

**LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN**  
**Fifth Session — Sixteenth Legislature**  
**11th Day**

**Tuesday, March 2, 1971.**

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

**WELCOME TO STUDENTS**

**MR. SPEAKER:** — Before the Orders of the Day I wish to introduce the following groups of students situated in the galleries: from the constituency of Regina North West represented by Mr. Whelan, 62 students from the O'Neill High School, under the direction of their vice-principal, Mr. Berezny; from the constituency of Regina South East represented by Mr. Baker, 50 students from the Arcola School under the direction of their teacher, Mr. Lindburgh; from the constituency of Saskatoon Riversdale represented by their Member, Mr. Romanow, 85 students from the King George School, under the direction of their teachers, Mr. Dickman, Mr. Sparks, Mr. Christianson and Mr. Semka; from the constituency of Lumsden, represented by the Attorney General, Mr. Heald, 22 students from the Pilot Butte School District, under the direction of their school teacher, Mr. Gordon; from the constituency of Regina Centre represented by the Hon. Leader of the Opposition, Mr. Blakeney, 60 students from Albert School, under the direction of their teacher, Mr. Sandness. Also in the Speaker's Gallery I wish to introduce to all Members of the Legislature representatives of the Keep In Touch Group of the Young Women's Christian Association under the direction of their Extension Director, Mrs. Grassie.

I am sure all Hon. Members will wish to join with me in extending an extremely warm welcome to these students and to the members of the Keep In Touch Group, and to express the very sincere wish that they will find their stay here informative and educational and wish them the best of luck for the future.

**HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**QUESTIONS**

**REPORT ON SASKATCHEWAN PULPWOOD LIMITED**

**MR. E. WHELAN (Regina North West):** — Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day I should like to direct a question to the Minister of Natural Resources (Mr. Barrie). Last year the Minister in charge filed the reports for Saskatchewan Forest Products and Saskatchewan Pulpwood Ltd., on the same day. Since the report for Saskatchewan Forest Products has been tabled, can the Minister tell us when the report for Saskatchewan Pulpwood Ltd., would be tabled?

**HON. J.R. BARRIE (Minister of Natural Resources):** — In due course, Mr. Speaker.

**MR. WHELAN:** — Mr. Speaker, may I ask a supplementary question? In order to study these reports it is necessary that we have them both and could you file the report very soon in order to facilitate the work of the House?

**MR. BARRIE:** — The report will be filed as soon as possible, Mr. Speaker.

## STATEMENT

### SHIPS WAITING IN VANCOUVER HARBOR

**HON. D.T. McFARLANE (Minister of Agriculture):** — It has come to my attention that ships are waiting in Vancouver harbor for the export loading of Canadian wheat. We are concerned that any vessels should be tied up at any time but the Government of Saskatchewan finds the present situation absolutely intolerable. If cleaning facilities are being operated by only one shift per day and if this is part of the hold up then we emphatically request that extra ships be engaged to speed up this process. It is absolutely imperative that there be no further delay in filling these ships. I have this day communicated with the Hon. H.A. Olson, Federal Minister of Agriculture, and to the Hon. Otto Lang, Minister in charge of the Canadian Wheat Board, pointing out the urgency of the situation. I have written these two Federal Ministers suggesting the use of two government elevators, one at Moose Jaw and one at Saskatoon, for cleaning the grain prior to shipment to the Coast. I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that this would greatly speed up the handling of the grain at export terminals.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. A.E. BLAKENEY (Leader of the Opposition):** — Mr. Speaker, we do indeed welcome the comments made by the Minister of Agriculture. However, we are a little surprised he confines his activity to writing letters and to otherwise leave the communicating with the Federal Government when there are any other interruptions. We see all manner of activity on the part of the Members opposite and we should have hoped that the Minister would have found it possible to send an official to Ottawa or to Vancouver or perhaps himself go to Ottawa or Vancouver, to see whether or not this vital movement couldn't be speeded up.

**HON. W.R. THATCHER (Premier):** — Am I permitted to comment? I have another statement to make, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I just simply want to point out to the farmers of Saskatchewan that if we thought any good would come by sending Mr. McFarlane to either Vancouver or Ottawa we would do it and we shall be willing to look at the situation about Friday or Monday, but we think we have taken all possible action at this moment.

**MR. W.S. LLOYD (Biggar):** — Would the Premier consider a suggestion as to where he might send the Minister in order to be of help?

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

## QUESTION

### REPORT OF THE PROVINCIAL AUDITOR

**MR. E.I. WOOD (Swift Current):** — Before the Orders of the Day, Mr. Speaker, I should like to

address a question in the absence of the Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Steuart). I would address a question to the Premier as to when we might expect the report of the Provincial Auditor to be tabled in the House. It is necessary that we have this before we begin the sittings of the Public Accounts Committee. Time is going on and we should be getting into this and we should appreciate it if he could have it tabled as soon as possible.

**MR. THATCHER:** — Mr. Speaker, I will make inquiries and try and answer the Hon. Member tomorrow.

## **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 the Committee of Finance; and the proposed amendment thereto by Mr. Romanow.

**HON. D.V. HEALD (Attorney General):** — Mr. Speaker, before I adjourned debate yesterday I was making a few comments on the contribution to this debate of the Opposition financial critic, the Member for Saskatoon-Riversdale (Mr. Romanow). I said that his speech was really a non-speech because in my opinion it lacked body and substance. I expressed the opinion that his speech had more froth than facts, more verbiage than validity. I thought that his speech was replete with all the tired old Socialist clichés, the pious platitudes of Tommy Douglas and Clarence Fines. I thought I should harken back to when I was a young fellow and came back from the war in 1945 and used to listen to Mr. Douglas and Mr. Fines, and at that time I even believed a little bit of what they said. The wonderful things that were going to happen to my native province, the Province of Saskatchewan.

I said yesterday that the Member for Riversdale and his leader (Mr. Blakeney) had set themselves an impossible task, the task of leading this city-based, urban-oriented, splintered party out of the wilderness in rural Saskatchewan. Then I invited Hon. Members to take a look at the so-called new platform of the Members opposite. The pride and joy of the Member for Regina North East (Mr. Smishek), the Regina trade union leader, who now occupies such a dominant position in the party opposite, Platform Committee Chairman, the architect of the new deal for the farmers of Saskatchewan. I invited Members to look particularly at two planks in the new policy, one was the plank which says that they would give consideration to bringing the multi-million dollar potash industry under public ownership. I thought it was interesting to discuss for a few minutes where they got the words 'public ownership' from. Then there was another plank that I wanted particularly to look at in their new platform, if it is new, a provincial housing authority and land assembly.

**AN HON. MEMBER:** — It was new 300 years ago!

**MR. HEALD:** — That's right, well 200 years ago, Karl Marx, new in the 19th century. But I thought it was interesting to look at where they got these words from, public ownership and land assembly,

and I found it rather instructive to go back to a news article in the Moose Jaw Times Herald of March 16th, 1970, which was headed as follows: "Snyder opposes land assembly plan — MLA says policy would destroy New Democrats." This was a meeting apparently of a regional convention of the New Democratic Party in the Moose Jaw area for the southwest part of the province, presumably:

New Democratic Party delegates came into conflict when the idea of farm land nationalization was debated Saturday at the regional conference held at the Union Centre. Early in the day, John Conway . . .

(He's a well-known Waffler).

. . . Sociology lecturer, had presented a position paper on party policy with the statements: Consider a prudent strategy of nationalization of such resources as oil, potash, pulp and paper. For Example, the Prince Albert pulp mill should be nationalized immediately.

So they had a discussion, Mr. Speaker, at that meeting about nationalization. You know there was a Bengough district farmer apparently at that meeting and this is what the press report says about him:

A Bengough district farmer, long-time associate of the NDP, said the farmers would not vote for a party using the word 'nationalization' in its policy.

Here is what he said and I think he was being very truthful:

My first object is to win the next election and then bring up nationalization.

The farmer said the word 'nationalization' would ruin the whole thing. There was an honest man, Mr. Speaker. And listen to this:

There was consensus to change nationalization to the term 'public ownership'.

So 'public ownership' progressed from that little meeting in Moose Jaw where they had some very frank discussions on the new platform looked after and spear-headed by the Member from Regina North East (Mr. Smishek), the trade union leader. That's the history of public ownership.

Then we go on to the word 'land assembly' which finds itself in the NDP new platform and was dealt with yesterday by the Member for Riversdale to some extent.

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

And then quoting another delegate, this is interesting, the kind of thinking in this party opposite, Mr. Speaker.

I don't think anyone has the right to own land. Can't own land, just like you can't own seas and rivers, said a spokesman from Arm River and Morse constituency.

March 2, 1971

I don't know how he can be from both constituencies. Anyway, Mr. Speaker, here we have this new glossy platform, as old as the hills, Karl Marx 19th century, now it is the bright new election manifesto for the Hon. Members opposite in the upcoming election.

Mr. Speaker, I said yesterday that Socialism or Social Democracy had been tried and found wanting in practically every country in the free world. They are even in trouble in Sweden. I read from an article in the Winnipeg Free Press, Thursday, February 25th where it was commenting on conditions in Sweden:

Inflation is rampant and to fight it and pay for the mounting costs of the government cradle to grave services, the government . . .

And get this:

. . . has introduced 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.

"Levelling down," the editorial observes. Is this the kind of brave new world we can expect in the Province of Saskatchewan if we elect the Hon. Members opposite, taxes, taxes and more taxes. Mr. Speaker, the people of Saskatchewan had enough of their taxations from 1944 to 1964. I don't think they are going to take another chance with them to give them another chance to impose yet more taxes.

The Opposition financial critic, Mr. Speaker, is going to vote against the Budget. That's what he said yesterday. Will he vote against the Public Works' capital budget of \$15.8 million, the largest of any province that I know of so far? What is Manitoba's — \$6 million? Will he vote against the job-producing projects of the universities, the schools, the hospitals and the nursing homes? Will he vote against \$525,000 in construction grants and \$60,000 in maintenance grants for special care homes that he knows we need in this province? As a Member for Saskatoon does he begrudge Regina a \$12 million construction program for the Regina General and the Regina Grey Nuns' hospitals? Is he against the \$1.5 million student job program? Is he against the Cutbank work training program for natives and the \$146,000 in the Budget for this purpose? You know their solution to the native problem is to abolish the department. Here we come along with a progressive, positive program and they are going to vote against it. Is he against the crop development centre at the University and the \$210,000 in the Budget for that purpose? Is he against the hog marketing premium plan? Is he against the development of new community pastures? Is he against the \$2 million in the Budget for the development of the South Saskatchewan irrigation area? Is he against the new timber mill and perhaps the Member for Shellbrook (Mr. Bowerman) would be interested in this. The new Timber Board sawmill at Big River, is he against that? Is he against the \$130,000 that the city of Saskatoon will receive for snow removal? Is he against the \$130,000 that Saskatoon will receive for police protection grant? These people, when they were in power gave zip, zilch, nothing for police protection in the province all through those years. Is he against the opening of new court facilities and the Land Titles office at Moosomin? You know, Mr. Speaker, when his centralizing partner was the Attorney General of Saskatchewan, he punished

politically the people of Moosomin and the people of Arcola. He closed their court houses, he closed the Land Titles office and they talk about saving the small towns in Saskatchewan. That's how they saved the small towns when they were the government of this province. They closed the Land Titles office at Arcola, they closed the Land Titles office at Moosomin. We are going to open the Land Titles office at Moosomin and we're going to open the court house at Moosomin on a full-time basis.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. HEALD:** — And we're going to open the court house at Kerrobert on a full-time basis effective April 1st. The Member for Kerrobert-Kindersley (Mr. Howes) will be interested in this. We're going to open it on a full-time basis April 1st of this year because we believe that the people in the outlying areas of the Province of Saskatchewan are not second class citizens. They are entitled to the same services as the people that live in the city of Regina and the city of Saskatoon. Is the Member for Saskatoon-Riversdale (Mr. Romanow) against the improvement of court facilities in Swift Current, Moose Jaw, Yorkton, that is provided in this Budget? I don't think he is because I know that he is interested in the quality of the administration of justice in this province. And yet a vote against this Budget, Mr. Speaker, is a vote against those improvements.

Is he against the highway program? I'd like to tell the Hon. Member a story because he wasn't here in those dark days when the people that he associates with now were the government of this province. I want to tell him the story about the constituency that I represent in this Legislature. I want to mention one or two towns, and I want to start off with the little village of Pilot Butte, and the students are here from Pilot Butte this afternoon and they will know what I am talking about, some of them. When I became the Member for Lumsden in 1964, the village of Pilot Butte sits about two miles off No. 1 Highway. But, Mr. Speaker, they might as well have been 52 miles off No. 1 Highway because they had no roads. Here was a town of 300 or 400 people. A lot of the people in that town are commuters. They come in to Regina and they work here and they have to get to work at 8:00 or 8:30 or 9:00 o'clock in the morning. There was no way they could get to work in 1964. They didn't even have a grid road.

**AN HON. MEMBER:** — Oh, shame!

**MR. HEALD:** — They had to do their snow removal in the middle of the night. The town had a small snow removal piece of equipment. They tried to keep that road open through the blizzards — there were many, many people left, many, many days away from their work because they didn't have a road out. We first of all entered into a deal with the municipality and the village whereby we built a grid road into Pilot Butte. Then we took that grid road into the highway system, and now we've oiled that road into Pilot Butte. They've got a first-class highway, and that's the way this Government has dealt with the people in the rural areas.

I think of Regina Beach. Regina Beach used to have a worn out oiled road of sorts which was blown in in the winter time. Regina Beach has a great potential not only as a summer resort,

March 2, 1971

but as a winter resort, and now it is reaching that potential because it has a new dust-free, all winter highway. It has gas, it has water and sewer, and Regina Beach is going to go forward from here and it's going to be a very viable economic community.

Mr. Speaker, don't talk to me about the way in which the gentlemen opposite when they were the government of this province looked after the rural areas of this province.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. HEALD:** — I get a little annoyed when I hear the crocodile tears from the Members opposite over the small towns and the rural areas of this province. Your party, Mr. Member from Riversdale, and you weren't here, your party when they were in government had relegated people in the towns and villages and rural areas to the role of second class citizens. Mr. Speaker, whether the Member for Riversdale likes it or not, whether he accepts it or not, the people of Saskatchewan will judge his party's policies for the future by their performance or lack of it in the past.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. HEALD:** — And no death-bed repentance, no flashing oratory, no last minute conversions, will alter that basic fact.

**AN HON. MEMBER:** — No promises!

**MR. HEALD:** — Now, Mr. Speaker, I'm proud of this Budget and I support it whole-heartedly for a number of reasons and I have given a few. I am proud of the priority that this Government has given to our environmental problems. We are setting up, as has been indicated, a clean environment authority. This clean environment authority is going to have the power to take the necessary tough steps, make the necessary regulations to ensure we have a proper measure of environmental control in the Province of Saskatchewan. As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, when the Premier and I were in Ottawa a short time ago at the Constitutional Conference, Saskatchewan went further than any province so far as the Constitution was concerned insofar as environmental control was concerned. We said, "sure, the province has jurisdiction, environmental jurisdiction, on pollution within the four corners of that province, but we are so concerned in the Province of Saskatchewan about environmental management and pollution that we are prepared to give up some of our provincial powers if it is in the interests of environmental control all across this country. We are prepared to acknowledge that the Federal Government has a responsibility and an obligation to ensure that there are pollution controls not only on the West Coast, not only on the East Coast, not only on the international waters, the Great Lakes, but also on all of the other waters, the rivers which run from one province to the other, and we in the Province of Saskatchewan are prepared to surrender some of our constitutional sovereignty in the interests of environmental management and pollution control." Mr. Speaker, this Act will be the Magna Carta in Canada for environmental control. It will be the best Bill, the toughest Bill that any province has in this country and I commend it to all of the people in this province.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. HEALD:** — Then we are going to pass the Litter Act as has been indicated in the Speech from the Throne. We are going to ban non-returnable bottles and cans when used for beverage distribution. You all know, particularly in the rural areas, how difficult it is particularly in the ditches of our highways, how difficult it is with these cans and with these non-returnable bottles and we are going to have the toughest legislation in Canada so far as control of litter is concerned. And when this is meshed in with our environmental control, we shall have a very comprehensive and effective umbrella of environmental pollution control legislation.

Mr. Speaker, the Member for Riversdale said a few words yesterday about the pulp mill and I don't want to talk for a long time about the pulp mill but he made a statement that I didn't think I could let go by. He said:

We, when we are elected, will protect the people of Saskatchewan against these pulp mill deals.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I think it's instructive to look at the record of the Hon. Members opposite when they were the government of this province. The Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Blakeney) uses the term 'developer' or 'industrialist' interchangeably with promoter. Now there is a great difference between a promoter, in my vocabulary, and an industrialist and a developer. Maybe not in the vocabulary of the Leader of the Opposition. I suppose it is understandable when you look at the record of the Members opposite with respect to consumer protection when they were in office. Because of their attitude of suspicion and distrust of all legitimate business, whether it be large or small, they failed dismally from 1944 to 1964 to attract very much legitimate business and industry.

As the years went by, during their term of office they became more and more sensitive to the charge that there was practically no business or industrial development in the province. As they watched our sister provinces pass and surpass us in diversification and development, they panicked, they overcompensated, they threw the welcome mat out for every promoter, every high-binder, every quick-buck artist on the North American continent.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. HEALD:** — There was hardly any field of commercial endeavor that was free from this invasion — direct sellers, cemeteries, investment contracts, securities, secondhand car dealers, and so on.

Pierre Burton's book, "The Big Sell" talks about commercial cemeteries. Some of the names that are in his book that were in Ontario came out here and found a haven to start commercial cemeteries in this province, and they all went broke, and you know what happened.

Then, Mr. Speaker, the securities story. Between August, 1959 and December, 1964 there were 67 Saskatchewan public companies struck off the Register of Companies in this province. Sixty-seven during the period of 1959 to 1964! There were 14 companies, Mr. Speaker, defunct Saskatchewan public companies now,



which obtained monies from the Saskatchewan public during the years 1954 to 1959. They took from the investing public of Saskatchewan between \$8 million and \$10 million. One of the poorest records of any province in Canada. I am not going to read the list of the companies but they make very interesting reading.

I do want to deal for a few minutes, Mr. Speaker, with one other area where the hon. gentlemen opposite were pretty weak. There was a company called Commonwealth Savings Plan Limited. This was an investment contract company. This company came into Saskatchewan in 1958, became registered under the Investment Contracts Act of the Province of Saskatchewan, and were finally licensed. They had a company's license and they also had a license under the Investment Contracts Act. However, on August 7th of 1962, Commonwealth Savings Plan Limited was struck from the Register of Companies under the Saskatchewan Companies Act, and from that time forward, from August 7th, 1962, Commonwealth Savings Plan Limited was not entitled to carry on business in the Province of Saskatchewan. This would mean, in my opinion, that they were not entitled not only to sell new contracts but to accept deposits under existing contracts. However, they were finally restored to the Register of Companies on January 15th, 1963. During the period of August 7th, 1962 to January 15th, 1963, when the company was not licensed to do business in Saskatchewan under the Companies Act, it still had a valid and subsisting license under the Investment Contracts Act. Mr. Speaker, I ask you, how could this company have a license to take money from the investing public of Saskatchewan over a period of five months when they didn't have a license to do business under the Companies Act of the Province of Saskatchewan?

Mr. Speaker, we passed a new Investment Contracts Act in 1966 and under that Act every investment contract company for every \$1 they take from the investing public of Saskatchewan, they have to have \$1.05 in unimpaired capital. And this company, of course, couldn't live up to those requirements and since 1966 that company has not been doing business in the Province of Saskatchewan nor have they been taking, legally at any rate, any money from the investing public of Saskatchewan. As a matter of fact, I noticed a clipping the other day in one of the Vancouver papers that there were some of the shareholders of this company in Vancouver who were thinking of suing the Government of British Columbia because of what they considered to be negligence there so far as these shareholders were concerned.

What are the facts about this company, and I only use this company as an example? Well, the facts are that this was an unruly arrogant company. Even at the beginning, it demonstrated little regard for our laws, and I ask the question again and I asked it of my officials and the only answer I got was they were too busy, they didn't have any proper amount of staff to look after all of these matters, and that they simply slipped up. Mr. Speaker, the Trustees' Deficiency Statement of this company shows a deficiency of over \$2 million. What can we conclude from this company that I use as an example? The government of the day starved this department of funds and personnel to the point where it was impossible for them to do any kind of a job of supervision whatsoever. The legislation was pitifully inadequate. The pre-licensing screening was non-existent, and the continuing supervision just wasn't there. Mr. Speaker, I hope

that the people in Saskatchewan who invested in this company will get their money back. (There was a little over \$100,000 invested by Saskatchewan people). I think there is a reasonable chance of them getting most of their money back, but, Mr. Speaker, where were the great defenders of the public interest while this was going on? This was gross negligence of the worst kind, inexcusable and indefensible.

Where were the people who now grace the front benches to your left? Well, many of them were in the Cabinet of that day, and apparently weren't really looking after the investors of this Province. Yes, these worn-out warriors, these tired toreadors, will soon be asking the voters of Saskatchewan to trust them with the responsibility of government. Cemeteries Act — \$250,000, Securities Act — \$10 million to \$20 million, Investment Contracts — \$2 million, Direct Sellers' Act (for lack of proper control), untold millions. Mr. Speaker, the people of Saskatchewan simply can't afford an NDP government, they simply can't afford to place their consumer problems, their investment problems, in the hands of these people, and above all, they can't trust their natural resources and the development of those natural resources to these people. How many of our citizens have lost their life savings because of this governmental negligence, this cavalier disregard for the public interest. Far too many, I fear. Mr. Speaker, this Government will continue to discharge its responsibilities to the consuming and investing public of Saskatchewan.

Mr. Speaker, before I sit down, I should like to congratulate my colleague, the Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Steuart), for a tremendous Budget, a timely Budget, a Budget that will create much employment, a Budget that will stimulate our economy, a Budget that will enhance the quality of life for all of our people, and finally I congratulate him on his leadership, leadership that he shares with our leader, Ross Thatcher.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. HEALD:** — Mr. Speaker, during the seven years that I have been privileged to be a Member of this Government, it has been my very great privilege to represent our Province at many Federal-Provincial Conferences along with our Premier. Mr. Speaker, Ross Thatcher is recognized across this country as one of the strong voices for confederation, for the West, and for Saskatchewan.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. HEALD:** — He serves this province and its people tirelessly and effectively in the councils of government. Saskatchewan and its people have a dedicated advocate in the Member for Morse, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to vote in favor of the Budget and against the amendment.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. H. COUPLAND (Meadow Lake):** — Mr. Speaker, I first want to congratulate the Treasurer (Mr. Steuart) for the Budget he brought down last Friday.

It is a pleasure to enter this Budget Debate because it is a good Budget, even though the Opposition do not like it. But I don't blame them, I should hate to have a government bring down a budget like this if I were in the Opposition. It is a continuation of our policy for a balanced budget and I am proud to be a Member of a Government that can accomplish this seven years in a row.

Mr. Speaker, no wonder the Opposition financial critic could not stay on the Budget in his speech yesterday, he talked about everything but the Budget. Oh, he did mention it occasionally but I wonder where he was when the Socialists were bringing down their budgets when they were in the government? Tax increases, hospitalization premiums reduced before every election, and then doubled right after the election, and he talks about bogus budgets.

Mr. Speaker, I want to explain what this kind of budgeting has done for my constituency, that is, the Meadow Lake constituency — since we have formed the Government. When we formed the Government, Mr. Speaker, our constituency didn't have one mile of oiled road that you could really travel on. By his own admission, the Member from North Battleford said that he had to take a horse with him so that he could get across No. 4 Highway some years ago. This, we inherited from the former CCF or NDP. Mr. Speaker, now we have a first class highway into Meadow Lake . . .

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. COUPLAND:** — . . . plus oiled roads into our Meadow Lake Provincial Park and to Goodsoil and from St. Walburg to Loon Lake. I should like to thank the Minister of Highways (Mr. Boldt) on behalf of the people of Meadow Lake for this co-operation and generosity.

Mr. Speaker, we had a reduction in our school mill rate last year through the increased grants by this Government. With increased grants again this year I am sure that our unit will be able to, at least, hold the line on school taxes.

