

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN
Fifth Session — Sixteenth Legislature
44th Day

Friday, April 16, 1971.

The Assembly met at 11:00 o'clock a.m.
On the Orders of the Day.

CONSTITUTIONAL CONFERENCE IN VICTORIA

Hon. W.R. Thatcher (Premier): — Mr. Speaker, I think Hon. Members know that about the middle of June there is another Constitutional Conference being held in Victoria. There are many people who feel that this is a make or break Conference. Hon. Members may recall that several months ago, there was a Conference in Ottawa and the nine English speaking Premiers pretty well agreed on a formula for 'repatriation' and an 'amending formula'. However, Quebec did not agree at the time.

There are many who hope that perhaps at the Victoria Conference Quebec may be able to go along with the repatriation and amending formulas. Certainly in this province, I think that most people have such a hope. Because if we can't even agree on those two simple propositions, certainly most Members on this side of the House will wonder whether there is any use really going to additional conferences. It would be pretty hard to justify the time that is involved.

We have the Minister of Justice (Hon. J.N. Turner) in the city today. I met with him for an hour and a half this morning, and he has been meeting with our officials since that time in preparation for the Victoria Conference. It occurred to me that Hon. Members might be honoured if he would say a few words. I discussed the matter with the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Blakeney) and I believe that unanimous leave will be forthcoming. So, Sir, seconded by the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Blakeney):

By leave of the Assembly I move this House do now adjourn and reconvene at the call of the Chair.

Mr. A.E. Blakeney (Leader of the Opposition): — Mr. Speaker, I have nothing to say except that we are delighted that the Minister of Justice is here and will be able to say a few words to us on this important topic. We share the concern of the Premier and other Members of this House concerning the success, the ultimate success, of the Federal-Provincial Conferences to revise the Canadian Constitution. We perhaps do not share the view that the next Conference is a 'make' or 'break' one, but we do share the view that it is an important one and that there cannot be a continuing succession of failures or half successes without there being very serious consequences for the continued future of Canada.

Accordingly, we shall be very interested in hearing what the Minister of Justice will say and we look forward to his words now.

Motion agreed to.

April 16, 1971

Hon. J.N. Turner, P.C., Q.C (Minister of Justice of Canada): — Mr. Speaker, Mr. Premier, Leader of the Opposition, Members of the Assembly. I want to say first of all that I recognize what an unusual honor you have paid me and the Government of Canada to allow me to address the Sovereign Assembly of the Province of Saskatchewan here in the heart land of our country.

I can say that I brought with me a delegation of senior officials, two of whom come from Saskatchewan, the talk of The Privy Council, Gordon Robertson. He was born and raised here. And with the Department of Justice, on loan to The Privy Council, Barry Strayer is here. I have an Assistant Deputy Attorney General, Jerry LaForest from New Brunswick who is with me as well.

It is a fact, Mr. Speaker, there are more people in high places in Ottawa who hail from this Province than perhaps any other. I heard the Premier on occasion say to me that in certain departments of government, particularly the Department of Finance in Ottawa, there may be too many people from the Province of Saskatchewan.

I am here to meet with the Premier, with the Attorney General and with other Ministers and officials to report progress on the discussions that I am having at the request of the Prime Minister, Mr. Trudeau, right across Canada with all the ten Premiers, first Ministers of the Provinces, to see whether in Victoria on June 14, 15 and 16 we cannot report some progress to the Canadian people on the revision of the Canadian Constitution.

The Premier, your Honour, has mentioned the repatriation of our Constitution bringing it back to Canada. The Premier also mentioned working out an amending formula.

There are other matters, as Hon. Members know, that have received consideration by the first Ministers at their meeting at Ottawa in February. The fundamental rights enshrining some of those in the Constitution, the important issues of language and the question of the Supreme Court of Canada, the mechanics of consultation between the Federal and Provincial Governments in the future as may be recognized in the Constitutional Document.

Now I want to say that the Federal Government hopes that there is some concrete advance in Victoria in June. We believe it is important not only in the French speaking parts of Canada, but in the English speaking provinces as well, that we show to the Canadian people that a revision and modernization of our Constitution is possible by way of democratic process within the Confederation of our country.

We think it is very important that we show the moderate people of Quebec who support Confederation that such process of amendment is possible. We think it essential, and I speak now as an English speaking Minister, we think it is essential that the English speaking majority in this country also believe that this process of amendment is credible and that first Ministers are meeting towards an eventual purpose.

It is our view that some progress must and should be made

in Victoria in June in order that we demonstrate both to the English speaking majority and the French speaking minority in Canada, that we in a free country are capable, rational, intelligent and accommodating enough to move our Constitutional Document forward as we can. There are people who feel that there are other problems in Canada more pressing. I don't deny that there are problems facing this country in terms of unemployment, in terms of cost of living, in terms of economic growth and so on, in terms of our agricultural produce, in terms of shipping some of the resources with which this country is blessed to every quarter of the globe.

But this Document under which we live, the Constitution, is one under which all other of our problems are regulated, whether they be the problems of agriculture, the problems of resources, the problems of economic growth, the problems of taxation, the problems of linguistic accommodation. And unless we are rational and accommodating enough, in a diverse, complicated, but beautifully fascinating country, to solve these problems then the everyday problems which concern us cannot be resolved within that Document.

Mr. Speaker, I have trespassed on your time and on the time of the Legislature sufficiently. I want to say that in the final analysis what first Ministers do in June will depend for ratification upon respective governments, and more important, upon the ratification of the freely elected Assemblies and Legislatures of Canada, Parliament and the Legislatures.

We hope for success, those of us who either at the Federal or Provincial level, enjoy a temporary mandate from our respective people who after all are the source of our thinking. We hope that the Legislatures across the country will provide both the scrutiny, the constructive criticism, and also the support that we need to move this country forward and to modernize the Document under which we live.

Therefore, I welcome this opportunity to meet those whom the people of Saskatchewan in their good judgment have put here. A wonderful Legislature. I repeat again, Sir, how much I appreciate the generosity of the Premier and of the Leader of the Opposition to allow me the consent to stand here on the floor of this Legislature.

Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Speaker: — I am sure that all Hon. Members would wish to express to the Minister of Justice of Canada their thanks and appreciation for the honor that he has conferred upon us by addressing us today on a subject of such vital importance to our province, our country and indeed to all Canadians now and in the future.

Mr. Speaker, according to Order, reconvened the Assembly at 11:15 a.m.

QUESTIONS

Return No. 108

Mr. G.R. Bowerman (Shellbrook): — Mr. Speaker, I asked the other day with regard to Return No. 108 from the Department of Highways. I wonder if that will be filed, Mr. Speaker?

Hon. D.V. Heald (Attorney General): — That's the Department of

Highways. I haven't had a chance to talk to the Minister. Perhaps the Minister could answer that.

Hon. D. Boldt (Minister of Highways): — Mr. Speaker, I signed a few Orders for Return. I don't know whether it was No. 108. I think I have signed them all now and they should be in within a day or two.

Homecoming Entertainment

Mr. E.I. Wood (Swift Current): — Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day I should like to ask the Minister-in-Charge of Homecoming, in regard to the Saskatchewan Chorus and the bands and the orchestra that have been set up. It is my understanding, in speaking to one of the citizens of Swift Current the other day, that to all intents and purposes the use of these organizations is now completed. They have studied, they have worked together, they have visited a few parks, a few places in the province and my information is that they are now through.

It would seem to me rather inappropriate, Mr. Speaker, that an organization such as this that has been brought together that they should not have had the opportunity for the people of the province to hear them in such places as the Centennial Centre of the Arts and also in Saskatoon and some other places in the province. I wonder if the Minister would be prepared to let us know just what proposals are made in regard to these organizations.

Hon. C.L.B. Estey (Minister of Industry and Commerce): — Just what type of band are you referring to?

Mr. Wood: — Well, I am referring first to the Saskatchewan Chorus that has been set up under the direction of Mr. Al Brown from Swift Current. I meant to ask this question yesterday in regard to the Arts and I was told it applied to Homecoming.

Mr. Estey: — I think the chorus to which you refer have been operating probably under a grant or subsidy from the Arts Board. I shall find out about it.

Mr. Wood: — I should ask that this be given consideration because I think it is a good organization and the people of the province should have wider use of them.

Return on Natural Resources

Mr. J.E. Brockelbank (Saskatoon Mayfair): — Mr. Speaker, if I may direct a question to the House Leader. I had a Motion for Return on March 30th which was approved. I spoke to the Minister of Natural Resources (Mr. Barrie) the other day about that item. It was with regard to \$500,000 of winter works programs for the Department of Natural Resources. I was asking for detailed information. I haven't received it as yet.

Mr. Heald: — Mr. Speaker, it hasn't come to my office. I shall check it out and see if I can expedite it.

ADJOURNED DEBATES

SECOND AND THIRD READING

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion by the Hon. Mr. Steuart that Bill No. 71 — Appropriation Bill 1971 (2).

Mr. A.E. Blakeney (Leader of the Opposition): — Mr. Speaker, when I spoke last evening I had delivered the burden of my remarks but there are a few things that I want to add this morning.

I had spoken, Mr. Speaker, about the failures of the Budget, the failure to honor the pledges of the Government. The pledge of the Government to create more jobs, the pledge of the Government to lower taxes. I have spoken of the fact that the Government through this Budget has failed to come to grips with the problems of Saskatchewan and particularly the problems of the small towns of Saskatchewan and particularly the problems of the small towns in Saskatchewan. I particularly mentioned the problems of businessmen in smaller centres and I instanced the problems which will be faced in a town like Davidson in the constituency of Arm River, or a town like Elrose in the constituency of Elrose. I had urged the pressing need to take a new approach to financing schools, an approach that would recognize that schools are a service to all society and therefore should be financed on a basis of taxes related to ability to pay. I reminded the House of the proposal of the New Democratic Party for a massive transfer of school costs from property tax to other taxes including corporation taxes, income taxes and resource revenues.

Others of my colleagues will pinpoint specific failures in this Budget. I want to set this Appropriation Bill in some perspective. The Budget confirms what many people have been suspecting for a long time, that the Liberal Party has become a millionaires' party run for millionaires and by millionaires or people who would be millionaires.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Blakeney: — Federally the leadership contenders for the Liberal Party were men, very largely, wealthy men. Unfortunately many of them had that attribute which sometimes goes with wealth, the arrogance which believes that they have a divine right to govern. We have seen this sort of arrogance in the Prime Minister. He has a contempt, a disdain for the problems of working people, a disdain for the problems of the farmers, a disdain for the problems of industrial workers. He has an almost bemused detachment from the problems of 750,000 people who are now unemployed.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Blakeney: — Provincially we have seen the same tendencies manifested in this Government, under this Budget.

April 16, 1971

Mr. Romanow: — Shame on you boys!

Mr. Blakeney: — This Government in this Budget provides tens of millions for Parsons and Whittemore. According to the Attorney General's own figures this Government has already allowed Parsons and Whittemore to make \$30 million or \$40 million in capital gain.

Mr. Steuart: — Where?

Mr. Blakeney: — According to the Attorney General the Provincial Government's shares in the Prince Albert pulp mill are worth \$15 million. And if that is true Parsons and Whittemore are now worth \$35 million or \$40 million by simple mathematics . . .

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Blakeney: — . . . in untaxed capital gain. And yet if this is true — and why should I dispute the words of the Attorney General — if this is true, yet this Government, in spite of that, comes in and asks the people of Saskatchewan to bankroll these same people for another \$130 million on this second promotion.

The Government took legal powers to tax the lands of railway companies. And then it gave up this right to tax. It gave up this right to tax in order to get concessions, concessions on freight, concessions for whom? For farmers? Don't be silly, No! For small businessmen?

Some Hon. Members: — No!

Mr. Blakeney: — No!

Mr. Steuart: — Old people? No!

An Hon. Member: — That's for sure!

Mr. Blakeney: — The people who got concessions were the giant potash companies.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Blakeney: — Potash companies which are struggling like Hudson Bay Mining and Smelting, a struggling potash company which is a subsidiary of the Harry Oppenheimer Empire, the same fellow who has the world monopoly on diamonds and is perhaps the richest man in the world. That's the person whom you decide to subsidize.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Steuart: — Old Oppenheimer!

Mr. Blakeney: — These are the people, Parsons and Whittemore, Harry Oppenheimer, whom the Government has selected to be the objects of their bounty. The local wealthy have also been included.

Mr. Brockelbank: — Who are the local fellows?

Mr. Blakeney: — We have this Budget which extracts from old age pensioners, from their pension cheques, deterrent fees.

Mr. Speaker, the Government also in the form of the Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Steuart) and the Minister of Health (Mr. Grant) has decided that when a patient dies in a mental hospital and leaves his estate to his children, the entire estate should be confiscated — confiscated I say — up to the full extent of the estate . . .

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Blakeney: — . . . up to the full extent of the bill.

Mr. Cameron: — Name one!

Mr. Blakeney: — But, Mr. Speaker, that's what happens to people who die in mental hospitals but if they die outside a mental hospital, does the Government say that they will even collect these estate taxes which are collected in British Columbia or Ontario or Manitoba? No! The Government says that the children of that wealthy man shall get a grant from this Government, a grant which in one case last year exceeded \$150,000.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Blakeney: — That, Mr. Speaker, is a fair measure of what the Government believes its priorities are, who it believes are entitled to benefit from the Treasurer.

We have seen Parsons and Whittemore, we have seen the potash companies, and we have seen one estate which gets \$150,000.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Blakeney: — Well, Members opposite may chuckle and laugh and they are indeed chuckling and laughing but may I just remind them of one or two facts. Because Members opposite are very much like Liberals in Manitoba and Liberals in Alberta who two and three years ago were similarly laughing.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Blakeney: — But this Government opposite was elected in 1967 and I say to them opposite that on the Prairies since 1967 every election Federal, Provincial, general election or by-election has been a disaster for the Liberal Party.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Blakeney: — In 1967 the laughing Liberals of Alberta lost 50 per cent of their vote.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Blakeney: — In 1968 the laughing Liberals

April 16, 1971

of Saskatchewan in the Federal election managed to get no more than 35 per cent of the vote in any seat.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Blakeney: — As they laughed, they ran third in 11 of the 13 seats, third in 11 of the 13 seats. That was their record in 1968. They went on to further triumphs in 1969 in Kelvington where they were almost wiped off the map.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Blakeney: — Then again 1970 the laughing Liberals in Manitoba faced electoral disaster when they were literally wiped off the electoral map.

An Hon. Member: — Old Izzie Asper!

Mr. Blakeney: — And then we had a couple of Federal by-elections. We had one in Selkirk where the Liberals lost approximately 50 per cent of their vote, and we had one in Lisgar a few months ago where the Liberals again lost approximately 50 per cent of their vote. And may I say that in each one of those the New Democratic vote advanced substantially.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Blakeney: — We have the Member for Prince Albert (Mr. Steuart) running from Prince Albert, and how he is going to run. He suggests that we look to Prince Edward Island. Well, I am afraid he's confused about whether it's Prince Albert or Prince Edward but I tell you the people of Prince Albert won't be confused. They know who they're going to vote against.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Blakeney: — Now what happened as the Liberals under Izzie Asper began laughing uproariously in Manitoba. In St. Vital and St. Rose they had two unmitigated disasters. In Alberta, as they're chuckling and laughing, they have chosen yet another new leader. I can't remember his name and my bet is that the Member for Athabasca (Mr. Guy) can't remember his name either.

Mr. Steuart: — . . . what people do in Alberta?

Who is the NDP Leader in Alberta? I can't remember his name either.

Mr. Blakeney: — Well, he got twice as many votes as Liberals did in the last election, whether you remember his name or not!

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Blakeney: — Well, now, it's very interesting there. Here in Saskatchewan the voice is the voice of the Premier but the words are the words of McLaren.

Mr. Steuart: — Of who?

Mr. Blakeney: — McLaren. Remember the name? The fellow who got \$150,000 from the Industry Department alone last year, that's the one.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Blakeney: — But now in Alberta they've decided that this idea of having sort of a puppet up there, isn't really very profitable. You know who they've chosen as leader?

An Hon. Member: — Who?

Mr. Blakeney: — They've chosen the advertising man as leader. They've made an honest man of him. They've cut out the middle man and now we have speaking for the Liberal Party the advertising agency which does the work for the Federal Government. I don't blame you for not remembering his name. They keep changing them every few months and it's pretty difficult.

Some Hon. Members: — What's the name of your leader?

Mr. Blakeney: — In Manitoba they have chosen a new leader. He's a corporation lawyer who has made something of a name for himself on writing articles on how corporations should minimize their income tax.

Mr. Steuart: — What's your guy? He's a professor or something!

Mr. Blakeney: — You're referring to our leader in Manitoba? He's currently the Premier.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

An Hon. Member: — With a majority government!

Mr. Blakeney: — Yes, with a majority government, thanks to the voters who used to vote Liberal . . .

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Blakeney: — You know, I was checking through a few figures the other day, in particular those of the St. Rose by-election. You know, the New Democratic Party contested that by-election. You know, the New Democratic Party contested that by-election in 1966, that was when Gil Molgat won it with about 2,200 votes and in that election the New Democratic Party got the impressive total of 86 votes and since 1966 the New Democratic Party has commended itself to the people of Manitoba to the extent that that 86 votes has grown to 2,400 votes and a majority.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Blakeney: — I think any analysis of these elections — Federal or

April 16, 1971

Provincial — Alberta, Manitoba or Saskatchewan, general elections or by-elections, makes perfectly clear that everywhere on the Prairies, the Liberal Party is rejected. It's rejected In Alberta, it's rejected in Manitoba and it's going to be rejected in Saskatchewan.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Blakeney: — It's going to be rejected because of a budget like this.

Mr. A.C. Cameron (Minister of Mineral Resources): — Mr. Speaker, on a point of order!

Mr. Speaker: — Order, order!

Mr. Cameron: — On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, I am enjoying the antics of the Leader of the Opposition but I would point out to the House, at least in my judgment, I see no relationship to how the political parties are faring across Canada to the matter of the Budget which is under consideration here and I should ask, Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, I would state that in my judgment the Member is out of order and I should ask that he be brought back to order.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Speaker: — Perhaps that's what we should do, adjourn the House while you run a pool on it.

Now, a point of order has been raised by the Member for Maple Creek. The point of order that he has raised is to the effect that the Member who is speaking isn't on the subject. The motion before the House is the combined second and third reading of The Appropriation Bill. The Appropriation Bill is the embodiment of all the various sums of money that have been placed before this House in the form of the Estimates.

I should suggest that the matters that are proper subjects of discussion in this particular debate are any matters in the Estimates that are embodied in the final financial total that has been placed before the House in this Bill.

I had hoped that there would be a debate inasmuch as this is the first time this House has followed this procedure. I had hoped that there would be a debate strictly relevant to the sums of money required by the various departments, item by item, that have come before this House in the form of this Appropriation Bill. I fail to see, personally, what the affairs in other provinces have to do with the financial affairs of this province particularly in connection with the Bill that is before us.

However, this debate has already been very wide-ranging. It has just been a repetition of the Budget Debate, a repetition of the Throne Speech Debate and perhaps it was a little too much to hope for that it would be a non-partisan debate strictly relative to the finances of the province particularly, when one considers the fact that we are approaching an election, or presumably we are.

I should ask Members to try to relate their remarks to the financial affairs of the Province of Saskatchewan as they are contained in the Bill which is before the House. This is what the House is debating, the combined second and third reading of the Appropriation Bill.

