 for a family of four, since the Liberals came over.

But, Mr. Treasurer, I know that you say things aren't all bad. After all, we are going to be getting a \$70 homeowner grant. You increase the taxes by \$600, so we'll get \$70 back

with a homeowner grant with the same old tired propaganda message about industrial growth in Saskatchewan. I can tell the people of this province, Saskatchewan can thank Ottawa for the increase in the homeowner grant and not the industrial growth policy of this Government. Without that \$70 million equalization payment, this Government would not have been able to make any homeowner grant payment whatsoever. Frankly, Mr. Treasurer, I expected the homeowner grant to go up to \$100 this year, this election year. Liberals are fond of trying to bribe the people with their own money. But I know why we didn't get the \$100 increase in homeowner grants. The bribing hasn't started yet. The bribe of an increase of \$100 will surely be another election promise by the Liberal party, in another futile attempt to get through this election but one more time. Mr. Speaker, that homeowner grant in today's depressed Saskatchewan is to the average person about as contemptuous as Marie Antoinette's famous last statement before the first French Revolution. All I can say is this, Mr. Speaker, that money out of the hands of Liberals and into the hands of the farmers will be supported by us. But that grant, just like all other promises in this Budget, is simply inconsistent with the true economic facts of depression in Saskatchewan today. That's the point. This Budget Speech is simply the first Liberal party election propaganda document. Like the last speech, if the Liberals get elected, the promises will never be kept. They didn't do what they said they would do in 1967. Why in the world should Saskatchewan think that they will do it now, in the next coming election?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. ROMANOW: — Well, Mr. Speaker, this Budget contains a portion which promises a shift in the tax burden to the province and relief for the local property owner. I predict that this Budget won't do that. I predict that this Budget will rather sharply increase local property taxes. Liberals haven't succeeded in the past seven years in lowering property taxes. In fact, all Hon. Members know that local property taxes have increased at a rate four times the amount that they were in the period of 1960-64, thanks to the Liberals. But with respect to this Budget particularly, there will be, I predict, yet another sharp increase in local property taxes. I'll tell you why. The Treasurer has budgeted the school grants this year to be about \$8 million. That is a reduction from the \$11 million that was in the Budget last year; \$11 million last year. \$8 million this year. A reduction of \$3 million in grants. What was the objective in making grants totalling \$11 million last year. To quote the Treasurer from page 29, he said:

Our objective at that time was simple — to bring some measure of relief to the tax-weary property owners.

Mr. Speaker, and Hon. Members, we have found at least that one kernel of truth which we have been looking for in the Budget Speech, and that is that there are thousands of tax-weary property owners in Saskatchewan.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. ROMANOW: — What is the objective this year? To quote again from this year's Budget, the same old objective with the same old government, quote:

March 1, 1971

Our objective in this Budget is the same, to lower property taxes.

Last year, the Liberal party stated that \$11 million would hold the tax line. What in the wildest imagination of the Treasurer and the Premier would make them think that only \$8 million this year will hold the property line when \$11 million last year could barely do the job.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. ROMANOW: — This paltry and measly sum of \$8.3 million is barely enough to cover the cost of education. When the Minister of Education tabled his Annual Report a few days ago he said the cost of education was \$14 million up last year compared to 1968. \$14 million more dollars! In order to hold the mill rate local authorities would need about half that much more in school grants.

So as a result of this Budget, one of two things will happen. First, either the local authorities simply have to increase the property taxes again, which I predict they can't do, or the entire education system is going to take it in the neck again by the Liberal Government and the Minister of Education.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. ROMANOW: — What are the local school authorities to do? Even if they cut and slash their expenditures they simply don't get enough money. Therefore the property taxes will keep going up and up. To add insult to injury, this Budget says with respect to grants for construction that they too will be slashed some more. Mr. Speaker, local governments have been trying to comply with every reasonable request of this autocratic Liberal Government. For example, in Saskatoon, the school board brought down a budget which followed the guidelines of this Government in 1970 almost to a tee and yet they are still being denied \$1.3 million by the Liberals.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. ROMANOW: — What do the local governments get when they ask for more funds? Well, Friday night I debated, if you could call it that, with the Treasurer on television. I brought this point up about local school authorities. He told the public on television that local school authorities are not responsible for financial spending — that he and the Premier were the people responsible. He said the local government officials have no responsibility. Then he tried, somehow, to get out of his statement after he was pressed on the point. I say to local governments and officials that not only will the local property taxes increase if this Government is elected, but your autonomy will be more threatened that it is right now. The attitude of the Members opposite is to view local government people as mere puppets and pawns. We, on this side, don't agree with that attitude. We believe in strong local governments. We say local government officials are responsible people, responsible to ratepayers.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. ROMANOW: — They will make the right decisions in the interests

of the local people. Well, with only \$8 million increase in grants, I say to Saskatchewan that if you re-elect the Liberals, local property taxes will skyrocket again.

Mr. Speaker, I find increasing support among local authorities for the proposal of our party to ease taxes. We say that we are going to finance education on a new basis. We will work out an approach that does not use property as a means of paying for the cost of education.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. ROMANOW: — We know that we can do the job of dramatically easing tax loads on the property owner. Shortly, Mr. Blakeney and other Members of our party will even more clearly detail the plan that we have in mind.

So, as you can see, Saskatchewan is in a depression, with taxation even to be increased again in this year of depression. Now, do we have a Government capable of meeting the challenge? No! Do we have a good Government? No! Does this Budget give us hope of a good Government? No! Well, what is good government? Well, I have a definition for the Hon. Members. I have a definition of good government that I know the Premier will accept . . .

AN HON. MEMBER: — He's not here.

MR. ROMANOW: — Well, the Treasurer will accept it on behalf of the Premier. The Premier was the Treasurer in 1967, the last great election Budget Speech. This is how he defined good government. His last words were, I quote:

If good government means:

1. A healthy agricultural industry.
2. Full employment at good wages.
3. Proper care of the unfortunate members of our society.

then he said . . .

I submit that the Liberal party has earned such a description.

No wonder the Premier is not here today. Well, we are prepared to accept that definition of good government. I am now going to analyze this Budget to see if this Government has given us a full agricultural industry; whether this Government has given us full employment at good wages; whether this Government has taken care of the unfortunate members of our society. I am going to prove to the Members opposite that the answers to all those questions are a resounding No.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. ROMANOW: — Well, Mr. Speaker, a healthy agricultural industry, according to the Premier. The Premier says that good government means a healthy agricultural industry. Does Saskatchewan have a healthy agricultural industry? The answer is too patently obvious, even to some of the Members opposite that it hardly needs stating.

March 1, 1971

MR. D.W. MICHAYLUK (Redberry): — 20-cent hogs!

MR. ROMANOW: — 20-cent hogs, as the Member from Redberry says so correctly. Mr. Speaker, Saskatchewan's most important industry is farming, it is also one of our most efficient industries. If Saskatchewan farmers are to be given an even break by the Liberal party, they would make out well enough. But, the Liberal party is led by a man who tells our farmers, "why should I sell your wheat?" With a Liberal party in power, the farmers have been battered to an extent unknown since the 1930s.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. ROMANOW: — Well, has there been good government? Farm cash receipts are at an all time low. In 1970, farm cash receipts were only \$684 million. The net farm income of the farmers is \$190 million, the lowest it has been since the Dirty Thirties. This net income of \$190 million under the Liberals, under the so-called good government of the Liberals, is only about one-third of the figure of \$480 million in 1964 under the CCF.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. ROMANOW: — As a result, small businesses have closed. The Member from Yorkton (Mr. Gallagher) knows what I am talking about. Auctions are common. I know the Member from Watrous (Mr. Schmeiser) tells me they are common in his riding. Communities are gradually withering and dying. This is coupled to Liberal party policies which makes the closing of post offices commonplace, 200 of them in Saskatchewan. This coupled to a Liberal policy which builds highways in Saskatchewan which bypass Craik, Girvin, Aylesbury and will bypass Davidson. Further neglect of our small towns and villages. In short, Saskatchewan's very farm existence is being threatened by the Liberal party.

What will this Budget do? This Budget says that the agricultural budget is going to go up by the grand sum of only \$800,000. Imagine that! In the most drastic and difficult years in the farmers' history, this Government only gives a measly \$800,000 to the farmers of Saskatchewan, but yet has millions for New York foreign corporations.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. ROMANOW: — Millions for the major industries, not even Canadian. Less than a million for the farmers of Saskatchewan.