Mr. Speaker, we have had major expansion in our telephone service in the past year. This is something that people in that area have been wanting for many years, but until we got a Liberal Government who implemented this unserved area, our people hadn't been able to get them. But now many, many farmers are hooked up to telephones, I understand more will be hooked up this coming year. Our Government has spent almost \$1 million on this program.

Mr. Speaker, the Opposition is always crying crocodile tears for the farmers. This Government has done more for the farmers in Saskatchewan in six years than the previous government did in their 20 years in office. In fact, Mr. Speaker, they drove the farmers off the land and if the Waffle element of their party has their way, they will take over all the land and the farmers will be nothing but serfs under their feudal system. Mr. Speaker, I am sure the farmers are not going to vote for this type of party.

Mr. Speaker, the farmers appreciate the programs our Government has implemented, such as loans for the hog industry, feedlots and loans to help farmers buy cattle and diversify.

I should like to commend the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. McFarlane) for holding the rentals down in our northern community pastures. But, I am also after him about lease fees in the North. Mr. Speaker, our grazing season in the North is far shorter than that in the South, so we feel grazing fees should not be as high in the North as they are farther south.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I should be very remiss in my duties if I did not mention the pulp mill for Meadow Lake. I know the Members opposite would like us to keep quiet about it, but I should like to point out, Mr. Speaker, that they tried to get one. In fact I have a Meadow Lake paper here dated in 1957.

**AN HON. MEMBER:** — Oh my gosh, mothballs!

**MR. COUPLAND:** — It is falling apart here. There is an article in here by Mr. Semchuck, who was a former CCF MLA for Meadow Lake. He wasn't the MLA at the time, but he was head of the Chamber of Commerce. I should like to quote from this article, this is, as I said, back in 1957. Now, Mr. Speaker, here is how he starts out:

I doubt that a thunderbolt could have electrified the residents of Meadow Lake more than the announcement that an agreement has been signed between the Government and . . .

(Get this, Mr. Speaker)

. . . a group of California businessmen, to build and operate a mill in the Meadow Lake area.

**AN HON. MEMBER:** — What do you think about that, Bill?

**MR. COUPLAND:** — This was way back in 1957, and to hear them cry about American capital. Here it is right here. They couldn't interest anybody to come in.

Mr. Speaker, this pulp mill is the biggest thing ever to hit northwestern Saskatchewan. When one considers the expenditure of \$177 million, what this will do to an area is hard to visualize. It is no wonder the Opposition is a bit jealous.

**AN HON. MEMBER:** — Sharing the wealth!

**MR. COUPLAND:** — Mr. Speaker, this development should create enough jobs to change the whole economic environment of the whole area. I understand 1,200 people will be employed in construction and when completed 1,600 will be employed in the woods and mill operation. This does not take into consideration the ancillary services which the area is already starting to feel. When we get a \$15 million a year payroll in the area everyone is bound to benefit, even the whole province.

Mr. Speaker, this mill will pay to the Province of Saskatchewan some \$1.5 million annually for stumpage, educational and hospital tax and others. It will pay \$22 million annually to contractors and others who cut and deliver wood to the mill. Athabasca will spend more than \$4 million annually for chemicals

March 2, 1971

manufactured in Saskatchewan. Athabasca will pay \$2 million annually to the Saskatchewan Power Corporation for gas, Mr. Speaker. On maintenance and repair they will spend \$1.4 million annually in Saskatchewan for maintenance and repair materials. They will spend huge sums to combat pollution in both air and water. I am sure that pollution — if any — will be kept to a bare minimum, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I was home on the weekend and I find the Opposition is working hard trying to downgrade this mill, saying such things as the Member for The Battlefords (Mr. Kramer) is saying, that the mill will never be built, that it will pollute the rivers and pollute Dore Lake and so on, even though it means jobs for our native people in the North, especially our native people who are natural bushmen and have a hard time finding jobs up to now.

The development of the northwest, that is, the pulp mill which incidentally is about 60 miles northeast of Meadow Lake, will automatically improve things for the people of the North. Now I am talking about the people in Ile-a-La-Crosse, Buffalo Narrows, La Loche, Canoe Lake, Canoe Narrows, and so on. This will bring them 60 miles closer to a good highway. Their telecommunications should improve in that area, which they need very badly. Also there is a chance that we shall be able to get television into the North now. All these things are bound to help improve the standard of living for these people in the North.

Some people, Mr. Speaker, are very concerned, and I admit I was, for the small sawmill operators in my area. But, I have been assured by the Minister of Natural Resources that under the agreement with Parsons and Whittemore there is a substantial exclusion for the Timber Board and for the requirements of settlers' permits and so on. There should be a minimum of disruption with the sawmill operators. I am amazed, Mr. Speaker, to hear the Member from The Battlefords always crying about the sawmill operators. Why didn't he cry for them in the 40s when his government ran them all out of the province? A lot of operators from the Meadow Lake area are still operating in Alberta and British Columbia, after being chased out by the Socialists in 1944 and 1945. You know, when I listened to the Member ranting in the House a few days ago, it sounded very much like a desperation speech. I wonder if it is because he feels he may not be back in the House after the next election. I know he is running scared.

With this mill only 18 miles from the road, our Member opposite is so concerned about, I wonder if he will admit to its value now. Even now it is making possible the employment of 100 to 150 men who are working in the woods operation along the road to Vermette Lake. I wonder what the Member would say if he was to drive up that road and meet all the trucks coming out with lumber today. To hear him talk, you would think that it was never used. I was up there three weeks ago and I am telling you you have to be watching when you meet these big trucks with lumber coming down that road now.

Mr. Speaker, with the mill in the area there will be a need for training and as you know Meadow Lake has been designated as a special area . . .

**MR. I. KRAMER (The Battlefords):** — On a point of order! The member has been continuing to refer to former debate.

**MR. COUPLAND:** — I am sorry it bothers the Member. I shall refrain from mentioning . . .

Mr. Speaker, with the mill in the area there will be a need for training and as you know Meadow Lake has been designated as a special area, the Federal Government will assist in some form of training for the people of the area, including the people of Indian ancestry. Accordingly one of the projects under the Federal-Provincial Agreement for the Meadow Lake special area is a Manpower Corps Program, which has subsequently been renamed Training Opportunity Program. The objective of this program is to provide intensive counselling services, coupled with on-the-job training for persons who have little or no previous experience in formal work programs. The Department of Education is the provincial agency with the primary responsibility for training and counselling services. The Indian and Metis Department is assisting in selection and recruitment of trainees. The Department of Education is co-ordinating training opportunity programs. We are confident, Mr. Speaker, that this dynamic program which has been undertaken will be of an immeasurable benefit to the people of the area, both in terms of immediate employment which is being provided now and also in terms of future opportunities for employment which may be available because of the training received at this time.

Mr. Speaker, if we can get started on the Vocational Training Centre in Meadow Lake, it will mean that most of the people from the area can take special training that will fit them for job opportunities anywhere in the province, or Canada for that matter. It is something that has been required for a long time, especially for the people of the North. Meadow Lake will then be a sort of half-way centre so that people can train there and either stay if the jobs are available or move farther south.

All in all, Mr. Speaker, we of the Meadow Lake area appreciate very much the efforts put forth by our Premier, Hon. Ross Thatcher, and Dave Steuart, in obtaining the timber complex for Meadow Lake, both the sawmill and the pulp mill. It will be interesting, Mr. Speaker, to see how the Members opposite vote when the Bill comes before the House authorizing the Government to proceed with the financial arrangements for the mill.

I should like to say a few words about the tourist industry, Mr. Speaker. This is a big industry in my area as we have some of the most wonderful tourist attractions in the Province. I am happy to say this Government is doing something about it. As I have already stated, tourists can now go right to the Meadow Lake Provincial Park on oil or dust-free roads.

The Department of Natural Resources is spending large sums of money to improve our park facilities and more people are using them every year and for longer periods. I think, Mr. Speaker, of our motor toboggans. We have to provide places for people to use them, especially with the restrictions that are being placed on them in the towns and cities. What better place than our provincial parks. The Department of Natural Resources is already installing snow toboggan trails in the parks in the southern part of the province and now are considering doing the same for our northern parks.

Mr. Speaker, I have asked the Minister of Natural Resources to look into the feasibility of setting up a game management area

in the North. We know there are a lot of moose in the North right now. But the moose population has a habit of going up and down so that we feel that with a management zone we can keep better control of them.

Mr. Speaker, there has never been a Premier or a Government in this Province who have been more sincerely concerned with the problems facing our native people in the North. Never in the history of Saskatchewan has the Government tried to do more things to improve their lot in life. Had the Socialists during their 20 years of office come up with any kind of program other than welfare, these people would not be in the situation they are today. Mr. Speaker, we have programs which are working and they are working because we are in full consultation with the people concerned.

The Indian Metis Department is helping people set up in business on their own by guaranteeing loans. I have several of these people in my area, Mr. Speaker, and they are doing very well. We are presently looking for a way to help some of the people in the Cole Bay-Jans Bay area. They are anxious to get established and do something for themselves. I feel it is up to the Government to help them.

Then, Mr. Speaker, there is the agricultural program for the North. We have established cattle operations at Ile-a-La-Crosse and at La Loche with the big project at Green Lake. Cattle will be up in these areas this year, which will create numerous jobs for the people in those areas. The Opposition may criticize these programs but they are good programs. It has taken awhile to get them into operation, because you have to get the bush off, the land broken and seeded. There were some very good crops on both those projects last year and in fact they are feeding quite a number of cattle in the Ile-a-La-Crosse project this winter.

Mr. Speaker, I should just like to mention another thing that has come about in my area due to a free enterprise Liberal Government and that is the gas find at Pierceland. This is a wonderful thing for the Meadow Lake area because the town of Meadow Lake will be getting gas this summer. I recall when Mr. Tommy Douglas, former Premier of this Province, promised us gas, natural gas for Meadow Lake in 1960, we never saw it. It wasn't until we got a free enterprise Liberal Government that we are getting gas. That gas was in the ground when they were the government but they couldn't get anybody to venture in developing it.

What has this meant to the Bighead Indian Reserve, who have several wells on their reserve? Mr. Speaker, all the members of the Bighead Reserve received \$100 for each man, woman and child this past winter, as first payment of royalties from the gas wells around their reserve. I understand that the Band has decided to put all their remaining royalties into their Band fund and go into a major cattle operation, which will pay them dividends for many, many years to come. This will also create a lot of job opportunities for their members. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the Council of the bighead Band for making this decision and I hope it will be most successful. As I said before, this was only made possible by having a private or free enterprise Liberal Government in this Province.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. COUPLAND:** — Just before I sit down, I should like to say that it has been mentioned that some businessmen from Meadow Lake were interested in a timber operation in Meadow Lake. I'll say we were, but not too big a one. We could never have raised the money that was needed to get the development that they are getting now. We served our purpose.

Mr. Speaker, I am very, very happy to support this motion and to vote against the amendment.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. N.E. BYERS (Kelvington):** — Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the people in the Kelvington constituency I welcome this opportunity to comment upon the 1971 Budget now before this House.

At the outset I want to congratulate Allan Blakeney on his election as Leader of the Saskatchewan New Democratic Party.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. BYERS:** — I also want to extend my congratulations to Roy Romanow for his appointment as Deputy Leader.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. BYERS:** — We, in this Party, are fortunate and indeed the people of Saskatchewan are fortunate that young able men like Allan Blakeney and Roy Romanow are picking up the torch from our former illustrious leaders like Tommy Douglas and Woodrow Lloyd.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. BYERS:** — On behalf of my constituents and thousands of people throughout Saskatchewan I want to acknowledge now the excellent leadership which Woodrow Lloyd has given this Party and this Province.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. BYERS:** — Mr. Speaker, the disappointment that I experienced when I studied the Budget is shared by many Saskatchewan people. I think that it is fair to say that prior to 1964 the CCF had established a tradition in this province, that promises made at election time were carried out.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. BYERS:** — One factor that helped the Liberal Party to get elected in 1964 and re-elected in 1967 was that the Saskatchewan voters expected the Liberal Party, too, to deliver the goods. But this Government has broken this trust. This Government has shattered this tradition and the budget Speech confirms that this Government is inept, incompetent and inconsistent.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!



March 2, 1971

**MR. BYERS:** — Since this Government is nearing the end of its lease on government, the Saskatchewan people had every right to expect that this year this Government would deliver the final instalments of their 1964 and 1967 election program. And in the area of past promises alone, what items did Saskatchewan people have a right to expect in this Budget — a drug program promised by the Liberals in 1964, Mr. Speaker, is still not a reality. The removal of the sales tax on children's clothes, a society where fewer people required social assistance, loan plans for young farmers and small businessmen. And if the Government Members Opposite don't like my list then I invite them to provide their own list of unfulfilled promises. My list is not complete, nor does it include the scores of local promises made by Government Members to get elected to this House.

The facts are, Mr. Speaker, that this Government has failed to deliver the goods. That is why most Saskatchewan people regard Liberal promises as gift certificates — gift certificates with no maturity date, no cash surrender value once Liberals are elected.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. BYERS:** — This Liberal Government is living out its last days on a lease which most Saskatchewan people believe is not renewable.

Mr. Speaker, it would require more than my allotted time today to discuss the numerous nuisance taxes and nuisance charges this Government has heaped on our people in the last seven years. Yesterday, our extremely able deputy leader and financial critic (Mr. Romanow) stated that in seven years this Government has levied or increased over 1,400 taxes.

I am going to single out only three items because these fees deter our people from using essential social services. They impose the greatest financial hardship on those who use the service at the time, and the revenues for the Government coffers is relatively insignificant. They are in all cases charges which the New Democrats, in their New Deal for People, will eliminate.

Mr. Speaker, I was disappointed but not surprised that this Government will continue to extract deterrent fees from Saskatchewan's sick citizens. On other occasions I have referred to deterrent fees as the "invisible plank" in the Liberal's 1967 election program. To the best of my knowledge, Mr. Speaker, not one single Liberal won election to this House in 1967 on a promise to impose deterrent fees. Not one, Mr. Speaker.

The question that people frequently ask me is: if deterrent fees are necessary to operate the medicare plan, then why are deterrent fees not required in the medicare plans of other provinces? The facts are, Mr. Speaker, that deterrent fees are unheard of in other medicare plans.

In the Financial Post, October 31, 1970 — and I am sorry that I didn't bring it today — is a chart comparing medicare plans in the Canadian provinces. It reveals this shocking evidence — that Saskatchewan people are the only people in Canada who are charged a deterrent fee to use their own medicare plan.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. BYERS:** — Charged to use their own medicare plan which they built though all the forces of reaction in this country and in this continent stood in their way. I say, Mr. Speaker, that it is time that Saskatchewan's medicare plan was handed back to its founding father.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. BYERS:** — I think the possibility exists that if the Liberals happen to be re-elected in the next election they may even possibly increase the present deterrent fee charges. The New Democratic Party is pledged to abolish deterrent fees for the people of Saskatchewan. That is only one item of our new deal for progress.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. BYERS:** — Mr. Speaker, I turn now to one item in our mental health programs. One hard lesson the unfortunate people of our Province have realized in the last seven years is that advances in social legislation pioneered by the CCF have slowly withered away.

When the Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Steuart) introduced his 1971 Budget he described it as a sunshine budget. The few shafts of sunshine in his Budget were too weak to make life brighter for the ill people in our mental hospitals. In 1945 the CCF government said that the financial responsibility for treatment of those Saskatchewan residents who were so unfortunate as to be stricken with mental illness and who were admitted to mental hospitals was the responsibility of our society, it was free. But in 1968 this Government brought in legislation which wiped out not only that benefit, but it also wiped out the benefits which those people who were in our mental hospitals thought they had during the years of CCF government.

In 1968 this Government made the legislation retroactive so that people who died in mental hospitals from January 1, 1945 up to March 31, 1959 had charged against their estates, the rate of \$3.50 per day. And then from March 31, 1959 up to the present the charge was \$5 per day. But the only light of human kindness that this Government has for these people is that there is an exemption of \$10,000 for widows or widowers and the few handicapped. Mr. Speaker, that is just about the value of an ordinary house in any small Saskatchewan town.

I want to refer for a minute to the Education and Health Tax brought up in this House last winter and some of the Education and Health sales tax regulations that were made thereafter. Members will vividly recall that at the 1970 session this Government applied the five per cent Education and Health sales tax to meals and lunches valued over 15 cents. Now it was certainly my understanding, Mr. Speaker, that meals served by church organizations and charitable groups were to be exempt from this tax. Now, Mr. Speaker, all Members of this House ought to know that in rural Saskatchewan, women's church organizations, in particular, raise a considerable portion of their church's revenue by catering at bazaars, fowl suppers and wedding feasts. But did these women's church groups escape the never-ceasing, bound-to-be-first taxing power of the Provincial

March 2, 1971

Treasurer's Department? They did not.

In May, 1970 the Treasury Department issued regulations which required church and charitable organizations catering to five or more bazaars, supper and wedding feasts in one year to collect and remit the five per cent Education and Health Tax to the Provincial Treasury. Now, Mr. Speaker, that must certainly be a new first in Canada. Mr. Speaker, when the sticky fingers of the Treasury Department extend into nearly every bride's wedding cake, I say that it is time for a change in management of this Province's financial affairs.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. BYERS:** — I say that any Provincial Treasurer who forces women's church organizations to become tax collectors for the Provincial Government is no longer responsible enough to manage the financial affairs of this Province.

Mr. Speaker, I want to offer a few comments now about the iniquitous gerrymander Bill which was rammed through this House by this Government in the dying hours of the 1970 session. I do so not only because of my own constituency of Kelvington has been substantially affected by this Bill but we can look after that, Mr. Speaker, but I doubt whether there is a similar instance in the free world where a Government has made a more desperate effort to silence dissent, to deny the people their will so as to retain power against the majority will. We wonder why a government that can apply a rigid pupil-teacher ratio in 10,000 classrooms in Saskatchewan, can't apply a similar uniform ratio when it comes to drawing boundaries in 60 constituencies of this Province.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. BYERS:** — Although this Bill has been on the statute books for nearly one year, this Government has made no effort to explain this Bill to the general public. This Government has plenty of money to spend on other types of advertising, but have they given our hard-pressed weekly newspapers any government information advertisements to explain this Bill? They have not. The order has gone out from the Liberal lords that the facts of the Redistribution Bill are not to be explained to the public and they are not to be discussed by Liberals anywhere in Saskatchewan. This Government knows that on its record alone it will be defeated. That is why the people of Saskatchewan are faced with this Redistribution Bill.

Mr. Speaker, this gerrymander Bill is obviously a bit of Liberal reprisal for the last Kelvington bye-election. You know it was to Kelvington that the Premier sent his top vote-getters, Mr. Heald, the Member for Lumsden, Mr. Steuart from Prince Albert West, Mr. MacDonald from Milestone. They were to direct the Liberal forces and to garner in the votes for the Liberal Party. And for a month they scoured the country and tramped the towns. And in nearly every instance, Mr. Speaker, when the votes were counted in the polls in Kelvington where these gentlemen had worked so hard for the Liberal Party, what happened? The NDP vote went up and the Liberal vote went down. The Premier's top vote-getters had let him down. Desperate in mood, angry at their failure and cunning in their purpose, Saskatchewan Liberals

sought a different approach to shore up their battered political ship. It was in this mood that this Government foisted this unfair Redistribution Bill upon the Saskatchewan people.

Mr. Speaker, they wouldn't resort to other methods. They wouldn't resort to stuffing ballot boxes because at that they could get caught and if they did they knew that they would deserve the contempt of the voters. They wouldn't resort to challenging the hospital voters because they know that they can't win that ball game either.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. BYERS:** — Mr. Speaker, many Saskatchewan people have given their lives and their loved ones to preserve democracy in this country and elsewhere. With the passing of this gerrymandering legislation, Liberal MLAs can make no claim that by their actions they have strengthened the democratic process in this province.

This Bill has shattered the principle of representation by population which is the only fair basis for electing a democratic government. The provisions of this Bill are so severe, Mr. Speaker, that it is now possible in Saskatchewan for 33 per cent of the voters to elect a government with a working majority. This is a brazen attempt by a minority — and the Liberals will be a minority after the next election — to subjugate a majority without firing a shot. Because this Government has juggled boundaries so that in some cases a Liberal vote counts four times as much as an NDP vote, many people are concerned whether they can still defeat this Government by their ballots. The answer is a very simple one, Yes.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. BYERS:** — The only way to retire these political weaklings who aren't prepared to run less they are spotted several votes, is to pile up such an impressive NDP majority in every constituency to put an end to this Liberal experiment in smart-aleckness and trickery.

Yesterday, Mr. Speaker, our Deputy Leader and financial critic, Roy Romanow, analyzed accurately and adequately the frustrations and despair facing our rural people. In particular, we must cope with the double problem of inaction by this Government on the farm front and the implementation of the Federal Task Force proposals that threaten to highjack two-thirds of the farmers off the land.

To this Legislature and the people of this province, our Leader, Allan Blakeney, enunciated and articulated our Party's New Deal for People in the Throne Speech Debate — the steps that we would take as the government to improve life for our Saskatchewan people.

Mr. Speaker, a rural Saskatchewan community, bordered with a sprinkling of superfarms, grain elevators at less than 100 points, small town hospitals closed (harboring memories of medicare before the days of deterrent dues) village schools, railway stations and post offices (once the heart and soul of rural Saskatchewan life) boarded up, neglected, unwanted, unused and rotting, may be a typical town in the Liberal's plan for a new

Saskatchewan, but, Mr. Speaker, we in the New Democratic Party say that the time has come for Saskatchewan citizens to unite in a common effort to fight these trends.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. BYERS:** — Mr. Speaker, this Government has failed to use the traditional band-aids — an extensive program of Public Works spending to maintain a high level of employment and income in this province. Most citizens in this Province know that our higher employment level in pre-Liberal days was due partly to a continuous well-planned Public Works program.

I believe, Mr. Speaker, that given a fair chance, municipal governments are willing to co-operate with the Provincial Government to maintain employment so as to prevent a further population drain. My experience with local governments over the years is that they don't expect the province to foot the whole bill for the entire cost of projects undertaken. All they ask is that they be allowed to follow their own spending priorities, not priorities "Made in Regina". And they will come up with their own plans if they are guaranteed that the rules are fair, that the cost-sharing arrangements exist on a permanent basis, and that they are available when they want them.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. BYERS:** — Mr. Speaker, there is a backlog of Public Works programs waiting to be started in rural Saskatchewan. Natural gas lines have been spreading out over this Province at a pace slower than a hobbled snail under this Government. Everywhere I go in my constituency I find communities that are willing to participate in cost-sharing Public Works programs of the Provincial Government. They have plans for nursing homes and civic centres, fire halls, swimming pools, sidewalks and skating rinks. All we need is a government with some compassion and feeling for their needs.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. BYERS:** — Dozens of villages and hamlets still lack water and sewer facilities because this Government has made the rules too tough to qualify for financial assistance.

The choice is clear for Saskatchewan people. It seems to me that the Liberal concept for public spending to curb unemployment is to hire a few grown men to chase tumble weeds on a windy day. But New Democrats believe that a high level of public spending is essential at all times to preserve a desirable level of employment, income security and happiness.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. BYERS:** — Mr. Speaker, it is my belief that this Budget virtually assures our young people the prospects of a continuous jobless future and limited opportunities under the free enterprise Liberals. But there is renewed hope for our young people awaiting the jobs envisaged in the New Democrats' New Deal for People. Because this Government fails to provide renewed security to our

senior citizens and this Budget fails to offer renewed prosperity to our debt-ridden farmers, unemployed workers and small-town businessmen, I will be supporting the amendment and voting against the main motion.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. W.J. BEREZOWSKY (Prince Albert East-Cumberland):** — Mr. Speaker, after listening to the Hon. Member from Meadow Lake (Mr. Coupland) who struggled so much with his speech, I can only make one comment and that is, he forgot and missed the point. I'll come back to that later in the day.