Mr. E.I. Wood (Swift Current): — Mr. Speaker, on the point of order. I am sure that Mr. Speaker is well aware of the importance of this point of order at this time, as Mr. Speaker has pointed out, this is the first time that we have dealt with this kind of debate in this House. As Mr. Speaker has pointed out, we have in the past had a very wide-ranging debate on our Throne Speech debate and on our Budget Debate. What we are establishing right now, Mr. Speaker, is a pattern for the future, it seems to me, and I think we must look at this very closely.

It would appear to me that it would be desirable that we, in this debate, do have the same wide range of material that we are able to discuss on this debate, a wide range of subjects the same as we have had in the past in regard to both the Budget Debate and the Throne Speech Debate.

I should like to place upon Mr. Speaker's remarks at this time the interpretation that we shall have the opportunity in this debate to cover a wide range of subjects that are pertinent to the business of the people of the province and I should like to think that this is the interpretation that would be put on at this time. I think it is important that we do establish at this time just what we may talk about in this debate.

Mr. F.A. Dewhurst (Wadena): — Mr. Speaker, further to the point of order. When we had the committee on the rules and procedure of which you had the onerous task of chairing, I think that all Members who were on that committee will recall, that the agreement was made that we would cut down the Budget Debate by a given amount of time and to some extent break the Budget Debate so that there would be the biggest bulk of it prior to the Estimates and the balance at the conclusion of the Estimates, but it would still be the same thing as the Budget Debate.

We were trying to decide and to find ways and means as to how that could be done without having another Budget Debate, and I believe if I recall right, Mr. Speaker, it was you, Sir, who suggested that the continuation of a so-called Budget Debate could be done on the second reading of the Bill which is now before us, The Appropriation Bill. And it was my understanding as a Member of that committee, when these rules were changed and at your suggestion that the balance of the Budget Debate, if it was split, could be done on this Bill. And I feel that anything that can be discussed on the Budget Debate itself can be discussed in this Bill because the intent was just to break that debate, shorten the length of time at the beginning, and to have a day or two days at the end.

Mr. T.M. Weatherald (Cannington): — Mr. Speaker, I also was on the rules committee and my understanding was somewhat different than the Member for Wadena (Mr. Dewhurst). My understanding was that the Budget Debate pertained to the Budget and that it not be a repetition of the Throne Speech Debate to which we seem to be moving.

April 16, 1971

Mr. Blakeney: — Mr. Speaker, I speak to the point of order. In my judgment what the committee did decide was that where on the resolution that ‘Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair’ it has been very well established over centuries of tradition that any matter might be raised which is legitimately covered by the phrase ‘grievance before supply’. We could equally well decide, and did decide, that this Appropriation Bill is The Supply Bill and that the same principle of grievance before supply could apply and should apply to The Appropriation Bill, rather than any particular rules with respect to relevancy of debate of the content of the Bill.

It doesn’t matter a great deal since it is not very difficult to make any remarks relevant to the spending Estimates of the Government. I shall come back to that point in a moment when I resume my remarks, but the point I wanted to make was that in my judgment what this special order debate was intended to be, and in my judgment should be, is the resumption of that sort of debate which is encompassed by the long-established phrase of ‘grievance before supply’.

Mr. Cameron: — Have I got the privilege to speak to the point of order since I raised it? I should point out that, in my judgment at least, we are debating the Bill. We are not debating a motion before the House that ‘the Speaker leave the Chair’ or anything of that nature. This is a specific Bill and I should think that the regulations apply to this Bill as the debating of any bill, that we confine our remarks to the substance of the Bill and what is pertinent thereto.

For this reason, I maintain that the speaker is out of order.

Mr. Speaker: — We have had a chance to listen to all the points of order that all the Members have raised.

Mr. Blakeney: — Well, I shall be happy to resume my remarks or to have your ruling . . .

Mr. Speaker: — May I draw your attention to the Report of the Special Committee on Standing Orders and Procedures of the Assembly which was tabled at the last session of the House. I wish to quote the reason given for the formal inception of this particular debate. The recommendation was:

That the debate on second reading of The Appropriation Bill should not exceed two sitting days. The second and third reading of The Appropriation Bill should be combined in one motion and so on.

And then it goes on to say how the debate should be conducted and that it should be a special order. The mover of the motion shall have 20 minutes in which to close the debate, etc. and it is all properly outlined.

The reason that the committee gave for this procedure was as follows:

Your committee believes that by debating second reading

of The Appropriation Bill after the Estimates have been discussed in the Committee of Finance, a better informed and a more meaningful debate would result.

This was the thinking of the Committee, I believed that it made more sense to discuss these matters in total after they had been through the Committee of Finance and been discussed item by item therefrom. These items that are in the Bill which is before us are a synthesis of the entire discussion that took place in the Committee of the Whole, Committee of Finance on the Estimates. And while I must agree, and do agree with the Member from Swift Current, in a great degree I agree with him, that this debate should be wide ranging, but I still think that it should be relevant to the particular items in the Estimates that are contained in this Bill. I think Members should try to relate their words to this. As the Member from Swift Current said, we are now starting out on a new procedure, we are breaking new ground, and I think that it is important. I agree with him again when he said that this debate should get off on the right foot. But again I say that it should not be just a repetition of the Throne Speech Debate or just another repetition of the Budget Debate. That would not seem to me to be too meaningful. I think it should be a debate relative to the Estimates that have been before the House and been passed in Committee of Supply. Now how widely you could interpret the words that are used in regard to that is another question, but I should suggest a great deal of latitude has been allowed and I should hope the Members would try to make this debate just a little more distinctive, just a little different than those that have been conducted previously and that speeches would relate only to the Estimates. I therefore ask the Members to relate their words as closely as possible to the finances of the Province of Saskatchewan as contained in the Estimates.

Mr. Blakeney: — Mr. Speaker, I resume my remarks and it will be recalled that I was pointing out that in this Budget is contained a philosophy of the Government. I was attempting to put it in a framework, I was saying that it was a government, as manifested by this Budget, which was a government for millionaires and by people who either were millionaires or wish they were millionaires.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Blakeney: — And I had pointed out that this same type of approach to the problems of government had become characteristic of the Liberal Party elsewhere, and I was pointing out the disasters which had followed for the Liberal Party in that regard. And I was saying, Mr. Speaker, that on the basis of this Budget, the same sort of disaster is going to overcome the Liberal Party in this province.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Blakeney: — And it's going to overcome them just as soon as the Government opposite dares to call an election.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

April 16, 1971

Mr. Blakeney: — When the people get a chance to speak they'll look at this Budget, they'll look at Liberal policies, they'll look at Liberal farm policies as manifested by this Budget, they'll look at the burden of municipal and local taxes, they'll look at deterrent fees still used by this Government, they'll look at the resource giveaway incorporated into that large vote for SEDCO, those propositions like the pulp mill, they'll see the mini-amount provided for the Department of Labour, they'll see that there is nothing there for the working man, they'll see that this Budget really incorporates an attitude of contempt for the working man.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Blakeney: — And they'll see, they'll contrast this Budget with the program of the New Democratic Party, our program to provide new life for the smaller centres in Saskatchewan.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Blakeney — Our program to abolish deterrent fees, our program to develop Saskatchewan resources for Saskatchewan people and not for New York developers.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Blakeney — Our programs to give working people a break, the sort of break they need, the sort of break they deserve.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Blakeney — And when, Mr. Speaker, the voters of this province contrast that Budget and the Liberal program that is incorporated in that Budget with the new Deal for People they will make their choice and they will decide, Mr. Speaker, that on the basis of that Budget, this Government must be thrown out of office. They will decide that they are going to throw it out of office.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Blakeney — They will decide that the Liberal Party has had its day, that the tired old war horses once again offering themselves as the Liberal Party, are no longer in tune with the people of Saskatchewan.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Blakeney — And whether or not they know their age or don't know their age, they're still old and they're still tired and they're still totally out of touch with the people of Saskatchewan.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Blakeney — And when the people look at this program, look at that

Budget, and look at the program of the new Democratic Party, they will decide to rid themselves of the Liberal Government, and they will decide it's time for the New Democratic Party, time for a new deal for people.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. R. Heggie (Hanley): — Mr. Speaker, I welcome the opportunity to take part in this Appropriation Bill Debate, and I hope for a few moments that I can take the time of the House to answer some of the allegations made by the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Blakeney) in the speech which he has just concluded.

Now I agree and I think we all agree that the speeches on the Appropriation Bill will be fairly closely related to the finances of the Province but much as we all admire the Leader of the Opposition as a skilful debater, I'm sure the speech he gave in the Chamber this morning was a political speech designed to go out to the voters in the expectation that there would soon be an election. Now, some of the things that he said were certainly overdone and overemphasized. He said that the object of the Budget should be to provide jobs, lower taxes, and help small towns and businessmen, and that there was a failure to reduce taxes. Now, he is wrong on almost every score.

As far as unemployment is concerned, we have the lowest rate of unemployment in Saskatchewan and this Government would be other than magicians if for some reason we had no unemployment when there are long lines of unemployed people in Edmonton, in Vancouver, in Winnipeg and particularly in prosperous Toronto. How he can get the people of Saskatchewan to agree to that or swallow that piece of propaganda is more than I can see.

Now as far as lowering taxes, he knows that there have been inflationary pressures on the whole of Canada including the Province of Saskatchewan and this Government has done very well in fighting that inflation. What about his own city of Regina. I just heard this morning that the school mill rate in Regina is down by 2 mills, a result of the \$8.3 million additional funds made available to school boards and school units in this province. How can you say that's an increase in taxes when the school mill rate for the first year in many years has gone down. And this exercise is repeated in Saskatoon. So you have it in the two major cities — lower school taxes.

Now as for small towns and for helping businessmen, just think of what this Budget has done. Grants for police forces, and police protection have been doubled. Grants to regional libraries have been increased. Equalization and snow removal grants to municipalities have been increased. Additional money has been made available to school boards to provide educational services to handicapped children. Homecoming grants in 1971 will assist many communities to build much needed recreational facilities. I dealt with the additional school grants, and of course, there is the Homeowner Grant being increased from \$60 to \$70 which every homeowner looks forward to and knows that this is help in keeping his taxes down. And perhaps, as an auxiliary or side issue, the fact that the Homeowner Grants are handled in the way they are (and the Opposition is always complaining that they should be deducted at the source) keeps the municipal taxes whether it's a city, town, village or rural municipality, paid up to a normal 80 per cent level which is

April 16, 1971

normal in good times throughout this province. So you have that incentive for people to pay their taxes and this is reflected in the fact that the municipal bodies are able to collect their taxes and carry on the services.

Now, there are many more things which this Government has done over its four-year term of office since the last election, but I won't go into those, they are well known. Just as an aside, the Leader of the Opposition was stating that in the last number of years, the Liberal Party was losing general elections and by-elections, but the record of his party is not very good. The NDP, or CCF as it was known in those days, in 1945 elected 25 Members to the House of Commons and in 1968 they've only got 23. So this looks to me, if the Leader of the Opposition wants to examine how popular his party is, that it's one step forward and two back, that in 25 years they have made very little headway with the people of Canada.

Now, on a more serious note, I should like to deal with some of the specific points in the Budget which were included in the Appropriation Bill. It's my first opportunity to do so and I want to congratulate the Provincial Treasurer on presenting a Budget of almost \$450 million to this House, the highest in the Province's history. Now he is asking that this Appropriation Bill of \$447,136,410 be passed and the Budget become the law of the land.

Saskatchewan is fast approaching its half billion dollar Budget which I predict will be under a Liberal Government in 1974. For the seventh time this Province has been presented with a balanced budget a remarkable feat in times of economic stress. A balanced budget is not an end in itself. A balanced budget would be a cruel hoax if it failed to deal with the crucial social problems of the day and the serious economic problems facing Saskatchewan and Canada. However, the Hon. Treasurer has not overlooked these important aspects of our social and economic life. He has taken substantive steps to correct these situations which I'll deal with in more detail later.

The Budget provides for massive spending in the educational, health, welfare and employment sectors of our economy. Who in all fairness can quarrel with that? The Opposition said we should spend still more. This can only be done by borrowing or the borrowing of substantial sums in millions of dollars in the money market and this only means huge interest payments on dead weight debt which will hamper next year's program. The other alternative is to raise taxes. Does the Opposition recommend tax increases in a time of economic slow down? No, Mr. Speaker, the Treasurer has struck a happy balance between income and expenditure. The very fact that the Budget is some \$45 million greater than last year means \$45 million more dollars will be spent in the social and economic sectors and is evidence of the concern of this Government for the people. It is truly a Budget for the people.

Now, what are some of the highlights of this Budget? Highways — continuation of the massive highway program. Saskatchewan has for years lagged behind other provinces. Our roads were the butt of many jokes by other Canadians. But you don't hear those jokes any mores. The province is now criss-crossed by a network of first class highways that will stand up under scrutiny with any province in Canada.

Mr. Romanow: — Have you been to Elbow? I did it last night.

Mr. Heggie: — Shouldn't have gone there, Roy!

The four-lane highway program is advancing rapidly. The next three years ought to see the completion of the first four-lane divided highway from Saskatoon to Regina and is proof that a four-lane highway between the Province's two major cities is long overdue. Therefore, the accelerated highway program brings threefold benefits to the province. First, the province is building up a network of first class roads. The construction companies are being kept in business thereby pouring millions of construction dollars into the economy. And thirdly, jobs for hundreds of workers are provided who in turn pump these dollars back into the economy. I have no apologies whatsoever for the road program and I offer my congratulations to the Treasurer for appropriating these funds and to the Minister of Highways (Mr. Boldt) for carrying out a sensible road program.

Student employment . . .

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Heggie: — It is here that the Treasurer has made a serious attempt to correct a thorny problem, that of summer employment for university and high school students. Each year, all governments in Canada lend every effort to provide jobs for students who need the work in order to help them finance the next year's costs. Don't let anyone tell you that university education should be 100 per cent free. As a matter of fact a large portion of the cost of educating a student is free. The general taxpayer, through the Budget provides the buildings, furnishing, equipment, libraries, theatres, scholarships and bursaries. The student actually contributes only a small part of the cost of his education by way of tuition fees and books. His board and room becomes a matter of contract between himself and his family and the student usually likes to work in the summer to help take the financial weight off his family. This is where good sound employment policies by a government comes in. If a student wants to work, and most of them do, it is the duty of the Government to see that the economy has a place for him to work. Since the end of World War II this has not been too difficult, but in the last two years the employment picture for summer work has been critical.

Mr. Romanow: — Thanks to the Liberals.

Mr. Heggie: — Each year, for the past two years, the number of students who failed to find employment increased and this only adds to other social problems of drugs, liquor and social unrest. The great movement of students going across Canada stems largely, but not all, from lack of employment opportunities. There is not a thing wrong with the 'see Canada' policy by the young people if it is done with the purpose of increasing their breadth and knowledge of this great country. If it is done because a student cannot find gainful employment or as a way of getting out of employment, then in my opinion, it is bad. Last year, 1970, saw the latter style of transients much in vogue and it is not good. Therefore, the Government's massive attack on

April 16, 1971

employment for students is most necessary and commendable. The aim of the Government is to find 4,400 jobs for students. This will be done in a threefold manner.

First, the highway program and the crash public works program including work in the provincial parks will supply a basic number of summer jobs. Secondly, the extension of pollution control will supply still more jobs for serious minded students interested in ecology and environment. Thirdly, subsidization of jobs in the private sector is the ultimate social measure which will serve to stimulate business and provide employment for students. The Student Temporary Employment Program now known as STEP is a new and innovative measure which out to bring wide public support. The Government will pay up to 50 per cent or \$150 maximum for three months between May 1 and September 1 with the employer paying the other half of the student's salary. I am advised that the jobs are filling up very quickly and students and employers are taking advantage of this great social measure. Therefore, the employment picture for students in Saskatchewan holds out more promise than has been the case in the last two years. And \$1.5 million has been provided for this program alone.

Mr. Romanow: — \$4 million in B.C., Bob!

Mr. Heggie: — Bigger province!

I now turn to the state of the NDP in the forthcoming election. Mr. Speaker, in view of your earlier ruling that you wanted the speakers to stick strictly to The Appropriation Bill I have attempted to do so except I took the liberty of answering some of the allegations made by the Leader of the Opposition. Having prepared my speech before that ruling I had some brief remarks on the position of the NDP in the forthcoming election but I am prepared to let those remarks stand aside and bring this address to a conclusion. I thank you, Mr. Speaker, for your attention. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I shall be recording my vote in favour of The Appropriation Bill as presented to the House by the Provincial Treasurer.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. J. Messer (Kelsey): — Mr. Deputy Speaker, in rising to speak to this Appropriation Bill I must say at the outset that the Government has been most short sighted in its actions and allocations of money. The total budget expenditures for the Department of Agriculture is 3.63 per cent. Out of a total of a \$450 million Budget, Mr. Deputy Speaker, or as the Member for Hanley has stated, nearly a half billion dollar Budget, this Government sees fit to supply to the primary industry of this Province only 3.63 per cent or \$16 million out of a half billion dollar Budget, an increase of only \$800,000 over last year's Budget. There is no assurance, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that this estimated amount or the 3.63 per cent allotment will be spent. Indeed, if we look at expenditures and the practices of the Government in regard to their expenditures and the practices of the Government in regard to their expenditures in past budgets we seriously doubt whether this amount will ever be spent in that Department. This at a time when farmers are facing change, a change which they have never faced before, adapting to programs such as the LIFT program, such as the block shifting program, the new and modified quota systems, changes in programs that farmers will be and are now adapting to, such as the production in Grains Receipt

Stabilization Plan, new delivery quotas for them in the year 1971, changes in regard to the new grades for red spring wheat, changes and adaptations to the 4H program, changes and adaptations to the new delivery provisions or specialty marketings of cash crops. These come along with the necessity of decision making by farmers for a given production year in relation to crop practices which are in relation to the Federal and Provincial outlook and their recommendations. The diversification by farmers, especially in the area of livestock, the changes and the adaptations that they have made in regard to the hogs and cattle industry are the most significant. All of these, I think, demand active and extended participation from the Department of Agriculture and the Government of Saskatchewan.

Things should have been done in order to assure that these changes would be made in the best interests of the farming climate in the Province of Saskatchewan and the economy in total. They should have extended publications for the farmer information. There should have been extensions of information from the Economic and Statistics Branch. There should have been money made available for expansion and increased activities in the Agricultural Extension Branch. There should have been more money made available to take advantage of the Agricultural information in the Audio Visual Aids Division. There should have been a more comprehensive Family Farm Improvement Branch accelerating programs so that the farmers could participate to a greater degree in regard to planning their future operations. This means larger expenditures from the Department of Agriculture. But we do not have those larger expenditures forthcoming from the Government to your right, Mr. Speaker. They have been short-sighted, they have been unresponsive to the needs of the people and, in particular, to the farmers of Saskatchewan.

There should have been money allocated for further investigation in regard to the Task Force proposals that came forward in that report. They should have been trying further to communicate with farmers and participate with farmers in regard to the recommendations of that report. I wish that there had been more debate from the Members opposite in regard to that Task Force and the Government decisions pertaining to agriculture. I wish that they had said something more about the reduction of farm numbers and its effect on agriculture in the Province of Saskatchewan. They should have said something with regard to the promotion of increased farm size and the implications of that increase in size. There should have been something said about the planned and paid, subsidized if you will, agricultural cutbacks while many in the world are starving and hungry. There should have been something more said with regard to the transferring of more financial responsibility on to the backs of farmers in a quest for overall economic stability. There should have been more debate in regard to the overall implications of the Task Force proposals in relation to Saskatchewan farmers and rural life.

I regret the Government has not clarified its stand in regard to these problems of agriculture and the Task Force in the Province of Saskatchewan.

