

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN
Fifth Session — Sixteenth Legislature
13th Day

Thursday, March 4, 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 to all Members of the Legislature the following groups of students situated in the galleries. From the constituency of Arm River represented by Mr. McIvor, 45 students from the Davidson High School, under the direction of their teacher, Mr. Janzen; from the constituency of Regina South East represented by Mr. Baker, 24 students from the Peart School, under the direction of their teacher, Mr. W. J. Fawley; from the constituency of Rosthern represented by the Minister of Highways (Mr. Boldt), 44 students from the Waldheim High School, under the direction of their teacher, Mr. Harder; from the constituency of Rosthern also represented by the Minister, 42 students from Langham School, under the direction of their teacher, Mr. Mechasiw; from the constituency of Humboldt represented by Mr. Breker, 26 students from the Leroy High School, under the direction of their school teacher, Mr. Schugman; from the constituency of Redberry represented by Mr. Michayluk, 32 students from the Vawn High School under the direction of Sister Jeanne Fortier; from the constituency of Saskatoon Nutana South represented by Mr. Forsyth, 32 students from the Alvin Buckwold School, under the direction of their teacher, Mr. Neufeldt; from the constituency of Regina North West represented by Mr. Whelan, 29 students from St. Patrick's School under the direction of their teacher, Mr. Z.A. Snyciuk. I am sure all Hon. Members will want to join with me in extending a warm welcome to these students in our galleries and express the very sincere wish that they will enjoy their stay here and find it educational and pleasant.

HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

CONDOLENCES

HON. D. G. STEUART: (Provincial Treasurer): — Before the Orders of the Day, Mr. Speaker, it is with deep regret that I must inform the House of the death of a senior member of the Treasury Department, Mr. William Stan, who died Wednesday, March 3rd.

Mr. Stan was born in Dysart December, 1914, and entered the service of the Government of Saskatchewan in the Treasury Department on May 7, 1935. His service with the Treasury Department continued up until the time of his death, broken only by a period of some two and one-half years during which he served in the Royal Canadian Navy. Having been retired from the Navy with the rank of Lieutenant he retained his connection with the Royal Canadian Naval Reserve and rose to the rank of Commander. In 1961 he was appointed as Director of Revenue in the Treasury Department, a position which he held until the time of his passing.

He was Aide-de-camp to the Lieutenant-Governor and senior honorary Aide-de-camp to the Governor-General. His passing brings to an end a life time of outstanding service to the people of Saskatchewan in peace and in war. Bill Stan was a fine, warm, friendly man who will be missed by the Government and his many, many friends throughout the province. I should like to convey to Mrs. Stan and members of the family on behalf of the Members of this Assembly our sympathy on the loss of her husband. I should further announce that the funeral services will be 1:30 p.m. this Saturday at the Trinity Lutheran Church here in Regina.

MR. A. E. BLAKENEY: (Leader of the Opposition): — Mr. Speaker, I want to associate myself and the Members on this side of the House with the regret expressed by the Provincial Treasurer at the death of Mr. Stan. As the Provincial Treasurer has indicated, Mr. Stan had a lengthy career in the public service of Saskatchewan. It was when I served as Provincial Treasurer that he was appointed as Director of Revenue. We were indeed fortunate, at that time, to have a person of his qualifications to assume that senior post. He was an able administrator. He had the very happy faculty of maintaining excellent relations with the taxpaying public. He was in many ways a model public servant. He will be known to many Members of this House because he attended a good number of openings of this Legislature in his capacity as Aide-de-camp to the Lieutenant-Governor and attended many other public functions in that capacity.

In addition, if I may add a personal note, he and Erna were friends of my wife and me; they were neighbors at the beach. Their cottage is next door but one to ours. He was not only an able and efficient public servant but a warm friend. I join with the Provincial Treasurer and I am sure with all Members of the House in extending our sympathy to Mrs. Stan and the family of, the bereaved.

MR. F. MEAKES: (Touchwood): — Mr. Speaker, I should like to add words of my feelings for the loss of Bill Stan. I have known Bill Stan for many years, in fact I have known the whole family. As the Provincial Treasurer has said he grew up in Dysart. The Stan family including Bill, is a family that has been known and respected in the community. I know that I agree with the Provincial Treasurer and the Leader of the Opposition that we have lost a good civil servant, a good citizen and a good friend.

QUESTIONS

HUSKY OIL REFINERY

MR. J. E. BROCKELBANK: (Saskatoon-Mayfair): — Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day I should like to direct a question to the Minister of Industry (Mr. Estey). It has come to my attention from an usually reliable source that in addition to the shut down of the Husky Oil Refinery in Moose Jaw this coming October, the Husky Oil Refinery in Lloydminster will cut back its operations by one-half after the mid point in 1971 with the resulting substantial layoff in staff. I wonder if the Minister would care to comment on that statement?

March 4, 1971

HON. C. L. B. ESTEY: (Minister of Industry): — Mr. Speaker, in answer to that question I have no information of a cutback at Lloydminster. It seems very odd to me that there would be a cutback after the very large amount of money that this Company has spent in the Lloydminster field annually. As the Hon. Member may know just a year ago they established a head office building there.

CREIGHTON - STRIKE AT FLIN FLON MINE

MR. W. J. BEREZOWSKY: (Prince Albert East-Cumberland): — Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day I should like to direct a question to the Hon. Minister of Welfare (Mr. MacDonald). I have received a communication and information that there is quite a serious problem in Creighton because you know there is a strike at the Flin Flon mine which may be quite prolonged. Apparently people, through no fault of their own, on strike are receiving the necessary help from the Manitoba Government but the complaint is that they are not able to get the same kind of consideration from the Saskatchewan Government. I should like to know what the policy is, Mr. Minister and will you look into it?

HON. C. P. MacDONALD: (Minister of Welfare): — I will make the policy very clear and very brief, the Saskatchewan Government or the Department of Welfare does not pay welfare benefits to strikers.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

STATEMENT

NEW APPOINTMENTS TO CANADIAN WHEAT BOARD

HON. D. T. McFARLANE: (Minister of Agriculture): — Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day are proceeded with I am sure that all Members will be interested to learn, as I was, of the new appointments to the Canadian Wheat Board. The new Chief Commissioner will be Mr. Jerry Vogel who formerly was the Assistant Chief Commissioner. The new Assistant Chief Commissioner will be Doug Treleaven who was one of the Commissioners, and the new Commissioner now will be Mr. Bob Essdak. I understand that these appointments have been discussed with farm organizations and they were quite appreciative of the manner in which it was done and voice their support of the people who were appointed. I am sure all Members will join with me in wishing these people every success in the tremendous responsibilities that they face in the future.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MISQUOTED IN LEADER-POST

MR. D. W. MICHAYLUK: (Redberry): — Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day I should like to turn the attention of the Hon. Members to a release in the March 3rd issue of the Leader-Post quoting me as saying that the net debt of the province in the period 1944 to 1964 was

slightly under \$6 million. This is in error. I think that during the course of my remarks I mentioned it was under \$600 million. I should like to turn your attention to this error in the release.

HON. D. G. STEUART: (Provincial Treasurer): — What are you apologizing for? Was it your error?

ADJOURNED DEBATE

BUDGET DEBATE

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of the Hon. Mr. Steuart (Provincial Treasurer) that this Assembly do now resolve itself into the Committee of Finance; and the proposed amendment thereto, moved by Mr. Romanow:

MR. I. H. MacDOUGALL: (Souris-Estevan): — The Budget which was just brought down by the Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Steuart) should be welcomed by all in the province. The very fact that more money has been allocated to the various departments without raising taxes, should prove to our people the soundness of our fiscal policies, as they are now, and as they have been since we came to office in 1964. A balanced budget - one where revenue meets expenses - is a sound budget. It is a responsible budget.

But, Mr. Speaker, it is being attacked by irresponsible Members opposite. Without a businessman in their ranks, the NDP call for a deficit budget because times are tough. What will happen if we have successive tough years? If we budget for a deficit, we are actually borrowing on the future. We shall be committing taxpayers of a future era to pay for today's bills. Your children and my children will be burdened with our debts. This suggestion from the NDP does not surprise me. They would like to see our finances so muddled that state ownership of everything would be the only answer. This would please the Waffle element and bring them back into the fold, and who knows, Mr. Speaker, they may even remain happy for one or two months under those conditions.

Personally, Mr. Speaker, I think the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Blakeney) would like to see the business community and the farmers accept his leadership, and no doubt he has tried hard to create an image which would indicate he was their friend. But that old bogey of nationalization, state control, plain, good old fashioned Socialism, continues to dog him. Deficit budgets at this time could have disastrous effects on our provincial economy. A few years ago, economists, Mr. Speaker, not politicians, but economists said the number one problem facing Canada and the United States was inflation.

For the past 18 months, Canada has been fighting inflation, and of all the provinces, Saskatchewan has been the most vigorous in this fight. Premier Thatcher and the rest of the Liberal party want to curb inflation because Saskatchewan residents, particularly farmers, pensioners, and those on fixed incomes would suffer most if inflation were to continue unchecked.

March 4, 1971

Many Opposition Members criticize us for using profits from Crown corporations to balance our budgets. Well, what is wrong with that, I ask again? Crown corporation profits such as SPC and Sask-Tel and the Transit System were always used, that is if and when any profits accrued. When the NDP were the government, and when Cass-Beggs and Russ Brown were in charge of the SPC, the profits were so small that the Government of the day could not really count on these profits to bolster their budgets. If you go back to 1960 when the profits for the SPC were in the neighbourhood of \$1 million, then look at it today when the profits for SPC are in the neighbourhood of \$20 million. I further want to point out to our people that the profits of the SPC were produced by our Government by greater efficiency of operation. Remember too, that was done without raising rates.

This, Mr. Speaker, seems to go against the NDP grain, it galls them to think it could be done and now the Opposition Members create bogus and I mean really bogus criticism.

Efficiencies were effected because we unloaded the old CCF Socialists, we unloaded Cass-Beggs and replaced them with people who produced a business-like administration and as they say on Laugh In, "And that's the truth."

Mr. Speaker, the Liberal Party is committed to creating all the jobs possible. We cannot be expected to, nor will we as a party create a mass of useless jobs just for the sake of having jobs. As the Member for Kelvington (Mr. Byers) suggested we'd be chasing tumble weeds over the Prairies, creating jobs like this. We are not in favor of this. Of course our friends opposite will argue against this because they think that the bigger the Civil Service is, the better it is for them to become elected. This theory worked for them until 1964, but since then, residents of Saskatchewan have voted for sound, business-like government to protect the public purse.

Mr. Speaker, Members opposite would have you believe that the Liberal Party in Ottawa and the Liberal Party in Saskatchewan have primarily caused the wide-spread unemployment in Canada. This is not true, and they know it. Economic conditions in most of the free-world are sagging and there are more persons out of work now in almost every free country. Mr. Speaker, unfortunately it matters little what Saskatchewan or even what Canada does in creating work. If the world economic picture is not bright, goods produced by the newly created jobs will not be sold.

In some areas we have, led by the Provincial Treasurer, made major strides in providing a vast number of jobs. But the Opposition rears its ugly head of Socialism in an effort to discredit honest efforts by the Government to provide work. Again I ask why? With all their talk about jobs one would think the so-called friends of the poor, the little people, the unemployed, would be happy to support us in finding ways and means to provide these jobs.

Pulp mills talked about for 20 years by the former CCF were brought into this province in five years under the Liberals and, Mr. Speaker, the first mill was located approximately in the same area as the CCF had promised to build theirs. But because the Liberals had it built, it's all wrong today. They say we are raping the forests. They holler 'pollution'. Mr.

Speaker, they holler and they holler, mainly to gain power but if they did get power then the rest of Saskatchewan would be entitled to holler. I suspect the two labor lawyers and their followers will also criticize the proposed Meadow Lake pulp mill, but I think these same Members will have the wisdom to vote in favor of it.

Industry is being created in the province to broaden the tax base and to make the economy more buoyant. The Liberal Government does not want to force taxpayers to be left holding the bag with industries like box factories, tanneries and woolen mills. This is the sad record of the Socialists. Their record, Mr. Speaker, was so bad that the people of Saskatchewan finally threw them out of office. They could not conduct the affairs of this province in a business like manner when they were the Government, but now that they are in the Opposition they pretend to know what to do. Mr. Speaker, I suggest to Mr. Blakeney and Mr. Romanow that if they wish to drop their so-called 'pearls of wisdom' of Socialist doctrine, that they get a suitable vehicle to do so like a manure spreader.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. MacDOUGALL: — I can recall the former CCF administration playing fast and loose with the tax rates, particularly before an election. I remind the Deputy Leader of the Opposition, the Member from Saskatoon Riversdale, how former Finance Ministers lowered Medicare premiums just before each election solely for election bait, then right after the election, they drastically increased these premiums in order to meet hospitalization costs and deficits Does the Liberal Government do this? No it does not!

The CCF used to adjust automobile premiums downwards before elections, up they would go after elections. I could go on, but I do want to get across to our people that we act in a responsible manner. We tell the Saskatchewan people, any time - the government gives things to people, they must first be taxed in one way or another, in order to provide these same goods and services. In line with this, many people have told me they wish governments would quit promising them new benefits and leave them some of their own money to spend as they see fit.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. MacDOUGALL: — No matter what programs this government has instituted, no matter what services, Mr. Speaker, we have provided, according to the NDP they are never enough. We instituted purple gas for farm trucks. They talked against the measure, and some of them even voted against it. We put in homeowner grants. They talked against that too, but they didn't have the courage to vote against it. I understand that in their coming up election platform that these measures will be abolished.

We passed Bill 2, the Essential Services Act, which was enacted to prevent union organizers from paralyzing our economy. We feel the ordinary citizen is sick to death of strikes in this country.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

March 4, 1971

MR. Mac DOUGALL: — Every year we see some segment of our economy bound up with strikes. I think most working people dread the thought of strikes. I think nobody wins when a strike takes place. Their financial losses take years to recover. Wives of workers, I'm sure would want this Government to find some other method of solving labor disputes rather than having their husbands walk off the job, lose pay, and walk picket lines. It seems the organizers don't care about that aspect of work stoppages. They have their jobs, and they get their pay anyway. I want to remind the citizens of Estevan that we have faced several strikes over the past four years. But the one that made even NDP supporters amazed was when Walter Smishek (Regina North East) and his gang of high priced organizers struck the co-op in Estevan.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Oh, oh, shame:

MR. MacDOUGALL: — Even some good loyal NDP supporters could not understand the union resorting to this drastic measure which only serves to weaken and undermine the co-op movement down there. Why did you do that, Walter?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. MacDOUGALL: — Labor leaders have pledged themselves to destroy this Government. They did this in Moose Jaw in 1964 even before we got started. They committed themselves to a political party, the NDP party and only recently they set about to raise \$70,000 from trade unionists on a so-called voluntary basis. If I don't miss my guess, Mr. Speaker, it will be voluntary like a bank robbery.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. MacDOUGALL: — Trade unionists will be high pressured, threatened and coerced into a \$2.50 donation. Mark my words, it's been done before and it will be done again.

Mr. Speaker, what the labor unions are doing to Great Britain is almost unbelievable. They have forced the government and the economy of that once great country to the wall. Their severe demands on corporations have bankrupted many of the large companies. But, Mr. Speaker, labor over there doesn't seem to realize what they've done or worse, they don't care. The Socialists over in Britain are responsible for the chaotic conditions that exist there. • See the headlines in the daily papers, "Desperate Mood Gripping Britain", "Continuing Strikes Cause Gloom in the UK", and on and on.

I see another column in the Leader-Post of March 3rd in which the Member for Regina North East (Mr. Smishek) claims, "work programs not planned". Now this Member as well as other Regina Members said the Base Hospital wouldn't be built, but Mr. Speaker, it's going ahead. It couldn't have proceeded any faster for two reasons (1) lack of advance planning by the former CCF administration, (2) strikes by the building trades last year which caused considerable delay. The latter could have been prevented by the union bosses who sit opposite.

To get back to this excellent budget, Mr. Speaker, I see an amount of \$15,000 for pollution control for our city of Estevan. This amount will be used for secondary pollution treatment at the sewage lagoon which is anticipated by the city of Estevan. This is part of the \$750,000 set aside in the budget towards the capital cost of pollution control works for various cities throughout the province.

I note, with pleasure, that an all out effort will be made to provide summer jobs for students. The plans call for at least 2,000 jobs and I'm sure students will welcome this program. Summer jobs for students have always been a problem, but seldom do you see such a major effort made by a government to help students find jobs.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. MacDOUGALL: — Naturally, the Government would find it impossible by itself to provide student jobs for every student looking for work this year. We would have to find 7,000 or 8,000 jobs in April and double or triple that number in June. However, by enlisting the co-operation of the private sector - farmers and so on - I think the minimum target of 2,000 jobs seems realistic.

I feel optimistic and confident that our overall economic picture this year will be buoyant. People everywhere seemed to sense an upswing as early as last December.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. MacDOUGALL: — I, for one, feel we are on the road back to fuller employment. This is not a time to listen to the Socialist prophets of doom and gloom; this is a time for positive thought, and this Government is thinking and acting for a bright future. —

I predict Homecoming 71 will be a great success. Our tourist trade is shaping up for a great year. As we open up the north with better roads we shall not take a back seat to any province in Canada in competing for the tourist dollar. Estevan's Winter Festival this year was a real success. The weather man co-operated with beautiful warm days and the crowds turned out in record numbers. This Winter Festival features our own Lignite Louie and the spirit surrounding the event is catching on. The Chamber of Commerce is very active as the sponsors of the Winter Festival, and they have started off what we in Estevan felt will be a record year for tourism and related activities for Home-coming 71.

In the area of protest, I must say, here today, how unhappy the people of Bienfait and the town council are, also the mines and so on, over the CPR decision to remove the resident station agent. We formally protested this to the Board of Transport Commissioners because the Bienfait CPR station is one of the busiest stations along the south east railroad system. With the much welcomed renewed interest in lignite coal and with the dollar value of shipments more than doubled over the past year, it does not make much sense for the CPR to try to run the operation from Brandon. Yet, Mr. Speaker, this is what the CPR proposes to do. Last month the Attorney General asked for a special hearing covering these problems which we face in Saskatchewan.

March 4, 1971

regarding railroads and I hope the Board can see the inconvenience which will be caused by further reducing our services. The railroads have gone far enough already.

Now we have had similar problems with post offices closing in rural areas. It was not until Mr. John Pierre Cote took charge of the postal system again that the closing or threat of closing of local post offices was halted. We had Mr. Cote in the Estevan area and it was pointed out to him what post office closure in the rural areas means. Subsequently, at a luncheon, Mr. Cote announced that there would be no further closings unless the village or hamlet itself closes down. And that's the way it should be. And I am sure all areas where small post offices are located were delighted with this announcement.

Mr. Speaker, I see that my time is about up. I will support the Budget and I will vote against the amendment.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. F. K. RADLOFF: (Nipawin): — Mr. Speaker, today as I enter the debate, I enter with the idea of leaving thoughts for beneficial consideration. Last year Opposition Members laughed at some of the ideas that I had expounded but they were true, and of course, to their dismay they found out that they were true.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. RADLOFF: — The insidious Mafia of the United States and Canada did have some influence on their thinking.

AN HON. MEMBER: — You cleaned the nation.

MR. RADLOFF: — Mr. Speaker, the sunshine Budget presented to this Legislature by the Hon. Dave Steuart spreads rays of opportunity for all the people of Saskatchewan.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. RADLOFF: — The 1971 Budget as presented by our honest and dependable Provincial Treasurer, Mr. Dave Steuart, is an accomplishment of great magnitude. He is somewhat short in stature, but he stands tall. He stands very tall. He is a pillar of strength to this Government and the people of Saskatchewan.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — True, true.

MR. RADLOFF: — This sunshine Budget was a budget without tax increases, yet a budget providing money for many increased services. For health, education, welfare, agriculture, for increased employment highway construction, money for a program in environmental and pollution control, assistance for students, assistance for municipalities, towns and cities. This 1971 Budget is a budget of glowing promise. It is an indication of the magnificent job being done by Premier Ross Thatcher and his Cabinet.

The people of the north eastern Saskatchewan area know, Mr. Speaker, of the progressive attitude and forward programs of this present Government. This Government has made a stupendous effort to recover from the lost years of CCF (NDP) control and to bring back sound management and sound administration. Mr. Speaker, tremendous efforts by this Liberal Government to meet the needs of the people have brought many benefits. Never before has the area encompassed by the boundaries of the Nipawin constituency had so much consideration as that given by this Government.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. RADLOFF: — Mr. Speaker, our area has new grid roads, new market roads, new highways, new bridges, and are maintained at the highest standards! Of course, of special mention, is the completion this year of Highway 163 linking the community of Carrot River to The Pas, Manitoba. This highway will encourage inter-provincial trade with new markets for agricultural products to the mining areas of the north. Highway 163 opens new frontiers to tourists and sportsmen. The Hon. Dave Steuart is without a doubt the most forward thinking highway builder of his time.

AN HON. MEMBER: — Well done, Davie. Ha, ha.

MR. RADLOFF: — My apologies, the Hon. Dave Boldt is the Minister.

AN HON. MEMBER: — True, true.

MR. RADLOFF: — We have only words of praise and thanks for the Hon. Dave Boldt, words of praise for his recognition of traffic problems, needs and hazards.

Mr. Speaker, industrial development has been encouraged by- the Thatcher Government. All Saskatchewan has benefited. Fantastic growth has taken place in this province. New or expanding industrial developments are under construction in north eastern Saskatchewan. I can say that the people of my constituency have benefited to a vast degree. We have four new alfalfa dehydrating plants under way or finished. The Agra industrial plant for rape seed oil production is being doubled. The live stock marketing and processing facilities are being expanded. There is expansion of seed processing and marketing agencies^ Not only do I have these to mention, but also the development of a peat moss marketing agency and plant over in Carrot River which is going to bring tremendous revenue to that area.

AN HON. MEMBER: — True, true.

MR. RADLOFF: — This is indeed a record for a Liberal Government. Mr. Speaker, I have a friend who was a Member of the CCF and saw the error of his ways.

AN HON. MEMBER: — He writes you every year too.

MR. RADLOFF: — He's just an ordinary person, but he has some very interesting opinions about today's political events. I think Members

March 4, 1971

on the opposite side would like to give consideration to some of his ideas.

AN HON. MEMBER: — Give them to us, Frank.

MR. RADLOFF: — The comments he had, I'm going to give to you somewhat along the lines as he has expounded them to me.

He said he had heard the NDP leader from Regina Centre (Mr. Blakeney) raving over the radio and television that Liberals did nothing. How he thinks us people are so ignorant. Liberals have done more in six years than the NDP did in 20 years.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. RADLOFF: — He says, "I hope the poor NDP souls will be enlightened or turned out to wander in the wilderness". He also stated that it was a very good thing this Liberal Government had made a move to get labor people back to work.

AN HON. MEMBER: — Groovy idea.

MR. RADLOFF: — Strikes serve no useful purpose and will wreck the economy. He thinks that government and labor people could work out a more intelligent way to settle complaints and problems. My thoughtful friend claims that only one to five per cent of workers are Communists. Yet with their control they can tie up all of Canada. He says it is time for honest workers to tell the big United States union bosses to go home.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. RADLOFF: — He says, we don't need those people. They are just trouble makers and "moochers".

AN HON. MEMBER: — Oh yes.

MR. RADLOFF: — Mr. Speaker, my CCF friend wants everybody to work harder than ever to keep the Liberal Government in Saskatchewan.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — True, true.

MR. RADLOFF: — He feels that if we could get Ross Thatcher to Ottawa it would be the salvation of Canada also.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. RADLOFF: — He says that Ross Thatcher is a dynamic individual who could do a great deal for this nation. Mr. Speaker, my friend wants Conservatives and Social Credit supporters to wake up and to help and do their best to defeat the NDP.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. RADLOFF: — Once and for all.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

AN HON. MEMBER: — Yes, once and for all.

MR. RADLOFF: — Put them out to pasture and lock the gate. My friend says Saskatchewan cannot afford an NDP Government.

AN HON. MEMBER: — Good friend;

MR. RADLOFF: — He feels that the Government has had enough problems without having a bunch of ranting raving, long haired, venomous, Wafflers making a mess...

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. RADLOFF: — making a mess of a "darn" good country. He says pioneer people sacrificed much to build this land, worked to make Saskatchewan a marvelous land and does not want it sacrificed to undiscerning people.

AN HON. MEMBER: — You can have only one friend like that.

MR. RADLOFF: — Mr. Speaker, my friends says the people will surely cry if the NDP ever form another government.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. RADLOFF: — He thinks that hard working, honest people will have, to leave Saskatchewan.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Oh yes.

MR. RADLOFF: — If ever such a disaster should befall.

AN HON. MEMBER: — It will never happen, Frank, tell your friend.