I have, Mr. Speaker, a firm belief that the people of Saskatchewan find nothing in the Budget of this Government which could give them some expectancy of better days ahead or even any hope of some kind of growth or development to correct the depressed conditions brought on by Liberal Governments of Saskatchewan and Canada. Indeed the Budget and Estimates before us very clearly demonstrate that there is no attempt being made at this time by this Government to save us from the financial mess and economic backsliding which the Liberals have engendered in the past few years. However, before I proceed to prove this fact, Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my people who come from all walks of life — farmers, miners, trappers, fishermen, teachers and others — who gave me the honor of representing them for a period of some 20 years.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. BEREZOWSKY:** — I cannot find suitable words to express my thanks and appreciation for the confidence they gave me and for the faith they had in me representing their aspirations, their hopes and their needs for the building of a better society and better life opportunities and for community development and for a better Saskatchewan.

Now if this should be, by any chance, my last session then I must not only recognize the warmth of these citizens, whom I represented over the years, but I must also say that without their help and their encouragement I could not have done the job required of me.

Let me remind you, Mr. Speaker, that I have miners at Creighton, hard tough men who work underground producing the wealth that has brought millions of dollars of revenue and royalties to this Government. They are the type represented by Joe Borowski who sits in the Manitoba Government — straightforward, full of courage to face the vicissitudes of life. And he is certainly honest. In the hinterland behind the agricultural belt there are fishing and trapping people such as the Carriers from Cumberland House who year after year at our festival take top honors as trappers and hunters and sportsmen.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. BEREZOWSKY:** — Then from Montreal Lake, or Molonosa, are such people as the Beatty brothers who are considered to be top fishermen. The people of Candle Lake who pioneer-like have developed that resort area and I'm thinking of the Hales brothers and the

Socket family, Fred Cole and others. Such people stayed, built and developed the resorts of my constituency. And then of course there are the people of the soil, people from many lands, British, French, Ukrainians, Poles, Hungarians and Czechs. All of these people cleared the land in my area, made it produce and made a garden out of the primeval wilderness. People have worked together to build churches, schools, and the communities that we live in. These are the people, Mr. Speaker, I call my friends and from the beginning and in spite of any differences we may have had in political affiliations, may I say, Mr. Speaker, that there was no barrier between them and me. So if this is to be my swan song let me say that I have enjoyed my job and I have nothing but a deep sense of appreciation for all those who gave me the cloak of public responsibility.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. BEREZOWSKY:** — Now, Mr. Speaker, the Provincial Treasurer, Mr. Steuart, has said that when the Liberals were elected in 1964 the province immediately began to move ahead. I agree, it moved ahead in reverse, backwards, as no province has moved before or since. The Provincial Treasurer has a sharp wit and has accordingly a straightforward way of dodging issues and a straightforward way of misleading the people in order that the real issues may be somehow drowned by the deluge of straightforward and deliberate fairy tales that he gives us.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. BEREZOWSKY:** — Does he really believe the fairy tale that the 20 years of CCF Socialist government was not productive in bringing in an era of power development, of prosperity and of progress on health, education and community development? Does he really think that his praise of Thatcher-Liberalism with its regimentation, its load of high taxes and stagnation will be believed by the good people of Saskatchewan? Well, Mr. Speaker, if the Hon. Provincial Treasurer waits for the results of the next election he will be disenchanted and will find himself defeated and alone in a realistic world once again and we will not believe such nonsense any longer.

Mr. Speaker, this is the Liberal Party the Premier and his Deputy from Prince Albert West (Mr. Steuart), which promised the people in 1964 and once again in 1967 a reduction in the load of taxes. Remember the slogan lower taxes, remove stagnation, and things like that. He can't get away from that. These promises were made, Mr. Speaker. But they countered at their conventions that people shouldn't expect Liberals to keep their promises and we have learned this to be true. They do not keep promises. And this is the Provincial Treasurer, Mr. Speaker, who said the other day in his speech that the Liberals in 1964 ended 20 years of regimentation and stagnation. He could not afford to tell the truth, Mr. Speaker, about the NDP progress and achievements of the previous 20 years.

He boasted about the industries that the Liberals brought into Saskatchewan — the oil and mining industries, the forest industries and the high-living standards for our people. Mr. Speaker, our people know what the situation is. But he is like the king in the fairy tale who was nude and naked and who believed his advisers when they told him that his body was

completely garbed in beautiful raiment. Such is the Provincial Treasurer and such is the truth of his arguments, Mr. Speaker.

The seven years of Liberal Administration, Mr. Speaker, will go down in Saskatchewan as the years of mounting deficits, increased unemployment, an exodus of people and a growing poverty in a land endowed with the heritage of wealth superior to any province of Canada.

Now, Mr. Speaker, let us look at some facts and figures. It is a fact that people are our prime resource. It is also a fact that other resources are only good if they can be of use to people. It is accepted that governments are elected to legislate laws for the good of people and lay out policies and programs which will be of benefit to the people who elect governments. No one, by any stretch of the imagination, can honestly say or provide facts or statistics which would indicate that this Liberal Government has been beneficial to the Saskatchewan people. No one, Mr. Speaker, not even the Liberals opposite who sit to your right can provide that information because there is none to provide.

Take the farmers for example. The financial critic and other Members have produced statistics and will produce more statistics showing that never since the depression have our farmers had as low net incomes as these few years under the Liberal Government.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. BEREZOWSKY:** — Farmers are having losses, deficits and no end of difficulties in trying to make ends meet.

Liberals in Ottawa under Mr. Trudeau, deliberately have manipulated the economy saying it was to control inflation. Too much money in the country they say. Then who has it? Interest rates went up and up. So farmers and businesses and workers who needed essential loans had to pay high interest rates. Only banks, Mr. Speaker, made money. Their profits doubled.

I mentioned that two years ago in this Government about the 89 per cent increase in profit made by the Bank of Montreal. Last year it was another 28 per cent overall profit again. And that is the way the Liberals serve the people of Canada.

The rank and file of Canadian people, Mr. Speaker, our farmers and workers in Saskatchewan pay higher taxes and interest rates, but banks and corporations, in many cases, increase profits year after year. Yet, the Provincial Treasurer does nothing and knows nothing except these words "balance the budget again".

Now it may be all right to balance a budget under ordinary conditions but our economy has gone riot and the conditions we live under are out of the ordinary.

Alberta is having a deficit budget this year and Alberta, I think, is economically better off than we are. Alberta is more prosperous than Saskatchewan, yet its government, a free enterprise government, is budgeting for a deficit to provide capital funds to provide jobs, employment to the people there, many of whom have migrated from Saskatchewan and settled there.



**MR. E. KRAMER (The Battlefords):** — Those are jobs for Saskatchewan people.

**MR. BEREZOWSKY:** — Right! For the Provincial Treasurer to say that he is balancing the Budget is a joke. If Ottawa had not come to the rescue of this Liberal Government this year, they would have been annihilated politically and there would not have been any balanced budget such as was presented to us by the Provincial Treasurer the other day.

**MR. I. MacDOUGALL (Souris-Estevan):** — Baloney!

**MR. BEREZOWSKY:** — Who said that? Somebody is sick over there. But, Mr. Speaker, a Liberal balanced Budget is meaningless. Last year when the Provincial Treasurer conceded by putting some public capital into the economic stream of Saskatchewan, we felt that he'd been converted to some realism and to the facts of life. Well, it is our job on this side of the House to check on the Government and to see what they did or what they intended to do. I asked some questions the other day. I asked how much money was voted for a work project for a government building at Prince Albert because my people there have been unemployed, many thousands of them. What answer did I get? An appropriation of \$150,000, not a very large sum, Sir, but it could have provided some jobs. But how much did the Government spend in the year up to February 15, 1971? Well, don't be surprised, Mr. Speaker, only \$935.19. I don't know what the 19 cents was for. But I know this, that for Parsons and Whittemore the Government is spending millions of our tax dollars and hundreds of thousands is spent as retaining fees to sustain Liberal friends who got SaskAir and other friends who have been receiving forgivable loans and outright gifts, but for the thousands of unemployed in Prince Albert, \$935.19!

Now it could be, Mr. Speaker, that there was a bind somewhere. So I asked other questions. I knew that my people at Cumberland who had been restricted in their fishing because of pollution needed some ready cash. As there was a vote for public works for a school at Cumberland House, my question was: "How much was allocated and spent in Cumberland House?" The Government indicated that there was an allocation of \$148,000, Sir. Now again one wonders how much was expended to help out the needy people of Cumberland House. Well, don't be surprised, Mr. Speaker, this is the way the Liberals do it, this is the answer they gave me: nothing. Nothing was spent. Not one cent of this appropriation. On this work project at Cumberland House, not one penny for an essential school.

I asked about other allocations. I asked about people living at Turner Lake where a school was promised — for the construction of an urgently needed school house for the children there. And the answer I received on February 19th of this year came back to me and I have it here indicating there wasn't any allocation — nothing, nothing for these Saskatchewan people. For people in the far north, nothing, Mr. Speaker, but for Parsons and Whittemore, many, many millions of dollars.

And when municipal councils which I know and have spoken to, have asked for public works and were in need of public works last year and still need them, when I made inquiries, I find that this Government neither approved such requests, nor

did they allow the Local Government Board to allow urban and other municipalities to issue debentures for capital needs, and Regina is one of them. Do you know, Mr. Speaker, what this means and what distresses us here? It means this Government has deliberately planned and encouraged and acted in the direction of getting rid of the many thousands of working people and farmers to get them out of Saskatchewan. That is what it means. It is a deliberate attempt to depopulate this province.

The Premier gloats over the seventh consecutive balanced Budget, boasting that it is a "pay as you go Budget". That is what he said at Weyburn. Well, Mr. Speaker, if the farmers did this kind of budgeting they would have left en masse, without having to be chased away by the Liberals. They would have been completely bankrupt many years ago.

One would expect that the Government would have proved themselves to be concerned about the needs of our people, of farmers and working people and that more than just a bogus Budget would have been brought in promising to save the economy, an economy so unjust to the people of this province.

Mr. Thatcher is quoted in yesterday's Leader-Post again and that is the one that I am talking about where he spoke at Weyburn. He said:

The only issue in this election is private enterprise versus Socialism.

Not the economy, not the hard times, not the injustices, but private enterprise against Socialism and he expects people to buy that. Yet I agree that it is an issue as well.

We on this side of the House are concerned about our people, our province and our society. We believe in an interdependent society where we can co-operate to make our society tick; to co-operate for education, for health and other services which must be made to work for us. And this is Socialism, Mr. Speaker. Even this same Premier Thatcher has not the guts to throw out the policies which our Socialistic government established in the past. Who does he think he is fooling when he bypasses the real issues? Who would want to go back to the pre-Ryerson days for education, for example, or pre-medicare days of 1962 which we all remember, or to the Victorian postal service days of Britain? No one. Yet these stupid statements are peddled by this Liberal Party and there may yet be people who believe such unmitigated political nonsense.

Every day, Mr. Speaker, this society recognizes more and more that for its survival we must become interdependent and socially conscious, Socialist if you like — I like it. And my contention and logic will be proven if and when the Premier has the courage to call an election. Then he will discover what the people are going to support.

Mr. Speaker, I ask this Government why a bye-election has not been called in Melfort-Tisdale. Our counterpart, Premier Schreyer, did not wait a year or half a year, as has the Premier of Saskatchewan — delaying over a year now. Schreyer called two bye-elections in record time after the seats became vacant. Now could it be, Mr. Speaker, that the Premier is apprehensive or scared? I am sure he is.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. BEREZOWSKY:** — Mr. Speaker, he has denied the people of Melfort-Tisdale their constitutional right to be represented in this Legislature. I call it disregard of people's rights and I call it political quackery, Mr. Speaker.

Now speaking more about people, may I submit that because of Government failures to check pollution by industry or other sources of contamination, the commercial and sport fishing has been virtually destroyed in the Saskatchewan watershed. Nothing has been done about it. They say they are going to do something about it. I admit that fishing had to be banned otherwise it would have been a criminal policy to allow fishing for consumption of a polluted product. But it must be remembered that there are people who depend upon fishing as their livelihood. My people at Cumberland House and at Birch River and in other parts of the province as far as Manitoba, were banned from fishing and their incomes were lost. This very friendly Government had to do something about it. So the Premier and the Minister of Natural Resources (Mr. Barrie) and this friendly people's free enterprise Government, after they received repeated complaints, came to the realization that it had to be either social aid which the people didn't want or some other kind of assistance or compensation. They settled for compensation. So these two representatives of this free enterprise Liberal Government, the Premier and the Minister of Natural Resources, decided to visit the fishermen at Cumberland House. Obviously for political reasons they did bring some cheques to these people, as was reported in the Leader-Post the other day, a grand sum of \$14,000 to compensate in full 67 fishermen who were dispossessed. One of them received the glorious sum of \$4.84 but the average works out at \$225. Jim Carriere, the winner of the festival, the top fisherman and trapper in the North, charged these same politicians that he received only \$213 and this amount did not pay half his fishing expenses, let alone provide anything for his lost income. This is the friendly Liberal Government and this is how they do things. But for Mr. Landegger there is no difficulty in obtaining not \$213 but \$117 million for a promotional deal. And this is the way Liberals practice wealth distribution to people and to promoters — pennies to fishermen, millions to developers. One sometimes wonders what kind of society or civilization we live in which is so polluted and condones such irresponsible acts.

Mr. Speaker, the Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Steuart) calls this a sunshine Budget. May I say this to the Provincial Treasurer, "thank God there is a bit of sunshine some place else." I was in British Columbia not long ago and coming through I stopped on one of the highways where repair work was being undertaken. A young man there came up to me and told me he was from Saskatchewan, as a matter of fact from the Wadena constituency. I asked him during the course of our conversation if there were any others in the gang of 20 or so men repairing that British Columbia highway who had come from Saskatchewan. Do you know what he told me, Mr. Speaker, that out of that gang of some 20, 18 young men were from Saskatchewan repairing British Columbia roads, men who should have been working here in Saskatchewan building roads. I am sure, Mr. Speaker, that when the Government changes and better policies are brought into effect and a better budget is brought into the House, that most of these 31,000 people who have left this province, or

whatever figure it is, will come back to this good Province of Saskatchewan. Then it will have a good government.

I will oppose the Budget of course, but it isn't the dollars that are in the Budget that are important. It is the overall policies, the lack of understanding by the Government as to what it's all about.

Mr. Speaker, when this Premier and the Minister of Natural Resources (Mr. Barrie) were at Cumberland House, the people there posed the problem of incomes and jobs, as reported in the press that I have before me. The Premier gave them an answer. He told them to move south and find jobs on the Prairies while at the same time he knew there were 21,000 unemployed on the Prairies, but that's where he was sending them. This kind of statement, Mr. Speaker, by the Premier indicated very clearly that not only has he caused the depopulation of the province but that he is intent on removing people from their own communities, from such communities as you have in the North — Cumberland House, Lac LaRonge, wherever it may be. I suggest to this Premier and to this Government it would have been better, though costing dollars, to train these people in these Northern communities for jobs in the forest instead of bringing in people from Hinton and Quebec to take jobs that rightfully belong to the people in Saskatchewan.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. BEREZOWSKY:** — And no amount of arguing from the Government benches will prove to me that my people from the hinterland have jobs because they haven't, nor did the farmers get jobs, because they haven't. The people who were hired were those brought into this province from Quebec and from Hinton and I am not saying that these are not entitled to jobs but they were given jobs that were promised to the people of Saskatchewan, northern Saskatchewan.

I recall as reported in the Star Phoenix, I think it was on August 3, 1968, the Premier said that 4,000 jobs would be provided for the people of the North. But look at the record, surely to goodness when the people of my constituency such as at Molonosa and Montreal Lake, who formed a co-operative and tried to operate as a group in the forest there, should have been helped. It would have been a commendable act had this Government assisted these people to get started rather than throwing them out on their own and letting the co-operative go bankrupt. Yet the Government boasts that it is a responsible Government, it has a good Budget. Very questionable statements, Sir.

I'll tell you, Mr. Speaker, who is concerned really with Indians. It's the New Democratic Party.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. BEREZOWSKY:** — I give you for an example a very recent event when Premier Schreyer held up the flooding of Indian Lake, many thousands of square miles, in order to protect the interests of the native people, in spite of the pressure from the big monopolies and big corporations. Because, Mr. Speaker, to the New Democratic Party and its philosophy people are important, most

important. But not to the Liberals who believe in free enterprise and would sell each other even for any kind of a gain.

Mr. Speaker, it has been said this is a bogus Budget, no matter how you look at it. Nothing for Indian employment or for Indian rehabilitation. Nothing. But for the Department of Indian Affairs, for the administration and what they call training which is no training at all, this year there is another \$364,000 in the Estimates and this, of course, is for an election year. Although money cannot be found, as I said, to provide jobs back in the hinterland, money can be found here in Regina for administration and I submit it is for political purposes.

Monies cannot be found for programs and for roads such as I have asked for to needy communities, yet \$1,348,530 is easily found for so-called training and political placement of Indian and Metis people. For those who need jobs, Mr. Speaker, the Premier says 'go south' and they go south. To those who need schools, the Premier says 'forget about schools, we don't intend to spend any money that has been appropriated' as at Cumberland House and Turner Lake. I heard the Premier some time ago speaking at Prince Albert when he said if it was necessary he would spend \$4 million for this Indian Department. He didn't say how he would spend it. I wish he had said that he would spend \$4 million to do the kind of thing that the Indian people want done, then it would have made some sense. But no matter what promises he may make let me assure him that in view of his past record even if he spends \$10 million he would never get the confidence of the Indian and Metis people after the results and derogation he has been throwing at them over the years. Because not only does he make statements like, 'They breed like rabbits. They're lazy,' but he tries to remove them from their natural hunting and fishing grounds and tells them to go south from areas which are home to these people.

And this Government does nothing, really nothing to train and provide jobs for these people in Saskatchewan industries. In fact there are more people on social welfare today in my city of Prince Albert, for example, than there were five or six years ago. According to the last figures I have been able to obtain, 2,500 people are out of work in that city. They want to work, they want to earn wages and they should work and should earn wages but they are not encouraged to do so by this Government. These people are told to move out and they are moving out. As a matter of fact although this policy has not been enunciated by the Minister of Social Welfare (Mr. MacDonald) I do know, because it has been brought to my attention, that Welfare officials are travelling across the frontier telling hard-hit farmers, trappers and fishermen that if it is tough for them then to move into the cities and get permanent social aid. I shall have more to say about that when we get into the Estimates.

I want to make a few brief comments on another area and that's on mineral resources. The Minister (Mr. Cameron) is here. He may want to listen to me. It may seem strange, Mr. Speaker, to the people of Saskatchewan that the Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Steuart) devoted only three lines to mineral resources in his long and tiresome speech. Exactly three seconds of time was devoted to a department which will require \$2.3 million to administer. The Provincial Treasurer was apparently ashamed of the mineral development in this province and his Government is ashamed of having no program or achievements to present to the

people of this province in spite of all the boasting we have heard. They are great promoters these Liberals, they are great boasters. Prior to the 1967 election, the Minister of Mineral Resources (Mr. Cameron) said in the House that tremendous development was in the offing. There was to be oil from the shales of the Pasquia Hills, manganese by the millions of tons, glass sands, and of course these statements were not new, Mr. Speaker. I knew about them and we knew about them because these discoveries were made as far back as 1913 but not feasible commercially. Some day I hope they will be used but for the Liberals, this was a new and challenging discovery on or about 1966.

Mr. Speaker, when we were the Government uranium was produced to the tune of some \$40 million worth a year. On top of that our base metal production was considerably higher than it is today. No wonder the Provincial Treasurer doesn't want to talk about it. In 1961 if you look at the record you will find hard rock production to the tune of \$75.5 million under the New Democratic Party government. But look at the outstanding mineral development of this boasting Liberal Government. Did the value of this production increase since 1964 as one would expect? Did it stay the same? No! Mr. Speaker, it has gone down and down and down until in this last fiscal year it was down to only \$40 million — about half. It is fortunate for this Government that we negotiated potash developments when we did which have grown and produced incomes or earnings from \$30,660,000 to a value of \$82,876,000. And I say it is fortunate because had not that happened all of us here would have had to pack up and close the doors of this Legislature because there wouldn't have been enough money to administer the province. So when you look at the production of the Mineral Resources branch everything is discouraging except for the new gas field that was mentioned by the Hon. Member from Meadow Lake (Mr. Coupland) a little while back. Fortunately for us we do have an odd bright spot of sunshine.

As I said, Liberals are great boasters, great dreamers but their actual achievements are dismal and sad. But, Mr. Speaker, it could be otherwise. This Liberal Government, you remember, did have incentives for prospecting and for mining companies and I remember the Minister came into this House last year, the Minister of Mineral Resources, who said there has been so much development in the Province of Saskatchewan that such a program was no longer required. Well I want to tell him that kind of talk may be big but it is not big enough. Let me put the record straight. There is yet no mine at Wollaston Lake, not even a town site and according to the information I have from the Government, it hasn't yet been surveyed. All you have is this big story of a uranium find and promises of big uranium development. Well, we have had uranium development in this province for 20 years and it was productive, Mr. Minister. We have also been told — it's been in the press — how this Government was going to assist this industry at Wollaston. The Government promised to spend up to \$70 million for a highway, another report said \$17 million. I don't know which would be correct, probably \$70 million would be what would be required to build a road for the Gulf Oil Company (which is half owned by foreign interests) out of the tax monies of this province.

I do recognize that highways are good and I want to thank the Minister of Highways (Mr. Boldt) for giving me \$21 million worth of highways since they became the Government but I do not want to thank him for the highways built for private corporations

at the expense of the taxes of the ordinary people. Because when you compare this — according to the information I have — with other constituencies adjoining me they got \$2 million and \$3 million. Mine got \$21 million. I am happy with that. Maybe I should have had \$10 million worth of highways which were necessary. But the Government spent an additional \$10 million or \$15 million on highways because the industry refused to build its own highways. My colleague says that I have half the province. I didn't want to go into that but that is partly true. I certainly have two constituencies, I have Prince Albert East and I have Cumberland. I think I have done a good job by both of them.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. BEREZOWSKY:** — Well, for all the voters there are in Athabasca I think I could have handled it better than the Hon. Minister from Athabasca (Mr. Guy).

I want to say, Mr. Speaker, to the people of Saskatchewan that all this is big talk at election time but until the project at Wollaston gets under way, it is like the oil shales, like the manganese that disappeared after the election of 1967. Mr. Speaker, we want development in mines and in industries but we want more than Liberal promises, we want action. We want more than big black smoke which soon dissipates into the air mass. And for making these big promises let the Government act, act now with positive ventures which will meet the needs of our people, in the North, in the South and right across the Province of Saskatchewan, on the farms and in the forests and in the mines. Let them provide the jobs because private enterprise can't provide the jobs. Let them provide for people's contentment.

Let me suggest a few things to the Members of the Government that should be done and these are just a few. Every Member here could give you a list of things that should be done if you haven't any ideas yourself, certainly I shall tell you what should be done in my constituency. Let's get on with the schools that you promised. What about the comprehensive \$10 million school which had big headlines in the Prince Albert Herald a year or two ago which was supposed to be built by this Government. Is that dead now? What about the government building for which money was appropriated which I mentioned previously. When is this going to get started? What about the construction of a public library for the city of Prince Albert and the people of that area for which the late John Cuelenaere left \$100,000 in a bequest. Cannot the Government find some money to see that our people get this kind of an educational institution? Let the Government undertake to build access roads in the northern communities as we did in Cumberland and Pelican Narrows. There are many areas such as Deschambault. I have asked and asked, and I repeat again, Mr. Minister, that this settlement must have a road because they are Saskatchewan citizens and must have overland access. Let not the Government forget that many of these people are desirous in commuting in and out of places like Deschambault and many other points in Saskatchewan. Let the Government undertake to build dams on our streams and rivers to protect the environment and retain a suitable and good water supply. These and other kinds of needs that are essential to the progress of our community.

Our governments should have the courage to enter into industrial development. Mr. Landegger is not afraid, he's got courage. He admits that he is building an empire for his son, he admits that there are risks but he has no fear of risks. But surely a government, a free enterprise government which is so brave and so boastful could do as much for its own people as Mr. Landegger is prepared to do for his son. This is in the Financial Post, last issue. But, Mr. Speaker, this kind of courage the Liberals do not have. In order to bring this province to its destiny you need the New Democratic Party, Mr. Speaker. The New Democratic Party is the Party that will undertake to develop our own resources through a development corporation. This is the Party which will give young people a chance to get a full education without imposing all kinds of economic hardships on students. This is the Party that can and wants to give the people a chance to work. This is the kind of government which will ease tax burdens by processes of equalization. This is the kind of government, the New Democratic government, which will be good for Saskatchewan and for Saskatchewan people. And because the record of this present Liberal Government is bad, I cannot vote for the motion but I will vote for the amendment.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. B.D. GALLAGHER (Yorkton):** — Mr. Speaker, this will likely be my last opportunity to take part in the Budget Debate in this House so I hope that you will bear with me if I cover a rather broad range of subjects in my remarks this afternoon.