There should have been more money for machinery development and testing in this province. I know the University is doing a small amount of developing, most of it in regard to the development of new and improved equipment for agriculture and this is good. But what the farmer of Saskatchewan is in

April 16, 1971

need of now is a real and meaningful testing program so that when he buys machinery he is assured the machinery will do what the brochures put out by the company says it will do.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Messer: — There should have been some action particularly at this time when farmers' incomes have never been so low. There should have been some action by this Government encouraging the Federal Government to do something in regard to pricing of farm machinery. No such thing was done during this Session. There should have been more incentives for machinery manufacturers to establish and develop within the Province of Saskatchewan. It appears that the Government still accepts the fallacy that problems in regard to farmers will all disappear if they simply increase their land size. There should have been money made available and an investigation, or at least a commission set up, to look into land movement and the related problems and to find out indeed if we do solve the problems confronting farmers in Saskatchewan today by increasing his land size. I suggest to this Assembly that in most instances we shall create a more serious problem in the future by simply encouraging increased land size. There should have been money made available during this Session to establish a Land Bank Commission such as has been proposed by the New Democratic Party.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Messer: — A Land Bank Commission which would purchase land offered voluntarily on the market at competitive prices and lease this land guaranteeing tenure on the basis of need with the option to buy, with the objective of promoting the maximum number of viable farms in Saskatchewan. The Members opposite seem to think that this is a revolutionary and new breakthrough in regard to land proposals and they try to associate it with the nationalizing of farm land. I bring to their attention an article in the Globe and Mail, March 31st, 1971. I want to quote one phrase out of that article in relation to the Province of Ontario. It says this:

The Government intends to create a new land bank program. This will be a major instrument in the implementation of regional development, recreation, housing, transportation and urban development plans.

It goes on to say:

Crown land will no longer be sold only leased and first to Canadians.

Now we are saying that we want to buy land and only lease it. We suggest that they lease with the option to buy. They seem to think that there is something wrong with that program. I bring to their attention that the Minister of Agriculture, federally, has proposed a consolidation program for the purchasing of farm lands so that we can give some protection to farmers. For the information of the Members opposite, the Province of Nova Scotia has a program something similar to this because they realize that some action had to be taken in regard to protecting viable family farms, and it should certainly have been done in the Province of Saskatchewan.

They should have made money available as matching grants at varying levels in participation with the Federal Government under the Fund for Rural Economic Development, so that it would help develop our North, both agriculturally and otherwise, to assist and ease young farmers in establishing themselves and assure the establishment of family farms or groups of families farming co-operatively.

There should have been money made available in the area of planning before the diversification into the livestock industry in the Province of Saskatchewan. Hogs, I think, would be a primary example where future planning was lacking when the present Government launched their diversification program. We have seen the price of hogs drop from a high of \$40 to \$45 per hog to \$25 to \$27 in the last few weeks. The Hog Incentive Program that was launched is admitted to be a good program but it in no way will compensate for the drastically reduced price that hog producers are now confronted with.

Mr. Speaker, one could go on and on with regard to the lack of incentives and monies made available for the crop development centre; in regard to the lack of incentive and money available to the Planned Industry Branch; in regard to their short-sightedness in the Veterinary Division. They brought in a Bill this year providing technicians for Veterinarians and I think this is good. But the fact of the matter is, when we have a situation such as we have in the province today where livestock is increasing in numbers, there should have been some future thought given to the establishment of clinics throughout the Province of Saskatchewan. There should have been some thought given in regard to the establishment and encouraging of more veterinarians in this province so that farmers and those in the livestock industry would have some assurance that they would have available the sort of care animals require when it was needed. They have a department which recruits farm labor, it expends only \$4,710. I think Saskatchewan, at a time when farmers are seeking qualified and trained personnel that this Department could have been of major use to the situation that we are confronted with in the Province today. It could have been turned into a training agency for those who are unemployed so that they may be capable of working in the type of specialize operation that farmers are requiring personnel for now. But none of this was thought of or none of this was acted on by the present Government.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, in the last few years agricultural industry and farmers have been confronted with barrages of problems on a daily basis, the most serious being economic. They have had problems adapting to the new type of farming that they are encountering. During this time the Government has been unresponsive. This Government did not once call a meeting of the Standing Committee on Agriculture that this Legislature has set up. In fact, since I have been a Member of this Legislative Assembly this committee has not sat once. During a time of crisis and change in farming in this province, this committee between sessions could have been sitting and contributing recommendations that were current towards solving the problems farmers are confronting in this day. Due to the disregard and lack of initiative to call such meetings, due to the anaemic inaction of this Government towards solving the province's problems, not only in the field of agriculture but in the areas of labor, taxation, natural resource development and many, many

April 16, 1971

others, and because this Government is lacking in its concern for the problems that are facing the economy of the people of this province, I will not support this Bill.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. J.J. Charlebois (Saskatoon City Park-University): — Mr. Speaker, the NDP as Opposition criticize anything and everything that is undertaken by the Government. While it is their duty to criticize, surely they should have regard for the utter and sheer hypocrisy of the attacks and the charges that they made. In their blind fury they have complete disregard for the things they criticize that they themselves did when they were in office. They question the procedure on contracts and question such things as awarding contracts on low bids. Well, I should like to remind them, Mr. Speaker, of their procedure in this regard on two buildings that were done during their regime in office. The first is the Health and Welfare Building. This building was built in Regina and I am referring here to the contract on movable partitions and I might say this was a very, questionable award. And on the University Hospital, it spread over ten years. The University Hospital in Saskatoon . . .

Mr. Romanow: — What year?

Mr. Charlebois: — I'm talking about contracts not about years, if you'd listen. The steel windows where even the privilege to bid was denied and the reason why is completely unacceptable. If you want to open up a can of worms you open up your own can of worms.

Now let's look at another piece of hypocrisy . . .

Mr. Romanow: — I haven't got any!

Mr. Charlebois: — Any time you think you're as sanctimonious as you pretend to be, guess again. I might say, Mr. Speaker, I should like to speak on another piece of hypocrisy that just goes on and on endlessly with this party opposite, and that's the matter of American capital being attracted to Saskatchewan. Let us look at the borrowing of the Government of Saskatchewan as at March 31st, 1969. The total funded debt outstanding \$746,184,322. Of this amount \$227,800,000 is American. That is money borrowed in the United States, it's American money and it's American money invested in our province — \$197,800,000 of this money was borrowed by the NDP when they were the Government. And when we look at the record, since they were put out of office this Government has borrowed \$30 million in U.S. funds. This means, Mr. Speaker, the NDP borrowed 6½ times more money in U.S. funds than the present Government. Close to 87 per cent of the money borrowed in American and foreign funds by Saskatchewan was borrowed by the NDP when they were in power, 87 per cent.

Let's look at the yearly borrowings by the NDP from 1950 to 1964. You remember . . .

Mr. Romanow: — . . . John Richards!

Mr. Charlebois: — Never mind John Richards, let's remember another one

of your fellows. I know you're a Waffler. I know you support Richards, you've declared yourself. You'll be on the same platform with him.

An. Hon. Member: — What is a Waffle?

Mr. Charlebois: — Look at Roy Romanow, he's a Waffle.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Charlebois: — You don't like to listen to this jazz, eh? Do you remember the time they used to take the picture of Clarence Fines out here on the steps with his suitcase, his satchel in hand going to New York? You fellows, when you were in power you boasted every year of your great ability to go down to New York and borrow American money and bring it back here so it was invested in Saskatchewan.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Charlebois: — You bet you did! In 1950 \$8 million dollars; in 1951 \$16,525,000; in 1952 \$20 million; in 1953 \$15 million; in 1954 \$12,800,000.

Mr. Speaker: — Order, order!

Mr. Blakeney: — Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point earlier made. Presumably the Member is going to turn to the Budget in due course. As I recall Mr. Speaker's ruling we were to talk about the Budget and the finances of the Province and Mr. Speaker very pointedly said 'next year and last year'.

Mr. Charlebois: — Mr. Speaker, could I speak to this item, just my own interpretation of what I am saying.

Mr. Speaker: — The Member wishes to speak to the point of order.

Mr. Charlebois: — I'm speaking of the funded debt and this funded debt is still in effect and it has been questioned during the Budget Debate. These figures that I have here, these have been questioned during the Budget Debate. It's part of our funded debt.

Mr. Speaker: — Order, order!

Well, I'm rather inclined to think that the Province of Saskatchewan is getting the bill for the interest on the borrowed money. I might be in error in this regard but I imagine that the Province is also paying the bill for the exchange rates at which the money was borrowed previously.

Mr. Charlebois: — I'll only refer to one more year then, the year 1959 only \$40 million, 1963 \$25 million. But what I'd like to say here, Mr. Speaker, you can go on through the years they were in office — one year they went to Switzerland — I don't know why the switch there but they went over there and they got over

April 16, 1971

\$9 million, \$9,102,000 in francs. We're still paying for it, by the way.

This is the record though that they boasted about and why now the sudden change of heart. How come you did this and now you criticize anything that's American, whether it's money or people or what you criticize and I say this is absolutely a hypocritical thing to do. Look at your own records. You should be ashamed to stand here and criticize on a basis of this kind. I'd like to say, Mr. Speaker, that wherever possible the present Government has borrowed in Canadian funds. Since the Liberal Government took office in 1964, they have gone to the foreign money markets on only three occasions; twice to the United States for \$15 million on each occasion and once to Germany for \$16,555,000.

The NDP when they were in power went to the United States or other foreign markets on at least 13 different occasions, and you should be absolutely ashamed of yourself to talk about American investment in this House or out on the hustings. Well, they're talking about getting people that have money to invest in industry. What happened when you fellows were in office? There were only two industries that dared to come into this province under their regime and both of theirs were American and I think, Mr. Speaker, the record speaks for itself. They are completely hypocritical when you speak about American investment.

I am going to vote for the motion.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. J.A. Pepper (Weyburn): — Mr. Speaker, as this debate draws to a close, I find that I must make just one or two comments in regard to it.

I spoke at some length during the first stages or shortly after the Budget was introduced in a general way. But after we had gone through the Estimates and now during this Appropriation Debate, I should like to try and confine my remarks to one or two specific areas which I think has certainly caused me great concern.

This area, Mr. Speaker, is the area of surface rights. Surface rights for the farmers of our province and why I think this Government should have given them greater protection and greater assistance for the inconveniences that many of them are forced to endure if they are in an industrial area.

I believe it was in the session of 1968 that The Surface Rights Acquisition and Compensation Act was passed in this Legislature, an Act which made various charges in which the surface Rights Organization and the farmers which they represent, were in agreement. However, Mr. Speaker, there were some requests and changes that still were not contained in this Act in which the farmers, or more specifically, the organization which represents them, would like to have seen included in it. And as we are going to vote on the passing of this Appropriation Bill which . . .

Mr. Coderre: — I am questioning what particular part of Bill 71 is the Hon. Member mentioning right now. He seems to be referring consistently to a Bill that was passed in 1968 and I was

wondering where it involves the coming Budget for 1971 and he is referring to that and I don't know where it can be dealt with.

Mr. Speaker: — Order, order! I think that the matter of surface rights must belong in here somewhere. There must be a financial item in this Bill somewhere that has something to do with surface rights. I think this is an exceptionally good point of order and I thank the Member for raising it because I think that this brings the whole debate into proper focus. I think that this points out to the House the debate as I would have hoped it would have been conducted as I think it should be conducted. We have an amount here of \$39,770 for Surface Rights and Arbitration Board on which obviously the Member can hang his words and I wish that some other Members had hung their words on similarly relevant items.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Pepper: — Thank you for your ruling, Mr. Speaker. I felt I was in order. And as we are going to vote on the passing, Mr. Speaker, of this Appropriation Bill, which reports in it some \$39,770 in the Estimates which are set aside for the Surface Rights Arbitration Board, I think it is only proper that they be brought to the attention of the Government which is now sitting opposite.

It was just one year ago when discussing the Estimates of the Surface Rights Arbitration Board that I made the statement to the Minister-in-Charge that it was perhaps a little premature to pass judgment on the personnel of this Board but I gathered there was considerable criticism by the Surface Rights Organization because of the Government appointments to it. And I again warn the Government that this attitude has not changed during the past year.

I understand, Mr. Speaker, that Board members were chosen without any consultation with the Association and I certainly believe that it is nothing but proper that they should have a voice in the selection of a Board that is set up to arbitrate for them because the most important structure or requirement of an arbitration board, I think, Mr. Speaker, is that it has the confidence of the people which it represents or arbitrates for. Apparently this is not the feeling of the farmers. It has been pointed out to me that settlements can be reached and better awards obtained by negotiating their own contracts with oil companies, than those awards which are made by the Arbitration Board.

So I should say, Mr. Speaker, that this in itself creates a lack of confidence among the farmers and the Surface Rights Association, in the operation of the Arbitration Board and in its ability to make fair decisions.

So if I might repeat, I think if we can look for harmony and satisfaction among our surface rights owners and our industrial companies, the appointment of this board must prove satisfactory to both groups. Furthermore, after all, we are setting aside an estimate of some \$39,000 or \$40,000 for the administration of this Board, so I think we should make every effort to spend it wisely.

There is a very firm recommendation, Mr. Speaker, that this Board, which is now under the Department of Mineral Resources

April 16, 1971

should be brought under the Department of Agriculture. I can certainly see great merit if this move was to be considered by the Government because after all you are dealing with the surface rights of the farmer and that top layer of soil that is so important and beneficial to him.

The Assembly recessed at 12:30 p.m. until 2:30 p.m.

Mr. Speaker, at 12:30 I was suggesting this recommendation that this Saskatchewan Surface Rights Board, which is now under the Department of Mineral Resources, might be moved to come under the Department of Agriculture. I can certainly see great merit if this move was to be considered by the Government because, after all, you are dealing with the surface rights of the farmer and that is that top layer of soil that is so important and beneficial to him. Because it is on this ground or surface that he owns and uses for this agricultural production, whether it be the growing of grain or pasture or hayland required in producing livestock.

So I think it is only logical that the Government looks at the feasibility of moving this Surface Rights Board to come under the jurisdiction of the Agriculture or even the Attorney General's Department. I should think the Agriculture Department would understand more fully the complications and the inconveniences that arise when industry moves in on a farmer's land and how in many cases it disrupts and hampers his farm and agricultural operations.

I am only passing these grievances on to you, Mr. Speaker, and to the Government, to try and show the need for the Government that is in power to give further consideration to these farmers, as I am convinced that the awards they have been receiving are not sufficient and not realistic for the added expense and inconvenience that they are called on to endure.

I think it is certainly the duty of the Government to see that the Surface Rights Arbitration Board which they have appointed fulfils its obligations. I know, Mr. Speaker, that I had to speak in support of many farmers who are involved in this industrial development on their agricultural land. With this 3.63 per cent of our total budget being set aside for our agricultural industry, I can only say it is not nearly sufficient for an industry which the whole economy of the province depends upon. Mr. Speaker, and as this Liberal Government is quite prepared to give tax concessions and incentives to other segments and groups of our province, I say there would have been no better place to allocate a substantial increase in this Budget than to our Saskatchewan rural people, the citizens who are striving and who are working courageously endeavouring to make ends meet, and who are asking for nothing more than a fair break in life. I say they deserve full consideration to see that they have an opportunity to achieve it. This, Mr. Speaker, I believe is the only manner in which our economy can once more start to gain momentum and once more reach the place where all our people can walk with dignity and pride, knowing that they have some security and assurance provided for them.

So, because of these reasons I have given, Mr. Speaker, I have no alternative than to vote against the motion.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

WELCOME TO STUDENTS

Mr. Speaker: — Before another speaker enters the debate, I wish to introduce to all Hon. Members the following groups of students situated in the galleries: from the constituency of Swift Current represented by Mr. Wood, 35 students from the Rosenhoff School under the direction of their principal, Mr. Robertson; and from the constituency of Humboldt represented by Mr. Breker, 15 students from the Lake Lenore School, under the direction of their school principle.

I am sure all Hon. Members wish to extend to these students, their teachers and their bus drivers, the warmest of all possible welcomes to the Legislative Assembly of the Province of Saskatchewan, to express the very sincere wish that their stay here will be enjoyable and educational and wish to all of them a safe trip home.

Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. L. Coderre (Gravelbourg): — On a point of privilege, Mr. Speaker. During the redistribution in 1952 I had the honor of inheriting the wonderful students from Rosenhoff School in my constituency. I wouldn't want to give them to the Hon. Member, Mr. Wood, so I should like to take credit for these wonderful students up there.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

The Assembly resumed the interrupted debate on Bill No. 71.

Mr. T.M. Weatherald (Cannington) — Mr. Speaker, I wish only to make a few brief remarks in this Budget Debate and to indicate that I fully support this Budget because it has the priorities of Saskatchewan in a proper prospective.

I should like to make just a few brief comments about some of the speeches made during this debate by the Opposition Members. I think that there have been a number of speeches that have brought up questions which I think the people of Saskatchewan will be most interested in hearing the answers.

For example, I believe, Mr. Speaker, the Member for Regina South East (Mr. Baker), the former mayor, has taken the liberty to pass out a manifesto of his own of various promises, certainly related to the Budget because they amount to millions and millions of dollars. I think one of the most important and most interesting parts of this program that the former mayor has produced and has sent to the constituents is the question as to whether this will be honoured in any budget that an NDP government may ever have at some time in the future. I think it would be most interesting to know whether the Leader of that party would honor that manifesto or whether it is that we are going to be treated to budgetary announcements and policy programs by every candidate of the 60 constituencies in Saskatchewan of the NDP Opposition. Because, Mr. Speaker, I am quite sure that the people of Cannington would really like to know if these promises the former mayor has made for the city of Regina are going to be honored because I am quite sure that if they are ever honored, there won't be any money left for the rest of us outside the city of Regina. And so we shall be looking forward

April 16, 1971

to find out if the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Blakeney) really endorses the former mayor's program.

Again, Mr. Speaker, the Member for Redberry (Mr. Michayluk) in the debate on the budget for Highways the other day, announced that he has already promised his constituents a road. I forget what the particular location of the road was, but he has promised that if he got in again, he would build such and such a road. So, I suppose that, again, we can look forward to announcements in all 60 constituencies by all 60 candidates on various road programs which added up, will certainly come to an astronomical figure which they could never, never hope to carry out.

This morning, we listened to the usual harangue from the NDP Opposition Leader against practically any person who has become successful in any field. This, of course, has become such a customary procedure from the NDP that it is one of the fundamental reasons why there are so few successful people in this country ever joining their party. And it is one more reason, Mr. Speaker, why successful people, whether they be middle class who have worked hard to make a meagre living but have been relatively successful doing so with limited means, fail to look on the NDP and why the NDP is accumulating so many candidates who have not done very well in their own businesses or in their own professions.

Now, Mr. Speaker, in regard to the Budget, I want to say that this Budget, on examination, puts a high priority on a highway program. And while the Opposition likes to berate the highway program, I have yet to come across a person who, when questioned would say, "I wish you'd spend less money on the road that I drive on." I've run, periodically, into people who want to spend less money but never on the road which they use. And so it is if we are going to have an adequate highway system in this province, the budget that has been produced by the Minister of Highways is not only supported by the people of Saskatchewan who want good roads, but is a necessity as many of us in rural Saskatchewan have substantial distances to drive to our communities and to the various larger cities.

Again, this was a high priority as was the assistance to our small towns. It's a well known fact that a Liberal Government has substantially increased highway programs or road programs in our smaller communities paying 50 per cent of the cost of oiling streets. I mention one town, for example, Lampman. They received a \$90,000 grant for paving their streets, half the total cost of fixing up that street, a cost which would have been otherwise impossible to implement. Another town is Carlyle which received \$35,000 for fixing up their main street. And this is most appreciated and far beyond anything that they had received up until this program was begun. Of course, the emphasis placed on the assistance to our rural municipalities is well known.

