

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN
Second Session — Seventeenth Legislature
13th Day

March 13, 1972

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

WELCOME TO STUDENTS

Mr. D.F. MacDonald (Moose Jaw North): — I should like to introduce to you and through you to this Assembly students located in the east gallery. We have 45 Grade Eight students from Lindale School in Moose Jaw. They are accompanied by Mr. Scorbohach, Mr. Powrie, Mc. Gamble and Mr. Stevens. Lindale is a school that is located in Moose Jaw and the students attend from the rural areas surrounding Moose Jaw. I hope these students find their visit to Regina most interesting and informative and I wish them a safe journey home.

Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. D. Boldt (Rosthern): — Mr. Speaker, I should like to introduce students from Dalmeny, Saskatchewan. They are in the Speaker's Gallery and accompanied by their teacher, Miss Capes. I am sure that all Members will welcome them here. I hope that they will have an enjoyable time here and that they will have a safe journey home.

Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. J.A. Pepper (Weyburn): — Mr. Speaker, I should like to introduce to you and to the Members of the Assembly a group of Grade Eight students from Weyburn Junior High School. I believe there are some 73 students here in number, a portion of the Grade Eight class at Junior High. They are sitting in the west gallery, Mr. Speaker, and they are accompanied by their teachers, Mr. Jim Nedelcov and Mr. Kohlenberg. Their bus drivers are Mr. Ernie Obst and Mr. Henry Bell. I am sure I am speaking for all the Members, Mr. Speaker, when I express words of welcome to them and that it is our wish that this visit to the Legislature will prove to be another day of education to them, giving them a little insight into the workings of the Legislature of our Province. I am sure we wish them a safe journey home.

Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. W.E. Smishek (Regina North East): — Mr. Speaker, permit me to introduce a group of 56 students to you and to the Members of the Legislature from the St. Augustine School in Regina North East. They are accompanied here by their teacher, Mr. Jim Frolick and Mr. Andrew Grosena. I understand they are seated in both the public galleries and express the hope that their stay with us this afternoon will be educational, enjoyable and it will assist them in their studies in school, and in particular in their Social Studies. So, welcome to the Legislature and again have an enjoyable afternoon.

Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

QUESTIONS

AREA 4 TEACHERS CONSIDERING WITHDRAWING SERVICES

Mr. K.R. MacLeod (Regina Albert Park): — Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, I should like to direct a question to the Minister of Education (Mr. MacMurchy). In view of reports from the Area 4 Bargaining Committees that teachers are, at least according to the Press this morning, considering withdrawing services beginning tomorrow on a rotating basis. Mr. Speaker, I want to ask the Minister, is he prepared to offer conciliation services once again or in any other way offer the strength and the solidarity of his Department in trying to help solve this particular dispute which I am sure none of us on either wide of the House likes to see come about?

Hon. G. MacMurchy (Minister of Education): — Mr. Speaker, in reply to the Hon. Member from Regina Albert Park, I share concern as he must be concerned about the report in the paper concerning Area 4. There is still time for a meeting this afternoon and this evening for negotiations. I haven't heard whether that in fact will be taking place. We have had a conciliator in Area 4 and we are certainly prepared, if requested by the two groups, to send in a conciliator again. There is still the option open to both trustees and the teachers to ask for voluntary arbitration. I hope that one of the three such actions does in fact take place so that we can avoid the situation that the Press reports on.

Mr. C.P. MacDonald (Milestone): — Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. I appreciate the Minister's comments and I am sure that the teachers and the trustees and the school children in Area 4 will express gratitude that he shares concern. We should like to know if he is going to get up from behind his desk and take some leadership in using the powers at his disposal within the Act to bring about some decent negotiations to see if he can't generate a settlement in Area 4.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. MacMurchy: — Mr. Speaker, as the Hon. Member from Milestone is aware that we are withdrawing the compulsory arbitration aspect from that Act.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. MacMurchy: — We are firmly convinced that collective bargaining is the best approach in the short run and the long run for results and I think if a determined effort is made by both sides we can reach a settlement in Area 4 and in all areas in this province.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

INCREASE IN PRICE OF MILK

Mr. E.F. Gardner (Moosomin): — Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a question to

the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Messer). Press reports over the weekend indicated that milk may be going up by 2 cents a quart and in view of the hardship that this will cause to low-income people and especially those with large families, could the Minister tell us if he is going to allow the Milk Control Board to permit this increase and if he thinks it is necessary at this time?

Hon. J.R. Messer (Minister of Agriculture): — Mr. Speaker, I am not prepared to answer in detail in regard to the Hon. Member's question. He knows that I do not dictate the recommendations of the Milk Control Board. They, however, do make recommendations to myself in respect of that increase. We shall be considering them and having correspondence and dialogue with them before any price increase takes place.

PURCHASE OF HOUSES FOR MÉTIS SOCIETY

Mr. A.R. Guy (Athabasca): — Before the Orders of the Day I should like to direct a question to the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Wood). I should like to ask him if his Government is prepared to move on the request of the Saskatchewan Métis Society to purchase 42 houses from the Hudson Bay Mining and Smelting in Flin Flon, Manitoba, for the people of Sandy Bay?

Hon. E.I. Wood (Minister of Municipal Affairs): — I don't believe that that request has as yet come to my desk so I don't think I can answer it.

Hon. G.R. Bowerman (Minister of Indian and Métis): — Mr. Speaker, the question posed by the Hon. Member from Athabasca is a question that has for some time been broached to the Government. It was raised first with the former government about two or three years ago I believe, it was when the present Member was then sitting as a Member of the Government of this House. There has been no direct application made by the Métis Society to the present Government for the purchase of those houses at Island Falls. When that request comes we will indeed consider it.

ADJOURNED DEBATES

BUDGET DEBATE

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

Mr. K.R. MacLeod (Regina Albert Park): — Mr. Speaker, the Budget presented last Friday by this Government is probably the most disappointing but significant budget ever presented in the history of this province. This is a budget of a government that has quit trying to play its full part in the development of Canada. It is a government that has quit trying to industrialize Saskatchewan. It is the budget of a government that has accepted a secondary role in our family of provinces. It is a budget of a government which is prepared to live on handouts from other provinces and from

the Federal Government. The Budget we received on Friday last is a budget of a government which is no longer prepared to make the effort to instil pride and prosperity in its people. It marks a distinct change in policy from the seven years of Liberal Government.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. MacLeod: — In June of last year, the Liberals handed over to this Government a province well financed, bulging with credits, surpluses in every Crown corporation, seven years of balanced budgets, an improvement in the financial condition of the province exceeding \$70 million — an average improvement of better than \$10 million per year. And then we add another \$40 million this year. A fat, bulging credit from the seven Liberal years, not counted previously, not credited previously to the Liberal credits, handed over to this Government in June of last year.

This \$40 million, together with the remaining not less than \$70 million brings to more than \$110 million the improvement in the fiscal affairs of Saskatchewan since the 1964 election when the previous Liberal administration first took office. Crown corporations were all in better shape in 1971 than at any previous time in history. One of these Crown corporations, the Sodium Sulphate Plant, made more money in one year under Liberal rule than all previous years under the CCF. A large part of the production of that plant goes every week to the pulp mill in Prince Albert.

The Liberal Government had made plans for further industrial growth and expansion. The Prince Albert Pulp Mill was already in operation. The contract for the Athabasca Pulp mill was signed and work was progressing. The Gulf Minerals Mine was being completed. A road was being built to the Gulf Minerals Mine. The Choiceland Iron Mines were to be developed. The opportunity for a steel industry was at hand, available in Saskatchewan. The cities of Saskatoon, Regina Yorkton, Melfort and the Naicam area were to become beehives of activity

The NDP Government received a province in good shape. Its Crown corporations were thriving. One pulp mill was bringing prosperity to Prince Albert. Other plans were going ahead. The province was ready and able to take advantage of all the opportunities available. We could afford to pay for the plans we had. The future looked bright. Saskatchewan was on the threshold of its greatest years. We were coming to the aid of our beleaguered farmers. Help was at hand.

But in eight short months the NDP have destroyed the plans, turned its back on industrial development, and used our resources instead to create a powerful political machine. And the Budget proves it. In its short life this Government's Budget has been called many things.

The Budget has been referred to as a poor cousin budget. People who call it that are referring to the \$140 million to be received this year from the Federal Government under three plans: a statutory subsidy of \$2 million (the same as last year); an equalization payment of over \$119 million (an increase in that category alone of \$49 million); and a post-secondary education grant of almost \$19 million (an increase in this category of \$2 million).

March 13, 1972

These are only three of the Federal subsidies. These three subsidies alone provide a total increase of more than \$51 million over last year. This does not include all other Federal Government programs, plans and subsidies. In addition, receipts from other governments in the coming year will exceed \$15 million.

This budget could well be called a poor cousin Budget. In all, about one-third of the entire Budget of this Province this year is from contributions made by other governments, other Liberal governments.

It has been called a windfall Budget. And when they talk about a windfall they are referring of course to the additional \$51 million handed out by the Federal Treasury. An additional \$51 million more than last year. And indeed it could be called a windfall Budget.

But I call it something different. I say that this is the Budget of a Government that has quit – a quitter's Budget. It is a budget that has quit and my friends in Opposition tell me that it is a budget of a Government that hasn't even started and I agree that it has not even started. But it has declared to the people of Saskatchewan that this province is going to quit trying to pull its economic weight in Canada.

Where are the plans today to harvest the huge pulp reserves in Northern Saskatchewan? Where are they? Where is the plan to develop the deposits of iron at Choiceland? There is none. Where is the plan to develop a steel industry in Saskatchewan? It does not exist.

Where is the worker going to the pulp mill at Durocher Lake, taking home a salary of \$10,000 or \$12,000 a year? Well he's around, he's here in Saskatchewan, but he doesn't have a job and he's going to have to leave. Where is the electrician and the plumber and the carpenter and the bricklayer building homes and schools and hospitals, in the town that would have grown as a result of this mill? Where are these workmen? They are here, they are probably on unemployment, or they are on welfare, on the huge welfare budget of this Province. But if they want a job this Government has told them they will have to leave.

Where is the nurse and the doctor going to work in that hospital? Where is the school teacher and the principal that's going to work in that school? Those hospitals aren't going to be built, those schools aren't going to be built. The nurse and the doctor are around. They are here but they will have to leave because this Government has turned its back on development.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. MacLeod: — Where is the clerk and the secretary who work in the stores? Pardon me again, that would have worked in the stores and the office of the pulp mill? Well, they are here and they are graduating from our schools, from our high schools, from our technical schools, from our commercial schools. They are in Saskatchewan but they will have to leave because this Government has refused to provide them with a place to work. What does this Government do for them? Nothing!

In most industrial states of the world the industrial sector of the economy subsidizes and assists the agricultural

side of the economy. This is true in Sweden and Britain and France and Germany, and all other countries in Europe. It is true in Japan and in the United States and in Canada as a whole but it does not occur in Saskatchewan. Under this Government, apparently, we have stopped trying to produce an industrial side of the economy. No major assistance to agriculture can be expected from the industrial sector of this province because such a sector does not exist and under the NDP Government it will never exist.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. MacLeod: — Our people will continue to leave Saskatchewan because this Government quit trying. This Government said that Saskatchewan was to be doomed to being only an agricultural society. But the NDP Government will continue their steady and continued demands on Ottawa, continued demands on the successful part of Canada. The NDP will continue to make application for welfare payments from other governments.

What do these other governments think about it? British Columbia isn't very happy. They have a population triple that of this Province of Saskatchewan. And the Premier's staff in Saskatchewan is double the size of the Premier's staff in the Province of British Columbia.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. MacLeod: — The Hon. Mr. Don Getty in Alberta says that Alberta does not wish to be classified with Saskatchewan and Manitoba as agricultural provinces. Only a small part of Alberta's wealth comes now from agriculture. The largest part comes from industrial development. And because of it Alberta is a province which does not require a succession duty. It is a province which does not require a gift tax. It is a province which because of its industrial development is able to reduce the taxation on its citizens.

The NDP Government has failed not only the people of Saskatchewan, they have failed the people of Canada. We are a wealthy province which this NDP Government is keeping on the relief rolls.

Our people deserve something better. Our people are decent, honourable, hard-working people, willing to stand shoulder to shoulder with their fellow Canadians, producing the goods and services by which we will all live a better life. The people of Saskatchewan and the people of Canada have been betrayed by the present Government of Saskatchewan. Saskatchewan's people are a proud people. They do not want to become a welfare island in the Canadian landscape.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. MacLeod: — What happens if the other peoples decide that equalization is unfair? Will they refuse to pay? How then shall we pay for the services we want and desire and have become accustomed to? Then we shall truly identify how this Budget was the budget of a Government that quit development.

How does this Budget bring a New Deal for People? I think, Mr. Speaker, the people of Saskatchewan will not be happy with the cards they have been dealt. What has happened to the municipal grants program? Grants to industrial towns this year are estimated to be \$15,000. One-tenth the \$160,000 actually spent last year under the Liberal Government, only one-third the amount budgeted for the current year. In what other ways do municipal governments suffer? Grants for police services — down. Grants under The Municipal Water Assistance Act — down. Grant for snow removal — down. Assistance for market road grids and main farm access roads taken together as they were last year, total expenditure — down. Grants for maintenance of grid roads — down. The NDP Government is intending perhaps to have people back on the farm and equally, obviously, does not want them to drive away from the farms.

What about the Indian and Métis? The Liberal Government under W. Ross Thatcher had a tremendous concern for the Indian and Métis. A concern for the disadvantaged people of this country. Under that Liberal Government the Indian and Métis Department was becoming a truly important branch of Government. Its last budget provided for more than \$2.4 million in expenditures. Under the present Government the Human Resources Development Agency has been downgraded and the budget reduced. Is this humanity first? It is not. It is politics before policy. It is programs before people.

How about unemployment? A major plank in the NDP platform was unemployment. It was also a major part of the Throne Speech. And it was also a major part of the Budget Speech. How does the Government actually deal with unemployment? It reduces the capital expenditures in its building and construction program. Look in the Department of Agriculture capital expenditures — down. Capital expenditures for the Department of Government Services, that is the former Department of Public Works — down \$4 million. Construction at the University of Saskatchewan — down \$3 million. Total government construction altogether down about \$8 million.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. MacLeod: — But the Attorney General's Department, where there is no construction, up \$2.6 million.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. MacLeod: — Is this the New Deal for the unemployed? Is this what the plumber wants? Is this what the electrician wants? Is this what the bricklayer wants? Is this what the carpenter wants? No, that's what Roy wants. Is this the New Deal for People?

The Premier will have to get over the idea that making a speech about something actually solves the problem.

This Budget provides for spending of \$100 million more than a year ago, a 25 per cent increase over the last Liberal year in office. And what do we have to show for it? Do we have better roads? No, the capital expenditures for roads this year is exactly the same as last year. Do we have a bigger university? No, we've got a \$3 million reduction in construction.

Do we have more welfare? Yes, we have more welfare.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. MacLeod: — What about the University of Saskatchewan? Construction is down and operation costs are up. But will the increase actually do the job? Apparently not! Drastic reductions in teaching staff will occur in Saskatoon and Regina. Dismissal notices have already gone out. As many as 175 teachers may be affected. 175 teachers at the university may be lost to the university.

The meetings held in Saskatoon last week reported in the Saskatoon Star-Phoenix indicate the seriousness of the situation. The university faculty has met, the university students are meeting and the university board is meeting. The university was not given what it had been led to expect. In Regina the situation is the same. Last week a travelling wake was held by those teachers and for those citizens of Regina who will no longer be at the university. They went from house to house expressing sadness that they would no longer be with the university.

I invite the Members and the public to look at the fine print in the Budget. Item 40 of the Estimates shows the number of posts budgeted for in each year. Here is a clear admission by the Government that it intends to reduce the number of positions in both campuses.

Do the Members of this Assembly remember the repeated election promises of the Government. Every NDP Member handed out a booklet in which this promise was made. "A New Democratic Party will sharply reduce property tax, mill rates for basic school operating costs on homes, farms and small businesses." Does this Budget keep that promise? It does not!

Some Hon. Members: — No, no!

Mr. MacLeod: — Are property taxes going down in Regina?

Some Hon. Members: — No, no!

Mr. MacLeod: — No, they are not. Are taxes being reduced in Indian Head and Southey and Sintaluta?

Some Hon. Members: — No, no!

Mr. MacLeod: — That's right, they are not. Is there a sharp reduction in taxes? No, there is not. Is there even a small reduction in taxes? No, there is not. There is no reduction at all.

An Hon. Member: — There may be increases, in fact.

Mr. MacLeod: — And when the Premier says he has eliminated the causes of friction between trustees and teachers, did he forget the city of Regina? Did he forget Area 4? This Budget fails to provide the money to pay decent salaries to teachers. It fails to reduce property taxes. But it does do something.

March 13, 1972

It passes the buck back to the school boards. And it very successfully breaks an NDP campaign promise.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. MacLeod: — The Government has gone into hiding on this problem. The only way mill rates can be held the same as last year is if the Government forces school boards to impose a bad settlement on the school teachers or increase taxes. The Government will be at fault, but just watch, very cleverly the blame will be shifted either to the teachers for asking for a fair wage or to the trustees for giving a fair settlement or to the trustees for raising taxes for wages as required. And the real culprit is the Government of Saskatchewan.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. MacLeod: — We notice today the demonstration of leadership displayed by the Minister of Education (Mr. MacMurchy) no longer in the House. In fact, half of their Members aren't in the House which is the way it usually is. Is this the New Deal for education? Is this the New Deal for the students who want education? Is this the New Deal for Saskatchewan? Is the decimation of our teaching staffs an indication of things to come? If so, I for one should like to declare a misdeal.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. MacLeod: — What about resource development? The Budget Address said the Government would support resource development and without excessive public subsidy. What do they provide for all resource development? A quick peek at the budgetary expenditures under Mineral Resources discloses grants for mineral resource development — nil. How about the Department of Natural Resources? Grants for development of our natural resources — nil. How about the Department of Industry and Commerce? Here we have it. Grants for assistance to business and industrial pursuant to The Industry and Commerce Development Act, 1972 — \$100,000. Total for all three departments, Mineral Resources, Industry and Commerce and Natural Resources, grants of \$100,000. Compare that with the RCMP Centennial. That's \$100,000. Compare it with the amount given to the 1971 Homecoming celebrations of the Province of Saskatchewan by the Liberal Government — \$1.6 million.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. MacLeod: — The industrial development of the entire province rates on a par with the RCMP Centennial. And while I am about it I might as well tell you that no Liberal will be so low or so cheap as to try to make political capital out of the RCMP Centennial the way the NDP Government did with Homecoming '71. Cheap political tricks.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. MacLeod: — How about the program for disposal of abandoned vehicles, \$465,000? The disposition of abandoned vehicles in Saskatchewan rates with this Government four and a half times

the grants for development of business and industry. And that \$465,000 is to be paid for by the drivers in Saskatchewan.

What is the entire budget for Industry and Commerce? \$2.6 million. Down from last year. What is the budget for the Attorney General? \$11.4 million. An increase of \$2.6 million.

Some Hon. Members: — Oh, oh!

Mr. MacLeod: — The increase in the Attorney General's Department in this year alone, just the increase, is equal to the entire budget for the Department of Industry and Commerce. That does not include what should be included (and was last year in the Attorney General's Department) consumer protection which has been put into a separate department. And it does not include our powder puff ombudsman. Mr. Speaker, we are to spend almost as much on the powder puff ombudsman as we do for the entire grants for industry in Saskatchewan.

What about the amounts for loans for industry? Less than the increase in the budget to the Attorney General. What about SEDCO? The Total SEDCO budget and total loans proposed under the new Industry and Commerce development Act are reduced below what the SEDCO budget was along last year.

That is the priorities this Government talks about. That is how this Government, the NDP Government of Saskatchewan so proudly concerns itself with employment, jobs and with industrial development of the province.

The closing words of the Premier on Friday were this and I quote: "We promise to protect and develop Saskatchewan resources for Saskatchewan people. We promised and we delivered."

Whom is the Government trying to fool? When they said they are not going to give unnecessarily high subsidies, Mr. Speaker, I believed them. They are giving no subsidies at all. They are providing for no industry at all. They are providing for no jobs at all. And eventually they will have no people at all.

Mr. Speaker, we provide an increase in the Attorney General's budget this year of \$2.6 million for numerous additional assistants, high salaries to defeated NDP candidates including Mr. Koskie at \$19,000 the defeated candidate in 1967 in Lakeview. The Hon. Member for Lakeview (Mr. McPherson) is probably to be credited for making him available to the Government at a high salary. And Mr. Shillington here courtesy of Mr. John Gardner, the Hon. Member for Moosomin. I think that Mr. Shillington actually won that Moosomin election — salary \$18,000.

The Premier says he is protecting Saskatchewan resources. Well, he must be. He certainly isn't developing them.

How about the highway program?. Well, the budget is up \$2 million. Last year it was \$65 million, this year it is \$67 million. But there was a great cry by the NDP that the Liberals spent too much on highways. They said there was a need for reordering of priorities. Apparently the Liberal program wasn't so bad if this Government sees fit to increase spending on highway maintenance. And all the while they keep the capital construction amount the same as last year. It couldn't have been too bad a program, a province which the NDP said was a wrong set of priorities.

March 13, 1972

An Hon. Member: — Shame!

Mr. MacLeod: — Agriculture. Mr. Speaker, the main thrust of this Government's Throne Speech was that agriculture was to have top priority. And how had this Budget reflected this priority? The budget for the Department of Agriculture up \$1.9 million. Compare that with the \$2.6 million increase to the Attorney General. The Attorney General's gross budget is \$12 million and the Minister of Agriculture where they have top priority is only \$12.6 million. That is the top priority given to our number one industry.

The Land Bank program. Land ownership by the Government is almost as large as the entire Department of Agriculture budget. Property improvement grants are 190 per cent of the budget of the Department of Agriculture. The Minister of Welfare himself will spend five and a half times the amount spent by the Department of Agriculture, 550 per cent more on Welfare than on Agriculture.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. MacLeod: — How about Municipal Affairs? 300 per cent of the Agriculture budget. And that doesn't include Municipal Road Assistance Authority which is \$2 million more than the entire Agriculture Department budget.