First of all I want to congratulate the Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Steuart) for the Budget that was brought down last Friday and for his usual entertaining manner in presenting it to this House.

It will have been noticed by all Members of the House that probably for the first time in the history of this Province the Budget had neither tax increases nor tax decreases. Last year's Federal Budget was similar in that respect and last year's Federal Budget was the first Budget in the history of Canada that had absolutely no change in taxes.

Mr. Speaker, any budget should chart the course that the government will follow for the next year. And the document presented by the Treasurer the other day does just that. It sets out the priorities of the Government, emphasizing the areas which the Government believes need the greatest attention.

Education and health have always received the first priority of this Government. Public Works to spur the economy and create jobs has been given special attention this year when the construction industry was lagging. Help for local governments in the form of extra grants has once again been a major concern of this Government as was indicated by the increased spending in the coming year for grants to municipalities, both rural and urban.

The 1971 Budget indicates the Government's concern with pollution. It outlines very concrete measures that will be taken to control the pollution of our environment. The Attorney General (Mr. Heald) mentioned something about this earlier this afternoon.



I should like to refer for a minute or two to some of the remarks made yesterday by the financial critic (Mr. Romanow). I wish that his Leader (Mr. Blakeney) was sitting beside him and I hope that he comes back to his seat. I know the task of financial critic is not an easy one and I sympathize with the Member for Riversdale in his role as financial critic. Really after yesterday I was disappointed with his effort. Of the one hour and 20 minutes he spoke, he dwelt on the contents of the Budget for just a little less than five minutes. During his remarks, Mr. Speaker, he mentioned the credibility of this Liberal Government, to use his own words. Now let's just deal for a few minutes with the credibility of some of the remarks made by the Member for Riversdale.

He called the Budget a bogus Budget, full of half-truths and inaccuracies. He stated that it was not balanced and the reason that he gave it was not balanced was that there was a federal handout of \$70 million. Well, Mr. Speaker, if that is what he thinks today I wonder what the father of the Member for Mayfair (Mr. Brockelbank) thinks today. I am going to read back into the records of this House, a statement that he made when he delivered his budget speech on Friday, February 21, 1964. Mr. Speaker, I quote from the speech of the Hon. J.H. Brockelbank in the Budget Speech of 1964. He was reviewing the fiscal position for the year 1962-63 and I quote:

I turn now to an examination of the fiscal position of the province following two small deficits. The Government recorded a budgetary surplus of \$9.9 million in the fiscal year 1962-63. The Public Accounts which were tabled earlier in the Session revealed revenues of \$195.4 million and expenditures of \$185.5 million. In the 1961-62 fiscal year there were revenues of \$149 million and expenditures were \$152.3 million.

And then he goes on, Mr. Speaker, to review the fiscal year 1963-64 and I quote again:

In the current year I expect a budgetary surplus of about \$7 million. All of the major revenue sources will exceed our estimates. Record mineral production and active exploration are pushing Mineral Resource revenues above the original estimate by some \$7 million. Consumption taxes which are sensitive to cash disposable income will be up. The education and health tax by over \$6 million; the gasoline tax by \$2 million, and liquor profits by \$1 million.

Revenues from the Federal-Provincial tax-sharing agreements may reach \$51.4 million instead of the estimated \$49.4 million because the national economy has grown more than was forecast a year ago.

Now, Mr. Speaker, \$51.4 million as related to a \$185 million budget represents 28 per cent of the total budget. But in 1971, in this Budget, the \$70 million that the Member for Riversdale calls a handout, only represents about 15 per cent. It is a handout when we get it, when there is a Liberal Government, and it is part of the way you budget when you have a Socialist government.

Let me continue. He also stated, Mr. Speaker, and I should like to refer to some other remarks that were made in

that same speech in 1964. The Member for Riversdale mentioned the other day that there was a figure of about \$10 million that the Government stole from the Saskatchewan Power Corporation and about \$6 million that went into revenues from the Saskatchewan Government Telephones. If he would refer, Mr. Speaker, to page nine of the same speech by the Hon. Mr. Brockelbank in 1964. The summary of results of operations of Crown corporations for the financial years ending in 1963. It might be interesting to note that two of them lost one quarter of a million dollars. But more interesting, Mr. Speaker, is the fact that the Saskatchewan Power Corporation charging the same rates that are being charged today made a profit of \$5,454,000 on advances of \$420 million.

Mr. Speaker, that represents a return on your investment of about 1-1/4 per cent, but that is about as good as you could expect, for Socialists running it. Mr. Speaker, all that is the matter with the Member for Riversdale (Mr. Romanow) and the Members on the other side of the House, when I look at the means by which the Government has balanced the Budget, is that they are jealous that when they were in office the Power Corporation and the Government Telephones couldn't be operated on a sound basis. And the \$16 million that Saskatchewan Government Telephones and the Saskatchewan Power Corporation have put into Treasury this year represents a tax saving in some other field, to the people of Saskatchewan, of some \$16 million.

The financial critic suggested the Liberal Government produced a depression. He said Liberal Governments both in Regina and in Ottawa were responsible for the number of people unemployed. Well, I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that he get together with his seatmate before he makes such statements because if his Leader agrees with him, I suggest that he review the speech that he, Mr. Blakeney, delivered in this House on March 9, 1962, when he was the Provincial Treasurer.

**MR. R. ROMANOW (Saskatoon-Riversdale):** — What year?

**MR. GALLAGHER:** — That was in 1962.

**MR. ROMANOW:** — I thought it was ancient history!

**MR. GALLAGHER:** — Not too ancient. I don't know whether you were a Socialist at that time or not, Roy. But I should like to quote from that speech of the Hon. Mr. Blakeney, now Leader of the NDP. He was a Minister of the Crown at that time. He was the man who was guiding your finances. He is now your Leader. He is the man who thinks that he should be the Premier of Saskatchewan. Now, the Member the other day suggested that Liberal Governments in Regina and Liberal Government in Ottawa have caused a farm depression and they caused the economic recession across Canada. If this is true, if the Member is right, then it must follow that a CCF government in 1960-61 and a Conservative government at Ottawa at that same time, caused that same depression. I want to read, Mr. Speaker, from the speech of the Hon. Member for Regina Centre, the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Blakeney). He said at that time, quote:

Two measures of farm income are often reported. One farm income reports the value of farm commodities sold during the year together with other cash incomes such

March 2, 1971

As PFAA payments. In 1961 because Saskatchewan farmers had some carryover supplies of wheat to supplement the short crop and because of earlier than usual interim payments on wheat and because of good returns on the sale of livestock, cash income stood up well. In fact it reached \$610 million.

But he goes on to say that this is not really a true picture of what the farm economy shows. And here is how he ends up:

Farm net income which reached over \$350 million in 1960 fell to \$104 million in 1961.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I think that even the Member for Riversdale with as little knowledge as he possesses of the agricultural industry in this province, should know that a Provincial Government hasn't a great deal of influence on the farm economy. Certainly then if the Provincial Government has that influence then he should bear responsibility and his colleagues should bear responsibility for the income position the farmers found themselves in in 1961.

I should like to go further, Mr. Speaker. My friend across the way stated yesterday afternoon that a Liberal Government in Regina and a Liberal Government at Ottawa are the cause of the economic recession across Canada. Let me quote further from Mr. Blakeney's speech of March 9, 1962:

What then is the state of the national economy? Looking back over 1961 we can see some signs that are hopeful and some that are disturbing. The year started poorly but by mid-summer the economy was showing strong signs of recovery, signs which intensified toward the end of the year. Most of the major sectors showed important gains, yet when the year as a whole is reviewed, we find that we were plagued by continuing high levels of unemployment which again reached record post-war heights. About this time last year the number of persons unemployed exceeded 11 per cent of our labor force.

This, Mr. Speaker, was stated by the now Leader of the Opposition. He was the Provincial Treasurer at that time. He continues:

By the end of this year, well into recovery, the rate of unemployment on a seasonally adjusted basis will be around the 6 per cent mark of the labor force.

Now surely, Mr. Speaker, if the words of wisdom that we heard yesterday afternoon from the Member for Riversdale (Mr. Romanow) were right, then they should apply equally in 1961 or 1962, 1963 or 1964, when the Member for Regina Centre and the former Member for Kelsey were the Provincial Treasurers of this Province.

**MR. ROMANOW:** — Bernie, I am only worried about 1971!

**MR. GALLAGHER:** — Well, I should expect that you will be one of the few that may still occupy a seat on that side of the House, Mr. Member for Riversdale. I know that he won't like to hear some of the remarks that I am going to make this afternoon, but he

made the remark yesterday afternoon that he questioned the credibility of this Government. I question, Mr. Speaker, the credibility of some of his remarks. He made the remark that the Budget was full of inaccuracies and half-truths. That's what he said. Well, let's go on and we shall see how many inaccuracies and half-truths were in the statements made by the Member for Riversdale yesterday afternoon.

He was talking about Public Works and the Public Works' Budget of 1971-72. He suggested that the Government has no intention of spending the money budgeted for Public Works. I should like to refer him now to what his party did when they were in power 10 years ago. In 1961, when according to Mr. Blakeney's own figures . . .

**MR. ROMANOW:** — What year?

**MR. GALLAGHER:** — In 1961. Take notes on it and remember this, Roy, when according to his own figures there was 11 per cent of our labor force unemployed, the Socialists actually reduced the Public Works' budget by over \$1 million. I want to refer the Member for Riversdale to page 40 of the 1961 Estimates. I hope that he bears with me for a moment. I shall find those Estimates. I am sure that he won't appreciate it, when I read him back the amount of money that was budgeted by that government at that time.

**MR. ROMANOW:** — Why is it that the Liberals want to get rid of two out of every three farmers?

**MR. GALLAGHER:** — Wait till I am done with you on the agricultural platform of the NDP. I refer the Member for Riversdale to the 1961 Estimates. In 1959-60 his party, being the government, budgeted \$8,167,000 for Public Works. That included ordinary and capital expenditures. In 1960-61 when unemployment rose to 11 per cent of our total work force, they just dropped it by \$1,160,000. Now these are the people who were going to look after the unemployed. That's not all, Mr. Speaker. If he looks to the 1962-63 Estimates he will find that it was even worse. It was dropped to \$6 million and some odd thousands and then to \$4 million and some odd thousands of dollars. And, Mr. Speaker, they didn't even spend all that money.

Mr. Speaker, if there is any talk of credibility I suggest that the credibility of some of the remarks from the Member for Riversdale are those things that may not be too credible. I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that the Member refer to the Estimates of 1963 and see what his party did when they were in power then.

I should like to turn for a minute to talk about taxes. Now this seems to be a favorite topic of the Member for Riversdale.

**MR. ROMANOW:** — 1,400 new taxes this year!

**MR. GALLAGHER:** — Wait until I am done with you, Roy. Yes, it is easily seen that he wasn't around here in 1960 or 1961 or 1962 or 1963. He talked about the terrible deluge of taxes heaped on the people of Saskatchewan in 1968. I should like to remind him of the 60

per cent increase in sales tax in 1961. I should like to remind him of the highest percentage increase in the gas tax in the history of Saskatchewan in 1962. I should like to remind him that every known fee, every known possible tax between 1960 and 1963 were raised under a CCF government, and his seatmate was part of that government.

**MR. ROMANOW:** — . . . and you guys managed to find 1,400 new ones to place on.

**MR. GALLAGHER:** — Well, Mr. Speaker, what did these people do? They are always crying about what they call deterrent fees. What did these people do with the hospital premium from 1947 until 1964? Some of the Members over there must know. Just for the benefit of those who don't, I am going to read into the records the antics of the NDP when they were the Government of Saskatchewan.

Mr. Speaker, in 1947 when the Hospital Services Plan went into effect, the government imposed a \$5 per head tax and a family maximum of \$30. In 1949 they increased that to \$10 per head. In 1954 they increased it to \$15 per head or \$40 per family. After they got through the election of 1956, they increased it to \$20 per head or \$45 per family. In 1959 they dropped it \$2.50. There was an election in 1960, they dropped it to \$17.50. Then in 1961, immediately after the election it was raised from \$17.50 to \$24 or a maximum of \$48 per family. Then in 1962 it was the same, then in 1963 there was the joint tax, the Medical Care and Hospital Tax, \$36 or a maximum of \$72 which is the same today as it was in 1963. Exactly the same. But in 1964 there was an election, they dropped it \$10 from \$36 to \$26. It was like a yo-yo. They dropped the family total from \$72 to \$52. They thought, we'll make it \$100 after the election because the people of Saskatchewan are so gullible they have been buying this for the last 16 years. In 1964 it was dropped \$10 — in case you didn't know — make some notes there, Mr. Member for Riversdale (Mr. Romanow), there are a lot of things you said yesterday afternoon that displayed your ignorance of what your party was doing when they were in office 16 years.

**MR. ROMANOW:** — You're hurting my feelings!

**MR. GALLAGHER:** — May I carry on, Mr. Speaker. I know he doesn't like to hear this. When they talk about deterrent fees and when they talk about taxes, and when they talk about hospital premiums, I want to remind him that in 1963, when they were the government, that the medical care and hospital premium represented 24 per cent of the total cost of medical care and hospitalization in this province. Today it represents 15 per cent, just 15 per cent or a little bit less than two-thirds of the percentage it represented at that time.

You know, Mr. Speaker, these are the people who should not talk about taxes. But they seem to get a great deal of enjoyment about talking about taxes. I should like to read something to the House, and particularly to the Member for Riversdale. You will find it in Mr. Blakeney's speech in 1962, I believe, on page 25. At that time, of course, we had seen all the taxes that could be raised, raised. The Opposition took exception to the raising of these taxes. Here is what Mr.

Blakeney, who is now Leader, said to this House in his Budget of 1962.

**AN HON. MEMBER:** — What year?

**MR. GALLAGHER:** — 1962. I wish your Leader was here.

The plain truth, Mr. Speaker, is that those who oppose taxes do so for one of two reasons, either they oppose the public programs which are being financed by such taxes and do not have the courage to say so, or they seek to mislead the public into believing that the services can be provided without being paid for.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I should like to know which category the Member for Riversdale puts himself in. He says this:

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. GALLAGHER:** — . . . Mr. Speaker, can I continue to quote from Mr. Blakeney's speech:

We are seeing in Canada increasing activities on the part of opponents of the first stripe, those who oppose the programs of public welfare and betterment, but disguise their opposition as opposition to the taxes required to finance these programs. As for the opponents of the second stripe, those who were certain the services can be provided without taxation . . .

(Then he goes on and on and on. He ended up by saying this):

Bankruptcy is the price paid by people who believe that you can have and continue to have something for nothing.

Mr. Speaker, I believed the Member for Regina Centre at that time. I had a lot of respect for him as a Provincial Treasurer, the man could talk some common sense and think sound economics. But from the garble that we listened to from the financial critic the other day, I don't think he knows anything about the finances of this Province.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. GALLAGHER:** — Surely, Mr. Speaker, he should have got together with his buddy before he made that speech.

**AN HON. MEMBER:** — They don't get together at all!

**MR. GALLAGHER:** — Mr. Speaker, speaking about taxes and they like to hear and talk about taxes because they think they might get some votes out in the country.

**MR. ROMANOW:** — 1,477 new taxes!

**MR. GALLAGHER:** — I'm not done with you yet! You know, Mr. Speaker, this Government since 1964, in the running of the affairs of this

Province, have only made one major mistake. That major mistake was supported by every Member on that side of the House, and I say that mistake was when the sales tax was reduced from 5 per cent to 4 per cent. Every Member of the House voted for that reduction in the sales tax and didn't we hear a cry in 1968 when we had to find the \$35 million that had been lost over three years of the 1 per cent on the sales tax. Where were the Members of the Opposition that time? The Member for The Battlefords (Mr. Kramer) was in his seat. The Member for Wadena (Mr. Dewhurst) was around, the Member for Cumberland (Mr. Berezowsky) was here, the Member for Biggar (Mr. Lloyd), the Member for Swift Current (Mr. Wood), the Member for Regina Centre (Mr. Blakeney), I think the Member for Turtleford (Mr. Wooff), and I think maybe old Henry was around (Mr. Baker).

**MR. ROMANOW:** — Will the Hon. Member permit a question?

**MR. GALLAGHER:** — As soon as I am done I'll permit a question.

Anyway, Mr. Speaker, these people . . .

**AN HON. MEMBER:** — You were in the paddling pool!

**MR. ROMANOW:** — You got elected on that promise!

**MR. GALLAGHER:** — Mr. Speaker, I made a statement that the only major mistake that this Government ever made, whether it was a promise we made and a promise we should have broken or not, was we made the mistake of reducing the sales tax from 5 per cent to 4 per cent at a cost to the Provincial Treasurer and this Province which we had to find in 1968. I think even the Member for Riversdale knows that from Prince Edward Island, from Newfoundland to British Columbia, education costs, highway costs, health costs, welfare costs and all costs have risen, and have risen at alarming rates in the last 10 years. I think the Member for Riversdale with his little knowledge of finance should have realized in 1965, although he wasn't in this House, should have realized then — surely his seatmate should have realized — that money had to be had to give the public the services that the public was demanding. So the Government made a promise, the Government made a commitment to reduce the sales tax. The Government made the mistake in making that promise and then made a worse mistake by keeping that promise and found ourselves wanting \$35 million in 1968. In 1968 all the Members of the Opposition voted against the tax increases and voted against the Budget, the Budget that found the \$35 million which they had voted to lose in 1965.

**MR. E.I. WOOD (Swift Current):** — So did you!

**MR. GALLAGHER:** — Yes, I did, Mr. Member from Swift Current. I did with some apprehension, just as I would not vote for the rebate of the estate tax a couple of years ago and when none of you had the guts to stand up and say, in two or three years this might haunt you. I did so, Mr. Speaker, with reservations. I thought that maybe we would be all right doing it. But, Mr. Speaker, it was a mistake and I say it was the only major mistake that this Government has made since we became the Government of this Province.

**MR. ROMANOW:** — That's two mistakes!

**MR. GALLAGHER:** — I'd like to remind the Member for Riversdale what his party did in 1961-62, again, just in case he's forgotten since I reminded him last time. That was the time when the sales tax, the education and health tax, jumped from 3 per cent to 5 per cent. That's the time we had a 2-cent jump in the gas tax, our income tax was increased, our corporation taxes were increased, medical care premiums and every conceivable fee that the government could slap an increase on was increased. It should be known by all Members and maybe our friends on your left, Mr. Speaker, should be reminded of what they used to do with the hospital premium. I think maybe I should send that chart over to the Member for Riversdale just in case he doesn't know. I think he needs to be reminded of this often. Every time a Member on the other side of the House gets up we hear him talking about taxes.

**AN HON. MEMBER:** — 1,477!

**MR. GALLAGHER:** — You know, Mr. Speaker, they talk a lot about utilization fees. I just happen to have with me this afternoon a list of the costs, comparative costs of medical care and hospitalization in all the provinces of Canada. It is rather an interesting one. You know, that with the medical care premium, the total revenues derived from the medical care premiums and the total revenue derived from utilization fees, the per capita cost of medical care and hospitalization in Saskatchewan last year was about \$23 per person. I should like to give the Member for Riversdale a few figures on how our neighboring provinces financed medical care and hospitalization. I think these facts about our neighboring provinces, Alberta and British Columbia and Manitoba and Ontario, should be given. The Maritime Provinces receive much, much larger grants for these services than the Western Provinces and the Central Provinces. Just for your information, Mr. Speaker, in the Province of Quebec they pay an 8 per cent tax on their net income to finance this. In the Province of Ontario, for example, the single premium is \$136.80, the family premium is \$309. In Alberta the single premium is \$69, the family premium is \$138; there is also a co-insurance or utilization fee of \$5 for admission to hospitals. In British Columbia the single premium is \$60, the couple premium is \$120, a family premium is \$138 and there is a co-insurance or utilization fee of \$1 per day for standard ward care, \$2 per day care for surgical services. In NDP Manitoba — and this might be interesting for the Member for Riversdale — the single premium there is \$49.80, the family premium is \$99.60, and immediately, Mr. Speaker, Mr. Schreyer became the Premier of Manitoba, what did he do? He raised the corporation and the income tax.

Now even the Member for Riversdale (Mr. Romanow) and Members of the Socialist Party know that you are not going to have medical care or hospitalization or any other kind of government service — we all want these government-sponsored services — you are not going to have them without paying for them. I should read back to remind him once again what his Leader, who was then Provincial Treasurer said in closing the remarks he made in the Budget in 1962. Mr. Speaker, in 1962, on page 25 — make sure you read it and make sure you remind your Leader that he made that statement in 1962. I should suggest that if the Member was concerned about the credibility of this Government, if he was



concerned about the half-truths or inaccuracies that he suggested the provincial Treasurer made in his Budget, I suggest he look again, that he look in the mirror and read back the speech that he made yesterday afternoon.

**AN HON. MEMBER:** — Stands in front of it all day!

**MR. GALLAGHER:** — Speaking about property taxes, Mr. Speaker, I want to say this. I think that the time has come now and I don't care what kind of a government we have, when the Government of Saskatchewan and I think the governments of most of the provinces of Canada, have got to move the cost of education away from the property tax base and move it to the income tax.

**AN HON. MEMBER:** — That's what I said!

**MR. GALLAGHER:** — I have to agree with you. Mr. Speaker, I see in my own instance as a farmer, I see in the instance of many, many business people, where their property tax is \$2,000 o \$2,400, two-thirds of which is going to pay for educational costs. Two crop failures can get the farmer into a really difficult position. Let me tell you further, Mr. Speaker, the culprits are the people who are high salaried people, who pay a modest rent in an apartment block, or a corporation lawyer like yourself, who probably lives in a very modest home, so that they won't have to pay their fair share of the education costs. I am not saying for a minute, Mr. Speaker, that . . .

**MR. ROMANOW:** — Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege, the Hon. Member said that I was a corporation lawyer. I take that as an insult. I am not a corporation lawyer, definitely not. That's the preserve of the Liberals opposite.

**MR. GALLAGHER:** — . . . I have never been in his home. I suspect that he lives in a modest home. Maybe he lives in a modest apartment, if he does he is doing like a lot more people who are not carrying their fair share of the cost of education. I know people, Mr. Speaker, who are in the \$15,000 to \$20,000 salary range, who live in suites who pay from \$100 to \$125 a month rent, who are not paying their fair share of the cost of education. I suggest there is nothing wrong with having dwellings whether they be on the farm or in the city, village or town, bearing part of the cost of education. A small part. I don't think that farm land should be any longer assessed taxes for education. I don't think business should any longer be assessed taxes. Because if I am operating my farm and I make \$15,000 and I pay \$2,000 property tax, \$1,200 of which goes to supporting education, I shouldn't mind an extra 10 or 15 per cent income tax, just in case next year and the next year I don't make five cents and I might have to give my farm back to the municipality. I have seen too many business failures in the last few years.

**AN HON. MEMBER:** — Convince Davey about that!

**MR. GALLAGHER:** — Will you keep quiet until I'm done, Mr.. . .

**MR. D.W. MICHAYLUK (Redberry):** — That's mistake number three of this Government!

**MR. GALLAGHER:** — I'm not done with you yet, Dick!

I think the Member for Riversdale said something about the NDP farm program. I suggest that he never ever again talk about farms, he doesn't know, in fact, Mr. Speaker, I think that if I was in real trouble in court, I could defend myself better in court than he could work my farm.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. GALLAGHER:** — In fact I am sure of it!

**MR. ROMANOW:** — That's how I got . . . the Liberal Government . . .

**MR. GALLAGHER:** — He talks about the Task Force and I think he made the suggestion that farmers are going to be sharecroppers for large corporations. Well, Mr. Speaker, I hope the farmers are never sharecroppers for large corporations. I hope that we can maintain viable family farm units but he and his party are the last people who should talk about Liberal Governments running the family off the farm. You know that 44,000 of them left here between 1944 and 1964. They, the Opposition, are the last people who should talk about saving the family farm.