MR. RADLOFF: — People do not understand the intent of the NDP to control their lives. My ex-CCF friend says that it's the thorough, hard working people in plain working clothes who can win the next election.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. RADLOFF: — Real thinkers will see that the Liberals win and keep winning. Mr. Speaker, he says he knows what it was like before the utilization fees. He feels that they are a good thing. The best thing that ever happened for the sick and the ill.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

March 4, 1971

MR. RADLOFF: — Before utilization fees it was hard to get into a hospital or to see a doctor or when you did the doctor gave you a bunch of pills and hoped that you survived. The doctors' offices and the hospitals were packed all the time by people who did not need much attention. Sick people had to wait for hours and days to get into the hospital. Now, with utilization fees, you can get a bed in the hospital and see a doctor. Now they really look after you with all the care in the world and it does not cost you very much more, at the very most it can cost a family about \$183 a year.

My CCF friend says that the radicals in the NDP just holler and holler. If not kicking, then they are plotting and scheming.

AN HON. MEMBER: — Those nasty fellows.

MR. RADLOFF: — These people really don't care about people but want control so that they can fill their pockets without working. The only time they care about people is on election day. My friend says he begs people not to be crazy and vote NDP but get off their butts and work hard to keep good old Ross Thatcher and his crew in office.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. RADLOFF: — They are fighting for the best things for the people of this beautiful and glorious land.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. RADLOFF: — Mr. Speaker, my ex-CCF friend is sincerely worried about labor's attitude. He says fanners would be in a lot better cash position if labor people would have more consideration for their fellow Canadians. This man feels that farmers have lost sales in markets resulting from indiscriminate strikes by workers employed in grain-shipping facilities. The biggest Problems farmers have are these grain tie-ups at critical times. Millions of dollars of revenue have gone down the drain.

My friend is really concerned about Socialists. He says he could feel that he was wrong a few years ago. He claims he has read a lot and talked to many people. It appears that every attempt at Socialism has failed. In fact the rivers of Asia and Europe have run red with blood from governments trying to force people to work for the state.

My friend is disgusted about the apparent approval of drugs by some segments of our society. He thinks that all society should take a firm stand against drug peddling. He wants to put drug pushers in jail for life. Isn't it a dirty crime the way our innocent young people are being trapped and led astray. He says he is right behind Mr. Heald and his work to control this scurrilous trade. Helping the young people blow their minds is a work of evil minds perpetrated on their fellow Canadians. He asked me to present each Member of the Legislature with a copy of an article from MacLeans magazine, March issue, stating that Canadians want stiffer drug penalties. I have the copies here and I'll ask the pages to pass these copies around after my speech

I ask each Member of this Legislature to give serious consideration to the contents.

Mr. Speaker, I can say without contradiction that Liberal years under the leadership of Premier Ross Thatcher have been good years for the communities that I represent.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. RADLOFF: — The Indian and Métis people of three communities - Cumberland, Red Earth and Shoal Lake - have been recognized by this Provincial Government with electric power and connecting highways. Telephones are to be installed this year.

Mr. Speaker, not only have our Indian people been provided with new services, but opportunities for farm ownership, increased employment and specialized training have been provided.

The Hon. J. C. McIsaac, Minister of Education, officially opened the newly completed L.P. Miller Comprehensive School in Nipawin. This school makes available many new avenues of educational opportunities for the many young people of that area. The school also provides new opportunities for the training and retraining of adults with technical courses. It is unfortunate, Mr. Speaker, that on the horizon still hangs that black ominous and threatening cloud of state control, regimentation and expropriation .

Mr. Speaker, there is little use for the people of Saskatchewan to kid themselves about the policies, desires and ambitions of our Socialist-minded friends opposite. Many are extremely radical and hold dangerous views, views that could demoralize our efforts and our plans.

Mr. Blakeney, leader of the NDP Party, and Mr. Don Mitchell, leader of the Waffling Wing of the Party, have made their party's position very clear. They stand for the nationalization of all resources, both natural and human. Mr. Speaker, it is to be hoped that the people of Saskatchewan have not forgotten about the unfortunate 20 years of Socialistic experiment when Saskatchewan regressed and not progressed. Twenty years of Socialist experimentation when, during the best years of Canadian history, Saskatchewan fell to the bottom in recognition by the people of Canada for economic development and industrial growth. Then Saskatchewan was wrecked by stagnation, dismay and patronage. How unfortunate, that young men of the calibre of the Member for Kelsey (Mr. Messer) and the Member of Saskatoon-Riversdale (Mr. Romanow) should fall into the clutches of these conniving Wafflers and squafflers.

The Member for Regina South East' (Mr. Baker) is also astray sitting amidst the representatives of continued defeat. It is an unfortunate paradox in our society when rich young men and for that matter young women, organize to destroy a society that has provided benefits that no other society can provide. The best of the world is at their feet for their use and their enjoyment. A responsible and free enterprise system has provided more opportunities, more advancement, more enjoyment, for responsible people than any other political system ever devised and adopted.

March 4, 1971

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. RADLOFF: — Mr. Speaker, it would be well for people to consider the many irresponsible political movements that are being organized for the enslavement of their abilities and their production.

Immorality, permissiveness, sexploitation, violence, revolution, is being encouraged by subversive elements. Peril and disaster can be the lot of innocent careless people. Mr. Speaker, the bird world has its vultures, and so does our world of human endeavor. Our society has its radical lefts, communal folk, society dropouts, the criminal underground, clandestine organizations and people of warped intellect. We have groups or individuals who will use any means to exploit others. Well constructed lies and clever brainwashing do much of the scurrilous work of undermining social progress.

Mr. Speaker, Saskatchewan is fortunate to have a strong, fearless leader in these days of peril and unrest. Premier Ross Thatcher is a good man for the people of Saskatchewan. He is a leader who does not fall for these fallacies spread by the enemies of our society. He is a man of colossal stature recognized for his ability wherever he goes. Premier Thatcher is an honest, forthright man, a man who works long tedious hours to build a solid foundation of advancement for all Saskatchewan citizens. Premier Thatcher wants Saskatchewan to enjoy a rewarding, pleasant, beneficial life.

Mr. Speaker, in particular, Premier Thatcher has recognized the plight of Saskatchewan's native people. This is a clear indication of Premier Thatcher's understanding, sympathy and determination to help all the unfortunate people of our society. There is perhaps one issue and development that I should say a few brief words about - the Prince Albert pulp mill.

Do not let anyone fool you, Mr. Speaker, about the value of the Prince Albert pulp mill to the people of Northern Saskatchewan. I know many men and their families who could not make a decent living before the construction of the pulp mill. Today these same people are enjoying a comfortable living with money in the bank. Millions of dollars of wages are being paid to employees at the mill. I have seen cheques for over \$700 net earnings for two weeks, for two weeks' work in the mill. Not bad pay for a man who wants to work, and I might add, work under almost luxurious conditions and luxurious accommodations. I ask New Democratic Party Members to consider this high wage return earned by bush workers in our day. Restrictive measures against lumbermen allowed only a pittance of return. Mr. Speaker, in fact if I recall correctly, the old CCF Government took over the timber business putting hundreds of operators out of business. Workers and lumbermen had to migrate to Manitoba, Alberta, British Columbia to find work and timber to saw. Our loss, of course, was in particular a gain for Prince George of British Columbia. They say that most of the people who brought prosperity to that city were refugees from the CCF hierarchy in Saskatchewan.

Many people should not swallow the many insinuations spouted by power hungry politicians but consider the assets and liabilities of this great achievement at Prince Albert. The successful completion and operation of the Prince Albert pulp mill is an achievement of immense magnitude. One must consider the

employment provided, the utilization of natural resources and the revenue provided, the employment provided and the future of continued employment for our youth.

I ask all people to consider that possible pollution is being eliminated, to consider all the forests that have been burned, rotted, and gone to waste. Forest control eliminates fire hazards. Clean cutting of forests provides an even regeneration. If one is in doubt as to the value of forest management, he should visit the area and see for himself what is being done. Last summer a tour was arranged for all MLAs and only a couple of Members opposite took the tour and not for a look at the truth, but to be able to come back and spread the gospel of uncertainty.

Mr. Speaker, the Prince Albert pulp mill is bringing opportunity, revenue, progress and development to Saskatchewan. The Athabasca mill and timber complex can do the same thing for the Meadow Lake area.

The Members opposite keep crying sour apples, now that the Liberals have accomplished a seemingly impossible task. Need- less harassment and criticism can only hinder this beneficial enterprise. The timber crop of the north is being turned into a permanent cash crop with efficient management practices. The forest will be protected and utilized for us and our children's benefit.

Mr. Speaker, the NDP platform reveals that present day Socialist thinking is no different from that of the old CCF policies. It is incredible that they should continue to spout the same old archaic, doleful balderdash.

Nationalization of land is first and foremost. Buy up the farms and leave the land to party faithfuls. Mr. Speaker, they want a nationalized industry to provide high salaried jobs for more party faithfuls, to regiment people to provide plums for their faithful followers because they are a covetous people. People of my constituency will easily recall the lease land fiasco of the CCF Party. Farm people who wanted to progress could not buy their leased land. If an ardent CCF Member wanted the land, their lease was cancelled and transferred to the party heeler.

Mr. Speaker, the old CCF ruling executive was Socialist minded but sincere in their beliefs and responsible to their own party members.

Mr. Speaker, the mystery question today is, who plans the policies and programs? Who cracks the whip for the successors of the CCF - our NDP Members across the way? I remind all that labor union bosses have a heavy hand. Their rules are hard and unbending. Their ambitions are unlimited, to the detriment of the rest of society. Their plans would be much more bearable if their policies were of truly Canadian origin. The day is long overdue for Canadian labor people to break away from United States labor unions and United States labor control.

Canadian union people would work for their own interest not pour millions of union funds into the United States union coffers and pay exorbitant salaries to union officials living in Canada.

March 4, 1971

Mr. Speaker, there is one thing for sure, the people of Saskatchewan know where Premier Thatcher stands on the issues of the day. He is a strong man needed to guide a government during this confused and uncertain era. Saskatchewan and Saskatchewan people are his first consideration. Saskatchewan people can be proud of Premier Thatcher and his Government. Obnoxious controls and political manipulation have no place in our society and are detrimental to our well being and advancement. Free enterprise motivated people must work together to provide a solid front against irresponsible political elements.

As I close my remarks I extend an invitation to all friends and former residents of northeastern Saskatchewan to return for a visit during Homecoming '71 celebrations. Come and enjoy our northern hospitality and friendliness in a happy atmosphere, beautiful scenery and a most attractive landscape.

It goes without saying that I will vote against the amendment and support the motion.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. H. H. P. BAKER: (Regina South East): — Mr. Speaker, the remarks of the Member for Nipawin (Mr. Radloff) as referring to his ex-CCF friend or his new CCF friend sounded more like those of an ex-Liberal friend.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. BAKER: — My first remarks in this debate are words of congratulations to those who have assumed greater positions of trust in this Legislature and within their own political parties.

In rising to take part in this debate, each year I find there is a greater destruction of a great province, eradication of our fine humane programs, with people slipping further and further into debt, the disappearance of our smaller urban communities and services such as the closing of post offices, railway stations, and I think our greatest champion in this House for their retention is the Member for Melfort-Kinistino, Art Thibault.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. BAKER: — And also we have seen the great exodus of all time of our good Saskatchewan people. The Government has said it has brought in a balanced budget. Do you realize, Mr. Speaker, that this is the largest deficit budget brought into this House since the Liberals have been in office these past seven years. Actually it is a balanced budget with borrowed money. Let me show you why.

The \$16 million taken from the Power and Telephones really belongs to those public enterprises for further expansion and development.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. BAKER: — Where will it get this extra

\$16 million. It will borrow it and call it a self liquidating debt.

In 1964 this self liquidating debt was \$595 million when the CCF left office. In 1970 it was \$852 million, an increase of \$267 million. Year after year, we have asked to increase the amount for borrowing to expand the Power and Telephone systems. Your inflated figures listed on revenues in this Budget indicate they are really padded. Several more millions will not come into the coffers of the Treasury because there will not be the resurgence in the economy you anticipate.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. BAKER: — These deficits will start to show up in early summer and fall, therefore we can expect an election this spring before it will be known to the public.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. BAKER: — In my remarks today I shall show that the Budget does not contain the answers to solve Saskatchewan's economic and unemployment problems now or in the future. It has been obvious that the Government across the way is doing everything it can to dodge the two main issues, namely, agriculture and unemployment.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. BAKER: — It tossed in the pulp mill early in this session to becloud the issues, to cover up its misdeeds in doing nothing over the past two or three years to solve its agriculture and labor problems, and in driving our farmers off the land and driving our workers out of the urban centres. It is calculated that over 100,000 people left Saskatchewan since this Liberal Government took office.

In 1964 there were 943,000 people in Saskatchewan when we left office. Add the 103,000; Saskatchewan today would have a population of 1,046,000 at least. Had the CCF NDP remained in office this would have been the case.

You can't blame the losses on Regina because we are the only city that showed an increase while Saskatoon has dropped and is still dropping in population. Perhaps it is because Regina had a good mayor for 12 years.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. BAKER: — The only reason why we had a measure of prosperity during its first three and one half years after 1964 was because you had the CCF savings to spend which amounted to millions of dollars in reserve funds, cash and liquidating capital. So when all these savings were gone you then had to embark upon recession and depression policies. First, by putting \$39 million of new taxes on the good people of Saskatchewan in 1968, and in subsequent years you put on a gross total of \$231.5 million in taxes with a net increase of \$134,500,000. Your policies not only caused high increases in taxes but put us into a borrowing

March 4, 1971

position. So what else could this Government do after the CCF savings were gone? It immediately started preaching austerity don't spend, restraint, as the Deputy Leader said, "We are broke . Developers quit spending, people tightened up on the little they had left. The Government directed the Local Government Board to stop approving projects such as schools, and other work programs in our cities, towns and villages. It wouldn't allow anyone to spend to create employment. "There is no money," the Government says. So what happened? Unemployment went up very rapidly in our province, so serious that 100,000 moved away.

When the Government saw things were really desperate, late this fall, it interjected \$17 million into a crash program, or again announced programs which don't seem to come to fruition. Things are serious, it said. Now it has announced a few more programs in this election budget. Heaven knows when and if they will ever begin.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. BAKER: — Mr. Speaker, what should have been done was to put sufficient capital monies into the budget each year so that we could keep our people here instead of having them move to British Columbia, Ontario, Manitoba and Alberta.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. BAKER: — Yes, many of our new Canadians who came in the 1950's have moved back to Europe. Yes, Liberal times are recession an. depression times, we now have less jobs and less people. The Budget brought down this year and I hope it is the election budget, will not solve unemployment and agricultural conditions now or in the future.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear

MR. BAKER: — So much said across the way is geared to degrade the worker and to take away his rights. Their policies are to destroy the family farm. The Task Force has said they will reduce the number of farms from 65,000 to 20,000 or 25,000. They want large corporate and cartel farms, and no doubt, most will be owned and operated by people outside of this province.

Turning back to our working people, the shameful way in which our civil servants of Saskatchewan are being treated by taking their merit increases is typical of this Government not living up to the collective bargaining rights and agreements.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. BAKER: — By this Government continually interfering with signed union agreements, or about to be signed agreements, it has affected the income of our workers, and has affected the financial position of Saskatchewan.

Mr. Farmer, there is nothing for you in this Budget either. All that is being done, Mr. Farmer, today in this Legislature is to use you as they did in years gone by, is to divide you

from the working people. This was their custom before 1944 when the CCF took office. They are trying to keep you divided from the working masses now.

In 1944, in Saskatchewan, the farmer, the worker, the businessman and the professional man, rallied together and we swept the Liberal Government out of office.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. BAKER: — Again we must go arm in arm in this great crusade to do the same at the next election, and we hope it will be in a matter of weeks.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. BAKER: — Mr. Speaker, just as we believe the worker deserves a guaranteed income, so should the farmer have a guaranteed income. As I said before our family farms are being destroyed by this Government and the one in Ottawa. They have put the farmer into debt. They have caused the price of wheat to drop and other farm products, such as was mentioned, 21 cents a pound for hogs - someone told me he got 14 cents a pound this morning. The backbone of our number one industry, namely, farming is the family farm which we must try to preserve. 40 per cent of our wealth in Saskatchewan is created by agriculture. It is looked upon as our billion dollar industry. Agriculture is the back-bone of Saskatchewan, the West and is the wealth and strength of the whole economy for Canada. When the western farmer is broke, the whole of Canada seems to be put into a depression.

Look at Canada today, the worst unemployment we have seen in more than a decade. What is the answer? First let us get rid of the Task Force and its report.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. BAKER: — Next get rid of Otto Lang. Let's lift him out of office, because of his chicken-feed agricultural policy LIFT. Last year several hundreds of millions of dollars were lost to the farmers. We must fight to keep the Wheat Board and orderly marketing. We must give support to doubling the capacity for handling grain over the Hudson Bay Route. We must build large inland terminals to store more grain. We must press for a guaranteed income for farmers with floor prices, not for one year, but for five and ten year periods depending whether it is wheat farming or diversification into livestock.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. BAKER: — This will keep the farmer on the land or in livestock. This will encourage the young men to stay on the farm and many will go back to farming.

What are some of the other ways we can serve the family farm and work towards a guaranteed income? I recommend interest free loans be made available to those interested in farming, particularly the young people who live on the farms now. My

two price system for the sale of wheat would give a good measure for a guaranteed income. I have said here each year the first 2,000 bushels of wheat should be sold at \$2.95 or \$3.00 per bushel, even if it means subsidization. Wheat over the 2,000 bushels could be sold at prevailing rates, with larger productions on a decreasing price scale. This would give the farmer a chance to survive and very few would need to use the advance wheat payment system. Farmers growing grain must know at least five years ahead what they can expect in average income. Those in livestock, 10-year plans must be worked out.

To help industry, I advocated the flour mill at Moose Jaw be opened. This would create work for at least 150 to 200 people and I still say the distribution of flour to our people is a good one. What would be wrong if even free flour was distributed today to those on welfare, on pensions and those on unemployment insurance. And free flour to our Indian and Métis. Why let the grain rot in the field while many of our Saskatchewan citizens are going hungry. Ottawa should buy up at least an extra 200 million bushels of wheat this year to ship to the hungry people of the world or sell it to them on long term credit, without interest, as our contribution toward promoting good world relations.

Only a New Democratic Government will pull us out of this terrible slump.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. BAKER: — Why do I say this? Let's look at what security the CCF gave during those glorious years of government from 1944 to 1964. What programs did they bring in that we in Saskatchewan and in Canada see today? We saw the Homestead Act brought in which protected the farmer and the people living in the cities, towns and villages from losing their homes. This is gradually — being eroded. We gave hospitalization and then full Medicare, now enjoyed by all Canadians. We brought in the Saskatchewan Government Insurance now copied by all provinces across Canada and other countries. We brought in the Air Ambulance known as flights of mercy, now copied by other countries. For the first time in history, we developed and constructed a great highway system. When we took over, I believe there were 10 miles of Liberal black topped roads, and those were impossible to drive on. We did more highway building with the \$25 million in the budget than you are doing with \$65 million today.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. BAKER: — Yesterday, the Minister of Highways castigated some Members on this side of the House for criticizing the Highways Department. If it weren't for this criticism and work by such people as the Member for Redberry, Mr. Michayluk, no work would be done to improve the roads in their ridings. We brought in an Act for Regional Parks and developed most of the recreational centres and resort areas we have today. Hundreds of new schools were built. Many new hospitals were built or extended. So were geriatric centres, nursing homes, hostel accommodation and low rental housing projects. We started the water and sewer programs for towns and villages and farm homes. The Saskatchewan Transportation bus system was established. We built the

successful sodium sulphate plant at Chaplin which encouraged others to start.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. BAKER: — Yes, we built the brick plant at Estevan and we are proud that we did it. We opened the North with Sask Air Lines, practically given away by this Government. What about IPSCO? It was backed and financed by a CCF Government and condemned ruthlessly by the Liberal Members in this House. This steel plant made Regina the steel centre of the province and beyond its borders. Now the Government is continually boasting about it across the nation. We're happy they have seen the light in developing and supporting public enterprises. The cement plant near Regina was financially backed by the CCF. Our great potash industry belongs to the great work of the CCF party.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. BAKER: — Several plants were constructed and opened by the CCF while in office. All plants in Saskatchewan except one were either constructed, planned or on the drawing board while the CCF-NDP were the Government. When we were in office we had 5,800 oil and gas wells able to produce. Mineral revenues in 1944 were only \$233,000 under the present Government. In 1963, they were \$30 million under the CCF. We carried out the natural gas distribution for the majority of people in our province. This Government gave away many of our resource rights in Saskatchewan. Our heritage in this respect is being depleted or destroyed.

What about the Power Corporation? This giant hydro project was built entirely under the CCF. From 1928 to 1944 under the Liberal Government which called it the Commission, it only had 129 customers. When we left it to you in 1964 practically the whole of Saskatchewan was electrified.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. BAKER: — \$10.6 million was put into the Treasury office for this year's Budget. You would almost think by the ads on television and radio that they built the power corporation system.

We expanded and rebuilt the telephone system which gave you over \$5 million for your Budget this year. I could go on and on telling of our CCF programs from 1944 to 1964. The building of a great, and yes, a just and humane society.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. BAKER: — With this Government and at Ottawa, our financial budget positions will always be hit and miss and jeopardized at any time.

This year the Budget contains \$70 for the Homeowner Grant, an increase of \$10. Last year instead of paying \$60, I felt it should have been put up to \$100 or \$110. With a Homeowner Grant of \$70 it doesn't come near what is needed to alleviate

March 4, 1971

The homeowners in urban centres and the farmer from the property tax burden particularly for the cost of education. I advocated in the 1970 Budget Speech that \$150 per year be paid to our pensioners 65 years and over to cover part of the education costs on property. The program the New Democrats have advocated through our capable Leader, of assuming 75 per cent of education cost is a good plan.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. BAKER: — In Regina, only 31 per cent of education costs are borne by the Provincial Government. Think of what it will mean to the taxpayers of this city of Regina when the grants to education in our city will be increased by 44 per cent. This will mean a cut in our education mill rate in Regina of between 25 and 30 mills. The Homeowner Grant should also be made available to those renting homes, suites, and apartments as they pay taxes indirectly too. It is most fitting that because I was the first to advocate homeowner grants in my maiden speech here seven years ago that I have a right to advise the Government and guide it on its proper course.

I was most disappointed to see that the Budget did not contain funds to provide chiropractic services covering at least 75 per cent of the cost. Treatments taken anywhere in Canada should be recognized in Medicare and paid for. This House passed my resolution six years ago by a unanimous vote. I can see now it will never be approved by this Government. I can assure you that I will continue to press for this necessary and vital program until there is full cost coverage under our Medicare Plan. We need a plan now to cover our boys and girls under the age of 16 with a free dental program. This year's Budget should have provided for that. I notice the Health and Welfare Department at Ottawa is talking about a dental plan for children. This can only get underway when provincial governments have taken the first steps. A New Democratic Government would have taken the lead in this several years ago.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. BAKER: — Optical services should not only include eye testing but should cover the cost of glasses too. The Budget gives no indication of this extended and needed service. I also looked for monies to be provided for a drug plan covering our children and pensioners at least.

I thought for sure, Mr. Speaker, the Government would have taken off the cursed deterrent fees for the sick in hospitals.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. BAKER: — For doctors' office visits and doctors' home calls. With the millions of dollars you received from Ottawa you should also have taken off the \$72 per family Medicare premiums. This is what our Government in Saskatchewan must work toward if we really want to call our Medicare Plan free. I will work toward eventually doing away with deterrent fees and Medicare premiums. I will continue to advocate that full old age pensions today should be paid to all pensioners without a means test, not a

measly \$80 per month, oh yes, a 42 cent increase. The \$135 per month or whatever figure they are talking about in Ottawa should be paid to all pensioners. I want to say most emphatically that we as a Legislature should be pressing to reduce the age to 60 from 65 for pensions under the Canada Pension Plan. Many are saying we should pension men off at 60 and women at 55. I would certainly support this step. This would alleviate the unemployment situation across this country and give many of our young people an opportunity to get jobs for the first time. This would certainly be better than putting hundreds of thousands of our people on welfare.

What about welfare assistance? Last year I asked this House to provide a \$30 per month increase for food, clothing and shelter for those on social assistance. The modest increases to be given this year are much too low. More must be provided to meet the higher cost of living these people have been faced with and forced on them these past five years.

Increases in the 1971-72 Budget show that modest amounts were provided for our two major cities. Police 50 cents, persons on snow removal 50 cents, library 10 cents, health 15 cents, making a total grant this year of only \$181,000 for the year, or \$1.18 per person. Calgary, last year, got from the Edmonton Government \$23 per person or \$10 million as an unconditional grant to that city. I have been asking for a \$10 or \$12 per capita grant for years for our community. SUMA requested it. Regina at \$10 would get \$1,450,000. All the present Government have given is \$451,000, \$3.15 per person, so again, you are \$1 million short on unconditional grants we've been asking for the past seven years.

More should have been put in the Budget if we are to achieve and complete construction of the buildings at the University planned and to be completed by 1974. We are now \$30 million behind in construction on our University site in Regina. We must work toward assuming costs of tuition fees for students attending university and living in Saskatchewan. At least the first three years should be looked at for free tuition.

I had hoped the Government would have provided the means to set up a university board and senate for Regina Campus. Complete autonomy here is the only answer for a well run university. Our faculty members and students must have the independence they deserve and it is the only way to community participation.