Education has also received a very high priority. And I am most surprised, Mr. Speaker, to hear the Leader of the Opposition simply say that we should take all of the taxes off property to finance education in another way. This may well be a desirable objective, certainly it will never be achieved with the suggestions that he is putting forth. Because if he ever implemented his plan by placing higher and higher income taxes we should simply have a mass migration of people from Saskatchewan because we could not have a system which would require 10 or 15 per cent tax rate here in this province that would be

10 or 15 per cent higher than Manitoba or Alberta. Those people who are working people with a trade, people who are in the professions, people who have mobility of work simply would not stay in Saskatchewan were we to transfer all of the property tax onto an income tax rate which would put us totally out of line with the rest of Canada. So I suggest if we are going to move in this direction it would only be desirable that we move only in step with our sister provinces and the other provinces in Canada.

I think what was disconcerting, Mr. Speaker, in his speech about education was that he did not indicate at all any method or any desire to hold at least the cost of education. He dealt solely on how we are going to raise more money. And I don't believe that this is what the people of Saskatchewan want. I don't think they just want more and new ways of raising taxes. They want a Government which is going to hold the cost on education because it has been going up at an astronomical rate. This Government has been holding the line on the cost of education as best it can. The cost of education is still rising, certainly as long as teachers' salaries, administration and people wanting better schools, it is going to continue to rise. This Government has been scrutinizing budgets and doing everything to hold the cost of education in line and at the same time transfer some off property.

I think the people of Saskatchewan also are going to be exceptionally happy that a substantial portion of money has been put into the Budget for the preservation of our environment and the cleaning up of rivers and streams. This, of course, is an exceptionally high priority not only of this Government but of public opinion today, not only in Saskatchewan but across Canada. And it is a new expenditure and a new item in the Budget outside of the Water Resources Commission and it's one which I think will certainly be noted by the public and certainly has their support.

In general, Mr. Speaker, I don't wish to dwell on the Budget to any great extent. But this is a Budget which puts incentive into our province. It's a Budget which fulfils the needs as best we can. And it is a Budget which gives opportunity to many people of Saskatchewan and helps to produce growth in this province. The Opposition likes to run down any incentive which may be given to the pulp mill or any type of industry. And certainly, Mr. Speaker, there would be no one who would quarrel with saying that if industry was itself able to finance all of these arrangements and new industries that we have that that would be more desirable. But the truth of the matter is, Mr. Speaker, as is well known and has been well documented, and I should commend to the reading of the Members opposite a book which recently came out called "Forest Growth" which suggests that it is the best field that Saskatchewan could exploit as far as bringing industry to Saskatchewan is concerned.

It is a good financial deal for Saskatchewan, Mr. Speaker. It is an excellent deal that this Government or that any government could have attracted a pulp mill to this province. And it is a question of whether we wish to give this type of assistance to industry so that we may have it on the best terms that we can negotiate or whether we wish to reject it outright. I think it is most unfortunate that the party opposite has suggested we should reject any type of assistance and therefore we should reject it on any grounds whatsoever. I do not think this is in accordance with the public's thoughts and I am quite

April 16, 1971

convinced that they will answer in their actions at the appropriate time. This Budget is a budget which people will support simply because it's a budget which gives opportunity to people and incentive. It is a budget which is well in accordance with the principles of Liberalism simply because, for long, we have believed that we should build a bigger pie not just cut up a smaller pie from year to year. The Socialists, you know, they can always tell you how to cut up the pie, but they never tell you how to make a bigger one, Mr. Speaker. I think this is what the people of Saskatchewan want. They want bigger pies each year. They don't want just the same old pie that we keep over and over and decide to cut it up in smaller slices.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Weatherald: — Of course, Mr. Speaker, you know this morning we listened to their great success. They finally did capture one of the provinces in Canada after the last 30 or 40 years. They are so elated that they forget that they haven't got much representation outside of about two provinces in Canada. I suppose if you haven't got anything and you get something you're better off than you were before. That's about the position they find themselves in. They didn't have anything before, and now they've got something. I'm reasonably glad that they won one province because now we can watch the mistakes they make there.

Anyway, Mr. Speaker, I wish to support this Budget for the reasons I have outlined and I think that at the appropriate time the people of Saskatchewan will find that they are very much in accord with the priorities this Government has put on financing the Province of Saskatchewan.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. G.T. Snyder (Moose Jaw North): — Mr. Speaker, this debate which is provided for under the new rules of the House gives us the final opportunity to gather together the information that has been made available during Estimates and questions which have been answered in the House. Hopefully, it will be possible to take a more objective look at the total scene and judge whether the Government has wisely allocated the tax dollars in a way which will be of benefit to the vast majority of Saskatchewan citizens.

It seems to me that this should be the predominant influence when tax dollars are being spent and priorities are being established. If a Government is to discharge properly its duty then special care must be paid to the prudent choice of programs and particular attention must be paid to those people who have little or no voice in order that they do not become a forgotten group. I place in this group, Mr. Speaker, the unorganized worker, large low income families, and large groups of people who make up Saskatchewan's pensioners and senior citizens.

The bulk of my remarks today, and they will be brief, Mr. Speaker, relate to health matters and other questions which bear upon Saskatchewan's senior citizens. I again suggest that this group is a large and a deserving body of people who have real power to bargain for an improvement or even for maintenance in their way of life. Saskatchewan's pioneers have made representations to governments on numerous occasions through their pensioners and senior citizens associations. For the

larger part, Mr. Speaker, their requests have been ignored and their voice has failed to impress governments both federally and provincially in recent years. This fact is borne out by the Federal Government's callous disregard for the economic plight of our old age pensioners when they granted this group a princely 42 cents a month increase in their old age security pension just a short while ago.

An Hon. Member: — Shame on you!

Mr. Snyder: — The Federal Government, Mr. Speaker, has ignored representations from senior citizens who have asked over the years that income tax exemptions be raised significantly. Pensioners' pleas have equally been disregarded by this Government, and I want to draw to your attention the most recent brief submitted to this Government by the Pensioners and Senior Citizens Organization when they again pressed for the removal of deterrent fees and for the inclusion of chiropractic services under medical care.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Snyder: — And for other measures which would be designed to give assistance to this particular category of Saskatchewan residents.

Like its Federal counterpart, Saskatchewan Liberals have given a firm 'No' to all of the major proposals which have been suggested by senior citizens' organizations.

A year ago, Mr. Speaker, that information could be gathered by the terms of this resolution concerning the operation of these private nursing homes over a certain capacity to file an annual statement of earnings, of operating expenses and profits. That resolution, Mr. Speaker, you will recall died on the order paper when we prorogued with not even a comment on this very important resolution by the Minister of Welfare.

It was our hope, Mr. Speaker, that information could be gathered by the terms of this resolution concerning the operation of these private nursing homes, information which could serve as a guide in determining what action should be taken in providing the most excellent nursing home care possible at the most reasonable cost. It has been and it continues to be the policy of New Democrats that our senior citizens are not a commercial commodity which can be exploited for private profit.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Snyder: — It will be our objective as a government to see that this kind of exploitation is banished from the Saskatchewan scene and that extended nursing care be included as an insured service and that all major nursing homes be operated as non profit institutions which will be obliged to live up to provincial standards.

During Public Health Estimates, Mr. Speaker, we learned that the Department has made a very minimal effort in terms of expanding health service over the past fiscal year and indeed over the past seven years. As I said on other occasions, it is

April 16, 1971

our objective as New Democrats, Mr. Speaker, to see to it that the widest range of health services be made available to all of the our people. We have said that only through public programs can these services be provided in a comprehensive way.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Snyder: — We are convinced that this objective could have been accomplished in a major way in the past seven years except for the selfish and reactionary stands that this Government has assumed in terms of providing health services to Saskatchewan people. It should be remembered, Mr. Speaker, that a former CCF Government introduced hospitalization to North America within three years of taking office and supported it financially without a penny from Ottawa for ten years. Only when Canadian people rid themselves and rid the country of a Liberal Government did we see a Federal plan introduced on the national scene and we then received some assistance for the cost of providing for hospitalization for Saskatchewan people.

In 1962, our Government introduced to North America the first medical care plan and this was introduced, I recall, in the midst of confusion and hysteria which Members opposite generated across the entire country. And, Mr. Speaker, we financed it alone without a penny from Ottawa and turned it over to Members opposite with an \$11 million surplus in the fund when this Thatcher Government assumed office in 1964. This, Mr. Speaker, was the heritage which the Government opposite claimed when they assumed office. Today, Mr. Speaker, Liberals have no choice but to appear to favour public programs which provide hospitalization and medical care for our people. Indeed, Mr. Speaker, some Liberals act as though it was they who conceived the plan. Those people, however, Mr. Speaker, are exposed by history and the events of years gone by. Yet, Mr. Speaker, some Liberals still attempt to take credit for a victory that was won in a battle which they lost.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Snyder: — Liberals, Mr. Speaker, have never devoted themselves to public programs. It is clear that if such had been their objective there might have been an unparalleled opportunity for the expansion of health programs in recent years.

Let's look for just a moment, Mr. Speaker, at the financial opportunity to nurture and to promote health services that the Government opposite has ignored. Let's look at the financial resources which were available to a former CCF Government in the 1964-65 fiscal year, when we financed medical care alone without the imposition of deterrent charges on Saskatchewan sick people and Saskatchewan senior citizens. During that fiscal year a CCF Government had estimated budgetary revenues of \$214,876,000. This Government's estimated Budget for the fiscal year 1971-72 will be more than double the 1964-65 figure in an amount in excess of \$451. In addition to this, Mr. Speaker, reimbursement from Ottawa has increased by something in excess of \$50 million since 1964. So let's look at it again — increased revenues of more than \$236 million, increased reimbursement from Ottawa for shared health programs increased by over \$50 million since the last year of CCF Government in 1964. I think one might have expected then some major improvements in Saskatchewan's health

programs. Instead of sharing and passing on some of the bountiful financial harvest to the most deserving of Saskatchewan's residents, this Government instead applied the thumb screws.

I believe, Mr. Speaker, that we might have logically expected the Minister of Health to promote a drug insurance program which he and his party promised during the 1964 election campaign and again in 1967. We might have expected an immediate start by providing drugs for terminal cancer patients. Surely, Mr. Speaker, this should have been regarded as a logical step to improve health care in our province.

The Member for Souris—Estevan (Mr. MacDougall) and I am sorry he is not in his seat, cannot, I am sure, be accused of being overly progressive and yet some years ago, Mr. Speaker, he was pressing the Government by way of a private Member's resolution to proceed along those lines of providing drug services for terminal cancer patients. Instead, Mr. Speaker, of even a limited drug program these promises made in 1964 and again in 1967 by a Liberal Government still appear to be in never, never land and will remain so until a New Democratic Party assumes office. At that point in time, Mr. Speaker, we in Saskatchewan will have a prescription drug program based on a drug formulary and an essential purchasing agency to provide drugs at greatly reduced cost. This, Mr. Provincial Treasurer, is a solemn pledge by those of us who sit on this side of the House.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Snyder: — One might have believed, Mr. Speaker, that in 1971 with a Budget more than doubled that of 1964 and with an additional \$50 million plus in cash-sharing revenue from Ottawa, that our health programs might have been expanded to include hearing aids and eye glasses and to provide a dental program for children. This, Mr. Speaker, we intend to do when the New Democratic Party assumes office later this year. Instead of increased services for health care as a result of expanded revenues this Government has moved in the direction which restricts and discourages the use of public programs. Studies the world over, Mr. Speaker, provide evidence of the value of preventive programs of early diagnosis and treatment. It can be shown that in circumstances where doctors' services are readily available that chronic ailments which require long and costly hospital services diminish sharply.

I should be surprised, Mr. Speaker, if the Minister of Health was not aware of the record of performance of medical practitioners who have associated themselves with group practices located in St. Catherines and Sault Ste. Marie, Ontario. Their record for hospital confinements per thousand of patients is far superior to any other clinic in that province. It is well known that particular emphasis in those clinics is placed on preventive medicine in both of these group practices. Their record of successfully treating their patients and keeping hospital days to a minimum is an outstanding example of what can be accomplished by a program of early diagnosis in treatment.

I repeat once again what I said on Estimates concerning the experience in the provision of health services for people in the far northern areas of our province. The annual report of the Department of Health indicated that as doctors' services have become more readily available in those northern areas and

doctors' visits have increased, that the number of hospital days have been declining and declining sharply. The annual report said that last year hospital days decreased from 774 to 559, while this year there was a further decrease from 559 to 356 days. During that brief period, Mr. Speaker, hospital days were cut in half as a result of, according to the Department's own annual report, an increase in doctors' visits. It is evident, Mr. Speaker, that this Government is viewing the whole matter of the provision of health services through its own tiny private little keyhole. It refuses to consider the humanitarian, the social or even the economic consequences of the road that they are travelling. This Government is determined to punish people for being sick and punish them for occupying a hospital bed. According to the Government's own figures they extracted \$4,504,941 in deterrent fees from hospital patients alone. These deterrent charges were broken down in this way: in-patient hospitalization fees \$4,440,941; out-patient physiotherapy fees another \$104,000, for a total of \$4,504,941 in deterrent charges on Saskatchewan's sick people. The complete economic folly of this program of taxing the sick is seen when we note that Ottawa will not share in that portion of hospital care which the patient pays directly. Accordingly, Saskatchewan is losing more than \$2.5 million in direct cost sharing as a result. The story may be somewhat tiresome to Members opposite because we have mentioned it on other occasions, but mention it we will, again and again, Mr. Speaker, in order that every person in this province will understand the sad and the callous and the stubborn approach which the Government applies to the problem of Saskatchewan's sick people.

Members may be interested to know also that the Minister of Health (Mr. Grant) admits that Saskatchewan's sick people in 1970 paid out \$3.2 million in deterrent charges additionally for medical services and this represents a further loss of \$1.6 million in cost sharing from Ottawa for a total loss of over \$4 million when it is added to the \$2.5 million sacrificed because of deterrent charges on hospital care. This, Mr. Speaker, tells more about the incompetence of this Government than any other single act for which they are responsible. They have chosen to bleed the consumers of health services while freeing Ottawa from a \$4 million cash obligation.

Additionally, Mr. Speaker, we find that the Government during 1970 also enriched the consolidated fund by \$271,000 by attaching the estates of mentally disordered persons. This is another source of revenue which this Government has exploited in its relentless search of ways to tax and punish those who use our public health plans.

This, Mr. Speaker, provides what I think has to be regarded as a rather incomplete summary of the abject failures of this Government in making available a broader range of health services for our people. It should be a worthy objective of any Government which regards its philosophy as humanitarian and progressive. This Government has failed Saskatchewan people in many ways, Mr. Speaker, but has fallen far short in the provision of one of the most important features of Government activity in the provision of health services for all our people. These and other failures condemn this Government and the Budget which has been presented to us for the 1971-72 fiscal year has been shown to have an inappropriate order of priorities. The Government has failed Saskatchewan people and the Government will fall because they have refused to listen to the people of this province.

This Government has lost touch, it has grown old in office, Mr. Speaker, and it will be replaced at an early moment when this Government has the courage to set a date for a general election.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. L.P. Coderre (Minister of Public Works): — Mr. Speaker, the 1971 Legislature presents Bill 71 and the Leader of the Opposition in this debate said he will reject this Budget. Mr. Speaker, how inconsistent can my friends opposite be. For every item that was presented in the Estimates, they voted for each and every one of them and now they say that they are going to vote against it. Not one motion during the Estimates was brought in by them to reduce the Budget. The present confusion, Mr. Speaker, is due in great part to the fact that they do not feel any certainty about the future as to where they are going or ought to be going. They do not seem to realize that political things have shifted from their fine old places. They cannot accept that there are many effective ways for our society to move without being a Socialist society. They know only too well that Socialism is fading throughout the world. They do not want to let this go by so they are groping, they don't know what they want. They are unable to recognize that they have to step forward to realize that the whole Estimate and the Bill itself is beneficial for society. The doubtful ideas that they have, it seems to me, Mr. Speaker, are much more destructive than beneficial.

You know, Mr. Speaker, they have been beating the drums and trying to denigrate this Bill that is truly a progressive looking Bill, because the Lieutenant-Governor has asked for this money and we will present to the Governor this money despite what the Socialists say they are going to do by voting against it.

The Hon. Member for Kelsey (Mr. Messer) was saying that they are going to vote against this, the Leader says they are going to vote against it. I am wondering if they are going to vote against homeowner grants, will they vote against the grid road assistance, against purple gas, against snow removal. I am just wondering what they are going to do. I am just wondering what their position is going to be, Mr. Speaker, when the Bill is presented and there is \$10 million in ordinary expenditures for agriculture. They are going to vote against that, Mr. Speaker. I wonder what the farmers in Saskatchewan are going to do. They are going to vote against \$470,000 for the Department of Co-operation, I wonder what the people are going to do about that. They don't want any education, Mr. Speaker, there is \$108 million for education but they don't want any part of that, they are going to vote against it. How inconsistent can they be?

Still, when the Estimates were up they went along with it. They don't want their salaries. This is the most amusing thing there is, Mr. Speaker. Note one of them across the way want their salaries, they are going to vote against that. They are going to vote against the roads in this province. They are going to vote against transportation. They are going to vote against labor, Mr. Speaker. They say we are not doing anything for labor when there is \$3,400,000 for the Department of Labour and they are going to vote against that. Then, of course, the Hon. Member for Kelsey was mentioning that we are not doing

April 16, 1971

anything for agriculture. He fails to do a little bit of arithmetic. There is \$10 million which goes for agriculture directly, \$5 million for agriculture indirectly. Then he fails to recognize, of course, the assistance for municipalities in grid roads, snow removal. This is all part and parcel of the assistance but they are going to vote against that, Mr. Speaker. They are not concerned one iota for the health of this province and the Hon. Member for Moose Jaw (Mr. Snyder) was just saying that we are not concerned. There is \$151 million going to be voted for health and what is he going to do? He is going to vote against it. How inconsistent my Socialist friends are!

Mr. Dewhurst: — Tell them about the car.

Mr. Coderre: — And then the Hon. Member for Wadena, the only thing he can think of is a car. Just a car, that's all, that's the capacity of his ability in this Legislature to talk about a car when we are voting money to the people of this province, for the people of the province, the poor people of the province, all the people of the province, \$447 million.

Worst of all, Mr. Speaker, and I should like to get to the point, Mr. Speaker, that I got up here to speak on and that is the question of the Department of Public Works. We are going to put out work to the amount of \$15,585,000 of capital programs this year, which is three times more than any year that my Socialist friends have ever put out even in their highest year. And this program is put into effect to assist those people who by the grace of God and other situations have been unable to get employment. This Government is doing something about it and my noble Socialist friends across the way are going to vote against it, Mr. Speaker. Can you imagine that?

Mr. Speaker, I will support the Bill wholeheartedly, and I will tell my constituents and everyone else in the province that my Socialist friends are so inconsistent they don't know where they are going. They are groping for something. But we have the most forward looking Budget, the most forward looking Bill, we are going to spend for the people of Saskatchewan \$447 million. That's wonderful! But they are going to vote against it and I'll be shouting from the roof tops, Mr. Speaker, about this. I will support the Bill.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. D. Boldt (Minister of Highways): — Mr. Speaker, this morning when I listened to the Leader of the Opposition and having listened to the NDP for a good number of years how they have criticized the support this Government gave to the pulp mill at Prince Albert. He now admits that this was one of the best deals and he said today that the pulp mill now is worth \$40 million more than it was at the time of construction.

Mr. Romanow: — No, he said . . .