An Hon. Member: — Shame, shame!

Mr. MacLeod: — How about the Natural Resources budget? \$2 million more than Agriculture. The Minister of Education himself will spend 800 per cent more than the Department of Agriculture. Government Services 180 per cent of the Agriculture budget. Minister of Highways 500 per cent more than Agriculture.

Is this the main thrust of the Government's priority? Out of an increase in Federal money of \$51 million, and I repeat, it's only the increase, an extra \$1.9 million is available to Agriculture. The total of Federal moneys paid to the Province is 12 times the budget for the Department of Agriculture.

I must say I am not giving credit where credit is due. The Hon. Attorney General spent \$1.36 sending a telegram asking for a \$25 million railroad in British Columbia and he wanted it built that same week. I shall be very interested to see whether this \$1.36 item is charged to the Department of the Attorney General under propaganda, which is the way it was used, or will be charged through to the Department of Agriculture. It certainly can't be charged to the Department of Industry and Commerce because it promotes industry and commerce elsewhere.

This Government has opted for politics rather than programs, and has hidden it all in a frilly Throne Speech and a devious Budget delivered to me at the very last moment. The Budget Address is available days in advance. Copies are made available to the Press on a confidential basis prior to delivery of the message. Not one Member of the Opposition in this debate received a copy of the Budget Address, other than the Financial Critic, and I received it only at the time I walked into this House. The Budget Address and the Estimates should be given in

advance. A budget dealing with a half billion dollars of expenditures is not something that can be dealt with on a few moments' notice, particularly when we are dealing with a budget as devious as this one.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. MacLeod: — Let me give you an example. Last year the budget for the Executive Council was \$1.4 million. This year the amount allocated to the Executive Council is \$1.385 million. The budget is calculated to give the appearance that these two figures are about the same. Nothing can be further from the truth. Last year the Purchasing Agency of the Government was included in the Executive Council. This year that entire branch, involving 25 members, has been transferred to the new Government Services Department, which used to be called the Department of Public Works. Last year there were seven people employed by the Executive Council, the NDP doubled that, seven more, and made it fourteen. Then they added an entirely new division. There are fourteen new positions in the new division. This was brand new. To accommodate these 21 new positions the entire Purchasing Agency, involving 25 members, were transferred to the Department of Public Works. You would expect when it arrives at the Department of Public Works it would have 25 people, but it doesn't, it has 31 members. In the process Mr. T.C. Douglas' campaign manager and five others are added to the staff. Rabbits can't multiply as fast as this Government hires political people.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. MacLeod: — That's Mr. Ables.

A Purchasing Agency of 25 members in one department becomes a Purchasing Agency of 31 members in the new department. And the Executive Council under the direct management and scrutiny of the Premier becomes the political arm of the NDP Government.

The only people in the Executive Council in the two main branches are entirely there for political purposes. They work for the NDP but are paid by the people of Saskatchewan. The transfer of the Purchasing Agency is to make it appear that the Premier's budget is no larger than last year. We are therefore involved in a game of hide and seek.

One item \$1.3 million in Government Services which was formerly called Public Works relating to the Department of Northern Saskatchewan was shown in the current year under the Department of Education. The Members opposite promised — a promise of every candidate on the opposite side during the last election — I quote,

To simplify government budgeting to show the public as clearly and honestly as possible the true picture regarding revenues and expenditures from all sources.

I welcome that promise, I don't expect it to be kept.

In the eight months since the NDP Government have taken power, they have been preparing and working on this Budget. I understood they had hired something close to 300 bureaucrats. I am now informed that I am conservative — that's the one thing I don't want to be — conservative on the estimates and

that they have hired over 400 bureaucrats. I want to distinguish clearly between our dedicated civil servants who work for the people of Saskatchewan, and the bureaucrats who are employed by the Government of Saskatchewan but who are in fact working for the NDP provincially and federally.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. MacLeod: — These bureaucrats will be seen throughout the land working for the NDP Federal candidates in the coming Federal election. They will be working for the NDP but their salary and their expenses will be paid by the people of Saskatchewan. It is this game of hide and seek which makes it difficult.

The comparisons of Estimates with previous years is totally and absolutely erroneous and false throughout the Budget. No person looking at the Budget can take anything for granted. This Government has changed names, subdivided departments, shifted branches and eliminated and re-organized or transferred departments. The entire purpose is to make it impossible to make a simple, reasonable and meaningful comparison with the previous government.

The Budget is a calculated design to disguise the fact that this Government is hiring at least 300 additional bureaucrats. It is also designed to make it appear that this Government is spending more money when in fact it is not spending new money at all. For example, the Property Improvements Grants Program shows \$23 million for this year and nothing for last year. A further study demonstrates that they have eliminated almost \$13 million in grants to homeowners which this year was to go to \$17.3 million under the Liberals. This was to provide each and every homeowner in the Province of Saskatchewan a grant of \$100 and it was eliminated. The homeowner grants as such have been eliminated and replaced by the Property Improvement Grants Program.

Salaries and staffs have been increased. We have no objection to the salary increases to the regular civil servants; they are entitled to them and deserve them. But the people of Saskatchewan should not be obliged to pay for the party apparatus of the NDP. Tax money should not be spent for a political army. Very little information will come from this Government.

There is a device, a technique whereby the Opposition may acquire information. We may ask questions and put them on the Order Paper. The Government may without question turn it into a Notice of Motion and a Motion for Return Debatable. The whole purpose of this procedure from “question” right through to a “Motion for Return Debatable” is so that it can be debated. When it is debated it will be voted on, and when it is voted on it will be defeated, and the information will not be given out to us. We will be denied the answers.

Let me give you a quick example of one question they refused to answer. Motion for Return (converted to a Motion Debatable) by Mr. MacDonald from Milestone for an Order that a Return show the following:

1. The total number of Executive Assistants, Special Assistants, research assistants and other aids attached to the Ministers of the Saskatchewan

government or their departments since July 1, 1971.

Surely the people are entitled to know that answer.

2. The names, titles and salaries of all such assistants and aids with a breakdown as to departments.

Aren't we entitled to have that information?

Were any such assistants supplied with a car at public expense.

3. The amount of expenses and other remuneration paid to or on behalf of each assistant in each month since July 1, 1971.

That has been converted to a Motion for Return (Debatable) for the sole purpose of refusing the information.

The next one by Mr. MacDonald (Milestone) requests:

1. The names of all individuals who were provincial candidates for any political party in the election of June 23rd, who have been appointed to any government board, commission, committee, agency, enquiry study or advisory group.
2. Give the position to which appointed, the political party of such candidate and the amount paid to each individual.

They won't tell us. Again a Motion for Return (Debatable) solely for the purpose of denying the information to the Opposition and the people of Saskatchewan.

We shall receive only controlled and carefully manicured information, tailored to make it appear that it is different from what it really is. What can you expect of a Government that imposes succession duties and gift taxes and headlines it by saying that these taxes are designed to help farmers and businessmen. Do you know what, if an NDP Government ever hangs a man and I am sure they'll tell him that they have done him a favour, they'll spread the news that they reduced his cost of living.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. MacLeod: — Let us look at the estimated revenues for the Government. Motor vehicles licenses, an increase. The Attorney General states there was no increase in licenses. Some silly people think that there has been an increase just because they have to pay \$10 more now for something they could have had for \$10 cheaper last December.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. MacLeod: — It brings us to the definition to what is meant by a tax. A tax is not a tax when it is imposed by the Attorney General. Apparently a tax increase is not a tax increase when it is imposed by the Attorney General. We in the Opposition will have to keep a sharp lookout for these unidentified flying

taxes. When the Attorney General goes around the province warning people about defective snowmobiles which in fact do not exist and have never existed in Saskatchewan, it is very likely that we shall get some threats and warnings about other things by other Members of the Government which do not exist and have never existed. This poses a particular problem because I had great difficulty in identifying and classifying things which don't exist. If the Attorney General identifies anything else that doesn't exist — any other non-tax increases — I wonder if he would be good enough to draw it to our attention.

I don't know if these things are careless or intended to deceive. I do know that this isn't the way the people of Saskatchewan want their affairs managed.

What about other revenues? Petroleum and natural gas payments — down \$1 million. Metallic mineral revenues down. Lands, forest, game fur, fisheries and water — down. Dividends from Saskatchewan Telecommunications and Saskatchewan Power Corporation already paid by the people of Saskatchewan — increased.

The biggest increase of all of course is the \$50 million more from the Federal Government of Canada. What is that a measurement of? That is a measurement of failure, it is the measurement of the inability of this Government or the NDP Government to bring in any real lasting production of wealth to the province.

Some of our Crown corporations, notably Power and Telephones, are heavily financed on borrowed monies. The Saskatchewan ownership portion is not a large portion. When they pay dividends to this Government then the money cannot be used to reduce their heavy debt loads. In the coming year Saskatchewan Telecommunications and the SPC will pay dividends to this Government of over \$17 million. The net effect is that the \$17 million taken in the coming year is, in effect, borrowed money. This is not the first year that dividends have been paid or, presumably, the last. Last year they paid \$16 million in dividends, but at that time the Members who now sit as the Premier and the Attorney General characterized these payments as robbing the piggy bank. If indeed the Liberal Government robbed a piggy bank, then robbery on a grander scale is to occur in the coming year. I am disappointed that the Premier and the Attorney General saw fit to label these last year as robbing the piggy bank. It is usually argued that these dividends are being returned to the people as a result of their ownership in the Crown corporation. If it is robbing a piggy bank, then it is a bigger robbery at the present time.

Of course the biggest single item in the Budget, the largest dollar change, is the change in the equalization payment from the Federal Government. This year \$70 million, in the coming year \$119 million. This is a windfall. An equalization of massive proportions. Why does Saskatchewan need this equalization payment? It is because Saskatchewan is still classified as a have-not province. It is a have-not province because of the years since World War II that we have had a CCF-NDP government. Our population drops from the third highest to the sixth, and this Budget we are studying today will not halt this decline. If there is a decline that has been temporarily stopped, if there is an appearance of an increase in population, it is solely because the Government has hired so many executive assistants.

The Budget speech itself was a Madison Avenue performance. The Estimates were prepared in a way that would reveal the least amount of information. I say both the Budget and the Estimates should be examined by the Attorney General's Department for breach of unfair advertising and false packaging...

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. MacLeod: — ...I think he can do it with his \$2.6 Member increase and his total \$11.4 million budget.

Where does the money go that this Government is spending? It goes into four areas. To begin with, normal increases in salaries and expenses and institutional allowances such as schools and universities. But not one institution will get fat on what this Government is handing out to them. Secondly, a big increase, property improvements grants. One of the major problems of Saskatchewan has been property taxes. The Liberals instituted huge equalization payments, grants for snow removal, grants for police services, grants under The Municipal Water Assistance Act, all now reduced by the NDP Government. It also instituted — the Liberal Government that is — Saskatchewan's first homeowner grant and promised to increase homeowner grants by \$5 million in the coming year, to more than \$17 million. Obviously, the Liberal plan was successful. Obviously people liked the plan. Just as obviously the NDP cannot get rid of the plan but, carrying on a tradition that has been observed since the commencement of this Government, it changed the name. A continuing and expanded Liberal program would have provided for apartment dwellers. The Budget Address does not mention them.

We call upon the Government to give full effect to a continuing and growing homeowner grant scheme, whether you call it the property improvements program or the homeowner grant program and give recognition to renters, apartment owners and apartment dwellers.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. MacLeod: — We in the Liberal Opposition will demand fair treatment for people who pay rent. The NDP considers that apartment dwellers are transients. It has no respect for them. The NDP Government considers that people who live in apartments are people going from place to place looking for a job, as little better than gypsies. I want to say to this Government that apartment owners have and are entitled to the same rights as any other citizens, they are not second class citizens, although this Government has treated them as such.

This Government pays very little attention to people who might not be around to vote at a coming election. They pay very little attention to people who do not have political power. The failure of the Premier in his Budget Address to make reference to apartment owners and in his Budget Speech to apartment renters, receives our utter and total condemnation. We demand that he reconsider his position and that he provide for apartment renters and apartment owners.

The third major increase in expenditures the largest single item of its kind in the provincial employment grants program of

March 13, 1972

\$4.5 million. But this program is to provide for matching grants to those applying for and receiving loans under the Federal-Provincial employment loans program. It is entirely a product of the Federal Government's original province. The NDP have accepted someone else's idea. It is worth noting that the Provincial Government at no place in the Budget Address gave credit to the Federal Government and which do not appear anywhere in the Budget. Yet they complain about the Federal program. Well for a party that campaigned on the pro of full employment, I ask, what were you doing all the time?

I invite the people of Saskatchewan to read the addresses of the Members opposite in the nine-day session of the Legislature last year. The Members were so fascinated by the fact they had won the election and so impressed by their own political ability that they forgot why they had been elected. We had nine days of speeches in which they were congratulating themselves. Most of the business of that session could have been carried on by Order-in-Council. The entire session was unnecessary. Now if those nine days had been spent in preparing an employment program instead of complaining to the Federal Government the people of Saskatchewan and the —un people in particular would have been far better off.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. MacLeod: — The fourth and by far the greatest increase in budget spending this year perhaps in any year in the history of Saskatchewan, is the increase in payments to the bureaucratic machinery established by this Government. I am not talking about the regular civil servants.

Some Hon. Members: — 900!

Mr. MacLeod: — As I have mentioned, we have excellent dedicated civil servants. They have our total and undying respect. But the greatest percentage increase in the Budget, relates entirely to the bureaucratic machinery created to win elections — not only Saskatchewan elections, but municipal elections, the election of Federal NDP candidates in Saskatchewan, the election of Federal NDP candidates in other parts of Canada. This entire mass of bureaucracy is established by this Government solely for the purpose of becoming a political weapon. That is the spending program of this Government, that is where the money of the people of Saskatchewan, and the people of Canada, is going in the coming year — increases in salaries, property improvement grants, matching Federal improvement loans program and a huge bureaucracy. And practically nothing for the development of our province and its resources as an industrial state.

I am not proud to live in a state that is dependent. And this Government is destroying the pride of the people of Saskatchewan. I want to live in a province that pulls its weight, a province that develops its resources and its people to the maximum of their abilities and their desires.

Some people have been calling it a 'ho-hum' Budget. They say that a government really can't spend so much and do so little unless you work at it. Any other government would have done

more accidentally than this Government does by deliberate planning.

What might have been done with this extra \$51 million from the Federal Government? Well, I have a couple of suggestions. A relocation study. In the Throne Speech I made reference to the rapid changes in rural Saskatchewan — rail lines being abandoned, stations closed, elevator companies planning for larger and more central elevators and the discontinuance of the use of small elevators. I noted that good roads had, in many cases, destroyed local communities. Yet these are people living, huddling around elevators and small villages who would sooner move to adjacent town or trading centres but can't afford to do so. I call on the Government to make a study of this problem. Assistance is given to farmers and other people to relocate. In many cases the Government has purchased land from farmers and taken it out of production. But no one assists the storekeeper and the person having property in a dying town. They have their life savings invested in houses which they cannot sell. Nothing in the Budget provides for a study of this problem.

How about teachers' superannuation? The plight of our elderly school teachers, living on inadequate superannuation, is severe. Times have changed, prices have increased, but these contributors to the education and development of our province are ignored. No Budget which ignores the needs of our elderly people can be regarded as acceptable to this Opposition.

Legal Services. The legal assistance plan was begun in 1967 by a Liberal Government. It provides for defence of people who cannot afford a lawyer. This year, the Budget provides \$282,000 for this purpose. But what do they provide for people with domestic troubles? In Regina alone, 1,500 married women are on welfare with children, living separate from their husbands. All are in need of legal services. Those who receive adequate legal services are receiving it at the charity of the legal profession. What is offered? Legal assistance of \$29,000, a reduction of \$1,600 from the figure budgeted for last year. Not one cent contributed by this Government to solve the real problems of these poor people, neglected men and women who cannot afford, but who so certainly require proper legal attention. And the Attorney General's budget up \$2.6 million. \$2,900 for real need. I suggest that these people band together. I suggest that they organize a pressure group which is the only way to get action out of this Government. I assure them that they shall have the total co-operation and support of this loyal Opposition.

Industry. One of the most important things that might have been done, or could have been done, to help the people in Saskatchewan, would be to provide for the industrial growth of our province. Surely out of an increased budget of \$51 million, \$10 million more could have been used for the industrial development of Saskatchewan. The \$100,000 in grants is nothing more than an insult.

Mr. Speaker, we are commencing some lean years. We will see continued and determined efforts on the part of this Government to shake down the Federal Government and the Governments of other provinces of Canada. But I warn the NDP that the other provinces are getting sick and tired of it.

Mr. Speaker, this is the first opportunity I've had to deal

March 13, 1972

with a Budget Debate in this House, and I fully appreciate the responsibility it entails. And because it is my first opportunity I consider it appropriate to set forth some of my priorities and my attitudes in dealing with the financial affairs of the Province.

To begin with, we expect the Government to act in a responsibility manner. The Government should not hesitate to intrude upon any part of society, any part of the economy, any business, any job, any service. If it is in the public interest. This is not a dogmatic view that the Government must intervene, not at all, just that, if necessary, Government should intervene. I am not a slave of socialist principles or free enterprises principles. I am a slave of the principle that people must do what must be done in a good management of their affairs.

Finally having properly managed your affairs, having refrained from investing when you should not invest, having invested when you should have invested, having encouraged business and having developed your province, it is for nothing if the benefit derived is not properly distributed to the people.

The whole purpose of sound business management is the welfare of the people of Saskatchewan. And that, Mr. Speaker, is why this is not a good Budget. It opted out of development. It opts out of doing something for ourselves. It depends instead on equalization payments from the Federal Government.

T.C. Douglas once said that people in need should be able to accept welfare, without damage to their dignity and pride. I believed it then, and I believe it now, but I did not think he was referring to the Provincial Government.

I have no satisfaction in what I am about to say. I am not proud to have our province reduced to the status of a beggar. This is a black time in Saskatchewan. With great sadness, I must say, Mr. Speaker, that I absolutely cannot and I absolutely will not support this Budget.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. J.C. McIsaac (Wilkie): — On Friday last the Premier, in his capacity as Provincial Treasurer, presented this Province with his first Budget as Leader of the NDP.

Now I wondered, I'm sure, as some of the other Members did why they all came in with red carnations, Mr. Speaker. As he began his speech and went on into the course of it, we can see that red being a good Liberal colour, he had good reason to be wearing red carnations. Because if it weren't for the Federal money, the Federal Liberal money that was in his Budget, Mr. Speaker, this would not have been a balance Budget that he presented to us.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. McIsaac: — You know, he made reference also, Mr. Speaker, to the narrow tie that he was wearing, as I recall. He indicated that this year's Budget would be a good deal more expensive than the tie. He might well have said expensive, as well as expansive. And I want to tell you, Mr. Speaker, and other Members of this

House that he'd better keep that narrow tie because he is going to need it next year and the year after when he tries to balance that Budget. Indeed, he's likely to have to take the scissors to that tie to trim it down in line with the narrow times that are in store for Saskatchewan taxpayers in the years ahead.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. McIsaac: — The Provincial Treasurer went on to take some time to indicate how his new Budget was an illustration of NDP philosophy and NDP promises and so on.

Well, it was an illustration all right, an illustration that they haven't really changed any of the philosophies or policies, it's still a philosophy for the Provincial NDP, a cry to Ottawa, a cry to the Federal Government!

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. McIsaac: — This Budget, Mr. Speaker, indicates certainly tough times ahead for the Saskatchewan taxpayer, because that Budget was in reality not a balanced budget.

The Federal Government equalization payment made to the Province of Saskatchewan in the forthcoming year will be up by approximately \$50 million. In other words it is a windfall, Mr. Speaker, and the chief reason that the Premier was able to balance his Budget this year is because first of all of the generosity of the Federal Liberal Government. That same Government, Mr. Speaker, that the NDP opposite are continually condemning at every turn, the same Federal Liberal Government which incidentally recently brought in the two-price system for wheat, benefiting this Province, that same Federal Liberal Government which recently brought in a \$5 support price for hogs, going up to \$1,000 as a maximum for the hog producers in this Province, that same Federal Government that extended credit facilities to foreign countries to the extent that we have record wheat sales and record barley sales last year and this year once again...

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. McIsaac: — The Provincial Treasurer did point out however, that a portion of the \$50 -mil, namely \$10 million will be a recurring annual payment. Now the other \$40 million is coming to Saskatchewan, Mr. Speaker, because of adjustments from the final calculations of what that equalization payment should have been two or three years ago. Now why is the Province in receipt of that additional money, of that additional windfall, Mr. Speaker? It's due to the good bargaining of the former Premier and the former Provincial Treasurer, the late Ross Thatcher when he drove that bargain with the Federal Government some four or five years ago.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. McIsaac: — It was when, Mr. Thatcher, then Premier and Treasurer, got a clause guaranteeing adjustments to the equalization formula in years when not income in Saskatchewan fell below average,

March 13, 1972

that that clause was built in and so, Mr. Speaker, as a result of that kind of bargaining we've had a windfall Premier of June 23rd here, able to bring in a windfall budget on Friday, March 10th.

Now, Mr. Speaker, where is the windfall here for the unemployment in Saskatchewan? And I would remind you, Sir, that the unemployment rate in this Province today is not the lowest in Canada, as it was a year ago at 4.7 per cent, December 1970. The unemployment rate for December 1971 was 5.4 per cent. And that rate is certainly not the lowest in all Canadian provinces, rather it is higher than Alberta or Manitoba and those two provinces are a part of that prairie basin and that same regional economy that the Premier refers to.

This is at a time when more jobs were created in Canada last year, Mr. Speaker, than at any other time in our history. More new jobs opened up than the total new job opportunities in Britain, France and West Germany combined. In short, Mr. Speaker, despite the unacceptably high level unemployment that still exists across Canada we did see a record increase in new jobs across the Dominion, but not in the Province of Saskatchewan.

