

**LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN**  
**Second Session — Seventeenth Legislature**  
**16th Day**

**March 16, 1972**

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

**WELCOME TO STUDENTS**

**Mr. B.M. Dyck** (Saskatoon City Park): — Mr. Speaker, I want to say how pleased I am to introduce through you to the Members of this Assembly the students from Richmond Heights Elementary School in Saskatoon. Judging from the performance of this group before the Session was called to order I think they are a rather enthusiastic group. I believe they are sitting in the west gallery. I trust that they will have a worthwhile afternoon and I hope they have a safe journey home.

**Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. W.A. Robbins** (Saskatoon Nutana Centre): — Mr. Speaker, I should like to draw to the attention of the Members in the Assembly 78 students from Lorne Hazelton School in Saskatoon. They are seated in the west gallery. They are accompanied by their teachers Miss Claxton and Mr. Panasiuk. I sincerely hope that they will have an enjoyable afternoon in the Legislature and that they find it edifying and we wish them a safe journey home.

**Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. A. Thibault** (Melfort-Kinistino): — Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to introduce the fine group of students from the Wakaw High School. They are 20 in number. They left Wakaw at six o'clock this morning and they are led here by their teacher Mr. Herman Kraus and their bus driver Mr. John Redl. I am sure their trip here this afternoon will be very educational. I hope they enjoy their trip and also a safe journey home.

**Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. D.H. Lange** (Assiniboia-Bengough): — Mr. Speaker, on behalf of Mr. Cy MacDonald, the Member for Milestone and Mr. Ivan Pepper, the Member for Weyburn, I should like to introduce a group of students situated in the speaker's gallery from Ogema, a small town situated in one of the many corners of the Assiniboia-Bengough constituency. They are accompanied by their teacher Mrs. Ivorson. I hope that when they leave the gallery this afternoon they will have been favourably impressed and educated by the rhetoric which will be disseminated on the floor of the Chamber.

**Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. C.P. MacDonald** (Milestone): — Mr. Speaker, I certainly do appreciate the comments of

of the Member for Assiniboia-Bengough and I want to tell him that many of the students in from Ogema do come from the Milestone constituency, I'm not sure how many in this particular class, but I, too, want to join with the member for Bengough in expressing a welcome to them and hope that they have an interesting and educational afternoon.

**Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. H.H.P. Baker** (Regina Wascana): — Mr. Speaker, I want to extend a very warm welcome to a group of Balfour Technical students from the Balfour Technical Collegiate. They are seated in the east gallery. They are 85 in number and are in Grade Twelve. They are accompanied by Mr. Wahl, Mr. Weickel and Mr. Harder. Of course, Mr. Speaker, you will realize that by the next election they will be potential voters. Balfour Collegiate has always been our family collegiate in this city. I hope that they will have a pleasant afternoon and that their stay here will someday inspire them to become more involved in the activities of our democratic system. It is our young people who are our potential and future leaders. Mr. Speaker, it is indeed a pleasure to welcome them this afternoon.

**Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

## ANNOUNCEMENTS

### WINTER WORKS PROGRAM

**Hon. J.R. Messer** (Minister of Agriculture): — Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day I wish to make an announcement in regard to winter works. The Saskatchewan Power corporation has and will undertake 13 special projects designed to create extra winter employment. The corporation has launched an on-the-job training program for apprentice linemen for field positions throughout the province.

Many of the projects have been advanced to alleviate a possible work shortage by contractors and manufacturing firms in this province. The work valued at more than one million dollars will create 40,000 man days of employment during the period January 1 to May 31, 1972. Three major Saskatchewan industries have received contracts for the supply of materials for the Corporation's forthcoming electrical program.

In north eastern Saskatchewan crews are now building pipeline through muskeg portion that when completed next summer will bring natural gas to Hudson Bay.

Tenders have been called for the dismantling of boiler room equipment at the Moose Jaw power plant. The plant no longer used by the Corporation was closed down several years ago but equipment removal was not planned for some time to come.

Two projects underway in Saskatoon will create and provide about 11,000 man days of winter employment in that city. Work is presently underway on renovations on the gas meter repair shop. Interior painting to the Queen Elizabeth power station will begin shortly. Maintenance programs for power plant equipment and upgrading of some rural electrification

systems have been brought forward and included in this winter works program.

**Mr. C.P. MacDonald** (Milestone): — Mr. Speaker, I just want to tell the Minister that we certainly welcome his announcement this morning, particularly after we have just received the information from Statistics Canada about the growing and increasing and expanding unemployment situation in the Province of Saskatchewan. It is now reaching staggering and frightening proportions.

### **BIRTHDAY CONGRATULATIONS TO R.L. HANBIDGE**

**Mr. A.E. Blakeney** (Premier): — Mr. Speaker, I should like to take a moment of the time of the House to extend on behalf of all members our heartiest congratulations to the former Lieutenant-Governor of Saskatchewan, the Honourable R.L. Hanbidge on the occasion of his 81 birthday which he is celebrating today.

**Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Blakeney:** — I don't think I need to outline to this House the Hon. Mr. Hanbidge's record of public service in municipal politics as mayor and as a councillor and as a chairman of a school board and a hospital board. He once was a Member of this House. He used to say that he retired from the Saskatchewan Legislature with the consent of the majority of his constituents. He then served in the House of Commons having been elected on two occasions in 1958 and in 1962. And, of course, he served as Lieutenant Governor of this Province as the Queen's representative from 1963 until 1970.

It gives me a great deal of pleasure to extend to this outstanding statesman of Saskatchewan our sincere good wishes and our best wishes for the years ahead which we hope will be long and happy ones.

**Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. C.P. MacDonald** (Milestone): — Mr. Speaker, I take pleasure on behalf of the Opposition in seconding the motion of the Hon. Premier extending congratulations to Denny Hanbidge. I am sure that the majority of us on this side that have had the good fortune of being elected to the Executive Council in Saskatchewan had the privilege of working with Denny Hanbidge for many years. His sense of humor, his keen wit, his love of Saskatchewan and the reaction and the response of the Saskatchewan people to his warmth and his generosity is something that none of us will forget for many, many years. We enjoy and support the motion.

**Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

### **QUESTIONS**

#### **TEACHER-TRUSTEE BARGAINING LEGISLATION**

**Mr. J.C. McIsaac** (Wilkie): — Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a question to the Minister of Education (Mr. MacMurchy). In his absence today perhaps the Premier would comment. Last weekend apparently

the Minister made an announcement with respect to a review of the teacher-trustee bargaining legislation. It was made outside the House and it didn't come to my attention until yesterday. As I understand the press comments the Minister proposes to appoint the four conciliators who were active in this fall's negotiations to bring it and to draft a new piece of legislation to replace the present one. I'm, first of all, amazed that the Minister finds an issue such as the extension of kindergartens in the province important enough – and I agree perhaps it is, to hold public hearings throughout the province – I would surely hope the Minister would reconsider this and agree to instead of having four people draft legislation, to hold public hearings.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order, order! I think that the members must realize that if you look on page 147 in Beauchesne you will find that part of the interpretations in Beauchesne, page 147. Too many of our questions are prefaced with a short speech and once we allow this it gets out of hand. I think Members should come back to the point and ask the questions and not preface with a statement.

**Hon. A.E. Blakeney** (Premier): — Mr. Speaker, in answer to the Hon. Member's question, I would point out that there has been extensive public discussion and there were opportunities at least for extensive public hearings, as I recall it, when the Moore Commission dealt at some length with the matter of teacher-trustee bargaining. I think that the comment made by the Minister of Education was to the effect that he was going to have the four persons who acted as conciliators advise him of ways in which the present legislation was defective. I don't think he suggested they were going to draft new legislation. I think he did suggest they were going to give to the Minister the benefit of their combined and collective experience as to the defects in the existing system of teacher-trustee bargaining. Those defects I think are obvious. He is simply trying to find out in a collective way what defects there are, at least, that are in the minds of the four people who acted as conciliators.

### **ESTABLISHMENT OF A DEPARTMENT OF NORTHERN AFFAIRS**

**Mr. A.R. Guy** (Athabasca): — Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a question to the Premier. It appears evident from the statements made by the Premier and his Ministers that until the new Department of Northern Affairs has been established there will be no changes or new policies respecting the people of northern Saskatchewan. Therefore, it would appear to be in the best interests of these people to have this new department established as soon as possible. I should like to ask the Premier, in view of his meeting in La Ronge yesterday with the Members of the NDP Executive if the Government still intends to proceed with the legislation to establish this new department and if so when we might anticipate the legislation?

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order, order! That notice of motion was given today that this was going to be introduced on Monday next.