What does the Budget hold for the future. I want today to spend some time to examine in detail Liberal party farm policy. Liberal party farm policy is based on the Federal Task Force Report on Agriculture. The Liberal party Federal Task Force Report was drafted by Liberal party economists, Liberal party accountants, Liberal party big city corporation lawyers from Eastern Canada and Liberal civil servants. But not one Saskatchewan farmer was represented in drafting this Liberal policy.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. ROMANOW: — The result is a document, a Liberal farm policy for the

future, which shows no understanding of farming. In fact, it shows nothing but contempt for farmers. Here is what the report of the Task Force says. Firstly, the Federal Task Force Report proposes that farms in Canada be reduced from 430,000 in number to 150,000 in number. Interpreting it another way, if this Liberal farm program is enacted, two out of every three farmers in Saskatchewan will be forced off their lands, thanks to the Liberal party.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. ROMANOW: — I ask the Member over there from Bengough (Mr. Mitchell) whether his community can stand two out of three farmers being forced off their farms by this Liberal farm program. I ask the Member from Hanley (Mr. Heggie): can your constituency stand two out of three farmers being driven off the land by this farm program of your party? To add insult to injury, there is no alternative program for the farmer who is displaced. None. The alternative the Liberals say is welfare for the farmers in the large cities of Saskatchewan.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. ROMANOW: — Secondly, the Federal Task Force Report will mean the end of the family farmer. The main thrust of this document is to replace the family farm by the large corporate, vertically integrated farming operation. To use the words of this Liberal party program or policy:

A corporate form of farming, hired management and equity financing for the stock-market will eventually evolve out of the far-reaching changes during the next two or three decades.

Mr. Speaker, I ask the Members opposite to remember those words. If this Liberal policy is enacted, corporation farms will be the order of the day and all farmers in Saskatchewan will be sharecroppers working for the corporation.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. ROMANOW: — Mr. Treasurer, you might be interested in knowing what the Task Force Report says about corporation farming:

This is the final solution to the farm problem.

And that certainly will be the final solution. Thirdly, the Task Force will mean a dramatic depopulation of rural Saskatchewan. The destruction of our rural way of life has already started under the Liberal party. If this Liberal farm policy is ever enacted, the very fibre of Saskatchewan will be destroyed. All of our social values, all of our social institutions will come tumbling down, thanks to the corporate big business friends of the party opposite who propose this farm program.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. ROMANOW: — Mr. Speaker, I cannot state too firmly that the New Democratic party is totally and absolutely opposed to this Liberal policy of depopulation and corporate farming.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. ROMANOW: — I can tell you, Mr. Speaker, and Members opposite that we will fight it with everything that we have in this coming election. I can tell you, Mr. Speaker, and the Liberals opposite, that we will fight the Liberals when they try to propose this Task Force solution on every platform, in every town, at this next election. I say that there is no security for the Saskatchewan farmer under the Liberals. Why, we know in the last seven years, more farmers have been forced off their farms, thanks to the boys opposite, than at any other time in the history of our province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. ROMANOW: — But all is not bad according to the Treasurer and his "bogus" Budget. We do get \$800,000 for the farmers. Yet, there appears to be lots of money around for foreign industry, but no money for our most important industry, the farmer. Well, what is the position of the Liberal party with respect to this new proposed farm policy of theirs? I say to the farmers of Saskatchewan that the Liberal party throughout Canada, here in Saskatchewan and elsewhere, is committed to implementing this program. I have in front of me a letter dated December 29, 1970 written by the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. McFarlane) of this province. It talks about the Federal Task Force Liberal farm policy. The letter talks about meetings that were held last year throughout the province to help sell the Task Force to our farmers. The letter says this:

Forty meetings were held in this province. Involvement of Agricultural Representatives and Agricultural Extension Boards in the preparation as well as evaluation of each meeting was absolutely first rate.

Forty meetings, Mr. Speaker, held throughout Saskatchewan by the Liberal party and the Liberal Minister of Agriculture sitting opposite in an attempt to sell the Task Force to the farmers of our province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. ROMANOW: — But isn't it strange, Mr. Speaker, the Liberal party and the Treasurer take a very firm stand against the White Paper on Taxation to save their big corporation friends in mining and oil, but not a mention of the Federal Task Force Report in the Throne Speech or Budget. Why is this the case? In Manitoba the Leader of the Manitoba Liberals is a man called Izzie Asper. Mr. Asper is a big city, big business, corporation lawyer, and a tax lawyer at that. There are a lot of big business, big city corporation lawyers in the Liberal party across Canada. A lot of them happen to be leading the party across Canada. The present Premier of Quebec, Mr. Bourassa. The present Premier of Nova Scotia, Mr. Reagan. Leader of the Ontario Liberals, Leader of the Manitoba Liberals. The Prime Minister is a big corporation lawyer. No wonder he doesn't understand farming and he says to the farmers, "why should I sell your wheat."

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. ROMANOW: — You know the type of big city corporation lawyers I mean. The farmers of Saskatchewan certainly do. He's the type of lawyer who draws up mortgages for these corporations so that the farmers can sign those mortgages.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. ROMANOW: — He's the type of big city corporation lawyer who forecloses on those mortgages against the farmers.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. ROMANOW: — And we know, yes, forecloses on the mortgages of the farmers. We know what the Liberals and what the history of farm loss was prior to 1944 in Saskatchewan. Every Saskatchewan farmer knows what the Liberal party was doing to the farm land when the corporations and the banks and the mortgage companies moved in to take over the machinery and the land.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. ROMANOW: — It wasn't stopped until the CCF came into power and gave the farmers security.

MR. ROMANOW: — And now, here they are again. These big business, big corporation lawyers. There are three of these big corporation lawyers in the Liberal Government opposite controlling the Premier.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. ROMANOW: — Three big corporation lawyers, one sitting to the right of the Premier, the Attorney General (Mr. Heald). One is a Minister of the Crown, (Mr. Estey) right behind the Premier. Another one is not a Minister of the Crown, but is certainly desirous of being a Minister of the Crown, a corporation lawyer (Mr. Heggie). Three of them.

I come back to what Mr. Izzie Asper says about farmers. Mr. Asper, this big corporation lawyer who leads the Liberals in Manitoba, says that when he becomes Premier (which will not be for a very long time), Manitoba Liberals will remove tax barriers on farming, and I'm quoting now precisely:

In order to facilitate corporate mergers and acquisitions.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. ROMANOW: — That's what their corporation lawyers who lead the Liberal party want. That's what the Liberal party has in mind for the farmers of our Saskatchewan. Sharecroppers for large foreign corporations.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. ROMANOW: — Mr. Speaker, if this Federal Task Report comes into operation Saskatchewan is gone. This Liberal Federal Task Force Report comes from the same party, the same Liberal party that introduced Operation LIFT. It comes from the same party that attacks the Canadian Wheat Board, like the Minister of Highways (Mr. Boldt) has done. It comes from the same party that has increased the budget of agriculture only \$800,000 in this period of crisis. Well, I'm not alone in my condemnation of this Liberal farm policy. Even some Liberals are opposed to your farm policy, Mr. Minister (Mr. McFarlane). On November 7, 1970, the Regina Leader-Post reported the following:

Senators Hazen Argue and Herb Sparrow . . .

(Those are two authorities, of course, in the Liberal party, people that Members opposite listen to. But I think what they are saying here is very serious and important).

. . . said the meetings sponsored by the Provincial Liberal Government sound more like a grade one school class than a meeting for adult farmers.

And then the report says, the Senators say:

Farmers aren't allowed to express opinions although they can ask questions.

Oh, they're entitled to come to the meetings. They're entitled to ask all the questions but don't please, whatever you do, tell us what you feel about the Task Force Report. We don't want to hear your opinions on the Task Force Report. Some farmers will be asking themselves why it is that the Liberal party has accepted the Task Force as the basis for its farming policy. I don't know. Perhaps it's as I said, because of the large corporate interests. Perhaps, also, this Government has agreed to accept some form of an acreage payment from Otto Lang, shortly, in return for keeping quiet on the Federal Task Force Report.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. ROMANOW: — Maybe another little bonus to help the Minister of Agriculture out of this difficult election that's around the corner. If the Minister of Agriculture and the Premier have done that, then Saskatchewan farmers will have been sold out at a cheaper price and at a worse betrayal than Judas ever did.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. ROMANOW: — Mr. Speaker, this Liberal party has strange ideas about agriculture's importance. A few weeks ago in Ottawa, the Liberal party held its big convention. 250 delegates were there, including many hard-working Saskatchewan farmers, gathered to listen to Liberal party farm solutions. The newspaper report of the convention says as follows. You weren't there, Mr. Treasurer (Mr. Steuart) so I'll read the report for you:

The Prime Minister arrived an hour later, after everyone had eaten. He spoke for about two minutes in English and one minute in French, and said that he felt agricultural pronouncements should be left to the Agriculture

Minister, and indicated that the delegates must provide the party with the policies needed for rural Canada.