Now what has happened with jobs in Saskatchewan and job opportunities since the NDP assumed office last summer? Well, we've had a closing of the Imperial Oil Refinery here in Regina with a net loss as I recall in the neighbourhood of something like 100 jobs. We've have the cancellation of the Athabasca Pulp Mill with a net loss of hundreds of permanent jobs for the labour force of Saskatchewan and that is a project that would have put millions of dollars into the pockets of the labouring people of Saskatchewan each and every month of the year for year after year after year. But they cancelled that, Mr. Speaker. Instead they hope to increase employment in the tourist industry by perhaps a couple of hundred people whose summer jobs in tourism in Saskatchewan might last for two or three months during the course of the summer. And then only if we as a province are successful in attracting tourists, not just to drive through Saskatchewan on No. 1 Highway, but indeed to stop and to turn north and to take advantage of the facilities up there.

We've also seen the announced intention of Burns Foods in Regina to close their meat packing operations here in the city. In recent weeks, I believe it was on Friday last, that it was confirmed, we have seen the merger of two of the major grain companies in the Regina, Mr. Speaker, Saskatchewan Wheat Pool and the Federal elevator chain. I have no quarrel whatever with the decision of both of these large companies in this endeavour, but it will mean a net reduction in job opportunities in Saskatchewan of perhaps three to four hundred by the time the Federal is completely integrated with the Wheat Pool.

Now what does this Budget hold for the unemployed? Absolutely nothing, Mr. Speaker.

Let's take a look at Public Works' spending. We have heard a good deal from the Premier and his Government, starting about last July, about the need for more public works in the Province. Well, there was \$15 million budgeted in the last Liberal Budget for capital public works, Mr. Speaker. This year, how much? Not 15 or 18 or 20, as you might expect, but \$11 million. \$11 million! Now one would have thought that

figure would certainly have been increased when we listen to our friends opposite extol the need and the value of public and winter works in the Province of Saskatchewan. And if that money last year, as the Premier indicated in his remarks on Friday, wasn't all spent well surely they had ample time from June or July, not only to spend that money but to plan the spending of it. And surely they had ample time since last June to plan, if not programs for this current winter but certainly programs for the forthcoming 1972-73 winter and we should have seen a reflection of that in this Budget and we didn't.

Instead, what do we hear? The Provincial Treasurer once again calling on the Federal Government to begin now to plan for next year's winter works program to help bail the NDP out of their own inactivity and inaction in this regard.

Now the fact that there were a number of job opportunities created during this current winter, Mr. Speaker, is due almost entirely to the former Liberal administration's Public Works budget and the Federal Liberal Winter Works Program which was launched last fall.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. McIsaac: —But surely, Mr. Speaker, the Government opposite can come up with something better for the unemployed in Saskatchewan other than a Winter Works Program. Surely our friends opposite must realize the severe limitations of extensive capital projects in winters such as we have here in the Province of Saskatchewan. Winter Works Programs after all are not a new deal, but indeed they're an old deal, and a very old deal, and one would have thought that the 'New Deal for People' would have included a better deal for the labour force of this Province than the band-aid approach of more and more winter works.

The Provincial Treasurer announces in the Budget Speech that he proposes to give emphasis to small manufacturing and small business and industry. And in this objective, Mr. Speaker, I for one would certainly concur and wish him very well.

Accordingly, when one looks at the estimates in the Department of Industry, we see a new sub-vote entitled "Grants for Assistance to Business and Industry" and we shall be asked to vote the grand sum of not a million dollars, or half a million, but \$100,000.

Now there is a very enlightening comparison here, Mr. Speaker, for the next line of the estimates that were put before us on Friday includes an amount of \$465,000 for the disposal of abandoned vehicles in the province. In other words, almost five times as much money to get rid of junk cars as they propose to spend to attract business and investment to this Province. And of course that \$465,000 as Hon. Members will recall is coming not from the public treasury but coming directly from the vehicle owners who are paying an extra dollar for their licence plates. That's not a tax increase, no, not according to the Attorney General. Mr. Speaker, even including these two amounts plus a paltry \$100,000 to celebrate the RCMP Centennial the total Department of Industry budget for the forthcoming year is down from last year. When one adds this up and considers the fact that we have seen an increase in royalty rates for oil companies which can do their exploration elsewhere, Mr. Speaker, for they are not confined to Saskatchewan, it adds up to bleak

prospects in the never ending struggle of any provincial government in Saskatchewan. Mr. Speaker, every government has this problem of trying to attract any kind of industry to the province, it has been difficult and it will continue to be but certainly with the attitude taken and shown by this Government that task will be almost impossible. And I submit, Mr. Speaker, we have already lost much of the ground gained by the former Premier who worked so hard to attract capital to this Province for when one listens to the public utterances of investor confidence in Saskatchewan which was built up by the former Liberal administration over the last seven years.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. McIsaac: — Now there is one ray of hope, however, for the unemployed in Saskatchewan, Mr. Speaker, and that is the growth of the bureaucracy in the Provincial Government. A very quick perusal through the estimates and I didn't take time to go through all of them, indicates an increase in the permanent staff of three or four of the major Departments of something over 300 people. One of my colleagues tells me the figure is 800, I'm not sure if that is correct or not but I counted over 300 myself. Now at an average salary of say \$10,000 which incidentally is considerable below the Order-in-Council appointments being made by the Government plus travel and other costs associated with any new position in government this increase in the civil service alone will cost taxpayers of this Province an added \$5 million in itself, not this year but next year and the next year and for years to come, and that increase, Mr. Speaker, is only the beginning because a good number of the new departments proposed by the Government have not yet been fully staffed and fully established. It is quite possible that when these various agencies have been staffed that total cost to the taxpayer will be likely double that \$5 million figure, in the neighbourhood of \$10 million.

I think it is interesting to note where some of those positions are, Mr. Speaker. Here are just a few illustrations. Executive Council, the administration of the Premier's office up from 11 people last year to 17 people. The information services of Executive council up from seven people to 14 people — double. Planning and Research, a new agency of the Premier's office, 14 new positions. Now the Attorney General's Department perhaps will prove more interesting than most others, Mr. Speaker. 30 new positions in the sub-votes that are under his department now and his department has been expanded a bit — 13 of these new positions are in the administration branch of his own particular office. Now, Mr. Speaker, only one brief comment on this; this is one increase that I am sure is justified because the rate at which my Hon. Friend the Attorney General has been putting his foot in his mouth both publicly and privately, if we're going to uphold justice and maintain it when obviously he must have more staff around him and this is one, Mr. Speaker, that we on this side of the House would take no exception to.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. McIsaac: — All in all, Mr. Speaker, I submit it will be obvious to everyone in this Province once we have studied these estimates in Committee that the increase in bureaucracy, new departments, new agencies, new commission established almost daily by this

Government, why we saw two new commissions established over the weekend by the Minister of Education. This will cost in this year's budget alone over \$10 million. In other words, Mr. Speaker, that amount alone is equal to the \$10 million that the Premier was able to bargain for with Ottawa during the course of last summer's Federal-Provincial Conference. In short, his bargaining to date has benefited not the taxpayer of Saskatchewan in any way, shape or form. One other proposal, Mr. Speaker, that I am sure was of interest to everyone on this side of the House, indeed across the province and that was the intention announced and spelled out in the Budget Speech to establish a toll-free hotline. Now no longer will Premier Kosygin and President Nixon have an exclusive on the hotline. Instead we are going to see a hotline available to every citizen here in the Province of Saskatchewan. Now we don't know who is going to man it. Presumably this includes every citizen, including the president of every NDP executive. I am not really concerned, Mr. Speaker, about possible abuses of the hotline as I am to the question of where are the calls going to go and here again, I want to suggest to the Premier that this is one more service I believe sincerely he should keep himself under his personal control. I realize he has a heavy administrative load but looking around at the front bench over there I can't see where else he could put that hotline. I surely hope it doesn't go in the office again of my Hon. friend the Attorney General because his record of questions and answers, straight simple questions, simple answers is well known to the Members of the House and by now of course well known to most people across the province. He is not sure of the insurance rates and last Friday he was proposing to transport grain, Mr. Speaker, over a non-existent rail line somewhere out in the Rockies.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. McIsaac: — What does this Budget hold, Mr. Speaker, for agriculture, one of the announced priorities of the Premier and the Government opposite? Once again as the Treasurer has been pointing out they are concerned with building more and more bureaucracy. Two new branches in the Department of Agriculture, one of farm management, one of planning and research plus an increase in the staff of the administration to 20 odd positions. Over half a million dollars increase right in these new branches. In other words, Mr. Speaker, this windfall Budget provides no windfall for the Saskatchewan farmer whatever. The Department of Agriculture budget does provide for \$640,000 for the administration of the proposed Land Bank and this amount will probably provide jobs for an additional 40 to 50 people. What are they going to be doing, Mr. Speaker? They are going to try and spend \$10 million to buy farm land.

This Land Bank, Mr. Speaker, as presently proposed will not achieve any of the objectives held out for it by the NDP Government opposite. With \$10 million as a capital budget the Government might be able to buy out let's say 200 older farmers at an average of \$50,000 per farm or if the average is lower than say \$50,000 per farm say \$30,000 to \$35,000 per farmer that will probably buy out in the neighbourhood of up to 300 farmers.

Now there is no question, Mr. Speaker, that Saskatchewan farmers who wish to expand and young people who wish to embark on farming are faced with a very major stumbling block in the high cost of land acquisition no one certainly will deny this.

The income problems of our farmers are well known to all Members in this House and I don't propose to get into a discussion on that point at this time. Mr. Speaker, the present proposals of the Land Bank scheme as they have been outlined by the Minister and the Government will not add to the numbers of farmers engaged in agriculture in Saskatchewan, indeed it will reduce the numbers. And what do we see in this Budget as direct aid and assistance for the farmers of Saskatchewan, Mr. Speaker,? Do we see anything like an expanded program for hogs \$2 premium that was introduced by the former Liberal administration? Do we see an expansion of The Livestock Loan Guarantee Act that was introduced by the former Liberal administration? Do we see an expansion of the feed testing laboratory, the soil testing laboratory, the new veterinary laboratory in Regina, all of these measure taken under the former Liberal administration, Mr. Speaker? We see no expansion, we see no addition, and we see no innovations and no new ideas of real value to the farmers of Saskatchewan in this Budget. The Land Bank may be of some value to older farmers wishing to see out to retire from farming and move to town. Incidentally for the Minister's information many of the people attending his meetings across the province were those same older people hoping to benefit from selling their land rather than of those who are concerned in buying and operating.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. McIsaac: — There is nothing in the Minister's white paper on the Land Bank, Mr. Speaker, to indicate that the father-son transfer will be facilitated by that Land Bank. Indeed the indications or proposed policies in this regard and this is coming from many individual farmers who sat at his meetings and listened to him indicate that this proposal will not be acceptable to people in that situation.

If the Province wishes to lend its backing to young farmers to utilize the Farm Credit Corporation such a move combined with new amendments to the farm credit regulations, that will be introduced shortly in Ottawa, would offer some real help to younger farmers getting established here in Saskatchewan. They would also be given the opportunity of owning their own farm when they are done. Mr. Speaker, I will support any sound policy put forward by the Government opposite to assist the farmers in Saskatchewan. So far I haven't seen one since they have been in office. The Land Bank scheme, Mr. Speaker, is doomed to failure before it starts. It's not only a hoax, it's a hoax land nationalization scheme, under a phoney name. It is not only a hoax but it is a farce as well now that we see the few numbers of people who will be able to benefit from it. In short, Mr. Speaker, this windfall Budget has no windfalls in it for the farmers of Saskatchewan.

The Provincial Treasurer in the course of his remarks on Friday, also announced a new grant formula for education that is going to be more equitable. This I believe was the essence of his remarks. Mr. Speaker, the Provincial Treasurer, I am sure, as a former Minister of Education himself is only too well aware that the NDP plan is not a new plan at all. Not only is it not a new grant scheme but it is a good deal more rigid than any policies we have developed in our term of office. And if the Government did not spend all of the funds allocated to school grants in last year's budget, Mr. Speaker, that is their responsibility. Grants to schools are paid in four quarterly

cheques and only one of those cheques had gone to school boards before the government changed. The second one may have been in the process of printing but I am not sure. So if less money was spent than was originally budgeted, then the Hon. Members opposite are responsible for that, Mr. Speaker.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. McIsaac: — Let us assume that the increase of \$8 or \$12 million whatever it is over last year's budget for school grants, Mr. Speaker, will probably cover increases in normal growth of costs, increases in salaries for teachers, for janitorial staff and others but by the Premier's own comments the average mill rate for school purposes will not go down as it did last year under the former policy.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. McIsaac: — It will still be around 43 mills and no closer to their promised 25 mills for education support. Not only that, Mr. Speaker, we shall see wider variations in the mill rates of various school boards across the province if the Treasurer brings in grant legislation as outlined in his Budget speech. I can't believe that he will because the way in which he allocates that \$8 or \$12 million will certainly have a bearing on how satisfactory that will be and how much help that grant money will really be improving the quality and equality in education throughout this Province. We're still no closer to their promise of 25 mills. Now if the Government wanted to show some innovation and some imagination they should have concentrated on a new grant formula that doesn't use the present inequitable mill rate structure as its base.

The University of Saskatchewan, Mr. Speaker, sees the smallest grant increase this year that we have seen in recent years, in short no windfall for the university in this Budget. Capital grants down substantially from last year. Total staff is down in the estimates and will be down more and hundreds of non-tenure teaching staff have received notice that they may not be rehired.

Now it is undoubtedly true, Mr. Speaker, that earlier projections of our University here in Saskatchewan and indeed others across the country for future university enrolment were probably overstated. The glut of university graduates on the job markets of North America over the last few years has certainly been a factor. I am sure, in the scaling down of those high projections but surely this in itself is no reason to reduce the capital spending in some of the older facilities where improvements are still required in the University of Saskatchewan. Once again no windfall for the university student, no windfall here in this Budget for the university professor or for the construction workmen who normally look to the university capital programs for work and for activity. Well, you might say, Mr. Speaker, surely there has to be something in this Budget for some aspect of life in Saskatchewan. Let's look at the rural municipalities, grid road construction down — in total a stand pat budget for rural municipalities. If anything we shall be seeing increases in municipal mill rates across the province this year.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. McIsaac: — No windfall for the rural municipality. What about the urban municipality? We have a lot of urban Members opposite, here in almost any category you look at, Mr. Speaker. The police grants are down but then mind you that may be made up for by the fact that the Attorney General's budget is up. Snow removal grants for the cities are down, in short, Mr. Speaker, there is no windfall and no benefit here for the urban dweller and the urban taxpayer in this Budget before us. His homeowner grant won't even be up over last year, maybe \$6 or \$8, but about the same as last year.

This Budget, Mr. Speaker, I submit demonstrates very closely that the NDP can only see one side of responsible budgeting. They are interested only as always in carving up the economic pie. No thought or effort is given to baking more and generating more economic activities so that there is indeed a pie in the years ahead to cut up and spread around to people of the province. This year is a perfect illustration of my earlier statement that they are spending millions of Federal Liberal dollars this year earned by the hard bargaining of the former Premier of this Province and they are spending it in a reckless abandon, Mr. Speaker, and of little actual benefit to the taxpayers of this Province. The chief benefit is in the increase of bureaucracy in every agency of government right across this Province.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. McIsaac: — In the Treasurer's own words, Mr. Speaker, much of that increase in equalization grants won't be available to Saskatchewan next year and that can mean only one thing for the future, either bankruptcy or the highest tax levels we have ever seen in this Province. Mr. Speaker, it is for this reason that I cannot support the motion before us.

Mr. F. Meakes (Touchwood): — Mr. Speaker, in rising to take part in this 1972 Budget Debate, I want to congratulate the Hon. Member from Morse (Mr. Wiebe) for attaining his seat in this Legislature. Some of our people worked hard to see he wouldn't get here but nevertheless he managed to make it even with a reduced majority. I also want to congratulate the Member from Souris-Estevan (Mr. Thorson) who isn't in his seat today. I was especially pleased to see that election won. He and I came into this House at the same time in 1956 and those of us who sat with him at that time knew that he was a young man with a great deal of ability, who, we felt, would well make his mark on the provincial scene before he retired of old age. He did that in his community. Certainly anyone who worked in the Souris-Estevan campaign, and I am sure Hon. Members across the way will agree, that nothing was said against the Hon. Member.

I want to say to all new Members of the Legislature who have come here for the first time, last June, that at times it may be a frustrating experience but all in all it is a very worthwhile experience. As I said many times before it is an experience that we should feel humble about. There is a very small majority of society that is ever lucky enough to be chosen to some and sit in this Legislature.

I want now to congratulate the Provincial Treasurer for the best Budget, I think, that has ever been brought down in this House...

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Meakes: — ...and certainly there is more for the people of Saskatchewan down by the previous Government. I am sure that the people of Saskatchewan regardless of political beliefs are going to say that it is a good Budget.

Now I come to the provincial critic, the Hon. Member from...I forget where it is...

Mr. MacPherson: — Albert Park.

Mr. Meakes: — Yes, Albert Park (Mr. MacLeod). You know I felt a little sorry for him having to get up for the first time, really his first Session, and have to get up and be the financial critic, especially financial critic of a Budget such as we are facing here today. I do think that he beclouded the issue but otherwise as I consider it being the first time, I suppose that he did a fairly good job. Certainly he must have found it very hard to criticize such a good document. I can't help but wonder why my Hon. friend from Milestone (Mr. MacDonald) with all his experience didn't lead off in that debate. I think it was the natural thing to do.

I couldn't help when listening to the remarks of both the Opposition Members who just sat down — and I am sorry that the Provincial Treasurer isn't here — but I thought of the words of Kipling when he said:

If you can bear to hear the truth you've spoken,
Twisted by knaves to make a trap for fools
And watch the things you gave your life to, broken
And stoop to build 'em up with worn-out tools,

Yours is the Earth and everything that's in it
And what is more — you'll be a man my son.

I come to just a few of the remarks made by my hon. friend the financial critic and he said that it was the most disappointing Budget ever heard delivered in the Province of Saskatchewan.

Mr. Messer: — Obviously a new Member.

Mr. Meakes: — Yes, that is right. He is obviously a new Member. He went on and he talked about the \$70 million that the previous Government had turned over. Well you know what he didn't go on to say was that there is pretty well always that \$70 million. In fact I believe that in 1964 when the New Democratic Government turned over to the Liberal Government there was something like \$84 million. There is always that money that is in the different funds. There was about \$84 million which was turned over by the previous Government to the Liberal Government in 1964. I am glad and I want to congratulate them that they kept those funds fairly full and they were able to turn over \$70 million. But really, and I am sure, Mr. Speaker, that all Members across the way will really agree that this is not a surplus.

March 13, 1972

Then he went on to talk about a poor cousin Budget. He talked about the extra money that was received from Ottawa. But the fact is that one of the reasons for this increase in money from Ottawa is that Saskatchewan's economy over the last three or four years has been down and it has become a have-not province. And so under the equalization grants, Saskatchewan received more money.

He went on and talked about the pulp mill, the cancelling of the pulp mill and the iron mine. You know my hon. friends across the way seem to have forgotten that there was an election last spring and that the pulp mill philosophy and the give-away philosophy of giving away natural resources of the people of Saskatchewan was rejected and rejected completely, by the people of Saskatchewan.

Then he compared Saskatchewan with Alberta and British Columbia – something like comparing lemons with oranges – then talked about how well off Alberta is. They didn't need an inheritance tax. I happen to know, Mr. Speaker, that the Alberta Budget is going to be on about \$220 million deficit. And just in case – we have a fairly good government here, a good budget and other people think the same – I am going to read just a little bit from an editorial in the Daily Colonist from Victoria. This is about the Throne Speech but it certainly applies to the Budget of Saskatchewan as well. I am only going to read a part of it. It says:

If the people of British Columbia need a reminder of the inadequacy of the Speech from the Throne given at the start of the 1972 Session in the Legislature nearly six weeks ago, it was provided the other day in Saskatchewan. The opening speech of the prairie province's Legislature unveiled a wide variety of government plans, with sufficient detail to allow a worthwhile discussion, not only within the Assembly but on the street. A healthy state of political affairs is nourished through constructive criticism and Premier Allan Blakeney is inviting this by revealing at once what he intends to do.

And further on it says:

While the plight of the aged on fixed income in an inflationary period is a prime problem in this province of Saskatchewan where the people were given assurance of relief at the outset of the Legislative Session. Premier Blakeney announced creation of a Land Bank Commission which will rent land to farmers who cannot afford or would prefer not to be landowners. It was described as one means to strengthen the family operated farm by easing the transfer of farm lands from one generation to the next and to facilitate the entry of young men into farming.

There is substance for the people to get their teeth immediately into other legislative plans announced in the Throne Speech. The appointment of a Human Rights Commission and an official Ombudsman, lowering the age of majority from 19 to 18, new consumer laws to control pyramid selling, give the people the right to see their credit rating files, new services and financial assistance for merchants and small business concerns, increases

in royalties and taxes charged against mining operations, expansion of no-fault car insurance, greater benefits included at 140 per cent in weekly indemnity. This gives some idea how the people are being informed and not kept in the dark until the legislation is eventually introduced which is Mr. Bennett's way of doing.

You know I felt a little sorry for the financial critic on Friday last when he complained about not being able to get a copy of the Estimates until just before he walked into the House, although certainly in the years that I have been here it was never any different. We never received those until after the Provincial Treasurer delivered his speech. I thought, oh, well he will have all weekend to prepare himself, but after three days of him studying it and after me listening for close to an hour, I don't think it would have really mattered if you had given it to him three days, or three weeks ahead, because I don't think that he could have done any better job of trying to find holes in a document which is as good as it is.

I am sorry that the Member for Wilkie (Mr. McIsaac) has left his seat. He talked about the increase of positions in the Executive Council. He was very careful not to say that there was going to be a smaller vote this year in the Executive Council than last year.