**Mr. Romanow:** — Where were you, Allan?

**Mr. Speaker:** — I don't think we should permit questions on what has already happened on today's Order Paper.

**Mr. Guy:** — I'm sorry, Mr. Speaker, I wasn't in the House when it was — you could have interrupted me a little earlier. I think the Premier would like to answer anyway.

**Mr. Blakeney:** — Mr. Speaker, I should like to point out as he did suggest that I was in La Ronge and I did meet with some people of our group. I also met with the principal of the school, with the administrator of the hospital, with the manager of La Ronge Industries, the mayor La Ronge. I discussed with all of them the possibilities of a new department for the North which we are going to proceed with at the earliest possible date.

### COAL MINE ANNOUNCEMENT REPETITION

**Mr. G.B. Grant** (Regina Whitmore Park): — Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day I should like to direct a question to the Hon. Minister of Industry and Commerce (Mr. Thorson), and when I say I was absent from the House yesterday I want to explain so that there won't be laughter as I missed it because I want on serious business. I was attending the funeral of the wife of a member of the staff in this building. Mr. Speaker, yesterday the Hon. Minister of Industry and Commerce from Souris-Estevan, Mr. Thorson, apparently made a statement that a new coal mine would be opened in the Estevan area and he took the opportunity to make this announcement in the House. While I missed the announcement, I see a news release that fills me in pretty well as to what was said. I should like to ask the Hon. Member from Souris-Estevan, Mr. Speaker, in light of the release dated May 17 over my own signature which says that Mr. Grant...

**Mr. Speaker:** — Would the Hon. Member come back to his question. We are getting too much of a preliminary lead-up to it.

**Mr. Grant:** — I have to tell them what I am going to ask, Mr. Speaker. At that time I announced that this mine would be in operation in 1972 and would do certain things in 1973 and 1974. In light of that announcement made last May I should like to ask the Hon. Minister why he felt it necessary in making the announcement of the first industry under the NDP for Saskatchewan, to repeat on my announcement of last May?

**Hon. K. Thorson** (Minister of Industry and Commerce): — Mr. Speaker, I'm sorry to see the Member for Regina City falling into the error of the ways and the precedent and example set by the Member for Milestone (Mr. MacDonald). There is some improvement. It isn't quite as loud and he doesn't throw his hands in the air and his voice doesn't get shrill, but he gets up and makes a little speech and then wants the House to believe that he is asking a question.

**Mr. Lane:** — Answer the question.

**Mr. Thorson:** — If the Member for Regina City had been listening yesterday, he would have known exactly what I said.

**Mr. Grant:** — I wasn't here, Mr. Speaker.

**An Hon. Member:** — Check with Hansard.

**Mr. Thorson:** — I indicated at the time, Mr. Speaker, that the first tangible evidence of the new coal mine at Estevan was in evidence as of this week with the movement of equipment by the M & S Coal Company to the site of the new mine. I indicated very clearly that this was the result of two years of negotiations and work, that there had been three mines in operation in Estevan and the area and that there are now going to be four mines. This new mine is not something that has come up all of a sudden. I made the statement in the House for the same reason that the president of M & S Coal Company made the announcement in the city of Estevan on the evening of March 14th.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order! I think we are getting too lengthy in questions and answers on the Orders of the Day and we will have to try to keep them down if we can. I hope all Members on both sides will co-operate with that.

#### **QUESTION OF PERSONAL PRIVILEGE – MR. GARDNER INCORRECTLY IDENTIFIED**

**Mr. E.F. Gardner** (Moosomin): — Mr. Speaker, I have a question of personal privilege. It will be very, very brief. Yesterday I spoke in this Chamber in the debate on the radio. I was incorrectly identified by the announcer. In fact, my name was not mentioned at any time during the speech but the name of another Member was.

**Mr. Romanow:** — That's what made it so good.

**Mr. Gardner:** — I consider this rather a serious error because I don't think that any member in this House wants to make statements and have them attributed to someone else. No other Member wants to take the responsibility for statements made by me. So I should like to suggest, Mr. Speaker, to you as chairman of the radio committee, that I hope you will take the necessary steps to look into this matter and to make sure that this type of an error doesn't occur again.

#### **ADJOURNED DEBATES**

##### **BUDGET DEBATE**

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of the Hon. Mr. Blakeney: that this Assembly do now resolve itself into the Committee of Finance; and the proposed amendment thereto, moved by Mr. Boldt.

**Mr. M. Feschuk** (Prince Albert East): — Mr. Speaker, may I say again that I am honored, Sir, as a representative of the constituency of Prince Albert and specifically representing the very good people of Prince Albert East constituency, in addressing myself to you in the

Budget Debate.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Feschuk:** — However, Mr. Speaker, had it not been for a serious illness a year and a half ago of my friend, Bill Berezowsky, he would be here today speaking and fighting for the rights, the charters and the privileges of the citizens of this province.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Feschuk:** — I propose, therefore, Mr. Speaker, to use a few minutes of my time to talk about the virtues, the love, the dedication that Bill has for his people and is remembered and known for. William John Berezowsky as a teacher, Justice of the Peace, Municipal Secretary, farmer, administrator or a Member of the Legislative Assembly, more often known as Bill, has always been a true servant of the Saskatchewan community.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Feschuk:** — Wherever people of all political faiths had problems, personal or public, they came to Bill and somehow he found the answers. As far back as the depression of the '30s when under the Liberal administration, and nature's drought, Saskatchewan farmers moved into northern Saskatchewan settling on sub-marginal lands, it was then that hopeless poverty was first on the Orders of the Day, Bill came up with the answer to their economic problems suggesting to the Hon. T.C. Douglas a Northern Settlers Re-establishment Branch, a program of rehabilitation for the thousands of displaced families.

Bill Berezowsky is one of these unique perceptive people who can see into the future. When the late Hon. Lockie McIntosh was faced with the problem of helping northern communities to build satisfactory schools, the then maximum allowable grant being only \$500 under The School Grants Act, Bill gave him the answer. "Rewrite the Act, change the law," he told the Minister. Mr. Speaker, the law was changed and schools were built at public cost.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Feschuk:** — Schools were built at Meath Park, Weirdale, Albertville, Macdowall, Hudson Bay and many more places throughout the North.

It was Bill Berezowsky and men like him who proposed the Market Grid Road system in 1954-55, a program which required a series of hard fought battles in caucus and finally became the pride of rural Saskatchewan.

As the records show, Mr. Speaker, it was Bill Berezowsky who urged a publicly owned pulp mill at Prince Albert in the late '50s and who urged the Government to transform the fish Marketing Service and Government Trading Stores into producer-consumer northern co-operatives, against the advice of the then administrators. Today, these co-operatives and the National Inland Fresh Water Fish Marketing Service are a memorial to

this hard fighting and dedicated man.

You will remember, Mr. Speaker, that it was Bill who prevailed upon the Government to build the Hanson lake Road to Creighton and it was Berezowsky who led the fight for the human rights of our native people.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Feschuk:** — These are only a few of the many achievements of this former MLA who represented Cumberland-Prince Albert East constituency. I could have mentioned his work and his interest in conservation, education, in resource development, demanding roads to isolated communities such as were built to Cumberland House and Pelican Narrows, the removal of school taxes from real property, a better and a more comprehensive health program and the removal of hotdog taxes.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Feschuk:** — This man, Mr. Speaker, has no memorial on these grounds nor has he a statue in this Legislature, but his works are seen all around us, even to naming the community of Uranium City which name he suggested to the then Deputy Minister of Natural Resources, Mr. Wilf Churchman in 1951.

I do hope that in due course of time, something may be done to commemorate the good name of William John Berezowsky, MLA.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Feschuk:** — I think Mr. Speaker, that too often the work of an MLA is taken for granted. I believe that there are occasions when people must be reminded concerning elected servants who never ask but always give. Mr. Berezowsky is known to be that kind of person who always give of himself.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Feschuk:** — Mr. Speaker, before I proceed to other matters I should like to advise this House and all those listening to me that Bill is once again, having recovered his health, giving of himself at the next forthcoming NDP federal Convention as a candidate.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Feschuk:** — I join with many people in and around Prince Albert, Melfort, Nipawin and Meath Park in prophesying that Bill Berezowsky will get the nomination and will also win the seat for social democracy. As some young people put, Mr. Speaker, "He will defeat John".

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Feschuk:** — Mr. Speaker, I should like to leave a word of caution



to the Hon. Members opposite and especially to my friend the Hon. Member from Regina Lakeview (Mr. MacPherson). I will say, boys, save your money because in the Prince Albert race your horse will be a sure loser.