The grant of \$500 toward homes for winter construction is not sufficient. This plan should be broadened so that those who build apartment blocks or other dwellings be given a grant toward each suite or related living quarters.

What about the power house? I had hoped the Budget would have provided capital funds to build a new power house for our city and locate it perhaps near our oxidation pond area. The agreement calls for the removal of this plant to another location. The people living in the area of the power plant deserve that something be done immediately to be relieved of noise and air pollution. You got our city plant for a song, your profits this year were high, of which you took \$10.6 million into revenue. I would say that \$4 million of that was made from our former city light and power system. I call on the Government to build a \$30 million new plant now adjacent to our city.

March 4, 1971

The Budget should also contain an amount of money to pay back the \$400 for each farmer who put in electricity. You promised this in 1964 as one of your main platform planks.

To sum up, we need more funds in this Budget to promote industry for public, private and co-operative enterprises. Less monies have been put in for capital programs. There is no guaranteed income for the farmers and you have done nothing to help seek markets for farm products. There is no guaranteed income for the wage earner. You have done nothing in this Budget to raise pensions above the \$80 per month and you have done nothing to get Ottawa to do something either. You should have given greater increases per month for those on welfare. Unemployment will continue to grow and the farm economy will continue to drop thus killing our business in smaller communities.

This Budget will not solve the problems facing our economy in Saskatchewan but is generating another 1930 depression. Yes, the coined phrase, "Liberal times are hard times", has come true again. The people of Saskatchewan now believe us in what we say. An election will bring a change in government to the New Democrats. Let's hope that it will be real soon. People of Saskatchewan are waiting, oh so patiently, to defeat this Government.

I support the amendment.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. E. I. WOOD: (Swift Current): — In entering this debate, Mr. Speaker, I too should first like to compliment the Hon. Member for Regina Centre (Mr. Blakeney) on his election to Leadership of the Opposition in this House.

Mr. Woodrow Lloyd held this position with dignity and ability and his will be hard shoes to fill. However, I believe- that the Hon. Member from Regina Centre is qualified to do just that if any Member in this House is.

I should like to congratulate the Hon. Member from Saskatoon Riversdale (Mr. Romanow) on his appointment as Deputy Leader. I am sure that he will fill that position with distinction, Mr. Speaker, bringing to it both his great ability and his personal charm. I should also like to congratulate the Hon. Member from Last Mountain (Mr. MacLennan) on his appointment as Minister of Labour.

One thing, Mr. Speaker, that I should like to commend in this Budget is that it promises the establishment of the Chinook Regional Library. This will be greeted with a good deal of satisfaction by the people of the Swift Current area.

A dedicated group of men and women have worked to line up the necessary support in the municipalities in that part of the province to make such a library possible. It is hoped that the support so arranged has not been lost while we waited for the Government to provide the necessary funds to start the project. But they are made available in this Budget and we wish the very best for the Chinook Regional Library.

Like some other Members in this debate, Mr. Speaker, I should like to say something about taxes. Taxes used to be a

favorite topic of the Premier when he was leader of the Opposition. I recall a speech he made in the 1964 session and I should like to quote a bit from that speech.

"Mr. Speaker, I assure the House and the people of Saskatchewan that if the Liberals form a Government next June, one of our primary, consistent, and determined purposes will be major tax reductions."

No one likes paying taxes. At that time provincial taxes were 6.9 per cent of income. This sounds like, and it was, a lot of money. I should like you to mark that figure because I may have something more to say about it later - 6.9 per cent of the provincial income.

In the 1964 election, the Liberals promised to reduce taxes, provincial and municipal as well as school taxes. During their first term of office, they claimed to have kept that promise. In a speech made in the Budget Debate of 1967, I endeavored to show, and I think conclusively, that while it had reduced some taxes, others had increased with the net result that taxes had increased considerably under the Liberals to that point in three years under Liberal rule, the people of the Province had paid some \$32 million more than they would have if tax rates had remained as they were under the CCF.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. WOOD: — But the Liberal Party went to the people of Saskatchewan in the fall of 1967, Mr. Speaker, saying that it had reduced taxes and all was well in Saskatchewan. It bragged about the new Saskatchewan. Well, there is no doubt that property taxes in those years increased from \$104 million in 1964 to \$137 million in 1967 - an increase of \$33 million. Even subtracting the \$8.5 million which was received in Homeowner Grants in 1966 there was an increase of some \$24.5 million in property taxes. Provincial taxes increased from 6.9 per cent - and I should like you to mark this, Mr. Speaker - of personal income in 1963 to 8.8 per cent of personal income in 1967 - an increase of nearly 2 per cent of the total personal income in the province. As I said at that time the province just couldn't afford much more of this kind of Liberal tax cuts. While it was talking about tax reductions it was actually increasing the taxes in the province by an increase from 6.9 per cent of personal income to 8.8 per cent. We said that we couldn't afford many more tax cuts of this kind. We got them, Mr. Speaker. The ink was scarcely dry on the election returns in 1967, before the Liberals changed their tune on all being well in Saskatchewan and began admitting part of the truth and actually talked about raising taxes. In the 1968 session it raised all taxes in the book except income and corporation taxes and last year it even raised income taxes. It even put a tax on the sick, Mr. Speaker, with the result that in 1970 provincial taxes were 11.6 per cent of personal income. Out of every dollar that the people of Saskatchewan earned in 1970, the Provincial Government took 11.6 cents, over 4 1/2 cents and 65 per cent higher than the percentage taken in 1963 by the former CCF Government. A 65 per cent rise in the amount of the provincial income taken by the Government.

Now please don't get me wrong, Mr. Speaker. I am well aware

March 4, 1971

that taxes are a necessary evil. If we are to have services and worthwhile programs we have to pay for them. What I have objected to is the Liberals promising to reduce taxes and saying that it had, while all the time it was raising taxes. I believe in calling a spade a spade and not a tax reduction.

MR. ROMANOW: — 1,400 new taxes;

MR. WOOD: — That's right, Mr. Deputy Leader. Since the Liberals came to office in Saskatchewan there has not only been a drastic increase in provincial taxes, but also in property taxation. They talked about how high property taxation was under the CCF and promised that they would reduce it. In the last five years under the CCF, Mr. Speaker, property taxes in Saskatchewan had increased by four mills or eight tenths of a mill a year. In the first five years under the Liberals, property tax increased by 16 mills or 3.2 mills per year, just exactly four times the rate of increase.

Mr. Speaker, in the political speech that passed for a Budget address, the Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Steuart) said that in this Budget, the Government had taken positive action to take the local tax load off property and place it on the broader provincial tax base. This is a commendable project which has needed doing for a long time. But I doubt if this Budget will actually accomplish much along this line.

In the 1967 election program, the Liberals' second promise was to continue local tax relief by increasing the Homeowner Grant with a minimum objective of \$100 annually. As a political gambit, where every homeowner got a personal cheque from the Premier, the Homeowner Grant program may have been highly successful, but so far as being an effective tax relief, the \$50 Homeowner Grant has failed dismally.

In 1966, the first year that the Homeowner Grants were given they amounted to some \$8 million in total. The amount of the raise in property taxes in that year amounted to \$10.5 million, a short fall of some \$2.5 million by the Homeowner Grants in keeping abreast of rising property taxation. But aside from its political overtones and its failure to help renters it was a step in the direction of alleviating the property tax load.

The next year there was another increase of \$13.5 million in taxes to a total increase of some \$24 million since the Homeowner Grant was started. There was an increase of only somewhat less than \$400,000 in the Homeowner Grant. It failed entirely to keep up with the increase in taxes.

In 1968 there was another increase of \$12.5 million in property taxation making a total tax increase of \$36,700,000 since the starting of the Homeowner Grants. But there was only another increase of less than \$120,000 in Homeowner Grants this year. In 1969 an increase of \$13 million in property taxation. Local taxpayers were now paying \$50 million per annum, more than they were when Homeowner Grants started, but Homeowner Grants were still only \$8,800,000. You can't really call this holding the line.

Since the inception of the Homeowner Grant program, Mr. Speaker, property owners had paid by 1969 in increased property taxes a total of over \$87 million more than they had received in Homeowner Grants. You can't call this holding the line at all on taxation.

We do not have any figures on taxation increases in 1970. We won't have for another year, but if they are of the nature of these we have had in the last few years, the extra \$10 given in Homeowner Grants given last year amounting to some \$2 million in total, will have little effect in stemming the inexorable march of property taxation in this province.

Coming to the statements in this Budget address regarding action to take the load off property taxation, I note that the Homeowner Grant has been raised another \$10. The Liberals had promised a minimum of \$100 in this term of office and it would have taken at least that much to have had any effect on the growth of property taxation. Property taxation has been increasing at an average rate of over \$13 million per year. Another \$1.9 million in Homeowner Grants will certainly be inadequate to hold down the increase in taxation.

There are however, several ways in which this Budget proposes to lift the tax burden off property owners, one of the largest of these is the increase of \$8,300,000 in grants to schools. Listening to the Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Steuart) tell it, this sounds like real assistance to the taxpayers of the province. One, however, must realize that during the years that I have just discussed in showing how Homeowner Grants have failed to hold down tax increases, school grants had risen by an average of \$7 million a year, but the average property tax increase during these years is some \$12.5 million even after the increased aid to education was applied. Increases in the aid to education in 1967 were over \$11 million. But in spite of this, property, taxes rose that year by over \$13.5 million. If there was an increase of \$13.5 million in 1967 in spite of an increase of \$11 million in school grants, I fear an increase of \$8.3 million in this year's Budget will not be adequate to hold them.

There are other items of increased assistance to municipalities in the Budget, also some decreases. Counting the increase in school grants which is \$900,000 more than the average for the last five years, the \$1.9 million increase in Homeowner Grants, increased aid for police protection, urban snow removal, municipal equalization, health and library services, I see increased aid to municipalities of some \$4 million. This is all very good, Mr. Speaker. I am certainly not criticizing the Government for this increase in assistance, but in view of the inexorable march of increases in property taxes in the last few years of \$12.5 million per year, I am afraid that the pious hope by the Provincial Treasurer that this Budget will help municipalities to cut- back their mill rates is just that, a pious hope, with no justification in fact.

The Provincial Government has indeed taken steps to endeavor to hold down the increase in education costs but it seems to me that it has gone about it the wrong way. Instead of doing away with guidance counsellors and librarians in the schools, they should have a hard look at the building of so many expensive comprehensive schools which when all is said, do not fit any technical student to take a job. He must still go to a technical

March 4, 1971

school and as nearly as I have been able to ascertain what he has learned in the composite school will not go far toward helping him to get a journeyman's certificate.

In a television broadcast a few evenings ago, the Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Steuart) upheld the practice of taking Sask Tel and the Saskatchewan Power Corporation earnings into revenue, saying that this had also been done by the former CCF Government. Insofar as Sask Tel is concerned this is true. For years, trans-Canada tolls, that is long distance charges crossing provincial boundaries, were divided on a basis of cost for each telephone system. The formula for cost included cost of capital in which was included not only interest but also dividends paid. Thus if Saskatchewan Government Telephones as it was then called, paid dividends to the Saskatchewan Government it thereby increased the cost of its money and got a larger share of the long distance charges. If it did not pay dividends to the Government it would be making a contribution to the private enterprise companies in other provinces which paid dividends to their private shareholders.]

It was good management, Mr. Speaker, good business management in looking after the best interests of the people of the province for the former CCF Government to have the Saskatchewan Government Telephones pay dividends to the Government. However, I understand that the formula for sharing trans-Canada tolls has now been changed and the payment of dividends to the Government no longer increases Saskatchewan's share. They are now simply a tax upon the telephone users without any redeeming features and should be discontinued.

There never has been any excuse for having the Saskatchewan Power Corporation pay dividends to the Government and the CCF Government never did collect any such dividends. Instead of running up big profit figures and taxing the users of power, we periodically reduced rates so that power users were getting the power as nearly as possible at cost.

I believe the only reduction in power rates since the Liberals came to office was in regard to cheaper power for curling rinks. This was much appreciated by curlers who had artificial ice, but it could scarcely be called an across the board power reduction.

This Government, instead of reducing power rates, has in its last five Budgets, budgeted for a total of \$30.2 million from the Power Corporation alone which is nothing more or less than a tax on the power users of the province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. WOOD: — In looking at Power Corporation reports, the amount taken in the first three years of such dividend taking was not the \$10 million authorized in the Budgets, but actually it shows that the Government took \$14,600,000. So we don't really know what the final takings by the Government may be. It may be considerably more than the \$30.2 million authorized by the Legislature.

I should also like to say something about the farm situation, Mr. Speaker. The Government, for years, has persistently looked on the bright side of the farm picture, putting the best face

on a bad situation and hoping for better things around the corner. There is some merit in this, Mr. Speaker. It is not good to be a calamity howler. This is a next year man's country and Saskatchewan has not become the province that it is by its people being faint hearted. But there is also such a thing as facing up to the facts as they are. If Saskatchewan farmers are going through a difficult time, nothing is gained by shutting our eyes to that fact but instead we should publish the facts and force the powers that be, in this case the Federal Government, to recognize them too.

Not long ago a Member of Parliament asked me what the situation was back on the farm. I found it rather difficult to answer. Farmers are not too prone to talk about their affairs. But I have in the last few months, Mr. Speaker, taken a hard look at things and decided that they are not all well down on the farm. For example, in my own case, my own farm income is down in 1970 by a third and that third was the profit.

If you take a look at the White Paper which the Government put out in January of this year, it has some things to say about agriculture which I should like to read into the record;

Total farm cash receipts should reach \$726 million in 1970, approximately the same level as 1969. The number of bushels of grain delivered in 1970 was almost 40 per cent greater than in 1969. Receipts from the sale of grain were only up 22.6 per cent, however, because of the lower final payments and lower unit prices. Cattle marketings are down substantially from 1969 due to herd buildup. However, because of higher prices, cash receipts will be up about 6.7 per cent. Hog marketings were up over 57 per cent.

They didn't say anything about the price.

Thus total receipts from the sale of livestock and products should increase approximately 13 per cent in 1970. Actual cash receipts have not increased even though receipts from the sale of grains and livestock are up substantially. This is due to repayment of Canadian Wheat Board cash advances borrowed in previous years. In 1970 Saskatchewan farmers paid back about \$55 million more than they borrowed but as of December 31st they still had some \$75 million outstanding.

During 1970 total operating and depreciation charges will increase about \$9 million. Realized net incomes will thus be \$192 million as compared to \$195 million in 1969.

This doesn't sound like such a bad picture except it says that we're down \$3 million in net income from last year. But when you turn back to the financial and economic picture in a Paper put out by the Saskatchewan Government in July of 1969 you find it reads as follows:

Although the wheat crop harvested in 1968 was almost 10 per cent larger than that of 1967, the value of wheat harvested was down 7.5 per cent because of the poorer quality of the grain. This was the main determinant in the decline in net agriculture production. Farm cash income was down 6.9 per cent from 1967 to \$905 million

March 4, 1971

primarily because of poor wheat sales. Because of these two factors plus increased operating and depreciation charges, realized farm net income was also down to \$415 million, a decline of 16.3 per cent from 1967.

Mr. Speaker, they were at that time bemoaning the fact that farm net income was down by 16.3 per cent to \$415 million. Well, you make a comparison of the two. They were complaining that it was down to \$415 million but in the last two years it has been less than half of that. And it was less than half of that in 1969 and it was down lower again in 1970.

Mr. Speaker, I think this shows what the actual situation in the province is. This is surely understandable when quotas are cut from eight bushels per specified acre - as they were in 1966-67 - plus a special quota of five bushels per seeded acre of wheat - was cut from that to four bushels per specified acre as it was in 1969-70. Prices for No. 2 in the elevator were cut from \$1.77 per bushel to \$1.27 per bushel with not much hope of any further final payment. You can see how this drastic cut in farm income came about.

Speaking of the farmers' position, I should like to read part of a newspaper clipping that was passed on to me by a reeve of one of our municipalities. It was taken from the Leader-Post of January 12, 1971. The headline is "Farmer Tied Up With Debt" by Mr. George Smellie, Leader-Post Ottawa editor, Ottawa:

It is virtually impossible for the average prairie grain farmer to clear himself of debts with the expected increase in grain sales this year.

In fact, the best Mr. Average Farmer might hope for is to get back into a position where he can go further into debt.

Things have been so bad for the Canadian farmer generally and Prairie farmers in particular, in the last couple of years, that the rate at which they were piling up debts earlier in the sixties slowed down drastically.

They are getting so poor they can't even borrow.

Farm figures for 1970 are far from complete yet but those that are available indicate decreased borrowings by farmers under a variety of government involved programs and even a drop in total indebtedness in some of them. But inability to pay off old debts probably more than offset lower borrowings in the opinion of Dr. Ron S. Rust one of the best informed men in Canada on the subject of farm credit. He is an economist with the Farm Management Division of the Department of Agriculture

This being from Ottawa, I would assume that was the Federal Department of Agriculture.

and emphasized that statistics just aren't available...

Some individual farmers may be able to get themselves out of debt, he suggested in an interview, but mostly he expected this to be a year of recovering from the

difficulties of the last couple of years. This would mean paying off some debts, those where pressure to pay is greatest, and looking after operational needs for the coming season

The experience of the last couple of years has given many farmers a scare, he said, and he would expect them to be more cautious about future expansion

If total farm indebtedness increased in 1970, Dr. Rust felt it would be due to difficulty in repaying debts that came due then. He said there would likely have been a reduction in new borrowings.

Repayment of debts due then and coming due now would likely be amongst the first demands made on the increased income farmers can expect from boosted grain exports in the current crop year.

This, Mr. Speaker, I think is a very good picture of what the farm situation is, that the farm debt situation is such that they find that they cannot even face up to borrowing more money for much needed expansion.

Mr. Speaker, even though the last annual report of the Department of Agriculture shows that marketings of cattle in Saskatchewan continue to drop off as compared to those when the CCF was the Government, I think that the picture for agriculture in Saskatchewan would be worse were it not for the diversification that we have. I am in favor of diversification but I think the Government should look ahead in fostering diversification, give fair market prognostications and take more responsibility in finding markets and fair prices for those who follow their advice.

What about the future for farming in Saskatchewan? In a hungry world that needs our products the future should be bright for agriculture. But need is not effective demand. However, I do believe that an aggressive and enlightened sales policy with proper credit arrangements could help out our market situation in regard to wheat and other grains.

A Wheat Board report which I have here, Mr. Speaker, for January 25, 1971 shows grain sales in the crop year 1970 were 640 million bushels as compared to 340 million in 1969. This looks rather hopeful so far as grain sales were concerned in this last year. It shows the wheat exports of 423 million compared to 273 million in 1969. These are hopeful signs.

Forecasts by the Federal Government indicate that in this current crop year, deliveries will total some 710 million bushels down from the 731 million bushels delivered in the 1969-70 crop year. This is more than either this present year or last year by a few million bushels.

In general this is not much of a change from what had taken place in the 1970 calendar year. In fact it's a reduction in regard to the wheat and flax deliveries.

The Federal Task Force on agriculture expects wheat exports of some 380 million bushels in 1980 which is down from the average of 415 million bushels in the last ten years. They are

March 4, 1971

expecting in 1980 that there will be 380 million bushels of wheat exported. This may be a realistic outlook, Mr. Speaker, but it is not exceptionally bright.

This Federal Task Force has also recommended some policies for Canadian agriculture to which our Deputy Leader (Mr. Romanow) has referred gently from time to time in this debate. I have heard him say things about it.

MR. R. ROMANOW: (Saskatoon-Riversdale): — Yes, it's the Liberal farm policy document, Everett.

MR. WOOD: — One is that they are proposing to make Canadian agriculture independent of government help. They also talk about increasing the farmers' efficiency. With this I can see nothing wrong, Mr. Speaker. But I do want to say that if other industries in Canada were as efficient as the farming industry they might not need all that tariff protection

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. WOOD: — that costs the people of Canada many, many millions of dollars a year in added costs to what they have to buy while farm products are sold on the international market not only in competition with producers in other countries but with the treasuries of those countries.

The report recommends larger, probably corporate farms with emphasis on better management and more hired labor. It envisages the reduction of the farm population in Canada from 9.8 per cent of the total population in 1966 to 3 or 4 per cent of total population in 10 or 15 years. I believe that's a reduction of taking two out of three off the farms. I believe I have heard that said here.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. WOOD: — The report, Mr. Speaker, recommends seeding huge acreages in Western Canada down to grass and shipping feeder cattle to the United States for finishing. I think it would make much better sense to finish our cattle here thus providing employment and markets for our own feed grains.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. WOOD: — This report, Mr. Speaker, is written by economists and accountants. There wasn't a farmer or sociologist in the group. I didn't say Socialist, I said sociologist. It purports to be good for Canada economically but even this I doubt. Taking people off the farms and bringing them into cities may not be good even economically. And what about the social results? The denuding of our countryside of population would mean the end of our small towns, schools, churches, curling clubs and like institutions.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. WOOD: — Also the end of the family farm and a very acceptable way of life as we have known it. If present trends continue and the policies of the Task Force are implemented, we shall see many farmers who have made a good living and have been well respected members of the community for decades, forced to quit and leave the farm.

And what perturbs me is that the Federal Government seems to be taking steps to fall in line with the Task Force recommendations. The policy of doing away with assistance for grain storage is one such instance. In the long run it might be as well for the farmer to deliver his grain as needed instead of paying storage charges but in the short run it is just one more blow to his present plight by forcing him to cutback on deliveries while the grain marketing pipeline is being cleaned out.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. WOOD: — The income stabilization plan based on 80 per cent of past income and supported by 3 per cent levy on grain deliveries is another. In the first place, Mr. Speaker, it is based on a reduction of income and making the farmer pay this 3 per cent levy is paying his own way with a vengeance. Three per cent is bad enough but this is of the gross and in many years this could amount to as much as one-tenth or a quarter of the farmer's net income. And while the Federal Government is playing along with the Task Force recommendations that would effectively abolish the family farm, the Government opposite is playing along with the Federal Government.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. WOOD: — True, Mr. Speaker, grain marketings are a Federal concern but in times when the shadow of extinction is hanging over the farming industry as we know it, the Government opposite should be giving leadership and fighting for the farmer.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. WOOD: — This it is not doing, Mr. Speaker. I will support the amendment and vote against the motion.

MR. W. A. FORSYTH: (Saskatoon Nutana South): — Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to have the opportunity of taking part in this rather wide ranging Budget Debate because there are several topics that I should like to discuss and all of them are related in some way to finance.

I want to talk about the philosophy of the Budget itself and about its impact on life in Saskatchewan. Then I want to say a few words about local government and a bit about the Federal proposal for a Canada Development Corporation. And then, Mr. Speaker, if any are left to listen, I should like to point out to some of the Members who sit on your left, the folly of their ways.

Let us turn now to the Epistle of St. David - St. David

March 4, 1971

Steuart, that is. The Epistle of St. David (Steuart) to the Philistines as it is recorded in the Budget Speech for 1971.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. FORSYTH: — And if we turn to page 4 we shall find the words that can be taken as a text for any discourse on Liberalism in Saskatchewan. The words of the text are: "We promised common sense business-like approach to government and we delivered."

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. FORSYTH: — Just as the words of the Holy Writ do not always fall on ears that wish to hear, neither do the words of our modern saint David always receive the welcome they deserve. Let us repeat that text, "We promised a common sense business-like approach to government and we delivered".

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. FORSYTH: — This is a common sense Budget. Thinking in terms of the past performances of his own party, the financial critic of the NDP (Mr. Romanow) expected it to be full of promises to spend money which we don't have. I don't really know why his mind works the way it does but the Member from Riversdale, the financial critic was so surprised by the continuation of our common sense approach that he couldn't find a plausible phrase to describe it so in desperation he labelled it a "bogus budget".

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. FORSYTH: — Can you imagine the leader of a wholly dedicated party, a wholly dedicated Socialist party, labelling as "bogus" a Budget which devotes 57.5 per cent of its expenditures to education, to health and to welfare? Can you imagine him having the nerve to try to tell farmers and travellers, and proprietors of tourist related business operations, that expenditures on good roads and highways are bogus expenditures?

Imagine him quoting - I am really amazed at this - imagine him quoting out of date statistics to run down his own home town. He bad mouths it into a feeling of depression. He says that there is a 20 per cent vacancy rate in the housing in Saskatoon. Now the 20 per cent vacancy rate to which he so proudly refers applied to all housing in Saskatoon, while actually it was the apartment vacancy rate at the end of the 1969 construction season. On January 8, 1971 Central Mortgage and Housing made a count of 4,250 apartment units in Saskatoon and found a vacancy rate of just under 10 per cent. This is not unusual in a situation following a period of great expansion.