I don't know what his answer is to the farm problem. I think he suggested something about a land bank. Mr. Speaker, I wonder if that land bank is his answer to the Wafflers who wanted to nationalize the land. I am going to tell you this, I like my life on the farm but I would rather be a sharecropper of the big corporation than be a sharecropper of a Socialist government with a land bank.

You know, Mr. Speaker, he talked about three criteria that should determine a government's credibility. The last of the criteria he suggested was looking after the needs of the unfortunate. Yes, I know it's the Premier's criteria. I am quite aware of that and he suggested the last one was looking after the needs of the unfortunate and he bemoaned the fact that the rates in our nursing homes were too high. Well, I am going to tell my friend from Riversdale (Mr. Romanow) that I know a little bit more about this than he does. I am very close to it because my father happens to be spending his last few years in a nursing home and I have rather strong feelings on this, Mr. Speaker. But the suggestion that the Member from Riversdale made yesterday afternoon that this Liberal Government is not looking after the unfortunate is wrong. I am not certain how many beds the nursing home in Yorkton holds but I know that a large majority of the patients in that nursing home are paid for by the public purse. The people that I feel for, Mr. Speaker, are the people — nobody is deprived from entering that nursing home — the people that I feel for are not the people who have nothing, they can still get in there. They are not the people who have saved a million dollars, it's the people like my father who have worked all their lives to save enough to try to look after themselves.

I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that this Government with all the monies that are being spent on health and hospitals, should take a look at the question of at least subsidizing nursing homes for elderly people of moderate means. The Opposition are the last

people who should talk about nursing homes for all we had during their regime were those built by private organizations. I repeat, some subsidization of these people of moderate means in their terminal years in a nursing home should be considered for in many instances this can become a serious financial problem for the family.

Mr. Speaker, I want to say a few more things before I close. You know, after I listened to the Member for Cumberland (Mr. Berezowsky) and I have a certain amount of respect for him. I am sure he is an honest man. I listened to the Member for Kelvington (Mr. Byers) and I listened to the Member for Riversdale (Mr. Romanow). After having listened to every Member on that side of the House I am reminded of a quote from Sir Winston Churchill, that great British statesman who once said, "Socialism is a philosophy of envy and a gospel of hatred."

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. GALLAGHER:** — Mr. Speaker, truer words were never spoken. It doesn't matter whether the Socialist is in Moscow or Peking or Stockholm or Regina, he believes in a philosophy of envy. If somebody else in politics, in business or in any other thing that they might endeavor to do in life, is more successful than they, they envy them, they are jealous of them. And what do they do? They go across the length and breadth of this province and this country preaching hatred because they couldn't succeed themselves.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. GALLAGHER:** — Because they couldn't succeed themselves they are envious and jealous of those who can. I know, Mr. Speaker, that it hurts, but some of the people who sit on the left of you, Mr. Speaker, and particularly the Member for Riversdale, lust so much for power — their lust is so great for power they will preach hate from one end of this province to the other trying to get into power. I can assure you, Mr. Speaker, although I shall not be a candidate for the next election, but after the speech that the Member for Riversdale made yesterday I am going to follow him in the next campaign to tell the people the truth, I can assure you. I hope that the election is sometime in mid October and I am sure I shall have the time. Mr. Speaker, I suppose after the next election there will be some of the NDP Members elected to this Legislature and unless Mr. Nasserden moves pretty fast they will still be able to occupy Her Majesty's Loyal Opposition seats. There is no chance of them being over here I am sure of that.

Mr. Speaker, this will be the last opportunity I shall have to speak in a debate where I can express my last wishes to all Members of this House. I want to say, Mr. Speaker, that I have had the privilege of representing my constituency for three consecutive terms and that's a privilege that I appreciate very much.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. GALLAGHER:** — Only three people from my constituency have ever had that privilege, Mr. Tom Garry was elected in 1905 as a Liberal Member when this province was formed, he served my constituency

until 1929 when he was defeated by the late Carl Stewart, who served in the Anderson government; Mr. A.P. Swallow, who still lives in Yorkton, represented that constituency from 1944 until 1956 as a CCF Member. Mr. Swallow still lives in Yorkton and the late Mr. Tom Garry's widow still lives in Yorkton, and I believe she is something around 92 or 93 years of age. I have had the same privilege and it's a privilege that I think anybody should be very grateful for. In leaving this Assembly I must say that I shall have no regrets, I shall leave with no bitterness. I hope that I have been able to make some small contribution to this country.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. GALLAGHER:** — I think, Mr. Speaker, it is a great privilege for any man or any woman to be able to serve in the Legislature of this province or any province. Very few of us have that privilege and although I can't wish good fortune in all your endeavors, I want to wish, with the exception of the political endeavors of those people opposite, I want to wish good fortune to all Members. I know that I will never forget the days that I have spent in this House and if I never take any part in the future in public office, this has been rewarding for me.

Mr. Speaker, it goes without saying that I will support the Budget motion.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. R.H. WOUFF (Turtleford):** — Mr. Speaker, before entering on my main address, I too, should like to take time out to congratulate our new Leader, Mr. Blakeney, on being elected to the leadership of the New Democratic Party and being the next Premier of the province.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. WOUFF:**— I also wish to congratulate Mr. Romanow on his appointment as deputy leader and for the masterful job he has just completed as financial critic.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. WOUFF:** — I must congratulate the Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Steuart) on the boisterous presentation of the Budget. This was one of the longest Budget addresses or else it seemed the longest Budget address that I ever listened to, but we understand the urgency and necessity of noise in view of impending events.

I also should like to congratulate the Member for Last Mountain (Mr. MacLennan) on his elevation to the Cabinet. However, if that elevation was repayment for what is known as the great gerrymander of Saskatchewan history, then it bodes ill for the people of Saskatchewan. No government attaining office by such subterfuge can ever govern with clean hands.

It is rather a coincidence perhaps that I follow right on the heels of the Hon. Member for Yorkton (Mr. Gallagher). This may be my last Session, my last year as an MLA, providing, of

March 2, 1971

course, that the Government finds and keeps its nerve to call an election. So I am not going to sing a swan song because I am still going to work for the good of my fellowman and my own constituency from time to time.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. WOOFF:** — I, like Mr. Gallagher, do thank the people of Turtleford constituency for the honor that they have done me in allowing me to represent them in the Legislature of this province. Not because I have always been fortunate at the polls, there have been times when I thought that they could have had enough of it, but nevertheless it has been a happy experience and a very valuable experience so far as I am concerned. It is one of the great satisfactions of my life, Mr. Speaker, to have helped to bring into being and build such things as the Power Corporation, Government Insurance, Sodium Sulphate, the Timber Board, the great expansion of telephones and microwave, medicare, hospitalization, free cancer services, free mental health services, until we had the application of deterrent fees. Most of these things, Mr. Speaker, were built in spite of opposition, Liberal opposition, to everyone of them . . .

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. WOOFF:** — . . . by kicking on legislative doors and even going to the length of suggesting bloodshed in the streets. Talk about an FLQ approach. Oh boy! Have we got them! Right in the seats of the mighty!

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. WOOFF:** — I should just like to remind the Hon. Member who has just taken his seat when he was waxing eloquently about Socialism, that if it were not for the Socialistic enterprises that the former government in this province built, you fellows wouldn't be sitting there, you would be dead broke. Mr. Speaker, the Budget is down! The die is cast! The Government smoke screen is up! In 1967, after three years of Liberal administration, we were told they had the province in marvellous economic condition, everything was booming, right up to 12 o'clock election night. However, next morning after the Premier had slept on the whole situation the province turned out to be dead broke, to use a slang expression. Mr. Speaker, what a nightmare! The Premier (Mr. Thatcher) and the Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Steuart) have not done one solitary thing to regain the confidence and assurance of the people of Saskatchewan. Why should he not be playing the same game, the same deceitful approach in 1971 as it was in 1967. The Provincial Treasurer tried to credit the Provincial Government for wheat sales, by claiming it raised cain with the Federal Government until the Federal boys "got off their fannies," I think he said. All I have to say is it took a lot of cain raising by the NDP Opposition and farm organizations, before the Provincial Government bestirred itself at all.

I remember during the session of 1965 a resolution passed this House unanimously, Mr. Speaker, dealing with a wheat problem of the day, pressuring the Federal Government to take action. Six weeks later the resolution was still lying on the Premier's

desk in his office and would never have been sent to Ottawa if some of my colleagues had not checked with the NDP in the House of Commons. Some cain raisers! Another case of Liberal deception. Is it any wonder we don't believe them now?

The Homeowner Grant got another nudge in the Budget the other day. I thought surely we were in for a big one this time, that they would catch up with the increase in taxation. But no, I guess the coffers were bare. The injustices still exist. Some of the people who need it most not only do not get anything but they are taxed to help pay for those of us who do. It is administered in the most extravagant and most expensive way to satisfy the political demands of the Premier and the Liberal Party. And on top of all that they save money every year by not paying a goodly number of applicants because they are past the deadline date. If this was administered through the rural municipal offices as it is in other provinces many of these inequities would disappear.

I was delighted to hear the Hon. Treasurer (Mr. Steuart) the other day, when he admitted that we hadn't heard the truth for a long time.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. WOOFF:** — Six long years to be exact. Since 1964 around 100,000 people have left Saskatchewan, liquidated and driven out. And then the Premier and the Provincial Treasurer with their evergreen audacity, first in Calgary, away from home, now in the House, boast about Saskatchewan's low rate of unemployment and compare it with Manitoba and Alberta, who are taking care of Premier Thatcher's responsibilities.

Another Liberal deception game. Is it any wonder that people cannot trust them? Besides, the Premier's figures on unemployment don't include those who have become weary of going to Manpower for nothing, or the native people. Any way you like to cut it, it's still baloney. 100,000 people left Saskatchewan. What's going on right now? The Premier sends Mr. Gardiner out to British Columbia to drum up Homecoming visitors to give a little touch of color to the election. Talk about statesmanship!

We welcome the Minister of Welfare's (Mr. MacDonald) belated announcement of increases to many recipients of welfare. The whole situation, Mr. Speaker, leaves one just a little cold because the increases announced have been delayed for the eve of an election. The needs of people come second to politics.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. WOOFF:** — It seems not only have the Premier and the Liberal Party pushed off their responsibilities onto sister provinces, but they can hardly do justice to those left. Even when 50 per cent of this cost is carried by the Federal Government. The Leader-Post, February 23, 1971:

Welfare cases up 590 in Regina. The number of welfare cases in Regina climbed to 11,069 February 1st, an increase of 590 over last year and 2,542 over the same date in 1969. Welfare cheques are issued under the

March 2, 1971

Saskatchewan Assistance Plan supported on a 50-50 basis by the Federal and Provincial Governments.

I will tell you who was raising Cain with the Federal Government on behalf of the needy, on behalf of the municipalities who are carrying the brunt of it, and incidentally helping the Minister of Social Welfare — and that is Tommy Douglas and his NDP gang.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. WOOFF:** — They are pressuring day after day for the Federal Government to raise their share to 65 per cent. These are the boys that are raising Cain with the Federal Government.

The House recessed at 5:30 p.m. until 7:00 p.m.

**MR. WOOFF:** — Mr. Speaker, when we adjourned for supper I had been pointing out the reasons why a great many people consider that the Budget that has been brought down this Session has some very phony aspects. It is quite possible that the Session may be phony yet in spite of the little dust throwing episode of the Member for Yorkton (Mr. Gallagher) suggesting an October election just before he sat down.

Mr. Speaker, I should like to turn now to the question of agriculture. Agriculture is in a mess, not just the usual mess of helter skelter Liberal policies, but the deeper fear that Lang, Richardson and Trudeau policies will ultimately take agriculture out of the farmers' hands, in spite of what the Member for Yorkton had to say this afternoon.

We saw the Liberal Party right across Canada go for unemployment of any amount in their fanciful policy to curb, what they termed inflation, until we now have what they admit to be a major problem that has reached proportions of a national crisis. The little person, the unimportant person, has certainly become a Frankenstein. But evidently without heeding one disaster, the Task Force and Mr. Lang are heading pell-mell for another by purposely planning to take about one-third of the farmers off the land in the next 10 years with nowhere to go, Mr. Speaker, except to social aid as a future.

Oh, no, it is not going to be done with a gun at their heads, it will be done in the quiet but nevertheless ruthless way, and thousands of them will never know just what happened to them. This policy, Mr. Speaker, is not just ruinous for farmers and farm families, and that's bad, it brings disaster to our towns and to our villages and to our cities as well.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. WOOFF:** — It is playing havoc, Mr. Speaker, with the small businessman everywhere. Let me warn the Premier, more and more urban people are alarmed and disillusioned. Agriculture is not just a dollar sign, and not just a capitalistic economic doctrine. Agriculture is a way of life, that has been the backbone and foundation of Canada.

Agriculture, Mr. Speaker, has been and still is, the

basic industry of our nation. But under Liberal administration it has never, in all the time that I have known Western Canada, been given an even chance with other industry.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. WOOFF:** — The best illustration of what I have just said is the type of forgiveness loan made to other industries compared to the loans made to the agricultural sector and that is done by a Prairie Liberal Government.

No matter what importance is attached to other industries, and they are important, very important, the nation and the world still live off the top six inches of the soil. It is not, Mr. Speaker, that farmers are not efficient, it would appear that they have been too efficient for the kind of capitalistic distribution system we are handicapped with. It is not that change must never come, some changes are inevitable and change will come. However, an NDP Government will have policies aimed at economic and social stability in which farmers will play an increasing role in the planning change.

Agricultural policies must be developed that assure an economic and social environment which provides a great measure of security and stability than we have ever known in the past. We must have policies aimed at keeping a maximum and not a minimum number of people on the farms of Saskatchewan.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. WOOFF:** — Policies that make it possible for retiring farmers to get their lifetime investment out of the farm. Policies that make it possible through low interest rate loans, for young people who wish and want to farm, to either lease or purchase land as they themselves decide. We of the NDP believe we have such a program in our proposed agricultural policy . . .

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. WOOFF:** — . . . in our land bank commission; in our capital credit to farmers, which the farmers proposed; in our farmers' bill of rights; in our bankruptcy proposals and in our moratorium emergency proposals.

We also believe that if the farmer is to be regimented, as he is being, then agricultural business must be controlled also. We believe it is absolutely essential that agriculture know the costs of its inputs and that these costs bear a reasonable relationship to the farmers' returns.

Let us look for a few moments at the stop-and-go policies of the present Government at Ottawa. Nothing serious, Mr. Speaker, was done about the grain surplus, in spite of the NDP proposals for a dynamic sales policy which has been advocated for several years. Nothing was done until surpluses became not just a problem but a national crisis. Then bang, we got LIFT, a one-year shot that was supposed to pump \$150 million into the Prairie economy. We were told to cut wheat acreage from 24 million acres to 12 million acres. And listen to this: we were warned against increasing barley or rapeseed acreage.



March 2, 1971

So much for policies. What has been happening in the country? The farmers did cut wheat acreage to about 12 million acres which meant crop rotations in thousands of cases were thrown into chaos after taking years to build them up. The last figure that I saw only about \$60 million, a little over one-third of the amount that Mr. Lang spoke of, found its way back into the pockets of the Western farmers via LIFT. Some lift!

By fall, Mr. Lang was crying for barley deliveries, claiming that barley orders could not be filled because farmers were not delivering barley fast enough. Maybe it was true. That is one side of it. It was hinted also that there was not now going to be enough barley to meet the tremendous market demand. And yet at the same time, Mr. Speaker, retired farmers with barley to deliver were denied the usual special Permit Book for three and one-half months — August 1st to November 15th — on the pretext that no decision had yet been made on this question of special permits. Yet when the Permit Book finally came out it was essentially the same thing that we had had for several years.

Barley sales were so good we were told there would be a substantial final payment. Well, that too disappeared in the political Liberal froth. So much barley was sold for so little on the great demand market that we are now told we shall get a little over 2 cents per bushel final payment.

Mr. Speaker, you can't sell more and more for less and less and buy prosperity for agriculture.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. WOOFF:** — Another interesting feature is the cash advance policy, but don't get me wrong, I support cash advance programs, properly administered. I have always been for it. But I know cases where an advance was taken on the 1968 and 1969 crops and then the price of wheat dropped until when all the wheat has been delivered, the farmer is owing Lang, Trudeau Company, a portion of that advance and they will have it out of their own pocket. You can't sell more and more for less and less and buy prosperity for agriculture.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. WOOFF:** — Just to put the icing on the cake, Mr. Speaker, the retired farmers who took a cash advance and then had been denied a special permit for three and a half months, got a letter just after New Year demanding that they pay interest on the unpaid portion of the advance. And if you don't believe it, I have a letter on my desk and anyone of you can have a look at it after. I take full responsibility for it. You can't sell more and more for less and less and buy prosperity to the farmer.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. WOOFF:** — Now, Mr. Lang, one year later wants wheat acreage jumped up to 20 million acres. Mr. Speaker, no other industry in existence could operate on such a stop, go, on again, off again policy.

To quote my hon. colleague from The Battlefords (Mr. Kramer) "meanwhile back at the ranch," what has been happening in the province? The Provincial Minister of Agriculture (Mr. McFarlane) has been riding the same temperamental and erratic horse as Mr. Lang.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. WOOFF:** — Right now he is busy trying to jockey his pony into a pole position but he is having some trouble with his running mates.

Unemployment, inflation, high taxation, are in the lead and worse still, they have just turned the corner in the home stretch. The Premier is standing up on the bleachers anxiously scanning the field and it doesn't look too good in spite of all the handicaps he thought he had gerrymandered into the race.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. WOOFF:** — When grain producers got into trouble with tremendous carryovers, this Government cast about for a dramatically speedy political answer and the cry of diversification or bust, became the riding orders of the race, by both the Premier and the Minister. However, Mr. Speaker, hogs have never been too prominent as long-distance runners, especially when you take the early laps too fast as the Minister of Agriculture did.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. WOOFF:** — If the Minister cares to look up the record, he will find that, though I believe in diversification, I warned him of the danger of a too rapid expansion, that unless there was going to be some kind of floor security on the marketing end, he would have the livestock producer in the same kind of trouble as the grain farmers.

Well, here we are, pig producers are going broke. The Provincial Government loans are such that they will be a millstone about the necks of many hog producers, a headache for Government collectors, and an added burden to the taxpayers of the Province. You can't sell more and more for less and less and buy prosperity for agriculture.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. WOOFF:** — Well, for many farmers hogs are out of the race, so now we concentrate on cattle. Again, Mr. Speaker, I believe there is room for a certain amount of expansion in the cattle industry. Mr. Lang and company are away on another wild cry of \$40 million and 4 million acres of land seeded to grass but not necessarily the marginal land. This goes on in spite of warnings from cattle producers that the kind of cattle increase that the Liberal Governments at Ottawa and Regina envisage could spell ruin in the long run to what at present is a good industry but one that is very heavily capitalized.

May I quote one or two clippings here, one from the Western Producer, February 11, 1971. Mr. Mead, director of Alberta's

March 2, 1971

Animal Industry branch was speaking to a provincial agricultural industry conference in Calgary and he said:

Although long-term prospects for beef are good because population is growing and per capita consumption is increasing, it is not likely North America will be short of beef by 1980 as some agriculturalists are predicting.

Then I picked up the Western Producer for February 11th again and the Western Stock Growers' Association met in Banff:

Far more tolerant of the needs of other communities — W.S.G.A. president, Gordon Burton of Clairholm, Alberta strongly attacked government policy and government interference with the beef industry. He called the type of person interfering in beef the adjusters. They had discovered the cattle industry he warned.

Look what they did to hogs. The hog business was adjusted in 1970 and the price fell from \$34 to \$21. This goes on in spite of warnings, as I said, from the cattle industry.

I recall, Mr. Speaker, when the bankers were following you down the street to loan you money to go into cattle. One year later we were tying a dollar bill to the critter's tail to get them to market.

Another experience 10 or 15 year later, I was again selling cattle at one-cent a pound to the Federal Government and I had to have the money. \$11 for 1,100 pound cow.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. WOOFF:** — All I am saying, Mr. Minister, is be careful. Be careful because you can't sell more and more for less and less and buy prosperity for agriculture.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. WOOFF:** — I become nauseated sometimes when the Premier waxes eloquently about what our wheat sales to China means to our economy. Because some years before any wheat was sold to China, the CCF in Ottawa were advocating just that kind of a policy. But we were termed 'Reds' and Communist sympathizers just as we are called in the House today, Mr. Speaker.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. WOOFF:** — We were called 'visionaries' and 'dreamers' who were going to lose both the wheat and the money.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. WOOFF:** — When Mr. MacNamara retired from the Wheat Board he appeared on Front Page Challenge one evening. The ever money-conscious Mr. Gordon Sinclair asked Mr. MacNamara three questions: (1) had China always paid cash for cash deals? The answer was — always; (2) had China always paid on time on instalment payments? The answer was — either before or on time.

And still Mr. Sinclair wasn't satisfied and he asked him the third question: (3) had we ever lost any money by selling wheat to China? The answer was — never.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. WOOFF:** — It was only when this free enterprise fallacy of ours got into real trouble that we turned to China in an effort to get ourselves out of a jam of our free enterprise making.

What better way, I ask, than trade for breaking down barriers and animosities? I commend the Federal Government right now for recognizing a government of 700 million people.

If my memory serves me rightly, Mr. Speaker, our grain carryover in 1961 and 1962 was just about as heavy as it was in 1970 but we didn't get into the kind of mess we're in now. But then we didn't have a Liberal Government in Regina and we didn't have a Liberal Government in Ottawa.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. D.G. STEUART (Provincial Treasurer):** — We made this country what it is today!

**AN HON. MEMBER:** — You're not kidding! The voters will remember that!

**MR. WOOFF:** — Mr. Speaker, you can't have a healthy economic climate in Canada on the inequalities that exist today with one-fifth of Canada's population at the top getting 50 per cent of the national income, owning the means of production and setting the prices.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. WOOFF:** — While you have one-fifth at the bottom that get five per cent of the national income and in most cases they can't even own their own homes.

Abraham Lincoln said: "No nation can exist very long half slave and half free." It was a bad omen when we saw five millionaires contesting for the leadership of the Federal Liberal Party.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. WOOFF:** — One is reminded of that oft quoted passage from Oliver Goldsmith's 'Deserted Village':

Ill fares the land to hastening ills a prey,  
Where wealth accumulates and men decay.

You can't have 10 per cent of the working force either unemployed or partly employed and keep and economic structure that is sound and workably stable.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

March 2, 1971

**MR. WOOFF:** — You can't give away your natural resources for merely employment — important as jobs are — without you becoming hewers of wood and drawers of water for those who have invaded our land.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. WOOFF:** — This, Mr. Speaker, is history. Any nation that has trifled with its inheritance has gone down the same path. You can't sell more and more for less and less and buy prosperity.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. WOOFF:** — You can't have a privileged affluent minority and an underprivileged majority and hope for peace and harmony.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. WOOFF:** — This was the very thing that brought on the French Revolution and the Russian Revolution and the Chinese Revolution. And this, Mr. Speaker, is really what is wrong in Eastern Canada, in Quebec at the present time. No extreme element could ever get any footing or get enough people behind them if you have the national well fed and satisfied and in the working force.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. WOOFF:** — Mr. Speaker, the NDP have presented their program that will put agriculture back on its feet, that will stimulate the economy with faith and confidence. Pulp mills or no pulp mills, labor courts or no labor courts, balanced budgets or no balanced budgets, the bread and butter issues, the life and death issues in this House or out in the country, are still agricultural . . .

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. WOOFF:** — . . . are still agricultural issues and there is nothing that can change that fact.

A vibrant, virile, viable agriculture will put life into our towns and our villages and our cities. It will put people back to work. It will see the silent cash registers ringing again. It will restore confidence, stability and security. A new deal for people.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. WOOFF:** — No matter what the Liberal Party may say, the CCF-NDP did it before when the Liberals had the province ruined and we'll do it again.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. WOOFF:** — But not, Mr. Speaker, on this Budget. I will not support the motion, I will support the amendment.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. W. McIVOR (Arm River):** — Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to take part in this Budget . . .

**AN HON. MEMBER:** — . . . old purple gas there!

**MR. McIVOR:** — What would you like? Would you like some purple gas? I've got a horse for you to ride if you have nothing else to work with.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. McIVOR:** — And if you want any other mode of transportation there are bicycles for sale.