Mr. Speaker, I now proceed to certain urgent needs of my constituency. Let me say that I am happy to pick up the fight for Prince Albert East and let me say, Mr. Speaker, that I am not disappointed. To me the duties and obligations entrusted by the electors of the Prince Albert East constituency have been pleasant and rewarding. I should at this time take this opportunity to convey to my people of the Prince Albert East constituency my sincere thanks for their confidence and trust conferred upon me at the last June 23<sup>rd</sup> provincial election. I will fulfil my obligations with humility and dedication in their best interest and in the interest of all the people of Saskatchewan.

Mr. Speaker, the constituency of Prince Albert East is located in the northeast of this province. It is about the most diversified constituency of Saskatchewan. My constituency, although proud of its farming achievements, is also concerned with its natural and mineral resources such as the mining industry at Creighton and the pulp mill industry in Prince Albert. Although the Prince Albert East constituency may be considered the largest constituency in this province, its constituents may be justly proud of its lakes and rivers and of the natural beauty much of which has not yet been spoiled by pollution or man. Mr. Speaker, within the boundaries of the Prince Albert East constituency we have what might be called a fishermen's paradise and I hope that my constituents will acknowledge that in this Budget we recognize and make provisions for the expansion of the tourist industry and I hope that this industry can continue to expand and to grow.

Let me repeat that my predecessor fought for and demanded of the previous Liberal administration an access road to Deschambault Lake from Hanson Lake Road. Over the years he asked for as little as \$12,000 and \$15,000 to be spent for a winter road, but quite obviously for political reasons the program was shelved by the then Minister of Natural Resources.

Let me advise this House that under the administration of the NDP Government and with the co-operation of the Minister of Natural Resources, \$47,000 was provided for a winter access road to Deschambault. The Department of Natural Resources work crews have completed cutting the road to Deschambault on March 9

. Mr. Speaker, I should like to refer to a progress report and I quote:

Progress report on Deschambault road. Clearing operations and the centre line location for the above road were commenced on Saturday, February 26, 1972. Location was established with the aid of a helicopter and ground crew. Dozer equipment was comprised of two TD-20 and TD-15 crawler tractor and dozer units.

Initial breakthrough of the 19 miles long route to the settlement was accomplished on Thursday, March 9. As of March 13 clearing of debris was completed on a path of 10 feet to 12 feet wide thus enabling the passing of truck traffic to the settlement. Widening of the right-of-way is now in progress. It is expected that

clearing operations will be completed during the last week in March.

The established route is suitable for the construction of an all weather road at some future date. Roadway alignment is suitable for design speeds of 50 miles an hour or better. It was possible to avoid most of the bedrock outcrops and thus actual construction costs will be quite reasonable.

Estimated spending to date is approximately \$18,000. This cost includes reconnaissance, helicopter services, camp moving costs, equipment, wages and fuel.

It is expected that final costs for this project will be below the original estimated amount.

Mr. Speaker, this report was submitted by Mr. Ed Krip, our civil engineer on March 13, 1972.

I know that the people of Deschambault will acknowledge that this Government is interested in their future and in the future of our northern communities.

As of April 1, 1971, Mr. Speaker, when the Smeaton Union Hospital was closed because the resident doctor had left, the community of Smeaton and area was without the hospital services, so critical to the health care of the people in that area and for many miles to the north. I am delighted to say, Mr. Speaker, that as of April 1, 1972 the Smeaton Union Hospital will once again be opened permitting the hospital to again function as an active treatment centre. I hope that in the near future we can review the merits of home care for this area.

The opening of the Smeaton Union Hospital with the removal of the two mill levy, the removing of deterrent fees and provisions of free medical and hospital premiums for our citizens over 65 will be acknowledged by the people of Prince Albert East. This Government is interested in setting a model of health care for rural Saskatchewan.

The small businessmen in this province will acknowledge that this Budget provides assistance for their development and maintenance and a new program will enable our towns and villages to apply dust-free surfacing to their streets. This not only will create employment and must needed facilities but this will improve the net assets of our rural communities.

The people in the field of labour welcome these programs as well, Mr. Speaker, and with the upgrading of our Department of Labour, our people in the labour forces are looking toward much greater industrial peace.

I want to reassure my constituents that in the highway program for 1972 paving will be continued from Meath Park to Choiceland and regarding from Choiceland to White Fox. This highway budget provides approximately \$1.75 million to be spent on this road. I recognize that in a constituency such as Prince Albert East this amount is very limited and has its shortcomings, however, I am hopeful that this Government will recognize the urgent necessity of improving our roads in the North and I hope that in the future we can take steps in that direction.

I suggest to this Government as did my predecessor, that a publicly owned paper newsprint mill be built in Prince Albert, Mr. Speaker. It is common knowledge that Parsons and Whittemore are disposing of the best pulp product in the world at reduced prices. Mr. Speaker, when this province exported pulpwood outside of Saskatchewan, we exported jobs out of this province. When we export our pulp product, Mr. Speaker, we are exporting jobs from this province as well. It can be said, Mr. Speaker, that like the farming community, we pay the freight rate both ways in the pulp industry as well. I request this Government to make a feasibility study into the production and sales of paper and newsprint. Whether this is a proper proposal to make at this time may be questioned. But more important to me is that the processing of pulp into high quality paper and newsprint be right here in Saskatchewan.

I strongly believe, Mr. Speaker, that our primary products should be manufactured into durable products here in this province and in our local communities to provide essential employment and to bring wealth, opportunity and sources of additional income to my constituency and to my province.

I also believe that some other minor industries could be brought into our northern communities. Prince Albert could well accommodate a rapeseed processing plant and is worth looking at. Rapeseed grown in this area is noted for its high protein content and high oil quality. The Prince Albert area is known for growing the best rapeseed in Western Canada. This area is well capable of sufficient production to maintain a 500-ton per day crushing operation. Prince Albert at present has supporting facilities and is central to the rapeseed production area.

Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the Premier for bringing in such a functional Budget. I will not support the amendment, I will be happy to support the Budget.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. W.A. Robbins** (Saskatoon Nutana Centre): — Mr. Speaker, in rising to take part in this Budget Debate, I wish to offer my congratulations to the Provincial Treasurer for his forthright presentation and clearly enunciated elucidation of the current state of affairs in the Saskatchewan economy within the context of the national economy and a reasoned resume of the financial prospects and problems in the years ahead. Many of us in this Party who supported the present Premier and Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Blakeney), the Hon. Member for Regina Centre, for the leadership of the New Democratic Party realized that his intellectual attributes, his social concerns and his innate capabilities would be highly beneficial to this province and this nation. I commend him for his efforts.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Robbins:** — Mr. Speaker, the second thought which is driven home rather forcibly in this Debate is the ineptitude of the Opposition benches and a continual bewilderment on my part concerning the eminent success the Saskatchewan liberal Party achieves at being so consistently wrong. When the party opposite, Mr. Speaker, was elected in 1964 after a long

and well deserved wandering in the wilderness, their first budget presented in 1965 included some tax reductions. In 1966 they presented a budget which continued the practice and reduced some additional taxes. However, when we arrived in the 1967-68 fiscal year, the financial shadows had commenced to lengthen and the cold winds of economic reality had arrived. Inherent financial problems were clearly identifiable. The then Saskatchewan Liberal Government prepared to meet the crisis. An election was prematurely called in October of 1967. A new mandate was essential prior to the opening of the books for an accounting. Impending financial problems demanded action — call an election. Liberals campaigned vigorously. All was well in “the new Saskatchewan”, according to the MacLaren Advertising Agency. I for one, predicted heavy financial going. Liberals scoffed. On the night of the 1967 Liberal election victory, when congratulating my opponent who amassed a 1,282 majority, I predicted that the re-elected government would shortly announce we were in a financial crisis. I expressed the view that heavy tax increases and/or possibly severe budgetary cuts would be announced shortly. I stated by perusal of the government’s financial situation indicated a deficit position of at least \$35 million.

Ten days later the then Premier of Saskatchewan, the late W. Ross Thatcher, announced — you guessed it — that we were in a financial crisis and in March, 1968, the present Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Steuart) that noisy little nuisance from the northern woods, the Provincial Treasurer, introduced the infamous Black Friday Budget increasing tax levies by \$38 million. That was the year of the crunch. Deterrent fees were introduced. Education and Hospital tax was made applicable to a host of new commodities and services. We even had a two-cent per gallon tax on fuel used in agriculture. The first time ever in the history of this province. The Liberal party had to be the first with something. The Saskatchewan electorate was rewarded for returning the Liberal government to power in the new Saskatchewan. The heaviest tax load in Saskatchewan history was imposed. Those shrewd, Mr. Speaker, — according to their own description — these shrewd business-like entrepreneurial gladiators, now sitting to your left — few in number — some no doubt saved temporarily — given minor respite from the electors’ wrath — through an unwarranted and unscrupulous redistribution of electoral boundaries — have been, in the management of Saskatchewan financial resources, consistently irrelevant and consistently wrong. Surely, they did not plan it that way, Mr. Speaker. After all, they do not believe in planning — planning they term as socialism. However, Mr. Speaker, planning does not, I hasten to add, mean that one will be exactly right. It does give reasonable assurance that one may be approximately right rather than exactly wrong.