But, Mr. Speaker, all wasn't lost because the report states that the Prime Minister,

then spent 10 minutes

(three times as long as he spent talking farming)

signing autographs as delegates began returning to the convention sessions.

Again, this is the Liberal party and their priorities to agriculture. Mr. Speaker, we on this side have a dynamic program for agriculture which is based to preserve the family farm.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. ROMANOW: — We propose a Land Bank Commission where a farmer, if he so chooses, may freely and voluntarily sell his land to the Commission at a fair market price. The Commission may then lease or sell back this land to Saskatchewan boys who want to enter farming.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. ROMANOW: — This Land Bank Commission will stop the corporate takeover of our Saskatchewan farms and give the land to our young people.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. ROMANOW: — Perhaps now it is time to support the idea of the net income plan, such as the one proposed by the Manitoba Minister of Agriculture, Mr. Uskiw. There, New Democrats propose a guaranteed \$10 an acre net for farmers. This would be an incentive where incentives should be, by the Federal Government, to make sure there is a good return by sales and keeping costs down. And Members on this side during this debate will explain more of this New Democratic program. At any rate, with views like those of Mr. Asper in Manitoba, Liberals, I'm sure, at the next election will lose easily. You wouldn't think that Mr. Asper needs much help on how to lose an election. But he got it nevertheless.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. ROMANOW: — He got it. He got it from no less an authority on losing than the Treasurer himself.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. ROMANOW: — Well, you know, the Treasurer attended a Manitoba Liberal convention just a few weeks ago in Winnipeg. He came out to help out his big corporation lawyer friend, Izzie Asper. I have a clipping from the Regina Leader-Post dated February 1, 1971. That's exactly what the Treasurer told the Manitoba Liberals.

March 1, 1971

And so he said this:

Dave Steuart, speaking during the Manitoba Liberal party's annual meeting, said, "Manitoba Liberals obviously knew how to lose an election, but they had to learn to lose with a little more class."

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. ROMANOW: — Well, Mr. Speaker, I want to tell you, Mr. Treasurer, judging from your 1971 Budget Speech, you're going to have to learn to lose with a little more class too come the next election.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. ROMANOW: — But the Minister wasn't finished yet, giving advice. The story says:

The Saskatchewan Cabinet Minister said he could speak with some authority on the subject of losing elections . . .

All I can say, Mr. Speaker, is I'm glad he's an authority on one topic at least.

. . . because he had some 25 years of experience as a Liberal organizer and loser in the Prince Albert area of Saskatchewan.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. ROMANOW: — All I can say to the Treasurer is that after this next election he will have another 25 years experience added on.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. ROMANOW: — But, perhaps now Members will see why the Treasurer and the Premier are so bitter and so vitriolic in their condemnation of the positive program that we put forward. Perhaps now Saskatchewan people will see why the Treasurer and the Premier are prepared to do anything, as they did in this Budget, to bribe the voters to get themselves back in again.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. ROMANOW: — The article goes on . . .

On the serious side . . .

(You would have fooled me that he wasn't serious all the time).

. . . Mr. Steuart said that there was no great strategy or secret to winning elections, that is just required a lot of shoe leather and a lot of door-to-door campaigning. He said, "What we have to do is to have some blind faith in our leaders and match dedication with dedication."

Blind faith in our leaders. If it could be any kind of faith in the Liberals, it would have to be blind, that's for sure.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. ROMANOW: — Leaders in the agricultural area, the Premier and the Treasurer at the head and the Agriculture Minister at or near the tail in the agriculture program, leading the party. But I ask the backbenchers opposite whether they give the Premier the blind faith that he asks. Does the Member from Nutana South (Mr. Forsyth) approve the population loss in Saskatoon and do you give him blind faith? Does the Member from Elrose (Mr. Leith) approve of the labor policy of this Government? Do you give them blind faith? Does the Member from Humboldt (Mr. Breker) approve of deterrent fees? Do you give them blind faith? Who over there will give the leaders opposite some blind faith because he's asking for it? Well, don't worry, Mr. Treasurer (Mr. Steuart). You ought not to worry because there will always be the Minister of Welfare (Mr. MacDonald) to give you blind faith and the Minister of Highways (Mr. Boldt).

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. ROMANOW: — But I say now to this House that it's time to put new faith in a new leader with a new program for agriculture.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. ROMANOW: — Well, we move on now to the second criterion of what is good government — full employment and good wages. The Premier says good government means full employment and good wages. Has the Liberal Government given good government, full wages and full employment?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — No!

MR. ROMANOW: — Is there full employment in Saskatchewan? There's the Minister of Labour (Mr. MacLennan). There he is. That he knows the answer is painfully obvious. It's painfully obvious to everyone of those 21,000 people who don't have enough money and don't have jobs. It's painful enough to those 31,000 others who have had to leave friends and homes and family behind here in Saskatchewan. Unemployment in Saskatchewan in January, 1961 was the lowest on the Prairies under the old CCF. Now, under the Liberals, unemployment is the highest on the Prairies. What is the Budget going to do about it? The Budget has a little section, highlighted by a quote, "to find jobs". Once again, the Budget promises a massive public works program to stimulate the economy and find more jobs.

AN HON. MEMBER: — 80,000 jobs!

MR. ROMANOW: — 80,000 jobs. They're still struggling. I say, once again, promises, because that's the same old promise we got from this Liberal party last year. They were so successful with their \$20 million crash public works program last year that there are 21,000 people unemployed this year in the province of Saskatchewan.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. ROMANOW: — Let's take a look at this new Budget 1971. What money

is there to provide jobs? Any government has an excellent opportunity to increase capital spending by construction, by use of the Crown corporations. It's correct to say the estimates may not show all the expenditures possible for construction by Crown corporations. However, at the rate that the government is taking from these corporations, any capital for construction will have to come from these estimates. And what do these estimates show? How much spending will there be? Here's the answer. For Saskatchewan Telephones, spending down \$5 million in the coming year from last year. From Saskatchewan Power, down \$3.8 million in the coming year from last year. Municipal Affairs, down \$1 million in the coming year from last year. And in the area of school and capital grants for construction, Mr. Speaker, down nearly \$4 million in the coming year. But there are two increases in the Estimates which total \$11 million, to be fair. But the overall balance sheet with respect to capital construction shows this — amount of money set aside to build, about \$11 million; amount of money less for building this year than last year, about \$13 million, a deficit of \$2 million, thanks to the Government opposite.

Now let's turn to the Department of Agriculture to see what's happening there to stimulate the economy. I want the farmers of Saskatchewan to know that the Budget shows this: money set aside for forage development, capital expenditure, down \$80,000; money set aside for community pasture, capital expenditure, down over \$100,000. Community pasture program is a popular one with the farmers. More should be spent rather than cutting back. This is consistent with the Liberal policy of downgrading agriculture in the Province of Saskatchewan.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. ROMANOW: — Now I turn to the Department of Public Works. Mr. Speaker, this Budget again talks of millions of dollars in public works. This crash public works program will end up just like last year's. Rather than being a crash, it is going to be a big bust. If the Government actually gets around to spending some of the money it won't be in the 1971-72 fiscal year. I'll show you what I mean. This bogus Budget 1971 has set aside \$2 million to be spent on a new Institute of Applied Arts and Science in Regina. That institute should have been built years ago by this Government. \$2 million on a building for which I bet the blueprints are not even yet complete. When will construction get started, Mr. Treasurer? A bogus Budget sets aside another \$2 million for a provincial office building in Regina. I bet the blueprints aren't even complete for that building. In fact, I doubt if the site for the building has even been chosen by this Government.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. ROMANOW: — Again, this bogus Budget 1971 sets aside another \$2 million for the University Hospital in Saskatoon. That addition should have been built years ago. But what does the Treasurer say about it? Page 10, quote:

Planning for a major extension to the University Hospital at Saskatoon has progressed to the working drawing stage. Construction is expected to begin in early 1972 and will be completed in 1974.

That's their crash public works program. Plans are at the working drawing stage. Construction not until 1972, a full year away from today. Well, that's not good enough for the 21,000 people who are unemployed in Saskatchewan now. That's not good enough for my constituents who need jobs today, not in 1972 or 1974.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. ROMANOW: — So, Mr. Speaker, if you total up the decreases in construction grants, the decreases in capital grants to schools amounting to \$3.6 million from last year, those sums simply cannot be spent this year because it is too late. The Liberal party's capital construction program will in fact be about \$8 million less than they budgeted for last year. That's how they are finding jobs. They say to find jobs in their Budget. I say that is a phoney election promise that's too little and too late.