Imagine belonging to a party which advocates public ownership of almost everything and then decrying as the Deputy Leader of the Opposition did, the payment of dividends from the Saskatchewan Power Corporation and Sask Tel to the people of Saskatchewan who own them. And incidentally, have considerable more equity in them than they did in the days of the NDP administration.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. FORSYTH: — You'll pardon us, Roy, if we don't hold our breath waiting for the explanation of the financial magic that can deliver such things as 100 per cent government grants for education without drawing dividends from Crown corporations, and these are the types of corporations in which you propose to invest hundreds of millions of dollars of people's money as you expand them to include things like the potash industry. I'm afraid I might have over taxed the imagination of Members of this House by asking them to believe that any man in a responsible position can say the things that the number two man in the NDP has said. Nevertheless, the records show that he has said them. Unfortunately, I find myself becoming rather hardened to this type of insincerity, but I hope it will not cause other Members to become cynical. Above all, I hope that the people who look at this Legislature for leadership will not be disillusioned by such a display of intellectual dishonesty as has been put on by the financial critic, and it has been echoed on so many occasions by his colleagues. Perhaps we should pause now and seek reassurance in the truth of the text which I quoted at the beginning, "We Liberals promised a businesslike approach to government and we have delivered it".

Now, the Member for Regina South East (Mr. Baker) who is an expert on borrowing complains that the Saskatchewan Power Corporation has been borrowing. Now I might point out that it has been borrowing at very favorable rates. Now we find that he is complaining also, in the next breath, that local governments have been discouraged from borrowing and they have been discouraged from borrowing because the rates at which they could borrow were absolutely prohibitive. And it is the type of borrowing that he is advocating from municipal governments which will be a part of a legacy of the next two or three generations of citizens of the city of Regina. I'm afraid this is what they will remember, the financial wizardry of the Member of Regina South East (Mr. Baker) - they will remember him for the wizardry that he showed in handling the finances of this city.

Part of the interesting thing about the party to your left, Mr. Speaker, is the absolute dichotomy which it shows. Following the speech of the Member from Regina South East, the Member for Swift Current (Mr. Wood) arose and after the Member for Regina South East had advocated spending to an amount which would almost double our present Budget, obviously increasing their taxation by the same amount, the Member for Swift Current represented rather a more common sense point of view when he got up and decried any increases in taxation. Now I don't know whether these two people get together or not but I sometimes hope that they don't because as long as there is that type of division in the party opposite, there is no opportunity for them to occupy the treasury benches.

Increased grants to both rural and urban municipalities are represented in this Budget and they will be most welcome, insofar as they help to bring the property tax under control. The \$8 million increase in grants to school districts when added to the record \$11 million increase of last year, should enable most school boards to maintain or reduce their mill rates. This along with the increase in the Homeowner Grants is a most acceptable and practical short term answer to a problem that

March 4, 1971

must eventually receive a long term solution. If the trend keeps moving towards higher and more specific contributions from Provincial to local governments, regardless of political party in power, the eventual outcome will be the loss of local autonomy.

Our cities -and this is what you Members opposite are advocating more and more, don't forget you advocated 100 per cent control of the expenses of education by the Provincial Government -are being placed in a position of having to grow ever larger to keep up the industrial portion of their mill rates. Thus, instead of spreading our industries around, they are being urged to concentrate in three or four cities. This process has caused complicated pollution problems in other parts of the world and we should take a very good look at our neighbors in Eastern Canada and in the United States before we go about encouraging uncontrolled growth in Regina and in Saskatoon. We still have time to study the situation dispassionately but eventually our time will run out.

In the Budget Debate of a year ago, I devoted considerable time to taking a look at the need for an examination of the basic organization of local government in Saskatchewan. In other words, the need to consider some form of regional authority. At that time I created about as much enthusiasm on both sides of the House as a power tobogganist on a ski run. Outside the House there was a bit more interest but since across Canada at least four Provincial administrations of all political stripes have gone down to defeat, in part at least, because of their attempts to rationalize their local governments, I am certainly not suggesting to our Premier that he embark headlong on any such program. Rather, I am asking the people involved, the people who are involved in local government to rethink their positions. From what I have observed, it is a foregone conclusion that no administration will act in this area unless it has a virtual mandate from the Saskatchewan Association of Rural Municipalities, Saskatchewan Urban Municipal Association, Saskatchewan Trustees' Association and the Saskatchewan Hospital Association. I am convinced, Mr. Speaker, that there is no conscious empire building by the Provincial Government, but rather there is an exercise of power by default. It is my feeling that this will increase in direct proportion to the truth of the saying that "he who pays the piper calls the tune". It is also my firm belief that a monolithic central government is not in the best interest of good administration for this Province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. FORSYTH: — Insofar as the cities are concerned, we shall look forward with interest to their participation with the Federal and Provincial Governments in attempting to define a constitutional basis for municipal government at a conference which I understand will be held later this year.

Speaking of the Federal Government, I should think that both sides of the House might be a bit concerned about the proposal by the Federal Government to create a Canada Development Corporation. Not being an economist or financier, I expect that my ideas on the subject are overly simplistic. However, it is my understanding that the Federal Government is about to

create a "conglomerate" using several existing Federal companies such as Polymer Corporation as a base. The Board of Directors will be men of substance and acumen well insulated from the Government. At a suitable time, with monies furnished by the Federal Government, the company will expand, and will "go public", offering shares to the people of Canada. Always its investments would be in Canada, by Canadians and for Canadians, a beautiful slogan for any company, but will it work?

Our friends, the Socialists across the way will say that this does not go far enough. In their minds the company should be completely in the hands of the Government. With this objection of course, I cannot agree. My own objection is that we shall be creating a situation in which faithful businessmen shall be asked to operate with the equivalent of having one hand tied behind their backs. For instance, what if the prudent business move happens to be to expand by going into foreign markets with plants and investment capital? Will the directors of the Canada Development Corporation go as diplomats or will they go as businessmen? And what if the market value of the common stock in Canada Development Corporation goes down just before an election? Will any Government, regardless of its politics, resist the temptation of buying in to support the price? Will businessmen avoid the temptation of "selling short" under some circumstances which can be imagined? There are certainly some theoretical attractions to this scheme, but if we want so desperately to keep Canadian money at home, might it not be better to offer greater incentives to Canadians to invest in Canadian enterprises, while at the same time offering relief to developers of such enterprises.

Mr. Speaker, this Budget is obviously built around the type of development of our resources which we see in the Prince Albert pulp mill, and to which we look forward in the Athabasca mill, and the Wollaston Lake development. It is also predicated upon the normalization of our agricultural industry. It is a Budget which anticipates the future growth of Saskatchewan in a spiritual as well as in a physical sense for it offers much in the fields of education and personal services as well as in highways and industries. In other words, the environment of the mind as well as that of the body receives due attention. Frankly, it is beyond me how a man like the Member from Regina North East (Mr. Smishek) can stand in his place and suggest that there may well be more jobs lost by the pulp mills than there are created by them. If he will take a look at the average family income of the residents of our northern reserves and our broad northern areas and compare it to that which he expects to obtain for his fellow unionists at the bargaining table, I am sure that the implication of his statement will be shocking even to him.

Mr. Speaker, if I may repeat the text once more, "We promised a common sense businesslike approach to Government and we delivered". I will support the motion and oppose the amendment.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. F. MEAKES: (Touchwood): — Mr. Speaker, in rising to speak on this Budget Debate, may I say to the Member who just sat down, although I don't agree with much of what he said, I congratulate him for at least thinking about some of the problems of social change that may have to come about in years to come. I give him credit for it.

March 4, 1971

I had hoped the Minister of Highways (Mr. Boldt) might be in his seat - he was sitting here and I regret very much he walked out - because I wanted to comment on a few of his remarks yesterday when he entered the debate. I could not help but think of the Biblical term "Take the mote out of thine own eye". He talked of the hate that he heard in the voices of the Members of the Opposition. I was amazed because it seemed to me that I heard that same tone of hatred and venom and sarcasm in his voice. I can assure him that I do not hate him nor any other Member over there. When one hates he destroys himself. And I can assure him that his sarcastic answer yesterday to a civil question that I asked him when he sat down doesn't hurt me, it only hurts himself.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. MEAKES: — I want to say to the Minister that we on this side hear from the other side about our lawyer leaders. I say again that we on this side are proud of our lawyer leader and deputy leader. What we want in our party, what we want for our leadership, is that whoever leads them is humane, honest and able. This we have in our leaders and we are proud of them.

Before I get into the criticism of the Department of Highways, I want to thank the Minister on behalf of the Standing Buffalo Indians that the Government is at long last fulfilling an old promise to these people in that of the oiling of Highway No. 235 from the Junction of Highway No. 35 to the Sioux Bridge. This may save a lot of lives. I said in a previous debate that conditions at times had been terrible. There are many pedestrians on this road and at times when the traffic was heavy in the summer time it was dusty and dangerous.

The highway program outlined by the Minister (Mr. Boldt) yesterday in my opinion is the most political highway program " that I've seen brought into this House and I've been around a long time. You know I spent some time yesterday evening transferring his program onto a highway map. When one looks at it, Mr. Speaker, one can readily pick out those seats that the Government is trying to save. It is in trouble. Secondly, it was looking at a few seats it hoped to win. It is not going to do them any good. I was amused when the Minister said the highway program would elect the Member for Estevan. It will take a lot more than that to elect the Member for Estevan especially after his ramblings today in the House.

Turning to highways in particular, I shall be having much more to say in the Estimates. The Government boasts of all the millions of dollars they have spent on highways - the Minister did it yesterday. I think all in this House will agree that modern up to date roads are necessary in this age of the motor on wheels. Trucks are getting bigger and bigger. I see it every day in my own home town. We have trucks owned by two railway companies travelling up and down our highways tearing up the roads. Yet there right beside that highway is a rail- road owned by the rail companies. At least to me this is the height of stupidity.

Because good roads are needed and because they are costly it becomes ever so much more important that the taxpayer dollar is spent carefully and wisely. As I said in a previous debate,

we in the New Democratic Party are convinced that millions of dollars can be saved in highway construction programs.

Wherever one travels one sees signs of waste. Whoever I talk to, in all parts of this province, they tell of the incidence of waste. Whenever one gets an answer from a question in this House, one finds signs of waste. I shall not deal with those questions today, I'll do it in Estimates. But what we do say is here is a place where the fat can be trimmed off the Budget. —We also say that the same quality and quantity of highways can be built for millions of dollars less.

I want to refer to a couple of instances of what I call waste. On No. 15 between Ituna and Melville, and I believe that road was built before the present Minister assumed responsibility, it was not built properly, it was oiled the same year, and to anybody who drives that road at any time of the year, it is an absolute provincial disgrace. Travellers and everybody talk about it. You can't get over 40 miles per hour on it and then you are lucky if you don't break springs.

AN HON. MEMBER: — Hear, hear!

MR. MEAKES: — It is really not- what you would call a good road for even a horse and buggy.

MR. J. J. CHARLEBOIS: (Saskatoon City Park University): — Rosthern.

MR. MEAKES: — You know the Hon. Member for City Park University (Mr. Charlebois) is a much better talker when he is sitting down than when he is standing up.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. MEAKES: — I note that the Department of Highways are going to oil that famous or infamous road from Watson to Wadena. I think they are only going as far as Quill Lake if I'm not mistaken. You know this is the famous road or the infamous road that the original tender was \$414,000 and they finally spent \$1,162,144 - \$414,000 was the original estimate and they finished by spending \$1,162,144, an over expenditure of \$748,836 or percentage wise \$180.5 per cent of an over expenditure in relation to the original estimate. And I hope sincerely that they won't take another five years to oil it as it took them to build it. After you fellows quit interrupting, I'll go on; I've got lots of time.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. MEAKES: — As I said at the beginning, that's all I'm going to say on highways at this time. We'll have a lot more to say in Estimates.

I'd like to turn for a minute or two to another item which has been long overdue in Touchwood constituency, and that is natural gas from Melville through to Watrous. All I hope is that it's in this year's program. I asked the Minister in charge of the Saskatchewan Power Corporation to remedy the

March 4, 1971

injustice that has been practised on the residents of Touchwood in that area (Fenwood through to Semans). A Liberal Cabinet Minister promised natural gas to this area in 1964 and again in 1967. George Trapp stood on the platform and said it was in the plans.

AN HON. MEMBER: — Where's George Trapp?

MR. MEAKES: — Yes, well he went some other place. But George Trapp stood on the platform and promised natural gas for that year. It was in the plans for 1965 prior to the CCF Government being defeated. That promise hasn't been kept and I accuse this Government of political discrimination. I don't mind them attacking me. This doesn't worry me in the slightest bit, but I do object to making all of these people of Touchwood suffer because they voted for me. And I say that only a New Democratic

Government will bring power and gas to this area. I hope I'm wrong, I hope the Minister will prove me wrong and bring it in this year. I'll give him credit for it if he does.

Now to the question of taxes - this question was ably handled by the Member for Swift Current (Mr. Wood) this after- noon.

MR. R. ROMANOW: (Saskatoon Riversdale): — 1,477 new taxes.

MR. MEAKES: — I won't spend very much time reading, but I have in my hand the Debates and Proceedings of the session of 1964. I'd like to make three or four quotations from them. Page 39, the then Leader of the Opposition and the now Premier (Mr. Thatcher), and I quote in part:

While there has been a shifting all right, Mr. Speaker, " a shifting of more and more taxes on the farmers and the property owners, today rural and urban taxation on the average is four times higher than it was in 1944. I repeat today what I have said on previous occasions that if taxes on land go much higher in Saskatchewan, our farmers won't have any land left.

I should now like to turn to page 245 and quote from the now Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Steuart), and again I quote in part:

The Government's refusal to give local governments the funds that they need is the major reason why municipal taxes are going up and up. And many of the essential services are slipping and slipping badly. Taxes on our farms, on our homes, on our towns, and our cities have increased 40 per cent since the Government took power. Make no mistake, Mr. Speaker, this hits everybody. The wage earner and small farmer are finding municipal taxes a real hardship. We say something must be done to give our municipalities the funds they need to carry out their responsibilities in a proper way without breaking their ratepayers.

I'd like to turn to one more quotation by the present Senator MacDonald who was then the Member for Moosomin. This is just

a very short one. He had been talking about the taxes in this province, and I now quote:

But there is a new definition for a dime in Saskatchewan. Mr. Speaker, it is that part of a dollar that is left after you pay your provincial taxes.

Well, I think the new definition of a dime must mean that it means nothing, it represents nothing. But property taxes since that time have gone up and up and up and I'm not going to belabor you with a lot of figures. I have in my hand two tax notices, one of 1962 and that is for the R.M. of Garry and one tax notice for the year 1970. Municipal general taxes in 1962 in Garry Municipality were 35 mills and they continued to be that way until 1964. Municipal taxes in 1970 - 45 mills, ten mills up. For Melville North School Unit in 1962 it was 32 mills, today 45 mills. In the urban school unit in 1962 it was 37 mills, today 45 mills. In 1964 the levies were the same as in 1962, exactly the same with not one of the items that I'm going to read out changed. Now we go to the Yorkton School Unit. Yorkton School Unit was 35 mills, now 53 mills, an absolute

HON. C. L. B. ESTEY: (Minister of Industry and Commerce): — What about...

MR. MEAKES: — Yes, and what good has it done them? Taxes have still gone up even though the unconditional grants have increased. They gave us very little. It wasn't enough to meet the needs in those municipalities and the Hon. Member knows that what I'm saying is right. I will admit that I'm not a big, corporation lawyer but I do know a few facts. Take on my own house in my home town; the taxes have risen terribly since 1967. I paid at that time \$310; this year I paid \$389 more than what any Homeowner Grant was going to pay for.\

My colleague, the Member for Swift Current (Mr. Wood-) dealt with school rates, but I just want to say one more thing about Garry Municipality and it's not different than many others. Prior to this year there were 30 parcels of land that were under tax enforcement. As at the end of 1970, this year, in the one year, there were 118 parcels of land under tax enforcement, and the blame lies on this Government.

You know, the Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Steuart) stood up and said the other day that this Budget will ease taxation and the following day the Star-Phoenix had a statement in which it said the Mayor of Saskatoon, Mr. Buckwold, said that they were going to be forced to increase taxes. The Leader-Post the following day says that

MR. J. J. CHARLEBOIS: (Saskatoon City Park University): — A Waffler.

MR. MEAKES: — He's not a Waffler, either, one of your boys, one of your boys, you know. The new Mayor of Regina, and I'm sure that my Hon. friends think he's all right, and I'm not going to be critical of him, quoted in the Leader-Post the day before yesterday, said that there wasn't enough money for the Police Commission, that they might have to cut down some services.

March 4, 1971

HON. C. P. MacDONALD: (Minister of Welfare): — What about the 14 per cent?

MR. MEAKES: — Oh that's a terrible thing. You want the policemen to work for starvation wages, is that it? Well, then don't blame the policemen. It was an impartial arbitration board. If what I have said isn't increased taxation, what is it? The people of this province know that in the last seven years the taxes have gone up and up and up. They know that the Liberals in 1964 and 1967 promised less taxes and it's just one more reason that when- ever you get the courage to go, and the sooner the better, you're going to be defeated.

MR. MacDONALD: — What happened in Manitoba?

MR. MEAKES: — We won an election in Manitoba.

MR. MacDONALD: — What happened after that?

MR. MEAKES: — Taxes went down to the property owner or are going to. Let us look at this Budget. You know the Member for Regina North East (Mr. Smishek) did a good job yesterday of analyzing just what has been going on and I just want to repeat a little bit of it to the House. You know the Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Steuart) says there are no increased taxes. Well, I look at the revenue from education and health tax in 1964 - \$37,500,000; 1970 estimate - \$68,750,000. If that isn't an increase in taxes. All the same tax, but the taxpayers paid a great deal more money. Now let's take the gasoline tax - \$27,500,000 in 1964. It is \$51,450,000 estimated for 1972. These are the gentlemen who are saying that income tax was too high. Income tax in 1964 - \$14,692,000; this year estimated at \$69,337,000. Another \$6 million in tobacco tax of which there was none in 1964. All together when you add those up it's about an increase of \$115 million in seven years. And then the Hon. Minister says there is no increase in taxation. Well, Mr. Speaker, I could go on and on and on. There are so many things that one might talk about but I know that there are others of my colleagues who want to get in on this debate as it winds up tomorrow at 5:00 o'clock. I'm sure from what I've said you all know I am going to support the amendment and I'm going to oppose the motion.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. G. F. LOKEN: (Rosetown): — Mr. Speaker, it once again gives me a great deal of pleasure to rise and speak in this Budget Debate. Here again, we find that under the direction of the responsible Treasurer (Mr. Steuart) and a free enterprise Government the Province has a balanced Budget. This I suggest is a commendable achievement under extenuating circumstances at a time when the economic conditions have been depressed. Mr. Speaker, a free enterprise system managed by a responsible, sincere person is undoubtedly far superior to a socialistic system which is advocated by the Members of this Assembly who sit opposite.

AN HON. MEMBER: — True, true.

MR. LOKEN: — At this time I want to

congratulate the Hon. Member from Last Mountain (Mr. MacLennan) on his appointment to the Cabinet, also the Member from Saskatoon City Park (Mr. Charlebois) on the outstanding job he did in managing the 1971 Canada Games.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. LOKEN: — Also the Hon. Member from Regina Centre (Mr. Blakeney) for his election to the leadership of the NDP.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. LOKEN: — I regret it very much that the Member from Yorkton (Mr. Gallagher) is retiring from politics but I do want to say that there will always be a Gallagher in the Liberal Government in Regina.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. LOKEN: — Mr. Speaker, when I rose in this House to speak on the Budget Debate during the Second Session of the Sixteenth Legislature I stated then that the Leader of the Opposition was on his way out due to the fact that he was riding two horses going in different directions and that he would fall flat on his back. It would appear, Mr. Speaker, my observation (which was based on information given to me by the rank and file majority of the electorate of this province) was correct. Now, these same people prompt me to forecast that the new Leader of the Opposition will fall in the same manner as his predecessor only sooner as he is not satisfied to ride two horses but three, namely, the NDP horse, the labor bosses horse, and the added new horse called Waffle.

AN HON. MEMBER: — What are the odds on that horse, George?

MR. LOKEN: — Mr. Speaker, at the same time that I referred to the ex- Leader of the Opposition I referred to the then dynamic Mayor of Regina who was making noises and was contemplating taking over from the big, little Tommy as National Leader of the splintered NDP. Alas, Mr. Speaker, it would appear that not only the rural population of Saskatchewan like the good people in Rosetown constituency but the urban citizens of Regina have seen the folly of the Socialists and it would appear that the ex-mayor, MLA from Regina (Mr. Baker) will be fortunate if he even gets a chance to be around after the nominations are complete. It's sad but it would appear that the ex-mayor has been ostracized.

AN HON. MEMBER: — He's only got three seats left to go.

MR. LOKEN: — Mr. Speaker, the Budget which has been brought down indicates that we can look forward to an upswing in 1971 despite the doom and gloom which those opposite spread in their travels throughout this province. They have brought forth their program of Socialism for the next election which confirms that the NDP is a party that believes that our citizens are not capable of

handling their own affairs, that all incentive of the free enterprise system should be abolished and that we should be like puppets on a string.

Mr. Speaker, we need all the capital we can obtain for expansion in this great province and I am concerned when they say that we should shun our neighbors to the south. In fact, to me, it's a bit of hypocrisy for a party such as the NDP to state that we should not accept capital from outside this province and this country.

Mr. Speaker, the Members opposite know very well that they receive the majority of their campaign funds from the international unions whose headquarters are based in the United States of America. Not only do they receive their funds from these unions but they also receive their instructions from the labor bosses and goons who control these unions. It's a known fact, Mr. Speaker, that during regular elections and bye-elections in our province these paid union organizers are quite evident. In fact, many are not even citizens of this province or even this country.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. LOKEN: — The National Secretary- Treasurer of the Canadian Union of Public Employees, Mrs. Grace Hartman, basing her remarks on government figures, told a recent teach-in at the University of Toronto that a U.S. based international union took about \$35 million out of Canada in 1967 and sent back only about half of it in wages and other benefits. The disclosures that the international unions are operating at a profit of about \$17 million a year on their Canadian operations should effectively demolish the argument that Canadian labor cannot be financially self-supporting. She concluded that the major international unions have put money into Canada during the development of the labor movement, but said that today all information points to the fact that there is a net outflow of unionist money to the United States. Mrs. Hartman added that this made Canada a unique example for it is the only solvent country in the world whose major labor base resides in a foreign country. While the workers of General Motors of Canada belong to the United Auto Workers based in the United States, those in England belong to the British Trade Union Congress, those in Germany to the German unions and those in France to the French unions. Mr. Speaker, I contend that if these monies which are milked out by the international unions for political reasons were left in our province, they could be spent and invested by the people who earn them and that much would be added to our economy. I am also convinced that the rank and file of the Canadian labor force would not be unhappy if we as a Government were to take steps to eradicate the hierarchy in these unions whose sole purpose is to line their own pockets and create havoc and unrest among the labor forces.

Mr. Speaker, the majority of our citizens in this province who are members of unions, do not wish to be unreasonable in their demands but in many instances they are not left free to run their own affairs and as a result we find when strikes occur many persons on strike unanimously approach those in Government urging action to be taken such as has been taken by the passing of Bill 2. Many workers do not wish to strike in order to obtain changes, they want to negotiate but the labor bosses and the

labor goons rule by means of creating doubt and fear on the old theory of might is right. I am confident that the majority of those in our Saskatchewan unions are now more convinced that the NDP have been using them to try to achieve their goal which is complete Socialism, state control. Our people, in order to enjoy their full freedom and have personal incentives of pride cannot support nationalization of industry, commerce and agriculture. Make no mistake, these fat cat labor bosses, their hired goons and their political affiliates couldn't care less about whether the goods we manufacture or the products of our farms or resources are competitive in the world markets. Their sole object is to destroy a way of life which has been enjoyed for many generations and I hope for generations to come.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all persons as well as management and labor to be reasonable in their demands thus creating a desirable society.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. LOKEN: — Mr. Speaker, the NDP platform released recently shows that the die has been cast for complete Socialism in this great province of ours. In their program they foresee a province where all persons will be indebted to the state and line up weekly to receive their dole and instructions as to how they should act for the next week.

They would rename the Parliament Buildings the Kremlin and would site satellite Kremlins throughout the province similar to the cell system which they have in their party organization now. Of course, the main Kremlin would be controlled by the Leader and the cells by his strong arms under him who dictate the policies at local levels. Mr. Speaker, there would be no Speech from the Throne, there would be no Budget brought down and there would be no debate.

Let us keep our freedoms, let us keep our personal incentives to better our lot in life, let us continue to go forward in this great province situated in the middle of this great nation. Let us completely reject Socialism once and for all. Mr. Speaker, I want to go on record as agreeing with this Budget and repeat the well known fact which is expressed frequently by our Hon. Premier:

There is only one thing wrong with Socialism, it won't work.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. LOKEN: — At this time I want to congratulate our Provincial Treasurer on this Budget brought in for the 1971-72 session. Homeowner Grants increased", increased grants for education, the largest ever given to education in our province, increased grants for police protection, in fact doubled, increased utilization grants for the rural municipalities, increased snow removal grants, library grants, also money available for assisting students to find jobs. I know that the people of my constituency will really be happy about this Budget.

Mr. Speaker, it is needless to say that I will be supporting

the Budget and not the amendment.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. F. A. DEWHURST: (Wadena): — Mr. Speaker, in rising to take part in this debate on the Budget, I should first like to extend congratulations to my Leader, the Member for Regina Centre, Allan Blakeney on taking over the leadership of this party. Allan Blakeney is a man who has sat in this Legislature for 10 years and proven his ability at all times under all conditions. He proved his ability back during the days of “kick on the door”. He proved his ability on many other occasions in his clear thinking way of being able to bring reason to bear on several chaotic occasions.