First, I should like to pay tribute to the Member for Yorkton (Mr. Gallagher). I think over the years, regardless of what the Opposition thinks of the man, he has done his best to give good representation in this House. He has made a decision that because of his health he should resign and he has accepted this and has resigned. I feel that regardless of what other people say about Mr. Gallagher, he's filled his chair well.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. ROMANOW:** — . . .

**MR. McIVOR:** — Ah, you with the big mouth, put your foot in it.

I listened to a tired, old recital about agriculture. Well, I surely wish they would get two critics over there who agree with each other. Here we have a poor, broken down farmer the needy one, and then the one from Kelsey (Mr. Messer) the greedy. They are the most amazing people in the world. They give us two different concepts of agriculture.

Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to enter this Budget Debate, a Budget which will aid all segments of society, a Budget that any true citizen of Saskatchewan could be proud of.

This is another balanced Budget and comes without any tax increases. This Budget so infuriated the Opposition critic, the Member from Riversdale (Mr. Romanow) that in his haste for words and adjectives referred to it as a 'bogus Budget'.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. McIVOR:** — One only had to listen to his reply yesterday to realize the word 'bogus' would have been used to describe his attack on this Liberal Government's policies and the promotion of their NDP platform and his address covered all areas but the Budget.

Mr. Speaker, when the Member for Riversdale spent more than 30 minutes of his address on the Task Force report, a Federal report . . .

March 2, 1971

**MR. ROMANOW:** — Why did you support the report?

**MR. McIVOR:** — Were you there when I voted? One would be led to believe he was giving the Hon. Federal Member from Regina East (Mr. Burton), who was present here in Regina instead of representing his constituency at Ottawa, a pep talk of what he should say when he returned to Ottawa.

**AN HON. MEMBER:** — Who was that, Les Benjamin?

**MR. McIVOR:** — It was that gentleman back there.

We were accused of bucking the Wheat Board. It is true we spoke out about the shortcomings of this Board, myself included. And the end result shows that we got action. The Minister in charge did some housecleaning.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. McIVOR:** — And now instead of half polite answers to inquiries we are getting some results during a very difficult period that the same grain market is going through. Mr. Speaker, when the day comes that a government-appointed board is beyond criticism, I do not want to be any part of government.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. McIVOR:** — May I again point out that at present there appears to be a problem at the Coast and I feel we have every right to speak out against such tie-ups.

Mr. Speaker, the Opposition critic (Mr. Romanow) in his address referred to the bypassing of towns and villages in my constituency.

**MR. ROMANOW:** — Craik, Girvin, Aylesbury.

**MR. McIVOR:** — For your information, Aylesbury was bypassed by the CCF government in 1950.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. McIVOR:** — They also bypassed Lumsden and did not see fit to go through Bethune, Findlater or Dundurn.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. McIVOR:** — When one realizes this highway No. 11, is the shortest route between our two major cities, Regina and Saskatoon, as well as being the major trucking route serving points east of Winnipeg, Regina, Saskatoon, North Battleford, Edmonton and on to the West Coast, this Government or any other government has just cause to bypass these towns.

The need for reconstruction was very evident. The number

of tragic deaths on this highway have been very high. I don't see how the Members opposite can justify playing cheap politics with other people's lives.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. McIVOR:** — Mr. Speaker, agriculture once again got a large increase which will make it possible to continue and expand our many worthwhile farm programs. The Opposition attack on our Government in regard to the hog prices have a hollow ring when the hog producers all know that here in Saskatchewan we produce less than two per cent of the hogs on the North American continent.

One only has to look at the returns we got in 1959 or 1962 when they were the government of the day. At that time nothing was done. However, because of the present price decline our Government has pledged a \$2 premium for any hog with a 103 index or over. Mr. Speaker, this is action not lip service.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. McIVOR:** — Municipalities are again getting large increases in grants and it was this Government who first recognized their need for greater equalization grants, snow removal grants, maintenance grants and police protection. Again, Mr. Speaker, any monies spent by the former government on municipalities was for a commission to ram the county system down the people's throats.

Mr. Speaker, this Government, which set up the Indian and Metis Department is the only Province with a department for its native people, has again recognized the value of this program by increasing its budget. I realize the NDP would like to do away with the department but they won't be here to do it so what are we worrying about.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. McIVOR:** — Mr. Speaker, the former Prairie Farm Rehabilitation Administration buildings at Cutbank have been taken over by this Government. Upgrading classes, driver training, welding and woodwork instruction are being provided for our native people. A cattle feedlot is being put into operation for the older members of the families and a piggery is under construction. There are 38 single dwellings, two duplex dwellings, a dormitory and cafeteria, administration buildings and many sheds and warehouses and recreation facilities within the site. We have at present people from Sandy Bay, John Smith Reserve, Lac LaRonge, Ile-a-La-Crosse, Regina, Balcarres, Broadview, Lebreton, Moose Jaw and other points more local. This project is estimated to cost \$5.2 million over a period of years. It is the only project of its kind in Canada which is very worthwhile and workable program to assist our native people.

I feel this program is worthy of the support from both sides of the House.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!



**MR. McIVOR:** — Mr. Speaker, the towns of Davidson, Craik and the villages of Bladworth and Girvin within my constituency were included in the expanding natural gas line program during 1970. These points were the first to be served by natural gas in the Arm River constituency and I want to thank this Liberal Government on behalf of these people who now feel their way of living is on an equal basis with any other points served by natural gas.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. McIVOR:** — In order to bring natural gas to this area, the towns of Dundurn, Hanley and Kenaston were also included in this program. The seat of Hanley was represented here in this House for years by a former CCF-NDP Member, who totally neglected this particular portion of his seat. The towns of Simpson and Imperial have for years asked for natural gas. I have no intention of bypassing their requests and will continue to press for this service for these residents.

Mr. Speaker, with the concept of a very drastic change in our storage, handling and transportation of our prairie grains, which in my opinion has long been overdue for some upgrading, I feel it may be of some value for this Government to consider the setting up of a committee to study the feasibility of building, or of granting incentives for the building of more storage for inland grain facilities.

Mr. Speaker, the Waffle element of the NDP Party at their convention here held in Regina last summer, described the Leader of the Opposition, Mr. Blakeney, as a right winger. They described the Deputy Leader of the Opposition, Mr. Romanow, as a phony. These were the reasons they gave for not voting. How childish, the old spoiled kids! If you don't play marbles my way, I'm going to pack up and go home. These Wafflers were wrong at least once. Mr. Mitchell and his followers have since been able to push and bend their new Leader to suit their own whims.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. McIVOR:** — However, I shall have to agree with them on their assessment of the Member for Riversdale, a phony and what a phony! He so ably displayed on Monday last by criticizing everything but the Budget, and why?

This poohey or phony, whatever way you want it, was green with envy that he was not part of the Government who could bring forward such an outstanding Budget. I will vote against the amendment and for the Budget as presented by the Government.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. D.W. MICHAYLUK (Redberry):** — Mr. Speaker, in rising to add my contribution to the records of this Legislature in this Budget Debate, I do so with utter reluctance and a feeling of utter disappointment, because of the methods employed by this Government and the Provincial Treasurer to again mislead the Saskatchewan people. Mr. Speaker, it is 11 years now since the Redberry constituents honored me to represent them in this highest tribunal of the province.

**AN HON. MEMBER:** — And you have been doing a good job, Dick!

**MR. MICHAYLUK:** — During this period I have had the privilege of sitting to the right of your position, Sir, and since the 1964 election in Her Majesty's Opposition.

I am saddened, as most sincere Members should be, as the purpose for which we are sent is not uppermost in the minds of some of the Members who sit in this Legislature. Since the 1964 election, Mr. Speaker, the people of this Province have been relegated to secondary positions and many of the privileges and benefits enjoyed during the 20 years of the CCF and NDP governments have been lost in one measure or another. Saskatchewan people, to the Members in Government are secondary, while their friends and the free enterprisers are now the beneficiaries of what rightly belongs to us, the people of Saskatchewan. However, Sir, I shall touch on some of these aspects at some future point in my debate.

Might I, Sir, congratulate the Provincial Treasurer for the difficult task he had to perform. I have in my mind a long list of words that I should like to use, however, in so expressing myself I should be treading outside the bounds of parliamentary language. I shall refer only to the Treasurer's usual style, mannerisms and political meanderings and not to the content of the document, which as the Hon. Member for Saskatoon-Riversdale (Mr. Romanow) termed "bogus" in every aspect except for the one fact that it was contrived to deceive the unsuspected voter. To this bogus Budget and the Treasurer's Budget speech, we on this side will devote scrupulous attention.

I should also at this time, Mr. Speaker, offer my sincere congratulations and my best wishes to our new Leader, the Hon. Member from Regina Centre, Mr. Allan Blakeney, in his new position.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. MICHAYLUK:** — The people of Saskatchewan are aware as all Hon. Members opposite are, that the affairs of this province after the next provincial election will be in capable hands under his stewardship as Premier. People will come before politics, Mr. Premier and Mr. Provincial Treasurer, while integrity, honesty, sincerity and credibility will take their rightful place in our social and governmental structure.

I too wish to congratulate the financial critic, the Hon. Member from Saskatoon-Riversdale (Mr. Romanow) and Deputy Provincial Leader for the New Democratic Party. He has demonstrated his ability within the confines of this Chamber since his election in 1967. In his usual able manner the Hon. Member from Riversdale revealed and disproved by tearing apart the well camouflaged Budget in his speech last Friday, and his astounding revelation yesterday over the airwaves to Saskatchewan people who will ultimately pronounce their verdict on this 1971 Budget.

Mr. Speaker, might I turn my attention to some of the remarks that were made earlier this evening by the retiring Hon. Member from the constituency of Yorkton (Mr. Gallagher). There is a saying, "It doesn't matter how long you wander and where

you tread, finally you come to the end of the trail." Well, listening to the speaker this evening, it appears that he has wandered for some 10 or 11 years. He mentioned that in 1961 the CCF government raised the sales tax from 3 to 5 per cent, that we put a surcharge on income tax and on corporations. Mr. Speaker, by increasing the sales tax from 3 to 5 per cent, by increasing the surcharge on the income tax, and by an increased charge on the corporations of Saskatchewan, the CCF-NDP implemented Saskatchewan medicare.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. MICHAYLUK:** — What has this Government, Mr. Speaker, to show for their 1968 tax increases. Deterrent fees, increases on all license fees, as a matter of fact, the Deputy Leader stated that 1,477 old and new taxes have been imposed since 1964.

**MR. ROMANOW:** — 1,477!

**MR. MICHAYLUK:** — That's right! 1,477 to be exact. The Hon. Member from Yorkton (Mr. Gallagher) also mentioned hate will play a role in the coming election. Mr. Speaker, we have but to turn our minds back to 1961-62 to the days of the KOD and the medicare crisis. I have, Mr. Speaker, in my hands a clipping from the Saskatoon Star Phoenix, dated December 31, 1962. I shall quote a few lines from this editorial, Mr. Speaker:

The year 1962 proved eventful for Saskatchewan and its people. It was above all a year of political turmoil. There were events which came nearer to precipitating grave civil unrest than any incident in the provincial history.

Who precipitated this grave event? The KOD and the Liberal Party.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. MICHAYLUK:** — This was the medicare controversy. I look at a few more phrases from the 1962 editorial:

The year also produced from the soil for some 94,000 farmers of Saskatchewan a bonanza income, principally wheat. The expected income for farmers as a result of the crop in all its phases for 1962 will be close to \$500 million.

Compare this, Mr. Speaker, to under \$200 million under a free enterprise government here in Regina and their distant cousin at Ottawa. Then the editorial continues, Mr. Speaker:

Providence brought the rains in contrast with 1961, one of the driest crop years on record.

Mr. Speaker, this is the year that the Members opposite have the gall to use for comparative purposes which according to this editorial was the driest year on record. But immediately the following year, \$500 million income from a basic industry, agriculture.

May I quote one more paragraph, Mr. Speaker:

White Paper published recently by Mr. J.H. Brockelbank, Provincial Treasurer for the year 1962, estimated that personal income would reach an all-time high, \$1,571 millions. That would be an increase of 43.5 per cent over 1961.

Can the Government and the Members opposite say this for their last two years? No. They have given the Saskatchewan farmers the Task Force which recommends that two out of every three farmers must pack their suitcases and walk the bread lines, as some farmers did during the Liberal days of the hungry thirties.

Just one more paragraph, Mr. Speaker, this is the closing portion of this same editorial:

Potash marketing from Esterhazy is due to expand.

This is 1962.

Helium uncovered north of Swift Current and in other areas looms as a new source of wealth.

No development, stagnation!

Opening of the new \$6 million chemical complex by Interprovincial Co-operatives near Saskatoon will help to broaden the provincial economy's industrial base.

No development, Mr. Speaker, stagnation according to Members opposite!

Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Member from Yorkton (Mr. Gallagher), who will be retiring if an election is called, stated that they had not promised to cut sales taxes from 5 per cent to 4 per cent to 3 per cent. He said they were using this as an experiment. Well, they definitely did experiment, Mr. Speaker. The reduction of the 1 per cent in the sales tax created a \$12 million deficit in the coffers of the Provincial Government. The reduction of 1 per cent of income tax and on corporation taxes reduced revenues by a like amount. This kept on for three years. This Liberal Government in the three years lost approximately \$30 million. The Minister or the Premier, who was then Provincial Treasurer, didn't know simple economics, that you can only spend a buck when you have earned one. The Government gave the Homeowner Grant, amounting to \$6 million or \$7 million. When you take away the \$30 million that they lost by reducing the sales tax, by reducing the income tax, by reducing the corporation tax and at the same time providing an additional \$6 million or \$7 million Homeowner Grant for the people of the province, the Government did find itself in grave financial difficulties.

So what did these Members opposite do, these economists, and politicians? A snap election in 1967. In 1967 we had the same kind of a bogus Budget speech from the Provincial Treasurer who was also Premier, as we heard from this Treasurer last Friday. It was contrived to deceive. Mr. Speaker, I can recall the precise words I used when I spoke in respect to the 1967 Budget. I said, "It was a spiced up, juicy chicken, put before the voters of Saskatchewan and its purpose was to deceive." And the voters of Saskatchewan were deceived. 1968 proved that what we said in respect of that Budget and the Budget delivered by the

March 2, 1971

then Premier and Treasurer was what we had predicted. The people sure got it in 1968.

Mr. Speaker, another clipping that will disprove precisely what the Hon. Member from Yorkton said here this evening. This is on tax cutting. This is from a paper that gives very, very little credit to our party for whatever is done. When our Leader and our Party presented our program to the people of Saskatchewan, we were castigated by an editorial in the Star Phoenix that we were going to bankrupt and ruin the province. So we don't expect any credit from these free enterprise supporting papers. But here is the Saskatoon Star Phoenix editorial, dated January 5, 1966, under the heading of, "Tax Cutting." It says this, I quote in part, Mr. Speaker:

Premier Thatcher has accompanied the forecast with the promise of further tax reductions.

Such tax cuts are long overdue. It says this:

In 1965 the Federal income tax abatement was 21 per cent on the individual taxpayers personal income.

Well, we don't touch that, that goes to Ottawa.

While the abatement for the Saskatchewan residents was 27 per cent, the additional 6 per cent tax deduction for Saskatchewan citizens should be eliminated as soon as possible.

Well, they did that! They decreased by 1 per cent the surcharge on income and corporation taxes. The Government did lower the sales tax from 5 to 4 per cent. But may I quote further, Mr. Speaker, from the editorial:

Last spring this tax was cut from 5 to 4 per cent . . .

(Referring to the sales tax)

The Thatcher Government has a firm (and mark the word) commitment on cutting this tax down to 3 per cent. We would like to see this promise fulfilled.

It is not the NDP talking! This is not the Member from Redberry or the Member from Mayfair, or Weyburn, castigating the Liberal Government for not cutting the sales tax from 5 to 4 to 3. It is the Saskatchewan Star Phoenix asking the Thatcher Government to carry out its pre-1964 election pledge to the Saskatchewan people. This is the paper which seems to have a friendly feeling towards the free enterprisers opposite. It goes on further:

It would certainly appear that the province cannot afford to live up to its commitments to cut taxes unless they keep their promise.

Further on:

Let's have some dollar and cents evidence in the form of those long awaited tax cuts.

Well, Mr. Speaker, two years later the people got their share of tax cuts. You know what happened, Mr. Speaker, a list of taxes amounting to \$40 million of tax increases in 1968. Also

they introduced Bill 84 which would practically confiscate the estates of the people who were unfortunate to be in the mental hospital, and the most vicious deterrent fee ever imposed upon our sick people of this province.

**AN HON. MEMBER:** — Worst tax of all, that deterrent fee!

**MR. MICHAYLUK:** — Now, may I go on, Mr. Speaker. The Provincial Treasurer's Budget speech, in my estimation, is a replica of the 1967 budget address delivered by the then Provincial Treasurer and Premier which ended with the same bold pronouncement on page 50 in the budget address of February 17, 1967 and may I quote in part, Mr. Speaker. Here is what the Treasurer said:

Despite the actions of other governments elsewhere in Canada, despite the huge increases in expenditures this year and despite the fact that we are the only province financing a universal medicare scheme, this Government feels that the burden of our provincial taxes is already too high. I am therefore proposing no tax changes in this budget.

Does that ring a tone in the ears of the Hon. Members?

**AN HON. MEMBER:** — Famous last words!

**MR. MICHAYLUK:** — This was the '67 pre-election bogus budget similar to the pre-election bogus Budget that was brought down by the Provincial Treasurer on Friday last. Mr. Speaker, and as I stated in my initial remarks, by simple financial manipulations by the Treasurer and the Government in the period 1965-1967 the voters were given tax cuts in several forms. The Government and the Treasurer realized a game of financial manipulation could not continue and that they were in difficulty. The Government realized too if they held office for a normal four year term with an election in 1968, their mismanagement would be unfolded. Thus, Mr. Speaker, to prevent this, a snap election was called for October 22, 1967. Mr. Speaker, the 1968 Budget brought down by the Hon. Member from Prince Albert West and the present Provincial Treasurer revealed the sorry financial mess the Government was in, when tax after tax after tax was imposed on the people of Saskatchewan. Education tax back to five cents, not down to three as promised; tax on the sick, tax on the estates of the mental patients, tax on gas, tax on meals, tax on hotel and motel beds, tax on hotdogs, tax on and increase in telephone rates, five per cent tax on power bills, liquor prices up, tobacco tax and a host of other commodities on which this money-hungry Treasurer could lay his hands on to extract more revenues to cover up the gap created by that financial mess. 1,477 new taxes, Mr. Speaker.

**AN HON. MEMBER:** — Shame!

**MR. MICHAYLUK:** — Mr. Speaker, may I turn to the flashy Minister of Mineral Resources (Mr. Cameron) who, in his usual ceremonious, pompous, and glorious way has risen in his seat on many occasions to convey to the Members facts of the terrific mineral development that has taken place in Saskatchewan since 1964. Potash royalties have increased since 1964, Mr. Speaker, and justly so. In 1964, Mr. Speaker, we had two mines in production, one at

Esterhazy and one at Patience Lake. Kalium Potash of America began operating at Pense in July of 1964 and there was a big fanfare by the Liberals as if they had brought in that mine. Since then a number of potash mines came into production, not because of this Government, but because of the time element. What this Government was able to do in respect to potash was to use its development for political propaganda purposes without due regard for what this development would do to the economics of the industry. Do you realize, Mr. Speaker, that people were able, in the city of Saskatoon, the potash capital of Canada, to walk on the streets in potash. Yes, so that this Government would get credit for potash to bolster their political prestige.

However, Mr. Speaker, and Mr. Minister of Mineral Resources, what has happened to our metallic minerals since these developers came into office and to metallic mineral royalties? Let's take a look at the comparative royalty figures from metallic minerals from the last three NDP years and the first three years of this Government, or which ever three years you wish, Mr. Speaker, of the Liberal years. Well, here is the picture, Mr. Speaker: in 1962, the days of stagnation, the NDP years, royalties from metallic minerals amounted to \$2,308,000 (I'll leave the hundreds out). In 1963, Mr. Speaker, another NDP year, dark days of stagnation, royalties from the same source, metallic minerals, \$2,363,000. The last year, 1964, the last NDP year, total royalties from this source, \$2,447,000, almost two and one-half million. Mr. Speaker, in 1965, one full year of Liberal Government by this developing Minister of Mineral Resources (Mr. Cameron) came the developing boom Liberal style. All the developers came according to the Premier, who had been waiting on the Saskatchewan border to rush in — development took place. How did this boom affect the royalties from metallic minerals, Mr. Speaker?

Well, Sir, the story is unfolded in the March 31, 1970 financial statement given out by the Government of Saskatchewan. Mr. Speaker, after two years of boom for the fiscal year 1965, royalties from metallic minerals dropped from \$2,447,000 for 1964 to \$1,608,000, almost \$1 million less. Mr. Speaker, I and probably the Members on this side, would have to forgive them their first year, they were inexperienced. We know they were inexperienced in regard to taxation so probably they weren't experienced in mineral development. We'll have to forgive the Minister and the Government for 1965 as they were just a young government and probably eager to learn. Sir, these lessons came expensive to Saskatchewan people as millions of dollars of resources were given away for less. If the development did take place, I want to ask the Minister and the Government what happened to the royalties? Let's look at 1966, two years later, what happened, Mr. Speaker? Did the situation improve as more development according to the Government and the Minister took place? Oh, no, Mr. Speaker, and please take note of the fact, \$1,608,000 royalty a year later for 1965. For 1966 royalties dropped from \$1.6 million in 1965 to \$1.2 million, \$1,250,000 less than the people of Saskatchewan received during the dark days of stagnation in 1964. Did this improve in 1967? Oh, no, Mr. Speaker, only \$1.4 million, another million dollars less. Did it improve in 1968? Not by a long shot. Mr. Speaker, from almost \$2.5 million in 1964, in 1968 it was only \$1.5 million. The last year of this Liberal Government, Mr. Speaker, for which we have a report, is 1970, the royalty for metallic minerals dropped to \$1.7 million or almost a million dollars less than it was in 1964.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**HON. A.C. CAMERON (Minister of Mineral Resources):** — Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege. I raise this point because it appears to me that the Member is quoting from the 1970 report which hasn't yet been tabled in this House.

**MR. MICHAYLUK:** — I have here the 1970 financial statement that was sent to me.

**MR. CAMERON:** — 1970? What color?

**MR. MICHAYLUK:** — March 31, 1970 financial statements. It's blue.

**MR. CAMERON:** — You're talking about the mineral report.

**MR. MICHAYLUK:** — It's not a mineral report but a financial statement which includes metallic mineral royalties for the last 10 years, 1961-1970.

**MR. CAMERON:** — . . .

**MR. MICHAYLUK:** — The last year of the Liberal Government, Mr. Speaker, for which we have a report, and which was 1970, the royalty from metallic minerals dropped to \$1.7 million or almost \$1 million less than in 1964, or to use comparative figures exactly what the Saskatchewan people got from metallic royalties four years prior to the election of the Liberal Government, in 1961.

The Prime Minister of Canada, the Hon. Pierre Elliott Trudeau, was quoted as mumbling "fuddle duddle" in the House of Commons. I say emphatically, Mr. Speaker, that the Saskatchewan people have been fed "fuddle duddle" by this Government opposite for seven years now.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. MICHAYLUK:** — Seven years of "fuddle duddle" while for weeks and months on end the people are fed the same propaganda by using the Socialist political difficulties. Day in and day out, Mr. Speaker, Saskatchewan Government Telephones, Saskatchewan Power Corporation, Medicare and Hospital Services Plan, were and are being used for propaganda purposes. Sask Tel, Saskatchewan Power are used to propagandize the Liberals. Could you conceive the two-faced standard employed? Mr. Speaker, the Premier is reported in the press to have demanded where and what false propaganda was used by these Socialist enterprise Crown corporations. Well, Mr. Speaker, all one has to do is to read the Hospital Services Plan and Medicare statements that go something like this: "one commodity which still costs what it used to in Saskatchewan is hospitalization and medicare." Mr. Speaker, Saskatchewan people know that in 1963 the hospital plan premiums cost the taxpayer of Saskatchewan \$52 per family and \$26 per single person. Mr. Speaker, in 1963-64 the NDP government had in the medicare fund a surplus of almost \$10 million (\$9.8 million to be exact). That was why a \$20 reduction per family and a \$10 per single person was given to the Saskatchewan people in 1964. What did these benevolent tax reducers do when elected? This Government upped the premium for medicare and hospitalization



March 2, 1971

from \$52 to \$72 for 1965 and then, Mr. Speaker, to top it off, in 1968 imposed the most inhuman and vicious deterrent tax on the unfortunate sick.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Shame!