Something that the Members across the way have been inferring for weeks, every since the Hon. Attorney General (Mr. Romanow) suggested that they might ship grain through the Pacific Great Eastern and get more grain into the Vancouver Ports. They tried to intimate — I think they said 40 miles of railway — needed to be built.

I don't know how many Members read the news item on the weekend and I believe it was in the Leader-Post in which it said that the CNR has already run 100 cars of wheat on the Pacific Great Eastern. I think they should remember that the suggestion by the Attorney General was not an impossible one. It is possible to transfer boxcars from the CNR to the Pacific Great Eastern with very little extra trouble or cost.

Mr. Speaker, before I turn to the Budget there is just one other thing I should like to mention. Last week there was an editorial in the Leader-Post, an editorial on my old friend Minty Lopston who was the Member for Saltcoats. That editorial referred to him and Mr. Danielson as the 'Gold Dust Twins'. If Hon. Members will check the records you will find that was not the name that they were called, in fact, I believe that it was Minty Lopston who dubbed the then Premier Douglas and Clarence Fines as the 'Gold Dust Twins'. They were referred to for quite a number of years as the 'Gold Dust Twins' by the Hon. Member, the then Member for Saltcoats. In return, the Premier of that day, Premier Douglas, nicknamed the Member for Saltcoats and the member for Arm River as the 'Dead End Kids'.

I just say that to keep the records straight. I know, Mr. Speaker, that you and the Minister of Natural Resources were the only two Members in the House when I came here, but I certainly do well remember the fact that it was Mr. Lopston who nicknamed the Premier and the Provincial Treasurer of that day the 'Gold Dust Twins'.

As I said, Mr. Speaker, I intend to speak on the Budget in two parts. First on the Budget, then I should like to give a

March 13, 1972

resume of my trip to Malaysia this fall.

The Budget as I see it and as I said earlier, is the best budget ever brought down in this House. There are just two or three things that I should like to talk about. I look at it naturally because this is an agricultural province, I look at the Budget and I see that there is to be \$2 million more spent for agriculture. I am pleased that this Government is putting an emphasis on the Department of Agriculture.

Going over the Estimates I see that the Land Bank is one of the priorities that the Government is emphasizing. We will have much more to say later on the Land Bank, but I just want to say here and now that this gives me a great deal of satisfaction when I look at the average age of a farmer in Saskatchewan today — about 57 — and we are now developing a program in which we hope that we can turn farms over from father to son in particular. I might hope that within 10 years that we could reduce the age of the farmer in Saskatchewan from 57 to 47.

I see in the Estimates that there are two new branches in the Department of Agriculture, one in Planning and Research. I want to compliment the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Messer) on this. I think this is one of the very important things that past governments have not done. We must have planning and we must have research. We must be able to produce information to our farmers that will help them to make decisions, make the proper decisions, of what they will be doing in the years ahead.

Also I think that the Farm Management Branch is another very important thing. Farmers — if they are going to survive in this economic jungle that we live in — are going to need a lot of advice and a lot of guidance.

When you go through that agricultural vote you see that practically every vote — sub-vote has been increased. I could not help but think and remember last year when the Hon. Minister of Agriculture of that previous government stood here and I told him if they weren't prepared to do something to assist the farmers, that the Minister would not be here in the next House.

The other thing in the Budget that I should like to talk about for one minute is the Department of Co-operation. Through the last seven years this Department has been neglected and downgraded. I remember last winter when the then Hon. Minister of Co-operatives, the Hon. Mr. Heald, admitted that the Department of Co-operation was on the way out. Certainly the record of a large majority of the Liberal Party through the recent years has been anti-co-op.

In my opinion, never in the history of people of Canada and in fact of all the world, are co-ops needed as they are now. I think there are many new areas that the Department of Co-operation should be looking at. I remember one year ago this spring when I was in Ottawa, visiting a poor man's co-op, I think this should be well looked at. I think that co-op methods are logical in the ownership of land, machinery, farm land and farm machinery if they are going to survive. I think there is need to reapply orient the goals of the Department so that it can be a powerful agency in our economic system.

There are so many good things in the Budget to talk about but I am going to leave that to other Members because, as I said, I want to talk about my trip to Malaysia. I could spend some time talking about the Human Rights Commission, which is very close to my heart, the Ombudsman, Property Improvement Grants or the Department of Consumer Affairs, or a better deal for Education. Or talk about the Department of Environment or the work and wage program. I could go on and on.

But I shall leave that to other Members of the House — on this side at least — who will be talking about it and so I should like to move on.

I said a few minutes ago that I wish to report on my trip to the 17th Commonwealth Parliamentary Conference held last September in Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia. I feel that the Conference and my trip should be reported on in some length. I realize that our annual meeting of the Commonwealth parliamentary Association held each year in the Dome Cafe is short, time does not permit and speeches must be short.

Yet I believe that these conferences are important to us here in Saskatchewan and I should like to put on the record of this Legislature a report of the Conference, both its weaknesses and its successes.

My first words must be thanks to my colleagues in Caucus, to the Premier for choosing me to represent Saskatchewan. I might say that this is the first time that a Member of the New Democratic Party has gone to a Commonwealth Parliamentary Conference, Mr. Speaker, since you went in 1962.

All my life I have had an obsession to travel to see the world. This was an opportunity that only comes to a few people and I consider myself very lucky to have had the opportunity to go and to take part in the Conference. I want to divide my report into four parts: the Conference itself, the tour of Malaysia, my views on the Conference and then the rest of my trip around the world.

As many Members are aware all travel expenses for delegates are paid by the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association, that is, I was supplied an air ticket from Regina to Kuala Lumpur and return. When I got to Malaysia I turned in my return ticket, put up another \$500 and bought a ticket that took me to Singapore to Hong Kong, New Delhi, Switzerland and Britain. While I was in Malaysia I was a guest of the Government of Malaysia, I was also supplied \$150 from our local Parliamentary Association.

As far as the Conference was concerned it was an outstanding success. I am absolutely convinced that these conferences are worthwhile efforts towards international understanding. To quote the King of Malaysia or in Malay, His Majesty the Yang di-Pertuan Agong, in opening the Conference said:

It is our belief that a criss-crossing of relations among countries in a spirit of mutual tolerance has a beneficial effect on the quest for international peace and stability. The development of extensive relations in addition to contributing to one's own national self-interest also encourages international understanding through greater awareness of the affairs of others.

The mere fact of meeting, discussing, visiting with delegates from the different countries is not only educational but very soul satisfying. All branches of the Commonwealth were represented except for Alberta, Barbados, Guinea, Haryana, Malta and Newfoundland. There were 152 delegates, 23 secretaries to delegations and 8 observers registered for the Conference. Words of congratulations must go to the Local Malaysian Branch. All arrangements from when we were met at the airport to when we left were fantastic. Every plan of movement was faultless.

The Conference was held during the second week of our stay in Malaysia in their beautiful House of Parliament. The building was built a little over a decade ago, it modernistic in design, situated in a large park area with modern and beautiful architecture. The complex consists of a 17- story office building for the Members of Parliament and a three-story structure for the Parliament room, the Senate, the dining area, etc. all in all, it is a parliament structure to be proud of. The chamber itself that we met in is a very beautiful room, very modernistic in design with good acoustics.

There were 18 delegates from Canada, two from the Senate, five from the House of Commons, one delegate each from eight provinces and three Canadian members of the executive of the Canadian Parliamentary Association. We were also, Mr. Speaker, very fortunate to have as the secretary of the Canadian Provincial delegations our own Clerk of the Legislature, Mr. Gordon Barnhart. I want to pay tribute to his hard work and dedication to keeping us all informed of the next move. Practically every night we were there, sometimes between midnight and next morning, there was a note under my door from him telling us what was coming up next.

Naturally, there were no decisions or agreements made at this Conference. That is the duty of heads of state. Rather, it was forum for discussion of the important issues facing the Commonwealth in 1971.

The discussions ranged around four headings: 1. The Commonwealth and the problems of world security. 2. The challenges to parliamentary democracy. 3. Economic development. 4. Problems of the environment.

Each one of these subjects were broken down into at least three subheads. I spoke on the subject of human rights, freedom of the individual within a parliamentary democracy. We were allowed 10 minutes. I must say I found it hard to cover the subject in that short a time. But because I believe that governments by the wishes of the people are getting bigger and bigger with more authority than ever before, it becomes important that we legislators must never lose sight of the dangers of losing these very important rights. I believe that what I said at the Conference is relative to the Legislature, I ask permission to quote extensively from my speech at the Conference.

I hope in the next few minutes to try to do justice to a subject which in my opinion should be central to any conversation, whether it is in a parliamentary conference or in this House.

Wherever politicians meet together and in the context of the challenges of a parliamentary democracy how can

the potentially conflicting concepts of human rights, freedom of the individual and authority to the maximum. One of the difficulties one faces when considering phrases as 'freedom of the individual' and 'human rights' is that the definitions attached to the phrases are very diverse. Everyone has his own idea of what freedom is, his own idea of what rights are basic and which are not so important. In fact, it is probably true to say that it is the differences of opinion over the meaning in the content of those words 'human rights' and 'freedom' which has resulted in the very political ideologies represented in our Commonwealth. The importance of this problem of definition should be clear to people subscribing to an involved in a system of parliamentary democracy. It is only when the governing machinery of that democracy is in touch with the people being governed and when the definition of human rights or freedom practised by the elected representatives closely represents the feelings and the opinions of the people doing the electing, then that particular democracy can be certain it has taken the first step and ensured its security.

I believe, Mr. Speaker, that we in the NDP were talking the language of the electorate last spring and we must see if we can continue to communicate with them.

One only has to look at the current world situation to see a number of instances where the governing bodies' definitions and the commitment to human rights and fundamental freedoms is out of step with the rising expectations of at least some segments of the people being governed.

It is this inability or unwillingness on the part of the political structure in our democratic parliamentary system to adapt its thinking, to redistribute its power in line with contemporary context of human dignity. This presents a most serious challenge to continued existence of democratic bodies. In my opinion it is going to be uncertain over the next few years as to whether our institutions and the people in them can be responsive enough to changing human conditions to survive or whether the superstructures created have become incapable of treating every citizen in the way that that citizen is going to demand to be treated, that is, as a human being entitled equally with every other citizen to the basic amenities and opportunities necessary to developing his humanity to the fullest.

I have been talking about the problem of defining human rights and the challenge this presents to a parliamentary democracy in ensuring that the government's definition reflects the electors' point of view.

There is, however, a second aspect to the challenge and one which is probably more important in present day terms than in the problem of agreeing on which rights are basic and whose freedoms are going to be protected. That aspect relates to the need for commitment on the part of government once basic definitions of philosophy are agreed on. It is pretty easy to agree in some abstract way that human rights are important and must be safeguarded, everybody agrees with that. To get even more

specific it is easy to pay lip service to the United National Charter or the United Nations Covenant on economic, Social, Cultural Rights or the Covenant on Civil and Political Rights. In my opinion the fastest way to discredit our democracies, to turn our people off, to bring about violence and civil disobedience, so prevalent at present, is to pay lip service to the need to guarantee a basic level of human existence and then fail to follow through with the action needed to live up to the spirit of the Charter and the Covenant. Our institutions will not be around much longer, and in my view rightly so, if we are long on pious talk on the trappings of office, on outdated protocol and on the pomp and glitter of the role of the Queen or her representative, but we are short on legislative action which guarantees free education, decent housing, liveable environments and all the other basic needs.

The double standard which allows legislators in a democracy to say that such programs are too expensive and at the same time making certain that their families do have a good education, adequate housing facilities and a nice suburban environment, it is being hypocritical to the extreme.

It is an attitude more suited to an aristocracy and is increasingly seen as such, not only by the poor and the uneducated and the inarticulate members of our society, but by an increasing number of people to whom affluence is hollow, in Canada what we call the middle class and the young. The mass, the majority of our citizens in our countries are committed to attaining some basic degree of equality of opportunity now and the arguments of politicians and power groups with vested interests to protect or the lack of commitment to ensure maximum freedom and dignity to all citizens are simply not acceptable. Politicians in parliamentary democracies who lack this commitment will in fact be a basic cause of social unrest if they don't safeguard every individual of social unrest if they don't safeguard every individual human right and not just the rights of select groups in our society. The possibility that we as elected representatives may cause our political system to come into increasing disrepute should be surely a challenge to all of us.

I should like now to turn briefly to the authority of government in our parliamentary system in an attempt to make clear that there is no necessary contradiction between the need to safeguard the freedom of the individual and the need to maintain the authority of government that is to keep some semblance of order in the system.

One hears a great deal in Canada and elsewhere about the breakdown of authority, of the increase in crime and social disobedience, of the need for law and order so that the government's authority will not be flaunted and institutions abused.

There seems to be a belief among some segments of our society that authority per se is desirable simply because it makes life more certain. In my view this is a question of what type of authority governments should exercise and what is the other side of the coin, so to speak,

of the problem of the definition of freedom of human rights. It is equally a challenge to the continued existence of parliamentary democracy. It is the other side of the coin because in my opinion authority based should only be heeded when it is broadly and properly based. It must be founded on something other than the trappings of office or the awe or the strict adherence to rules and precedents which hinder the progress and thereby discredit our institutions that are must with time and therefore retained. In fact, and this has great relevance in my opinion for the parliamentary system, the authority must be based on something much more substantial than the Crown, than on a figurehead whether church, or state. If the authority of government is not based on generally thorough going democratic process in which every citizen has access to the decision makers regardless of how great the superstructure and bureaucracy may be the government's authority will be lessened. Non-parliamentary bodies based on a more legitimate authority of broad public support will come about. If big governments, the needs of which I don't question, cannot keep in touch with ordinary people and if elected representatives fail to take time to treat every individual as worthy of attention and deserving a fair hearing the artificial authority to which I referred will not be sufficient to maintain the degree of order needed for our society to function smoothly. Governmental authority will only be accepted and a parliamentary system will only go unchallenged when it bases itself on appreciation of and the respect for the lives and the opportunity to develop the lives of every individual who must submit to that authority.

If we are unable to take advantage of technological innovation to keep in constant contact with our citizens, if we do not establish ombudsmen or justice dispensers throughout the governmental structure, if we ourselves don't act as guarantors of all citizens' basic human rights then the disaffection and alienation which our governmental institutions are currently experiencing will ultimately engulf them and cause a complete breakdown of that type of unresponsive dream world of government authority.

In the short run of course, authority in the old sense will be effective in maintaining order in the system. Sanctions will still be available to use against those who do not obey the laws or the commands issued under the authority of government. But as civil disobedience has shown over and over, authority enforced at the barrel of a gun or the jaw of a dog is not likely to be effective over time and is scarcely consistent with the mutual consent which should characterize the laws and actions of a particularly democracy.

I'll go on now with my report. I was surprised and pleased that the Canadian delegates representing nine governments and four political parties were very close in their thinking on all the subjects discussed. I can sincerely say that I was in near agreement with every Canadian speech made and believe all made a good contribution.

I did in a way feel sorry for the British delegates. Whether the subject under discussion was selling arms to South

March 13, 1972

Africa or the problems of world security, they had little support for their actions and policies. Basically, the only delegates who gave them any support were the Australian delegates and a few from New Zealand.

I was extremely impressed with many of the delegates from the newer emerging nations. There were several delegates from the African nations, Ceylon and India that were outstanding orators. Most of them were younger men and I expect to hear more of them in the future. It was very noticeable that all of them are very much afraid of the three great powers, Russia, the United States and China. All of them are afraid that democracy in their countries will fail unless the economic conditions of their citizens are improved. All of them are looking to the more advanced nations like Canada, for help, especially technical education in training people to go out and teach.

In Malaysia itself there are a number of Canadians there for two-year terms working for CUSO. The Canadian High Commissioner held a reception for all the Canadian delegates and invited all Canadians that lived in Kuala Lumpur to attend. We had a very pleasant and informative evening. I met several Saskatchewan people and was very proud to meet the head of the CUSO group. He grew up in the Touchwood Constituency in the town of Cupar. These people are to be given great credit. They give a couple of years of their lives at low pay to assist their fellowmen.

Let me return, Mr. Speaker, if I may, to our so-called democratic processes in Canada. We here in this Legislature and other Legislatures tend to think we have democracy down to a fine point. We tend to think our administration of justice is good. We tend to think that our administration of welfare in Canada is good. We tend to think that we have a good educational system. To all this I say, "Baloney."

Let me first deal with our democratic process. How many of us here in this Legislature say we truly can represent our voters. Certainly, we have our political machinery and Party. I don't know about other parties, but we as New Democrats endeavour to consult our Party members and workers and are prepared to follow the instructions of conventions, etc. But I am afraid in many cases the other people, the poor, and the inarticulate, are not heard and are often forgotten. Most of us cannot be aware of their needs, desires and their wishes to be masters of their own destiny. Too often they have no change to decide what is best for themselves. I am convinced if we do not change our ways in the years ahead we will have unrest and dissension on our hands.

I turn to Justice. Certainly we have a different justice for the poor than the rich. If I can afford to hire the most brilliant lawyer my chances are good to get off. The poor are often forced to plead guilty. There is no doubt this is one of the main causes of the growing disillusionment in our society towards law, the courts and our police force. A way must be found to give all people the same opportunity before the law. This is why our jails are full of poor people, a large proportion of them native people. I see it happening every day in my area. We must find a solution or remain in peril.

Let me turn to Welfare. The Canada Assistance Plan and the Saskatchewan Assistance Plan at its best are, half-measure

stop-gap plans. They are based on the premise that no one should physically starve, period. There are other forms of starvation. Starvation of the mind and starvation of human dignity. In my opinion the Plan tends to destroy the recipients' initiative and pride of self. Sell everything you own and when you are down to \$1,000 — enough for a decent burial — then we will feed you for the rest of your life. If you go out to work part time you won't get so much assistance. In fact, this in my mind, is an important reason for raising the minimum wage. Many people have told me that they couldn't get as much money working as from welfare. Yet, welfare is still a precarious living. I still have faith in humanity that the great majority of people would much sooner have a meaningful job than welfare.

Let me turn to Education. Our educational system is geared as I see it, as aimed to train good technical workers for corporate industry and the capitalistic system. They are taught the philosophy of making money. They are not taught to think of their fellowman, of the common good. No, it's grub, grub and grub.

We are now in this great new technological age where man will work less. Twenty-five years ago Walter Reuther talked of learning to live with leisure. Here we live in this beautiful wonderful space ship called earth, yet most people are so immersed in trying to keep the wolf from the door, they have no time or knowledge of enjoying a flower or a bird or a western prairie sunset or even a blizzard. How many Beethovens or Reynolds or Shakespeares may there have been who never had a chance to grow in the interest of their choice? How many Gordie Howes, Babe Ruths or Arnold Sneads are there who never had the opportunity to prove themselves?

More important, how many Dr. Bantings or Chester Ronnings have we lost because our youth has not had the opportunities to develop their best potential. Instead, we see them slip on to the unemployment rolls and into the sea of despair.

It seems to me that we are going to have to find the money and the way to channel the energy and the minds of our youth or we may have trouble on our hands. We have to find new answers to new problems. I feel, Mr. Speaker, that this Budget has started and is hopeful of doing something to solve some of these problems.

I should just like to say a few words about the rest of my trip. I want first to say that Malaysians are lovely and wonderful people. I have been around the world now, but I have been in many countries and have never met a people who are as friendly and as smiling as they are. Kuala Lumpur is a city of one and three quarter million population. It was nothing to walk out in the morning and see utter strangers smiling and greeting one another, to be met on the sidewalk by a policeman who smiled and said good morning to you. It is a country of beautiful tropical growth. The average temperature is a low of 70 and high 90s the year round, with 110 inches of rain. It rains every day. The sun gets up in the morning and sometimes between 2:00 o'clock and 4:00 o'clock it clouds over and it doesn't just rain, it pours. By evening the sun is shining again before it goes down.

Kuala Lumpur is a very modern city. Everyone is busy. The countryside is tropical and beautiful, but farming methods are backward.

March 13, 1972

Their four main exports are rubber, tin, coconut and palm oil. The population of Malaysia is about 50 per cent Malaysian, 30 per cent Chinese and 10 per cent Indian, the rest cosmopolitan. A large part of the Malaysian people live in the country and in the villages. The business sector is mostly Chinese. Actually the Chinese came about 125 years ago to Malaysia when tin was found and they are the wealthy group in society.

I might say that their government — a supposed Democratic Government — the democracy veneer is very thin. From May 13, 1969, to February 20, 1971, it was a police state. On May 13, 1969, they had an election and that night it was found that the political party had collected a little over 50 per cent of the votes, a party based around nationalism of the Malaysian people. That evening there were riots in the streets and the police state took over, Parliament was suspended. They did after one year and three-quarters call another election and it is now back to the democratic process.

I might say — and I want to repeat the Malaysian Attorney General's remarks when we were discussing revolution one morning, a discussion of the parliamentary procedures — the Attorney General made the statement that there was never any need for a country to worry about revolutions. All you had to do was to make sure that the police, the army were well fed, well clothed and well looked after; that the children were fed and educated and there would be no revolution.

Most of the rubber plantations and the palm plantations are owned by absentee landlords mostly from Britain and also most of the tin mines. Most of those are absentee owned. Very interestingly enough there has been no talk about nationalization. What they have done is to tax the profits of these landlords. Any money which goes out of the country is taxed heavily before it leaves.

Rubber plantation workers — and it is a very expert job — work for \$3 per day which is about \$1 Canadian. Sometime I hope to go back to Malaysia. I should like to go back and find something useful to do as it is a lovely country.

I went from there to Singapore, Hong Kong, New Delhi, Agra, Switzerland and London. That trip has left an imprint on my mind and memory that has in many ways left me a very different person, with many of my lifetime views in serious question.

I am convinced that unless we in the Western World are prepared to share now, our abundance, our good fortune with those underprivileged people of the world, they will come and take it from us. I will never forget the thousands and thousands of Hong Kong families living in the squalor of their small boats, anchored in some of the bays of the Port. Here children are born, grow into manhood and die. Their sewage system is the sea. Yet, Hong Kong with a skyline like New York is bursting at the seams with luxurious hotels, high-rise apartments and office buildings. It is claimed that Hong Kong is the cheapest place to buy in the world. Why? I'll tell you why. Factory workers work as long as 72 hours a week at starvation wages. Hong Kong is still full of rickshaws and coolies burdened down with heavy loads on their shoulder yokes.