When the Liberals occupied the Treasury benches they reduced taxes when they should not have done so and increased them enormously when they should have reduced them. In this respect they are right in step with their Ottawa counterparts. When inflation was a serious threat in 1969-70, monetary restraint was stringently applied. The result, clearly predictable and readily admitted by the Prime Minister of this country, increased the unemployment rolls. The approach the Prince Minister said was economically essential and required despite the side effect throughout the economy. In 1971 the crunch came again. In 1972, however, the prospect of an impending Federal election evaporated the inflationary threat. Money

supply is being sharply increased creating inbuilt inflationary probabilities in the months to come at both Provincial and Federal levels. Trying to get Liberal politicians to realize economic realities is like trying to pin a piece of jelly to the wall.

I should like now, Mr. Speaker, to look specifically at the revenue side of the Budget presented to this Assembly last Friday. A budget, Mr. Speaker, should be one's servant and not his master. It is a guide and a guard. It is a measurement of the probabilities in the financial accounting of government. The financial critic from Her Majesty's Loyal Opposition, the Member from Albert Park (Mr. MacLeod) — that concentrated constituency — that two by four bit of real estate — had severe difficulty in coping with the budgetary figures. One must admit he is normally used to rather small mathematical calculations related to the limited electorate he represents. His difficulties come about somewhat naturally.

A perusal of the budget indicated estimated revenues totalling \$514,046,680. Income tax will, it is estimated produce \$86,120,000 - \$70,800,000 from individuals and \$15,320,000 from corporations. This is the fairest tax of all, Mr. Speaker, based on ability to pay. The financial critic never even mentioned it.

The financial critic, Mr. Speaker, had harsh words for the sums available to Saskatchewan in the form of Federal-Provincial payments. A statutory subsidy of \$2,122,000, an equalization payment of \$119,300,000 and a post-secondary education equalization grant of \$18,914,000 — a total of \$140,336,000. By some queer Liberal logic this was a handout from Ottawa. Does the member know that Saskatchewan is part of Canada? Is he not aware that Liberal governments in Prince Edward Island and Nova Scotia receive much larger percentage proportions of their annual budgetary requirements from the Federal authority than we do in Saskatchewan? Is he not aware that funds from Saskatchewan end up in terms of trade in the 'have' provinces, particularly Ontario and British Columbia as a result of a national tariff policy which is tough in an economic sense on this province? Equalization payments do not put us in the category of paupers and mendicants.

I note the Liberal Party is currently advertising in the Regina daily paper for organizers. I suggest they add a new category — financial critics.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Robbins:** — The reason equalization payments rose substantially in the current fiscal year and in the preceding fiscal year was because Saskatchewan income plummeted and the Saskatchewan economy suffered sharp decline in the preceding Liberal years 1968-69 and 1969-70. Saskatchewan average income fell well below the national average, and equalization payments are required and are available as a right, as they should be, to adjust the imbalance.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Robbins:** — Mr. Speaker, our Government's Budget for 1972-73 anticipates revenues of \$514,046,680. This is made up as follows: the

amounts I have previously mentioned in relation to Federal-Provincial payments and income tax receipts plus a proposed \$72,500,000 from Education and Health tax; \$55 million in gasoline tax — and I should like to remind the Member for Cannington (Mr. Weatherald) that it was the Liberals who raised the tax from 15 cents to 19 cents per gallon during their period of office. Tobacco tax is estimated to bring in \$6,200,000; liquor profits are estimated at \$29,500,000 and resource revenues at \$47,174,000. Resource revenues will come from petroleum and natural gas to the extent of \$27,342,000; \$1,497,500 from metallic minerals; \$6,539,000 from mineral tax; \$4,013,000 from potash; \$448,000 from other minerals and \$7,334,500 from fish, fur, game, water lands and forests.

The financial critic insists we do not develop our resources but resource revenues come from resource development — a total of \$47,174,000 in this Budget.

I recall a Liberal who sat in this House and asserted during the 1944-64 CCF administration years that not a single oil well would be discovered in Saskatchewan while the socialists were in office. There weren't any oil wells in this province in 1944, there were 5,337 in 1964. The Hon. Member for Lumsden (Mr. Lane) agreed the other day that a Liberal is a Liberal is a Liberal. Only a Liberal, Mr. Speaker, could be wrong 5,337 on the one statement.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Robbins:** — Later that same Liberal Member stood for Federal Liberal nomination. He didn't make it. Was it because he was wrong 5,337 times on the one statement? A Liberal analysis of such horrendously inaccurate proportions should have eminently qualified him as a Federal Liberal candidate, for only the Liberal Party, Mr. Speaker, even without conscientiously working at it can be so consistently wrong. The financial critic follows the same old out-moded propaganda line.

A perusal of the expenditure side of the Budget is revealing, Mr. Speaker. We are castigated, Mr. Speaker, for giving priority to people. We spend \$37,000,050 for public health and \$56,130,090 for hospitalization and Medicare plans, a total of \$93,103,140. Welfare requires \$39,435,960 a rising cost which is a concern of all governments, a portion of which, Mr. Speaker, is directly attributable to misguided economic policies at the national level.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Robbins:** — Educational costs total \$161,419,540 including general educational costs of \$117,169,540 and \$44,250,000 to the university. Opposition Members have been highly critical of the grants to the university. May I inform them the university administration heretofore worked on a policy of confrontation in relation to its financial requirements from the Saskatchewan Government, a policy which should not and I trust will not work with this Government.

Highways and grid roads will take \$82,051,020 — \$22,301,200 in maintenance, \$45 million in capital grants, \$14,749,820 for grid roads.

Municipal Affairs budgets for \$36,307,610, a large increase because of the Property Improvement Grant for homes, small businesses and farms. We said we would bring significant property tax relief in our first term of office. In eight short months we finished our Property Improvement Grant program. I wish to assure the Opposition, Mr. Speaker, it is in readily marketable condition.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Robbins:** — Government services will cost \$20,499,870 — \$11,743,000 for capital expenditures. The secondary financial critic for the Opposition, the Hon. Member for Wilkie (Mr. McIsaac) reports a decline from some \$15 million in the Public Works' budget in the last Liberal Budget in this item down to the \$11,743,000 in this one. The Liberals had no plans to spend that \$15 million on Public Works in the 1971-72 Budget, they only said they had. Mr. Speaker, there is a vast difference between propaganda and performance.

Agriculture in the 1972-73 Budget is estimated at \$18,378,100 — \$12,684,090 for ordinary expenditures and \$5,340,150 for capital expenditures, with \$353,860 assessed for the Saskatchewan Crop Insurance Board.

Resource development will take \$17,525,180; \$1,768,190 is required by treasury for interest on non-self liquidating debt.

Total expenditures, Mr. Speaker, are estimated at \$513,195,090 resulting in a budgetary surplus of \$851,590.

Mr. Speaker, by some strange machiavellian mathematical formula, the financial critic concludes that because this Government spends \$18,378,100 in agriculture out of a total expenditures of \$513,195,090, agriculture is not being accorded the priority the Government claims it has for this industry.

Mr. Speaker, people in the agricultural industry require health and welfare programs; their children require education; they use the highways and grid roads, they will benefit from municipal services and the Property Improvement program; they will enjoy recreational facilities and benefit from general governmental services. According to the financial critic, Mr. Speaker, there is little or no interconnection or interdependence between other government services and the agricultural industry. The implications should be apparent to even a political sibling like the Member for Albert Park (Mr. MacLeod). However, he does not live in this century. His cogitations are related to the feudal past of out-moded thinking. His criticisms are as irrelevant as is his constituency when it is examined as a model of representation by population.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Robbins:** — Mr. Speaker, critics in Opposition condemn public enterprise as exemplified in our Crown corporations. We still hear the old stories about the box factory, the shoe factory, the tannery and the woollen mill. They lost \$1,675,200 in total, Mr. Speaker. Their comments were, as always, designed for a purpose. This has been done in the past and is still being done in an attempt not only to blacken the record of the

1944-64 CCF administration, but in an attempt to create the impression amongst Saskatchewan citizens that publicly owned enterprise is somehow totally inefficient and somehow totally reprehensible. The reprehensible part of the whole proposition, Mr. Speaker, is the Liberal Party's attitude and tactics in this relationship and in this context. Successful Crown corporations outside of the two major utilities (Saskatchewan Power and SaskTel) have returned \$33,717,021 in surplus earnings to the people of Saskatchewan. They have done this in successful publicly owned insurance, printing, fur marketing, minerals, bus transport and forest product production.