Mr. Boldt: — Oh, he said exactly this and I don't need any lawyer to tell me what he said. This is right, he said the pulp mill is worth \$40 million more than it was at the time of construction so they have made a capital gain of \$40 million.

Mr. Romanow: — On a point of order I am sure the Hon. Member would not want to misquote the Leader of the Opposition. The Leader of the Opposition was simply saying that the Treasurer and the Premier said that the shares were worth \$40 million. That's all he said, he didn't say that he said it was worth \$40 million.

Mr. Boldt: — The Leader of the Opposition said that the mill was now worth \$40 million more than it was at the time of construction. Let the Leader of the Opposition be in his seat if he wants to protect what he has said.

Also I was interested in hearing that school taxes were going up. The second last issue of the Rosthern Valley News indicated that the Rosthern School Unit will reduce its tax rate by five mills. They are setting a really good example for school boards throughout the province and the Rosthern Unit will teach students — on the cheapest level — I shouldn't say the cheapest level — but the most economical level.

I was also interested in the remarks made by the Member from Kelsey (Mr. Messer) when he read an article from the Globe and Mail in which the Ontario Government is going to set up a land bank. I don't think he heard me, maybe he did hear me but he didn't want to hear me, when I mentioned that there is no farm land involved in this land bank. The Socialists want to buy up all the farm lands and make Socialism out of the farm industry. This is the program of the NDP here in Saskatchewan.

Just a few minutes ago the Member from Moose Jaw (Mr. Snyder) pointed out and wanted to tell the people how hard we were on the sick. Well you know there are more nursing home beds built since 1964 in seven years than you people did in 20 years. There are more hospital beds now than there ever were and the people of Saskatchewan are under the best medicare of any province in Canada.

Now I want to make a few comments regarding the criticisms that were made about highway contracts. The Opposition in their opposition to the Estimates in the Budget Debate have continuously for the last couple of years discussed and criticized and made accusations on highway contracts awarded and payments made to the contractors. I can assure you, Mr. Premier, that if there is an election called that they will make every attempt to smear the present Government and how the highway contracts were let and how highway contractors were paid. But one thing that is amazing about the Opposition is that they are always very, very careful that they are not going to criticize the Department officials. They always seem to criticize either the Government or the Minister.

Mr. Romanow: — You can criticize everybody else.

Mr. Boldt: — Well let me tell my hon. friend from Saskatoon Riversdale that I shall also protect the officials in the Department and if I couldn't they wouldn't be there. I want to be equally strong in protecting the Government's stand on its highway program and its policies.

May I first point out that before awards are made the

April 16, 1971

estimated costs of a project are either made by Department officials, namely our consultants and engineers employed by the Department or by private consultants. In most instances the estimates are made when designs are completed but there are instances when awards are made before the designs have been completed and estimates are purely estimates only. I don't think that any government in Saskatchewan, I don't think that any government in Canada has ever made an award to a highway contractor, let's say for \$500,000 and that the final payment made came out to the exact final estimate of \$500,000. The amount of dirt to be moved, the yardage of rock to be moved, the tonnage of asphalt are estimates only and if the contractor moves less dirt, he is only paid for what he does and not what was estimated. During the course of construction after the award has been made and the estimated cost determined, farmers might want a cattle pass or someone wants a service road, or an overhead sign is requested or additional lighting is requested. These items have not been included in the original estimates and if our district engineers recommend to our head office that such items be included the cost would be increased accordingly. Yesterday, the Hon. Member from Kelvington (Mr. Byers) came to me with the request for a cattle pass on No. 14 in the Insinger district. It is a legitimate request and I shall consider it. If it is granted it will mean an additional cost of \$4,000. This item is not included in the award that has already been made.

Now if the Opposition want me to balance the books then there is no way that I can consider granting the cattle pass. I should just say, No. We haven't got it in the Budget, it wasn't budgeted for and I wouldn't even consider it. I take the position that I am not that much concerned about balancing the books as I am that a good facility be provided for the public to travel on as well as the farmers. If he really needs a cattle pass he should have it whether it was included in the estimates or not. The Opposition well knows that the dirt moved, the tonnage of asphalt is all weighed, calculated by the Department officials and the contractor is paid on the basis of work performed, not on the basis of the estimate. The contract clearly spells out that it is an estimated cost only. The contract has certain clauses in it that specify that the Department of Highways can force the contractor to do certain things that might not be included in the contract. We can force him to build extra mileage. We can force him to build service roads. We can force him to build additional access, cattle passes and many other related items pertaining to highway construction. The progress payments on contracts are made monthly. These are all calculated by the officials in the Department. If contract prices over-run, every increase in the price is accounted for and the Opposition know that this is true.

It is about time the Opposition told us what they want to do with the Department officials. If contractors are overpaid on the estimate cost of the project, this is then being done by highway officials, and not by the Government. No instructions have ever gone out to my officials that contractors should be overpaid. I am absolutely certain and I am convinced of this that my Deputy, L.P. Holmes, the chief engineer, Bill Sheard, every district engineer in the Province or branch heads in the department would resign immediately if they were told to pay out more than was earned by the contractor. The Government, of course, must take some responsibility for the inefficiency of the cost estimates. We drastically increased our highway budget during the term we have been in office and our department was short-

staffed, our highway program was so far behind that this action of injecting additional funds had to be made before some of these projects were designed and a survey made and a proper estimate made.

So the estimates in some cases were ball-park figures. But let no one suggest that contractors were paid for work they never did. The Provincial Auditor is there to protect the public and the Opposition can question in public accounts and they can ask for information and they can go and see the documents. You can come to my office and I can show you the contracts and the amounts that were paid out. The Opposition can make no case whatsoever that my officials are not conducting an honest business.

During the course of the Budget Debate, I believe, a statement was made by the Hon. Member for The Battlefords (Mr. Kramer) regarding a \$400,000 payment made to a farmer who is supposed to be a member of the Liberal Executive at North Battleford. The statement was reported to me is as follows: —

Mr. Kramer, MLA for The Battlefords told the Legislature yesterday that a member of the Liberal executive received \$400 an acre for sub-marginal land which was not worth more than \$50 per acre. Mr. Kramer said Mr. Gabruck received more than \$24,000 for 50 acres needed for a highway interchange for a south approach to the North Battleford bridge. He said the Government made an inane attempt to cover up a dumb deal. In a telephone interview from Regina this morning, Mr. Kramer said Highways Minister Dave Boldt tabled some of the correspondence under Gabruck land purchased.

Mr. Kramer said that the appraisal of the land was made, not by a land appraiser but by a prominent Battleford Liberal, E.G. Marshall, a theatre manager.

Well you know this gentleman from North Battleford, you know I doubt whether he could tell the truth if it was under oath and if he did, it would be an accident.

Here I tabled this report and on the reply that I had it was mentioned in this report, which I tabled . . .

Mr. Snyder: — On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, do you regard it as parliamentary language for a Member to say that another Member probably couldn't tell the truth under oath? What is your learned judgment on that kind of a . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order, order! I think the point of order is well taken.

Mr. Boldt: — Well I'll withdraw that statement. I'll say that he is awfully reckless with the truth and if he . . .

Now he made a great deal out of this deal and he said, "Even the Highway officials said that this was not a good deal for the Department of Highways," but he took it out of context. And this gentleman wanted \$33,100 and this is what the Highway officials made a comment about. He said this, "this amount would include land, crop damage, summerfallow, fencing, etc."

April 16, 1971

He says, "I find it impossible to justify his claims since land values on the Battleford side of the river have been depressed compared to North Battleford." So he works out a schedule this land appraiser of ours, and he reduces that figure to \$24,000. This E.G. Marshall, where he comes into the picture is this, and this is the thing that our people had to take into consideration. I'm reading from a letter sent to Mr. Gabruck November 30, 1966 and signed by E.G. Marshall. It goes on to say:

I am writing you to enquire about the possibilities of purchasing land which I have been led to believe that you own on the south side of the river in the vicinity of the new bridge across the Saskatchewan River linking Battleford with North Battleford.

We would require 15 to 20 acres of land not necessarily with highway frontage and we would consider paying \$1,500 to \$2,000 per acre should the property meet our requirements, our intentions being the erection of a drive-in theatre and accompanying development. Should we be able to reach agreement, I would like to take an option for 12 months until the necessary financing is arranged on the basis of 5 per cent of the total purchase price.

This was an offer that came from a private individual to a private individual which our land appraisers had to take into consideration. We made a deal with this gentleman. Our highway people made a deal, not the Government, and they paid for 30.12 acres \$250 an acre, for 12.36 acres we paid \$500 an acre and for 6.91 acres \$600 an acre, for a total for the land of \$18,000. That's a long, long way from \$24,000. Then, in addition, we paid for farm operation severance and the Member for The Battlefords had this on record. We paid for farm operation severance \$1,700, for summerfallow \$2,680 and the cost of the additional expenses, fencing, etc., for a total price of \$24,590. We had some additional land which we exchanged for \$500 an acre and we came up with a price of \$24,000 for this parcel of land. At no time was the Government, at no time was the Premier at no time was I as Minister, involved in the negotiations. And the land appraiser as reported by Mr. Kramer was not an E.G. Marshall, the theatre owner, but the appraisers were Highways people, very competent people, the chief appraiser being Mr. Warren and Mr. Alf Hawes, whom many people have a good deal of respect for.

Mr. Kramer: — Mr. Speaker, is the Minister prepared at this late date to table the letter now of E.G. Marshall?

Mr. Boldt: — Oh yes, I'll table that letter. Sure. It isn't a confidential letter at all, it is in our files.

But here again the Member for The Battlefords is so far off base, he is so far off base, he doesn't know a theatre owner from a land appraiser; he doesn't know a Hereford bull from a Yorkshire sow. Always these kinds of statements. He doesn't care what he says. As long as he throws it out of there and he'll go and peddle that kind of garbage. During an election campaign you know, despite the fact that I've tabled all the evidence, he'll still go and say to the people that the Government, the Premier and Dave Boldt were involved with a Liberal at North Battleford and a Liberal who was the appraiser and they

gave their friends \$24,000. That's what he will say. That's the tactics he uses. We will see to it that the truth is going to be known in that area. When the election comes around I feel very, very sure — as a matter of fact if I was a betting man, I would bet my last bottom dollar that the Member for The Battlefords would not be sitting where he is now. He will be out of the House.

Mr. Speaker, I take great pleasure in supporting this Bill.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. E. Kramer (The Battlefords): — Mr. Speaker, we have heard the continuation of the serial story of bits and pieces of information that have been given to this House over a period of time. First of all, when a question is asked in the House, “how much is paid?” we get the simple answer from the simple Minister . . .

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Kramer: — . . . plain simple farmer from . . .

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Cameron: — Mr. Speaker, I should ask that the Member withdraw that imputation that the Minister is some sort of a simple . . .

Mr. Kramer: — If that was offensive I will withdraw it. I'm simply saying this, Mr. Speaker, that the Minister has been giving piecemeal information to this House and he gives us some more piecemeal information today. First of all, there is a question on the records which says that \$24,200 was paid to Mr. Gabruck for 50.2 acres of land. That was the question that was answered by the Minister, that was the question that I spoke on first of all. Then the Minister came along after that and tabled information which referred and I quoted from it. He said, “However, a letter from E.J. Marshall indicates that land values have considerably increased in that area.” Nothing else, nothing else! More piecemeal information. Now he comes along and there is nothing to indicate, there is nothing to indicate in that information that the Minister tabled that this was not an appraisal or a suggestion of value. There was nothing there. And what the Minister tabled now is even worse. This has to be the phoniest deal between two Members of the Liberal executive trying to suggest that this land is valuable. So in order to hide the truth, in order to inflate the value of that land, there is a phony letter from the theatre manager, another member of the Liberal executive to prove that this land, somehow this gravel heap, somehow is valuable — \$1,500 an acre. Mr. Speaker, I challenge the Minister to show me where in that area any land is sold for more than \$100 an acre. The same people, the same Government, just on the other side of the town of Battleford, sold agricultural land to the same Mike Gabruck during the same year for \$45 an acre, just on the other side of Battleford, better land. Now if that is not a dumb deal, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to know what is. It is all very well to come along and bolster up the value of that land with fences and so-called summerfallow. That land never produced a thing for years. It is not good crop land. You could summerfallow it and leave it for three years and you still wouldn't grow a crop

April 16, 1971

on it. It was a phony deal and the Minister knows it. I don't back off it at all and you are right, you are right, the people will continue to hear about this, especially since I find . . .

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Kramer: — . . . the Minister has been using phony values created for the purpose of inflating the value of the land from one Liberal member of the executive to another, a man who had no intention whatever of buying that land under any circumstances.

An Hon. Member: — How do you know?

Mr. Kramer: — How do I know? Did he buy it, did anyone else buy it? There is not one single . . . Mr. Speaker, there is not even an out-house built on that valuable land today six or seven years later. Don't come along and try to tell this House about the valuable land. It is not valuable land, it was a bad deal, with summerfallow and fences it is still a bad deal. That's all I have to say, Mr. Speaker, and I need no more lecturing from the sanctimonious Minister of Highways (Mr. Boldt).

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. J.E. Brockelbank (Saskatoon Mayfair): — Mr. Speaker, I am glad to be able to take part in this Appropriation Debate. It was mentioned by my Leader at the beginning of the debate that this Budget would never see the light of day completely and I am sure the Members opposite caught the implication of that. The implication is quite simple, that this is an election Budget designed for one specific purpose and one purpose only and the Budget will never reach its complete expenditure.

Now this happens to be a situation similar to that in which we found ourselves in 1967, Mr. Speaker. The Government came up with a budget which was a phony budget just as phony as this Budget is, they paraded it before the people in an attempt to show the people that everything was fine in Saskatchewan. We were living in the land of milk and honey. But then they had an election in the fall of 1967 and they were able to wiggle back into power and then, Mr. Speaker, at the first session in 1968 the greatest burden of taxation that was ever foisted on the people of Saskatchewan was dropped on them at that time. And that is what this Government intends to do with this particular Budget.

I am always pleased to see the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Coderre) speak in a debate in this House. It's entertaining, painful at some times, but entertaining. I was quite interested to listen to his remarks today and I noticed he didn't say very much about his crash winter works program. He did say about the Department of Public Works that this is the largest public works program ever. Well, I think I could say that safely about any year that we were in office about the Department of Education, the Department of Health. Every year a bigger budget, it has never failed, Mr. Speaker, and that is a fact. So really the Member for Gravelbourg didn't have a point there.

The other area where he approached the ridiculous, not

uncommon at some stage of his remarks, was when he was talking about health programs. He was saying in this Appropriation Bill we have X number of dollars for health and he said those people across there don't care about the health of the people of Saskatchewan. You know how ridiculous can a person get, Mr. Speaker. The people across here, or some of the people, who were the Government of Saskatchewan brought in and advanced the health programs of the Province of Saskatchewan more than any Government in Canada.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Brockelbank: — The interesting thing about the Minister of Public Works in his speech was that he stands amid the wreckage of his winter-works program oblivious to what has happened. That is what the Minister of Public Works has done. He stands there unable to recognize what has happened to his public works program. Well, Mr. Speaker, the other day I said that that ugly green sign in front of the Legislature that the Minister of Public Works had erected, I found, cost \$61.80. And there are 62 of these signs, Mr. Speaker, spread around the Province of Saskatchewan. Therefore, this Government spent \$3,831.60 putting up those green signs around the Province of Saskatchewan. What is written on the sign, Mr. Speaker? There is a quotation on it and I don't know what sage made that quotation but here it is: "Building for the future with jobs for today." The question to ask, Mr. Speaker, is how accurate is that information? That particular sign in front of the Legislative Building lists three items: "Legislative Building, first floor, south wing, expenditure of \$80,000; Legislative Cafeteria \$371,000; Legislative Building, first floor, west wing, \$91,000." A total of \$542,000, Mr. Speaker, a half million dollars! It really looks as if the Minister of Public Works is going to work on his cash winter works program. If the former Minister of Public Works will sit down and quit cleaning out his desk, I shall give him something about the public works program.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Brockelbank: — What did the Minister of Public Works spend? He spent \$43,000 out of an amount of \$542,000. Winter is past, Mr. Speaker, the investigation revealed that only \$43,000 had been spent out of half a million dollars to create much needed jobs to alleviate unemployment in the Province of Saskatchewan. Not only is this Government planning too little, too late, but it is poorly executed as well. The Government, and I have said this before, Mr. Speaker, will have to account to the people of Saskatchewan for the fact that they are making political capital out of their crash winter works program.

Now this is not the only area, Mr. Speaker, that we find this Government is making political capital on public programs. We find from investigation during this Session of the Legislature, and it was discussed during the Budget, that this Government has spent \$3,127 more on hospital and medicare advertising in the Province of Saskatchewan than they did in the year previous, and to put a political flavour on the hospital and medicare plan so strong, Mr. Speaker, that it isn't being done anymore by the Hospital Medicare Plan, it's being done by McLarens' Advertising.

April 16, 1971

That is the same outfit that does the advertising for the Liberal Party in their election campaigns. They now do the advertising for the bulk of the Government's advertising in the Province of Saskatchewan.

What is happening in another agency of this Government, Saskatchewan Telephones — \$54,836 more is being spent on advertising of this Crown corporation that was spent in the previous period. Mr. Speaker, that is being spent on politically motivated advertising and you've seen it in Sask Tel advertisements in Saskatchewan recently.

Not only this, Mr. Speaker, but we, the people of Saskatchewan, are getting an opportunity to participate in the Young Liberal Party and in a month from now, Mr. Speaker, the 15th and 16th of May the Young Liberals are going to be having their convention. And it happened that the notice for the convention for the Young Liberals came out with public service stamps on the letters. When approached about this particular coincidence, if you wish to call it, Mr. Ben Freitag of Alameda, the Association President, today said that the releases were sent out by the Government Information Services. And he had this to say: "Government Information Service officials asked him if he wanted 'something sent out on the convention' so, of course, they were sent out from there," said Mr. Freitag. Well, Mr. Speaker, political advertising, and that is what the Government is doing on their ugly green signs that we see posted around the province. Now the outright distortion that is evident on that sign, Mr. Speaker, must be multiplied by 62 times because those signs are all around the Province of Saskatchewan.

I have taken the opportunity to take this three page list that the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Coderre) gave me during his Estimates, and broke it down into four sections. I am sure the Members opposite will be interested in hearing what I have found. In the first section, Mr. Speaker, there is an expenditure of \$5.227 million on 24 items, but there is one interesting thing about these items, Mr. Speaker. It is not anticipated that these particular projects will start before March 21st and as we all know, Mr. Speaker, March 21st marks the beginning of Spring. So the crash winter works program is nowhere in sight for these 24 projects that total \$5.2 million. What about some of the items on this particular list? Well, one of them is low rental housing and it will begin after March 21st and it is \$2.1 million. It is interesting to note that the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Guy) — and I'm sorry that he is busy cleaning out his desk and not in the House now to listen to this, but I suppose somebody could take notes for him over there — but the Minister of Municipal Affairs had this to say in December. This is an item from the Saskatoon Star Phoenix, December 19, 1970:

Housing projects boost employment. The Saskatchewan Department of Municipal Affairs is making a good contribution to the Government's stepped-up winter works program through the construction of low-rental housing in Saskatchewan, according to Municipal Affairs Minister, A.R. Guy.

Mr. Guy said seven low-rental housing projects in Saskatchewan valued at \$2.1 million (Mark that figure) has been approved or are to be approved shortly.