In Hong Kong, as in Singapore, east meets west, north meets south. Every nation, every language is seen and heard yet English remains the language of communication.

Here, on the edge of China it sits, certainly with the permission of China. China could take it overnight. I imagine china has been glad to use it as an unofficial mouthpiece or speaking tube to the rest of the world.

It is interesting to note that the Chinese Government has several retail stores in Hong Kong, where Chinese products are sold. Also, Hong Kong gets its water, drinking water, from China, over the mountains and through the New Territories by pipelines.

From Hong Kong I went to India and India I will never forget if I live to be 150 years old. It is a country of contradictions and contrasts. The most startling thing is the number of human beings. If one hasn't seen it, nobody on the North American Continent can imagine how many people there are. Five hundred and fifty million people — with a net population increase — that is after you subtract the deaths and the births of one million people a month, 12 million a year. As I said it is a country of contradictions and contrasts. You see the professional beggars, children that were maimed at birth with broken legs and twisted legs at birth so that they become professional beggars. Yet you see the people working. One of the things that I noted was, especially in the areas where I was, there was no unemployment.

For the first time India was beginning to be self-sufficient, not on our standards of living, but for the first time in 1971 they could say they are now self-sufficient. One of the things that I realized, after discussing with Indian delegates in Malaysia and again in India, that there was going to be war if the United Nations didn't do something about that 8.5 million Pakistani refugees. As they said to me "We can't feed 8.5 million refugees and see 8.5 million of our people go hungry."

I couldn't get into East Pakistan and I am very sorry because many years ago I had some friends in east Pakistan and I should have liked to have visited them.

But certainly in India one of the things that impressed me was their culture. When you went to Taj Mahal and saw the beauty of the knowledge and the beauty of the 1600s, or when you went to Old Delhi and saw the ruins dating back close to 4,000 years; when you saw on the roadside the wells and the women pulling the water out of the well and carrying the pitchers on their heads it made you realize that this was the same as it was in the time of Christ. When I talked to the guide that I had and he was a very delightful Hindu, when you talked to him about this culture, when he took me to his temple, it seems to me that we have a lot of audacity to send missionaries there to civilize them.

The hotel that I stayed in was the Hashora Hotel owned by the Indian Government. The United Nations wanted to meet in India and they asked Prime Minister Nehru in 1946 if they could have a place to meet in 1947. Private industry wouldn't build a hotel so the government built it. It takes 1,500 people to staff that hotel.

I think, maybe, the greatest thing that I got out of India was the ultimate faith that democracy was going to win in India. When I asked them how can a democratic society of well over 550 million people work, one Indian said it was heat and dedication and with belief, "It is working and it is going to

March 13, 1972

work more.” It didn’t matter whether you talked to the guide or the fellow who worked in the hotel or the cab driver the feeling was the same.

When I left India I felt that here is a country with hopes, with hopes of the democratic process. They said to me — not one, but many — that they had only one fear. They had the fear of the three great powers. They said possibly some action of Russia or China or the United States could stop the growth of democracy in India, but otherwise they said it was growing.

I left it with wonderful memories in my heart.

Well, from there I went to Switzerland and I enjoyed the very beautiful country for a few days. Then I went to Britain and spent half a dozen days in London. But I came home realizing how small, yet so big a world we live in. A wonderful world yet torn with strife and war. A beautiful world spoiled by man with his pollution and his destruction and wilful thoughtlessness. A world of cruelty to our fellowman. I came home dedicated to do my share to save it.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that the Budget that the Provincial Treasurer has presented is a budget that hopefully can do some small part in making the life of ordinary people better. It gives me a great deal of pride to support the Budget.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Larson (Pelly): — Mr. Speaker, in as much as this is the first time I have had an opportunity to speak in this Session, I want to take the opportunity to congratulate the Member from Souris-Estevan (Mr. Thorson), the Member for Morse (Mr. Wiebe) on their election to this Assembly. I want to congratulate the new Ministers and probably more important, I want to congratulate the Premier and the Provincial Treasurer for the job he did in presenting his Budget.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Larson: — I listened very attentively to the financial critic of the Opposition, the Member from Alberta Park (Mr. MacLeod). I have to agree with my friend from Touchwood (Mr. Meakes) that he certainly had a very difficult task, a very difficult job. It was difficult because it is very hard to pick holes in this kind of a document. Difficult because you have to really delve into the very picayune minor items in order to find very much to say. He strove very hard to create the impression that the whole Budget was a cutback. I want to spend a few minutes looking at it through the eyes of this side of the House.

He suggested that revenues, for example, were totally solely the responsibility of grants from the Federal Government. I am looking at, Mr. Speaker, the 1972-73 Estimates and I find under taxes, general and total taxes, an increase of some \$16 million. Hardly an insignificant item. You look at private privileges licence and permits, again we find about the same amount as last year. Sales and service fees, \$10.7 million compared to \$9.2 last year. Fines, forfeits and penalties \$2.3 compared to \$1.9 and I am using very round figures. Then we get to the item which seemed to create such a tremendous amount of interest and controversy on the other side of the

House and that is receipts from other governments. It is true that under the payment of shared taxes that the Federal Government under equalization payments has increased this by some \$50 million. I think there are two very obvious reasons for this, Mr. Speaker. One is the ability of the Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Blakeney) and his Cabinet and colleagues in negotiating with the Federal Government. I think for too long we have negotiated from a false premise. The negotiating that they did certainly produced results. But there is another reason and I suggest to you that it is a very important reason. If it was necessary for the Federal Government to up equalization payments by some \$50 million this year obviously somewhere along the line we must have become a very 'poor cousin' to quote the financial critic. And certainly this cannot be laid at the door of this Government. Certainly not!

Then I look at total budgetary revenues, I find a total estimate of \$514 million compared to \$451 million last year. Certainly a very healthy indication of the direction that Saskatchewan is going. I could go through the revenues and expenditure estimates in a like manner. He quoted specifically where there are reductions. I am only going to quote at random: agriculture, ordinary, up from \$10.7 to \$12.6; Attorney General, and he seemed to have some very serious misgivings, almost some sinister motives about this. I think that the increase from \$8 million to \$11 million is justified. I think it is something that was overdue because the people of Saskatchewan need additional legal services and our Attorney General and this Government is providing them and the money that is so spent should not be begrudged.

Looking at other Estimates, we find some very substantial increases. When you look at education, when you look at health services and when you look at some of the other very important ones, I think they indicate very clearly the specific purpose of the Budget. Some very disparaging remarks were made about the Budget. Some very disparaging remarks were made about Welfare. I agree that it is an increase from \$29.7 million to \$39.4 million, a substantial increase. I don't think anyone is particularly proud of increases having to be made in welfare programs. The former Government, if they check their Estimates, will find that they found it necessary from year to year, in spite of the attitude they had, to increase welfare payments. Certainly not an item that a government on either side or of either political stripe ought to be scorned for looking after. We would all be happy, we would all be very pleased if we were able to totally wipe out the welfare structure. Unfortunately, from a humanitarian point of view, this is not possible, has not been possible either from a Provincial or a Federal Government point of view. Probably the day is not too far away when we ought to be looking very seriously and doing some very serious planning about a guaranteed annual income, doing away with this whole structure and type of welfare programs and welfare payments.

The Member from Wilkie (Mr. McIsaac) made a couple of remarks that I thought needed a word or two said about and I am sorry that he is not in his seat. He referred to the two-price system for wheat. I think that all Western farmers welcomed the announcement of a two-price system of wheat. I don't think any of us had thought that it was going to be paid out in a fashion where it would look like a direct charitable subsidy to farmers. But very unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, this is precisely what is happening. Rather than a consumer subsidy

which is what it ought to be and which is what it in essence is, it is being paid out in a fashion whereby it looks as if we're getting a dole. Very typical of Liberal actions in an election year. We still, Mr. Speaker, haven't got the principle of a two-price system for wheat in Canada. In one sense yes, under political pressure, definitely not.

The Member from Wilkie also mentioned in almost a sad tone, and I agree with him to a point that probably it is sad, the sale of the Federal Grain Company to the Saskatchewan Wheat Pool. I fail, Mr. Speaker, to read anything wrong into this transaction. I couldn't think of a better place or anywhere I would sooner see the Federal Grain go than to the Saskatchewan Wheat Pool.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Larson: — I want to remind Members opposite of one very important fact concerning this sale, Federal Grain offered themselves for sale to the highest bidder, the highest buyer. Nowhere along the line did the Pool go seeking purchase of the Federal Grain Company. It was put on the market for sale, it was to be sold to the highest bidder. So let no one make any insinuating references to the fact that the Saskatchewan Wheat Pool bought Federal Grain. They bought it in the open market, they bought it at an agreed price and they bought it because it was for sale, Mr. Speaker. If there is anything wrong with this I fail to see it.

I want now to spend a few moments revealing a few items of the Budget of this new Government. I think it is quite clear that the general direction that we planned on going was clearly outlined in the last session, that this direction embraced people and was in line with the New Democratic Party program, 'New Deal for People', already evident at that session. In the hope, probably the vain hope, Mr. Speaker, that Members opposite can grasp what is going on in this Province I again want to remind them of a few things that happened.

I think of deterrent and utilization fees. Well, they're gone, Mr. Speaker. Health care premiums for 65 and over — gone. Bill No. 2 — gone. Increases in the minimum wage — accomplished fact. Forty-hour week — accomplished fact. Family Farm Protection Act in practice and working. The teacher-pupil ratio gone. Chiropractic services under Medical Care soon to be a fact. Resource giveaways — stopped. Student Bursary Programs established and working. In this Budget provisions are made for more New Deals for People. Some are of a major consequence and I will have a little more to say about them, but just let me review for a few moments. The Land Bank to be established. Property Improvement Grants doubling the payments to taxpayers under the Homeowner Grant Program. I will have a little more to say about this later on. Small business assistance, the first of its kind in Saskatchewan. Department of Environment, a bold and necessary step. Education, a new realistic fresh look at equality, at grants, as well as the pertinent needs of education. Add to this, Mr. Speaker, the number of Bills that have already been presented to this House and the list becomes even more impressive. Small wonder the Opposition and the whole Liberal Party are in disarray and disillusioned. Small wonder that every desperate effort is being made to distract and to confuse. Small wonder that all the fuss over radio time, the hiring and firing of some people are being dragged in in an effort to focus

away from the limelight of the real issues and the facts in this House.

It was an interesting and amusing exercise to watch the antics last Friday to your left, Mr. Speaker. When it became obvious that the Provincial Treasurer was presenting a well-documented, far-reaching Budget, the Acting Leader (Mr. MacDonald) very rudely and very unnecessarily interrupted him. Why did he do this? It is very obvious, Mr. Speaker, it was an attempt to distract and to confuse. All in an attempt to gain some political advantage. All through the presentation there was a scrambling and a popping up and down from seat to seat, little notes and figures being passed to the financial critic. All in all, Mr. Speaker, it was a pretty bad performance. A bad performance coming from a political party which on June 23rd last, presented themselves to the people of Saskatchewan as a credible party to govern the province. Small wonder the people reacted as they did and as the result of that reaction, Mr. Speaker, they sit to your left today.

It is very interesting to note the reaction of the Acting Leader of the Opposition. As quoted in the Leader-Post of Friday last, under the heading "Budget said Countdown," Mr. MacDonald had this to say:

Liberal spokesmen Friday described the NDP Government's Budget as a countdown to bankruptcy and a poor cousin Budget. Cy MacDonald, Acting Opposition Leader, while Dave Steuart is in the hospital, predicted that Saskatchewan is destined to become the highest taxed province in Canada within a few years.

Well, Mr. Speaker, all I can say is that the Liberal soothsayers are at it again. These prophets of doom and gloom have made the same predictions for the last 30 years. When the CCF introduced hospitalisation, what was the cry? It will bankrupt the province. When Medicare was introduced the same cry, bankruptcy! When the grid road program was brought in, again it will bankrupt the province and the municipalities. It would be very difficult, Mr. Speaker, to find a more negative and a more unimaginative political party.

I want now, Mr. Speaker, to make some specific comments on various items of interest to me. The elimination of the sales tax on meals up to \$2.50 is to me a very humane and a very desirable move. It never seemed right to me or even humane to tax the sick or the hungry. By eliminating the tax on meals up to \$2.50 no one needs to be taxed for hunger. This measure is certainly in keeping with the principle of humanity first and a New Deal for People.

The Property Improvement Grant is a good program in principle. That property tax relief is needed for harassed property tax owners has been evident for quite some time. The principle of the Homeowner Grant was totally politically motivated. It never made sense to me, Mr. Speaker, to receive from the Premier a letter making statements about industrial development and why I had got this money when I did not see them or believe them. The 13-mill rebate, based on maximum assessments with a minimum of \$70 repayable recognizes a new principle in tax grants. The fact that almost double the amount will be paid out indicates that the principle of equity is at least partially being established. The fact that small businesses are now

March 13, 1972

eligible makes for greater equity that was not recognized by the former Government. The establishment of a Business Assistance Branch under the Department of Industry and Commerce will be welcome news to small businessmen. For too long they have been left to the mercy of their own fate and the competition of well-organized chain stores and the like. There is little doubt in my mind that this will be a help to small towns and villages which are now struggling for their very existence and for survival.

The non-repayable bursaries for students proves that this Government is widely concerned with those seeking an education. It is my sincere hope that these bursaries will be made available to a much larger group than has been in the past. The cost of education to many people is a very formidable load.

The establishment of community colleges, Mr. Speaker, represents a bold and imaginative step into the future of education.

I want now to say a word about the \$10 million set aside to establish a land bank. Let me say at the outset that this is a very modest amount. Let me say further that the idea of a land bank is not new in the world. It's very obviously new to the Liberals and to the Liberal Party. Scandinavian countries, France and of course the Soviet Union have all had some form of land bank. Even the United States has experimented with a form of land bank. The principal function, and I wish the Members opposite would pay particular attention, the principal function of a land bank is entirely dependent on the objective it is designed to achieve. These objectives differ from country to country, and from condition to condition. The Scandinavians use the principle to control and direct the ownership of land to be sure it goes into the hands of farmers in need and not to those who already have large holdings which is enough to meet their needs. The United States has made use of the land bank principle to control production, basically for conservation and overproduction of grains and other commodities. The Soviet Union, on the other hand has used so-called land banks as a method of total control of land resources as well as production. It becomes very obvious and evident, Mr. Speaker, that land banks can be used for different purposes.

Saskatchewan has a different need. The average age of farmers running at approximately 57 years of age and with the economic conditions that make land transfers very difficult and with fewer and fewer young farmers it is necessary to devise some form of land transfer. This is the sole purpose of the proposed Land Bank. It will on the one hand make it possible for those wishing to retire because of age able to do so with enough money to live on and to retire in dignity. It will, on the other hand, make it possible for young farmers to start farming without the added burden of principal payments on land purchases. If and when they are in a position to buy and wish to do so they are free to buy.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I am going to have more to say on this. May I now call it 5:30?

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

Mr. Larson: — Mr. Speaker, when you rose at 5:30 I was briefly reviewing some of the objects and some of the purposes of land banks. I pointed out that the Scandinavian countries have had Land Banks, making use of them, pointed out the purpose of it.

I pointed out the purpose of the United States Land Bank, the Soviet Union Land Bank and I went on to define some of the needs and purposes of the Land Bank in Saskatchewan. I pointed out that it is a different need. I pointed out, for example, that the average age of farmers runs at approximately 57 years of age. I pointed out that there has been a transfer of land from generation to generation in this country that takes place with every generation. I pointed out the difficulty of a farmer who wishes to retire doing so with the high cost of land and the high cost of getting into farming and the almost impossible position of young farmers being able to get enough money. I was closing by saying if and when they are in a position to buy and wish to do so, all young farmers that make use of the Land Bank and are in a position and wish to will be able to buy the land that they lease.

The Members to your left, Mr. Speaker, as usual are able to read all kinds of dark, devious and sinister motives into the scheme. The same kind of red baiting, the same kind of scare tactics, the same kind of gloomy predictions that have prevailed throughout the whole history of the Liberal Party in Saskatchewan is again being mooted and is heard.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Larson: — It might be interesting for them and for this Assembly to review some of the facts in so far as land ownership and land transfer in Saskatchewan is concerned. It is equally interesting to note that the Liberal Government of Canada is looking into the setting up of a program of land purchases on its own. The basic difference, of course, Mr. Speaker, between the Saskatchewan plan and the Federal plan is that one is designed to keep farmers on the land while the Federal program intends to keep farmers off the land. This is the basic difference.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Larson: — It is also a fact, Mr. Speaker, that the problem and the cost of land transfers in Saskatchewan is certainly not a new one. As I have said it goes on continually from one generation to the next. This continuous transferring of land has created a situation of almost perpetual mortgages. A brief review of the Farm Credit Corporation annual Report makes some startling revelations. It shows, for example, that in Saskatchewan alone there are at the present time some 19,808 outstanding loans. It shows that there is a total of some \$2,300,000 that is now due and payable in principal alone. It shows that \$2,964,000 is due and payable in interest charges. It shows that a total of all principal outstanding in Saskatchewan stands at \$315,264,000. It shows a total of \$15,787,000 as outstanding in interest payments alone. This makes a grand total owing to the Farm Credit Corporation in Saskatchewan of \$333,406,000 payable on mortgages on farms. Now add this to the amount that is outstanding to banks, to credit unions, to trust companies and other mortgage and private loans and it is not hard to get a picture of the land ownership and land control in Saskatchewan. To show what has happened to land sales and transfer it is only necessary to again check the Farm Credit Corporation records. From a high of 3,665 loans granted in 1967-68, loans granted have dropped to a low of 992 in 1970-71. Yet, Mr. Speaker,

March 13, 1972

Members opposite brazenly and boldly shout that they are going to oppose the Land Bank.

In its review of the Saskatchewan economy the Budget makes some startling revelations. It shows, for example, that farm income dropped from \$480 million net to \$193 million net in 1970. As most farmers will never forget 1970 was the year of LIFT and Otto Lang.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Larson: — Most farmers won't forget either the events prior to 1970. Most farmers won't forget the new Liberal Leader in a very charismatic and very cocky manner known then as Pierre Elliott Trudeau telling farmers to grow all the wheat you want and we will sell it. They will remember as Prime Minister the famous statement, the very real famous statement that he made with a shrug of his shoulder, "Why should I sell your wheat?"

They have not forgotten either the performance of the Saskatchewan Liberals. To the LIFT program, Liberal Government in power in Saskatchewan, Liberal Government in power in Ottawa, fencing, putting on a sham battle, trying to persuade the farmers that they were helping them out and were very concerned, but privately they were saying, "Amen." To the Task Force Report which recommended the removal of one of every three farms from Saskatchewan, again Liberals said, "Amen." When the Stabilization Bill was proposed they said in unison, "Hurrah, hurrah." When farm organizations rebelled against the Bill, they shouted, "It's the NDP who are stopping it." Truly a remarkable performance, Mr. Speaker. After this kind of action it is small wonder that the people of Saskatchewan rebelled. It's small wonder that the people of Assiniboia rebelled. Liberals in Ottawa and Liberals in Saskatchewan — just too much to take.

No budget, Mr. Speaker, is ever without its sour note and this one is no exception. The \$6.3 million that is set aside to pay for the philandering of the former Government must go down as a sour note with the people of Saskatchewan.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Larson: — It was no easy task or easy decision to cancel the pulp mill or the Doré Lake pulp mill deal. That there was a price to be paid was obviously evident. What was even more evident was the fact that it was not a feasible project to proceed with. Responsible and practical governments of the past and of the future must ask themselves, "What price are we prepared to pay for jobs for our working people. Future governments must realize that industrialization in Saskatchewan is a very big and costly project. Industrialization in Saskatchewan, Mr. Speaker, doesn't come by offering giveaways. It doesn't come by penalizing the most important and the most long-lasting industry we have and that is agriculture. If we think for one moment that agriculture can buy industry in Saskatchewan, then we are talking irresponsibly and we are talking out of turn.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Larson: — We cannot expect and we cannot try to believe that this will ever happen. We must live with the fact that for a long time to come farming will be our backbone and must be looked after.

There is a lot more that I could say in this Budget. But I want to spend a moment or two dealing with some of the other problems that can be and will have a very major effect on this New Democratic Government. And I refer, Mr. Speaker, to inflation and unemployment. I am speaking in terms of all of Canada. Very seldom do you find a country with the potential that Canada has suffering from an overproduction of goods and at the same time suffering from unemployment. It takes a government with lack of planning, with lack of direction and wish lack of purpose to have both inflation and unemployment. With a gross national product increase last year of some 9.2 per cent these things ought not to exist, and they can only be credited to the bungling of a government that doesn't know where they are going.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Larson: — With a Federal election in the offing, with taxpayers' money being pumped into the economy at this time to create jobs that are really fictitious, jobs that should have been planned for, jobs that should have been on the drawing board two and three years ago when the whole world economy pointed in the direction that it has been going for the last year, we now are trying to put a band-aid on a very serious and a very far and long-developing infection. Whatever government happens to be sitting in power in Ottawa after the next election, it is going to find that they are going to have to do some very unpalatable things. Such devices as voluntary restraints on inflation will not work. Such devices as pumping some money into the economy a few weeks and a few months before an election is not going to work. The great and powerful United States with the tremendous amounts of money, the tremendous amounts of expansion, have found that they could not depend on the private sector, they found that they could not depend on capitalism and its ravages to cure both inflation and unemployment. And therefore they were forced and compelled into doing the kind of things that President Nixon found very unpalatable and very undesirous of doing. The uncertainty of Canada and United States relations the uncertainty of the Canadian economy and the uncertainty of the whole future of this country will reflect very directly in what this New Democratic Government in Saskatchewan is going to be able to do and what the whole country of Canada as a nation will be going or will be forced into doing within the next three or four or two or even one year's time. Certainly, Mr. Speaker, never in our history have we suffered from the kind of dilemma that exists today. Total gross national product satisfactory, an overabundance of goods and an overabundance of people to make more goods. What an undesirable and what a dangerous situation to be in.