Mr. Speaker, not one dollar of that \$33,717,021 would have been returned to the people of the Province of Saskatchewan had we not had a democratic socialist government elected in 1944.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Robbins:** — Mr. Speaker, I should like to make a brief comment on the financing programs of the previous administration. They made much of the fact that they seldom went to borrow money. I agree with such a general approach. However, the province borrowed a good deal of money during their administration and two figures will suffice as examples to illustrate — Saskatchewan Power Corporation borrowed \$136,679,000 from the Canada Pension Plan; SaskTel borrowed \$50,130,000 from the same Plan. Each province may borrow employee-employer contributions raised within its jurisdiction annually at the long term Canada bond rate. This is highly advantageous. However, Mr. Speaker, one should again look at historical facts. In 1945, M.J. Coldwell, a grand old statesman of the political scene in Canada, the then national leader of the CCF, proposed a national superannuation plan for Canadians. Liberals said it would bankrupt the country. In 1966, the Pearson administration introduced the Canada Pension Plan using 11 of the 12 proposals the CCF had for a national superannuation plan in 1945. The then Premier of this Province the late W. Ross Thatcher condemned it as a socialistic measure, which it was and is, and said that Canada could not afford it. Yet, his Government was saved in respect to its capital cost requirements by the accumulations in that socialistic plan. This again, illustrates, Mr. Speaker, the type of rather delicate double talk we consistently get from the Opposition benches.

Mr. Speaker, I should like to sum up the Budget very quickly. On the revenue side \$86,120,000 from income tax; \$140,336,000 from Federal-Provincial payments; \$72.5 million from Education and Health tax; \$55 million from gasoline tax; \$6,200,000 from tobacco tax; \$29.5 million from liquor profits; \$47,174,000 from natural resource revenues; \$14,800,000 from motor licences; and \$62,416,680 from other sources including governmental enterprises — a total of \$514,046,680. The Members can check these in their books. They are on their desks. On the expenditure side — \$93,103,140 for health; \$39,435,960 for welfare; \$161,419,540 for education; \$82,051,020 for roads; \$18,378,100 for agriculture; \$36,306,710 for municipal affairs; \$20,499,870 for government services; \$17,525,180 for natural resources development; \$1,768,190 for treasury interest; and \$42,706,480 for other expenditures — a total of \$513,195,090 resulting in a budgetary surplus of \$851,590.

Mr. Speaker, I should like to conclude my remarks with a brief reference to my constituency of Nutana Centre in the city



of Saskatoon. It was a badly gerrymandered seat but we managed to change a 1,282 vote deficit into a 1,182 vote majority. The seat's physical appearance reminds me of a young friend I once knew who wished to show off his muscle. His remark was, "It's not very wide but is sure is long."

I wish to express my confidence in the people of Nutana Centre who are responsible for my being here. They were fed up with an arrogant government and they took the route that must be taken, that is, defeat them at the polls. Liberals opposite have attempted to make much of individual New Democratic campaign promises. I said in my campaign I would work for eight different matters for the constituency and the province. Five of the eight have already been completed or partially completed. Five out of eight is a .625 batting average and that's a pretty fair average in any man's league.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud of this Government and I am proud of this Budget. I am sure that Members of this Assembly, as well as those within the sound of my voice will realize that I will not support the amendment, I will support the main motion.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. E.I. Wood** (Minister of Municipal Affairs): — Mr. Speaker, in entering this debate, I should first like to congratulate the two Members of the Legislature who have been elected since our Session last summer, the Hon. Member from Morse (Mr. Wiebe) and the Member from Souris-Estevan (Mr. Thorson).

The Hon. Member from Souris-Estevan I am glad to welcome back to our group. He sat across the aisle from me back in 1957 when I sat with my good friend Frank Meakes back behind with the backbenchers. I am also glad to welcome to the House the Member from Morse. Whether his stay in the House is short or long, I am sure that he will find it interesting, informative and useful.

I should also like to congratulate the Hon. Members for Souris-Estevan and Saskatoon Mayfair (Mr. Brockelbank) upon their appointment to the Cabinet. Especially the Hon. Member from Saskatoon-Mayfair. As Minister of Public works he has taken over a very fine department which will present him with many stirring challenges and one of which I am proud of having been Minister.

I think, Mr. Speaker, that the Budget before us is a particularly good one. One swallow does not make a summer and one Budget does not determine what a government will accomplish during its term of office. But this Budget, especially if taken in conjunction with what was done at our session last summer, shows definitely the direction that this Government proposes to take.

I should like you to look, Mr. Speaker, at the winter works program to which this Government has allocated millions to help find work for the unemployed. Last summer, when speaking in this House, I pointed out that while the former Government has a capital budget of \$15,775,000 for capital public works, half of it was frozen with no intention of it being spent in the current year. We immediately went to work and got all the

work underway for the fall and winter that was possible for us to get going. Other departments and Crown corporations did the same. You will have noted, Mr. Speaker, what the Hon. Minister-in-Charge of the Saskatchewan Power Corporation said today in making an announcement of yet further work along these lines which is going forward.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Wood:** — A few days ago, the Hon. Member from Athabasca (Mr. Guy) put a question in the form of an Order for Return asking what were the number of jobs created by the Government of Saskatchewan since July 1, 1971 in the public sector. We really appreciate this as I think the answer when it is brought in will show that this Government has been awake to its responsibilities.

Our Provincial Municipal Local Initiatives Program was intended to complement the Federal Local Initiatives Program by taking care of municipal projects which we expected the Federal Government would reject after the Federal allocation to Saskatchewan municipalities have been used up. Assuming that the Local Initiatives Program funds would be allocated on the same basis as employment loan funds, we anticipated that out of the \$50 million allocated for municipal projects throughout Canada, Saskatchewan municipalities would receive about \$2 million. We expected that the Federal Government would take care of the first \$2 million worth of municipal projects submitted for approval and Saskatchewan would take over the applications in excess of the \$2 million total. Because this was a crash program we assumed that the applications would be processed promptly as soon as Provincial concurrence was given so as to get the projects underway as quickly as possible.

Unfortunately, this is not the way the Federal program was administered. By January 14, 1972 three months after the program was announced we had transmitted to the Federal Government 86 municipal applications amounting to \$2.6 million in requested grants. Only 18 applications had been accepted, Mr. Speaker, 17 had been rejected and 51 applications were still waiting for Federal decision as to their fate. Some of these had been waiting for six to eight weeks. For a crash program the Federal Government took a remarkably long time to approve applications. We have not found out yet what amount of funds have been allocated to Saskatchewan municipalities. By the end of February the Federal Government had approved less than \$1.4 million in Local Initiative Grants to municipalities. This is considerably short of the \$2 million we had expected. However, in order to get the municipal project started, the Saskatchewan Government reviewed all the applications that have been rejected by Ottawa and to date has committed \$1,160,000 in grants under the Provincial Local Initiatives Program for municipalities. The total cost of the projects for which Provincial grants have been approved under the Local Initiatives Program alone is estimated at \$2,363,000.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Wood:** — These projects will employ approximately 1,370 persons for an average of eight weeks. They will provide 10,966 man weeks of employment for a total of \$1,248,000 which will be paid out in wages. This, Mr. Speaker, is under the Provincial Local

Initiatives Program alone.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Wood:** — Altogether under this program we received a total of 180 applications from municipalities and other local government institutions for which grants would have amounted to over \$4 million. The Federal Government approved only 61 projects of the 180 total of 58 projects amounting in grants to \$1,160,000.

Now, besides this Local Initiatives Program, Mr. Speaker, there was the Provincial Municipal Loans Program. The Federal Government's loan allocation to the Province of Saskatchewan and/or its municipalities is \$6.9 million. This money has been fully committed for 13 provincial projects and 70 local government projects. I should like to say that in handling the loans program, it was not handled by manpower, it was handled by DREE and in our opinion was handled much more efficiently. It was a straight-forward handling and they didn't jump around, skip all over the place, refusing here and picking up there. They went through the applications as they were sent to them turned the others back to us and we were able to proceed in a much more workman-line manner.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Wood:** — For the provincial projects the Province will borrow \$1,900,000 all of which is subject to forgiveness. For municipal projects the borrowing will be \$5,113,000 of which amount the sum of \$1,874 is subject to forgiveness.