I should like to congratulate our Deputy Leader, the Member for Riversdale. Roy Romanow is a young lawyer referred to by my friends opposite as a labor lawyer. Roy Romanow is a man born and raised in this country, knows the problems of this country and is determined to do what he can to help to improve the living conditions and the standards of the people of this country. I am sure that with a Leader like Allan Blakeney and a Deputy Leader like Roy Romanow great things will come to this province in the future under their leadership and guidance.

I should however, not like to pass up this opportunity of saying a few words of congratulations to my former Leader, the Member for Biggar, the Hon. Woodrow Lloyd. Woodrow Lloyd is a man who has now given over 26 years of service to this province. In 1944 he became the Minister of Education and brought in and pioneered many of the new ideas for education. Sure they were not all 100 per cent, they weren't all perfect, but he blazed trails. There was no trail to follow, he had to lay the new trail. He had the courage of his own convictions and he had the co-operation of the Trustees' Association and the Teachers' Federation and the public and he blazed new trails and new- things were done. Thousands of boys and girls in this province in our rural schools previously never had the opportunity to get a high school education. Due to the policies that were brought in by Woodrow Lloyd as Minister of Education, they were able to get a high school education and go on to greater learning. This in itself will put Woodrow Lloyd down in the books of Canadian history and especially Saskatchewan history as being one of our great men.

In 1961 he took over the Premiership of this province. He guided this province in the early 1960s through our Medicare program in spite of all the opposition that my friends opposite could muster, in spite of them kicking in the doors, in spite of them trying to create dissension and revolution by their actions and by talk. Woodrow Lloyd was a quiet spoken man who went on to bring Medicare to this province and today to the whole of Canada. No wonder MacLeans in one of their issues said that he was one of the top ten statesmen of Canada, one of Canada's top ten men. This province owes a lot to Woodrow Lloyd and history will record a lot of the things he did during his quarter of a century stay in this Legislature.

I should also at this time like to congratulate all those who were involved and responsible for the Winter Games we had in Saskatoon at the beginning of this past month. I think it was a credit to our province to be able to have the Winter

Games here. I think it is a thing that should be done more often to be able to get more national activities within our province. If people will learn to play together, we can teach them to work together. But if you can't teach people to play together, we cannot get them to work together. I was however, a little disappointed that most of the Members of this Legislature - things being organized as they were - had no chance whatsoever to take in any of those Winter Games. The vast majority of us never got an opportunity to go to the official opening because everything was set up in such a manner. The Games opened on the weekend and the House opened on the Tuesday and we had to be here for the opening of the House. I think as far as I am aware on our side, the only Members who had an invitation to the opening were our Members who live right in the city of Saskatoon. However, I do congratulate those on the job they did.

I should also like to congratulate my own home town of Wynyard for the activities and the part they played in the Winter Games. We had a group of girls from Wynyard and I have their picture right here in the Wynyard paper who represented Saskatchewan at the Games in the ladies' curling. They took third place in the Canadian curling - four girls from Wynyard and district, four fine curlers.

HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. DEWHURST: — I think a lot of credit is due them and due to their teachers and their parents for the job they did.

Also the Saskatchewan men's volleyball team came from Wynyard. They were guided by John Campbell, their physical education teacher. It is true that after they had won the right to represent the province they were supplemented by a couple of players from Foam Lake and one or two from other parts of the province. They didn't do as well in the competition as the girls' curling team but they did give a good account of themselves. I am sure that we are all proud of our Saskatchewan athletes although they didn't all get medals.

Now the young men's curling team from Wynyard was competing for the Winter Games trial. They were led by Danny Peterson and lost out in the Northern finals to Humboldt. Humboldt, in turn, lost out in the Southern finals so Wynyard wasn't represented in the men's curling team at the Winter Games. The same Danny Peterson took his foursome to Yorkton and won the Northern playdowns on the "A" side for the Briar competition. He and another rink from the North played against the southern rinks and lost out to the southern winners. All in all I think Wynyard gave a good account of themselves this winter in their sports activities.

Furthermore last fall, the Wynyard High School once again was the winner of the nine-man provincial football for the province. They have won the Provincial Championship for high school football seven or eight times in the last ten or eleven years. I think Wynyard is doing a very good job in helping promote sports.

But the one thing that is wrong is our lack of assistance to sports. We do not give enough assistance to sports to help

to get trained personnel to assist sports and sports facilities. Many of our boys and girls in this province could do much better at our various games if they had a little more help through better facilities for sports. We have a long winter season in this country but about the only sports that we have really have to be done indoors with the exception of things such as skiing and ski-dooing or so forth. But for curling, hockey and so forth we need more facilities, not only in Wynyard, but in many points in this province and many points throughout Canada. If we would spend money throughout the whole of Canada on facilities for sports we should have a much stronger and better nation.

At this time too, I should like to congratulate the Member for Last Mountain on his promotion to the Cabinet. I can well understand why some of his colleagues sitting behind him feel very sore at being by passed. Nevertheless, the Member for Last Mountain is to be congratulated for being included in the Cabinet. There is no question about it; two redistribution bills wouldn't save him so now they are hoping that promoting him to the Cabinet will save him. Time will tell that it won't.

I must congratulate the Member for Gravelbourg (Mr. Coderre) on his promotion or change of portfolio to Public Works. You know for years now I have been one on this side of the House who has been trying to find out what happened to some lost articles which he is now responsible for.

MR. J. E. BROCKELBANK: (Saskatoon Mayfair): — What did he lose?

MR. DEWHURST: — He lost a car that he had and he doesn't even know where it's gone. He said there was another one in California. So now I hope that now as Minister of Public Works he will find out what happened to these cars and give us a report on what happened. I believe we have a right to know what happened to, the property that was there. According to him it was there on the parking lot when he took over, he saw it, the license and everything else. But we should like to know where it is now.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I should like to turn my remarks to some of the general statements in this debate. I believe that the Attorney General (Mr. Heald) adds quite a bit of color to this House when he speaks. You know he is a man whom we should expect as a corporation lawyer to be able to weigh the pros and cons very well and come up with a sound decision. But unfortunately somehow or other he gets things rather twisted at times. He doesn't present his case very clearly. I can't congratulate him on the weak speech he made here the other day. I could well understand this when in Wynyard he spoke at the Liberal nominating convention. Some of the people told me afterward that it was the poorest speech they had ever heard a Minister present at any time. At the same-time, I don't know whether it was a coincidence or whether it was by design, but during the speech they had the ambulance standing outside the door. This is the first Cabinet Minister I have ever seen who put on a public speech and had the ambulance standing by for those who got sick. But nevertheless the ambulance was there ready to take them away. I'll give him credit for looking ahead to try to look after the people when they got sick.

He said the other day that he gets a little annoyed when

the Opposition cries crocodile tears for the small towns and rural communities. He couldn't understand why Members on this side of the House would cry crocodile tears. I can well understand then why he made the statement on February 28, 1969 that:

I never saw better times than there are now and the farmer's wife drives into town with a new car, the husband comes after her with a new truck with a snowmobile in it.

Then he went on to say in that same speech. Now listen to this, Mr. Speaker, this should be read and re-read and inwardly digested by the Hon. Members opposite. I quote:

In 1942 the farmers and the elevator agents looked after it (referring to the damp grain). You know all things cannot come in a day. The average farmer knows that you cannot take a cow to the bull and bring the calf back in your arms. The average farmer has his bins full of wheat, his barns and corrals full of cattle and most wives full of babies for the bonus.

Is that why he is saying that we cannot cry crocodile tears for the farmers and the small towns? I wish to advise the Attorney General that the small towns are in trouble and the rural people are in trouble and the policies of this Government- are driving them deeper and deeper into trouble and doing nothing to lift them out of the trouble.

We must have a Government that believes in humanity or believes in people and not believes in Wall Street or Bay Street first. Here is a man who hopes to be a judge but I hope that if he is elevated to the Bench he will appraise the facts better than he has done in this debate and give a better judgement than he has on his speech in this House. I think we have to look at his ability for fair play and I resent it when he heaps scorn or ridicule on our rural people. That is what he did in his speech the other day but more so two years ago. You don't need to take my word for it, just read his speech of February 28th two years ago.

HON. D. V. HEALD: (Attorney General): — I was quoting from a letter.

MR. DEWHURST: — You were quoting from a letter that is true, Mr. Speaker, a letter for which he says he takes full responsibility.

I wonder where he stood on the Davey-mander that we saw here last year. We had a Davey-mander in this Legislature that Canada has never seen the like of. I should like to say more on this topic before I leave it, so at this time, Mr. Speaker, I would ask you to call it 5:30.

Mr. Speaker, when you called it 5:30, I was starting to discuss the redistribution that we had in this Legislature a year ago. While it is usually referred to as a gerrymander, I think in Saskatchewan it will be known as a Davey-mander because the Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Steuart) was the Minister who was in charge of redistribution. This will go down in the history of this province as one of the greatest blights on democracy that any Government perpetrated on an unsuspecting public. There is absolutely no rhyme or reason for the type of

March 4, 1971

redistribution that was brought into this Legislature one year ago. It is plain to be seen that the Members opposite are not prepared to be judged by the people who elected them in the first place. The Government wants to change the constituencies, make little pocket boroughs in order to try to get what it considers are safe seats for themselves. And I am sure that history will record this as a "black blight".

Furthermore, Mr. Speaker, I have been trying to get a map of what is supposed to be the constituency of Wadena when the new Bill is proclaimed. I have a map here, Mr. Speaker. You can see the size it is, but even at that, the map isn't all there. There are two townships missing from this map and also the township numbers are in the wrong places. I have been back to the returning officer on several occasions trying to get a proper map of my constituency and as yet I haven't been able to get it. If this is a correct map, when you look at the map for Melfort-Kinistino and the map for Humboldt, then there are two townships where there is no constituency. I don't see any reason why we shouldn't be able to get a map of the proposed constituencies after the Bill has been passed through this Legislature after a year. I think there is something drastically wrong with the Administration or with the running of the returning officer's department or whoever is responsible for preparing these maps. There is no reason why the maps aren't printed correctly.

I notice on the bulletin board that a school is coming tomorrow from Gronlid purported to be from the constituency of Nipawin. Gronlid is not in the constituency of Nipawin, not yet. Gronlid is still in the constituency of Melfort-Tisdale, the constituency that has no Member, the people of that part of the province who have been denied their right to have a Member in this Legislature to speak for them, a constituency that should have a right to be here and be heard, but they are not. This Government has seen fit to disfranchise all those people in the constituency of Melfort-Tisdale because they didn't have the courage to call a bye-election.

They talk about Ed. Schreyer and the Manitoba Government being dictatorial - "little Ed Schreyer, old Ed. Schreyer" and all the epithets that they use - but here is an article in The Leader-Post of March 1, 1971:

Schreyer has called two bye-elections for April 5, one of them he had the writs ready to issue before he was officially advised of the resignation of one of the Conservative Members of that Legislature. Unofficially he had been advised but officially the Tory Party had never turned over to him the official notification that this man was resigning. But in order to see that those people had representation at the earliest possible moment because by the time the bye-election is held their session will be on and Premier Schreyer did not wish to see those people without representation. He has issued the bye-election.

That is a far cry from what we see of the so-called defenders of a democracy who sit to your right, Mr. Speaker. So it is a funny thing that this Government cannot do a little practising what they preach when they start talking about democracy.

Now I should like to turn for a few moments to resources.

The Minister of Natural Resources (Mr. Barrie) spoke the other- day and I appreciated his speech very much. I have always enjoyed listening to the Minister of Natural Resources. I'm not saying that I always agree with him but I enjoy listening to him. But I should hope sometime that when the Minister of Natural Resources is speaking that he will tell us what happened to the Hatton gas field. For how much did they sell the Hatton gas field to private interests? What kind of a deal was made? How much are we paying now for the gas? Those are things we don't know, Mr. Speaker. We do know it sold our reserves of natural gas but we don't know for how much or what deal we are buying them back for. Sodium sulphate deposits that were owned by the Crown in this province at Snake Hole Lake and Alsask were sold for one cent a ton to private interests. Now that some of these deposits are being developed we heard the Premier and the Minister of Mineral Resources (Mr. Cameron) saying that there was an over production of sodium sulphate and it may be necessary to pro-rate sodium sulphate. When we had the monopoly on sodium sulphate we were able to supply the demand and any money that was made on it went to the people of this province to provide other services of one type or another. This Government saw fit to sell it for one cent per ton. Those are some of the blots which it will never erase from the pages of the political history of this province.

It has already given away our road allowance oil, the oil which is on the road allowance in the proven fields. We had the rights on those but it let the oil companies attach them to the main bodies. We are not getting our fair share out of our resource revenue of this province.

The timber right leases in the North, Simpson Timber Company, MacMillan Bloedel to a lesser extent and Parsons and Whittemore have huge tracts on leases but they don't pay the taxes the same as a farmer has to pay when a farmer gets the lease. When a farmer gets the lease he has to pay the Crown the lease fees and then he has to pay municipal taxes. But the big companies, when they get a timber lease, they don't pay municipal taxes the same as the farmer must pay. Once again, it takes from the little fellow and gives to the big fellow.

All the southern lakes of this province now are not fit for fishing. There isn't a lake south of the North Saskatchewan River that one can feel sure that he can go and fish in and safely eat the fish. It is true that a number of the lakes and rivers have been condemned in this province for fishing but others have not. Lakes such as Greenwater, Marion Lake, and some of those, people can go and fish in but we do not know whether those fish should be used or not Because the fish come into Greenwater Lake, Marion Lake and other lakes up the Red Deer River from Manitoba and because we know that the Manitoba lakes due to the pollution down stream are not safe to be fished in, I feel that every lake, Mr. Minister of Natural Resources, should be tested for fishing because maybe they are" good and maybe they are not, but we don't know. I hope that the Minister will see fit this coming year to see that every lake is tested for fishing to make sure that our anglers are not taking home a bad fish and consuming it.

Now I should like to turn to agriculture -for a few moments. This province is suffering from an agriculture depression. The farming community in this province is in a depression such as

March 4, 1971

we haven't seen since the '30s. The farmers do not have the money to buy the things they should be buying. They do not have the money to be able to do the things they should do. Our Budget that we have before us offers little or no relief for them. We saw this Government soon after it took office do away with the AMA, the Agricultural Machinery Agency. Under the AMA the farmers knew that when new machines came into this province there was a way of having them tested. They could get reliable information to see whether that machine was good or whether it wasn't. Implement dealers knew also where the weak parts on the machines were and they were in a position to go after the companies to see that the implement companies didn't leave the dealer holding the bag on repairs. But it did away with AMA. We were assured at that time that we should be getting bulletins from the University which would do similar testing but to this day I have never received a bulletin from the University on machinery testing nor have I seen a bulletin that has been issued to any- one else. I just don't think there are any bulletins being issued. The farmers have a right to have that type of protection. We spend more on farm machines in this province than any other two provinces put together yet we cannot have the protection now which was there up until 1964.

The farm sewer and water program of this province has been a blessing to rural people giving farm homes sewer and water. Once again, while that is a good program, a good policy, it is not being pursued with the vigor and with the assistance to the farmer as it was before. The cost has gone up to the farmer and the service has gone down.

We saw Operation LIFT last year which the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. McFarlane) boasted about that it was a good program. The Premier said Operation LIFT was a fine program if people would only co-operate with it. We were assured this would be the real thing. The only thing Operation LIFT is going to do is lift them clean out of their holdings and lift them out onto the road allowance and onto social aid. And according to the Minister of Social Welfare (Mr. MacDonald) if the farmer should strike against such goings on, if they are on strike, they'll get no assistance whatsoever from his department.

We saw last year the Task Force report issued where they are going to take two-thirds of all the farmers off the land. What are they going to take two-thirds of the farmers off the land for, Mr. Speaker? They are going to take two-thirds of the farmers off the land, so they say, to make more efficient agricultural production. More efficient agricultural production for whom and for what? I feel society should be organized to serve people not people manipulated to serve a society.

Under the programs we are getting from our Minister of Agriculture (Mr. McFarlane), who sits across the way here and from his counterparts at Ottawa, the -authorities are just trying to manipulate people to serve an outmoded, outdated, rotten system. The Task Force should be scrapped and assistance should be given to our farmers because our people need some security on the land, they need some help. Agriculture is the greatest industry we have in this province and it gets the least consideration and pays the most taxes. We've seen in the past few years the Minister of Agriculture promote the production of hogs in this province. And now the price of hogs has gone down over the past year or two. A man who runs one of the auction markets

told me a year ago last spring that weanling pigs were selling as high as \$26 a piece. He says, "I'll admit that was a high price but I have sold them for that price." He said the average price for a good weanling or feeder pig was running around \$18, \$19 or \$20. But this fall he said he sold them as low as \$2 admitting they were the poorer ones but he said they were averaging only around \$4, \$4.50 and \$5. Well, people cannot raise those weanlings and feeder pigs and sell them at that price nor can those who bought high priced weanling pigs last spring afford to sell them at the prices we are getting for them now. We have seen the Government put money into expansion of hog facilities. But now we see the Government telling the insurance office not to insure those hog barns without a special rating on them because there are too many hog barns and cattle barns being burned down and therefore no Government insurance agent is to issue an insurance policy and commit the insurance office to any insurance whatsoever without a special rating from the insurance office. They must only take the application, send it into the insurance office and let the insurance office do the underwriting on it. Once again, it proves to me that they don't trust the farmers. Now that the Government has the farmers expanding into livestock it says, "Now we won't give you any insurance protection."

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. DEWHURST: — The Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Steuart) appears to doubt that but he knows it is true, he knows it is true as well as I do.

I have a farmer in my constituency who is raising hogs. The price was down and he didn't have any to put on the market, hence no cash. At 1:00 o'clock one afternoon a power man was sent to cut off his power. If his power was cut off then he would lose a lot of small hogs because he wouldn't have the heat lamp to keep them warm. No consideration, nothing was given. He was able to talk the power man into waiting for an hour or two before he carried out his instructions. He was able to phone around and get some of his neighbors and others to help him to raise the money to pay his power bill so he could carry on until he was able to sell some of his hogs. As the price was so low he was unable to pay his power bill. He borrowed money which he has paid back since to pay his power bill. That is the kind of treatment, the hard, cruel, callous treatment that is given by this Government to agricultural people.

The Government has no compunction or no pity for the producers of this province. They do not care, the producers are dispensable, get rid of them. The Government would like to see large companies like Kern County Farm Company move in here where they own thousands and thousands of acres of land and farm with big machinery. This press-button system makes all the hired men slaves on their farms. That is the type of system that we are headed for unless we can divert this trend which the LIFT and Task Force brings forth and the policies of this Government. We've got to be able to stop the takeover of our farm land by big monopolies, big corporations and the absentee land owners from other countries. We've got to be able to set up a system whereby if an elderly farmer wishes to retire from farming the Crown will buy up his land at the going price. If he himself wants to sell it to a neighbor that is fine and dandy but if he

March 4, 1971

has to retire he shouldn't have to give his life long work away for nothing. The Crown should buy that land, make it available to others to give them a larger holding to make a viable farm either on a rental basis or a lease option to buy when they wish to do so. And that can be done. I've heard these Members across the way say, "Oh, these leases, they want to have every farmer under their thumb." The Premier and his son didn't object to taking leases on grazing land but they never told us whom they took it from.

MR. C. P. MacDONALD: (Minister of Welfare): — Russia.

MR. DEWHURST: — Yes, that's what they did in Russia, just what the Premier did in getting his grazing land. You are right, Mr. Minister, that is what they did in Russia, take it away from the peasants and give it to the big boys. That's what they did in Russia, you admitted it. Now I could go on for some time expounding on their farm policy but I don't intend to take too much time this evening because there are others who wish to speak.

I am sure that the farmers of this province would sooner have the land collectively owned by themselves in the name of the Crown or their Government than they would have it owned by Kern County Farm Company or other big mortgage companies from across the border or from Eastern Canada. You just go and ask the farmers. If you don't believe us, call an election and let the farmers tell you.

Now, Mr. Speaker, if the policies are so good that this Government has pursued over the past seven years why is it that we have driven so many people out of this province, when unemployment has been higher than it has ever been since the thirties. There is no work to be had any place, people walking the streets, there are thousands registered under unemployment, and many more thousands that are not registered with Manpower or with the Unemployment Insurance Commission because they haven't been three years on the labor market and they can't apply to Manpower. People out of high school, people on the farms who are trying to get jobs in the wintertime are unemployed. During the past year when we take into consideration the natural increase, well over 30,000 people left this province. That is a lot of people in one year, Mr. Speaker, over 30,000 people. What does that mean? It means that this past year, during the year 1970, the equivalent of the population of Battleford, Broadview, Watson, Watrous, Wadena, Foam Lake, Kelvington, Wynyard, Humboldt, Melfort, Tisdale, Nipawin plus the city of Melville, all left this province in one year. That is the amount 'of population that left here - 10 of our larger towns in the North, one in the northwest and one in the southeast, plus the city of Melville, that's how many have left the province in one year. How can we carry on and have a society for people when people are never considered?

You know when the Premier was with the CCF, prior to his leaving the CCF, the Liberals and the Tories didn't believe what he said, and you know, Mr. Speaker, we couldn't trust him. And now today, we can't believe what he says and most of the people across there don't trust him. So it's quite a problem to see the way that this number one man can operate and the hold

that he has over his backbenchers and the way he operates in this province.

When we talked about electric power here on March 18, 1965 this Legislature passed a motion unanimously asking that the power rates be reduced for skating rinks, curling rinks, community owned and operated, and also community halls. We are still waiting for the benefit of that resolution. They tell us there has been no increase in telephone or power rates but people know differently. Last summer I, myself, in Saskatoon went into a call station and put in a call from Saskatoon to Regina and the minimum charge for a three minute call from number to number was \$1.65. I could have driven from Saskatoon to Regina if I had a Volkswagon for less than that in the amount of gas, but that is what it cost me. When we have to pay that kind of bill what do we get? I have here a photostatic copy of a sales bill of a farmer in my constituency who sold a 350 pound boar on January 12th. After he paid the hauling fee and the commission it netted this man \$2.44. That same hog would sell over the counter for many, many times that amount after it had been dressed and processed. These are the types of conditions the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. McFarlane) should be looking into. But he is not.'

At the same time the farmers talk of taxes going up, they are going up tremendously all the time. According to the answers I have received to questions in this House - and I don't have the latest figures for 1970 because they are not yet available to us - in the rural areas since 1963 to 1967 property taxes have gone up by \$7 million and for school purposes the taxes on rural property have gone up by over \$12 million or a total for the rural property of \$19.7 million more now than obtained in 1963. For the urban population of this province for the local general municipal purposes their taxes have gone up \$14.2 million and their school taxes, Mr. Speaker, have just doubled. In 1963 it was \$24.8 million, in 1969 \$48.9 million or an increase of \$24.1 million. In round figures it has just doubled as a school tax on the urban properties of this province. And then they say they are giving assistance in keeping the taxes down.

The other day speaking in the House, the Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Steuart) says, "You know, people should look up to the Liberal Party." You know when it's the Provincial Treasurer whether he's standing up or sitting down you still have to look down on him. We can see how the taxes have gone up in this Budget. We have a \$450 million Budget. Where does the money come from? We see that from the Federal Government there is an increase this year over last year of over \$69 million. We can see on the consumption taxes that the taxes have gone up for the people of this province on the education and hospital tax, gasoline tax, insurance, and a whole host of others. The individual income tax this year is estimated will be down about \$200,000 from last year. So they say that proves that the people of this province are not too badly off because their income tax is going to remain about the same. The corporation income tax, I don't know why, but that is down \$7 million in the Estimates this year to what it was last year. The corporations are either doing so well under this Government or else they plan to give them greater concessions than ever because they are going to pay \$7 million less this year in corporation income tax than they did last year. I could go on item after item but the same story is there. The poor people, the farmers, and the working people,

March 4, 1971

the small businessman have to pay the taxes, the taxes have gone up. But where the big corporations pay, it's gone down. When we look at the income from oils and minerals and all the things that go into the big companies, the same story holds true.

Mr. Speaker, this is not a Budget for progress, it is not a Budget for people, it is a Budget to prolong and to increase stagnation. I cannot support this Budget but I must support the amendment.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. M. BREKER: (Shellbrook): — Mr. Speaker, the Member for Wadena (Mr. Dewhurst) talks like an authority on hog raising. Now I admit that if you farmed like he did, had one sow come in the spring and sold it on its anniversary date, naturally your entire sale could be sold at low prices, if you're truly in the hog business during the entire year of 1970, then your average sale could be about \$42 a head. I wonder if the Member for Wadena remembers that Bred Sow program in 1963? Do you remember that Bred Sow program? I know of one sow that had three owners and the fourth owner said, "I hope to God that she doesn't have little ones because we need meat in the house." This sow made 90 miles, she was worth \$120 and didn't have any loving. Now they talk about 22 cent hogs.

MR. D. W. MICHAYLUK: (Redberry): — 20 cents.