I could go on and cover very many more items of the Budget. I am going to leave them to my colleagues to cover as they take part in this debate. Again, I want to congratulate the Premier and the Provincial Treasurer for an outstanding job, that Saskatchewan will feel for a long time. Obviously, Mr. Speaker, I will be supporting the motion.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear

Mr. H.E. Coupland (Meadow Lake): — Mr. Speaker, on entering this Budget Debate I should first like to congratulate my colleague the Leader of the Opposition on his election to the Leader of the Party. As we all know, he is in the hospital and I wish him a speedy recovery and hope to see him back in his seat in a short while. I should like to congratulate the Member from Morse constituency (Mr. Wiebe) on his election to this House. I am sure he will serve his constituents well. I must also congratulate the Member from Souris-Estevan (Mr. Thorson) on his election and also his appointment to the Cabinet. It must have come as somewhat of a shock to some of the backbenchers over there especially to the Member from Cut knife (Mr. Kwasnica) or possibly the Member from Wascana (Mr. Baker).

Mr. Speaker, the Budget talks about employment. You know, Mr. Speaker, the Premier likes to run around the province saying how unfortunate it was that the Federal Government did not provide jobs. Why the Federal Government? It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, as I recall during the June election the NDP were running around the country saying they were going to sell all the grain. But what a change, Mr. Speaker, once they became the Government they not only did not provide jobs but they cancelled programs that were supplying jobs. Good jobs. Ask some of the people in Beauval who were on those jobs, and who now incidentally are back on welfare. Not only that but they fired a lot of individuals solely for political reasons. No one is safe from the boys opposite. What is the most disturbing thing about it all, Mr. Speaker, is that these are the sanctimonious group who pass resolution after resolution at their conventions, saying in effect that a person's politics would have no bearing on his job. Apparently this means it won't have a bearing on his job as long as his politics support the socialist views. They never cease to amaze us when they say one thing and do just the opposite. They accuse the Liberals and Conservative parties of pork-barrel politics. Well, Mr. Speaker, if you want to see a real example of pork-barrel politics go to Glaslyn, see what the NDP did in regard to a liquor vendor. I imagine Turtleford and Spiritwood are the same.

Mr. Speaker, I only ask that the Members opposite be honest, not only with themselves, but with the people of Saskatchewan and stop this cheap political trickery they are so good at.

Then we come to agriculture, Mr. Speaker. And here there is not too much for the farmers. Here again we see they will urge the Federal Government to help the farmers. Well, Mr. Speaker, this is an old NDP song. The farmers are saying it is not good enough any more, for the provincial governments to cry to Ottawa. It's time they did something on a provincial basis to help the farmers.

The Land Bank, Mr. Speaker, which could have been a wonderful program, seems to be nothing but a smooth way of taking over the farmland in Saskatchewan. Some of the Members on this side of the House have already stated it will not help the farmers especially the small farmer. I urge the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Messer) to present the Bill so that we can see what the Government really intends to do in regard to the Land Bank. You know the \$10 million in the Budget will only be about enough to pick up roughly 150 sections of land. There are some minor planks in agricultural, some of them continuation of Liberal policy. One of them I wish they would continue is

the \$2 payment to mink ranchers in the north who are still in need of some government assistance.

Then, Mr. Speaker, we come to minerals and industrial development. This Government seems to give this a very low priority where it should rank at the top with agriculture in this Province. They are going to have to supply jobs for the young people they will be driving off the farms due to their land program which will make sharecroppers out of the farmers. And the only way to supply jobs is with industrial development.

They say they are going to help small businessmen. Well, Mr. Speaker, anything that has been introduced to date has been a detriment to small businesses, such as the 40-hour week and the minimum wage. This did not help small businesses and it did not help the workers. There was over 20 of them lost their jobs in Meadow Lake in the first couple of weeks. These people didn't appreciate this kind of help from the Government. A lot of businessmen are beginning to say, with friends like the NDP who needs enemies.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear

Mr. Coupland: — Due to this so-called help many businessmen have had to curtail services especially to the farm industry on account of the 40-hour week. Mr. Speaker, in Meadow Lake we had industrial development and this would have done more to raise wages and without hurting anyone than any government regulation could do. But this Government, to your right, Mr. Speaker, saw fit to pay over \$6 million to do away with this development. By doing this, Mr. Speaker, they relegated a large number of people back to welfare. I must admit, Mr. Speaker, the Premier and some of his Cabinet must seem very guilty about cancelling the pulp mill. This seems very apparent because of the amount of time they spend trying to defend their actions. One would think that if they are so convinced in their own mind that they did the right thing by doing away with thousands of jobs and relegating a lot of people to the welfare rolls they wouldn't have to spend so much time trying to convince the people of Saskatchewan that it was the right thing to do.

It could be, Mr. Speaker, that they are starting to wonder about the \$2 million a year revenue they would lose from the sale of natural gas from the Pierceland Beacon hill gas fields which would have been used by the pulp mill and this was due to the Liberal policy after a barren 20 years of the socialist policy, or about the extra jobs it would have created from the policy, or about the extra jobs it would have created from the use of the chemical that would have been needed in the pulp mill.

The Budget also mentions that the Government will increase returns to the people of Saskatchewan from mineral wealth of the Province. I wholeheartedly agree, Mr. Speaker, if they are talking about the development of our resources. But I disagree just as strongly if it just means higher royalties which could stop any development and thus mean less jobs for the people.

Mr. Speaker, the God-given resources of this Province are for the people of this Province, for Canada and for the world.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear

Mr. Coupland: — If we do, just wait. They are for this Province, but

March 13, 1972

if we do not develop these resources, Mr. Speaker, someone else will. This world is getting smaller all the time as far as travel and so on is concerned. Other peoples in the world are not going to sit idly by while we sit on these resources that they want and need and refuse to develop and share with them, whether it be wheat, mineral, timber or whatever. Even the Lord did not bless the man who would not develop his resources.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is time the Minister of Industry (Mr. Thorson) made known the Government policy in regard to industry development. There are a lot of conflicting statements coming from the Members opposite. Some of their Members urged the Government to take over industry, even go so far as to say, take it without compensation. The Minister of Industry says he welcomes people with drive and initiative in the private sector of our economy and even goes so far as to say it is proper that they should make a profit. Now this seems queer coming from a group who have used the word 'profit' more as a swear word rather than something that is quite necessary if jobs are to be created.

Mr. Speaker, I'm afraid the same thing is going to happen as it did in 1944 when the socialists first were elected in this Province.

With the increased royalties, industry will once again retreat into Alberta and it's going already, or some of the other provinces, the same as it did back in '44. But, Mr. Speaker, all is not lost, because Alberta pays into the equalization fund and our socialist government will have their hand out for our share, even if we don't deserve it, when the Government deliberately drives out capital.

Mr. Speaker, the citizens of Saskatchewan should not be made poor cousins to the rest of Canada, when we rank with the best in the resources. The NDP Government owes it to the people of Saskatchewan to encourage industry to come into the Province to develop those resources.

Mr. Speaker, if this Province is to progress, or even hold its own we need continued investment in the Province and I feel that provincial, national and international business communities should know what the real economic development policy of this NDP Government is.

Mr. Speaker, the only alternative to industrial expansion is, of course, bureaucracy, government bureaucracy with most people working for or depending on the Government for their livelihood.

Uruguay is the most outstanding example of a country needlessly ruined by welfare policies. Here is a country of less than three million people with a literacy rate estimated at 90 per cent. It was once distinguished for its high living standard and good management. Now, ms because of their welfare state system there are between 45 and 50 per cent of the 2.6 million in this once affluent land now dependent on the government for their total income. It is common for government workers to retire on full pay at 45. It is also equally common to collect on one retirement while holding a second job or to hold a job while collecting unemployment compensation. These are a few facts of like in Uruguay, a nation gone wild over the welfare state. I mention this, Mr. Speaker, only as a

warning to the Government and the people of Saskatchewan that government welfarism with its every increasing army of people dependent on the government whether it be civil servants, pensioners or other beneficiaries is fatally easy to launch and extend but almost impossible to bring to a halt. It leads to runaway inflation, government bankruptcy, political disorder and a disintegration and will finally lead to repressive dictatorship.

Mr. Speaker, the Budget brought in last Friday shows how we are going down the path to the welfare state, it indicates there will be an increase of some 500 civil servants, a major increase in welfare payments. These should have been reduced and would have under a Liberal Government...

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear

Mr. Coupland: — ...because we were establishing opportunities for people to get employment under our industrial expansion and this is what people want. If you would look at the Gallop Poll when it was out in the paper just a few days ago, you will find that people all across Canada are very concerned about welfare and are asking governments all across Canada to provide an alternative to welfare, which I do not see in this Budget.

Mr. Speaker, people are concerned about the future. I talked to quite a few over the weekend and they are wondering what they are going to do over the next four years. They had a bright future ahead in the Meadow Lake area and it turned out to be a pretty bleak looking future after June 23rd.

Another think that I noticed on the weekend was the odd Government car floating around up there and they didn't have "G" on their licence plates. I'm wondering if this is going to be the policy of the Government to take the "G" off the licence plate so that the people of Saskatchewan can't tell how many civil servants are running around the country. I hope not.

Mr. Messer: — It might be the one Lionel lost!

Mr. Coupland: — Well, it could be the one Lionel might have lost, but I'm sure that you fellows are going to make sure there's a lot more of them that are lost too. But I just hope that the Government doesn't take the "G" off the licence plates.

All in all, Mr. Speaker, there's not very much to look forward to when this Budget was brought down and I will not support the Budget.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear

Mr. J.G. Richards (Saskatoon University): — Mr. Speaker, I want to discuss this evening a subject which is very close to me personally: the relationship of the university to the Government and suggestions of reform with the university.

It is with a certain reluctance that I raise this subject

in the Legislature because, on the grounds of academic freedom, which is a very important concept to preserve, one could argue the subject should not be raised because it inevitably threatens academic freedom.

I am very cognizant, having studied in the three countries, having taught in two, having spend some of the best years of my life in university, that a university is a valuable institution in any kind of society. The criticisms that I level at the University of Saskatchewan, I do not I trust, make because of my own personal experiences, whatever they say have been, favourable and unfavourable. I trust that they will be interpreted in the spirit of wanting to help create an institution of academic excellence, an institution which serves the people of Saskatchewan.

Having said that, Mr. Speaker, there are very serious shortcomings in the senior administration of our University. It is secretive, it is undemocratic and, in my opinion, it is not competent to plan for the future of the university within our province.

To begin to understand the phenomenon of university administration in our province as elsewhere it is necessary to go back into the feudal origins of universities. The organization of universities around feudal colleges was characterized by cloistered secrecy and removal from the hurly-burly of every day life. Legacies of this tradition are carried forth to this day.

Colleges are but a complex of organizations within universities. There are departments, with departmental chairmen or heads with tenured faculty and untenured faculty, and finally students. One also has elaborate rankings – one has full professors, associate professors, assistant professors, lecturers, special lecturers, etc., one has ranking of the students into honours and ordinary, graduate and undergraduate. The departments are organized into colleges with their deans, and the colleges are organized in a university with its complex levels of administration – principals' offices, president's office, vice-principals' offices and vice-presidents' offices. We have a senate and board of governors and innumerable overlapping committees. There is a tangle of administrative inefficiency which, in our particular university is augmented by the problem of the two campuses in the one university.

To look at the problem from another point of view, we have organizations within the university which represent particular groups within the university community. The Students' Representative Council represents supposedly the interest of students; the faculty association represents the interest of faculty and the Board of Governors, supposed to be an institution representing the interests of the general public. But none of these organizations, I would put to you, Mr. Speaker, really effectively plays any role in the determination of policy.

How, in fact, are decisions made within this University? Because of the secrecy it is very difficult to get at, and find out, anything about the making of these decisions. Decisions are made behind closed doors by small select groups for reasons which nobody is really aware of. For example, who made the decision to expand the engineering budget at the Regina Campus by 16 per cent this year given the restricted overall budget? Who made the analogous decision to contract

expenditures on Arts and Sciences at Regina when the University at Regina was supposed specifically to encourage and specialize in the teaching of arts and sciences and humanities and was not intended to duplicate the training of professionals at Saskatoon. Who made those decisions, Mr. Speaker? It is impossible to find somebody who will openly take the responsibility for making them. There are many surmises, Mr. Speaker. It is surmised, for example, that this is part of a deal to buy off "separatism" at Regina. There is a great deal of dissatisfaction at Regina with the senior administration of the University and they want a separate university. So it is surmised that the powers-that-be in Saskatoon offer the powers-that-be in Regina an engineering faculty if they keep quiet and they accept one university. Is that what happened? We'll never know for sure because nobody is publicly accountable for this kind of decision.

Why is the distribution of operating funds between the two campuses such that the amount spent per student in Regina is 40 per cent above that in Saskatoon? Why have we this discrepancy in amounts spent per student, Mr. Speaker? Who made this decision? It was not made by the Government. This is a decision made somewhere in the interstices of the senior administration of the University.

Why, Mr. Speaker, when it is becoming increasingly apparent that there is a declining Canadian content in the disciplines which are crucial for the transmission of culture from one generation to the next does nobody in the university administration consider this to be a sufficiently important question to warrant a response? I might, as a footnote, say that I'm not in any way intending this as a criticism of particular foreign professors, because many of them have made very valuable and significant contributions to intellectual life in the province. I am merely noting the fact of the decline, in my discipline as in many other social disciplines, in Canadian subject matter, in Canadian examples and this I would submit is critical.

Now, Mr. Speaker, many of the problems of administration of a university can be covered up during a time of expanding budgets. When everything is going well, when everyone is getting more and more no one challenged seriously the critical problems of allocation. This Budget reduces the percentage increase in this year's operational grant to 11.7 per cent relative to last year's 14.2 per cent increase. That is one statistic of contraction. Maybe a more relevant statistic for contraction — I am sure the Members opposite are fully aware of it — is that the total operational funds available to the university increased this year only by 6.8 per cent relative to a 9.7 per cent increase the year before. This, it could be argued, is an insufficient increase, on the basis of the fact that the per student costs at this university are still below the national average. However, this is not, Mr. Speaker, any calamitous decrease in expenditure, and I would submit that the Government has every right at this stage to think very carefully about the spending of monies on this institution, until it gets its internal house in order. Until this university re-examines internally what are its priorities, how it is to organize itself and what kind of relationship it should have to the government, until it answers the question of Canadian content the question of engineering, the question of one university or two, the question of who in the vast maze of committees and hierarchal structures that exist at the university is to make decisions —

until these things happen, I think the Government has very good reason to want to be cautious in its expenditures of public monies.

I do not want in any sense to underestimate the problems that are occasioned by the fact that the Government has not been overly generous. We have a phenomenon, maybe deserving of some elaboration in this House, of what has happened to junior faculty members at the campus. The Government made available to the University last December what would be its operational grant, but the university administrators did not take the Government seriously because one could never take the initial figures given by the previous Government seriously. The administrators failed until late February to take seriously the figure of \$35.7 million. By the time they realized that this was to be their operational budget and they were faced with the immediate requirement under university regulations to tell all junior non-tenured faculty whether or not their contracts for the following academic year would be renewed. This decision must be made by the end of February and since they had not done their budgeting, administrators played it safe and sent out approximately 175 letters to junior faculty members saying that the university would not at this moment offer any of them contracts for the following academic year.

Mr. Speaker, this has placed junior faculty in a very unfortunate position. It is just one further example of the failure of this university administration to plan ahead, and to take into account the interests of all involved. The people who are bearing the brunt of the restricted budget appear to be junior faculty members, those without tenure. Nobody is sure, least of all the junior faculty members, what criteria will be used in allocating the budgeted money. Will the university administrators continue with their pet projects - increase by 16 per cent the amount of money spent on engineering in Regina if that means the cutting back on Faculty of Arts and Science junior professors? Will the victims of the lack of a coherent administration at this university be the junior faculty? Mr. Speaker, the Government has made manifest the existence of inadequate senior administration at the university, by the fact that it has not been willing to continue to pour money in an unregulated manner into the university.

Having made these criticisms, I repeat the cautionary note that I made at the beginning of my speech. It is a very serious matter to stand up as a politician in the Legislature and make criticism of an academic institution, because I am acutely conscious of the need to maintain independence of academic life from government power. However, we must realize that when an institution spends over \$50 million of public funds, there are political as well as academic decisions to be made within its walls. The nature of the subject material which is taught by my former colleagues in their classes is a private matter, and should not be subject to interference from the Government. On the other hand, in making broad policy decisions whether to have one or two colleges of engineering, whether to have one or two universities these are public political decisions which should be made jointly by the University, and by the Saskatchewan people through their representatives in the government. Here has been the failing of the university administration. Administrators have not been able to act as 'politicians', and by this word I mean it in the best sense of the word, as people who are able to articulate issues that must be decided by the general public. Because of the feudal background of the

institution and its development with small secretive decision making processes, there has been no good public debate on these kinds of issues. Public debate is thwarted by the elements of secrecy which surround the whole university administration.

As one very small reform, Mr. Speaker, why could we not have, to paraphrase Woodrow Wilson a former President of the United States, "Open budgets openly arrived at?" why should it be that one university department head does not know the budget of another department head, that one college dean does not know the budget of another college? In the Government, budgets and salaries are published in the public accounts annually. As a very simple reform, there should be open budgets. I would add that there is a need to democratise the senior administration. I would put it to you that it would be a worthwhile reform to elect presidents, to elect principals and vice-principals. They should be elected by the faculty and via some formula students should participate in such elections. These reforms obviously pose all the problems of democracy. It would immediately be argued by academic elitists that the men elected would merely be the men and not necessarily the men most qualified. However, Mr. Speaker,, administration, especially of an institution as crucial to our society as a university, is too import to leave to the administrators. If we have any faith in democracy at all I suggest that is appropriate to try and apply it to the university. To date we have had far too little democracy. We have principals appointed; we have deans appointed; we have head of departments appointed. We have complicated systems of committees by which these appointments are made. The institutions which are supposed presently to represent the interests of students and faculty are ineffectual. Despite the problems open elections, for specified periods of time of senior administrative positions within the university would be a most worthwhile reform.

There are other specific reforms needed. We must specifically come to grips with the question of two universities or one, and in my opinion the time when we could pretend that we have one university and two campuses, is past. In effect we have two universities with different philosophies of the way they should proceed. Their respective philosophies both have some legitimacy, and each should be allowed to pursue its way. There will be an obvious need for co-ordination at a central level to prevent unneeded duplication of expensive capital projects such as engineering colleges. It could be achieved hopefully by the new Department of Continuing Education.

The university must consider how it is to relate to the rest of the community. How, for example, are community colleges if they come to our province to be linked to the formal academic institution of the university? These decisions should be made jointly by the Legislature and by the university, which obviously has professional academic interests in the subject. These are not questions to be answered behind closed doors. These are questions that invite public debate, public discussion.

Mr. Speaker, I have said harsh words perhaps about the senior administration of our university, and I have talked about the need for reforms. I have talked about the need for democracy within the university, the need for openness, the need to free us from feudal anachronisms within the university. I have talked about specific reforms such as the need to create two universities and end the fiction of one university. I implicitly approved the philosophy behind the Regina campus,

March 13, 1972

that of emphasizing Arts and Science, emphasizing that undergraduate education be available to the vast majority of people in the province. There is still limited access. People do not get to university who could certainly profit from it. There are inadequacies in the priorities of spend monies. For example, too much in professional schools to train people for industry relative to the amount spent to train people in their own interests. In conclusion, I have been talking about some of the necessary conditions to create a good academic institution. It is necessary to have a more rational and reformed administration. However, none of these reforms are sufficient conditions. It will never be possible for governments to create a core of good qualified academics who work well together to produce academic excellence in their teaching and their research. That involves a mysterious process present in good universities, in good departments. We can never produce it by a formula. Mr. Speaker, I hope that I have contributed in some small way to the beginning of a public debate about the universities should be administered. I hope that my speech will not be interpreted as an unwarranted interference with academic freedom. I will support the motion.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. J.K. Comer (Nipawin): — Mr. Speaker, I should like to first of all begin by congratulating the Premier and Provincial Treasurer on his Budget and on the presentation of that budget.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Comer: — I should like to comment for a few moments on some of the tax changes that have been proposed in this Budget. I should like to talk for a minute about Succession Duties and also about the hot dog tax. Members opposite have on a number of occasions criticized the idea of succession duties, they claim that this is going to hurt the small farmer, it's going to hurt the homeowner. In fact, this legislation is not going to hurt the small farmer or the homeowner it will be a tax that will be applied to large estates just the same as anyone's income is taxed. I think it is a fair tax.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Comer: — At the same time this Government is removing the hot dog tax, the tax on meals under \$2.50. The removal of this tax will save the ordinary people of this Province \$750,000.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Comer: — It will save the workingmen and the farmers that \$750,000. The Opposition has made a lot about the fact that the Government is getting \$50 million more from the Federal Government. They've also made a lot of the fact that the Government according to their figures is spending about \$500,000 on assistants, on special assistants and executive assistants. I think that to invest \$500,000 and get a return of \$50 million is pretty good return on your money. The Hon. Member from Regina Whitmore Park I think it was on a number of occasions talked to us about the values of businessmen. Does he know of any businessman and any businesses that have give that return?