The Provincial loans program to municipalities complements the Federal program in three ways. First the Province undertook to match the Federal loan program by making loans up to \$6.9 million dollars. Two, the Provincial loans are subject to the same forgiveness features as the Federal loans. And three, in addition to forgiveness of the Provincial loans the Province will pay grants to municipalities equal to the forgiveness on both the Provincial and Federal loans to municipalities. In total the Provincial Government has approved subsidies to municipal governments, schools and hospitals of \$2,925,000. In addition there are 146 different projects in which the Federal Government has not put and will not be putting \$1. These projects will provide an estimated 18,749 man weeks of work.

We have had a little difficulty getting publicity through this. I think the media thought we were talking about projects to which the Federal Government had already given publicity but these are entirely different from the ones that the Federal Government has sponsored. They are projects that the Federal Government has rejected for one reason or another. I note in the Leader-Post the other day that they gave us good publicity for one batch of projects we had approved and I think it is starting to trickle through that these are strictly provincial-municipal projects. The Federal Government has nothing to do with them.

Besides these Provincial projects on which I have been speaking we have approved grants totalling \$1,875,000 in which we are matching Federal grants on Federal-Provincial-municipal projects on which there will be another 16,000 man weeks of work.

And besides all this work in which municipalities are involved there are the 13 Provincial Government projects with a total cost \$13,800,000 providing 14,472 man weeks of work. On these the Federal Government has approved subsidies of \$1.9 million.

Taken all together it is expected that these projects will provide a total of 49,301 man weeks of work. Mr. Speaker, approximately 50,000 man weeks of work on projects to which the Province is a major contributor.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Wood:** — Now, Mr. Speaker, I should like to turn to a matter in which we are very interested, that of our house building assistance grant. In July of 1970 the former Liberal administration initiated the house building grant program under which a grant of the lesser of five per cent of the cost or \$500 was paid to the first occupant of a house regardless of the income of the owner. This was, in our opinion, quite a good program and although it was to have terminated last July 1st, we kept it on until December 31st of last year with the stipulation that any house started before December 31, 1971 and occupied before May 31, 1972 would qualify for the \$500 grant. Since April 1, 1971 over 2,600 homes have qualified for a grant under this program.

Beginning April 1, 1972 we'll be having a new house building assistance program. Under the new program those whose income is low enough to allow them to qualify under the CMHC home ownership program will qualify. At present this income ceiling is approximately \$7,000 per annum. The assistance under this program would be 10 per cent of the cost of the house or \$800 which ever is less than five per cent or \$500 as under the old program. This assistance will also apply to major renovations of over \$2,000. All home builders in the province in the \$7,000 or under income bracket are eligible for assistance whether they are under the CMHC program or not.

Mr. Speaker, I should also like to say a few things about our Grid Road and Municipal Road Assistance Authority budget. Looking at this it can be pointed out that approximately the same amount will be available this year as last. There will be less demand for grid road construction this year but approximately the same amount of money will be made available to rural municipalities by greatly increasing the amount available for main farm access roads. The amount of the equalization grant fund has been increased by \$100,000 but the most notable increase has been in our budget for assistance for urban streets.

In our New Deal for People we indicated that we would be prepared to take steps to improve the quality of life in the small urban centres. Last year there was some \$250,000 for gravelling of urban streets. We have found that many of the small towns are more interested in hard surfacing some of their streets than in gravelling. So instead of so much for gravelling of streets we have more than doubled the amount of money in that vote and allocated it for street improvement which will allow the towns and villages a good deal more latitude in their choice of program and will allow us to do a good deal more than in the past. Instead of \$250,000, Mr. Speaker, we are looking at some \$650,000.

Mr. Speaker, I should like to go on and speak about several other things but I think that you can see that our Budget is indeed oriented toward a New Deal for People. The \$8,000,500 for employment making programs says that we mean what we said, that we would be maintaining and mounting a massive make-work program. Our house building grant policy shows that we will be giving worthwhile assistance to those who need it to build a home. Our \$650,000 street improvement program shows that we mean to do something to help out the smaller urban places. Our \$23,000,400 Property Improvements Grants amount means that we are making a big stride towards helping our taxpayers. And, Mr. Speaker, I think that you can gather from my remarks that I will not be supporting the amendment but I will be supporting the motion.

**Mr. T.M. Weatherald** (Cannington): —Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege this afternoon to take part in this debate and I should like to congratulate the last speaker for a very forthright presentation to the Assembly of his programs and policies and I am sure we all appreciate them. If I had time I would offer a slight variation to his version but since my radio time is limited I won't attempt to this afternoon. On the other hand, Mr. Speaker, I do feel the Member for Saskatoon Nutana Centre (Mr. Robbins) treated the Budget with a very flippant attitude and with reckless abandon in putting to the people of Saskatchewan what this budget actually does. I want to bring to his attention that his logic was somewhat hard to follow when in the one portion of his speech he talked at great length about the Federal Government's responsibilities in controlling inflation and in the next moment he spoke glowingly of the Provincial Government's increase in expenditures of \$63 million. Now this may sound somewhat illogical to most people interested in financial matters and I certainly think that most people would think that this type of logic would not make any sense whatsoever. Certainly if the Federal Government is to control inflation they should have some help at least from the Provincial Government here and it is obvious if the Members opposite are going to attempt to put the total responsibility on the Federal Government for any problems of inflation, that in this Budget the members opposite will certainly have to assume a complete and total responsibility for adding to any inflationary fires which may develop in the near future.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to talk for a moment about the announcement yesterday about the new coal mine at Estevan because I've taken the liberty to look up an old edition of the Leader-Post. The front page, Monday May 17, 1971 says "New Coal Mine to Supply Saskatchewan Power Corporation". Right on the front page, Mr. Speaker. And it says:

In announcing the agreement at a press conference Health Minister, Gordon Grant, Vice Chairman of the Board of the Saskatchewan Power Corporation said the company will develop a new strip mine just a mile from Boundary Dam. Mr. Grant said the company will undertake preparatory work in 1972, begin stripping the overburden in 1973 and make its first delivery of coal in 1974.

And included on that front page of the Leader-Post of May 17, 1971 is a picture of Sir Harold Mitchell, Chairman of the Board of Luskar Ltd. Signing a \$40 million coal supply contract to the Saskatchewan Power Corporation for a new mine at Estevan. Mr. Speaker, if this mine will only be in operation in 1974, I

would be prepared to guess that the Government opposite will likely announce it at least twice more before it actually comes into operation.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Weatherald:** — Mr. Speaker, I want to talk at length about the Provincial Budget because this Budget I think has omens for the people of Saskatchewan which are not yet totally appreciated. Provincial expenditures, Mr. Speaker, in the coming fiscal year show an increase in spending of \$63 million. This is the first time a Provincial Budget in Saskatchewan has surpassed the half billion dollar mark. The taxpayer, Mr. Speaker, has in this Budget received a one year reprieve due to an equalization payment from the Federal Government of \$9 million. Make no mistake, Mr. Speaker, without this tremendous increase in equalization payments from the Federal Government, Saskatchewan taxpayers would have suffered enormous and massive tax increases. Mr. Speaker, the Member from Nutana Centre spoke of equalization payments and spoke of what my colleague from Regina Albert Park (Mr. MacLeod) said was a poor cousin budget. It's true that in this country equalization payments are needed, agreed to by all across the country. But is also true, Mr. Speaker, in order to get equalization payments you have to be poor as a province in this country because there are not rich provinces in this country that are getting substantial equalization payments.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Weatherald:** — Mr. Speaker, you receive equalization payments from the Federal Government when you are hard up as a Provincial Government and that is precisely why we got this much money this particular year.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Weatherald:** — Mr. Speaker, this money came because of an under payment in the past three years to us and it cannot be expected to be duplicated in the coming year. And yet, Mr. Speaker, the Members opposite have built into this Budget an increase in education expenditures and I am going to use round figures of about \$9 million. The Department of Welfare is up \$10 million. Medical Care and Hospitalization Services account for an increased cost of \$30 million. The amount, Mr. Speaker, in this amount of \$30 million does not include, according to my calculations, any amounts of money due to the taking off of the premiums for people over 65 years of age.

Mr. Speaker, in essence most of this Budget will show very little improvement in services to the people of Saskatchewan but will simply be going to increased costs of services that we already have.

Mr. Speaker, we have not developed any great new programs in the Province of Saskatchewan. What we are doing is spending most of the increased budget of \$65 million for services the province already possessed. In the coming year they are going to cost us a great deal more money.