MR. BREKER: — No, 22 cent hogs, \$21.50 in Regina. Now don't get excited Dick, just keep your cool. If we have any more money left in Public Works we are going to build you a little bench so that you can really get up and give that Mussolini speech. But here's the thing here, Economic Statistics, a little yellow book. Now what was the average yearly price in Winnipeg, not in Regina, but in Winnipeg which is two cents higher? Was it 22 cents?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — No!

MR. BREKER: — Was it 21 cents?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — No!

MR. BREKER: — Was it 20 cents?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — No!

MR. BREKER: — Was it 18 cents?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — No!

MR. BREKER: — Was it 16.41?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Yes!

MR. BREKER: — \$16.41. Now what did they pay in 1945? That was 1944, now this is 1945. Did they pay 22 cents for hogs in Winnipeg? Did they pay 18 cents? They paid \$16.70. They paid \$17.85 in 1946. In 1947 they paid \$20.61. Oh, but now the farmers got lucky - \$27.94 in 1948. It's going up. Back in 1952 - \$24.45.

Now let's get up to 1959 - \$21.30, Winnipeg price, \$2 more than any Saskatchewan price. 1960 - \$21.65. Big deal! 1963 - \$24.80; 1964-\$23.55; 1965 - \$30.05.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. BREKER: — And how many hogs did they have with their Bred Sow program? In 1964, do you know how many hogs they had? Did they have a million?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — No!

MR. BREKER: — Did they have 1.3 million?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — No!

MR. BREKER: — Did they have half a million?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — No!

MR. BREKER: — They had 441,000. Oh yes, they are hog men. They are great hog men. The Member from Riversdale (Mr. Romanow) said the only contribution that the Member from Souris-Estevan (Mr. MacDougall) made was to give somebody a tie. He said something about my contribution to this House. Well, I looked over there and I've seen that dearth of intelligence and that dearth of ability and if that situation existed on this side of the House I wouldn't be the financial critic, I wouldn't be the Provincial Treasurer, I would be the Premier of this province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. BREKER: — I know you are going to bring your big gun up here tonight right after me. You know a year or two ago he was running around up in North Battleford putting up stop signs. He was concerned with the safety of the travelling public. He even forced himself to put up illegal highway signs and the Attorney General (Mr. Heald) had something to say about that. Isn't it funny, on the one hand we have a Member of the Legislature putting up illegal stop signs to protect the travelling public and on the other hand he refuses to take drunks off the road?

In the last two weeks I have listened to the Leader of the NDP (Mr. Blakeney), I have listened to the Deputy Leader, (Mr. Romanow), the frontbenchers, the backbenchers, I have listened to the Throne Debate and the Budget Debate.

MR. R. ROMANOW: (Saskatoon Riversdale): — And Otto Lang?

MR. BREKER: — Yes, I've listened to him too.

MR. ROMANOW: — You've listened too much.

MR. J. MESSER: (Kelsey): — Your brother-in-law, remember the phone call. You forgot about that one.

March 4, 1971

AN HON. MEMBER: — They are better when they're sitting down, it keeps their brains warm.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. BREKER: — They didn't say they were against a highway program. People up in Lake Lenore, you talk about the people up in Lake Lenore. They are only too happy with Highway No. 368.

MR. ROMANOW: — \$3 million.

MR. BREKER: — Oh no, not \$3 million. We're not going to spend \$3 million up there but we are going to spend \$300,000 when we rebuild and regrade the roads on No. 20. We are going to spend another \$70,000 for oil. The people in Annaheim are perfectly satisfied that we are going to take in that road from St. Gregor to Annaheim, take it into the highway system. The people across the way haven't said anything against the steps that we have proposed and are proposing to help the farmer such as the Guaranteed Livestock Loan Act, cash intended for hog barns, the help for Indian Bands to get into cattle. As far as education is concerned I tell the Members opposite it is the largest provincial grant ever paid in the history of this province. They didn't tell us whether they were against increased pensions for teachers retiring prior to 1963. Oh, but the Member from Swift Current (Mr. Wood) says his income is down by one-third and I don't doubt it a bit. I'll bet his income was down the year before that and I'll bet the year before that his net income was down. The people yonder are so concerned about taxes going up and new taxes there is no wonder they have gone up. There is a teacher on that side of the House whose wages have gone up 76 per cent since 1963. Another teacher, the teacher from Kelvington, his wages have gone up 51 per cent.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. BREKER: — We haven't heard if they are against the increases to the Workmen's Compensation Act. Are they against the Homeowners Grant? Some of them voted against it. They don't tell us what their stand is on the Homeowners Grant if they got in next year. I would have expected from these two lawyer leaders who are now so thoughtful that we should have something bold and something imaginative. Instead they just gave us the old Regina Manifesto (dress it up a little bit and give it to them again).\

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. BREKER: — For the farmer, all his ills, they cure everything with one dose of Socialism. They contend that the land should be owned by the Government and they will lease it back maybe to the owner maybe to the neighbor depending on his political views. But recently the cries for Socialism have increased. The younger NDPers voted for nationalization of all farm lands. The old NDPers advocate the same kind of action. The university boys advocate the same kind of action, socialize everything, the natural resources, you name it. In short, the Socialists have only one answer to give the farmers and that is to socialize the farmers' land.

AN HON. MEMBER: — What's your answer?

MR. BREKER: — The Opposition contends that farmers and unions have the same interests and that they should unite under the NDP banner. For years the CCF marriage counsellors have been trying to arrange for a nice little nuptial hour where the farming bride and the labor groom walk up to the altar and make a perfect union. And they stand there wringing their hands waiting for the bride and groom to jump into bed to consummate the marriage.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. BREKER: — Most of the rural residents are a bit dubious about that proposition because year after year the farmer notes that every time they're getting ready to move their wheat to market, it's either the dock workers, the railway workers, the terminal elevators, or the sailors who go out on strike. Such strikes always disrupt the movement of grain. And I shouldn't be surprised if the dock workers will go out again this summer. In a major strike no one can win, the workers or their families, and this Saskatchewan Government is determined to find a better way of solving strikes in the not too distant future.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. BREKER: — I am sure it won't go with- out notice that every time there is a labor dispute regardless of the public interest, the Socialists side with the unions. Did you ever hear one of them speak up?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — No, no!

MR. BREKER: — Never, never, never; It, doesn't matter if it's against the farmer. It doesn't matter if it's against the sick in the hospitals. It doesn't matter if it's against the old folks' home. Do you ever hear them speak up against labor?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — No!

MR. BREKER: — And another thing, this hasn't gone unnoticed either. If they do win the next election, they'll do away with Bill 2. Now watch them clap.

This Bill at least gives some protection to farmers, the aged and the sick, and for that section of the population that isn't organized and that segment of the population that cannot pass on increased cost of production and increased cost of living.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. BREKER: — As I mentioned a few minutes ago, this Government has given grants to hog barns in order to increase diversification, in Alberta 40 per cent of the farm cash receipts come from livestock, in Saskatchewan 20 per cent. Our hog population has gone up 200 per cent for two reasons (400,000 to 1,200,000), (1) because of the hog grant program, and (2) because of the wheat glut and

March 4, 1971

this was a quick way of turning grain into dollars. But the Member from Kelsey (Mr. Messer) and the Member from Wadena (Mr. Dewhurst) blame this Liberal Government. They blame our hog program for depressed prices (20 cents in Saskatchewan). You fellows were paying 16 and 17 cents in Winnipeg. Our hog numbers have expanded in a most encouraging manner and I'm glad of it because in our area one of the largest hog producing areas in the province, I think we're better off even if the prices are depressed temporarily. We are still better off than the fellows who aren't doing anything.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. BREKER: — We know that the price has dropped recently, but we know as the Saskatchewan farmers know, that hog prices depend to a very considerable degree upon the American market. You know that the State of Iowa raises more hogs than the entire country of Canada. And the price of hogs would be 21 and 22 cents whether we had one hog in Saskatchewan or whether we had a million and a half.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. BREKER: — In the past year they interviewed the Member from Kelsey on the radio. I thought he was their big hope but I have been wrong. I was wrong on three occasions. One time I bought an Edsel, the second time, that the Member for Kelsey would really be something, and I can't tell you what the other time was. Someone told me it was when my brother-in-law became head of the Wheat Board.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Ha, ha.

MR. BREKER: — In the past year, the United States has increased its farrowing by 10 per cent. You know what 10 per cent is? 10 per cent equals more than the entire hog population of Canada. Right now we know that the farmers in the United States are paying 21/4 cents for their feed. The farmers in Saskatchewan were paying 1 1/2 cents. We know now too that the decrease in hog farrowings is down by six per cent

MR. D. W. MICHAYLUK: (Redberry): — You should have waited to get that on the air tomorrow.

MR. BREKER: — Dick, don't get off your chair, you're going to get your, you know...

I was disturbed by the discontinuance of the Federal Hog Subsidy and because our Government feels that it makes sense for farmers to remain in hogs and to produce hogs they will be paid \$2 on all hogs grading 103 and over.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. BREKER: — Now this is welcome news, very, very welcome news up in our country. I hope farmers will not think me presumptuous if I offer one word of advice. The improved grain picture

could tempt many a Saskatchewan farmer in my area to get out of livestock I believe that such a trend is dangerous and to ensure and protect themselves from future grain gluts farmers snout! continue to expand all kinds of livestock including hogs.

I will support the Budget, but I couldn't possibly support the amendment.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. E. KRAMER: (The Battlefords): — After that particular set of comments he might just as well call it an evening almost. All I would say to the Hon. Member who just sat down, "Don't drive home tonight, daddy, it won't be safe."

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. KRAMER: — There are some people who we like to believe to be better than others, but you know, a chap told me when he was asked to blow the balloon, "You know, I just couldn't. I just thought of that Liberal Government and the Premier and I said that I thought one more Liberal wind bag would be too much. One more Liberal wind bag would be just too much.

AN HON. MEMBER: — That's a good reason for anybody to have.

MR. KRAMER: — That's right. You know, Mr. Speaker, I want to say a few words about some of the things that have been said in this debate and add a few comments of my own. It seems there have been some strong speeches here in this Budget debate The Hon. Minister of Health (Mr. Grant), the Attorney General (Mr. Heald), and we even had the sanctimonious, self-righteous. Member for Rosthern the Minister of Highways (Mr. Boldt) giving us a bit of his wisdom and otherwise. The information he tabled in the House I think he should have kept in his files. I think he had better Have kept it in his files. It was even more damning than the information, Mr. Speaker, that they gave us in answer to a question in 1969. The Minister of Highways attempted in tabling the information to give the impression to the House that God was in His Heaven and all is well with the world as far as the Department of Highways was concerned. Well, let's take a look. He didn't change anything. The fact of the matter is that the answer was exactly as I said it was - \$24,000 plus \$200 for 50 acres plus a fraction of sub-marginal land.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!!

MR. KRAMFR: — And no amount of arguments by the sanctimonious, self- righteous Member for Rosthern is going to change that. No amount of tabling documents in going to change that.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. KRAMER: — Yes, it's a pity, Mr. Speaker, that he hadn't tabled all the documents. Because I note that not only did they pay this amount of money, this \$400 an acre for

March 4, 1971

sub-marginal land to a Member of the Liberal Executive in the Battlefords but they brought a witness. They brought as a witness another Member of the Liberal Executive or a former Member. I notice that Mr. Warren, land appraiser, says this in referring to the document here, and I quote from it, he's referring to what he thinks. Mr. Warren says:

Regarding the claims of Mr. Mike Gabruck, I find it almost impossible to justify his claims since land values on the Battleford side of the river have been depressed compared with North Battleford.

Apparently, at this point, somebody had been talking to Mr. Warren so he waffles a little. He waffles a little and he says:

Also a copy of a letter from E. J. Marshall.

MR. R. ROMANOW: (Saskatoon Riversdale): — Who is E. J. Marshall?

MR. KRAMER: — He's a former Member if not a present Member of the Liberal Executive. He owns the Capitol Theatre and Marshall Enterprises in North Battleford. He was a trustee of the Public School Board until he was voted out of office last fall. And he said that E. J. Marshall has enclosed a letter indicating a substantial increase in the potential of this land. All this, of course, is due to the new bridge according to Mr. Warren, but it was contracted prior to our expropriation and may pose a problem in establishing the value in court. Well, the Minister of Highways has left. He's probably thinking up some answers for some other problems that he's going to have to meet.

You know, Mr. Speaker, that is the most inane attempt at covering up a piece of questionable dealing, to be as kind as I can, a dumb deal, yes DDT.

AN HON. MEMBER: — You can do better than that.

MR. KRAMER: — That's right, I can do better than that, that's right. They like to throw innuendo across the floor of this House. We've seen some of these stalwarts get up (this afternoon was no exception) and they like to refer to the Mafia, they like to refer to labor leaders and so on, and indicate that there is something, some connection between these racketeers and labor leaders, and I'm talking about racketeer labor leaders, not the good Canadian, honest labor leaders that are our supporters and whom we're proud to have for our supporters.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. KRAMER: — They hope, Mr. Speaker, that the public will forget the Hal Banks deal. You know the friends of Basford, the friends of some other Basfords that are in Ottawa too. Yes, that gentleman who was allowed to cross the border. The friends of Rivard and a few others. They'd like us to forget about those deals. They'd like to forget the fact that Hansard shows and I quoted from that last year, and I hope I don't have to do it again, that several Members of the Liberal Party were financed by Hal

Banks' racketeers.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. KRAMER: — We haven't heard very much from that side of the House about a recent Senate appointment from the Teamsters' Union. That haven for political heelers and sellouts and the senile, old men of the Liberal Party that are no longer useful to them. Jimmy Hoffa appointed Lawson, we know that. Of course, I think that probably Estevan is a good stopping off place for Hal Banks and I think the liaison man at North Portal must be the Member for Souris-Estevan (Mr. MacDougall). He's so worried about covering the tracks of some of the rest of the DDT (dirty deals by Trudeau and company and Thatcher).

Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to draw to the attention of this House once again, some other remarks that were made about the former deals. There were some complaints that the odd shyster got through the net when the former Government was in office. And we've heard some deals mentioned about the cemetery plots and so on. I thought that was a dead issue. The Hon. Attorney General (Mr. Heald) is trying his best to keep it alive. I appreciate that he got a lot of his friends off the hook as well as a lot of citizens of Saskatchewan when the Government bailed out those cemeteries and that was a mixed blessing. And now it seems strange to me, Mr. Speaker, the Government of Canada, the Liberal Party, the Liberal Government has a lot of muscle, (some between the ears) when it comes to making heroes of themselves attacking a group and imposing the War Measures Act on a group of demented racketeers, the FLQ. And I don't blame them too much for that, that was their business. But they don't have much muscle, Mr. Speaker, when it comes to doing something about the Mafia in Canada that is getting stronger every year permeating the whole life of Canada more every year.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. KRAMER: — We read in our weekend magazines and I haven't heard anyone refuting it that the Federal Government was asked and the Quebec Government also (Liberal Governments both of them) to bring in Legislation to stop the loan shark racket. Refused. Why? Where is their muscle when it comes to doing something that is going to protect the young of Canada?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. KRAMER: — Mr. Speaker, the tentacles of the Mafia are reaching out into every corner of Saskatchewan today in the drug racket. And I ask the Attorney General and the Federal Minister of Justice what are they doing about it? What are they doing about it? I should like to see some beefing up, Mr. Speaker, of the police forces to see to it that there isn't any further spreading of crime in this country and my city of North Battleford. And it's getting worse all over. I want to see some action where it counts against organized international crime. Fine, go after the FLQ and the other rabbles that are seeking to damage our nation. But a far greater danger exists in the ever-spreading, ever-increasing power of the Mafia. Surely, the lessons of our neighbors to the south ought to be enough to spur action.

March 4, 1971

Mr. Speaker, I am sorry to say that some Members opposite when they were trying to discredit our Leader, our new Leader, even tied in the old Columbia Metals deal. Nobody should bring this in from that side of the House. I should have thought that they would have been satisfied to leave that alone. With all due respect, Mr. Speaker, I say that if anybody opened the gate to that type of racket it was the gentleman that is sitting across in the seat of the Attorney General. What did he say, Mr. Speaker, after the former Attorney General had tried to bring the Columbia Metals manipulators to justice for years and spent thousands and thousands of dollars? When the judge ordered a retrial, the Attorney General said that it would cost us too much to continue this fight. That's what he said. In other words, he said, that if you are big and powerful and wealthy come to Saskatchewan, we won't fight you. We can't do anything about it because you have too much money. I say that was the opening up of the gate to the Mafia. I say that the Member for Notukeu-Willowbunch (Mr. Hooker) would have been better to have remained in his seat. Yes, and kept quiet. It was an unhappy set of circumstances but the present Attorney General did very little. Here is a case where strangely the brave freedom fighter wasn't too anxious to continue that fight.

MR. D. V. HEALD: (Attorney General): — I shall show you the file sometime.

MR. KRAMER: — Very well. Mr. Speaker, the Attorney General

MR. HEALD: — You loused it up. You tried to prosecute him and you had no case.

MR. KRAMER: — Mr. Speaker, do I have the floor? Well, suffice it to say that the Attorney General did not pursue that case and I am suggesting that they, least of all, can talk about making deal's with various people.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. KRAMER: — Mr. Speaker, another one to rise in his place was the Minister of Health (Mr. Grant). He chose to juggle some figures around. He talked about hospital depopulation in reply to Mr. Snyder. He chose just part of one year or a year that might have overlapped. But the point is when the Member for Moose Jaw was speaking about the Weyburn depopulation and 1,000 patients being discharged in one year, they were discharged quite often without the knowledge of their relatives, those statements were true.

A woman who lives at Moose Jaw - and we are prepared to give the name - was moved three doors, -down from her daughter in Moose Jaw and the daughter didn't even know that she had been moved during that period of time.

He brags about the new cafeteria in North Battleford and it is a beautiful thing. I am quite happy with it. But I am saying this, that it is just too bad that some of those poor mental patients who are sitting back in the bush quite often being used as slave labor, can't enjoy some of those facilities. No way, Mr. Speaker, are these kinds of people going to get the

kind of treatment that is given at the Saskatchewan Hospital to the patients that are there.

Mr. Speaker, I want to say this, that the treatment that is given to the patients at the Saskatchewan Hospital today, as in the past, is excellent. I think that the Department of Health can be congratulated on the care that has been given. The staff at the hospital can be congratulated and should be congratulated for the care that is given to those people who remain there. I say that it is unfortunate that some of those hopeless cases that have been shoved off in garages and basements and so on could not be there to enjoy those facilities.

Mr. Speaker, I want to say further that some of the boarding places are doing an excellent job but there is still a lot to be desired. I am not going to say where the places are because the social workers who are working the area throughout the various parts of northwestern Saskatchewan are doing their best. But that whole program is still under staffed and I would not cast any reflection on those social workers who are doing the best they can because they can't possibly police that boarding out program properly. Mr. Minister of Health, I say that if you are going to continue this boarding out program, you must beef it up as well as see to it that these people who require more supervision receive it. The people who are boarding these people should get a great deal more supervision than they are getting today.

MR. ROMANOW: — Just like the Frazier Report.

MR. KRAMER: — Yes, just like the Frazier Report says. Mr. Speaker, it will not be forgotten that there are scars on the communities and scars on the lives of families and individuals in this province that would not be there if it was not for this hasty program that was engineered and organized and permitted by the former Minister of Health who fills the Treasury seat and is not in the House.

He is a man who bragged about depopulation and who maligned those people who said, "You are going too fast with the Saskatchewan Plan and you are going to run into trouble." I say that we did run into trouble in this province and the tragedy that people suffered and especially in my area in Saskatchewan is not forgotten. There is a case still before the courts that is a tragedy and that tragedy could have been avoided if the Department of Social Welfare, the Department of Health had been more vigilant and had provided that young man with the care and treatment that he needed when he was there and had not turned him loose to repeat another tragedy, nearly a double tragedy. It was a double tragedy because that father will never recover from that trial.

I don't like, Mr. Speaker, to see the Minister of Health and I am not blaming him, but I don't like to see him stand in his place in this House and ridicule the people who have given constructive criticism on this side and completely ignore what went on in the past and what is still going on in the area of the mental health policy.

Mr. Speaker, I want to turn for a moment now to the Department of Natural Resources and some of the things that have been

March 4, 1971

said. It seems to me that there is a great deal of bragging going on. Quite a few statements have been made regarding the former treatment of Indians and Indian Bands in Saskatchewan. It seems to be rather strange that the Premier, who is the most voluble, forgets completely that the Department of Indian Affairs has always been in the hands of the Federal Government and that most of the time since Confederation that the Federal Government has been a Liberal Government.

It seems strange that he will choose every time he gets on his feet in this House and every time that he moves around the hustings to point out or try to point out that the former Provincial Government was to blame for the situation that existed in Indian Affairs.

Mr. Speaker, it is a historic fact that the people who ran the Department of Indian Affairs, the Indian Agents that were appointed throughout the province, for the most part, were not equal to the job. If the Liberal Party had someone who embarrassed them whom they would like to get out of town, often times he turned up as an Indian Agent in some distant reserve. That was the history of the Department of Indian Affairs and the method of appointing Indian Agents. That, Mr. Speaker, is one of the reasons why we find the Indian Reserves in the condition that they are today. You will find there, hopelessness and distrust for the white man. You can't blame them. But when the people across the way including the Premier say that nothing was done for the Indians in the 20 years we were in office, that is an absolute untruth.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. KRAMER: — Mr. Speaker, in 1944 when the CCF Government was elected, the Indians in the North and especially the northern Métis settlements were dying faster than they were being born. The first thing that had to be done was a crash program, a program of moving in to clean up the tuberculosis and all the other social diseases that the white man brought to those people over the years. They were dying faster than they were being born.

Schools, hospitals, the fur conservation practices, the fur conservation blocks, fish filleting plants - don't boast of what you have done for the Indians and the Métis when the Federal Liberal Government failed to assist with the filleting plants. They failed in this except for a 50 per cent contribution for the plant at Sandy Bay. That was the only time the Federal Liberal Government participated in assisting community projects such as a fish filleting plant and it is to the ever-lasting shame of the Liberal Party that they never did one other thing. They are the ones who never did a thing for the Indians.

With the limited budgets we had to make the first moves to bring those people out of the morass. The fishing co-ops, the co-op stores were all started and these people were gradually getting on their feet. I think that it is to the credit of this Government that some of these programs have been carried on. I think that it is to the discredit of this Government that many of the programs that we had in 1964 were discontinued because they didn't want to give credit to the former government for the sawmilling program. LaLoche was a good example where we had a milling program and an Indian Band of 22 natives went into

the Clearwater River area, felled and sawed 250,000 feet of lumber and brought it out to LaLoche for a housing program which was dropped in its tracks in the spring of 1964. Half of the lumber rotted and the rest went out to God knows where. This Government threw out work programs and went out and brought pre-fabricated houses in from Alberta. Prefabricated houses! A self-help program? A lot of good that did, Mr. Speaker, to help the natives to help themselves.

Mr. Speaker, let it not be forgotten that there is more social aid being spent, there are more people on social aid, there are more social welfare workers in northern Saskatchewan now than there has ever been in the history of the province.

One industry that really went up in the town of Meadow Lake where social aid was formerly handled by Jim Elliot and two clerks was social aid bureaucracy. At last count there were over 30 people working for the Department of Social Welfare as well as others in various points in the North. They created jobs all right! Plenty of jobs! Jobs for government workers and social workers dispensing relief. There is very little to be said for a program like that. We make no apologies for the programs that we had with and for the native people.

The Minister of Natural Resources (Mr. Barrie) spoke pontifically about reforestation and all the wonderful things that were being done. He did say, "You are bound to be shocked when you walk into the forest and see the clear cutting program." He went on to say, "We are enjoying an enormous program of reforestation." Well, Mr. Speaker, that enormous reforestation program apparently is about two and one-half per cent of what they have clear cut in one year according to Parsons and Whittemore's own advertisements. Parson and Whittemore's \$500 advertisement that I referred to before and I have it here says that they are clear cutting 23,000 acres and by their own admission they have planted 900 acres last year. There is far more to be said about this than can be said in just one evening.

I should like to quote from a statement by Dr. William O. Pruitt, Jr. He wrote an article on the rape of our environment in Newfoundland. He is now with the University of Manitoba. In replying to one of the Canadian foresters he said this:

Probably the most important environmental change affecting Newfoundland at the present time is the current cutting practices, and I won't even call them forestry practices, of the large pulp companies. Because black spruce is more useful for their pulp making process than balsam fir and because of the economic pressure to get the maximum return for the unit effort, the companies practice clear cutting on Crown land as well as on lease and freehold land. There are several- results from this practice. One is a virtual tundra landscape for many years. Indeed some botanical plant experts believe will never regenerate over a large area.

Strong winds will sweep over the denuded land and dry up everything before them. Consequently as the accumulation basins of certain key rivers have been denuded the paper mills had a recent shortage of water for power purposes. In the area where recovery is possible the regrowth is almost pure black spruce. These areas of

single species of pure cultures are extremely susceptible to the invasion by parasites and disease thus the justification is established for mass spraying. The clear cutting practice carried on in this province has led many laymen to believe that this is the only way to exploit the forest. Thus, when the St. Johns' city council needed money they authorized the clear cutting of the St. Johns' watershed the water source of the city's major impoundment. The result has been, as predicted, a series of summers with emergency water conservation measures enforced.