I think that one of the directions that this Government has taken and a very important direction is the hiring of a number of highly qualified people to take part in planning, planning government activity, planning the direction this Government is going to take. Probably the biggest difference right now between the former Government and this Government is the fact that this Government is not afraid to plan, it is not afraid to hire people who can provide information we need, it does not fly by the seat of its pants as the former Government did.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Comer: — The former Government managed to make it by the seat of their pants in 1967 and I am afraid the seat of those pants was ripped out in 1971.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Comer: — I think there is a real value in having planning and at the same time I should like to issue a bit of warning about planning. There is always a danger that all of us here as elected representatives can be displaced by the planners, we must always at the same time as we are employing planners keep in contact with the elected representatives, we must keep in contact with what the people in the country are thinking. The Hon. Member from Meadow Lake (Mr. Coupland) in his speech made the statement that the God-given resources of this Province are for the people of this Province. I think every Member on this side of the House and probably some on the other side of the House will agree with this statement. The Hon. Member talked about the exploitation of timber. I should like to submit that there is a way for the development of our timber resources by the Big Three or the two and a half, the Prince Albert Pulp Mill, the Meadow Lake Sawmill and Simpson Timber. That answer is an answer that has been around for a long time, that's the Saskatchewan Timber Board. The former Government re-named it Saskatchewan Forest Products but that name has never caught on with anyone.

Today we received the annual report of Saskatchewan forest Products. In the last year that corporation under the management of the businessmen lost \$266,842. I should like to quote what the report gives as a reason for this. "This deficit was largely due to the high per unit cost of lumber manufactured at Big River." The former Government established a lumber mill at Big River. It established it, it appears, deliberately, to lose money as an excuse to sabotage the Crown corporation, the Timber Board as an excuse to sell out all of Saskatchewan's timber resources to foreign companies.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Comer: — I spoke about the Timber Board before, I am not going to speak about it at any length today but I urge this Government to continue the Saskatchewan Timber Board to expand it and if possible to get rid of the Big three, the timber cartel in the North, and replace it with a Crown corporation developing the forest products of our province for the people

of this Province employing people from this Province and returning the profits to the people of this Province.

Mr. Speaker, I should like for a few minutes to comment on some of the programs outlined or some of the expenditures outlined in the Budget with regard to the Department of Education. In the Budget, the Department will be spending \$120,420 for research and development compared to \$24,960 last year. Much of this money will be spent on research and development into kindergartens and into community colleges.

Tonight I should like to spend some time commenting on the development of community colleges. I should like first of all to comment on what appeared to be the emphasis of the former Government with regard to community colleges. The former Government planned to establish basically what we could call technical and vocational institutes in various towns around this Province. Although I am not opposed to technical and vocational institutes, I don't think we should call them community colleges. They planned to construct a lot of buildings it appeared around this Province or at least in the election they help out the possibility of constructing a lot of buildings around this Province. I should like to see and I feel fairly confident that this will be occurring, the community colleges being really community colleges, colleges serving communities. Colleges that can identify the needs of the local areas, identify what needs there are in education for adults and supply education in these lines to these people.

I feel that it would probably be a good idea to utilize or in some areas to establish committees in the local area probably struck from the municipal bodies much the same as the adult education committees right now in many of the rural communities. These committees could meet with the people in the community find out from them what they want, what type of courses they want, whether it is on income tax whether it is on pottery, whether it is on credit union board of directors' duties, anything they want. Identify these needs, locate the people who can give this sort of education, some of them will be local people, some of them may have to come from other areas and send them into these communities. Not build buildings, but rather to use the existing schools and halls that are there right now. If we get into a system of building a number of community colleges as physical structures, as buildings around this Province we'll end up with a few serving few people. If we use the facilities that exist today, the schools and halls that exist today, we can serve almost every person in this Province who wants to take part in any sort of adult education program. I think the aspect of serving the community is the most important aspect.

Mr. Speaker, I should like to leave my comments on the Budget now. I should like to state that I will gladly support this Budget, I think it is a progressive, forward moving budget.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. H.H.P. Baker (Regina Wascana): — It is wonderful to get a nice ovation from across the floor once in a while.

First of all, Mr. Speaker, while it is really my first opportunity to say a few words in this Session and on the Budget

Debate, I too want to congratulate the two new Members elected in the by-election last fall. I am sure they will make a fine contribution to this House and be a credit not only to themselves but as well to their constituents.

I congratulate the Hon. Member, the Leader of the Opposition Mr. Steuart) from Prince Albert West on his elevation to the leadership of the Liberal Party. I was very interested in watching that convention last fall, I think it had gone along very well, for the present Leader of the Opposition. In this remarks, he made one error in his acceptance speech, he made a find acceptance speech but when he ended up by saying, "We've all got to get out and elect Otto Lang," I am sure that will be his defeat in 1975.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Baker: — I know the Member for Albert Park (Mr. MacLeod) wouldn't have wanted him to say that either.

I do want to commend the Member for Albert Park for his first effort as critic of the Budget Debate. I could say many things for and against but I will not do it today because it is his first attempt. While he was critical in some ways, I am sure he was searching really hard for many things to say to try to criticize such a wonderful document that was brought in here on Friday.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Baker: — I want to congratulate the Premier in bringing in such a fine functional and security Budget, that will one again put the Saskatchewan economy back on the rails.

I said in the last session the two main problems facing Saskatchewan over the next while will be unemployment and agriculture. Many factors over the years have operated in this country which have caused unnecessary unemployment and agricultural setbacks. This is a country of such vastness and of such great wealth. To help employment we heard a lot late last fall about winter works projects. Crash programs were announced. We knew it was a dismal failure and became a spring and summer program, or better named, an election gimmick. We know it was too little and too late in creating employment particularly in the West. Our province came through with matching funds and even provided additional money to municipalities on the forgiveness features of the Federal plan and making our grants probably the most generous in Canada, in order to co-operate and spur on employment.

However, winter works programs in our extreme climate are not the answer, our seasons differ from most parts of Canada. I say we need full employment the year round but particularly let's have full employment spring, summer and fall, as many projects will spill over during winter if planned properly. Some winter seasonal unemployment will always affect us because of climatic conditions but let's keep it to a bare minimum. We know winter works is much more costly so let's keep full employment when the weather is permissible. Let's create sufficient work so that every grown Canadian in this country will at least have the opportunity of being offered a job and make their contribution to the development and growth of this fine country of ours.

March 13, 1972

I hope the \$500 grant for building of homes will be increased during this Session and tied in with this program, I would suggest that we have a program of renovation and repair for old homes with similar grants provided.

It is most unfortunate, Mr. Speaker, that \$6.3 million has to be provided to cover debts incurred on the Athabasca Doré Lake Pulp Mill. The Provincial Treasurer should send a bill with a mortgage to the Leader of the Opposition, the former Deputy Premier and his party for signing the document nine days before the election. They really had no right to sign a document of that magnitude while they were only acting as a care-taking government. This is your debt and that of your party. If you default by not admitting owing this debt, then you will be forfeiting the remaining seats you have in the year 1975.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Baker: — Think of what we could have done with this \$6.3 million. We hear a lot of talk about industry, private enterprise, public ownership and so forth. The proposed closing of Pat Burns and the Imperial Oil in Regina clearly points to the fact that, Mr. Speaker, the day is now here, more than ever before, when the economy cannot rely on private enterprise alone as advocated from across the way as their chief policy. But we must be realistic enough in this day and age that we need private, public co-operative and joint ownership to develop this Province for industrial and commercial and agricultural growth. Inflation with all its by-products created by the Federal Government was one of the root causes for high unemployment. Imagine deliberately creating unemployment to stop inflation. We all know that the chief and main cause of inflation was high interest rates, they are still high and this is still causing in the main, increases in the cost of living. An increased money supply would drive interest rates down.

Yes, there are other factors that have caused excessive unemployment, such as the restrictive tight money policy of the present Government at Ottawa. If the interest rates were kept at a stable and sensible level the economy would once more regain the confidence necessary to have it flourish. As long as interest rates are going to be permitted to fluctuate the way they are, investment will be slow and we are in for an overcautious economy which could continue to result in more unemployment, a lower standard of living with a continuance of rising costs, ultimately leading not only to a recession but a serious depression lurking in our midst.

In the 1972-73 Budget we find many items of cost that dovetail into the legislation we passed last summer. Our short session last summer produced some far-reaching legislation which fulfilled a sufficient number of our promises and funds provided in this Budget. I refer briefly to some of them. We abolished the cursed deterrent fees. We changed the legislation affecting and protecting our helpless mentally ill and their family estates. We established a proper minimum wage of \$1.70 as of January 1st, and \$1.75 as of July 1st. A 40-hour week for the province went into effect. The Farm Implement Protection Act was passed. We repealed Bill 2, allowing collective bargaining as a free instrument to resolve out labour and wage differences. We instituted a new bursary program for several thousand students who made use of these for higher education. The Budget

now instituted plans for non-repayment, actually following what many of us have said over the years who have argued for free tuition to help students to go on for higher education. We removed the pupil-teacher ratio stigma. Oh yes, we gave free Medicare and hospitalisation cards to all those over the age of 65. A compassionate piece of legislation on recognizing our pioneers.

In this we brought back the measures the CCF government legislated from 1944-64 with some extensions. A glorious 20-year record of our party. How I love to remind our antidemocratic socialists across the way about these, many of which they deliberately tried to erode during these past seven years particularly to ruin our Medicare and hospitalisation through deterrent fees. They tried to ruin our Trade Union Act with Bill 2. They kept minimum wages down to bare subsistence levels as compared to other jurisdictions. They impaired our educational standards by cramping children into small classrooms through their pupil-teacher scheme. Yes, our 20-year record from 1944 to 1964 was a blueprint upon which we can continue to build and expand for years ahead. Why do I say this? We are the ones who instituted hospitalization and Medicare. We are the ones who development the oil, gas and potash industries and developed our mining resources. I hope we develop an accelerated gas-drilling program in Saskatchewan in the next while so that we become self-sufficient. We are the ones who initiated our great highway system and parks and recreation areas. We are the ones who gave our workers decent minimum wages and free collective bargaining. We are the ones who brought in a modern educational system, built new schools and gave teachers proper wages. We are the ones who pressed for better old age pensions and welfare standards. We are the ones who protected the farmers and city dwellers from losing their homesteads as well as those who owned homes in communities. In this way we gave them a real measure of security through The Homestead Act. We were the ones who built a wonderful province only to be torn down these past seven years. And not it is up to us again to start rebuilding a new Saskatchewan, Mr. Speaker. And in line with this I intend to make a few more remarks tomorrow, therefore I beg leave to adjourn the debate.

Debate adjourned.

ADJOURNED DEBATES

SECOND READINGS

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion by Hon. Mr. Messer that Bill No. 6 – An Act to amend The Horned Cattle Purchases Act be now read a second time.

Mr. J.C. McIsaac (Wilkie): — Mr. Speaker, the Bill before us to amend The Horned Cattle Purchases Act is really nothing more than a tax on the livestock industry of the province.

Let us just look for a minute at what the Minister is proposing to do in this Bill. At the moment The Horned Cattle Purchases Act calls for a \$2 penalty or surcharge, if you like, on all cattle marketed throughout the province's stockyards to the provincial yards or the markets as the case may be, all cattle weighing 500 pounds or more. The Minister has brought in a Bill that will mean that that penalty will now be charged on all cattle weighing 250 pounds and up. This, of course,

March 13, 1972

Mr. Speaker, will mean that every spring calf that is marketed in the fall will be subject to that \$2 surcharge.

First of all this will mean that I would guess, and it is only a guess, that the money derived from this particular Act will probably triple as a result of the introduction of this surcharge. I am not really sure why the Minister is doing it. He hasn't really told us why he is bringing this in at a time when the Province of Alberta is lifting for two years similar legislation in this regard. Now I can see some reason for Saskatchewan bringing this in if, indeed, Alberta was carrying on the provisions or the Province of Manitoba. I can see some merit in his suggestion that it hopefully might result in a bringing a better calibre, if you like, of feeder calf to the markets of Saskatchewan. I am not sure that it will. I will bet, Mr. Speaker, that most of the feeder calves coming on the market this fall will still have their horns. At a time when most of the markets throughout the province are very crowded and busy in the fall of the year with the fall rush of calves coming on the market, we shall have brand inspectors working them over, we shall have health inspectors and we shall have someone to check to see whether or not these calves have horns and should be subject to the \$2 surcharge.

Again, I will say that this might be the right age of cattle as far as that goes to put the surcharge on. But, surely if he is going to do that, should he not also reduce the surcharge from 550 or 600 pounds and up, because surely at that age the adult cow is quite a bit different to dehorn than it is to dehorn the younger calves.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation was brought in, as I understand it, without the Government or the Minister consulting with the Horned Cattle Advisory Board which administers this fund. This is the Party opposite, Mr. Speaker, that is always so anxious to consult with people. There was no board or commission set up to investigate this. The cattlemen weren't asked whether they wanted it or not. And again, we haven't been told, at least as I recall the remarks of the Minister in introducing this Bill, to what various uses he plans or proposes to suggest to the Horned Cattle Trust Advisory Board where the extra funds are going to be put.

In this regard I must say that the funds raised through this tax through the years have been put to good purposes to improve the livestock industry in various ways and means. I can only hope that that will be the case again. I only suggest, Mr. Speaker, here is another tax on the livestock industry which will undoubtedly go to support the livestock industry. But once again, it takes the Government off the hook in so far as putting their money up in support of the livestock industry in this Province.

I will not support the Bill, Mr. Speaker.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. E.F. Gardner (Moosomin): — Mr. Speaker, I too will oppose this new tax on the cattlemen of the province.

We certainly have the bulk of calves, I believe, marketed around 400 pounds in this Province. So this lowering will

include most of the calves that were not covered before. A 250-pound calf has a pretty small set of horns in most cases. I don't really see the need for such a tax and particularly such a selective tax. I believe that this is the worst part of this tax.

It is discrimination by the Minister of Agriculture against people who raise certain breeds of cattle. If we had a Civil Rights Commission I suppose this would be a good place to report it. Anybody that raises Angus or Polled Herford cattle will never be subjected to this tax. People who prefer some other breeds probably will, particularly at this time when crossbreeding has become quite popular in the beef cattle field. We have people experimenting or cross breeding with Charolais, Simmental and other breeds of cattle and in many cases, the calves, as a result end up with horns.

So we find, perhaps, that the Minister has been talked into this program by some purebred Angus or Polled Herford breeders and not really too concerned about the commercial cattle raiser.

The penalty for the person who raises calves and sells them with horns is already paid by the seller. The person who buys the calf, very carefully notes if it has horns, he pays his dollars and so the penalty is already there. This is only another fund raising gimmick by the Government, a tax by the Government. It is not a penalty because there is a substantial penalty already there. If the Government really wanted to do something about the horn problems they could have inaugurated some type of a program to provide the farmer with dehorning paste at no charge to get rid of that particular problem.

The Minister didn't decide to do that. He apparently wants the funds rather than the calves without horns and we will certainly oppose this Bill.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. J.R. Messer (Minister of Agriculture): — Mr. Speaker, I just wish to make some remarks before closing debate on this amendment to The Horned Cattle Purchases Act.

The Members opposite say that there was no consultation before the amendment was suggested. I should like to bring to their attention that I told the livestock people at their convention some six weeks or two months ago that it was the intention of the Government to draft legislation to amend The Horned Cattle Purchases Act and to do exactly as has been done in the Legislature today.

There was no communication from their organization as to any objection to such legislation. In fact my office received two letters, Mr. Speaker, only two letters expressing some concern in regard to lowering the penalty from 500 pounds to 250 pounds.

The Members also, Mr. Speaker, keep on referring to this as a tax and it is not a tax, it is a horned cattle penalty for not dehorning cattle. It can clearly and honourably be avoided altogether by simply dehorning the cattle before they go to market. It is a penalty imposed originally at the request of cattlemen themselves for the good of their industry. And

if they want to go back some years they will find out that this penalty was originally legislated at the request of the cattlemen in this Province.

The Hon. Members from Cannington (Mr. Weatherald), from Wilkie (Mr. McIsaac) and from Moosomin (Mr. Gardner) mistakenly suggest that this is a tax which the Government has imposed to increase revenues. I have pointed out that in no way can this be considered a tax. Further, The Horned Cattle Purchases Act itself limits the spending of the funds that arise through the imposition of the penalty of cattle improvement. I should like to quote from Section 8 of that Act:

Such funds together with any income accruing thereon shall be available for discharging expenses incurred in the administration of this Act and such expenses incurred by the Minister for the improvement of cattle as may be approved by the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council.

Now Members may recall that the Act was amended in 1970 so that the fund may be used to reimburse producers who suffered losses not covered by dealers' bonds and where a dealer had gone bankrupt. I would note in addition that all requests for expenditures from the fund are referred in the first instance to a Horned Cattle Advisory Committee. That committee is constituted of the following: two members appointed by the Cattle Breeders' Association; one member appointed by the Saskatchewan Dairy Association; one member appointed by the Stock Growers Association; one member appointed by the Federation of Agriculture; one member appointed by the Farmers' Union; one member appointed by the Saskatchewan Association of Rural Municipalities.

Finally, I would emphasize again, Mr. Speaker, that the time to dehorn animals is when they are young. The reduced price paid for dehorned cattle is rarely identifiable by the man who sells them. He doesn't really know that he is taking the loss. The penalty identifies the cost to the marketing of horned cattle. We hope, through it, to further reduce the number being marketed, and again, I emphasize to further develop and improve our growing cattle industry in this Province.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Motion agreed to on Division and Bill read a second time.

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion by the Hon. Mr. Snyder that Bill No. 4 – An Act respecting the Department of Social Services be now read a second time.

Mr. C.P. MacDonald (Milestone): — Mr. Speaker, on the last occasion that this Bill came before the House, I expressed general approval of the principle of the Bill and of the idea of the Minister in attempting to change the connotation of the word 'Welfare' to that of Social Services.

I did express an objection to the concept of giving to the Minister the authority to issue grants up to the amount of \$5,000. In doing so I pointed to one grant that had already come before the House and some general concerns on this side of the House in relation to that grant. It is our feeling on this side of the House, Sir, that this is "cabinet government" not "ministerial government". We feel very reluctant to grant

a Minister the opportunity and the responsibility of providing one grant, or any grant, to any organization in the Province of Saskatchewan at his own will without even taking it to Cabinet or to the Executive Council.

The Minister was good enough to supply me with a list of grants that have been issued by the Department of Welfare since April 12, 1971. In that ten or eleven month period, Mr. Speaker, there were only 16 grants that would have required Executive Council approval and I see no great administrative difficulty in continuing the practice of taking them to the Executive Council for approval.

I would tell the Minister that I am going to support this Bill in principle in second reading and that this side will be submitting an amendment in third reading reducing the amount from 45,000 to \$1,000.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. H.H. Rolfes (Saskatoon Nutana South): — Mr. Speaker, I should like to take a few minutes in saying that I will support this Bill.

Hopefully the changing of the name itself is just a minor function of this House. I would hope that changing this Act to The Social Services Act would change the whole direction of the Department under which it would come.

For too long, Mr. Speaker, people who have been on welfare have been looked down upon by society. Welfare is something that we give to those who are not willing to help themselves in this competitive society. In many instances, Mr. Speaker, let me say that these people, through no fault of their own are on welfare and these people for the rest of their lives may have to beg this society to keep them in the necessities of life. I would hope that by changing this name of the Act to Social Services that those people, will not have to hand their heads in shame when their neighbours find out that their family received aid from society, the type of aid, Mr. Speaker, that I feel that they should have by right.

Secondly, Mr. Speaker, I want to support this Bill because I believe if we really carry it through to its logical objective this Bill will put emphasis on prevention rather than on rehabilitation. This really should be the function of our welfare on society or of the new social services program.

I think all we have to do is just look at a few of the organizations that we have. For example, why is society so quick to help people who go into Ranch Ehrlo or who go to Sedley at a tune of about \$10,000 or \$11,000 a year, but this same society is very reluctant to give maybe another \$15, \$20 or \$50 a month to help a family who might be experiencing some difficulty in these areas. Why is this society so reluctant to give these people the types of services that they need at very early stages in order to identify the problems. I would hope that this Government isn't just taking this as a minor change, this will change the whole direction and the whole emphasis of the Department of Social Services.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I feel very proud to support this particular Bill.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. T.M. Weatherald (Cannington): — Mr. Speaker, I had not intended to say anything on this particular subject but the last speaker has forced me into it, you might say.

Mr. Speaker, I want to give a few views of my concept of Social Welfare and I intend to be very brief on the particular subject. But the Members opposite and a number of other Members opposite have apparently concluded that there is a great stigma attached to a person receiving social welfare. Well I can assure you, Mr. Speaker, that for those people who are receiving social welfare that really need social welfare and have no other alternatives then in my opinion and in the opinion of most people there is no stigma attached to it whatsoever. Certainly there is no stigma attached to social welfare that a person who is disabled or is in poor health or is not able to provide through no fault of his own, there is no stigma attached to receiving those payments. I don't think, I'm speaking particularly only for myself, but I'm saying that that is generally agreed upon by 99 per cent if not all of the population. When required the payments are legitimately made to that person in need when his needs are such that he cannot do anything for himself. But I think, Mr. Speaker, at the same time it would be a very, very sad day if the status of social welfare reaches such a level that an able bodied person who is capable of looking for work, capable of working at least part of the time, is able to receive social welfare payments and that is as acceptable a method of getting a living as by working. I think that would be a tragic day for our social system, the day that a person can live on social welfare, a person who should be looking for work, is capable of work and simply does not choose to do either. I think it would be a sad day for us all if that person is able to receive payments from the state with no stigma attached whatsoever.

We seem to be constantly heading in that direction and while the change of name is all right and I see no particular objection, the Members who spoke last seemed to indicate that he would like to arrive at the situation where all social welfare payments were received and the person receiving should not feel that there is any stigma attached whatsoever to those payments. I think there are legitimate payments where there is no stigma attached to now and I believe, Mr. Speaker, as I have stated before, that the day that all persons regardless of whether they be legitimate or not legitimate can receive substantial payments from the state, the day that he can receive these payments and is put on an equal basis with that person who is really trying to carry the load, trying to work, and sometimes there are many people who work for less money than they can actually receive through social welfare payments. I think the day that the person on social welfare is put on an acceptable level with other people not on welfare, it will be a very sorry day for our society.

Mr. Speaker, while I support the change of the name, I have given my views as why I hope that this isn't a step to try and put welfare, that is not totally legitimate, completely on the same basis as those people who choose to work.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. G.T. Snyder (Minister of Welfare): — I want to say just a few words in closing the debate, Mr. Speaker.