Mr. Speaker, I want to talk for a few moments about what the previous Government had done to control increased and escalating costs. I even wish to offer a congratulatory remark to the Minister of Health (Mr. Smishek) who appears to have recognized at least some of the problems the administration opposite is going to be beset with in the next two or three years. He is, I must admit, the only sign of hope that we have for those of us who want a fiscally responsible attitude from this Government of the Province of Saskatchewan. Mr. Speaker, the previous Government did not win great popularity on some of their measures to hold down expenditures and control the cost of living. The previous Government brought in utilization fees, they had the pupil-teacher ratio and for some time the six per cent wage guideline existed. These did not exist because we thought they were politically popular. They existed because the Premier of the day recognized the extreme difficulty of financing for the Province of Saskatchewan and he knew that we could not live beyond our means as the members opposite seem to live in a dream world and think that we can.

Mr. Speaker, the Government opposite has taken off all these fiscally responsible measures and now has gone on a wild spending spree that will last for approximately this year. I will predict, Mr. Speaker, that unless the present Government comes back to some sort of financial sanity and returns the taxpayer to a responsible type of administration that over the next three years the people of Saskatchewan as taxpayers will be praying for help.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Weatherald:** — Now let's look again at where some more of this money is going. Approximately 500 people more are being hired according to the Estimates that have been presented to us. When you add up the increased staff in the Estimates, Mr. Speaker, there is provision for at least 500 more people above what existed last year. This does not include the people hired in the Crown corporations such as Saskatchewan Power, Telephones, etc. Many of these people, Mr. Speaker, as you look into the various offices, are hired for political purposes and for political propaganda. Let's take a look at the Executive Council, the Planning and Research Division, an increase over last year of over double, an increase of \$267,980. In the Executive Council appropriation, Mr. Speaker, which means the Premier's office itself, the appropriation there shows an increase in personnel of 23 people. Mr. Speaker, in the Planning and Research accounts, an increase of 14 people; in Personnel Services, an increase of seven persons. Mr. Speaker, most of the questions which we have been asking and will continue to ask will be showing that many NDP defeated candidates are rapidly coming onto the government's payroll.

Mr. Speaker, I want to talk for a few minutes about Municipal Affairs and I want to talk in some detail on the Property Improvement Grants. Last year, the Members opposite, Mr. Speaker, made a great cry and rightly so because a problem exists as far as raising revenue for education purposes on property is concerned. Last year in the election the Members opposite talked at length about how they would reduce the property tax to the 25-mill rate. We have, Mr. Speaker, a 13-mill payment coming to the property taxpayers. This payment means absolutely nothing unless the Government opposite shows

some indication that they will hold the tax line. The previous administration attempted to give the taxpayers and the property owners and the municipal people of Saskatchewan enough money to hold the tax line. I want to show you what will happen to a farmer this year because already in last night's paper — let's look at the headlines — “Moose Jaw Faces Tax Rate Increase of 6.1 Mills”; “Yorkton Tax Boost 2 Mills”; “Regina Municipal Levy May Climb 5 Mills”. Mr. Speaker, the maximum amount the homeowner rebate this year of the New Deal that the Government opposite has can be \$78. A one-mill increase on that \$6,000 assessment will show an increase of taxes of \$6 so a five mill increase will show a tax increase of \$30. Mr. Speaker, that money which the property owner would be receiving in the city of Regina has gone out the window and a lot of his own money besides. The Property Improvement Grants, Mr. Speaker, will quickly turn out to be a hoax and the property owner of Saskatchewan, within the next two or three years as this Government spends more and more, will be worse and worse off.

Mr. Speaker, this Government opposite is on a spending spree. This Government opposite has no plans to bring expenditures into line and no fiscal responsibility. Mr. Speaker, the Members on this side took tough economic measures when they were the Government of Saskatchewan. They were not popular ones, they were ones which kept Saskatchewan and Saskatchewan's taxes at a minimum. I hope, Mr. Speaker, that the Members opposite will take a look at what they are doing in the expenditures. They got Santa Claus this year but we all know that Santa Claus comes at Christmas and the hard realities of life come in January when the bills start coming in. Saskatchewan hasn't got too long to wait before the bills start coming in. It is obvious, Mr. Speaker, that I will not be supporting this Budget.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. P.P. Mostoway** (Hanley): — Mr. Speaker, let me say at the outset that if Opposition Members belittle this year's budget, it is probably because they are green with envy. Further derogatory remarks from them will surely indicate that they are not in favour of the concept of more economic and social equality among the citizens of this Province but that is their right.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Mostoway:** — Mr. Speaker, what struck me in regard to the Budget was the fact that our Government did not hesitate to act on numerous election promises which will save our people millions of dollars. Insofar as increased revenue is concerned it did not hesitate to take action. Mr. Speaker, the people of Saskatchewan elected a government to act and it is acting.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Mostoway:** — The Hon. Member from Albert Park (Mr. MacLeod) accuses this Government of failing to pay its economic way. Well, this, I don't think, holds water. I don't think this holds water because if he is right it indicates that we presented a better case to Ottawa than they ever did.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!



**Mr. Mostoway:** — Or else it indicates a weak Federal Government. In all sincerity, Mr. Speaker, I don't think the Federal Government is weak. I just happen to think that for the first time in many years, a meaningful presentation was made to Ottawa.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Mostoway:** — Also, Mr. Speaker, why does the Opposition critic — may I presume that he speaks for all Opposition Members — why does he imply that the industrial sector of Canada subsidizes the farming sector? Well, I ask him, Mr. Speaker, how can you deny the most efficient farmers in the world the right to market their produce at a reasonable price, then turn around and give industrialists all kinds of concessions just for the asking and call any help to the farming sectors a subsidy, I call it an attempt to make right what is drastically wrong in the first place.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Mostoway:** — Therefore, I don't look on any money our province receives from Ottawa as a handout. I look on it as a rightful contribution from the richer areas of Canada towards dirt-cheap prices paid to Western farmers and towards Eastern Canada's desire to monopolize industry and finance.

Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the people of Hanley constituency I welcome this Government's move to revise tax and royalty rates on minerals extracted from Saskatchewan soil. I don't think we should overlook the fact that those concerns involved in the mineral industry have done much for our province and in particular, the communities close to their centres of operations. Here I refer to the potash industry in particular. Jobs have been created, regular pay cheques directly and indirectly benefit a host of people. But let us not overlook the fact that there has been no adjustment on royalty and tax rates for many years. In this regard, Mr. Speaker, I am sure that all parties concerned will agree that this upward revision of rates is necessary if more government attention is to be given to such things as pollution and occupational health hazards which I am sure governments will have to do to a far greater extent in the future than it has been in the past.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Mostoway:** — Mr. Speaker, the removal of the five per cent tax on meals of less than \$2.50 will be greatly appreciated, at least, by the younger set and by families who go out for an occasional meal. Now I have always considered it a tax on given your wife a break. I'll show you what I mean. If you Buy groceries, take them home and your wife slaves over a hot stove to prepare a delicious meal, no tax. But decide to take her out and give her a much needed break, why you'll pay a tax. Mr. Speaker, I don't suggest the removal of this tax will make us a province of diners-out but it will be a much needed break for which many will be thankful.

Mr. Speaker, it was my hope that the five per cent sales tax on children's clothing might be removed at this time. I

think we are all familiar with the way children seem to go through clothing especially in this province where we experience such severe climatic conditions. In this regard, I should hope this Government will give serious consideration to the removal of this tax which logically hits larger families the hardest.

Mr. Speaker, I was pleased to see that this year's grant to the Saskatchewan Research Council is to be increased by roughly \$100,000. Because of staff that it well qualified, it is my hope that this body will be called on more frequently in the future to work on problems peculiar to Saskatchewan.

Mr. Speaker, I welcome the new employment program offered students this summer. I am particularly pleased to see that Grade Twelve students who wish to further their education will be included in the program this year. In this regard, I should hope that the Department of Education sends out information to all Grade Twelve classes so that these students will know how, where and when to go about taking advantage of this program. Gone is the tax on Grade Twelve examinations. For this I am sure students and parents alike will be thankful. Now if we could just get rid of the examinations, I am sure that students would be thankful no end.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Mostoway:** — Mr. Speaker, the \$23,400,000 to be given back to the people in the form of Property Improvement Grants indicates, as far as I am concerned, that this Government realizes that many people need a break from crushing taxation. Under this program, Mr. Speaker, no homeowner, small businessman or farmer will receive less than the Homeowner Grant, many will receive much more.