These are the people who tell us, oh everything is fine. God is in Heaven and all is well with the world.

Mr. Speaker, this Government and the exploiters are prepared to take the short term advantage of rape of the forest rather than the long term advantages of love and care and thought to future generations.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. KRAMER: — Mr. Speaker, there will be more said before this session is over. We were promised by the Government when the Prince Albert pulp mill was brought in, promised that there would be no pollution. We are being promised now there will be no pollution of the Churchill watershed if and when Athabasca Forest Industries builds. I have some serious doubts about that project I am not getting too excited about that developing. To those people who are holding their breath waiting for the mill to come I'd say this, they had better take a look at what happened to the promise of no pollution of the North Saskatchewan River. I haven't got the final return to my question. I should be interested to get the return of the Water Resources Commission but the one from the Fisheries branch is bad enough. Not only do we lose 60 per cent of the oxygen content of the river before it comes from the industrial area of Alberta at Edmonton, 60 per cent of the oxygen is removed, 40 per cent still remains before it gets to Prince Albert and when a count was taken on January 6th approximately six points per million remained of that oxygen. That is a little higher than the 40 per cent. What was there after it had gone downstream? 3.7! That's bad enough. On February 16th it dropped to 2.0 - 2.0 before it joined the South Saskatchewan River.

Now the Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Steuart) was telling the people of Meadow Lake that the South Saskatchewan River ran past Prince Albert but he was a little out in his geography. The fact of the matter is that after that water passes Prince Albert, passes the pulp mill and the city of Prince Albert, again more than 50 per cent on an average of the oxygen is removed from that water and that 50 per cent that is taken there brings that water down to a level that is impossible to support marine life. When it gets down to less than four points per million fish will die.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. KRAMER: — I challenge this Government to say that the pulp mill and the city of Prince Albert combined - and they knew that there

was pollution before the pulp mill was built, they knew we had that to contend with - is not polluting the North Saskatchewan River. I am going to be very interested to see what the Saskatchewan Water Resources Commission report says about the pollution level before it joins the forks of that river.

MR. D. W. MICHAYLUK: (Redberry): — They'll probably...

MR. KRAMER: — Oh, I don't think they'll dare do that because it is still possible to get free samples and an independent analysis done. I don't think they'd be so foolish. Well, they attempt to cook pretty nearly anything but I don't think they'll be cooking that.

Mr. Speaker, I say they broke their promise about guarding the river and our waters against pollution at Prince Albert. They have admitted this with the announcement of an expansion - a \$1.3 million expansion - of sewage treatment if and when it happens. Whether that's to get them off the present hook I'll never know. We won't know because that's going to take a while before that river can be tested again. So I say there is a danger, Mr. Speaker, that the pulp industry is going to pollute the northern watershed and that northern watershed, Mr. Speaker, is far more valuable to us and to future generations than even the biggest pulp mill in the world or two of them.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. KRAMER: — Mr. Speaker, I say this, that if we are going to put up all that money, back the rates, take all the risks in putting up a pulp mill, maybe we might just as well own the pulp mill ourselves. It might seem logical. They say, "Oh, that's Socialism." Well, they don't hesitate to own 30 per cent. They say that's good. In fact, I think it was the Premier who said that we are much better off than Manitoba because we own 30 per cent of it. Well, Mr. Speaker, if it is good to own 30 per cent, I imagine it would be better to own 50 per cent. I should think so. And if it is good to own 50 per cent, why not 75 or 100? The Premier by his own admission says that we're better off than Manitoba because we own 30 per cent. Why not all of it?

I'll tell you another reason, Mr. Speaker, why it might be a good idea. The reason we are facing this pollution situation on the North Saskatchewan is because we are running so close to the line. This Government is so anxious that the pulp mill shall not be hampered in any way to give them a free go that they have refused to take the necessary precautions or make the mill take the necessary precautions.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. KRAMER: — Because the investment and the margin of operation seems to be too great. Another reason our forestry practices have become so lax is once again to allow Saskatchewan Pulp Company, our subsidy, to operate as cheaply as possible. So here again we have sacrificed our forest, our forestry practice in order to pour a cheap product into the mill. I say if we have to do all these things, Mr. Speaker, we might just as well lose a little money, provide the employment that's necessary and keep

March 4, 1971

a little closer tab on the mill. We can do that with public ownership rather than be blackmailed as apparently the chemical plant - the Co-op Chemical plant - was into providing cheap chemicals to the point where it nearly went bankrupt.

Mr. Speaker, I say that the only thing that stands between us and the proper and safe utilization of our resources is the courage to do the job. And as far as I am concerned the Saskatchewan people, certainly the New Democratic Party, have no such lack of courage. We are brave enough to tackle this job.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. KRAMER: — We were brave enough to tackle the Saskatchewan Power Corporation, one of the most successful Crown corporations in Canada. We are told this was started by the Liberals.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. KRAMER: — The wreckage, yes. We know about the puny, little wreck the Liberals called the Power Corporation. We know about that, Ross. Yes, the wind-chargers of Jimmy Gardiner, we know about them. We know about Saskatchewan Government Insurance which was maligned and continues to be maligned by some of the Members opposite, one of the most successful Crown corporations anywhere in Canada, possibly anywhere in the world.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. KRAMER: — A real success story. We know how healthy Saskatchewan Telephones became after the Liberals went out of office in 1944. Now it has even got to the point where it can even subsidize the Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Steuart). We know about many of the - others. The Provincial Treasurer likes to sit and burp pulp mill and shoe factory and woollen mill and one thing or another but with all those combined, you know, you can't have a lot of successes without a few failures.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. KRAMER: — That's right, but you never talk about successes. Saskatchewan Sodium Sulphate ran pretty well until the Premier got hold of it. It doesn't look very good by the report right now. If you'd have kept your cotton-picking fingers out of it, Mr. Premier, and hadn't let your friends in on Snake Hole and some of the others and given those resources away, it still would have been making a million dollars a year for the people of Saskatchewan.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. KRAMER: — But you couldn't leave it alone, could you?

MR. W. R. THATCHER: (Premier): — make more this year than you fellows ever did;

MR. KRAMER: — Oh yes, sure. Well, Mr.

Speaker, I think we'd just better take a look before we leap into this major pulp mill operation. And that Bill is coming before the House. We'll have ample time to take a look at what is being done there.

Mr. Speaker, we've had enough of this pollution party. We've had enough of this DDT.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. KRAMER: — I agree with Mr. Deputy Leader (Mr. Romanow) and the Member for Moose Jaw (Mr. Snyder) that the sooner they call an election the better.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. KRAMER: — The sooner you people get out of office the better.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. KRAMER: — We're ready any time. How about it? How about it, Ross?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. KRAMER: — Mr. Speaker, it's a pleasure to support the amendment. I do not support the motion.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

HON. A. R. GUY: (Minister of Municipal Affairs): — Mr. Speaker, I had no intention of taking part in this debate but I cannot let some of the misrepresentations and un-truths that we have heard in the past few weeks go unanswered.

First of all I want to refer to some of the comments made by my good friend the former mayor who is still my MLA for Regina South East (Mr. Baker). He referred to everyone in Saskatchewan being deeper in debt. Well, I don't know, Mr. Speaker, if that's true for everybody in Saskatchewan but I can tell you that anybody who lived in the city of Regina while he was mayor for 12 years is deeper in debt.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. GUY: — In fact the reason he was defeated at the polls last fall is because of his completely irresponsible approach to financing. He ran the city of Regina into a financial fiasco which it will take years to get out of.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. GUY: — In fact he's done so badly that even his own party aren't sure that they want him back. He hasn't got too much left to go for. He tried one nominating convention and because

March 4, 1971

of a packed house from the union hall he lost that one. Now today he's waffling around trying to find a seat where he thinks he can win and there isn't much left. They hurried up the nomination in Lumsden so that he couldn't get in there. They rushed one in Touchwood so that he couldn't get in there. So they say, well, maybe we'd better let you go in Wascana, you'll never win it anyway and this is really what we want. Because I can tell you that as long as they have Members like that as well as the Member for Riversdale (Mr. Romanow) who gave the financial speech the other day, there is no one in his right mind in this province who would let anyone from those benches control the financial responsibility of this province.]

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. GUY: — We've listened to it over the last few days. They don't know what financial responsibility is. One minute they say you shouldn't be doing that and the next minute they've got \$30 million or \$40 million of new projects and they say, we'll do it without any tax increases. Well, they tried that for 20 years and it finally caught up to them and the people. As I said earlier in this session, I believe one dose of Socialism in any province is more than any province can stand.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. GUY: — Now I want to refer for a minute or two to the comments of the Member for Wadena (Mr. Dewhurst) and I am sorry that he is not in his seat.

AN HON. MEMBER: — Oh, there he is.

MR. GUY: — Oh, I must apologize to the Member for Wadena because he didn't make that intelligent speech. It was the Member for Touchwood (Mr. Meakes) to whom I want to refer. He referred to some of the rising property mill rates in rural municipalities. He referred specifically to the Rural Municipality of Garry where he claimed the mill rates increased from 35 to 45 mills since 1964. Well, we all recognize that mill rates have been increasing over the years and it isn't only since 1964. I remember a lot of rural municipalities in 1944 that had mill rates of 12 and 13 by the time we got rid of the Socialists they were up to 30, 31 or higher. But what the Member for Touchwood conveniently forgot to tell this House was that in 1963-64 under the NDP the municipality received the magnificent sum in equalization grants of \$2,027. \$2,027 in equalization grants when the mill rate was 35. In 1970-71 from the benevolent Liberal Government they received \$14,955 in equalization grants.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. GUY: — So while the mill rate went up 28 per cent their equalization grant was increased by 700 per cent to help cover this increase. Why didn't he tell the House this?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. GUY: — Now we come to the fellow

from North Battleford (Mr. Kramer) and he's out of the House as usual. As I said, I suppose he's starting to walk home.

He referred to the Senate and he said that this is a haven for political heelers. You know a few months ago I was rather proud of the Prime Minister for going across party lines and picking some of our great Canadians to fill seats in the Senate. And I can think of one, of Mme. Therese Casgrain of the Province of Quebec who, regardless of her political affiliation, has made a tremendous contribution to Canada particularly the eastern provinces. She has been well thought of by members of every party particularly the Liberal Party or she would never have been asked to occupy one of those honoured seats in the Senate. And so what does one of the NDP Members in Saskatchewan say about this lady? They say that she is a political heeler and should never have been appointed to the Senate. A Member of her own party attacks her when she's not here to defend herself. This is the way they attack the women's movement in the NDP. We only have to think back a couple of years when the women tried to get some additional representation on the federal council and they said, no, there's no room for women but we've got room for 12 automatic members from the international labor unions. That's the way they treat the women in their party.

I think that this is a statement that the Member for North Battleford (Mr. Kramer) should come back in here and apologize for.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. GUY: — One of the finest women in Canada and one of his own party and he calls her a political heeler who has no right to go to the Senate. It's a disgrace.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. GUY: — I am sure that the Member for Moose Jaw North (Mr. Snyder) will get up and compliment her for her appointment and ask for an apology from his colleague.

The Member for North Battleford then went on and talked about the cemetery fiasco and he said it was a dead issue. He thought he was being funny but I can tell Members of this House that the people of Saskatchewan know that it isn't funny and it is not a dead issue. Members opposite should be ashamed of themselves for the pain and misery caused the thousands of people in this province who were rooked by this organization.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. GUY: — But no, they say that there is nothing to it. As I pointed out earlier, the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Blakeney) over there now was so pleased with his accomplishment in getting these people into the province and the chap from Toronto even held a tea for him in the 1960 election. This was part of the payoff for allowing them to come in here to carry out this nefarious program.

March 4, 1971

Then he got on to drugs and I don't know whether he's on them or off them. He never told us. But I want to tell this House that only since 1964 has there been a Federal Royal Commission and that was the LeDain Commission on Drugs and the Opposition didn't present a brief to it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. GUY: — Why didn't they present a brief at that time? I'll tell you, because if you want to look for most of the drug pushers and users in this province, you'll find them in the NDP.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. GUY: — Then he went on to Columbia Metals and he said, you know, this wasn't that bad. It wasn't that bad to Members opposite but he forgot to mention another case that was in the public eye about that time and that was the Rawluk case. T.C. Douglas, Fines and Walker wouldn't even let the Rawluk case go into the courts. They said, no, no, we'll have a legislative committee. They packed the legislative committee with CCF Members and they then came into the House and made their report. They said everything was fine, nothing was wrong, everything was above normal. But when the Liberal Opposition at that time asked to have a judicial enquiry, the Leader and Premier of the province Tommy Douglas looked at Mr. Fines (now in a \$500,000 home in Fort Lauderdale) and said, don't worry, we've got our cut, forget about it. It never did get into the courts of this province where it belonged. The MLA for The Battlefords didn't have the courage to stand up and say anything about it.

HON. D. G. STEUART: (Provincial Treasurer): — Was he in the Cabinet?

MR. GUY: — No, he was the last one to get into the Cabinet. They ran out of possibilities and they had to scrape the bottom of the barrel.

Then the Member for North Battleford came down with one of the great statements of his speech. He said, regarding Indian Affairs, we never did anything because it was a responsibility of the Federal Government, the Federal Government is responsible. Well, I can tell the Members of this House, in fact I don't have to tell you, the Federal Government today is responsible for Indians on Indian Reserves. But we haven't let that deter us from accepting our responsibility. We have provided roads, power, telephones, housing, employment, education. We have done every- thing within our jurisdiction to help our Indian and Métis friends. We weren't prepared to sit back and say, " Oh, this is a Federal responsibility, we're not going to do anything." In fact, we are trying to help the natives in the face of opposition politics. I think we are doing a good job. In fact, I read a letter to the Editor in tonight's paper and I'm sorry that I didn't cut it out and bring it with me but it's in to- night's paper if you want to take the trouble and look it up. One of our Indian friends has written a very heart-warming letter to the Editor commending the Government for the things that they have tried to do.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. GUY: — But in the last sentence he said, "In spite of what the Opposition and those leaders of ours who are playing politics, the majority of Indian and Métis people in Saskatchewan are very pleased and happy with what the Government is doing."

Now the Member for The Battlefords came to the question of reforestry. You know, for a man who was a former Minister of Natural Resources his comments leave a great deal to be desired. After all, he knows full well that he had people in his department who were the best qualified foresters in the country. Yet who does he refer to making comments about reforestation? He goes back to some Socialist professor in Manitoba who knows nothing about Saskatchewan and according to the Member for The Battlefords, based his report on what he knew from pulp mills in St. John's, Newfoundland. He overlooked the capabilities of this province for some Socialist professor whom he doesn't know and has never met. He picked up a paper, probably the Commonwealth, read it and now all of a sudden it becomes gospel. That's the attitude of Members opposite. They never accept the facts from people who know. They've got to be Socialists or else they are not on the right wave length.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. GUY: — Tell you what: Put them in a can of beans, shake them up and they'll all come out the same color.

Then the Member from The Battlefords goes on to pollution. I want to tell you, Mr. Speaker, if there is any one thing in the minds of the Members opposite it's that they hope that the North Saskatchewan will become polluted. Everything they say is never positive it is always that they think it is going to be polluted. Well, what makes them think so? Well, I'll tell you. Somebody in the university or somebody in the Commonwealth said it's polluted. So that is all they go by.

I can tell you that there will be no pollution of the North Saskatchewan. We are as aware as any government in this country that you have to be able to put the clamps on industry and you'll see from our legislation this year that we are prepared to. But another thing to recognize is that you can't have a pollution free environment over night when it is polluted to start with. This is something that Members opposite won't recognize.

Then the great Member for The Battlefords who was a Minister of Natural Resources got on the pulp mills. Of course, he is an authority there. He never got one so that makes him an authority and he starts to talk about the financing of the Prince Albert and the Athabasca pulp mills. I am going to have a little more to say about that later on so I won't spend too much time on his comments. I want to tell you, Mr. Speaker, that 30 per cent equity in Saskatchewan is far better than putting \$92 million in cash into a bankrupt project in Manitoba. They talk about Manitoba but they don't tell the truth. They say that this was a project that was under way before the Socialists got into power that this is a Conservative fiasco. I have to

admit that the Conservatives are the ones who probably started the problem but I'll tell you one thing, after the NDP became the Government in Manitoba, it was then that the \$92 million of the taxpayers' hard cash was thrown down the drain. They didn't have to put that \$92 million in there. They could have called an enquiry right then before they spent one dollar. You know what Premier Schreyer said when he was asked, "Why didn't you stop that \$92 million?" He said, "Well you know we just came into Government. People think we are a little bit anti-free enterprise therefore we don't want to stop a project even though it doesn't look that it's too good." So what did he do? He put \$92 million down the drain to try and show that he was a friend of free enterprise.

MR. D. W. MICHAYLUK: (Redberry): — Baloney, baloney!

MR. GUY: — Those are the facts and I defy you to stand up on the floor of this House and prove otherwise. You haven't done it yet: The Member for Redberry made a great speech the other night. He waved his arms and took off his shoes and did every- thing but tell the truth about the pulp mill.

Now finally the Member for The Battlefords referred to the election with tongue in cheek. I'll tell you, Mr. Speaker, we have a candidate in North Battleford this year, Roy Dean who was a former mayor and who will take that Member to the cleaners as he has never been taken before. I think he is a little worried. If you look back and I took the trouble to look back over the last five or six years, I found out that the Member from North Battleford made one speech over the last five or six years in each session. He attended three days each week, gone Monday, gone Friday. But what about this year? Oh no, two speeches already and he is supposed to be - I think somebody from the other side today said - the clean-up man. Can you imagine that? The clean-up man from North Battleford. Well I can tell you if anybody gets taken to the cleaners it will be the Member from North Battleford by Roy Dean. There's a winner if I ever saw one.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I should like to refer to the comments from the Member for Prince Albert East-Cumberland (Mr. Berezowsky). I regret that I have to do so. I am sorry to have to criticize the Member from Prince Albert East-Cumberland on the veracity of the statement that he made because probably this will be his last Budget speech in this Legislature. I am sure that I speak in sincerity for all Members on this side of the House and I say sincerely that we shall miss our friend from Prince Albert East- Cumberland.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. GUY: — My only wish is that he could have left this House in the knowledge that at least in his last speech he had told the whole truth and nothing but the truth. But unfortunately this was not the case. I was disappointed when he used one of the most bare- faced political tricks that has ever been used in this House. He mentioned questions that he had asked regarding the amount of monies paid out on February 15th on construction projects that were announced late in December which was only six weeks earlier. Now anyone who knows anything about the construction

industry - and it is obvious that Members opposite don't fall into that category - knows that very little if any has been spent for several good reasons. First of all, it takes time to complete the working drawings, calling the tenders and awarding the contracts. After the contract is awarded it takes time for the contractor to get his equipment and men on the site and arrange interim financing. It is also well known, certainly by those in the labor movement, that the first progress payment is not presented for at least 30 days after construction starts. Following that, it is several weeks before the Treasury makes the payment. So therefore, it is very unlikely that any money will be spent within two months after a project is announced. Members opposite know this. In fact, the truth of the matter is that the answer tabled in the Legislature the other day which showed some fairly substantial figures on some of these projects showed the sincerity of this Government in getting these projects under way.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. GUY: — Now the Member was concerned that no money had been spent to date on the Cumberland House School. Again, he knows that this isn't surprising and he is trying to play a little politics. After all, schools are not due to open until September 1st in the year that they are constructed and there is plenty of time to complete the construction before school starts this fall.

MR. W. J. BEREZOWSKY: (Prince Albert East Cumberland): — It took seven years to build it.

MR. GUY: — You know better than that, Member from Prince Albert East-Cumberland. We built more classrooms and teacherages in Cumberland House in six years than you ever built in 20 years. In fact, I sometimes wonder whether the Member ever went into one of the polls in your constituency. Then he made the statement that no money was being spent for schools in northern Saskatchewan this year. I don't know whether he is blind, dumb, or a combination of both, but why would the Hon. Member make such a statement, Mr. Speaker, when all he had to do was pick up the Estimates for 1971-72 and see that \$1.3 million was budgeted for northern schools in the next fiscal year. In fact, Mr. Speaker, this will be the fourth year in a row that more than \$1 million has been spent in providing educational facilities for our northern students. I want to tell this House that the most that the NDP ever spent and that was in an election year, was \$400,000 or just a little more for northern schools. The Member for Prince Albert East-Cumberland also conveniently overlooked the fact that in this Budget there is \$200,000 for a sewer and water system in his beloved Cumberland House. Why didn't you give thanks to the benevolent Liberal Government when those people had been trying for a sewer and water system under the NDP for so long. As I say, I am the most disappointed Member in this House to think that the Member from Prince Albert East-Cumberland is so ungrateful because in so many respects he's a good guy and we've all gotten along fine but I can't stand this politics at the expense of northern students.

The MLA for Prince Albert East-Cumberland next claimed that all the people from Creighton were like Joe Borowski in the NDP

March 4, 1971

Government in Manitoba. I doubt that this is true or that they would wish to be placed in this category. The people from Creighton whom I know and I know a fair number of them after having to go over there from time to time to look after things for the Member from Prince Albert East-Cumberland. I know for a fact that they have never gone around the province casting slurs against our war veterans and our Indian friends. This is the record for Joe Borowski of the NDP Government in Manitoba.

Several Members opposite have made references to the aid we are providing for our rural and urban municipalities. I think the Member from Swift Current whom I have a great deal of respect for was one of the Members but again, I was very disappointed in his veracity. They are trying to convince the people that their assistance was much greater than ours. But I want to put a few facts on the record and I trust that the Member from Swift Current (Mr. Wood) will take these facts home and tell them to his RMs.

I want to turn first to some of the grants for rural municipalities. I want to look at the grid and farm access road grants. In 1963-64 - and I am glad you are listening. Sir - do you know how much you provided to municipalities? You provided \$4.3 million. Do you know what we are providing this year? \$6.3 million. Then we go to re-graveling grants. In 1963-64 the big NDP spenders put \$189,000 out for re-graveling in municipalities. This year - \$480,000.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. GUY: — What about equalization grants? This is a story in itself. We had one example earlier tonight, and this is a pattern that appears in every RM in this province. In 1963-64 the benevolent NDP gave \$420,000 in equalization grants and I think the Member for Swift Current was a Minister at that time. What is it this year? \$2,750,000. I know that he is ashamed of himself and I am sure it isn't his fault. It is some of those Wafflers he got mixed up with.

Well the facts are, Mr. Speaker, that in the last eight years that we were blessed with Socialism they spent \$3.3 million in equalization grants and in the eight years of Liberal Government we spent \$14 million. More than 400 per cent increase in those hard Liberal times that we hear referred to.

Now we can turn to resort roads and in 1963-64 they out did themselves - \$2,000. This year, \$100,000 and the same was true last year.

Now here is a good one - maintenance grants. We always hear about the maintenance of grid roads and how hard pressed the municipalities are. In 1963-64, what did they spend? Zip! Nil! No program for maintenance, not a dollar, not a cent! What do you think we are spending this year? \$1,255,000.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. GUY: — Those were the so-called friends of the municipalities.

Now we have got another good one - snow removal. How much do you think they spent in 1963-64? You're right again. Nothing, not a penny, not a penny. This year - \$360,000. Where was the Member from Swift Current in those days? Where was he?

You know we heard quite a bit from the Member for North Battleford (Mr. Kramer), the Member for Wadena (Mr. Dewhurst), the Member from Touchwood (Mr. Meakes) about how they are all for the Indians, how they want to see them get the same services as any other people in this province, how they want to treat them the same as we do the municipalities. Well I guess they did. They gave them nothing, absolutely nothing! This year we are spending the same as we did last year, \$500,000 for roads on Indian Reservations.

So the facts are, Mr. Speaker, that the total grants to RMs in 1963-64 were \$5.8 million. Today they are \$30.3 million. If you want to carry it a little further, in the last eight years of the NDP it was \$44.9 million, the first eight years of Liberal Government \$71.4 million. Who are the friends of the RMs? Well, I'll tell you, Mr. Speaker, they know, they don't have to be asked.

Now we come to the urban municipalities. You know, this is where all the working people are living who need assistance and who want their property taxes lowered. They need help from the Government. Let's look at the record. The graveling of urban streets - what do you think they were paying in 1963-64?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. GUY: — I don't think the former Minister of Industry should be answering these questions because he has an inside track because he was the former Minister of Municipal Affairs. I should like to have some of the other Members answer this. What do you think they gave?

MR. ROMANOW: — Zip!

MR. GUY: — Right, zip, nothing! In 1971-72, \$250,000 will be paid. Homeowner Grants - in this regard it is funny to hear the Members opposite. One day you hear the Member from Regina South East (Mr. Baker) saying, "Oh, those Homeowner Grants, I announced them in 1964, I introduced them, they aren't big enough, they should be bigger." But the Member for Swift Current (Mr. Wood) says they are a complete and absolute failure, they have done nothing. So who are you going to believe? But anyway let's look at the record. 1963-64, Mr. Attorney General, what do you think they paid?