I want to say furthermore, Mr. Treasurer, this unemployment crisis is directly the fault of the Liberal party in Saskatchewan and in Canada.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. ROMANOW: — In 1968, the Treasurer told this House in his Budget Speech that because of that big, bad bogey of inflation there would be a "public freeze on employment" and that there would be no sums borrowed. We warned that the disastrous policy would create a double blow to the farm recession which in 1968 was all about us. The Members opposite know — the farming Members — they knew the farm economy was in recession then. We told the Treasurer then that, "you have to stimulate the economy. Don't wait." We said in 1968, "get things rolling." But yet he stuck slavishly to the balanced budget so that he could show his corporate banking friends he had another balanced budget at the expense of 21,000 unemployed.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. ROMANOW: — Now what should be done in this present period? Another balanced budget? We should be planning deficit financing in order to get our economy going. These are not normal times with the farmers being broke, the laborers being unemployed. These are not normal times to balance the Budget. These are times to get the economy rolling and that's what we will do when the NDP are elected in the next election.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. ROMANOW: — My leader has already detailed our program for employment to stimulate the public economy. It is to provide jobs by attracting industry and I'll have more to say about this. 21,000 unemployed, thanks to the Liberal party. Is that good government? Is this Budget taking care of it? The answer is that the Budget is a cruel hoax on the working people and the unemployed.

Mr. Speaker, the Premier says that a good government means proper care of the unfortunate members of our society. What is

March 1, 1971

the record of the Government in this third area of good government? With respect to the elderly, Mr. Treasurer, does a good government place deterrent fees on the sick and the old? Is this the Premier's way of properly taking care of the unfortunate members of our society. Deterrent fees of \$2.50 a day, especially on those who are 65 years of age and over, is an unwarranted hardship and an attack on the principle of medicare.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. ROMANOW: — Mr. Attorney General, (Mr. Heald) you will be following me in this debate. I ask you, is it correct and is it proper care of the unfortunate members of our society to charge deterrent fees on those who are ill with cancer and require constant treatment? What doings is it of theirs if the health facilities are used? That is what they are there for, to be used. And I say again, Mr. Speaker, to the party opposite, if there is any one reason why you are going to get defeated in this next election, it is over deterrent fees, which we'll abolish.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. ROMANOW: — Is it proper care of our unfortunate members of our society to have them pay exorbitant highway robbery prices, rates for nursing homes and old folks' residences. Is it proper care of the unfortunate members of our society who have their estates taken away because they are mentally incompetent? This Government passed legislation charging the estates of those who, through no fault or doing of their own, are mentally ill, thanks to the Liberal Government and they did it even retroactively.

Now what about students. This Budget provides \$1.4 million for students aid. I say there is nothing more blatant, a political move for votes, than this section on student aid. This Budget says the Government is going to put \$1.4 million into the Student Aid fund, the fund that was broke for six long years under the Liberals. To begin with, Mr. Speaker, it is not really \$1.4 million of new dollars that they're putting in. It is the following. If you notice the Estimates, the Liberals have taken \$600,000 out of the university budget of last year and they have added on top of that \$800,000 new dollars to come to their figures of \$1.4 millions. These Liberals are the experts at switching figures around about unemployment. You don't know what figures to believe or where to look.

We commend the Government for at least saying that they're going to be making a start on student aid. Mr. Speaker, it will be a start when returning to the Student Aid fund, the sum of \$2 million which they took out in 1965.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. ROMANOW: — That they took out in 1965 chiefly for political purposes. In 1965 we had \$2 million in our fund to help our young people get an education. The Liberals took it all out for political purposes. Once again, the students took it from the Colonel. That money could have helped untold thousands of young people in Saskatchewan get an education. That money could have been used for a period of six years by our students. But, it wasn't, thanks to the Liberal party.

Now they say that they are all for the students. Now they say to the students, "we are your true and real friends." Now they say to the students after robbing funds and taking away their opportunities, "We really didn't mean to do it. We really didn't mean to deprive you of your opportunity." Now they are saying to the student, "Here is your money back." Or at least a portion of it. But why wait six long years? Because as I said at the beginning, this is nothing but a blatant attempt to buy votes, student votes.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. ROMANOW: — And I can tell the Government opposite that from my talking to many young people, they are not going to get those student votes because this Government has lost touch.

Mr. Speaker, I say to the students that this Government has never believed in giving student aid and never will believe it. If they are re-elected, I say to the students there will be no bursary plan. If they are re-elected, I say to the students the amount allocated for student aid will not be spent. And the reason is this: bursaries and student aid are foreign to the ideologies of the Liberal party who sit opposite. Because you see the Liberal party is made up of men who are self-made men. They believe in the concept of being self-made. Student aid and bursaries are contrary to the very way that they think students should get an education.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. ROMANOW: — Furthermore, from the Premier down, the Liberal Government has consistently taken a stand against bursaries and student aid. I'm going to remind the Minister of Education (Mr. McIsaac) that on December 1, 1970, two or three months ago, the Leader-Post reported on your own Liberal convention right here in Regina. Here is the story and I quote:

Proposals to make student loans more readily available and have bursaries available for post-secondary education were turned down Monday by a panel discussing education at the Provincial Liberal convention.

Turned down, Mr. Minister of Education, three months ago.

A short two or three months ago, the Liberal party said, "No" to student aid, said, "No" to bursaries. But now all of a sudden, they say they are all for it. Now all of a sudden, they say, "We are going to get it." In fact at the convention, and I ask the constituents of Wilkie to keep this in mind, the Minister of Education led the fight to get the resolution for student aid defeated. Now he says he is for it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. ROMANOW: — Mr. Speaker, the fact is that students need aid and that is above argument. Tuition is up 20 per cent. Books up 6 per cent. Room and board up 20 per cent. A \$1,000 Canada Student Loan will only cover a partial cost of financing which is now nearly \$1,800. Now the Liberal party has again promised student aid. But they are doing it, not because they believe in it, but because they need the votes and need the votes desperately.

March 1, 1971

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. ROMANOW: — While commenting on the committee on bursaries, the president of the Saskatchewan Association of Students said in the Carillon the following:

Anybody who votes Liberal because of this scheme is out of their head.

And he added:

Anybody who votes Liberal is out of their mind, period.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. ROMANOW: — All I can say is with sound judgment like that by our youth, I know that Saskatchewan's future will be safe.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. ROMANOW: — Mr. Speaker, our party program is clear. We are committed to putting the Student Aid Fund money back to help our young people who are committed to a bursary plan. We are committed to the autonomy and independence of the University, not like you people are. We are committed to the autonomy and the independence of local education authorities. We are committed to a new and exciting and bold approach to education which will open new horizons for knowledge.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. ROMANOW: — We say that our young people are the most valuable asset Saskatchewan has. And this bogus Budget has overlooked the young people of this province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. ROMANOW: — Mr. Speaker, using the Premier's definitions, "Do we have good government? A healthy agriculture industry?" That's a joke. "Full equipment." That's a joke. "Good wages, the lowest minimum wage in Western Canada." That's a joke. "Care for unfortunate members of society." That's a joke. Our Government is a joke and the sooner we can beat them, the better off.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. ROMANOW: — Now, Mr. Speaker, this Budget Speech deals at length with the pulp mill industry. The pulp mill industry for jobs is the slogan of the Liberal party. Well, we have had a pulp mill in Prince Albert for the last two years now. Why is it that with all the jobs the Prince Albert mill is to provide, there are still over 21,000 people walking around without jobs in Saskatchewan. With a pulp mill in Prince Albert, why is it that we have the highest unemployment rate that we've ever had in our history? Why is it that with a pulp mill in Saskatchewan, over 31,000 people have still left the Province of Saskatchewan

because there were no jobs for them. Liberals say pulp mills will keep people off welfare rolls. Why is it then that two years after the Prince Albert pulp mill, the number of people on welfare is greater this year, than it has been in the past. To the Treasurer I say, why is it that in your own home city of Prince Albert, where the mill is located, there are more unemployed and more people on welfare than in the past? In 1967, 2,568 were receiving benefits. January of 1971, 3,133 were receiving benefits and the pulp mill is going. The Liberal party would have Saskatchewan believe that our native people are the ones who are really benefiting from the mill. Why is it that so very few of our native people are employed by the Prince Albert mill?

Mr. Speaker, hasty give-away programs which destroy our natural resources in the result, will not make jobs for the people of Saskatchewan. What they will do instead in the long run is create more unemployment than jobs. Rather, what will make jobs for our people is an intelligent and reasoned program to attract industry to this province on terms that are always consistent with the best interests of the people of our province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. ROMANOW: — I tell the Premier that a government that seeks industry, that fails to protect our natural resources at the same time, is doing the worst disservice that any Premier could or any government could do.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. ROMANOW: — We must attract industry, Mr. Premier, Mr. Treasurer. We will attract industry when we become the government. But we must always attract industry within the framework that what industry does must be in the best interest of all our people.