**MR. MICHAYLUK:** — Mr. Speaker, only a little over two weeks ago I brought home from a hospital an 86-year old gentleman who was a patient for three months in a Saskatoon hospital undergoing surgery. He lives on an old age pension cheque. On his release he was handed a bill for \$170 for deterrent fees and will probably have to pay the difference between the 85 per cent and the 100 per cent coverage of the doctor's fee. The reason is that this man has enough money in the bank to pay for his funeral. What a farce!

According to my friends opposite and the Premier, together with the Minister of Public Health (Mr. Grant), hospitalization and medicare in Saskatchewan costs what it used to. Mr. Speaker, I maintain, even if you didn't go to a hospital, the premium is up by \$20 to what it was in the last year when we were the government, but if you are one of the unfortunate ones, you will quickly realize how fictitious these Liberal humanitarians and their statements are.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. MICHAYLUK:** — Mr. Speaker, one of the barriers to go out with the Liberal Government is the vicious inhumane tax on the sick which according to the Provincial Treasurer and the Premier was put on to save the plan. What a farce! More in tax from our sick, Mr. Speaker, less from mining companies in the form of metallic royalties from mining companies. It is unfortunate that people are penalized when they seek aid to restore their health. Mr. Speaker, the NDP Party is committed to the Saskatchewan people to remove this unjust tax on our sick.

**AN HON. MEMBER:** — That we will, Dick!

**MR. MICHAYLUK:** — According to the Government spokesmen, Mr. Speaker, their benevolence shows on the knees and the seat of their pants, as their hearts melt in purple gas. Granted, Mr. Speaker, if the gasoline tax was left unhampered and over-pampered, it would have benefited our agricultural industry, but these farmers' friends believe in the old adage that "he who receives must also give." Mr. Speaker, when the farmers of Saskatchewan were granted tax free gas for farm trucks, these friends of the farmer slapped on a two-cent tax out of generosity on all farm fuel. In this tax free purple gas deal it is not too difficult to understand who the beneficiaries were. Could you imagine, Mr. Speaker, the Hon. junior Member from Saskatoon City Park University (Mr. Charlebois) trading Mount Blackstrap for Mount Robson with his free enterprise Premier of British Columbia? Who do you think, Mr. Speaker, would get more dirt in the exchange? Well, the farmer, in that single exchange got more dirt from this free enterprise humanitarian government. Next came the period of general reductions, Liberal style, as far as gas tax is concerned.

Mr. Speaker, under the NDP government for the period 1961-64, the gasoline tax was the second lowest in all of Canada . . .

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. MICHAYLUK:** — . . . 14 cents a gallon to be exact.

**MR. ROMANOW:** — That was good government in those days, full employment.

**MR. MICHAYLUK:** — These tax reducers opposite, Mr. Speaker, pride themselves on tax reduction. 14 cents in 1961, 1962, 1963 and 1964 was the second lowest gasoline tax in Canada. And note, Mr. Speaker, only the rich oil province of Alberta had a lower tax of 13 cents per gallon. What did this Liberal Government do because of purple gas in farm trucks to the automobile drivers, truck drivers, transport truckers, and so on? Mr. Speaker, here is the story of the tax reductions by friends of the farmer and the Saskatchewan people.

The Minister of Public Works (Mr. Coderre) says, "People before politics." Did the Liberal Government put people before politics when they increased gasoline tax by 25 per cent in the six years 1964-1970? Now that you have changed portfolios, Mr. Minister, and I notice he is not in his seat, you have more time and you might, instead of trying to confuse the people try to locate those Fords you were unable to locate as Minister of Labour. Too bad he is not in his seat.

Well, Mr. Speaker, the gasoline tax story since 1964 goes like this. 14 cents tax, Mr. Speaker, — please note — 14 cents tax per gallon from 1961 to 1964. What happened under these tax reducers? 15 cents per gallon effective March 15, 1966; 17 cents per gallon effective March 2, 1968; 19 cents — mark that — per gallon effective March 3, 1970. In six years gasoline tax went up by 5 cents per gallon because of the benevolence of a government which gave the farmers tax free purple gas. In terms of revenue extracted from Saskatchewan people, Mr. Speaker, here are some facts: Saskatchewan gasoline users paid a total of \$29,673,244 in gasoline tax in 1964. What happened under these tax reducers? In 1970 a total revenue from the gasoline tax as given in the 1970 financial statement is not \$29 million but \$46,894,000. \$20 million more in one year. This is real tax reduction? With such friends, Mr. Speaker, Saskatchewan people need no enemies.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. MICHAYLUK:** — Mr. Speaker, the farmers and the agricultural communities in my constituency, together with hog raisers, who raise hogs at 20 cents a pound — Yes, have been receiving as low as 20 cents a pound for hogs — have suffered to the same extent as have the businesses, the unemployed and the sick.

**MR. ROMANOW:** — Everybody suffers under the Liberals!

**MR. MICHAYLUK:** — This Saskatchewan Liberal Government stands condemned for its action as well as its inaction.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. MICHAYLUK:** — Lack of Government programs, coupled with bad taxation policies have led Saskatchewan into a depression.

While the farmer and the working man have suffered from unemployment, lack of sales, poor prices for their products, and spiralling costs, this Liberal Government has had no programs of assistance except 20 cent hogs. Besides doing nothing themselves, it has gone along and is going along with everything thrown at us by the Liberal bureaucrats in Ottawa.

The result has been, and is, that the people of our province have suffered the same problems that beset us in the thirties, the last time we had a Liberal Government in this province.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. MICHAYLUK:** — On the action side, the Liberals have moved rapidly, and often to increase — according to my hon. friend from Riversdale (Mr. Romanow) and Deputy Leader — 1,477 new or increased taxes, license fees. Per capita taxes jumped from \$129 per person in 1964 to \$238 per person in 1970. I have already, in the course of my remarks, Mr. Speaker, mentioned that royalties from minerals have gone down. This Government has used monies from the Telephone and Power Corporation as general revenues and this Budget will bolster its coffers by almost \$15 or \$16 million, rather than using it to give people lower rates for telephones and the use of power and gas.

You know, Mr. Speaker, the basic concept of the NDP and the CCF government when we brought in those corporations or expanded them was that the users should assume the liability for the borrowed capital, for the interest on the capital, for the repayment of monies, and to allow for the depreciation or to pay the personnel who serviced the corporation, and also to set aside a reserve for the depreciation of a plant because they would have to be replaced in the years ahead. Whenever the corporations made a surplus, what did the CCF-NDP do? Lowered the rates for the users. In the period of 1949 to 1964 the power rates were reduced some six times to the benefit of all the users.

I have here, Mr. Speaker, the financial statements which indicate that dividends from the Saskatchewan Power Corporation for 1961, 1962, 1963, 1964 were nil. Not a red cent to the general revenue of the province. When we come to the last three years of the tax reducers, in 1970, \$4,100,000 taken out into general revenues; the year before \$3.5 million; in 1968, \$3 million, and for the coming fiscal year 1971, \$10 million. This, Mr. Speaker, is added taxation on a special segment of our population and it is unjust and unfair.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. MICHAYLUK:** — Under this Liberal Government, Mr. Speaker, the people will pay more while corporations pay less. We remember that when the Treasurer started raising taxes, up went the sales tax from four to five; up went the income tax, lo and behold the corporation tax got lost in the papers.

**MR. ROMANOW:** — What do you expect? Corporation lawyers over there. Three of them!

**MR. MICHAYLUK:** — Yes. Mr. Speaker, lack of programs coupled with oppressive taxation levels is leading to the destruction of the family farm and the rural community. This Government has created massive unemployment. It is selling out our resources to foreign promoters who are getting most of the gravy while the people of Saskatchewan are getting very little.

Mr. Speaker, the voters of Saskatchewan will let it be known to the gentlemen opposite in a united voice whenever they have the courage and the gall to call an election.

Mr. Speaker, for lack of providing leadership, for lack of programs, for lack of social conscience, this Government is attempting to use the building of an additional pulp mill as an election issue. This, Mr. Speaker, is to overshadow the record of this Government and its dismal performance since its election in 1964. The group opposite maintains that people should supply the risk capital, give away our resources, provide roads, guarantee profits, reduce taxes to maintain their sacred economic cow known as free enterprise, Liberal style. But, Mr. Speaker, let's analyze briefly the basis on which the Prince Albert mill was built. The Government of Saskatchewan and Canada gave grants amounting to some \$8 million. The Province backed a \$50 million loan. The taxpayers provided a \$20,000 site for the mill. Power and gas was brought in at public expense. This Government gave tax reductions by introducing a Bill in this Legislature. This Province is committed to build 200 miles of roads in 10 years. A Saskatchewan company was created at great cost, several million dollars, to supply logs to the mill for five years then resell to Parsons and Whittemore at 25 per cent of its initial cost. The Saskatchewan people, through this benevolent Government, guaranteed to Parsons and Whittemore \$1 million profit, plus 70 per cent of the balance, while the people of Saskatchewan get 30 per cent of whatever is left. We own 30 per cent of the equity the Premier says. If we own 30 per cent, Mr. Speaker, I ask the Premier and the Government, why can't we own 55 per cent? If we own 55 per cent, Mr. Speaker, why can't the people of Saskatchewan by the same token own 100 per cent? Why can't they, and get all the profit. Mr. Speaker, this is free enterprise, Liberal style. This is the only basis on which the Saskatchewan taxpayers and our resources could be fleeced by the free enterpriser friends opposite. Would it not be more profitable, Mr. Speaker, for the people of Saskatchewan to own the mill, to get all the profit, because they put in all the capital? We take all the risk. But, Oh no, Mr. Speaker, according to Mr. Thatcher and company, this is Socialism.

Mr. Speaker, if DDT means "destruction of democracy by Thatcher," then Bill 86 passed during the 1970 session precisely carries out that function.

It is recognized, Mr. Speaker, that there are population shifts both in rural and urban constituencies. Because of this, it is necessary at certain intervals of time to make changes in constituency boundaries commonly known as redistribution.

A Liberal Government of Saskatchewan prior to 1944 had redistribution in 1938. It was not until 1951, Mr. Speaker, that it was deemed necessary to change the boundaries of constituencies. Therefore, from 1938 to 1951, a period of some 13 years had elapsed. Up to 1964 another 13-year period had gone by without an additional change in the constituency

boundaries. But this Liberal Government, Mr. Speaker, had three redistributions in the last six years. The redistribution introduced as Bill 86 in the 1970 session of the Legislature is a disgrace to the Members of the redistribution committee of which the Provincial Treasurer acted as chairman. Bill 86 is an insult to the intelligence of the Saskatchewan voters. Yet the Government opposite prides itself by denying the democratic process of rule by the majority and fair play.

Mr. Speaker, may I give to the Members of this House some of the constituency voter populations recorded for the 1964 election, and this will justify if it was necessary to carry out this Liberal hari-kari. Mr. Speaker, let's examine the drastic changes in constituencies affected by Bill 86.

The constituency of Kinistino in 1964 had 7,860 voters. Melfort-Tisdale, because of a city within this constituency had a population or a voting population in 1964 of 9,950 voters. The constituency of Last Mountain had a voting population of 8,042. The Touchwood constituency had 7,936. There wasn't a 100 vote difference between your constituency, Mr. Minister of Labour (Mr. MacLennan) and the Hon. Member for Touchwood (Mr. Meakes). The constituency of Wadena had 8,652 votes. Mr. Speaker, what did Bill 86 do to the constituencies in this area? The largest constituency with a voting population of almost 10,000, Melfort-Tisdale, completely disappears from the map, and a general shift of population takes place. The two new constituencies, Melfort-Kinistino and Melfort-Tisdale are created thus giving the new Melfort-Kinistino a voting population of 13,145. This may now have changed because of people moving. Mr. Speaker, an increase of almost 7,000 votes, 2,000 more than the Member for Last Mountain will have in total in the coming election were thrown into Kinistino constituency. The new Tisdale-Kelsey riding has a voting population of 10,170. It was increased by almost 3,000 votes. However, Mr. Speaker, I don't know whether the Hon. Minister of Labour was on this redistribution committee. Were you a member of this committee?

**HON. D.G. MacLENNAN (Minister of Labour):** — I was in England.

**MR. MICHAYLUK:** — You were in England, he says, Mr. Speaker. Last Mountain, a Liberal constituency, now has a voting population of a little over 5,000. In 1964, Mr. Speaker, the voting population was 8,042. Touchwood where there was only a difference of 100 voters from Last Mountain in the 1967 election, goes up to 10,300 from 7,790 votes. In other words, Mr. Speaker, in the constituencies that I have just mentioned, Melfort-Tisdale constituency that was for a long time held by a New Democratic Member completely disappears. Last Mountain constituency where the Liberals won by the skin of their teeth loses some 3,000 voters to an NDP Touchwood constituency . . .

**MR. THATCHER:** — . . .

**MR. MICHAYLUK:** — Just wait, Mr. Premier, you may bet the Hon. Member for The Battlefords (Mr. Kramer) take him on a bet. I challenge you to take him on another bet.

The redistribution allocates 10,000 voters to the NDP candidate while Last Mountain drops by 3,000 voters to only 5,000.

Mr. Speaker, I'd be ashamed to speak up if I was sitting on your side, Mr. Minister of Labour.

This Government has created rotten and pocket boroughs as known in English history by which these Liberals hope to perpetuate themselves in office against the wishes of the majority of Saskatchewan voters. Mr. Speaker, this negates the wishes of the majority on which our democratic process is based.

Mr. Speaker, Bill 86 so distorts the electoral map so as to make it possible — and this has been mentioned in the House by other speakers — for only 33 per cent of the voters to elect a working government with 53 per cent of the seats. But, Mr. Speaker, may I say here and now that because of this unjust allocation, only 33 per cent of you fellows will be back. Yes, only 33 per cent and that's a probability.

The Hon. Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Steuart) with his gang of hucksters has not and is incapable of setting the rules for a fair game. If you, Mr. Provincial Treasurer, have no respect for good judgment, for honesty and fair play and a fight on even terms, then the people of Saskatchewan will demonstrate to you in no uncertain terms that they treasure the basic concept of the democratic process and rule by the majority.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. MICHAYLUK:** — You must be smugly satisfied, Mr. Provincial Treasurer and chairman of the gerrymander commission, that only 5,560 voters will elect a member — regardless of party affiliation — in Saskatoon City Park-University while 16,500 voters or 3 times that number will elect our Deputy Leader in Saskatoon-Riversdale (Mr. Romanow). That must give you great satisfaction and comfort. Or you, Mr. Minister of Labour (Mr. MacLennan) who may be laboring in this portfolio giving your constituency slightly over 5,000 voters while one constituency up, the Hon. Member for Kinistino-Melfort (Mr. Thibault) will be elected by 13,000 voters. It is a shame! 2,500 voters to elect a member in Last Mountain, 6,500 to elect a member in Kinistino.

It has been said that boots were meant for walking. If so, Mr. Speaker, the Government opposite has already been walked all over, and will be walked all over by the Saskatchewan people. It is high time that the Premier and his Executive Council realize that ordinary Saskatchewan people are aware and conscious of the fact that honesty and integrity are a part of our Saskatchewan way of life.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. MICHAYLUK:** — Mr. Speaker, over the past two weeks and particularly since the opening of this Legislature, I have noticed that the Members on the Government benches, and particularly the Ministers have become more co-operative. The Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Steuart) willingly tabled information requested some four years ago which initially was not in the public interest. I don't blame the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Guy), who was emotionally upset over the Wafflers, he has no record of Saskatchewan population statistics. No, the Minister of Highways (Mr. Boldt) who has already loaded his constituency with all the necessary highways so he now authorizes announcements for his program in the Redberry constituency.

**AN HON. MEMBER:** — Look out, Dick, look out he may cut you off again!

**MR. MICHAYLUK:** — This is done, Mr. Speaker, even before any announcements are made by the Minister himself in this Legislature. Last year, Mr. Speaker, not a red cent for Redberry. Not a red cent, Sir. Suddenly in 1971, the Hon. Dave Boldt, Minister of Highways authorizes an announcement by the Liberal candidate for Redberry that the Government will take the Radisson-Hafford grid road into the highway system. Good! I'm pleased, Mr. Minister. I am glad that the Minister has mellowed and I'll be waiting for his practical confirmation of this fact.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. MICHAYLUK:** — Well, Mr. Minister of Highways, in taking this grid road into the highway system do you realize that this 20-mile stretch was the first section of grid road to be built by the Rural Municipality of Redberry No. 435 and the Rural Municipality of Great Bend No. 405 early in the mid fifties planned by the CCF government, carried out to the people and you Members said this would never be done. It is worn out and needs a complete rebuilding to bring it up to highway standards. Anything less than that will be looked upon as a political hodge-podge. Mr. Minister, therefore my constituents are expecting an announcement in your '71 program of a complete rebuilding and dustproofing of the Radisson-Hafford grid and I should like to remind the Minister (Mr. Boldt) that since 1964 I have also brought to the attention of the Minister the need for a highway connection between Highway No. 40, Highway No. 5 and Highway No. 3. I trust that you, Mr. Minister will find it convenient during your highway program to make this announcement personally.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. MICHAYLUK:** — If this is not done by you, Mr. Minister, I shall be making that announcement to the constituents of Redberry constituency whenever the Premier has the gall to call an election.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. MICHAYLUK:** — And then, and only then, will the NDP department of highways and an NDP government make that necessary connection for which I now have fought for some seven years.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. MICHAYLUK:** — Mr. Speaker, the Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Steuart) on Friday last stated that 1964-70 were the best years this province has ever had. This may be by Liberal standards. However, Mr. Speaker, let us take a look at the provincial debt picture and this was the only criterion that the now Premier used when he was in the Opposition. Yes, from '44 to '64 the CCF borrowed for the expansion of power, gas and government telephones and this is a self-liquidating debt, some \$595 million. To the Liberals, Mr. Speaker, when in Opposition this self-liquidating debt was intolerable. Let's examine what happened in respect to the gross debt under this Liberal Government in six years.

I want you to remember in 1964 \$595 million, six years later, Mr. Speaker, was this debt reduced? Oh, no. It went up to \$852 million — an increase of \$238 million in six short years.

Mr. Speaker, the \$595 million of self-liquidating debt in the 20 years was borrowed for expansion of power and gas and government telephones throughout the length and breadth of this Province. Power alone, Mr. Speaker, was made available to 60,000 farm homes. With rural electrification our farmers were beginning to enjoy the same amenities that their city counterparts had enjoyed. All the major cities and several hundred communities enjoyed the use of natural gas. Yet this Government, Mr. Speaker, was able within six years to create an additional debt of \$238 million, making a total of \$852 million.

Only yesterday, Mr. Speaker, while on the Harasen Line, the Provincial Treasurer was asked by an inquiring lady, "What was the total provincial debt." The Treasurer replied, \$600 million." He knowingly did not give an honest reply when out of the Chamber, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, this Liberal Government in their 1964 election program promised to increase grants to school and municipalities to reduce taxes. In 1971 the Budget again offers to the people of Saskatchewan the same proposition. Reduce taxes! May I begin, Mr. Speaker, with some of the municipalities in my constituency. The R.M. of Meota No. 468 in 1964 had a municipal mill rate of 26 mills. Six years later the municipal mill rate went up to 35 mills. You really got it! An increase of nine mills in six years. Again we got a reduction. The R.M. of Blaine Lake No. 434 had a mill rate in 1964 of 41 mills. What is their mill rate after these tax-reducers had a hand at reducing taxes? In 1970 their municipal tax is 50 mills. Real tax reduction!

Let us examine, Mr. Speaker, the school mill rates in the units within the Redberry constituency. In the North Battleford Unit No. 58 the mill rate for school purposes in 1964 was 22 mills. Mark that, Mr. Speaker, 22 mills. In 1970 what happened? It went up to 41 mills. A real reduction there. In Turtleford school unit, Mr. Speaker, in 1964 the rate was 36 mills. In 1970 it went up to 47 mills. A real reduction. In the Medstead school unit No. 64 in 1964 30 mills and in 1970 43 mills. Parkland school unit, Mr. Speaker, had 31 mills in 1964 and in 1970 it jumped to 45 mills, a 14 mill increase. Some reduction, Mr. Speaker!

The same picture is evident in the Blaine Lake school unit. In 1964 34 mills, in 1970 42 mills. People got some tax reduction! Now these types of tax reductions the Saskatchewan taxpayers could get along without, Mr. Speaker, and will not be fooled by more of your tax reductions.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. MICHAYLUK:** — Mr. Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Steuart) Saskatchewan people are not prepared to buy your bill of fare as they have already had a round of Liberal tax cuts. So, Mr. Provincial Treasurer, you may howl 'wolf, wolf' all you want, Saskatchewan taxpayers and voters will refuse to bail you out. Your promises are hollow and they will not accept at face value your words anymore.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!



**MR. MICHAYLUK:** — Saskatchewan taxpayers, Mr. Speaker, will not be fooled again by you, Mr. Provincial Treasurer.

Mr. Speaker, before I conclude I should like to bring to your attention this bag of wheat labelled "Surplus Prairie Grain" which I purchased in Ottawa early last September when I had the opportunity of being a delegate to the Canadian Area Conference of the Canadian Parliamentary Association held in Ottawa. This bag is labelled "Souvenir of Canada". It is being sold to tourists visiting Canada from all over the world. These representatives and tourists come to Canada and are sold or probably receive a bag of excellent prairie wheat labelled 'surplus'. Canada sells bags of surplus wheat to visitors who visit our national capital but cannot get it to their populations . . .

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. MICHAYLUK:** — . . . thus allowing starvation to continue while our farmers sink into a morass of debt and leave their land. It is not very funny for either farmers or visiting tourists who visit our country. Mr. Speaker, this surplus prairie grain, souvenir of Canada, is being sold at 50 cents a bag and contains about half a pound of good prairie wheat. This too at the time that the Prime Minister of Canada says, "Why should I sell your wheat?"

**MR. ROMANOW:** — Yes, corporation lawyer!

**MR. MICHAYLUK:** — So the farmers in desperation were forced to sell their surpluses to feedlots at 50 cents a bushel. Mr. Speaker, it must be a sorry memento of Canada for foreign visitors, many of whom come from nations where excruciating poverty and starvation are the orders of the day. And at the same time, Mr. Speaker, they may either buy or see small bags of wheat labelled 'surplus'.

Mr. Speaker, it may now be evident to you from the remarks that I have made during the course of my participation in this debate that I will be supporting the amendment and will be voting against the motion.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. J.J. CHARLEBOIS (Saskatoon City Park-University):** — Mr. Speaker, I should like to commend our Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Steuart) for bringing in a common sense balanced Budget and I should like to say that the criticism by the new financial critic for the Opposition (Mr. Romanow) might well have been preached into an empty barrel. This NDP Opposition does not have one constructive thought and they seek only to destroy, and the truth and the facts do not matter.

**MR. CHARLEBOIS:** — I should like to refer to two public pronouncements made by the Hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Blakeney). The first refers to the potash industry in this province when the new leader referred to what he called a drastic cutback in the labor force of the potash industry as a result of the prorationing of potash production by this Government. This statement by

the Leader of the Opposition is nothing short of nonsense. There has been no cutback in jobs in this industry with the exception of one mine. The actual figures show that in 1964 this industry employed 572 people in the production of potash. This figure increased steadily until 1969 when it reached 2,800. And it is still 2,800 and it is my understanding that a very important sales announcement will be made shortly that will increase the number of jobs by a further 75 people.

Let me assure you, Mr. Speaker, that Alwinsal, Noranda, Allan Potash, Duval, Potash Company of America, none of these have had a cutback and each one of these declare appreciation to our Government for the fact that theirs is a viable industry today.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. CHARLEBOIS:** — The future of this industry in world markets is absolutely assured. It is presently giving close to 3,000 jobs in this province and to try to destroy the image of this great industry by a statement such as Mr. Blakeney has made is an utter disgrace.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. CHARLEBOIS:** — The second statement that I should like to refer to on the part of the Leader of the Opposition is his public claim that our Government is allowing the Saskatchewan Pulpwood Company to devastate our forests claiming that they are making vast areas into a desert wasteland.