MR. HEALD: — Zip!

MR. GUY: — Zip, right you are. 1971-72, \$12.8 million to the property owners of this province.

Now we come to police grants. 1963-64, what do you think they paid? Nothing, nothing. This year, \$560,000.

March 4, 1971

Snow removal grants to the urban municipalities. The Member for Regina North West (Mr. Whelan) should have the answer. What did you fellows pay? Come on, answer up, tell us. Absolute zip again, nothing. This year we are going to pay \$410,000.

Now surely the Member for Saskatoon Riversdale (Mr. Romanow), the Deputy Leader, the financial critic, can answer this one. What did you give in house building assistance grants? Zip: Right. He's got the answer. We've got \$500,000 to spend again this year, the same amount that we had last year.

Now we come to one of the most important aspects of all and Members opposite have been crying that we are not doing enough in this regard. This is in the area of subsidized low- rental housing. What sort of a grant are we giving there? Well, you've got to have the answers. What sort of grant did you give in 1963-64?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. GUY: — You gave nothing. You gave absolutely nothing. This year we are providing \$204,000.

You know in the first year that we became the Government we found out that in their last year the NDP made a contribution of \$2.3 million in grants to urban municipalities. This year we shall pay to urban municipalities \$15 million, a 650 per cent increase. So in 1971-72 we shall pay to urban municipalities the sum of \$28.3 million compared to \$8.1 million during the NDP's last year of office. Again I ask you, who are the friends of the municipalities in Saskatchewan?

Now we come to low-income housing and the NDP record is one that I want to put on the records of this House. You know the Federal-Provincial program for lower income public housing was started in 1949. Do you know how many houses the NDP built in 1949?

AN HON. MEMBER: — Zip.

MR. GUY: — Zip. What about in 1950?

AN HON. MEMBER: — Zip.

MR. GUY: — Zip. What about in 1951?

AN HON. MEMBER: — Zip.

MR. GUY: — Zip. What about in 1952?

AN HON. MEMBER: — Zip.

MR. GUY: — Zip. But in 1953 they started to use it. It built a few houses in 1953-54. What do you think it did in 1955?

AN HON. MEMBER: — Zip.

MR. GUY: — Zip. 1956, 1957, 1958, 1959, Zip. That Government never used it again until 1960 before a general election. In 15 years

it built 344 units, an average of 23 units a year.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. GUY: — In the seven years we've been the Government, 1,282 units have been built or 183 units per year. In the coming year we expect to participate in an additional 382 senior citizen and low-income housing. This year alone we shall participate in more homes than the NDP did in the complete 15 years that they had the program. And they call themselves the friends of our low-income and senior citizens.

The Members opposite call themselves, as I mentioned, friends of our Indian and Métis. How much public housing did it provide for them? Its only interest now is to abolish the Indian and Métis Department. The answer again, of course, is none, not one home. Today, we have built 145 in centres where Indian people have secured employment. In addition, another 40 were provided in northern Saskatchewan because we believe, regardless of what Members opposite believe, that providing housing for our native people is as important as providing jobs or training programs.

Now, Mr. Speaker, as in the Throne Speech Debate, Members opposite cannot take their seats without lashing out at the Prince Albert and the new Athabasca pulp mill. The fury of their speech is in direct proportion to how little they know about the mill. A good example was the Member for Redberry (Mr. Michayluk) who was a good example of Members opposite. Oh, here he comes.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. GUY: — I'll tell you, Mr. Speaker, there is a man who couldn't finance a free lunch without going broke and yet he is trying to tell this House how to finance a pulp mill. What Members opposite refuse to recognize is that regardless of who owns the pulp mill, some company has to build it and no company will build it unless they can make a few dollars profit. Even if the Government owned 100 per cent of the mill it couldn't build it. It would have to contract it out to a company in the pulp mill construction business. I am sure that our friends opposite will agree that if we had to choose a company that we should be wise to choose a reputable firm with plenty of experience. If one were to do this, experts throughout the pulp industry around the world will tell you that there is no more reputable or experienced firm in building pulp mills than Parsons and Whittemore. They have built mills all over the world in all kinds of climatic conditions. The fact that the start up period of the Prince Albert pulp mill was shorter with less problems than any mill in the history of Canada is testimony to their capabilities. So if your Government, regardless of ownership of the mill, was to use any company but Parsons and Whittemore it would not have the best interests of Saskatchewan people at heart. Whether they make a profit or whether they don't doesn't enter into the picture at all. Whether it is company ABC, XYZ or PDQ it doesn't matter who built it, they would expect a similar profit and in all probability their work would not be as well done. It is this failure by the NDP to understand the basic facts of economic life that makes its criticism of the pulp mill so ludicrous. In fact, it points out more than ever that its criticism is politically oriented rather than economically oriented.

March 4, 1971

You know, Mr. Speaker, there is nothing that rankles the Opposition as much as the fact that they failed where we have succeeded. Our success is eating away at their insides and they can't help it. What is bothering them more is the knowledge that they will have to stand up and be counted when the pulp mill legislation is before them. I don't think, Mr. Speaker, there is one chance in a thousand that they will have the courage to vote against the pulp mill legislation. But I wish they would, oh how I wish they would! Because I can tell you, Mr. Speaker, that I cannot think of one issue that I should rather fight an election campaign on in my constituency than the issue of the Athabasca pulp mill and Gulf Minerals. And, Mr. Speaker, if an election is called on this issue, it wouldn't be just whether we get a pulp mill or don't get it or whether it is American money or it is not American money that builds it, the big issue is one of pride and dignity. Whether we should deny the thousands of unemployed in the northwest part of our province the pride and dignity of having a chance for permanent employment or whether we should desert them and leave them forever the slaves of social welfare. And you know, Mr. Speaker...

MR. ROMANOW: — And polluted environment

MR. GUY: — Our polluted Member for Saskatoon Riversdale (Mr. Romanow). You know he resided in a city which put the raw sewage in the North Saskatchewan River all the time that his Government was in power and never had the courage to say one word and now he talks about pollution.

But I think that this is the difference between the Liberals and the NDP, Mr. Speaker. We believe that we have the responsibility to provide an opportunity to everyone if at all possible. We believe that a man will be a better member of our society when he has the pride and dignity of being permanently employed. What do the NDP believe? They believe that by controlling a man's stomach through welfare payments they can also control his mind for their own political benefits. I'll tell you, Mr. Speaker, the Prince Albert pulp mill, the Athabasca pulp mill, the Wollaston Lake developments are the greatest developments northern Saskatchewan has ever seen and will provide opportunities for thousands in their own environment. You know, the Members opposite and this is one of the comments of the Member from Prince Albert East-Cumberland who said, "Oh you moved the Indian people South to find employment when they should have jobs in the North." Now that we are creating job opportunities in the North they are going to vote against it.

You know, Mr. Speaker, if the NDP vote against the pulp mill legislation, I submit they will be wiped off the face of Saskatchewan in the next election. You know, people are sick and tired of their attacks on industry glared to help our province for their own political gain.

You know, Mr. Speaker, before taking my seat I should like to refer to one other part of the Budget that has been criticized by all Members opposite and that is the transfer of dividends from Crown corporations to be used for financing Government programs of benefit to our people. I'm glad the Member for Swift Current (Mr. Wood) is in his seat because I'm going to have a few comments to make about him. You know, these criticisms

fall into the same category as the pulp mill. They come from envy and jealousy rather than common sense. This envy, of course, results from the fact that under the efficient business-like approach of the Liberal Government Crown corporations like Saskatchewan Power Corporation, Sask Tel and so on are making substantial profits. This was an event relatively unknown in the days of the Socialists. Members opposite are so blinded by this envy and jealousy that they won't accept the truth.

The Member for Redberry (Mr. Michayluk) the other night was the loudest and most vocal in his criticism of his approach to budgeting. He said what a terrible thing for the Provincial Treasurer to balance his Budget by taking 50 per cent of the profits of the Saskatchewan Power Corporation into general revenue. The NDP never did it when it was the Government. That is what you said.

MR. MICHAYLUK: — Hear, hear!

MR. GUY: — All right, good. I hope you'll stand up and apologize when I'm finished. You know I don't expect the MLA from Redberry to stick to the facts because he never has but I did expect better from the MLA for Swift Current (Mr. Wood). I always thought he was an exception on that side of the House who would, on principle, rather tell the truth than an untruth. And it was a surprise for me today, in fact, I was very unhappy to hear him say categorically and I hope that if I heard him wrong he will stand up and correct me because I didn't want to hear this from the Member from Swift Current. But he said categorically that the NDP never took profits from the Power Corporation into Government revenues.

MR. WOOD: — No.

MR. GUY: — Oh, oh, don't go away. He doesn't want to hear the truth, he can't stand it. You know the trouble with Members opposite is that their brains have been whitewashed by their leaders. They should take a little time to see what really went on when Douglas, Fines and company were in charge of the provincial treasury because it would be a real revelation to them. The fact is, Mr. Speaker, that it took them only three years to start that kind of financing and I've got here the annual report for the Saskatchewan Power Commission for 1947 and 1948 and it is a very revealing statement and I hope the Member for Swift Current will pay attention. In 1947 the annual report of the Saskatchewan Power Commission, page 23 shows that from a profit of \$632,774, 500,000 was transferred to the Government finance office. And he had the nerve to stand up here today and say, "We never took a nickel from the SPC." No, never took a nickel.

Then in 1948, the 1948 annual report showed that there was a profit of \$427,000. You'll notice that it is down as Socialism is starting to creep into this Power Corporation. But of \$427,000, \$400,000 was transferred to the Government finance office. This isn't 50 per cent, Mr. Speaker, but literally 100 per cent and at a time when profits were declining under the Socialists and every dollar was needed for expansion. Now this shows the stupidity and ignorance of Members opposite when they attack procedures and policies which their own Government followed religiously. And again, it is almost beyond comprehension that the Member for

March 4, 1971

Swift Current whose integrity has always been above reproach in this House would stand up and say categorically that the SPC never took one nickel from the profits and put it into the general revenues. I must tell you. Sir, that I am disappointed.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. GUY: — You know, Mr. Speaker, because Members opposite have adopted this approach of spreading untruths and misrepresentations and the fact that they are more interested in political gain than in the welfare of the province, I am sure that the answer will be told by the people of this province before too long. And because I know what their answer is going to be, I am very proud to Support this magnificent Budget of our Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Steuart) and I oppose the amendment.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. D. W. MICHAYLUK: (Redberry): — Mr. Speaker, will the Minister permit a question? You mentioned that I stated that we didn't take any dividends from the Power Corporation. Mr. Speaker, I want to say this, that in the financial statement for the fiscal year ended March 31, 1970 issued by this Government, page 94 shows comparative statements for 1961 to 1970 of the general revenues of the Province under the major sources of revenue. Permit me, Mr. Speaker, to prove my point. Saskatchewan Power Corporation dividends

MR. SPEAKER: — Order, order:

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

AN HON. MEMBER: — Let him ask the question.

MR. MICHAYLUK: — I'll ask the question. 1963, 1964, 1965...

MR. SPEAKER: — Now this started by you asking me if you could ask the Minister a question and you are not going to have a second debate. You have spoken once in this debate and we are not going to have people speaking twice. Now state the question. The Minister will answer as he said he would.

MR. MICHAYLUK: — Would the Minister agree with this report published by the Government for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1970?

MR. GUY: — Mr. Speaker, it is not a question of whether I agree with what happened from 1961 to 1962., The question that the Member from Redberry (Mr. Michayluk) in his ignorance didn't know that the NDP were in power from 1944 isn't my fault. But the fact is that he is a present Member of the Opposition party and is responsible for every action that party took from 1944 to 1964. As I pointed out the NDP did take profits from the Saskatchewan Power Corporation regardless of what the Member from Swift Current (Mr. Wood) or the Member from Redberry or the so-called financial critic from Saskatoon Riversdale (Mr. Romanow) says. They did take those profits and they misrepresented the facts. In fact if I wasn't a gentlemen and I knew

that you wouldn't call me out of order, I should say they told a down right lie but I know that it wasn't, it was an untruth and I would never, never suggest that those two hon. Gentlemen would ever tell a lie but they didn't tell the truth.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. E. WHELAN: (Regina North West): — Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Members opposite have counted the Hon. Member for Regina South East out before. They counted him out in 1967 and they should know by now they shouldn't count him out too soon or too fast. I want to say to the Hon. Member who has just taken his seat: If you are so confident and you're not afraid of the people why then such a blatant, undemocratic gerrymander in preparation for an election?

Mr. Speaker, this Budget was balanced only because of the benevolence of the Federal Liberal Government, the administrative governmental partners of the Members on that side of the House. At one time the Hon. Premier carried on a running battle in the newspapers with the Government in Ottawa. The Premier insisted that Ottawa didn't understand Saskatchewan and that we should think in terms of seceding from Confederation. The Liberals at Ottawa and Liberals in Saskatchewan were different. All of us recall the battles over special concessions to potash companies. Under the heading of secession, Mr. Speaker, numerous statements and news stories galore received attention right across this country announcing the need to let Ottawa know that we were prepared to quit Confederation. Mr. Speaker, everyone in this House watched in the last provincial election as the Liberals campaigned with the slogan "Vote Saskatchewan Liberal". Mr. Speaker, as if there was a difference?

What is the picture today? Mr. Speaker, Federal Liberal Cabinet Ministers are brought to the province in droves to campaign provincial ridings because they understand the problems of the day, federally and provincially. The talk of seceding has creased. The Premier in his most expansive style has become a Confederation exponent in favor of a strong central government, advocating policies of any kind providing they are Liberal. The Saskatchewan Liberal slogan has disappeared, Mr. Speaker. As the Conservatives, New Democrats and everyone else who has suffered at the hands of the Liberals federally and provincially know, they now admit for all the world to see that they are the same people.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. WHELAN: — With his best public relations image the Premier says of the Prime Minister, "Right man for the job." What brought this about, Mr. Speaker? Well, Mr. Speaker, can't you see the Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Steuart) advising the—Premier, can't you see him saying, "We're in trouble and if we're going to balance the books even after we take money from the Crown corporations, we still need around \$70 million." Mr. Speaker, what a rude awakening: What a shock! What an assault on the fierce independence, the all-out against Ottawa image of the Hon. Premier. Mr. Speaker, those must have been trying times, they must have been very, very difficult times for the Premier, to have to come all the way down from his perch where he fired away at Ottawa. Can you imagine him saying, "Mr. Minister, we're in trouble. We can't

March 4, 1971

get out unless we get \$70 million.” Get the picture. A humble Premier talking to the completely independent and powerful Prime Minister who is also a Liberal and at the moment he is begging for \$70 million. What is the Prime Minister saying? “Mr. Premier, you're lucky we are still on speaking terms. I'm surprised you are still in Canada and part of this country. And for someone who is not supposed to understand, I'm surprised that you even suggest that I should recognize that you might need \$70 million.”

Then the Premier says to the Hon. Prime Minister, “You know I was only kidding, I didn't mean what I said about Otto Lang and I didn't mean to humiliate him in front of that big convention and I shouldn't have mistreated him and I will be nice to Otto from now on.” And can't you see the Prime Minister in his moment of triumph, “Oh, this is all very well. Well, you are going to get \$70 million with a few conditions attached. First, if we decide to introduce a plan to reorganize the farm economy of the province and the number of farms is reduced by 50 or 60 per cent, we don't want one squawk out of you then and secondly, if we have a policy convention in Ottawa, you will do one of two things, you will either stay home and keep your mouth shut or will come to Ottawa and keep your mouth shut.” Mr. Speaker, they couldn't go to Ottawa and keep their mouths shut so they stayed home and kept their mouths shut.

Mr. Speaker, there was another condition – “We want to come to Saskatchewan to visit and we want to be introduced to everyone including the ladies and we don't want any of the former Liberals throwing wheat at us.” Mr. Speaker, thus far the conditions have been met. It has been a very satisfactory arrangement for the Prime Minister of Canada. When they introduced their new agricultural policy plan to stabilize or eliminate farmers and had meetings all over the province. Liberal MLAs, Liberal Presidents, Secretaries and Executives did what they were told. They must have cried in the corner. They must have felt frustrated and hamstrung. They must have felt tied and gagged and muzzled. But they did what they were told. Why even their own farms were probably being included in the elimination scheme. They stood by the Premier for his \$70 million.’

And then there was that convention at Ottawa. Don't you remember how they flew in Liberals from all over Western Canada, met in a group, hammered out a western policy, led by people with lots of enthusiasm they headed for Ottawa. Not this time. They were told to stay home and be quiet. They picked out the nicest fellow in the group and they sent him, Mr. Speaker, on about the third day and to my knowledge he didn't let them down. He didn't say anything on behalf of anyone.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, there was that party on Saturday in February when we cancelled the session to roll out the carpet for the Prime Minister. There were photographers and there were Cabinet Ministers holding teacups and there were announcements hither, thither and yon, and when it was all over, Mr. Speaker, they said in glowing terms and the Premier said, “He's the right man for the job.”

Mr. Speaker, what a price to pay for a \$70 million grant. The Premier if he was representing the people of Saskatchewan should have said, “Mr. Prime Minister, you're the author of the unemployment idea, you caused it, you sponsored it, you originated

it, you advertised it, you did this to us deliberately. You are chasing the people out of the province, people whom we trained, they're gone and we have lost hundreds of them, thousands of them in one year, lost forever the money spent on education. The cream of our population, technicians, tradesmen, gone never to return. You did this to us to fight inflation, so you did." And he could have said, if he hadn't taken the \$70 million grant, "You could subsidize our farmers, you could give them some income, you could stabilize their positions." And he wanted to continue in his best labor baiting style, but the Federal Liberals need labor votes. After the \$70 million payment wasn't there a change? No more anti-labor legislation, no more anti-labor speeches. After all these fellows saved us from complete financial ruin, Mr. Deputy Speaker. You can eat a lot of crow for \$70 million.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. WHELAN: — No, it wasn't the Hon. Member for Elrose (Mr. Leith) who by his courageous one-man stand stood up for labor. No. They did it for money. They did it because they needed money, Mr. Deputy Speaker. And the price came as high as \$70 million. Mr. Speaker, it is just amazing, nothing short of amazing, how we could suddenly discover that the Ottawa Liberals understood them after all and they're absolutely in favor of Confederation. There is no difference between Saskatchewan Liberals and Federal Liberals. Otto Lang even with his wildest ideas to eliminate farmers is absolutely okay. Unemployment isn't too bad. Those labor fellows are nice fellows. Isn't it amazing, Mr. Speaker, what \$70 million can do for the philosophy of the Saskatchewan Liberals?

Mr. Speaker, I now want to turn to the Budget itself. It doesn't matter what we vote for in the Budget but what really matters is what money we spend. Last year, Mr. Speaker, when the Throne Speech came down there was a big headline in the paper, "Speech Predicts Winter House Building Grant" (February 12, 1970). There was going to be a bonus to build houses. I am sorry the Hon. Member for Athabasca (Mr. Guy) isn't in his seat. Mr. Speaker, we voted these administrative geniuses, these aggressive leaders, these convinced fighters of unemployment, \$500,000 to build houses, enough money for 1,000 houses with a \$500 bonus for each. Mr. Speaker, first the program got away too late, about July 1st. Second, the contractors couldn't make any plans and didn't. Third, in answer to a question the other day on the order paper, they spent \$218,000 of the \$500,000 at \$500 a house, a total of 451 houses. Mr. Speaker, this program was so effective, it was planned so well, it was handled in such an aggressive manner, the contractors got off to such a flying start, that they didn't build more houses, they built fewer houses in the province of Saskatchewan than at any time for many years.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. WHELAN: — Mr. Speaker, if you look at this Budget, they've got \$500,000 again and with the aggressive leadership, the cost of publicity, the lack of income and the need for employment, they probably won't do as well this year. They probably won't spend the money we vote them for housing.

Mr. Speaker, this Budget should provide employment. People

March 4, 1971

who claim there is no unemployment haven't counted the number of people who have left every block in the city of Regina. Housing construction has to be down. They didn't spend the money for the \$500 bonuses and they didn't spend the money we voted for our share of low rental housing either.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. WHELAN: — Mr. Speaker, this has been consistently the case under this Government. What makes anyone in this House think that they might change? On behalf of the unemployed, on behalf of the people who have left, on behalf of the people in the city of Regina and the smaller towns and the farms who need good housing, Mr. Speaker, I have no intention and there is no justification for voting for this Budget.

Grants for urban assistance have been listed and sent out. But does Regina get its share? It will be so small, I predict, that it will not prevent a mill rate increase.

Mr. Speaker, the plan for bursaries and the plan for hiring 2,000 students is woefully inadequate, completely unimaginative and will not prevent an exodus of our best people and will not renew the faith the young people of our province should have in those who administer our affairs.

Let's look at this, Mr. Speaker: 2,000 jobs. In my constituency alone, Mr. Speaker, there are 1,500 grade 11 and 12 and university students - 1,500 in my constituency alone. Add to that the students in nearby constituencies in grade 11 and 12 and going to university on the Regina Campus and those who have graduated from grade 12 and university and who have nothing to do and one can come to the conclusion that this is a frivolous item thrown in and will not satisfy the demand and solve the unemployment problem for the young university students or the secondary school people over the whole province. Mr. Speaker, I question if there has been any planning. We will be asking for the names of the Committee on Scholarships and Bursaries. We will be asking for detailed information on the work that has been done in the Crown corporations and in Government departments to provide employment. We will be asking these questions when the Estimates are before the House.

Mr. Speaker, I wish that the administration of the program for bursaries and jobs was in the hands of an independent committee rather than the Provincial Government. When the bursaries and job program were announced it was drawn to my attention by the young people in my constituency that in most instances scholarships and jobs even on a temporary basis had constantly gone to the people who were friends of the Government. Mr. Speaker, with the former organizer for the Liberal Party in charge of this job program, it is the considered opinion of the young people in my constituency that there will be job precedence for certain people. There won't be enough jobs for all the students. There will only be enough jobs to take in some of them. The record of this Government thus far in providing employment for students and giving them an opportunity to receive loans is ineffective and without imagination. I have a constituent who has a dependent, who has a BA and who has been unable to find work. Because she has been unable to find work, this constituent has been unable to pay back her loan. Let me

read a paragraph of a letter from this constituent pointing out how anxious they are to collect that loan and what action has been taken. I'll take responsibility for the letter. I'm quoting directly from it.

Because I am unemployed and have a daughter, I am forced to accept welfare. Out of my monthly cheque the Government receives \$10 to repay my student loan. This to me does not make sense. For three years the taxpayers of Saskatchewan have helped to educate me. Surely these same people should not be expected to support me any longer.

Without a job would a student want to owe this Government for a loan? Mr. Speaker, I wonder.

Mr. Speaker, may I turn for a moment to the Budget and what it says in regard to senior citizens. In this area, Mr. Speaker, the Budget is hazy and without positive proposals where action is needed. In my constituency because of lack of maintenance grants by this Government, rents in Pioneer Village have been raised effective April 1st from \$49 to \$51. And in the bachelor units the rents were raised \$1.50 per month effective April 1st. This is a result of the Provincial Government's program to make these senior citizens' housing units self-sustaining. Senior citizens whose pensions have been increased 42 cents per month by the Government's friends at Ottawa.

Mr. Speaker, the New Democratic Government will subsidize maintenance grants to prevent this type of increase. Pensioners in my constituency are harassed and worried and embarrassed by the payment of \$2.50 per day for deterrent fees. Mr. Speaker, a New Democratic Government will abolish this unfair tax on the sick. Payment for drugs by senior citizens who are ill is a hardship, a worry and a constant fear haunting them. The New Democratic Government will provide a prescription drug program. Mr. Speaker, senior citizens are without finances to pay for hearing aids, teeth and glasses. A program to provide these needs will be undertaken by a New Democratic Government.

Mr. Speaker, I intended to speak at some length about the problems of the senior citizens and day care but my time has run out. In summary I just want to say this, that I feel very strongly that the Budget does not really consider many people in my constituency. For those without homes there is no hope for low cost housing in this Budget. For those who are unemployed there is no hope for a job. For the student there is inadequate money for bursaries or employment. For the senior citizens there is no relief from economic hardship and medical costs. For working mothers the day care grant is absolutely unrealistic. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of those people in my constituency I most strongly oppose the Budget and support the amendment.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. J. E. BROCKELBANK: (Saskatoon Mayfair): — Mr. Speaker, I had intended to speak a little longer this evening than I am going to have the opportunity to speak. While I was listening to the Hon. Member from Athabasca (Mr. Guy) I was thinking of an old story about someone telling all that he was going to do and where he was getting all this stuff

March 4, 1971

that he was going to do it with and I thought to myself, "Where is the Member from Athabasca getting all that money from which he is giving out in grants?" And I guess, Mr. Speaker, he's getting it from the highest tax rate ever in the history of the Province of Saskatchewan.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. ROMANOW: — 1,477 new taxes, John.

MR. BROCKELBANK: — That's where he's getting the money from - from the highest tax rates ever in the Province of Saskatchewan, and the highest debt rate ever in the Province of Saskatchewan.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. BROCKELBANK: — Since I have some more remarks to make later in the debate, Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to adjourn the debate,

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

Debate adjourned.

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