The Liberal party has no such reasoned industrial program. Its only program is a give-away program of resources for one cheap political advantage for the next election.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. ROMANOW: — While polluting our rivers and streams and clear cutting our forests to boot. I know something of this destruction of our natural resources. I flew over Camp 1 and Camp 3 a few months ago and saw the devastation of clear cutting. I saw, Mr. Treasurer (Mr. Steuart), the pale, grey slime creeping down from the mill into the North Saskatchewan River when you were saying that the river wasn't being polluted.

Mr. Speaker, New Democrats want jobs for people. New Democrats want jobs for people.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. ROMANOW: — But we'll get jobs while at the same time protecting our natural resources for our children.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

March 1, 1971

MR. ROMANOW: — We'll get jobs for our people without giving away our royalty rights. We'll get jobs while at the same time planning for the orderly use of these resources for our children and their children.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. ROMANOW: — Now, the Premier and the Treasurer (Mr. Steuart) talk about pulp mills and our stand on them. I want to tell the Government opposite that Saskatchewan is sceptical about this proposed second mill and I say 'proposed second mill'. The Premier would have us believe that it is completed. But do you know that Ottawa has not yet approved the sum of \$12 million, which is a basic ingredient to financing and getting this mill going.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. ROMANOW: — They haven't approved it. They said so in the House of Commons. If they haven't approved it, the deal isn't finalized. Yet, the Premier says the deal is finalized. But the Minister Jean Marchand says, "no \$12 million.". And he says, "you know why? We're going to take a good look before we commit our \$12 million." That's the way it should be done. Ottawa is looking hard before they give their \$12 million but our boys give \$107 million away, just like that on a guarantee.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. ROMANOW: — Will the Government ever start telling the truth about this pulp mill to the people?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. ROMANOW: — Will the Government ever start telling the truth about jobs and the pulp mill to the people?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. ROMANOW: — Will it ever start telling the truth about conversations between Parsons and Whittemore and the Manitoba Government of Ed Schreyer?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. ROMANOW: — Will it ever start telling us the truth about the profits that Parsons and Whittemore may get from the second mill before even an ounce of pulp is produced? The Financial Post says it's a 10 per cent or \$12 million profits before the people of Saskatchewan see one red cent.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. ROMANOW: — And the Treasurer doesn't say a thing about it. Will this Government ever start telling the truth about pollution as a result of this mill? Inaccurate and misleading statements

about all these areas are being made daily in this House and outside the House by the Liberal party and I'll give you an example. I have a full page advertisement about the Prince Albert mill and pollution and the advertisement says:

It is not a joke when I say that the water we put back into the river is much cleaner than the water we take out.

That advertisement was, in part, paid by the Government opposite. Yet, just a few days ago the Liberal party says that we need a \$1.3 million brand new pollution treatment program there. Why has the Government acted all of a sudden if the water was so clean? Because there is an election around the corner and it has finally responded to the public pressure that we, the New Democrats, have put on this Government.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. ROMANOW: — The Treasurer says that the Government has to determine first if the present treatment was adequate. He states that some time had to elapse before the Government could determine whether this new treatment plant should be put in and so, typically Liberal, he waits for two ears and acts now only after the river is polluted and there is a public outcry which threatens his political survival in Prince Albert.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. ROMANOW: — The Treasurer (Mr. Steuart) comes from Prince Albert and if he ever visits his home riding and his constituents, he would see the effluent coming down from the mill and strung out for hundreds of yards down the river.

Well, Mr. Speaker, statements about the pulp mill are being made by this Government which have opened up the largest credibility gap the people of Saskatchewan have ever seen. We simply can't believe anything the Premier tells the people about pulp mills.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. ROMANOW: — We know, we know that pulp mills are the worst polluters. The Minister of Environment in Ottawa, Jack Davis, said in the House of Commons — and I am quoting his exact words:

Half or close to half of all the wastes being dumped into Canadian waters by industry originate in our pulp and paper mills.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. ROMANOW: — And yet our Treasurer says there is no pollution. He says there is no pollution. There is no pollution and then, one day, all of a sudden, we are going to have a pollution treatment plant.

Jobs, jobs, jobs we are told, while all around us 21,000 people are unemployed.

March 1, 1971

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. ROMANOW: — What makes it even worse is that the Liberal party tries to publicly and privately intimidate anyone who dares speak up in the interests of the entire province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. ROMANOW: — The Member from Saskatoon Nutana South (Mr. Forsyth) intimidates biologists and pollution groups and suggests infiltration. The Treasurer says that biologists are politically motivated. They even try to intimidate us, the members of the New Democratic party. For purposes of intimidation they yell that we are against jobs. I say, Mr. Speaker, nonsense. We are not against jobs but we are against bad deals which could result in fiascos such as Churchill Forest Industries in the Province of Manitoba.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. ROMANOW: — And if we remained stone silent as the Liberals would want, then the people of Saskatchewan would rightly censure us for not having spoken up earlier when we should have.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. ROMANOW: — Friday, the Treasurer in his Budget, talked about us protecting our friends, the co-ops. He said we don't protect our friends. You see the Liberal party's thinking in this way? They always protect their friends, the big business corporations in New York and Montreal. He's right. The Liberals do protect their friends. But, Mr. Speaker, New Democrats are not of the view that we are in this Legislature to protect our friends.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. ROMANOW: — We say that it is our duty to protect no special interest group. We are not here to protect co-operatives or pulp mills or trade unions or big business corporations. We have only one duty and that duty is to speak up and fight for the interests of all of the people of Saskatchewan.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. ROMANOW: — I say this, Mr. Speaker, with respect to the Prince Albert pulp mill and other mills that may be proposed, and I say to the people of Saskatchewan who are listening and to the Treasurer opposite who is not listening, that we shall not be intimidated. Al Blakeney and the New Democrats will speak up and will criticize whenever and wherever this Government is selling out our natural resources and our future opportunities.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. ROMANOW: — We will speak up to protect our environment because that's what the people want. A leader and a party with guts, guts to stand up to big business.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. ROMANOW: — Guts to stand up to big business and guts to do and say what is right by the people for all the Province of Saskatchewan.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. ROMANOW: — And that's why the Liberals are going to lose next time around because they don't have the guts to call a spade a spade. What the people want, they'll get — a new leader and a party with those guts. And one more point. If Dore Lake is to be polluted as badly as the North Saskatchewan River seems to have been polluted, what of our native peoples and those who fish up there? What of the trees that are destroyed by clear cutting? What of the native people and what's for them? What about the multi-purpose use of our forests? What will become of the person who goes to Northern Saskatchewan in the hopes of getting clean air and clean water and beautiful trees? What is the Liberal party offering to these people? What is it . . .

MR. A. THIBAUT (Kinistino): — Pollution!

MR. ROMANOW: — You said it — pollution. The Member from Kinistino said it all. We will vote on the Athabasca mill once and if, I say, if because we had a bad experience in Prince Albert, if the documents are tabled, we will examine the documents, consistent with our duty to the people of Saskatchewan in their best interests and we will act accordingly.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. ROMANOW: — Mr. Speaker, I could go on at length about the fallacies of this Liberal party and this Liberal Budget. I could go on at length about the New Democratic party programs, exciting and imaginative programs which are offering concrete solutions for our people; the proposals we have to revitalize this great potash industry that has been brought to its knees by the Minister of Mineral Resources (Mr. Cameron) and the Government opposite; proposals to expand our horizons of education; to develop bold and imaginative education, that presently has been brought to its knees by the Minister of Education (Mr. McIsaac). I could talk at length about our proposals to save our rural life and our family farms, values that we want, values that are being destroyed by the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. McFarlane) and the members opposite.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. ROMANOW: — But you will hear of these proposals during the course of our debate by other colleagues on this side and of course during consideration of the Estimates. You will hear more of these programs we offer. In the meantime, as I have said, this Budget offers nothing but election promises that I predict will be broken just as quickly as the ones in 1967 were. Furthermore, by the record of the Government itself, and by the very words of the Government itself, the Liberal party has failed to provide good government. What is good government? I repeat again, Mr.

March 1, 1971

Speaker, Premier Thatcher in 1967 said,

If good government means a healthy agricultural industry, full employment and good wages, proper care of the unfortunate members of our society, then I submit that we have earned such a description.

I ask Hon. Members, have we had good government?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — No!

MR. ROMANOW: — I ask Hon. Members is this Budget a good budget?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — No!

MR. ROMANOW: — I ask Hon. Members opposite does the party opposite have a program to attract industry on a wise and sensible basis?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — No!