Then he goes on to list where those projects are being located, Mr. Speaker. Well, here we have \$2.1 million which the Minister in December of 1970 was saying was going to create employment for this crash winter works program gone by the board because winter is gone and the projects have not started, not providing jobs for Saskatchewan people. They were in some other housing, and I asked the Minister of Municipal Affairs the other day about ten units at LaRonge, and I gather that his opinion is that these particular items have not been retendered because they haven't the location of where they should put these particular units of housing. But in an article back in October last year it states that the tender for these ten residences at LaRonge had been withdrawn and new tenders were to be called in February or March. The fact of the matter is if the tenders had been submitted and opened on October 22nd people must have known where the housing was going to go; at least have a pretty good idea where the housing was going to go. There is another ten units of housing that is not even mentioned in this crash winter works program which in effect has gone out the window as far as creating winter employment in the Province of Saskatchewan.

What about another area, Mr. Speaker, well, we have the area where no funds have been dispersed as yet. This is the second section of my remarks. There are ten items in this particular section, Mr. Speaker, and they amount to \$6.952 million from which no funds have been spent up to this point. Another failure on the part of the Liberal Government's crash winter works program.

Now we come to the item where some funds have been expended. Mr. Speaker, in this there are 17 projects in which some funds have been expended out of the 62 — just 17 out of 62 in which some funds have been expended. And how much did they expend? Well the dollar value that the Minister gave me in his Public Work's Estimate was \$3.1 million and they spent \$883,000 — \$883,000 on these 62 projects, Mr. Speaker. Can you imagine, a crash winter works project and that's all they spent! The winter's gone — say good-bye to winter.

There is another group, another section of items here in which there are seven items in the program which amount to \$805,000 and I haven't got the complete information about it. I was asking the Minister of Natural Resources (Mr. Cameron) for some information, however, Mr. Speaker, if you were to take that \$805,000 just to be completely generous with the Government and add it on to the money they had spent already it would just be \$1.6 million out of \$17.9 million. They only spent that much and that is if we are to be completely generous and I know some of this money is not spent at this time.

This presentation that I have made, Mr. Speaker, demonstrates what our Leader said the other day when he announced in December, when the Government announced the projects, that they were too little and too late.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Brockelbank: — At that time the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Blakeney) stated, "The Provincial Government should have taken the NDP's advice last summer and started public works projects then." And he goes on to state, "Every economist and every Government official in Saskatchewan knew there would be thousands of people who couldn't find jobs this winter." The careless manner in

April 16, 1971

which the Minister of Public Works treats the truth is surpassed only by his unusual mathematics.

What was the total on this list of public works' projects for the crash program? Well the Minister of Public Works said it was \$17,966 million, but on adding the list up, Mr. Speaker, I find it was \$17.6, in other words he is out \$349,000 in his addition. This is absolutely true, just get the list from the Minister and add it up, put it in your little computer and you'll find out that the Minister of Public Works can't even add the list up properly. He was \$349,000 out.

There was another error in his calculations and I am beginning to doubt all these errors. I think maybe there is some devious plan to try and fool the public about crash winter works programs. What did he do? Well, remember that \$2.1 million for public housing that I mentioned earlier, what did the Minister of Public Works do? Well you take a look at this list — he added it in twice. That makes up the figure a little when you toss in \$2.1 million twice into the list. It also makes the man-hour figure look better, Mr. Speaker, because it looks as if you have got a lot of man hours. But I think that's about standard for the Minister of Public Works.

You will recall, Mr. Deputy Speaker, how the Members across the way applauded every item the Minister of Public Works presented? How they applauded his every error and every distortion as he presented them. They were enthusiastic because they thought they were really moving on a crash winter works program. I must say that Liberal failures and inaccuracies will receive no applause or support from this side of the House, nor from the public.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Brockelbank: — The Liberal Government here and in Ottawa are plagued by critics in their own ranks who cannot abide by Liberal failures any longer. Here in Saskatchewan we have Mr. Gardiner who is apparently revealing the truth about deals and practices within this Government. I say, the truth, Mr. Speaker, because the Premier has done nothing to answer those charges.

In Ottawa, Mr. Hellyer, former Liberal Cabinet Minister, former contender for the Liberal leadership of Canada had this to say . . .

Mr. Gallagher: — A crash . . .

Mr. Brockelbank: — Perhaps you should listen, Mr. Member for Yorkton, because you weren't in here when I was talking about the crash winter works program that this Government stands convicted of failure.

What did Mr. Hellyer have to say in the Ottawa Citizen, March 26th, 1971, and you may check it. The headline was "Government Job Policy Disaster, Hellyer." Mr. Hellyer summed up his feelings in the article by saying:

The right to work is fundamental. The only reason there wasn't enough to go around now was the poor economic management on the Government's part.

I must say, Mr. Speaker, that in this province I am ashamed of the poor management of this particular Government. It is obvious, Mr. Speaker, that I shall not be able to support this Bill for the reasons which I have outlined on this crash winter works program, where the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Coderre) stands amid the wreckage of his program, oblivious to what has happened, totally unaware of what is happening. Perhaps he is not totally unaware, perhaps he has other reasons for pretending to be unaware. Perhaps he has other reasons for pretending to say that all is well in Saskatchewan, just like it was in 1967.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. A.C. Cameron (Minister of Mineral Resources): — Mr. Speaker, I want to be very brief and I should like to answer statements made by two Members in this debate, the Member for Weyburn (Mr. Pepper). I also have a few comments about the actions of the Member who just sat down to which I shall refer later.

The Member from Weyburn, I understand, took the occasion this morning to attack the actions and operations of the Arbitration Board and the substance of his criticism, as I understand it, was that the Board has not been consulted — the Surface Rights Arbitration Board has not been consulted in the appointment of the Board and the appointment of the Board was made by the Government. And having been made by the Government it is of a political complexion. He indicated, although he didn't say so in so many words, that the members of the arbitration Board were, in essence, hacks of the Government. Also that the farmers of Saskatchewan are not happy with the Arbitration Board. They are not happy with awards which have been given and that they had far greater and more equitable treatment under the old formula than they have today.

Mr. Speaker, these are strange words coming from a Member who had an opportunity during Estimates to search for all the information that may be at our finger tips. It was certainly there for the asking. But during the Estimates he had very little to say about the Arbitration Board. Oh, he asked one or two questions. Then he wound up, as I recall, complimenting the Board and the work they had been doing. But I noticed the other day a very prominent fellow from the southwest part of Weyburn was in over the wishing fountain here, talking to the Member from Weyburn and they had a very serious conversation.

So he comes into the House today and he tells what this gentleman could not come into the House to say. This is the switch that we experienced today. Now I want to tell the Hon. Member from Weyburn . . .

Mr. E.I. Wood (Swift Current): — Mr. Speaker, I don't know whether I am in order or not but I should like to raise a point of order on this.

I do know that there was some discussion as to whether or not the Estimates of the Surface Rights Board had been passed by the House. Some Members on this side thought that they hadn't and had things to say but felt that they didn't have the opportunity. I should just like to point this out.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: — I don't feel that I am qualified to rule in this

April 16, 1971

case. I am going to ask the Hon. Member to continue.

Mr. Cameron: — Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am not going to comment on that other than to say that he is challenging the record of the Clerk of the House. He is challenging the record of the Procedures in which a formal motion was given at the end of the Estimates and it was passed by this House. And the records verify that.

Mr. Wood: — On a point of order, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am not challenging the Clerk. I am simply saying that there was some misunderstanding and that the Hon. Member on this side thought that he was going to have further opportunities to speak in regard to Estimates and he didn't. I am not saying that the Clerk had a wrong order. But there was a misunderstanding and I am simply bringing this fact up.

Mr. Cameron: — I accept that the Hon. Member was not alert enough at the time to understand what was going on in the House. I accept that.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: — Order! Will the Hon. Member accept the ruling that he didn't challenge the Clerk?

Mr. Cameron: — . . . who is not aware of it. I can readily understand that.

I want to explain to the House the type of members we have on the Surface Rights Board. He asked for this in Estimates and I gave it to him.

An Hon. Member: — Oh, he asked for it?

Mr. Cameron: — Oh, yes he has this information. We have Mr. Neilson from Lloydminster, a prominent farmer in the Lloydminster area and a man who not long ago was honoured by the community for the tremendous contribution he has made to the people of that area.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Cameron: — This man has been Reeve of the municipality for years. He pioneered in the hospital field and sat as a member of the Hospital Board. He organized the Lloydminster Surface Rights Association and for years was president of it. When I asked the Lloydminster Surface Rights Association if they could give me a name for the Board there was only one selected and they said to me in a letter, "We will be honoured indeed to appoint as our representative, Mr. Neilson."

Mr. Estey: — A political hack!!

Mr. Cameron: — A political hack! Now we come to Mr. Geisel a member from the Member's territory, from near Estevan, a prominent farmer. A man who has made a great contribution on a municipal council. A man who has had to do with hospitals and all types of local government. A man who is held in high esteem within his community. I checked with officials of the southeast

Surface Rights Association before appointing this man and he came highly recommended. This man was a prominent member of the executive of the Estevan Surface Rights Association. And now he is called a party hack!

The other member is a prominent farmer and had been a prominent merchant and had dealt with people for a lifetime. Now we come to the fourth member and the chairman of the Board. He is a retired member who worked for the BA Oil, a university graduate. I know that these people have whispered in his ears, and if they haven't I should be very much surprised. They say of the chairman, "You know this man is in the pockets of the oil industry and we can't get fair trial and fair treatment as long as the president of the Board is a man who is in the pockets of the oil industry." And yet when I heard this I went to the Arbitration Board and I looked at the file and I asked them to reveal to me how many letters had they received from farmers across the province complaining about the awards. Have you had any representation from the Rural Municipal Association which is vitally concerned for they were to help compose and draft the legislation? I asked them if they had any correspondence or dissatisfaction with the process of the Board. I asked them if they had heard from the Wheat Pools who were there. I asked them if they had heard from the oil industry who were likewise sitting around the table drafting proposals.

So you know what the reply was? They haven't received one single complaint from the Saskatchewan Association of Municipalities, nor from the Farmers' Union, nor from the Co-operative Association, nor from the oil industry. And I asked: how many have you had from the farmers? In my office as a Minister there hasn't been one letter of complaint sent to me and I should think that I should be the first to know. I checked in the files down in head office in Regina and I came across four or five. Out of all the hundreds of thousands of farmers and people in the province, they got four or five letters complaining about the awards of the Board.

And under the Board set up any farmer who is not happy with the award has the right to appeal it to the courts. That was granted to protect the farmers. There has only been one case of appeal to the courts of the Province. You will be interested to know, Mr. Speaker, that the award of this court was less than the award of the Arbitration Board. And now the lawyer concerned is appealing this to the Appeal Court here in Regina.

Now he likewise made the accusation and he made a pretty good deduction. He said, "You know the farmer who is settling with the oil industry in negotiating his own compensation is doing better than those who went to the Board." And I shall agree that it is so, because the whole purpose of the legislation is to encourage the farmer and the oil operator to negotiate their own contracts. The only time that the Board enters into the picture is when the oil operator and the farmer cannot come to terms. And the legislation is such that when it comes before the Board they will be guaranteed that they get just and equitable treatment and no more. They know that and the oil industry knows that. And rather than going to the Board with this formality and legal representation and all that they want, the farmer because he has the Board standing behind him is now able to go to the companies and negotiate higher awards than he can under the Board.

April 16, 1971

This is because of the action of the Board. Not to be turned around and say that the Board is not doing justice because they are free to negotiate a better agreement. It is simply because the agreements are such that the farmers are free to negotiate and free to enter into a freely agreed to, binding contract which the Board doesn't enter into. Only in the case where they can't agree does the Board come in. And the one case that they have had upheld that the Board has given them just and equal treatment, and in fact reduced the compensation.

Now I want to turn to the Member who just sat down, the Member from Saskatoon Mayfair (Mr. Brockelbank). You know I went home last night and I was rather tired. I was trying to open the door to come into the house because there was no one home as my wife has gone to Vancouver, because, incidentally, we have a new grandson and she flew out to meet him.

Now the phone was ringing and I rushed to the telephone and said, hello. Do you know who was calling me? They were calling me from Maple Creek. They said, "You know, Mr. Chairman, that we are rather perturbed." And I said, "What is the matter?" Well, they said, "You know that you had been out here, you outlined before us how we may proceed to build a new home for the aged, a special-care home for the people of our area. You assured us that your contribution from the Government was provided for in the Budget. You assured us that you had been in touch with CMHC and they had put aside in their budget, so that if the decision was made to go forward, that we could go forward." I said, "Yes, I did that." And they said, "Did you not urge us to go into Level III care. That it would be better because we could keep more of our aged at home rather than sending them away?" I said, "Yes, I did." Well they said, "Before the meeting this evening which we are having with the 12 municipalities and have just completed, our secretary got a phone call." He said that the man identified himself as Mr. Brockelbank from Saskatoon. And he said that he put some very pertinent questions to us and he said that the essence of his conversation was this; you know we are checking on the credibility of the Government. And he said, "Can you assure me that you are considering the building of a new home for your aged people? Can you assure me that the Government has put the money away? Can you assure me that CMHC has put the money away?" And he said to them, in essence, "Be careful where you step because the rug will be pulled out from under you".

There are 12 municipalities who had gathered that afternoon to sign the formal documents and this busybody is sticking his cottonpicking fingers in our business in Maple Creek and trying to create fear in the hearts of those people that somehow they weren't going to get their home for the aged.

I tell him this: After I talked to those people, and there were several on the phone from 12 different municipalities, I am telling you today that story is reported in every community in Maple Creek constituency. And if he wanted to do anything to discredit himself, that this Mr. Flash, he did it yesterday. Mr. Flash will end up as a flash in the pan after his inquiry of yesterday.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Cameron: — These are the tactics that he is using. These are the tactics which my people in Maple Creek resent and they wanted

me to stand up in this Legislature and say so on their behalf on no uncertain terms. This is the type of trash that he would peddle to discredit and fight the rural people in the hope that he could make some cheap political gain by it. Mr. Speaker, I wanted to answer those and I am happy to support this Bill.

Mr. Brockelbank: — On a point of personal privilege, Mr. Speaker. The Minister of Mineral Resources has challenged me on something that I said in this House. I have in my hand here the document that the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Coderre) gave to me during Estimates. On it, it has replacement of two nursing homes, \$1 million. I asked the Minister for information about this and he said that I should have to go to Welfare to get it. So when the Welfare Estimates came up I asked the Minister of Welfare (Mr. MacDonald) — how about these two projects? And he said, “One is in Canora and one is in Maple Creek. But if you want the information about the beginning of construction date you will have to phone the community, because they are in charge of that.” So I phoned the community, I phoned Canora and I phoned Maple Creek. And, Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Mineral Resources put an interpretation on what I said and that is not what I said to the Clerk. I merely asked, “Have you had an item here and the Clerk said, “No we haven’t.” And I said, “When do you anticipate that you will start?”

Mr. Speaker: — Order, order! I think that this is a dispute that is not a proper matter for debate in the House. It is now a matter for debate amongst the people of Maple Creek, perhaps on the hustings at some future date.

Mr. Brockelbank: — Mr. Speaker, may I appeal your ruling.

Mr. Speaker: — Order, order! The Member for Saskatoon Mayfair has already spoken in this debate and he has already spoken for the second time now. He has no right to close the debate because he did not move the main motion.

Mr. Brockelbank: — I am still on the point of privilege, because he said that I was peddling trash.

Mr. Speaker: — Oh, well we have had people making accusations of others peddling trash, back and forth across the floor of the House on numerous occasions. What I am saying is that I think that this is a matter to be settled by the people of Maple Creek on the hustings during an election.

Mr. Brockelbank: — The fact of the matter is that the architect hasn’t even been engaged yet.

Mr. G.R. Bowerman (Shellbrook): — Mr. Speaker, with regard to this little debate that has just concluded, I am not sure what goes on down in Canora or down in Maple Creek but I want to inform the Hon. Minister that I do know what goes on in the Shellbrook constituency.

April 16, 1971

I do know that the late Mr. Cuelenaere, when he sat as a Member in this Legislature, promised the people of Shellbrook, and indeed indicated that there would be an old age home built in that community in 1964 and it is not built today. It is not yet built to this day. But there is an indication that it will be built this coming year. There is a promise that we'll have it in 1971.

Mr. Steuart: — I'll get in touch with . . .

Mr. Bowerman: — Very good, I hope you will.

Mr. E. Kramer (The Battlefords): — Yes, that is just pretty damned rotten!

Mr. Speaker: — Order, order! This debate hasn't got much longer to go. At 5:00 o'clock the mover of the motion will be called upon to close the debate according to the rules. I ask all Hon. Members to listen to the Member for Shellbrook, he's got the floor. I ask his seatmate to not interrupt him.

Mr. Kramer: — I am not interrupting, I'm pointing a finger now, whether you heard it or not. A respected Member of this House and a friend of mine . . . when a sacrilegious statement is made by the Member for Prince Albert . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order, order, order!

If I wasn't in such a wonderfully good humor . . . I have expressed the very sincere wish that the importunate Member from The Battlefords would try to contain himself. The same words apply to the Provincial Treasurer also. Perhaps this debate would continue to its conclusion in an orderly manner.

Mr. Bowerman: — Mr. Speaker, I shall attempt to limit my remarks in this debate to the annually increasing appropriation of provincial funds with their obvious lack of any defined identification with the Northern Development Program. I find it somewhat ironical, Mr. Speaker, that this area of our province has been represented by Members of the Government during the last decade and there has been little more than a mere caretaker approach toward the development of the North. There have been no programs nor have the Members proposed any programs. Perhaps one should not be too astonished knowing that this has been the Government's general approach to all Saskatchewan programs. It is obviously, however, the reason why Northern Liberal Members or MLAs will not be returned to the next session of this Legislature.

It would be interesting to know, Mr. Speaker, although I presume that it would be very difficult to conclude the ratio of per capita spending of public funds on the areas which may be defined as Northern and Southern Saskatchewan. I am really not referring to the normal budget items of Health, Welfare, and Education, but I am referring more specifically to the per capita spending for development and investment in future expansion of this area and of its people. I want to refer to such programs as we see in the South like the grid road program, and the water supply programs, agricultural assistance, highways, Saskatchewan Telephones, such as the unserved area program. The present approach by the Government to northern development is one wherein the investors and the developers go in and in a

sort of grab-bag approach they attempt to develop the Northern area. Programs of this nature, I suggest, will quickly denude this vast area of its resources and of its potential livelihood for future population. There are no other areas in this Province or in Canada that can more quickly become an economic liability or a barren and unwelcome wasteland than can the vast areas of the Canadian Shield if they are left without well-informed and the Canadian Shield if they are left without well-informed and well-programmed development. Conversely also I suggest, there is no other area of our province or of Canada that can as quickly become the unfathomable economic asset to its benefactors and the envy of every North American in this bountiful and unique ecological area which is so well defined by the Canadian Shield . . . Pardon me?

Mr. Steuart: — You can't even . . .

Mr. Bowerman: — That's fine, if you can pronounce it you can stand and do it.

An example of this opinion is not too soon and now is being expressed and also being researched by the Canadian Northern Corridor organization. But here again under this present Government in its priorities for appropriation of funds we do not have a northern development program as such. A program which will protect and objectively develop these interests for our generation or for the generations to come.

May I deal briefly with some of the historic and aesthetic values that make Northern Saskatchewan what it is. In my opinion these are some of the reasons why we should be appropriating more provincial funds toward a well defined northern program. Historically, settlement of Northern Saskatchewan by European cultures far outdate those of our prairie development. It is a history that is both interesting and very informative. Our dated history beginning about two centuries ago in the 1770s and this settlement began along the Churchill River as far West as Ile-a-la-Crosse. For the information of those who may be interested, Ile-a-la-Crosse was selected by the industrial mines of the Northwest Company as an appropriate site for a silk industry that would supplement the fur trade as early as the 1780s. Alexander McKenzie took them down the Churchill River System and left them there at Ile-a-la-Crosse to undertake the silk industry. It is obviously unnecessary to say that the silk industry didn't meet with the success promoters had expected.