This is a completely irresponsible statement that could only be made by someone who is either completely ignorant of the facts or is deliberately trying to mislead the people of this province.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. CHARLEBOIS:** — Let me assure the Members of this House that we have the finest reforestation program in the pulpwood industry in North America.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. CHARLEBOIS:** — Mr. Ballantyne who manages the Saskatchewan Pulpwood Company is without question one of the most highly regarded foresters in this country and the efficiency of our pulpwood cutting and the reforestation under his guidance is unquestioned in the industry.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. CHARLEBOIS:** — I should like to remind the Members of this House that when Mr. Ballantyne arranged a trip through the pulpwood cutting area for all Members we were shown exactly what was going on in these areas. And Mr. Blakeney was not there and I say he doesn't know what he is talking about. And I say the same about Mr. Romanow, who also made a statement to the Star Phoenix that we

have no proper reforestation program. This made great news but I say 'for shame' to make such a devastating and irresponsible statement. I say that Mr. Romanow too may know something about the legal business but he knows absolutely nothing about our reforestation program or else he is very deliberately misleading the people of this Province with absolute falsehoods. His statement compares with his same blatant and false statement that the Saskatchewan Power Corporation and the Saskatchewan Telephones are NDP establishments when the truth is they were established by the Liberals.

The Power Commission which was later named the Saskatchewan Power Corporation was established under the management of Mr. Thornton under a Liberal Government in 1928 and you know it, Mr. Romanow, and you are absolutely and deliberately misleading the people. The Saskatchewan Telephones was established by this Government in 1908 and we are very proud of the fact that under the Liberal Government in 1910 we had one of the first dial telephone systems in North America.

I say that you should be completely ashamed of the misleading remarks that you make in this House because you know better. Now let's get back to the pulpwood cutting area trip. Those of us who took the trouble to go on this trip through the cutting areas met with the team of experienced biologists and foresters from the Federal Government and we had explained to us at least four reforestation plans that are in use and under observation. We saw with our own eyes and we felt with our own hands the young seedling trees that will be part of a pulp industry that will continue in perpetuity as a result of a truly well planned reforestation program.

I think, Mr. Speaker, in matters regarding industry we should try to be constructive rather than destructive. During the past while we have been facing many problems in our economy and not the least of these is the matter of labor union strikes. Don't ever think that you haven't had your own troubles. You have them right in your party, old Brutus sitting next to little Caesar with his knife ready to stick into his back, is one of them.

I had the privilege of studying, at one time in my life, and I will never forget the story of Julius Caesar. I tell you that Shakespeare did a great job and must have had you in mind.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. CHARLEBOIS:** — It is not only those with the lean and hungry look that are around you, Mr. Leader of the Opposition. Look out for that blatant boy next to you.

A strike, Mr. Speaker, in a key industry can now have such disastrous effect on the economy generally that it must not only be viewed with alarm but for the benefit of all of our people whether laboring, farming, managerial or whatever, it is time we took a more realistic view of our bargaining system. Certainly we cannot deny a man's right to withdraw his services, but common sense dictates that there has to be another way to settle the differences between management and labor, something other than these devastating strikes.

Naturally when we discuss matters concerning labor we must consider the relationship with management and the role of

Government. The focus of course is on the difficulties that come out of bargaining. The history of collective bargaining is certainly well known in general terms to all of us and I do think we could do well to think back on some of its history. It was in the early part of this century that unions, and the right to collective bargaining were generally established and although this was not generally accepted by industry at the beginning, over the years the right to bargain collectively has become generally recognized and accepted.

In the earlier years it was a tremendous struggle for labor to have its needs and merits recognized. With very few exceptions the conditions of employment and the standard of living for the working man of that time were far below what would be recognized as acceptable today. So with a few exceptions it was an extremely difficult undertaking for the laboring people.

During the years that have transpired many, many advances have been achieved and I think we must recognize that in these advances there has been a contribution not only by labor but also by management and government. It hasn't involved just hours of work and rates of pay. Many changes have been mutually beneficial. Work shops that are built in this generation are designed to give increased production through proper lighting, ventilation, ease of handling materials, and all of the many other things that amount to decent working conditions, as well as top production. Our present pulp mill and the new one to be built at Meadow Lake are excellent examples. So, too, our potash mines and refineries.

Through our labor laws we have achieved such things as Workmen's Compensation, holidays with pay, Unemployment Insurance, Canada Pension and so on. I think we can all agree that the lot of the labor union member of today is not only vastly improved, it is very, very good.

Even to the point that in a sense we may have come to the other end of the spectrum. There is a real danger that we are tipping the scale in the other direction where there may be the danger of a collapsing economy. Labor cannot be considered the only cause, but it must certainly be considered as one of the major contributing factors to this condition.

In Canada in 1905 the national debt was about \$378 million. Today it is \$38 billion, 100 times what it was. The interest on debt was \$10.8 million in 1905 and now it is \$1.6 billion. At one time our dollar was worth a dollar. A few years ago we complained that 30 cents out of every \$1 was going into taxes, then 33 per cent, now we are looking at a 60-cent dollar. Surely we have been made drastically aware of the inflation and surely we must all realize that it is time discretion is used in all parts of our economy and included in this must certainly be the bargaining between labor and management, in order to help in the correction and balance that is needed.

At one time the weapon of the strike was used by labor as a last resort. Now in too many cases it is a first threat in the bargaining process. Then we have cases where in a planned way, no sooner one trade settlement is made through strike than another starts. Now we see labor so strongly organized that settlements are made through power and threats rather than through reason.

We have witnessed the need of government intervention in our own province in order to protect our essential services. During the past year the scope of our Essential Services Act was extended to protect our economy from coming to a complete standstill through needless and crippling strikes. And I am one who has declared emphatically in favor of this move. But surely it should not be necessary for government to look at this kind of legislation as anything but an emergency measure. None of us want to think that we must look to this kind of legislation as a regular method for settling labor-management disputes. Government should certainly not be so directly involved as this on a regular basis. Surely all of us want to find the best ways possible to avoid strikes, but to me it is questionable that this should be left to government to legislate and thereby have a compulsory atmosphere.

Rather, I think it is time that management and labor sat down with each other to discuss their differences with honest wisdom and understanding. We are presently facing an unemployment situation that is certainly more severe than any of us want it to be. This is not just a problem for the unemployed, it is a very real problem for all of our people, particularly our people in business. No business can survive unless it has people employed.

Surely then the time is opportune. We hear suggestions that we should copy Sweden or Australia or some other imaginary Utopia. This is fine and dandy to see what is being done in other parts of the world, but let's face it, what we need is a good look at ourselves as Canadians. Surely we as people have enough intelligence to figure out a more intelligent approach from both sides than what we have been witnessing.

I don't think that this is a hopeless thought and I think we should recognize that advances are taking place. The development at Meadow Lake is an example where both labor and management are co-operating to co-ordinate and harmonize the activities by the unions and companies working together to promote the growth and the development in the northwestern part of the province.

The Northern Saskatchewan Allied Council, which is composed of the International Building and Construction Trade Unions is working on a project-type collective agreement with Parsons and Whittemore. This projected agreement is intended to prevent work stoppages due to jurisdictional disputes, strikes or lockouts.

A full time council representative will be appointed by the council to represent the council and all employees to assist in carrying out the terms and conditions of the agreement. The council representative will work with the Company Labour Regulations Officer on the project to abate any problems right on the site. Labor and management should be commended for arranging a sensible and acceptable bargaining arrangement at the start of what will eventually be a very complex industrial development.

While none of us can expect that we can sit down and suddenly come up with a trouble-free world, surely we can take a good honest look at the situation together and come up with some genuine improvement that will give mutual benefits. There can of course be different approaches but I suggest that the

discussions be instigated by labor and management at a time between bargaining sessions so that the heat of bargaining is not a factor in the deliberations.

Now if this is left to government then there is the danger that the timing will be bad and no matter when it takes place, if it is left to government, you have the inevitable result that people who are not as knowledgeable as those directly involved in industry will be making the decisions. Recently we have had the Labour Management Committee Report and we have had other submissions criticizing this Report.

We have had reasonable presentations favoring price controls. Surely it is an encouraging thing to see labor and management sitting down together and let us hope that a new and improved atmosphere will develop as a result. Mr. Speaker, this Province really has a bright future and this Government can be proud of the part it is playing. I will vote for the motion.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. W.E. SMISHEK (Regina North East):** — Mr. Speaker, I would concur with the Hon. Member for Saskatoon City Park-University (Mr. Charlebois) that Canada needs its own approach to the problems of industrial relations. I will agree with him that it is advisable for us to study and see what is going on in other countries like Sweden and other European states. We do have problems of our own and we have to mould our own way to see what can be done in the area of improving labor-management relations.

The one thing that I should have hoped that the Hon. Member would have also said, that the restrictive and oppressive legislation which this Government has enacted in the form of Bill 2, The Essential Services Act, and the severe amendments to The Trade Union Act has not helped in the area of industrial relations. The truth is these actions have hindered industrial relations, and added to this, the constant political interference by this Government has added to the problems we have faced in the last few years. The additional truth is that since this Government has taken office, the number of industrial disputes and the number of man days lost due to strikes, has been much more than in a period of 20 years of CCF administration.

Mr. Speaker, I say that the answer is to restore The Trade Union Act to where it was in 1964, repeal Bill 2 and strengthen the Department of Labour and provide the kind of services that are needed in the area of industrial relations. After the Government takes these steps, we can then go, we can proceed, to building a more harmonious labor-management climate in the Province of Saskatchewan.

Mr. Speaker, I have followed Saskatchewan budgets for over 20 years. During the CCF years the Budget was a document where the Government took stock of conditions of the previous year, set out its economic and social priorities for the coming year and presented to the Legislature and to the people of Saskatchewan, a program of concrete action.

Mr. Speaker, last Friday we were subjected to a most inflammatory and political propaganda address ever presented to this Legislature by any provincial treasurer since Confederation.

This speech demonstrated how politically insecure this Government is and how bankrupt it is of any thought or ideas. The Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Steuart) started by saying that he was going to place on the record the achievements of this Government since 1964, particularly in respect to industrial and business development. After telling us again about the Prince Albert pulp mill and the potash industry, he stopped dead. He said secondary industry and business followed. But he couldn't think of any, Mr. Speaker.

He then proceeded to repent and made these concessions: the potash industry faced disaster; some mines were actually considering total shutdowns; farm cash income took a drastic drop; oil and uranium production slowed down, slowed down in employment and royalties; tight money and high interest rates; virtual collapse in the construction industry; thousands of men and women out of work. This is what seven years of Liberal Government gave Saskatchewan, Mr. Speaker. These are his words, not mine. This is the way that the Provincial Treasurer described the "New Saskatchewan Today". He should have added two more items and this would have given us the complete and full picture, a massive population exodus and oppressively high taxes. Saskatchewan is in the midst of the worst depression since the Dirty Thirties.

I must commend the Provincial Treasurer, this year he did manage to add up the figures he used in the Budget address to correspond with those in the Estimates. Hon. Members will recall this was not the case last year. So after four Budgets, the Provincial Treasurer did learn something, he learned to add and that's an accomplishment. What he is adding and how he is going about it is another thing and I shall discuss that a little later.

Mr. Speaker, I had hoped that the Provincial Treasurer this year would have placed before us a different kind of a document, a different form of Estimates. Members will recall that last year the Select Standing Committee on Public Accounts recommended that consideration be given to budgeting and accounting on a gross basis. This recommendation received the unanimous approval of this Legislature, including the support of the Provincial Treasurer. The Provincial Treasurer could have, at least, advised us what consideration was given to converting into a gross budgeting and accounting system. I believe it is important that Government budgeting be simplified to show the public as clearly and as honestly as possible the true picture of Provincial revenues and expenditures from all sources. The public is entitled to know and understand the financial affairs of its Government. There should be no ambiguity, no mystery about Government finance. The way the Government and this Legislature handle its finances and other affairs and the manner in which they are presented to the public contributes to the degree of confidence which the public will have in their government. The more obscure and confused the handling of finance and other functions by the government, the less confidence people will have in government, particularly by our young people. The manner used by the Provincial Treasurer to present his Budget address did nothing, Mr. Speaker, toward the building of confidence in government. Indeed, the way he behaved and the type of an address he delivered only helped to reinforce the fact that this Government even lacks confidence in itself.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. SMISHEK:** — Mr. Speaker, for the Provincial Treasurer to say that there were no industries in Saskatchewan until this Liberal Government took office is insulting the people of this great Province. It is an affront to all industries and employers who since the province of Saskatchewan was created have tried to make a contribution to Saskatchewan's industrial growth. The mining industry, the milling industry, the meat packing industry, the logging industry, the steel mill, the oil refineries, just to name a few that were here prior to 1964. You know the way the Liberals talk about potash, you would almost think they had planted it in the ground.

Well, Mr. Speaker, let me talk about the economic conditions as they are. The Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Steuart) tells us that the Province's economy is out of the doldrums and that the Government is looking ahead with renewed confidence to more prosperous times. Mr. Speaker, I wish I could share his optimism.

Let us look at the facts. The Dominion Bureau of Statistics reports that at mid January 21,000 or 6.2 per cent of the gross labor force was unemployed, this includes the farm workers as well and the farm people in these statistics. However, these unemployed figures do not take account of the Indian and Metis population living on Reserves who are mainly unemployed. Therefore, another 20,000 should be added to this work force in the Government's figures. Thousands of workers are employed on a part-time basis and whose pay cheques have been cut drastically in the last few months. The truth is that today in the Province of Saskatchewan no less than 15 per cent of the Saskatchewan non-agricultural labor force is unemployed.

Another fact to remember is that since this Government took office 100,000 people left Saskatchewan. Of this large number about 35,000 were in the labor force. The Liberals promised in 1964 to create 80,000 new jobs during their first term of office. After seven years of Government we find that close to 80,000 wage earners are either unemployed or have left the province in search of jobs elsewhere. Mr. Speaker, a city like Saskatoon only a few years ago was the fastest growing city in Canada. Last year it had a population drop of 3,000. Regina had a population growth of a mere 1,000 in 1970, the smallest growth in over 20 years.

The growth and prosperity of our urban centres can often be measured in the number of homes that are being built. Let us look at the report appearing in the Regina Leader-Post on January 8th of this year. It says that during the 11-month period in Regina there were only 372 housing starts in 1970 as compared to 1,640 the year before. In Saskatoon only 248 housing started as compared to 1,823 the year before. The same situation prevails in every other urban centre, virtually no homes built. But worse yet is the number of "for sale" signs. I invite you to drive down any street in a residential district in any one of our cities and you will find in almost every block homes for sale. In Regina some 1,200 homes were up for sale; in Saskatoon 1,800; and in the smaller cities like Weyburn, Estevan, Yorkton and Moose Jaw, the ratio was even greater. While the number of people trying to sell is large now, the future prospect despite the Treasurer's optimism looks much worse.



You know, Mr. Speaker, last Friday evening after the Budget address, a constituent of mine came to my home to tell me of his plight. He is 49 years of age, a journeyman painter, has a family of six and he has not been able to find work since last July. For the last few months he has been unable to meet the Central Housing and Mortgage payments and is now being threatened. He has been paying on the home he is living in for the last 10 years. Since last July all his savings have disappeared. He had to borrow \$700, in order to live. He is worried and embittered. I wish the Provincial Treasurer's renewed confidence, or Mr. Trudeau's Just Society, would find this man a job. All he wants, Mr. Speaker, is the right to work.

Then there are other stories of frustration and suffering that have appeared recently in the Regina Leader-Post. A Regina man, like Joe Daniels, 34, an electrical worker has been unemployed for seven months; Bob Harding, a 22 year old Bachelor of Arts graduate, has been unable to find work since he graduated; Brian Dunlop, 25, had been only able to find six weeks of work last summer. This story appeared in print in the Leader-Post earlier this month. It shows the severity of the problem — 50 per cent of the iron workers unemployed, more than 35 per cent of plumbers and painters are jobless; 40 per cent carpenters unemployed; only about 10 per cent of Regina laborers do have a job. Wage earners, Mr. Speaker, aren't the only victims, some 600 school teachers were unable to find jobs this year. Workers in the Cement Plant in the city of Regina have been laid off since last September and still are not working and will not be working until about mid-April, Mr. Speaker. This plant was operating on a 12-month basis during the CCF administration.

Mr. Speaker, the Liberal depression did not miss the business community either. Between August of 1969 and July of 1970, 134 Regina businesses closed their doors. Look at some of the places that have closed down: Chrysler parts depot; Ford Motor Company — used to employ 28 people, only four left to look after the tractor parts; White Farm Equipment, formerly Cockshutt Company, Barber Tractor Ltd.; J.H. Ashdown — at one time employed close to 100 people; Canadian General Electric; Union Oil Company of Canada; British Pacific Life Insurance; and dozens and dozens of small businesses have closed shop. Other businesses like Christie Grants Department Store, the Wascana Hotel, almost as old as the city of Regina itself have closed down. They survived the great depression but are unable to continue any longer under the Trudeau-Thatcher created depression.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. SMISHEK:** — Government Members boastfully recite the number of jobs they created by getting the Prince Albert pulp mill built at a cost of \$63.5 million. Let us not forget the Government expenditures as well, \$10 million on roads, at least \$7.5 million for Saskatchewan pulpwood, that's over \$80 million. How many jobs were created? Well, the Provincial Treasurer told us — 419 in the mill and 500 in the wood operation but according to the 1969 report of Saskatchewan Pulpwood Ltd., it was not 500, Mr. Provincial Treasurer, but only 206 in the wood operation. Admittedly there are some trucks, perhaps 75 — let us be generous and make it 100 people that are employed in trucking — that is being most generous — that is no more than 800 jobs that have been created by this project. Only 67 native Canadians employed — this is what the Premier told us. In other

words for each job created by Saskatchewan Pulpwood there was an investment of \$100,000. But how many loggers, how many sawmill workers lost their jobs as a result of this? How many Indian people lost their means of livelihood as a result of this? I submit, if the inventory was taken, we should find that perhaps more jobs were lost than were created, Mr. Provincial Treasurer.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. SMISHEK:** — The Government became so preoccupied with the pulp mill it lost sight of all other adverse economic conditions surrounding it.

Let us look at Saskatchewan retail sales. In 1964 they climbed to \$1,147 million and the cost of living at that time stood at 104.8 points. Retail sales then followed this pattern, in 1967, \$1,335 million; in 1968 down, \$1,318 million; in 1969, down again, \$1,208 million; in 1970 a further decline, in fact a major decline to \$1,086 million. The percentage drops are as follows: in 1968 a drop of 1.3 per cent over 1967; in 1969 a drop of 8.3 per cent over 1968; in 1970 a drop of over 10 per cent over 1969. In total a drop during this three-year period of almost 30 per cent in retail sales in this province. Since 1964 the cost of living has increased by 23 per cent. In January it stood at 129.8 points. In terms of the 1964 dollar value Saskatchewan sales in 1970 would have amounted to only \$826 million or a drop of 38.5 per cent. Mr. Speaker, if only business could have back those CCF years, no bankruptcies, no business failures, no mass unemployment, a booming farm economy, government work projects, retail sales rising and so were the profits.

Mr. Speaker, in the tables appended to the Budget address we were told that in 1970 the Saskatchewan average wage stood at \$114.74 per week. The Dominion Bureau of Statistics' report shows that as of November, 1970 the Canadian average wage was \$130.23. This means that Saskatchewan average wage is \$15.49 per week less than the Canadian average wage. In 1964 it was only \$5.24 behind Canada as a whole. This Government's anti-labor policy, unrealistic guidelines and maintenance of a pathetically low minimum wage standard has caused this situation. Had Saskatchewan even retained the same differential as there was in 1964 and updated minimum wages equal to those of our neighboring provinces in Alberta and Manitoba, the earnings of our work force would have been some \$150 million more a year. This would have meant more purchasing power, increased retail sales, more jobs for the citizens of Regina.

Mr. Speaker, much has been said about public works. This Government is telling us they are going to create thousands of new jobs through what they call a massive public works scheme. More money will be spent on Government capital works projects than last year. For weeks they have been repeating, announcing and re-announcing that \$17 million will be spent on public works, but when the Estimates came down we learned that only \$15.8 million is appropriated — \$1.2 million short, Mr. Speaker.

Well, let us take a closer look. Let us look at the facts as they appear in the Estimates. I urge the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Coderre) to take note of these figures. Let us look at the facts as they appear in the Estimates, which lists the

amounts of money that are supposed to be voted for capital projects by various departments. Last year the Department of Agriculture's appropriation for capital works was \$5.6 million, this year \$5.4 million — a quarter million dollars less in exact figures. School construction grants, last year \$12.7 million, this year \$9 million, to be more exact \$3.6 million less. Highways, last year \$44.5 million, this year \$45 million, \$460,000 more. Natural Resources, last year \$1.5 million, this year \$1.8 million — \$292,000 more. Hospital construction grants, \$8 million last year, \$8.2 million this year, the exact figure is \$161,000 more. Public Works, \$8.3 million last year, \$15.8 million this year, \$7.4 million more. University, \$11.5 million last year, the same amount this year again. Housing under Municipal Affairs Department, \$2.5 million last year, \$1.7 million this year, the difference is \$794,000 less. But that's not all. We find items like loans to school boards and school units amounting to \$550,000 in 1970-71 for school construction are completely eliminated from this year's Budget, Mr. Speaker. Loans to the Saskatchewan Power Corporation and Sask Tel for capital works has been cut by \$818 million and since the Government robbed these corporations of the profits to finance ordinary Government expenditures there certainly will not be much profit left for new and expanding capital works projects. When you consider the two, Government and Crown corporations capital works expenditure as they appear in the appropriation, it means that \$5 million less has been allotted for capital projects this year than the year before, Mr. Speaker. The naked truth is that the Government has no plan to stimulate the economy with any massive public works program since the facts prove by their own Estimates that there is no additional money available, the fact is there is less money available for capital works.

Now, Mr. Speaker, let me say a word about the two newly announced Government construction projects in Regina. Let me first say I welcome the announcement. But the people of Saskatchewan and particularly the citizens of Regina ought not to be too excited about them. I refer to the proposed Institute of Applied Arts and Science for Regina and the Regina Office Building. In reference to the Regina Institute of Applied Arts and Science, the former Minister of Education, Mr. Trapp, told this Legislature in 1966 that the Government was considering the need for such an educational institute. This was way back in 1966. I regret, Mr. Speaker, that today there are no blueprints or detailed plans for construction to proceed forthwith. I can't resist the temptation to point out that while the Minister of Education (Mr. McIsaac) announced the proposed institute last week, he said the first phase of the project would cost \$2.5 million. The bulk of the money will come from the Federal Government but the Provincial Treasurer in his appropriation only gives us a figure of \$2 million with no reference whatsoever to an Ottawa contribution. It is important to note that \$7.5 million of money for technical school construction has been taken into general revenue to finance projects. The truth is, there is hardly a chance of the Government expanding the amount of money this year on this project. The possibilities of it spending two and one-quarter million on the office building is even more remote. Again, Mr. Speaker, there are no blueprints, no locations selected. All that is being done is that the Government is trying to make some election propaganda with which to fight the next election. I welcome the announcement. Both are needed. We have asked for both of these but, Mr. Speaker, the trust is that no \$4 million or \$4.5 million will be spent on these projects in the coming year. So the fact is

that about \$8 million or \$9 million less will be spent this year than was spent last year.

Let me conclude, Mr. Speaker. The Provincial Treasurer during the debate on television last week made reference that there was no need for any more school construction. I invite the Provincial Treasurer to visit my constituency. It is a constituency with some 40,000 citizens. We have no high school in that constituency. I ask the Provincial Treasurer again to consider our needs. I have been making this appeal about the need for a high school in the northeast, more education facilities in the city of Regina and in other communities, so don't tell us there is no need for further educational institutions.

Mr. Speaker, I shall have more to say in regard to the Budget tomorrow and beg leave to adjourn the debate.

Debate adjourned.

The Assembly adjourned at 9:30 o'clock p.m.