MR. ROMANOW: — If the Budget ever earned and if this Government ever earned a reputation of good government, this Budget shows that it no longer has it.

Therefore, I move, seconded by the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Blakeney):

That all the words after "That" be deleted and the following substituted therefor:

this Assembly expresses its profound regret that in this Budget the Government has again failed to provide funds and programs in order to give Saskatchewan residents:

1. A healthy agricultural industry;
2. Full employment at good wages; and
3. Proper care of the unfortunate members of our society.

Mr. Speaker, I so move.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

The debate continues on the motion and the amendment.

HON. D.V. HEALD (Attorney General): — Well, Mr. Speaker, we have had the heat for the last hour and 15 minutes and now perhaps for a few minutes we shall have a little light.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. HEALD: — Mr. Speaker, I should like to make a few comments on the speech of the Opposition's financial critic (Mr. Romanow) and I am sorry that he has left. Perhaps I shall send him a copy in the morning.

Technically and from a debating point of view the Member for Saskatoon Riversdale (Mr. Romanow) of course did his usual rather sound performance, from a technical point of view. But, Mr. Speaker . . .

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. HEALD: — . . . don't clap yet. Mr. Speaker, from the point of view of body and substance, it was sadly lacking.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. HEALD: — It was really a non-speech. The speech had more froth than fact, more verbiage than validity, more verbosity than veracity and it was more vacuous than vibrant, I suggest, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. HEALD: — Mr. Speaker, this speech was replete with all the tired, old Socialist clichés, the pious platitudes of Tommy Douglas and Clarence Fines, the mayor of Fort Lauderdale these days. Mr. Speaker, I suggest to you that it was a sad speech. It was a wistful speech, wistful because it was full of unfulfilled longing and that is the definition of wistful — longing for the treasury benches to your right, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. HEALD: — Sad, yes, sad because misplaced enthusiasm or faked enthusiasm is always sad.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I suggest to you that he and his leader have set themselves an impossible task — the task of selling the splintered party that sits to your left, Mr. Speaker, to the people of Saskatchewan. This party of contrasts, this party of contradictions, this party of Wafflers, this party of trade union bosses, of impractical theorists, the party with a 19th century Marxist platform.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. HEALD: — The policies he now advocates, Mr. Deputy Speaker, were either ignored or found wanting during the 20 years they were in office, found wanting in most of the free world, including Britain and Sweden. And I am going to say a little bit about Sweden because the Hon. Members opposite are always holding up Sweden as a shining example of social democracy and I'm going to talk about Sweden perhaps a little later.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, the speech of the Member for Saskatoon-Riversdale (Mr. Romanow) was revealing. It revealed a sensitivity — and I'll tell him this outside the Legislature — it revealed a sensitivity that may turn out to be the Member's Achilles' heel. He revealed himself as being sensitive to the charge that he was a city labor lawyer. His answer to that charge was that those of us over here who are lawyers are corporation lawyers. Well, Mr. Speaker, as far as I am concerned

March 1, 1971

I don't propose to get hung up on types of lawyers. I think it is far more important that a lawyer be honest, that he be industrious, that he be as competent and as dedicated to his task as it is humanly possible for him to be.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. HEALD: — When I was engaged in the private practice of law I was honored to receive the confidence of some companies, mostly small companies, some medium in size — very few that were large — but by far the largest part of my practice — and I am sure I am in the same position as the Minister for Industry (Mr. Estey) and the Member for Hanley (Mr. Heggie) — my practice consisted, and so did theirs, of individuals, average Saskatchewan citizens like you and me.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. HEALD: — So I don't attach much significance to the type of practice that a lawyer may have. Although I can tell you that after listening to the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Blakeney) and listening to the financial critic (Mr. Romanow), their complete lack of understanding about pulp mill deals, and their complete lack of understanding about corporate law — maybe they need a couple of corporation lawyers over there and they would have a more substantial assessment, an assessment that makes sense of the pulp mill deals, both the Prince Albert deal and the Meadow Lake deal.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. HEALD: — They don't know very much about corporation law and maybe they should know a little more about it if they are going to be the great defenders of the public interest in the Province of Saskatchewan.

Mr. Speaker, I attach more significance to the fact that both their leader and their deputy leader are urban-oriented, they are city lawyers and most important than that, they represent city seats in a rural province. Both of the leaders — the leader and the deputy leader. And what about the second tier in the party hierarchy over there, Mr. Speaker. Everybody knows who is in that second tier — the Member for Regina North East (Mr. Smishek) who is in his seat, the platform committee chairman, the platform for people, the platform for progress — the Member for Regina North East, the Member for Regina North West (Mr. Whelan, who is not in his seat. The Member for Moose Jaw North (Mr. Snyder) who is running in Moose Jaw South, the Member for Saskatoon Mayfair (Mr. Brockelbank) — three out of four of them in that tier, Mr. Speaker. That's the second tier of leadership over there. Three out of four of them active in the trade union leadership.

Mr. Speaker, I ask you — is this a broadly based party? Is this a credible party? Is this an acceptable party for rural Saskatchewan, Mr. Speaker? I think not. I found the financial critic's speech full of inconsistencies. For example, he tried to argue that our seventh balanced budget was in reality not a balanced Budget because the Province will receive in the order of \$70 million in payments from the Federal Government. Now the

financial critic (Mr. Romanow) seems to have complained about these federal payments, Mr. Deputy Speaker, and yet only a couple of years ago the Member from Regina Centre (Mr. Blakeney), who is now his leader, was blasting the Government over here and said, "You made a lousy deal. You went down to Ottawa and you made a poor deal for the Province of Saskatchewan.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. HEALD: — "You aren't getting enough in equalization payments." Well now, Mr. Speaker, the Members of the Opposition can't have it both ways. Their credibility, I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, would be enhanced if they weren't trying to work both sides of the street at the same time.

Mr. Speaker, one or two other things that are very interesting and inaccurate so far as the financial critic was concerned. First of all, his speech was more notable for the things he didn't say than for the things he did say. For example, he didn't acknowledge the fact that the Province of Alberta, old rich Alberta, with far more revenues than we have ever had, has had a deficit budget in the last two years — \$140 million in 1970-71; \$160 million in 1971-72.

MR. D.W. MICHAYLUK (Redberry): — Why don't you stay at home?

MR. HEALD: — I'm not going to stay at home because you don't stay at home. We are going to go to Manitoba in a few minutes, so just listen. We shall be there any time now. And then he made a statement about keeping the farmers on the farms in Saskatchewan and this was really something, Mr. Speaker. He talked about the people in Manitoba being protected by their government. Mr. Speaker, I should like to remind the Members of this Legislature that about a year ago, perhaps a year and a half ago, not long after the Manitoba Government was elected, there was a meeting of the Prairie Economic Council in Regina and this, as you know, is the three Prairie Premiers. I asked my Premier to put on the agenda of the Prairie Economic Council a matter of moratorium legislation to protect farmers in Western Canada. Hon. Members will know that a province by itself can't pass moratorium legislation. It has to be Federal legislation. I asked my Premier to put this matter on the agenda because we were getting complaints about farmers who were having difficulties in paying their bills. We put it on the agenda and we were prepared, if the Provinces of Manitoba and Alberta would go along with us, to recommend to the Federal Government moratorium legislation which would enable this Province, along with the other Prairie Provinces, to set up a moratorium board that would deal with individual applications of farmers in difficulty.

You know what the Premier of Manitoba said? Do you know what the Premier of Alberta said? They weren't in the least bit interested in joining with us in going to Ottawa for a moratorium board for the farmers of Western Canada. So don't tell me, Mr. Speaker, and don't tell the Members of this House, and don't tell the people of Saskatchewan that this great defender of the public interest in Manitoba is so concerned about the farmers when they had a chance to look after the farmers and they had a chance to join with us on a moratorium board and they said that they were not interested.

March 1, 1971

Now, Mr. Speaker, we have heard much recently about the Members opposite and about Manitoba. Why, one of them said the other day in the House, "as we campaign in Eastern Saskatchewan we find that we are greatly helped by the example of the Government in Manitoba. It is a great thing to have the Government of Manitoba, such a great example of progressive government." Well, I thought that it might be interesting and instructive to look at some of the Manitoba happenings in recent months. You know we heard a lot earlier today, Mr. Speaker, from the financial critic about taxes and education estimates, and taxes going up in Saskatchewan. You will recall that the Treasurer, the other day when he gave that very fine Budget Address, reminded the people of Saskatchewan that because of the increase in the amount of estimates for education last year most school units were able to hold their own, some even able to reduce a mill or two and we hope to do the same this year because of the substantial increase in the amount of money being spent on education.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I have here a note from the Winnipeg Free Press of Thursday, January 7th, 1971 which deals with the Education Estimates for the city of Winnipeg, and it is headlined: "Education Estimates up four and one-half mills." Just a stand pat position, four and a half mills up in Manitoba. That is for school alone. Then the other day, Thursday, February 25th the Winnipeg Free Press, "17 mill tax boost looms for the city." That's for the city of Winnipeg in Utopian Manitoba. Four and one-half mills for school, 17 mills across the board. Here is the party which says it will reduce taxes.