Mr. Steuart: — . . . still there!

Mr. Bowerman: — Yes, they are, there is some indication that the evidence of the historic settlement of those people are still at Fort Black. The thing that I am trying to raise with the Government, Mr. Speaker, is that we are not doing anything to preserve that history of our province. I think that it is a history that should be preserved.

I wonder if a parallel may not yet be written about the proposed pulp industry for Northwestern Saskatchewan. I say that at least those of earlier vintage left for their inheritors

April 16, 1971

an unspoiled land. I suggest that it must be assured that our experimentation in the pulp industry will do equally as well in the future.

In our undated history we are believed to have Canada's oldest known pictographs. These are rock painting and carvings left by the indigenous populations of generations past. The greatest abundance of these are on the Churchill River system as well. Programs for their preservation must now be developed. I am sure that all of us will agree that they should become national historic sites. This means that there must be appropriation of funds and a well defined program for their development as tourist attractions on the scenic canoe routes that follow the last of our nation's great explorers. These pictographs were first reported by Alexander McKenzie in his early trips in the late 1780s. They remain there yet for all to view on the main canoe routes through the beautiful picturesque lakes of the Churchill River. I say they must continue there for many generations to come, and I hope that they do. But in order for them to remain there for the generations to come it means that responsibility by government should soon be taken to make available necessary funds and the energy that is required to that end.

May I review for a moment, Mr. Speaker, the history of the development of Saskatchewan to the latter 1940s. Progress up until this time was without any programmed government assistance. This includes both Federal and Provincial governments since Confederation and since Saskatchewan became a province. Any development that was undertaken in those years was either by the churches or it was by the fur trade industry or it was by the free traders. Under the Liberals until 1944, the Hudson's Bay Company and the free traders had full sway in the northern part of our province. I have only to enumerate the price of fish and furs in relation to the costs of food and materials required by those populations who were becoming more dependant on the new way of life to show the desperation of Northern people during those years. Until 1944, there was literally no beginning consideration of the North and its people for their appropriation of public funds in the development of a northern program. I challenge the Member for Athabasca (Mr. Guy) and the Member for Meadow Lake (Mr. Coupland) if he was in the House, and their Government or any Members of their Government to name me any northern settlement other than Ile-a-la-Crosse and LaRonge that had a school house before 1944. These two communities, Ile-a-la-Crosse and LaRonge, the school houses there were sponsored by the churches. The only medical care centres for the entire northern part of the province were two nursing stations, one at Lac LaRonge and the other one at Cumberland House. Northern residents were limited exclusively to Hudson's Bay Company stores and two or three free trade outlets in a few sparsely scattered northern settlements. As late as 1945 and 1946 there were only winter roads into Lac LaRonge, into Doré Lake, into Green Lake, Beauval, Fort Black and Cumberland House. For settlements that were the oldest in this province, and to not have had a road not have had access it seems to me to be certainly unbecoming of the governments who were in power in those days.

This is the result of years, I suggest, of unaided development, years when the elected government cast off their responsibilities for appropriation of public funds in the direction of development programs.

I should like to point out to the Members of the Legislature, Mr. Speaker, the kind of government responsibility and direction which I think is necessary for successful development of resources and people. The unprecedented progress which came in the development of Northern Saskatchewan from 1944 to 1964 did not come without many mistakes, it can be admitted, nor without the government accepting responsibility for large appropriations of public funds. Evidence of the success of these programs for development however, can be measured and viewed in many practical and in many other ways. I should like to list some of the practical advantages of this development which was inherited by the government, the present Government in 1964. I could speak of the all-weather roads they inherited in 1964. These roads went into Doré and Green Lakes, they went into Beauval and Fort Black; they went to Ile-a-la-Crosse, Buffalo Narrows, LaLoche; they went to LaRonge and into the Churchill River. There were all-weather roads to Cumberland House. There was an all-weather road from Reindeer Lake to Lynn Lake; from Stony Rapids to Black Lake; from Uranium City to Eldorado and from Prince Albert to Flin Flon. There were air fields built at Stony Rapids, at Cree Lake, at Uranium City, at Lac LaRonge, at Wollaston, at Buffalo Narrows and at Ile-a-la-Crosse.

Hydro power, Mr. Speaker, was taken to Green Lake, it was taken to Beauval, it was taken to Ile-a-la-Crosse and Buffalo Narrows. Stationary power plants were provided in all other northern communities such as Pine House, Pelican Narrows and Stanley. Hospitals were provided for at Uranium City, at LaRonge, at Pelican Narrows, Stony Rapids, at Ile-a-la-Crosse and Buffalo Narrows.

Regularly scheduled air services and air ambulance services were provided to all northern communities on a year-round basis. I say again that fish plants were provided through government finance and turned over to fishermen, processing plants that were the leaders in the freshwater fish processing industry and were built in all major fishing centres.

Consumer owned stores were operated and owned in every older settlement and in all the newly established settlements.

LaRonge was developed as a tourist area and fly-in camps were provided in all of the major water areas in Northern Saskatchewan. Schools were provided in every settlement with the exception of three or four smaller settlements and these were settlements such as Black Lake and Deschambault.

Fisheries research was undertaken in most of the major lakes over that period of time. Then the ecological studies of all major water areas established the productivity and the relationship of the species that could be utilized from those lakes by tourist fishers and commercial fishermen.

There was a fur program established for the development of fur trapping blocks improving the fur harvest and the conservation and the return of beaver and muskrat pelts, including the establishment of a fur marketing service for the use of the primary producer. Then there was a fish marketing service established, producer-owned, with programs for increasing the production of commercial species. I say to you, Mr. Speaker, and to the Government, these are some of the practical results of a northern development program that was backed by reasonable appropriations of public funds to assure their success.

April 16, 1971

Let's now look at the development of the last seven years from 1964 to the present day. This Government has been, as I said earlier, a caretaker government only. They have not developed any new ideas nor have they any programs for development of local northern resources for the use and benefit of northern people. The northern welfare rolls have had staggering increases since 1964 and certainly there isn't any Member on that side of the House that will deny that fact. Although there has been over 100 per cent increase in appropriations of provincial funds since 1964, may I remind the Government that with its two Northern Members that it still hasn't provided roads to the community of Deschambault which is only 20 miles off the Hanson Lake Road. Even in this Session of the Legislature that road was suggested to be too expensive and the Government couldn't afford to put a 20-mile road into the community of Deschambault. There is no road into the community of Pine House. There is no road into the community of Cree Lake, Stanley Mission and that's not very far off the road. Yet this Government to this day has not provided even access to those four communities in the North, and they are spending more than twice the amount of money we spent back in 1964. In regard to Doré Lake only 20 miles from the Hydro line to Buffalo Narrows they have not to this day been provided with power. The Government said to the people of Doré Lake that they couldn't build a power line 12 miles to supply them with some hydro power, because the Government had indicated that the cost would be too high and it would be too expensive.

You have provided no new hospitals since 1964. There has been no provision of stores, nor has there been any consideration for the assistance of the consumer owned stores in the North with financial assistance of any kind. You have made no financial contributions, Mr. Speaker, to the fish plants or to the expansion of those fish plant industries.

In the fur program. What's new in the fur program? And air ambulance services are not now readily available unless the patron or patient is first able to show that he is able to finance the necessary flying time involved.

Tell us of any new major tourist developments in Northern Saskatchewan since 1964. There has been no major tourist development in Northern Saskatchewan since 1964. To my knowledge there have been no new air fields built since 1964. I suggest to you that these are the sad results of seven years of a government that has not had a development program for Northern Saskatchewan and without suitable appropriation of funds for development of people oriented programs.

Let me now turn to what this Government should have been considering as one of its priorities for appropriation of public funds.

An Hon. Member: — . . .

Mr. Bowerman: — No I don't intend to, I don't intend to listen to you fellows either 'til I get finished.

In view of the almost inexhaustible market for unspoiled natural areas by the tourist potential throughout the world, serious consideration must immediately be given to the establishment of large wilderness areas for exclusive recreational enjoyment of people. These should not be subjected to economic

exploitation of a technological or industrial nature.

Development of northern resources must be primarily for those who reside within its boundaries. Financial and monetary economics must not be the only measuring stick. Social and environmental criteria must be a major consideration too in all of the decisions of development.

New programs must be developed to utilize the renewable resources to their maximum potential. That means that new techniques and trapper assistance programs must be developed. It means also, Mr. Speaker, a co-ordination of the commercial and tourist fishing industries. It will mean new harvesting techniques for commercial fishermen so that they may utilize those species that will not impair good sports fishing for the future. But it must not as well impair their own efficiency to produce in an economic and practical manner.

Every northern community must be served with a permanent communications system on a basis similar to Sask Tel in our Southern communities. Access roads must be provided to all northern communities, both to the south and laterally in order that northern communities may have an interchange of persons and interests from east to west and north to south.

Full development and protection of natural and historic sites must become a major and prime consideration. Re-creation of historic waterways enhanced by track and power portages will place emphasis on year-round tourist development.

Major assistance programs for northern housing must be developed commensurate with needs and undertaken principally by local manpower using local resources. In order properly to plan and develop for the future, I think it would seem advisable to establish a northern development authority. This authority would co-ordinate the natural and social sciences with the practical approach, long-term advantages and the rights of northern people and their government would be the objectives of that authority.

In order that northern residents may participate to the fullest extent possible in their local government, provisions should be made for the establishment of regional councils, representatives from such councils to form a larger northern territorial council.

This, Mr. Speaker, is northern development for the '70s. Under a New Democratic government it is assured and as a result not only Northern Saskatchewan will benefit but Saskatchewan as a whole will be recognized as one of the recreational areas of North America.

Because little or no thought has been given by the Government for development of such a northern program, I cannot therefore support the Appropriation Bill that will spend indeed large public funds without consideration for northern development or for the northern half of our Province. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I propose that the Bill should be defeated.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. J.C. McIsaac (Minister of Education): — Mr. Speaker, it's a great pleasure to be able to say

April 16, 1971

a few words on this particular motion.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. McIsaac: — This is the motion that indicates more clearly than any other the spending priorities of this Government, Mr. Speaker, and it is because of the tremendous priority that it gives the field of education that I am particularly glad to be able to draw some of those items to the attention of Members at this time.

We've heard a good deal from Members opposite through this entire debate making unfounded charges as to cutbacks in education and so on. Any time any of them have been challenged they have been unable to give instances or examples, Mr. Speaker. I just want to remind Members of some of the many program expansions, program additions and construction facilities that are contained in this Budget and in this motion before us.

The comprehensive school program begun by this Government is being continued and expanded, not only from the point of view of new facilities but from the point of view of new and additional programs, revised and updated curriculum. School construction across the province, Mr. Speaker, this year will exceed \$6 million to \$7 million in normal building construction, despite the comments of the Member for Saskatoon Mayfair (Mr. Brockelbank) who tried to imply that there is going to be practically no public construction anywhere in this province this year. There is going to be construction in his city by this school boards, some of them are already under way and to imply, as he tried to do earlier today, that some of this money to be voted here is for no other purpose than window-dressing, Mr. Speaker, is only misleading the House and misleading the public in that regard and he knows it.

University construction is expected this year to go on at the same level as previous years, about \$11 million, Mr. Speaker. The increased operating grant to the University this year which this motion provides for will enable the continuation of expanded opportunities at the Regina Campus and the Saskatoon Campus of our University, where today there are twice as many students attending university as was the case a few short years ago when my friends opposite were removed from power.

This Budget contains, again, Mr. Speaker, provision for over 10,000 training spaces in the vocational and technical area as well as the university increases just referred to.

This motion also contains provision for the establishment and construction of a major new third institute here in the city of Regina to round out the technical and vocational facilities required to serve the needs of the people of this province when it is completed.

As far as the student is concerned in the field of education, Mr. Speaker, we have provision in the Budget for a summer temporary employment program known as STEP, a program to provide 4,400 jobs for university students, the best program of its kind in Canada, Mr. Speaker . . .

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. McIsaac: — . . . and one that is now

being copied by some of the other provinces since it was announced by this Government.

Going along with that program (STEP) this Budget provides for the first comprehensive bursary program that we've established here in the Province of Saskatchewan. It contains provision also, Mr. Speaker, for increasing the pensions of older retired teachers and that is a provision that I am sure will be welcomed by all Members opposite.

Now, Mr. Speaker, yesterday evening when this motion was introduced, the Leader of the Opposition spent a good deal of his time discussing another way of financing education. He referred to various proposals and perhaps conveniently, because it's a subject that they don't like to discuss, he didn't make any reference to the fact that the major problem in education still is the allocation of the many dollars that are now being collected from taxpayers and whether or not this country can afford to continue increases in spending at the rate of \$13 million, \$14 million, \$15 million a year. As I understood the financial critic to say, he supported it when he moved a motion earlier in this House.

I'm satisfied, Mr. Speaker, that if my hon. friends take time when this Legislature prorogues to go into their various constituencies, both rural and urban, they will find that the public is concerned about education costs right across this country. And I want to quote very briefly from a report in the Star-Phoenix about a month or so ago concerning a survey conducted by the Canadian Institute of Public Opinion. 49 per cent of the people polled thought education costs were too high; 32 per cent said they were about right, and only 3 per cent thought that they were too low. As to the various reasons as to why they felt these costs were too high, the ranking order of their suggestions to improve them, they said buildings and equipment are too expensive. We don't need frills and so on. I can point out that this Government has taken action to ensure that we're getting good efficient use out of buildings and we're building good sensible buildings that can be and may be used for purposes other than instruction.

The next reason that was given was too much waste and inefficiency in the system in general. There should be more public use of buildings, there should be larger classes and so on. Now this is the second reason given by the majority of people right across this country as to one means of reducing some of the costs of education or getting better value for the dollar.

Away down the line, homeowners pay too much of the taxes. Governments should provide more funds and this I realize is something everybody would agree with; the suggestion that we try and find other means of financing education. What did the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Blakeney) say that we should do? He said, Mr. Speaker, that we should increase resource revenues while earlier in this Session we saw him and all of his colleagues opposite vote against the development of resources and the establishment of a pulp mill in Northern Saskatchewan.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. McIsaac: — He said, 'Where are we going to get the money? We have to find some other means other than the property tax to cover

April 16, 1971

educational costs. Where shall we get the money?' And I think I am quoting correctly from his remarks when he said, 'from a pool of resource revenue'. Well, how in the world are we going to develop resource revenue under a Socialist administration? We're not satisfied with the size of that pool right now, Mr. Speaker, in Saskatchewan but I can tell you it'll dry up completely if the Socialists are ever back in power in this province.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. McIsaac: — He went on to say too that we should take a stand on mill rates in this province. Well, Mr. Speaker, had he been reading the paper and reading the press releases in this regard, he would know that we have taken a stand on mill rates. Last year in 1970 mill rates across this province were held and lowered in many cases. This year once again mill rates in rural and urban Saskatchewan are going down anywhere from 2 to 5 mills right across this province and he suggests that we should take a stand on mill rates, after we have taken a stand.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. McIsaac: — He had some reference, I think, to the fact that he felt these were puny and insignificant reductions. Well, Mr. Speaker, I am sure that when this next election is called and afterwards the people of Saskatchewan will tell us that they were not puny and insignificant but rather that they were very significant reductions.

Mr. Speaker, this motion, as I say, provides for many new improvements in programs in education in the province for handicapped students. For the first time ever, they will be provided free educational services right across Saskatchewan. It provides for free school books from grades 1 to 12. It provides for increased library service to the rural areas of the province and, as I say, hundreds of new school programs in every jurisdiction in this province and for this reason I am very happy to support this motion.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. A.R. Guy (Minister of Municipal Affairs): — Mr. Speaker, I want just to take a couple of minutes to make a few comments as this debate draws to a close.

I listened with particular interest this morning to the Leader of the Opposition review the leadership of the Liberal Party across Canada. It was interesting, coming from a man who has spent one year — less than one year — as leader of a political party, and it was quite revealing. You know, I have sat across from three different leaders of the New Democratic Party since 1960 and I am afraid I have to tell this House that the performance of the leadership of the NDP this year has been the poorest that has ever been witnessed in this Province of Saskatchewan. And I say this for two reasons: first of all, never before has the NDP forsaken the people of Saskatchewan for their own political purposes as they have during this present Session of the Legislature. Without exception, NDP speeches and criticism have been on a purely political nature. They have opposed everything that we have proposed and they have done it for pure, straight politics.

Think of the pulp mill, labor legislation, homeowners grant, education grants, increased aid to municipalities, assistance to agriculture — without exception they have stood up, they've made long speeches opposing it. In some cases they've had to end up voting for it for the same reason that they are afraid of their political skins. But this was the first reason why I say the new leadership of the NDP is completely out of touch with what the people of Saskatchewan expect. Even their own supporters say that. Look at Don Mitchell, what he said the other day, he was going to have to leave the party because of the fact that they are more political than they are going down the philosophical and Socialist road to the Utopia which he envisages.

The second reason why the present leadership is the weakest in their history is their inconsistency and this is probably related to politics as well. The people of Saskatchewan cannot understand how the NDP can talk about unemployment and loss of population but they vote against the new pulp mill which will provide thousands of jobs directly and indirectly. They voted against the massive Public Works' building program. So, one minute they say they want jobs and to keep the people at home and the next minute they vote against anything that will achieve that purpose.

The NDP are against American capital and American takeover of our resources but they are all in favour of American labor unions and the money that they give to the NDP for election campaigns. People of Saskatchewan can't understand that. They say on one hand that they want to help the Indians and then Members stand upon the other side and they say, "We're going to abolish the Indian and Metis Department," which provides jobs, training programs, housing, social development. People of Saskatchewan can't see how you can abolish this Department and still say you want to help the Indians.

The NDP are for individual freedom of the working classes. The people of Saskatchewan can't understand how they can be for that and then they can still support the idea of compulsory union dues to support the NDP. Then they say that they are interested in the North and then the Member for North Battleford (Mr. Kramer) gets up and says that we shouldn't fight any forest fires north of the Kramer line. Let the communities burn out. Let the tourist camps burn out. Let the game burn out. People of Saskatchewan don't understand this inconsistency.

Some of the NDP say that they are for the separation of Quebec and others say that they are not. They can't understand this one and finally, and perhaps the most confusing of all, is their stand on compulsory arbitration. Last year they opposed it, then for one day they were in favour of it when they were threatened by a strike, the next day the threat of the strike was over and once again they were back in their own position. This is one of the mysteries of the Session and I tell you the people of Saskatchewan want to know before we leave it — and I hope that in closing the debate for the NDP, that the Member for Saskatoon Riversdale (Mr. Romanow) will stand up and say whether he is in favour of compulsory arbitration or whether the telegram to Ottawa was nothing more than a political ploy because no one on that side of the House has answered that question to this date.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

April 16, 1971

Mr. R. Romanow (Saskatoon Riversdale): — Mr. Speaker, the Session now is nearing the end and we have considered, after 44 sitting days, a number of Bills that have been introduced and detailed consideration of the Estimates. I think that there is a need perhaps to look at the advisability some day in the future, no matter what government or political party is in power, to have perhaps two special sessions, one in the late fall, one perhaps in the early spring, to consider the public's business. I think the workload generally gets a little more onerous and tedious and requires probably more careful consideration and I do commend it to the consideration of all the Members here.