I want to refer very briefly to the remarks of the Member from Cannington (Mr. Weatherald) who has just taken his seat. I have to agree wholeheartedly with the remarks that he has passed on to this House and agree with his suggestion that there should not be a stigma attached to the receiving of assistance from the public purse when the assistance is warranted and when there has been a needs test that has been acknowledged and when the person who is in need of assistance is provided with that kind of assistance. I wonder just how long the memory of the Member from Cannington really is because it isn't a very long time ago that a Member sitting front row centre on these benches on this side of the House used to refer to welfare recipients as drunks and deadbeats and people too lazy to work. You know that has been the connotation that has been attached to welfare as a result of some of these ultra-reactionary right-wing views that have emanated in large part from that side of the House...

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Weatherald: — On a Point of Order, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: — Order!

Mr. Weatherald: — Point of Order. Mr. Speaker, I believe that the rules of the House dictate that a Minister closing a debate is not allowed to introduce new material and I don't think that I introduced the remark that a Member at one time sat in the middle benches on the other side. I used my own personal opinion and it had nothing to do with what someone else said who used to sit in the middle of the benches over there.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Speaker: — Order! It is true that new material cannot be introduced into a debate but the Minister may answer statements that are made during the debate but he can't bring in new material.

Mr. Snyder: — I think this is rather unfortunate, Mr. Speaker, that this should have to be introduced at this stage but I think there is no question but what the connotation, the stigma, that was attached to those who were unfortunate enough to be relegated to the roles of the public assistance program had foisted upon them and dropped upon them the stigma that I think was in very large measure imposed by the Government that occupied the benches on this side of the House from 1964 to 1971.

I think, Mr. Speaker, that this is good legislation that is being presented here. In large measure it does some of the things I think that will cast a new light and a new view with respect to the administration of the Department of Welfare. As has been indicated the name has been changed to the Department of Social Services and I think that this is a progressive move in the right direction. Additionally this legislation gives specific authority to the Department to receive and to manage

money which is held in trust for plans of the Department. This is an area which the Member for Milestone (Mr. MacDonald) will know was one of concern and received a great deal of scrutiny in recent years. It was felt that the Department required very specific authority to perform this function and for this reason this is why this is being placed directly in the Act.

The proposed Act also intends to give greater definition to the Minister's authority to appoint advisory boards and appeal committees and I think this is in keeping with the 20th century concept. Additionally the Act attempts to define in a specific manner the Minister's authority to make certain payments up to a specified maximum and perhaps this is a point at which the former Minister of Welfare, the Member for Milestone, and myself are inclined to disagree. I rather think that if the Member for Milestone were sitting in my place at this moment he would probably be introducing legislation of a very similar nature to this but I think perhaps he is inclined to look with a certain amount of scorn on the person who is not occupying the position of Minister of Welfare. He probably feels that he would treat the powers that are given in this Act with greater judicious care. I think in light of the list of grants that I provided for him some time ago, it indicates quite clearly that the paper work is fairly substantial and I think the grants which it allows the Minister to make are not particularly overpowering. The annual grants are expected to increase over the next number of years now that the programming in community services is being accepted in very large measure by a greater number of Saskatchewan communities than at any time in the past. We also expect to co-operate very closely with the Department of Health in developing alternative health and social programs in those communities with small hospitals and special-care homes where they have some difficulty in being viable and operational. I think we will add considerably to the number of grants although many of them will be in excess of \$5,000 and it will still be necessary under those circumstances for us to have an Order-in-Council in order to make these grants.

It should be pointed out that the Minister of the Department must present his budget to Treasurer Board and subsequently to Cabinet to have his programs approved and to have the funds to implement these programs. This applies equally to grants under \$5,00 as well as grants exceeding the amount for which approval of the Lieutenant-Governor-in-council is going to still be necessary. A considerable amount of administrative time and effort is going to be conserved if this amendment is provided in order to provide for a larger volume of grants that are going to be made by ministerial order. I think the former Minister of Welfare should perhaps have a rather wide understanding of this because this practice isn't unique to this particular Department. It is not unique in terms of the fact that he had those very powers when he was Minister-in-Charge of the Youth Agency for a number of years. You will know somewhat similar provisions were in effect in the Department of Natural Resources under the former Liberal regime. Some of the same powers were established and used widely in the Department of Mineral Resources except that no limitation is placed on the amount of payments that the Minister may approve under those circumstances. The overriding condition is, of course, that the policy must be approved before the payment is made. I think, in general terms, this is not legislation that is giving the minister any kind of hard-fisted, autocratic power. I think it is good legislation and I think it deserves the consideration and the support of Members on both sides of the House. Accordingly, Mr. Speaker,

I am pleased to move that this Bill be now read a second time.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Motion agreed to and Bill read a second time.

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion by the Hon. W.E. Smishek that Bill No. 3 – An Act to amend The Mental Health Act be now read a second time.

Mr. G.B. Grant (Regina Whitmore Park): — Mr. Speaker, I am a little concerned about where the present Minister of Health (Mr. Smishek) plans on going with these pieces of legislation he is bringing in. It has been the practice, in the last seven years anyway, for a very brief explanation to be given to the changes being introduced and in this particular Bill I think the same might have sufficed but the Minister chose instead to give a long dissertation on the entire mental health program. I forget how long he went, I think it was about 20 minutes and it was at least twice as long as it should have been. And as a result my remarks are going to be twice as long as they should be under normal circumstances.

I was amused by a little quote that came to my attention today. It said:

Some men of history won fame because they didn't talk much. They said little and did much.
These men were not morose or unsocial they were simply not loquacious.

Well, I can tell you, Mr. Speaker, if the present Minister of Health attains fame, it certainly is going to be because he is loquacious and nothing else.

Let's look at some of the observations that he made and I assure you, Mr. Speaker, that I wouldn't have referred to this at all if he hadn't made a political speech of introducing amendments of a very simple nature; some are very worthwhile and very necessary, some are merely housekeeping amendments. I can tell you we are going to support them because I can't see anything wrong with them except the Hon. Minister spoke too long.

First of all he very blithely spoke of, 'we' have community based psychiatric services now in Saskatchewan and 'we' have them in Yorkton and Prince Albert, leaving the impression that 'we' was the government of this day and he knows perfectly well that the Prince Albert Psychiatric Community based service connected to the hospital there was established by the Liberal Government, not by his Government. He also knows, and I am going to make distinctly clear that this side of the House has always and will continue to recognize that it was your Government, your previous Government that introduced the very far-reaching Saskatchewan Plan and now it is being adopted by some other provinces. I don't want you to think I am trying to steal from your thunder at all, but I would point out that the Yorkton Psychiatric Centre, as planned by the Members opposite, provided for 150 beds and the most they have ever used there was between 45 and 50 for psychiatric patients. The others are used for Level III or housing the Yorkton Regional Health Centre or other uses. Let's not be misled by these statements that blithely ride-over the exact situation and lead the public and lead some of the newer Members opposite to believe that all the goodies in the Psychiatric Services Program were brought about

by the previous administration and that everything we did was bad.

Okay, here's another one. He spoke of the patient being locked away, that this is an idea that 'we' have to get away from and that 'we' are going to move in this direction. Well, I don't think he could accuse the Liberal Government of locking the patients away because the Hon. Member from North Battleford (Mr. Kramer) was all for taking my scalp off a few times when I was Minister of Health and Mr. Steuart's scalp also for not locking up enough patients. That we were letting them out too fast. Let's look at what happened up in North Battleford. At a warehouse that was never intended for patients. Eating facilities were not fit for animals let alone people. This was tolerated by the former NDP Government. The population of that institution last year when we gave up the office of governing this Province was down to the figure recognized by Federal authorities as being suitable for that type of a building. The eating facilities are among the best in Saskatchewan now and no one, including the present Minister of Health, I am sure would have any hesitancy to eat meals there. But I can tell you a good many people did hesitate prior to the renovations. We had the welfare of these psychiatric patients at heart.

Let's look at what happened to the Budget. I believe and I stand to be correct, I may be a little bit out on this – it's just my memory – but I believe the figure back in 1964 was about \$11 million or there about, \$11 million or \$12 million and last year the Budget was almost \$18 million. Not a bad increase for a seven-year period. In addition to the current operating budget as I have indicated tremendous improvements were made in Battleford and in Weyburn. A new Psychiatric Service Centre added in Prince Albert. Improvements made at Yorkton.

He also made reference to funds being earmarked for improvements in Regina. I welcome this very sincerely because they are overdue, the facilities here in Regina are most inadequate. I hope we can move along quickly to get better accommodation of psychiatric patients in this area so that few or possibly none will have to be transferred elsewhere.

The Minister also made reference to some very interesting research being done by a Dr. Bolton up in Saskatoon and referred to research funds that were made available to him. I think that the Department under my administration can take credit for this because we recognized the value of Dr. Bolton's work. Granted it is in an area of research that there are many questions and imponderables but we were confident that Dr. Bolton is on the right track in this particular field of research and we encouraged him to move ahead.

Now he couldn't resist getting in the remark about removing the taxes on the estates of the mentally ill and thereby saving, I think the mentally ill some \$400,000. First of all, it is not the mentally ill who saved the \$400,000, it is the beneficiaries. In many cases beneficiaries not really needing the additional funds because once again the Members opposite are always guilty of suggesting that everyone who is in an acute hospital bed or in a mental hospital comes from a poor family and has no estate. He knows better than that because he sees the estates that are going over his desk.

Let's not fool ourselves. Prior to 1967 when the amendment to the Act was introduced, there were collections being made from the estates of the mentally ill. It was started way back in the fifties by the CCF Government. They are the ones that started taxing the estates of the mentally ill. It wasn't the Liberal Government, it was the CCF Government.

An Hon. Member: — Why didn't Walter tell the truth?

Mr. Grant: — In referring to the tremendous changes that are going to be taking place in the psychiatric program, I couldn't help but refer to some figures here and I find that (and once again, I stand to be corrected if I am wrong) but it appears that the budget this year is about \$19.3 million compared to the budget last year of \$18 million, an increase of slightly over \$1 million. A large portion of this is going to be taken out that there is no increase in staff if I have figured correctly. Actually there appears to be a slight reduction in staff compared to last year. And I was merely totalling up the staff figures on the Estimates here. So the psychiatric program does not appear to be as earth shattering, at least the changes as suggested by the Minister.

Now I will get down to the Bill which I said was quite acceptable to us and make a few comments. I don't think the Minister in his explanatory remarks adequately explained why we are going to be asked to change the words "own affairs" to "estate" and I hope he will give a further explanation of this. The explanatory note tells us that is what is going to be done but that really doesn't explain why it is being done. The other amendment to that particular section is quite in order because it changes the words "facilities" to "a facility" so that a certificate of incompetence can be issued in any facility rather than just the one that he has been housed in. The other clauses are quite acceptable and I see nothing wrong with them at all. The final clause, I should like the Hon. Minister to explain what is the intent of Section 59(1) which is a new section. I know what is meant by Section 59(2) but the requirement for Section 59(1) leaves me a little puzzled. Thanks, Mr. Speaker.

Hon. W.E. Smishek (Minister of Public Health): — Mr. Speaker, since the Hon. Member who has just taken his seat said that I spoke too long in the introduction of the Bill, I am going to be very brief in my closing remarks. He raised a number of questions on particular sections of the Bill, perhaps to be even briefer yet, it might be just as well to deal with those in Committee to explain the particular sections if he wishes me to be brief. Otherwise I can go into some explanations on a number of questions that he has raised now.

He made a number of references to the progress that has been made in the seven years that his Party was in office. I did not at any time infer that no progress had been made. I thought it important in introducing this Bill to enunciate the Government's policy and philosophy and approach to psychiatric care. I think this is important when such Bills that have an effect on particular programs should be explained in terms of government policy. That was the reason for my explanation. I believe I gave the House a reasonable explanation on the

particular sections of the Bill. It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that the best way to deal with the particular items raised is to consider these questions in Committee of the Whole. I will be glad to explain in detail the particular sections and questions the Hon. Member may have when we are in Committee. I therefore move second reading of the Bill, Mr. Speaker.

Motion agreed to and Bill read a second time.

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion by the Hon. Mr. MacMurchy that Bill No. 1 – An Act to establish the Department of Continuing Education be now read a second time.

Mr. J.C. McIsaac (Wilkie): — Mr. Speaker, I don't propose to take the time of the House for very long to conclude my remarks on this. Before I adjourned debate last week on this particular Bill, I had outlined to the — me and to the Minister the reasons why I felt we do not need a second Department of Education to administer the various aspects that are proposed under this piece of legislation. I pointed out that in Saskatchewan we have only one university, we have only one Board of Governors, that the institutes at Saskatoon, Moose Jaw and the one being built in Regina are presently administered under the Department of Education. I had also pointed out that if the Minister wants to try and avoid some of the duplication and bureaucratic confusion that he spoke of when he introduced this Bill that he certainly won't do that by setting up a second department with respect to education. If we are going to maintain the continuity and if we're going to continue to keep schools and the communities involved in the development of community colleges as was mentioned in another debate earlier this evening, Mr. Speaker, then surely that kind of development will not be facilitated by the establishment of a second Department of Education.

It's fine to say that in other provinces, Alberta and Ontario have much larger but similar institutions and a good many more universities than we have here and that they have been built and developed under a different system and another department that might make some sense. Mr. Speaker, again I suggest that I have no quarrel whatever with the objectives of community colleges as set out and of the various programs that the Minister spoke of, but I only say and repeat once again that to establish a second department to provide services for those aspects of education will in no way facilitate the operation of community colleges, adult programs, trades training and so on in the province and for that reason I will be opposing the Bill.

Mr. E.L. Cowley (Biggar): — Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise in this debate and speak on Bill No. 1, an Act to establish a Department of Continuing Education. I listened with interest the other day, and again this evening, to the former Minister of Education, that Member for Wilkie (Mr. McIsaac), who listed what he thought were some of the objections to the establishment of a second Department of Education in this Province. Mr. Speaker, he stated that he had no quarrels with the objectives of the Department and he had no quarrels with the objectives that are laid out for community colleges. I gather that he is indicating that he doesn't feel the new Department of Education will accomplish those objectives. Obviously, we on this side of the House don't agree with him. I think the proof of the pudding will be in the eating. He is obviously not opposed to it in

principle, simply on the basis that he doesn't feel the objectives will be attained.

There are certain reasons why I think we need a second department in Education, a department to deal with continuing education in this Province. One of the reasons is that the present Department of Education spends most of its money and a good deal of its effort in the field of the one to twelve, or perhaps in the future the 'k' to twelve, operation. Consequently, you might say that post secondary education or continuing education has always been a poor second cousin in the Department of Education Saskatchewan. The result is that we haven't spent the kind of time or put the kind of effort into co-ordinating activities in the field of post-secondary education that we should have. I think we can find examples of this throughout the province. We haven't put the kind of effort, particularly in the last seven years, into deciding what kind of a university system we want in Saskatchewan, what kind of other post-secondary operations we want, such as the community college and the institutes in Saskatoon and Moose Jaw. It takes a great deal of planning and co-ordination to avoid duplication of facilities and duplication of efforts around the province

Community colleges are an exciting idea, an exciting concept and one in which I see a great many opportunities for people who haven't in the past had these kinds of educational opportunities in Saskatchewan. But at the same time it is going to require a great deal of co-ordination with the university because what we don't want to see is little university campuses popping up all over Saskatchewan. They have had that experience in Alberta. They have had that experience in Ontario where they started out with a community college that was designed to do a specific thing, they hired staff and they went off on their own down the garden path. Low and behold, five years later there they were knocking on the door of the Provincial Government saying, "We're all ready, we want to be a Junior College." And the next step was, "Hey, we're all here, we're all ready, we've got this Junior College and now we want to be a university." Mr. Speaker, we can't afford that in Saskatchewan. We can't afford ten or twelve or fifteen universities. I think the Members opposite would agree that this isn't the kind of development we are looking for in Saskatchewan.

We have problems with the one university we have right now in Saskatchewan. The question of what should be the role of the campus in Saskatoon and what should be the role of the campus in Regina is still unanswered. I note with interest the discussion that is going on in the university community with respect to how much money should be spend on one campus or on the other campus. One of the problems that this Government is faced with is the fact that when we took office there really weren't any plans anywhere in this Government as to what the two university campuses should look like ten years from now. What was the role the Government saw for the campus in Regina and what was the role that the Government saw for the campus in Saskatoon? Somebody has to do this kind of planning. Somebody here has to make those kinds of decisions because, after all, it's money from the taxpayers of this Province that is eventually going to pay for it. Another problem that we faced and we still face is that we really didn't know what we were getting into when we looked at some of the capital projects that were proposed. It's one thing to give somebody \$10 million and say, "Build a building." If you've got \$10 million it's an easy

thing to do. However, when the building is built, you know, something has to happen in it. And in many cases, I suggest that in past years buildings have been built and no one has taken a look ahead of time at what it was going to cost next year or five years later or ten years later. I think a Department of Continuing Education has a job to do here so that we will know as a Government where we are going when we make these kind of commitments.

Mr. Speaker, I have some more things that I'd like to say about the new Department of Continuing Education and I would like therefore to beg leave to adjourn the debate.

Debate adjourned.

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion by the Hon. Mr. MacMurchy that Bill No. 2 – An Act to amend The Teacher Salary Agreements Act, 1968, be now read a second time.

Mr. McIsaac: — Mr. Speaker, last week in discussion of this motion before us I pointed out that the proposed amendments in most cases these are simply housekeeping in nature and amendments that we would take no exception to. However, I pointed out that there is one major amendment in this Bill which will remove the possibility of the Minister establishing a board of arbitration to settle a dispute and that I would oppose. That amendment was put there not because it was the intention or the hope of the Government, I am sure, then or now to use it particularly but it was put there as a means of getting out of a situation, the very kind of situation that could – and I say could – perhaps be building up in Area 4 today. I don't know if it is or not and I am sure the Minister hope as I do that it isn't But that particular amendment provides for the Minister who does have a responsibility if not to the teachers and trustees, but certainly to the students and the parents of the province, to try and help arrive at a settlement when normal means of bargaining have been exhausted and conciliation and mediation and so on have brought no results. And if for one reason or another either side or both are not able to agree to go to arbitration then that amendment gave the Minister power to appoint an arbitration board and arrive at a settlement. Mr. Speaker, as I say it seems when we have a situation developing such as may well be developing in Area 4 in the city here today. Accordingly, Mr. Speaker, as I mentioned last week, I will be opposing this Bill for that particular reason.

Mr. C.P. MacDonald (Milestone): — Mr. Speaker, first of all I want to tell the House and you, Sir, that there is no way that the Opposition will permit this Bill to get second reading this evening. Here we are the night before, Mr. Speaker, the night before several hundred or even a thousand or two thousand or three thousand children in Regina will not be permitted to go to school tomorrow because of a withdrawal of services because of the inability to strike an agreement with the trustees in this Province. And here we are, Sir, the night before this kind of a breakdown, the night before this kind of a withdrawal of service the Minister of Education asks us to pass a Bill in this House which allows him to relieve himself of all responsibility in the future. It allows him to take away the authority and the responsibility perhaps to find a solution to this problem.

Mr. Speaker, we on this side of the House have been saying that he has been sitting on his backside. He has been hiding behind his desk ever since he became the Minister of Education in relation to area bargaining and in relation to the negotiations presently going on. I also suggest, Mr. Speaker, that it is the Minister of Education who has deliberately gone out and attempted to destroy area bargaining. He has criticized it from the day he has become the Minister and you know, Sir, today I pick up the newspaper and he has already appointed a committee to propose a new act. And now, Mr. Speaker...

Mr. Romanow: — It doesn't work!

Mr. MacDonald: — Of course it doesn't work when the Minister of Education won't support it and doesn't want it to work. Mr. Speaker, in Canada in the last few months we have experienced some very major strikes that have caused some real heartache and hardship to the Canadian economy and the Canadian public. A few weeks ago we had the air controllers' strike then we have the technicians, we've had the postal services, people in this nation are demanding that both employer and employee get down to worthwhile negotiation and that every possible means be used to solve disputes that arise. Here, Mr. Speaker, we have in this Province an Act that states that it does not prohibit a strike it puts no onus on teachers and trustees to abide by it, it merely states that here in a time when teachers and trustees in this Province cannot get together cannot reach an agreement that then they will sit down and the Minister of Education can appoint a board of arbitration and come in with a recommended settlement. First of all I'm not sure who is to blame, I'm not sure whether it is trustees or teachers but certainly in negotiations that are going on there is going to be a collision. Very often it becomes extremely difficult to sit down and talk to one another and very often when a withdrawal of service comes along there is a device or a technique that is needed and required to bring those two groups back to the negotiating table. Here we have one in the Province of Saskatchewan and now on the night before a strike on the night before a withdrawal of service the Attorney General and the House leader calls this Bill and asks us to pass second reading to withdraw this opportunity for the Minister of Education.

Mr. Speaker, I call on the Minister of Education to take a little leadership in this dispute and whether or not he uses this clause or not to call upon both sides and to use his personal offices to get them back to the negotiating table and see if he can't get it to work. Mr. Speaker, I intend to have more to say on this after we watch developments in the next week or two and I therefore beg leave to adjourn the debate.

Hon. R. Romanow (Attorney General): — Before the question is put on leave to adjourn the debate, and I have no objection to granting the Hon. Member the request for leave to adjourn the debate. Just on a brief Point of Order, I should like to say again for the purpose of the smooth running of the House that the request for this Bill to come on for continuing debate on second reading was at the instance of the Hon. The Whip from the opposite side and we concurred with that, not at the call of the House leader. I just want to say this, I say as a Point of Order, Mr. Speaker, that had I known that those were going to be the substance of the remarks by the acting Leader of the Opposition, believe me I never would have called Bill 2, but I did so taking the word

March 13, 1972

of the Hon. the Whip of the Liberal Party.

Mr. Speaker: — Order! That is a Point of Procedure, not a Point of Order. That is procedure of the House.

Debate adjourned.

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