Are they reducing them in Manitoba? Heavens no, they are going up every year. Then we hear much about population. Well, I have here an article from the Winnipeg Free Press dated December 29th, 1970: "Few Municipalities show population increase". Of 105 rural municipalities in Manitoba only 12 showed a population increase and those 12 are all within a 25-mile radius of Winnipeg and Brandon.

And then from the Leader-Post of March 1970, "Manitoban exodus rises". This is the great promised land where nobody leaves. Three times as many people left Manitoba in the last quarter of 1969 than did in the same period of 1968. Mr. Speaker, I wonder if it is a coincidence that the NDP Government took office in the last half of 1969 in the Province of Manitoba.

And Premier Ed Schreyer told the House that migration out of the Province in the last quarter of 1969 was higher than his Government would have liked. Of course it was higher. Nobody likes to lose population, but don't put it on a political basis because it is happening in Manitoba the same as it is happening here. It is happening in North Dakota, it is happening in all the agricultural areas of this continent and it is going to continue to happen unfortunately.

And here is another Winnipeg paper, 1970: "33,000 jobs over three years needed." This is the new Leader of the Opposition. He said, "10,000 persons left the Province in 1969, 75 per cent of them in the past six months."

Then Manitoba taxes, and we heard a lot about taxes today. Here is a note from the Free Press a couple of months ago: "The Schreyer Government is on the lookout for ways and means of getting more money out of Manitoba taxpayers," Municipal Affairs Minister Pawley told the Union of Manitoba Municipalities

that legislation will be brought in at the next session of the Legislature designed to shift much of the responsibility for education in accordance with the ability to pay, a phrase to which NDP Ministers are much addicted.

In a later interview, Mr. Pawley said that inasmuch as the personal income tax and corporation tax fields had been pretty well used, the next area for examination was sales tax. The implication, Mr. Speaker, is that the sales tax will go up by one per cent or even more. At the present time in Manitoba they have the highest personal income tax of anyone in Canada and they have the highest corporation tax of anywhere in Canada, and pretty soon they are going to have next to the highest sales tax anywhere in Canada.

You know, they have some very interesting individuals in their party in Manitoba and I want to mention one or two of them because I think that the people of Saskatchewan would be interested in knowing what kind of people there are in that Government. There is a fellow there by the name of Cy Gonick. Mr. Gonick was very concerned about the War Measures Act a few months ago and the FLQ and he lost a Member of his constituency executive. A Member of the Crestwood New Democratic party constituency executive board has resigned because of statements made by the riding's MLA, Cy Gonick. What did he do? Well, this gentleman who resigned said that his disenchantment with Mr. Gonick's stand on the Quebec issue started Friday when Winnipeg police requested the removal of a sign from the window of a bookstore partly owned by Mr. Gonick. And what do you suppose the hand-lettered sign said? "Freedom for the FLQ." That is the kind of CCF-NDP MLAs we have in Manitoba, Mr. Speaker.

There is another interesting gentleman in that Government by the name of Mr. Borowski. Mr. Borowski is the Minister of Public Works and he is also the Minister of Highways. I have here the Winnipeg Free Press of a few days ago. "Borowski flaps at all and sundry." And here is what Mr. Borowski said when he was making his speech in one of the constituencies. He said, and he was talking about the Indians:

One trouble is that it is hard to get Indians up in the morning to go to work. That hinders their integration into the routine of industrial society. Besides that, Indians go on a drunk every fourth week when they get off work under the Provincial Government's bush clearing program.

Mr. Speaker, what a terrible statement for a Minister of the Crown to make about our native population in this country. Mr. Speaker, they are running a circus down there, they are not running a government with characters like that.

Another statement that Mr. Borowski made. He lost the master key in the Legislature, and so what did he do. He suspended the poor veteran who had the misfortune to come in line of fire of the Minister, and here is what he said:

What kind of security can we get from a person who is a cripple because of the war.

He was referring to the Legislative buildings chief security guard, Tudor P. Jones, who was suspended.

March 1, 1971

Do you know what one veteran did about that, Mr. Speaker, he paid \$87.95 of his own money to put up a billboard outside the union centre on Portage Avenue and do you know what the billboard says. It says:

Joe, a man's integrity is not affected by his war service disability.

To that, Mr. Speaker, I am sure everyone on this side of the House will say "Amen".

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. HEALD: — This is the kind of circus-like atmosphere that we have in the Government of Manitoba. If my hon. friends opposite want to endorse and embrace the policies of the Government of Manitoba, we shall gladly accept that challenge.

I want to talk for a minute or two about some of the other things that are going on in Manitoba. You know, the Opposition has been very critical about the pulp mill deal here. And they said, "we haven't disclosed the documents." Well, I should like to read from the Winnipeg Free Press of Monday, January 18th, and the editorial is headed, "In the dark" and here is what it says:

Much of the present trouble . . .

(Talking about the present trouble with Churchill Forest Industries' pulp mill deal)

. . . is the result of a lack of information — first on the part of the Churchill Forest Industries, the previous Provincial Government, and latterly on the part of the Schreyer Government. To hold behind doors meetings now would be to compound secrecy, to raise new doubts and fears in the public's mind . . . In the meantime, the public whose \$92 million is at stake, remains in the dark about many things. Information appears to be dribbling out or being forced out piecemeal.

And this is Mr. Schreyer whom they talk about.

For example, it now appears from Mr. Schreyer's statement last Friday, the Government, contrary to the impression that it has left until this time, did not renegotiate certain unsatisfactory points in the agreement — the amount of land involved, the export of pulpwood, the amount of capital to be put up by the companies. There was, according to Mr. Schreyer, a verbal agreement and some letters, but that was all. The changes were never ratified so the improvements for which the Government has been given credit were, by Mr. Schreyer's own admission, non-existent.

Here are the defenders, the protectors of public interest, Mr. Speaker, the Government of Manitoba, with their blood brothers, the Opposition here to your left, who are standing up and complaining about lack of information when they talk about a pulp mill that they haven't even got yet.

The financial critic (Mr. Romanow) a few minutes ago was saying, "Oh, you haven't got your \$12 million for your second pulp mill."

Mr. Speaker, Manitoba hasn't got their \$12 million for their first pulp mill. And they have been fooling around with it for the last three years — this Government has been fooling around with it for the last year and a half.

You know, Mr. Speaker, they are doing a few other things down in Manitoba that are interesting. They have got an urban reorganization going on around the city of Winnipeg. And you know if you read about the urban reorganization you could pinch yourself and you could just think that you were back in Saskatchewan in 1962 and 1963, when Mr. Brownstone and the people in the Department of Municipal Affairs were trying to ram the County System down the throats of local government in the Province of Saskatchewan, because that is exactly what they are trying to do with the urban reorganization in Manitoba. I read from an article in the Winnipeg Free Press, February 24th:

It cannot, however, be denied that stiff even violent opposition to the Government proposals, does exist in the suburbs, led in most cases by the mayors and the councils of the municipalities involved. They are not prepared to buy the Government plan and they have been spending public money to fight it.

Some of this opposition rises from the fear of higher taxes. Higher taxes from a Socialist government — after listening to the financial critic this afternoon? Heavens, it couldn't possibly be higher taxes!

Some of this opposition rises from the fear of higher taxes which the Government has admitted will hit some municipalities and from the Government's inability to say what the cost of these programs will be. There is a fear on the part of some people that their community will lose its identity in the larger city and the needs of their area will not be met as effectively as they now are through a local council. Also seriously questioned is the effectiveness of the proposed community committees.

And get this:

Premier Schreyer is ready to appoint a non-partisan board to look at the proposed ward boundaries following charges of gerrymandering.

Can you ever imagine that? That anyone would ever accuse a Socialist Government of gerrymandering. But apparently someone is unkind enough to suggest gerrymandering in the Government system in Winnipeg.

Well, Mr. Speaker, they have all sorts of difficulty, just like they had here in 1963 when they tried to force local government, tried to force the County System. Here is the Treasurer, Mr. Cherniak, heckled at a meeting of over 900 people. So they have lots of difficulties there.

Mr. Speaker, we shall be glad at any time to defend and compare the works and the policies of the Government of Saskatchewan with the Government of Manitoba. We are delighted that our friends opposite have accepted them and have taken them to their bosoms, so to speak. We will fight any election any time on the basis of our record against the record of Manitoba.