Mr. Speaker, in the very few minutes that are left to me I should like to make the observation that in the 3½ years that it has been my pleasure to be a Member of this House and this is my fourth full session, I don't think that I have ever witnessed a legislative program that is so barren of new ideas and new programs basically for the people of Saskatchewan than the legislative program introduced by this Liberal Government.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

I recall it seems like yesterday, after a long Session, the Speech from the Throne, where the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Blakeney) made the comment — I didn't think that it was particularly applicable at the time but I am beginning to think more and more that it might be — that the entire legislative program for the Province of Saskatchewan really does not indicate an election because it is just not imaginative and provides nothing whatsoever.

This Budget that we have considered and the Estimates that we have gone through, Mr. Speaker, and this Bill that we are debating points this out. I think we have here a Government that is, in fact, a Government that is very weak from a political standpoint; it is a Government that is leaderless; it is a Government that is divided and wracked with bitter feelings — prominent Members of the Liberal Party against other prominent Members of the Liberal Party — it is a Government that is concerned about all sorts of allegations made by those within its own ranks and not concerned about the Budget priorities that the people want it to be concerned about; it is a Government that has no objectives; it is a Government that has no program for the people of the Province of Saskatchewan.

I say this quite sincerely, that I honestly feel that after seven years of power, this Administration simply has either lost the will or the foresight to plan legislation for the people of Saskatchewan. I don't think they have any objectives in education or any long range or substantial direction. Certainly this Budget and this supply Bill that we are debating would indicate that. I know that they have no industrial program in terms of development of the natural resources other than giving away our resources on a piecemeal basis, announcing a \$107 or \$130 million pulp mill, whatever the figure is, without any major contracts agreed, no arrangements with the Department of Regional Economic Expansion for the federal grant, nothing on the rail, nothing on the cutting rights for Meadow Lake, documents unsigned, estimates nothing, not a cent of the \$7 million that is to be thrown in for the share capital of the \$3 million of the Highways program for this great development of pulp. Nothing in this Estimate with respect to this program.

The Treasurer, in the consideration of the Budget, Mr. Speaker, I think and submit to the Members of this House, has introduced inflated revenues that are unrealistic. Why are they unrealistic? The Government misleads, either deliberately or purposely, the people of Saskatchewan by estimates showing that equalization payments will be \$70.6 million. Yet the Ottawa Government says that according to its estimates equalization is only \$61 million. The Provincial Government says that we are going to get \$71 million; the Federal Government says that we are going to get \$61 million. Estimates that say that in terms of the revenue we can expect from lands, forests, game, etc., will be \$7.5 million this coming year and yet in Estimates, Mr. Speaker, we asked the Department of Natural Resources to table their estimates and they total to something a little over \$5 million, not \$7.5 million. A government that tells us and has been telling the people of Saskatchewan throughout these Estimates that there is no pollution in the Prince Albert pulp mill area and yet says that there is going to be a provision of \$1.3 million for pollution treatment; a government that is absolutely and totally lacking in the credibility insofar as the people of Saskatchewan are concerned because of the program of this nature.

I can't help but think to myself that the most reinforcing argument for the proposition that I advance that this is the weakest legislative program of recent sessions has ever had and that the Government has failed to legislate an act, is probably exemplified by the words of the Minister of Education who just took his chair. The Minister of Education says the Government has reduced the mill rate for education. In some areas it appears that in fact there has been a mill rate reduction, a mill rate reduction, Mr. Speaker, that was made only after it was clear from all indications that there was a strong Government directive that pulled — they can't be described any other way — or dictated to their school boards that reductions must be made or certain grants for education would not be made. The best example is my own school system in Saskatoon. I have a copy of a very recent Star-Phoenix, page 3, "Two mill cut adopted reluctantly by Public School Boards."

Government memorandum, the deciding factor, the time to recite in detail the bitter accusations of the School Board Members about being told to cut back on their budget.

Collegiate teachers, Mr. Speaker, protest the cutbacks and still in the midst of all this, as we predicted when the Budget Debate started, the mill rates in the Province of Saskatchewan and taxation are going to increase. North Battleford has struck a mill rate which will now be in total 2.5 mills increase over last year. In Regina nearly 4 mills, in Saskatoon 2 or 3 mills. Throughout the Province of Saskatchewan the financial assistance given by this Government to our local governments is very weak indeed. This is a government that I think has very little else to do but to throw bitter accusations at Members for doing their jobs. This is done by the Minister of Mineral Resources. He berated the Member for Weyburn (Mr. Pepper) because the Member for Weyburn got up and communicated to this House the concerns of literally hundreds of members of the Surface Rights Association about the Surface Rights Board. Accusations and concerns that those members try to communicate to the Government opposite with no sympathy whatsoever. The Minister who gets up and tries to berate my colleague from Saskatoon Mayfair (Mr. Brockelbank), who was told by the Minister's colleague from the Department of Welfare to enquire in the Minister's own constituency to find

April 16, 1971

out when the projects start and he did in his job as an MLA and the Minister berates him. A government that has resorted to berating individual MLAs, intimidating in a sense, individual MLAs for doing their jobs. This comes from a Minister who is in charge of the Mineral Resources Department and in that area the potash industry which has been humble to his actions and the actions of the Liberal Government opposite because of a failure of policy.

I want to tell the people of Saskatchewan and the Members of this House that we in this Province, this side of the Legislature, are very sorry indeed that this Budget has not seen fit to expand our health programs, to include drugs under Medicare and the like. We regret no public works program of any meaning; we regret that there are the highest welfare rolls in the Province of Saskatchewan's history right now; we regret that the Budget increase for agriculture is less than a million dollars where agriculture supposedly is the most important of all, was only 3.6 per cent of the Budget; we regret this Government's complicity with their Liberal counterparts in Ottawa to sell the people and the farmers of Saskatchewan down the road to large corporate farming; no legislation, nothing in this Bill to try to counteract that. We regret indeed, Mr. Speaker, the fact that in the area of labor this Budget does not provide for increased sums for conciliation and mediation; we regret that there are expenditures for compulsory arbitration.

I'm sorry that the Minister of Athabasca (Mr. Guy) is not in his chair because I tell him, like we've been saying throughout Saskatchewan that we are against compulsory arbitration as set out in Bill 2, that's what our convention says, that's what we say. We are against compulsory arbitration in Bill 2 and we will always say that. We also say that the Government and many Members opposite, like the Member for Elrose, know that to be the same situation.

Mr. Speaker, the vote on this Bill will go along party lines. Everybody knows that. The Bill will be carried. But ultimately the vote with respect to this Bill will come only when the next election is called. This is my first session to have served under the leadership of the Member for Regina Centre (Mr. Blakeney) and I want to say that everywhere that I travel throughout Saskatchewan and in the corridors from Members opposite and all the Members on this side it is acknowledged that we have had dynamic leadership by Mr. Blakeney, the Member for Regina Centre.

Last night I was in the Melville constituency speaking to over 350 people about this Budget, 350 persons! I want to tell the Members of this House that the people of the province will not accept the Appropriation Bill that has been put forward by this Government.

I ask you, Sir, before calling it 5:00 o'clock, I ask you, Sir, to draw to your attention and mine to the contrasts in the leadership of the party on this side and the programs compared to the leadership and the lack of programs of the Members opposite. I ask Hon. Members of this House to compare the leadership of a dynamic and young and highly intelligent lawyer, who speaks for all Saskatchewan and not the vested corporate interests of the Province of Saskatchewan. And no one knows that better than the Premier and the Liberal Party opposite because when the next election comes, and they know it by their opinion polls, they'll suffer the worst electoral defeat that they've ever had in the history of the Province of Saskatchewan.

Mr. Speaker: — Under Rule No. 16, subsection (2) it becomes my duty to call upon the mover of the motion to close the debate.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. D.G. Steuart (Provincial Treasurer): — Mr. Speaker, I listened to the Member for Saskatoon Riversdale (Mr. Romanow) with interest. I waited almost to the end to see if he would deal with the telegram. He was challenged by the Member for Athabasca (Mr. Guy) to . . .

Mr. Romanow: — I didn't have enough time!

Mr. Steuart: — You haven't had enough time? You've had days. You've made 14 speeches.

I wanted to know whether he would definitely give us his stand or the stand of the NDP on compulsory arbitration. But he didn't give it. He said, "We are opposed to compulsory arbitration on Bill 2." But how about the amendment to Bill 2? He didn't say that. He didn't tell us that one day they are for compulsory arbitration when it suits their purpose and the next day they are against it and the next day they are for it. He wiggled and wagged but the never really said it. I understood they met until about 1:00 o'clock or 2:00 o'clock in the morning trying to iron that one out. He talks about us having problems within our own party but I notice he didn't talk about Mr. Mitchell. I thought he would have because Mr. Mitchell would have become the Leader. Well, did he say what their stand is? Mr. Mitchell is a great power in the party, at least the press says he is a great power in the Party. But he doesn't want to talk about Mr. Mitchell or the problems they have in their own party and I don't blame him.

He talked about credibility. Well the credibility of the Opposition is open to question when the people look at their on-again, off-again attitude at the cheap politics they tried to play with the strike, when they look at how they talk to the farmers when they are out in the country and how differently they talk to labor unions when they are in the city. I don't think there is any wonder that they are where they are and that is where they will stay — in the Opposition.

The think that I noticed really about the financial critic today — I don't know if he got some of his time cut off today or what it was, I don't think it was that — I was disappointed. He had no fire. I looked forward to the last 10 or 15 minutes hoping we were going to hear some of that old fire . . .

An Hon. Member: — He's getting old!

Mr. Steuart: — I'll tell you what. He's given up. Roy has given up. He knows the election is just around the corner. He has given up. I thought, this is going to be the great last charge of the NDP but there he was talking and talking and saying nothing new, hoping against hope that they can charge their followers up, stir them up for the next election. He failed. You know if I had any doubt, if I had any doubt about the next election, it was wiped out today when I listened to the Members opposite,

April 16, 1971

because they proved without the shadow of a doubt to the people in this House and if it is reported correctly, they will have proven to the people in this province that they are negative — we've taken public opinion polls and they show exactly where you are, away down — you are hypocritical and you haven't got a new idea for years. All you can do is carp and criticize.

The Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Blakeney) stood up and he said, "We have discovered you are a party of millionaires." There is only one millionaire in this House and that is the Hon. Member for Kelsey (Mr. Messer) and I don't know what he is doing as a Socialist. I think he married into the clan, I'm not sure. But he is the only millionaire in this House. We are the party of the ordinary people. We should like to make them all millionaires. And if we are given long enough in this province we will make them all millionaires.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Steuart: — Because, Mr. Speaker, we believe in increasing the wealth and in sharing the wealth. The Opposition views over there are, 'let's share the poverty'.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Steuart: — He talked about education. It always amuses me when they stand up and say, "Elect us, look at our program, look at our program, we will pay 75 per cent of the cost of education." I can't believe it. I keep telling them over and over again and it is still not too late, Tommy Douglas promised 100 per cent back in 1943 and he got elected. And by the time you beggars had left office, you were only paying 43 per cent. Now you have another chance and you want to settle for 75 per cent. Mind you, it is interesting.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Blakeney: — Call the election.

Mr. Steuart: — Mr. Blakeney, we will call it but don't worry and it will be too early for you. Enjoy your time in the House while you can because it is short, believe me. Then the Leader of the Opposition gets up and cries about jobs. He says, "We've got to find jobs, look at the unemployment, look at the people leaving the province." Then he stands up and what does he do? He criticizes the pulp mill, they all oppose the pulp mill; they say it won't create any new jobs, they are against it. Why? American capital. We are going to cut down the trees, the Socialists say, keep those resources, don't touch those trees. The Member for The Battlefords would sooner see them burned down. They are opposed to the great mineral development, the Gulf Minerals, they are opposed to that. Every time we come into this House with an announcement about new development to create jobs, the NDP opposite have opposed it.

Let's see some of the things they are going to vote against. They will vote in a few minutes against this Bill, I'm sure they will vote against it. They are in fact going to vote against the homeowner grant. Let me tell you that homeowner grants not only will re-elect us but with a greater majority . . .

Mr. Romanow: — That's why you put it in!

Mr. Steuart: — No, that's not why we put it in, we put it in to help the people. You are afraid to vote against it. You were afraid to vote against the Bill to increase the grant, you were also afraid to vote against the Bill when we first brought it in. But you are in fact voting against it if you vote against this Budget. You will be voting against the increase in school grants that have allowed people all over this province to have their mill rates reduced by 2 to 5 mills. You are going to vote against equalization grants, against police grants, library grants, snow removal grants. You are going to vote against the STEP program, the most imaginative program that has ever been brought forward by any government in any province to give over 4,000 of our young people jobs and a chance to continue with their education.

The former Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Lloyd) gets up and he is their spokesman on pollution. He talks about the need for a clean environment. But in a few minutes he will, in fact, vote against the money we put in this Budget to pay for this program. There are two or three other things. You will vote against a Budget that will give a grant to cities for the first time in history to put in primary sewage disposal plants. You are going to vote against the money we put in to set up the new Clean Environment Authority. You are going to vote against the agricultural budget. You must be against new community pastures, against the cattle loans, extension to the cattle industry.

An Hon. Member: — Hogs . . .

Mr. Steuart: — I never thought of the hog industry. Are you against that too, Mr. Member from Kelsey? I am amazed at you! You are going to vote against more help for the Indians.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Steuart: — How they can stand in their places and vote against the greatest Budget, the most forward looking budget ever brought down in the history of this province, is beyond me. It is the seventh time in succession we have balanced the Budget.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Steuart: — We have a reputation as being the most responsible Government anywhere in this nation. Anywhere in this nation.

An Hon. Member: — What about the telegram?

Mr. Steuart: — Oh he didn't tell about the telegram. He wiggled around on that and he wiggled and wiggled and he didn't tell us . . . Oh, he mentioned the telegram. He said, "When it comes to Bill 2 we are against compulsory arbitration, but any other time when it suits our purpose we shall be for compulsory

April 16, 1971

arbitration for half a day.”

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Steuart: — Well, Mr. Speaker, I'll tell you what I predict. I predict here today, going on the basis of this Budget, and our record and our platform, the next election we will win at least 45 seats.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Steuart: — The NDP will win 10 seats and the Wafflers will win 5 seats. Mr. Speaker, I give them one last chance to mend their ways, to see the error of their ways and vote for this great Budget. I urge everybody in this House to vote for this Budget. It is the most forward looking budget designed to solve the problems that face the people of Saskatchewan today and to do something about the problems that will face them not only in the year 1971 but the years that lie ahead. I will support the motion.

Motion agreed to on the following recorded division.

Yeas — 28

| | | |
|------------|------------|------------|
| Thatcher | Howes | McFarlane |
| Boldt | Cameron | Steuart |
| Heald | McIsaac | Guy |
| Barrie | Loken | MacDougall |
| Grant | Coderre | Larochelle |
| Estey | Gallagher | Hooker |
| Heggie | Breker | Leith |
| Weatherald | Gardner | Coupland |
| McPherson | Charlebois | Forsyth |
| Schmeiser | | |

Nays — 23

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

MOTIONS

Review of Liquor Regulations for Saskatchewan

Hon. D.V. Heald (Attorney General): — Moved by myself, seconded the Minister of Education, by leave of the Assembly:

That the special committee on the Review of Liquor Regulations in Saskatchewan, appointed on April 8, 1971, be composed of the following Members: Messrs. Charlebois

Breker, Byers, Leith, McDougall, McPherson, Pepper and Whelan.

Motion agreed to.

The Assembly recessed until 7:30 o'clock p.m.

First Report of Select Standing Committee on Law Amendments and Delegated Powers

Mr. M. Breker (Humboldt): — Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by Mr. Heggie, that the first report of the Select Standing Committee on Law Amendments and Delegated Powers be now concurred in.

Motion agreed to.

QUESTION

Advisors for Saskatchewan Pharmaceutical Association

Mr. Breker: — Mr. Speaker, by leave of the House, I should like to have the Registrar of the Saskatchewan Pharmaceutical Association and the Association's legal counsel as advisors. This Bill has been ticked, turned, amended and if it could be, I request by leave of the House that they assist me in Committee of the Whole.

Mr. Heald: — I'm afraid I'm going to have to disagree with the Member for Humboldt. I think it creates a dangerous precedent by having people like this. The solicitor for the Department of Public Health is coming over very soon and I hope the Member from Humboldt will accept his assistance. I think we'll get through the Bill. We've had a very good discussion in the Committee. And I think it sets a very undesirable precedent to have people come in and I therefore decline leave as far as I'm concerned.

Leave denied.

ROYAL ASSENT AND PROROGATION

At 8:59 o'clock p.m. His Honour the Lieutenant Governor, having entered the Chamber, took his seat upon the Throne and gave Royal Assent to the Bills presented to him.

His Honour the Lieutenant Governor was then pleased to deliver the following speech:

Mr. Speaker, Members of the Legislative Assembly:

It is my duty to relieve you of further attendance at this Legislative Assembly.

In doing so, I wish to thank you for, and congratulate you on the work you have done.

I wish also to express my confidence that the approval of the programs and plans presented to you will continue to provide the services necessary to the orderly growth and development of our Province.

The legislation you have passed in this Fifth Session of

April 16, 1971

the Sixteenth Legislature has been designed, both to speed the development of those resources Providence has bestowed on us, and to secure an equitable distribution of the benefits of that development, for present and future generations of our citizens.

In keeping with the absolute priority my Government places upon our education programs, you have again approved measures to counteract the ever-escalating cost of education.

You have also approved large new expenditures to make possible the further improvement of educational facilities throughout the Province.

Recognizing the responsibility of our young people, you have passed legislation placing students on the University Board of Governors.

You have agreed to certain measures to facilitate the bargaining process between teachers and trustees.

You have also made possible an increase in superannuation for retired teachers.

Recognizing the prime importance of agriculture to the people and the economy of the Province, you have agreed to several measures designed to stabilize the industry and stimulate further diversification.

You have passed legislation extending The Live Stock Loans Guarantee Act to include our native people on their reserves.

You have agreed to quality incentives and a floor price for our hog producers.

You have established a Clean Environment Authority, in an effort to keep Saskatchewan pollution free.

You have passed a measure designed to regulate, control, and prevent litter within the Province.

You have also approved measures dealing with pollution caused by intensive livestock operations.

While the Nation has been troubled by rampant unemployment, Saskatchewan has been relatively fortunate to maintain the lowest level of unemployment of any Canadian province.

Nonetheless, you have approved large sums of money to stimulate the construction industry and thereby, a major sector of the whole economy.

Further dramatic efforts to alleviate unemployment includes your decision to approve sizable expenditures for the Student Temporary Employment Program.

Approval of the new Athabasca Pulp Mill is of prime importance in the fight against unemployment.

The new mill will make available many badly needed jobs for our northern residents, especially those of native ancestry.

I note with pleasure your approval of the raising of the homeowner grant to \$70, thus easing the burden of taxation on property owners.

You have approved changes within The Elections and The Controverted Elections Acts, designed to provide a more effective approach to the election of Members to this Legislature.

You have approved certain changes in The Essential Services Emergency Act to facilitate the settling of major labor disputes in the public interest.

You have also agreed to changes in The Workmen's Compensation Act which will expand benefits for those employees injured at work.

Finally, you have given approval to many other measures designed to improve the lot of individuals in our Province and to make possible the fullest development of our resources.

I thank you for the provision you have made to meet the further requirements of the public service and assure you that this sum of money will be used economically, prudently and in the public interest.

In taking leave of you, I desire to thank you for the manner in which you have devoted your energies to the activities of the Session, and wish you the full blessing of Providence as you return again to your respective homes.

The Hon. Mr. Heald, Provincial Secretary, then said:

It is the will and pleasure of His Honour the Lieutenant Governor that this Legislative Assembly be prorogued until it pleases His Honour to summon the same for the dispatch of business, and the Legislative Assembly is accordingly prorogued.