March 1, 1971

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. HEALD: — Now, Mr. Speaker, I thought it might be instructive for a few minutes to talk about the platform of the Hon. Members opposite since it is kind of an interesting platform. I am only going to talk about a couple of the items and I shall have more to say tomorrow about some of the other matters.

In the Leader-Post, "Blakeney proposes platform for election," and one item — "considers bringing the multi-million dollar potash industry under public ownership."

I should like you to note those words "public ownership" and then further down reference to a provincial housing authority and land assembly. I should like you to note those words "land assembly". I have here the Moose Jaw Times Herald of March 16th, 1970 and here is the heading: "Snyder opposes land assembly plan. MLA says policy would destroy the New Democrats." Here is the discussion amongst the New Democratic delegates at a meeting in Moose Jaw. Here is what they say:

A Bengough district farmer, long time associate of the NDP said that the farmers would not vote for a party using the word "nationalization" in its policies. "My first object is to win the next election and then bring up nationalization."

Now there is an honest man! Now the truth comes out.

"My first object is to win the next election and then bring up nationalization," the farmer said. "The word 'nationalization' will ruin the whole thing."

And he is right. Now get this:

There was consensus to change nationalization to the term "public ownership". Considering bringing the multi-million dollar potash industry under public ownership, for public ownership by nationalization according to the farmer from Bengough.

And then they go on, Mr. Snyder tangling with Mr. Conway of the Wafflers:

Mr. Snyder said he felt that the group was arriving at a policy that would shoot us down in flames at election time. It would destroy us politically.

And then Mr. Don Mitchell gets into the act, who is going to run in Moose Jaw North one of these days. Speaking on the need for immediate action, Mr. Mitchell said — and he is talking about you fellows — "Our MPs and MLAs are running scared." Here is what Mitchell believes:

I don't think anyone has the right to own the land just like you can't own the seas and the rivers,

said a spokesman from Arm River. That's what he thinks. It was also decided to send Mr. Mitchell's paper to party headquarters for policy discussion. Well, that they did, Mr. Speaker, that they did, because it finds itself in the policy, this great new policy. We've had it dusted off — the old cliches,

a provincial housing authority and land assembly, and that is what Mr. Snyder was talking about in Moose Jaw last year.

Then of course we've had some other frank discussion about their policy. Here is an article in the Star Phoenix a few months ago by a Mr. Warnock, Mr. Warnock of 3305 Cronkite Avenue. He is a Waffler. He said:

How will the farmers and those trying to live in the small towns dependent on agriculture react to the same old agriculture policies by the NDP. An indication can be seen by the reaction of the 7,000 members of the National Farmers Union who gathered in Regina not too long ago. While the news media did not generally report it, those of us who were there were surprised when the farmers loudly booed references to Roy Romanow, Jack Messer, and the agricultural policy put forth by the NDP in the Saskatchewan Legislature.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. HEALD: — And then of course we have authority for the lack of policy that they have insofar as agriculture is concerned. The statements by the Member for Kelsey (Mr. Messer) who is also not in the House. You know, you don't have to make a speech based on what the Members on this side think about the Members opposite, all you have to do is quote some of their own Members. Here is the Member for Kelsey before the leadership convention. He said:

NDP agricultural critic, Messer, expressed concern that neither of the two provincial leadership candidates, Blakeney or Romanow, had taken a stand on the Province's depressed farming economy. Because of the attempts to gain his support, Mr. Messer said it was obvious both candidates are having some trouble in the country.

He isn't kidding, they are sure.

He said he would not announce his support until early June. He said, "I have to consider my friendship with Roy but it can't be the basis for the final decision. But whoever I align my support with, there is a very good chance he will end up with the leadership."

Well, he was wrong again.

Mr. Messer predicted because of the large percentage of rural delegates who will attend the July 2nd to 4th convention — though both Mr. Romanow and Mr. Blakeney are lawyers — in the NDP with most rural members there is a tendency to associate the leader with farm background, he said.

There we are. That's what Mr. Messer thought about the leaders. And of course the Member for Regina South East, you know, he had something to say about this too:

Baker feels he has farm belt appeal.

This is when he had delusions or aspirations. He said:

March 1, 1971

A lot of things can happen in the next few weeks. Both are urban men.

He was talking about Romanow and Blakeney.

He said he was receiving many requests to run from the farm population. He said he felt Mr. Romanow was hurting himself by running and would be hurting himself even if he did get elected as provincial leader. "You must remember it has to be someone who can take on Ross Thatcher on his own terms."

And Henry, you were right. You were right.

Then of course you will all remember what Mr. Smishek said. Mr. Smishek, when he was running, criticized the two announced leadership candidates, Mr. Romanow and Mr. Blakeney.

He said that he felt that it appeared to him after reading news reports that the declared candidates have dealt with only side issues saying there were many new problems, so they weren't really getting to the gist of the matter at all.

This is what they think, Mr. Speaker. This is one of the problems with the Members opposite and their lack of policy.

You know a few months ago there was an advertisement in the Moose Jaw Times Herald. It was an advertisement by the Waffler group in Moose Jaw signed by Mr. Conway, Mr. Mitchell, and, I have always wondered how strong the Waffle or the very extreme left wing element in this party is. I was very interested to read this advertisement which I don't think has been denied. It says:

These gentlemen (these are the people in the party) should also realize that they are attacking a large part of the New Democratic party when they attack the Waffle. Every national and provincial leader, while disagreeing with aspects of the Waffle, has applauded its contribution. Gerry Ackerman, leader of the Nova Scotia NDP, which is predominantly Waffle oriented, was recently elected MLA as a Waffler. Over 25 per cent of the delegates to the Saskatchewan leadership convention voted for Don Mitchell, a Waffler. One-third of the Ontario NDP delegates at their recent convention loyally supported the Waffle and quite often a majority support Waffle resolutions. One-third of the Federal NDP council are Wafflers, prominent Canadians like Laurier Lapierre, Melville Watkins, Cy Gonick, Donald Creighton, Bruce Kidd, John Warnock, are either participants in or favorably disposed to Waffle.

Get this:

Woodrow Lloyd, Frank Meakes, Walter Smishek are three Saskatchewan NDPs who voted for the Waffle Manifesto at the last national convention.

And we could go on and on. For example, every provincial New Democratic youth section as well as the national NDY support the Waffle. So it is a fairly lengthy group, Mr. Speaker, a fairly lengthy group indeed, a fairly substantial part of the

party opposite is controlled lock, stock and barrel by the radicals.

Now, we've heard a lot over the years, Mr. Speaker, about Sweden, the welfare state in Sweden. How are they doing in Sweden? Well, I just noticed an editorial in the Winnipeg Free Press a few days ago and I think Hon. Members will be interested in this:

The Swedish Socialist dream collapsed last week when 30,000 civil servants were locked out by the government. Doctors, dentists and local government officials went on strike. Railways ground to a halt and electricity and gas workers organized sudden stoppages that disrupted supplies at peak hours. The Government of Premier Palme, the young man with a mission determined to bring yet more egalitarian socialism into a country where the state has already become a bad tempered domineering nanny . . .

That's what happens under Socialism.

. . . has lost the battle against inflation, is in dire financial straits and being a minority government depends in parliament on the support of the 17 Communist deputies.

Now listen to this:

Inflation is rampant and to fight it and to pay for the mounting cost of the government cradle to grave services the government has introduced . . .

Now listen to this:

. . . a 17.65 per cent sales tax on all goods and services and an extra 10 per cent tax on gasoline, electric power, wines and spirits.

Think of it — 17.65 per cent plus 10 per cent, a sales tax on gas of 27.65 per cent, electric power 27.65 per cent. They didn't stop there. The Government has also doubled the employer's payroll tax, a device aimed at eliminating feather-bedding and making companies more efficient. This in turn has infuriated the unions, Mr. Member for Moose Jaw South (Mr. Davies), who demands wage increases to offset the new taxes — and it has lost the last sympathies of the business community, which until 1969 was a tolerant partner of the Social Democrats. Indeed polarization has come to Sweden where the radicals within Mr. Palme's party and outside it, demand more equalization and more levelling down. That's what happens, Mr. Speaker, under Socialism. That's what happens under Socialist Democracy. Levelling down, never building up. Everybody has to go down, get down on the bottom. That's the trouble with Social Democracy and that's what the trouble is with the philosophy of the Hon. Members opposite. Think of it, Mr. Speaker. The sales tax is 17.65 per cent, 17.65 in the Socialist Utopia — Sweden.

Mr. Speaker, I have a few more things I should like to say tomorrow and therefore I beg leave to adjourn the debate.

Debate adjourned.

The Assembly adjourned at 4:40 o'clock p.m.