May I now take a few minutes to talk about the proposed Land Bank for which this Government has set aside \$10 million this year. Now, I think one thing has to be made perfectly clear. The selling of land to the Commission will be on a voluntary basis, farmers will be entirely free to participate or not. There will be no compulsion to sell as some Members opposite seem to suggest. How well I remember when just a few days before the election one of your members opposite came to my home town of Allan to explain our Land Bank. Well, no mention, Mr. Speaker, was made of the fact that the plan would be on a voluntary basis, that is, until a fair-minded citizen informed the hon. Speaker at that meeting that he had it a little distorted. I just wonder if that was deliberate.

I notice that an onion storage warehouse is to be constructed at Outlook to encourage the production of onions in that area. Now, Mr. Speaker, may I presume that this will bring tears of joy to those concerned? I hope so because the whole area of irrigation needs immediate attention due to government bungling, mismanagement and failure to plan adequately in the past.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Mostoway:** — Mr. Speaker, according to the Estimates, expenditures in the field of health will be increased about \$16 million this

year. I was particularly pleased to see that provision has been made for a certified home program for emotionally disturbed children and more than pleased to see that expended treatment for alcoholism is also to be given more consideration. I am sure also that the 10 per cent increase in payment rates to foster homes will be met with approval by all. I sometimes think that not enough credit is given to those willing to take in homeless children and give them the love and attention that most people take for granted.

Mr. Speaker, it is my hope that something will be done in the very near future in regard to the terrifically high cost of drugs. Having done some reading on American Senate Sub-committee hearings, chaired by the famous monopoly buster, the late Senator Estes Kefauver, I know that unbridled profiteering is the rule in the drug industry. I would say that this preying on the sick is a black mark on our society. Therefore, I urge this Government to take steps necessary to expose the lucrative and despicable practice of accumulating vast amounts of wealth at the expense of the unfortunate sick. Followed to its logical conclusion I hope that those people who are oppressed by heavy drug costs will soon be able to realize some measure of relief.

Mr. Speaker, no doubt you are aware that public hearings are now being held in regard to the whole area of Workmen's Compensation. It is my hope that this Board and those who present briefs will have good dialogue which will result in a major overhaul of the Act as it now stands. In this regard, it is my hope that members of this jurisdiction advocate flexibility as they look well into the past, present and future. It is my hope that any wrongs which may have been done in the past are righted.

Mr. Speaker, I am sure that most people in our province will agree that our university is something to be proud of. Both campuses have served us well in the past and I am sure will continue to do in the future. However, without knocking academic excellence, I should like to remind those who think that the university has been short-changed in construction grants, that such an increase might be difficult to justify when one considers a decrease in the projected enrolment. Now, I am not saying an increase is not justified, I simply say that it might be difficult to justify to the forgotten taxpayer who very often views such decisions as beyond his power to comprehend.

The proposed establishment of a toll-free hotline to a government information and referral centre will be welcomed by many of our citizens. I know it will be welcomed because in visiting constituents in my area time after time, people tell me that rather than write to a certain department they would sooner put in a phone call and would do so if they were sure that they were going to get the proper individual or jurisdiction on the first call.

Mr. Speaker, I see Opposition Members seem to belittle this Government's proposal to establish the position of Ombudsman. They refer to this idea as a "powder puff ombudsman". Obviously, they are suggesting that a lady be given the position. But I ask Opposition Members, why belittle the position regardless of who is appointed? At any rate, it is to be hoped that whoever is appointed Ombudsman, that person will be vigorously involved in righting the wrongs that may be inflicted on citizens by

government agencies whether that Government be New Democrat, Liberal or whatever we have.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Mostoway:** — Mr. Speaker, Opposition Members claim that under this Government not much is being or will be done. Obviously, they haven't been to Hanley constituency lately where rinks, libraries, road building, natural gas, telephone conversion, parks, a boys' provincial hockey championship team from Allan, a girls' provincial basketball championship team from Kenaston and great people are just some of the things that make this constituency a pleasure to serve.

**Mr. McPherson:** — Onion storage.

**Mr. Mostoway:** — I've gone through that. You must have been sleeping. Mr. Speaker, I want to congratulate the Premier for a Budget that will probably go down in the history of this province as one of the finest and fairest.

Let me say at this point, Mr. Speaker, if it embarrasses Members opposite that this budget is such a fine Budget that is their business. Now, if it drives people out of Saskatchewan, as one Member opposite claims it will, it will be because they have so distorted it in a mist of gloom, doom and despair.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Mostoway:** — Mr. Speaker, I want to go on record as saying that Saskatchewan people are the ones who will determine whether or not this Budget is a good one. No Member in this House will do that for them, although Members opposite may try to. When the time comes they will respond one way or another.

Mr. Speaker, I oppose the amendment, but it is obvious that I will support the motion.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Hon. J.R. Messer** (Minister of Agriculture): — Mr. Deputy Speaker, I want to at this time, because I have not had the opportunity in the past, to welcome the two newly elected Members to this Legislative Assembly, the Member from Souris-Estevan (Mr. Thorson) who is now a Cabinet colleague of mine and whom I'm sure all Members of this Legislature have, I think, already recognized as a most able and qualified Cabinet Minister. The activity in the departments that he now holds portfolios for, Industry and Commerce and Mineral Resources, certainly show the kind of activities that we can expect to show results in the near future. I also want to welcome the member from Morse (Mr. Wiebe). In fact, I believe he is sitting in the seat that I sat in when I was first elected to this Legislative Assembly. I don't want to wish him the kind of political success that I have had given to me or extended to me from that seat in the Legislature. However, I do recognize him and I welcome him as a Member of the Opposition to this Legislative Assembly.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, the Premier, the Hon. Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Blakeney) has delivered, and I think it has been made obvious by the remarks that have been made in this Budget Debate to date, one of the best, if not the best Budgets that has been brought down in this Legislature.

Just to look at the Members to your left, I think, shows that they are rather shocked and stunned that we would be able to deliver a Budget that can do so much for the people of Saskatchewan without burdening them with increased taxes at this time.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Messer:** — I would recommend to those Members opposite who continue to criticize and try to tear that Budget apart, that they should go to the country and hear what some of the people in the Province of Saskatchewan are saying about the Budget.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Messer:** — I suggest to them that if they would take that recommendation to heart and if they had done that and if they had polled the feelings and the reactions of the people in Saskatchewan rather than trying to steal a little bit of radio time they would have been more effective than they were in saying the wrong things they did about this Budget.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Messer:** — Now, Mr. Speaker, a few moments ago the member from Cannington (Mr. Weatherald) was making some remarks, I believe he referred to a fellow Cabinet colleague of mine, the Minister of Health (Mr. Smishek), saying that he was the only Member on this side that they had any real hope in. I should like to remind him that Member is only one of 45 on this side that we have a tremendous amount of hope in and so do the people of Saskatchewan.

There is also the mention that when they were the Government that they attempted to keep taxes to a minimum. Obviously, the Member who said it, the Member for Cannington who is not in his seat now, I think he probably spends some time out of his seat because he obviously missed the remarks made by the Member for Saskatoon Nutana Centre (Mr. Robbins), when he reminded this Legislative Assembly of the Budget, that was brought down by the new Leader of the Liberal party (Mr. Steuart) the then Provincial Treasurer, referred to as the “Black Friday Budget,” for taxes had never been increased to such an extent in the history of Saskatchewan and in all probability never will be increased in one fell swoop like they were at that point in time.

Now, Mr. Speaker, this afternoon I want to address myself to the future of agricultural policy in this province.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Messer:** — Mr. Speaker, in this particular case, one of the special, mystical powers which is often considered to be associated with crystal-gazing are needed. This Government is

firmly committed to careful, long-term planning in order to give direction and purpose to government programs and activities. I know that commitment which the New Democratic Party has to planning has been the subject of derision and criticism by some of the Hon. Members opposite. But the principle of planning for the future in a careful and detailed way is now widely accepted not only in the Province of Saskatchewan, not only in Canada, but the world over, by governments and by businesses. Such diverse institutions as the Federal Government, the United States Department of Defence, the Democratic Socialist Party in Sweden, General Motors and many others are all firmly committed to a comprehensive planning policy. Every successful and responsible organization in the private and in the public sector engages in very sophisticated planning. And it's incomprehensible that members opposite do not understand that basic fact of modern life and planning. Thus, we do not claim that such planning is novel in today's world. It is quite apparent that the members opposite are part of a very small but shrill minority who continue to insist that sound economic planning was clearly indicated in their inability to govern, Mr. Speaker. Policies in this province over the past seven years were ad hoc to say the least, uncoordinated and badly considered before they were implemented, those that were implemented were few.

In the areas of agriculture and rural life the results were disastrous. The declines in numbers of farm people, in per capita income and in social development all continued unabated while the government of the day sat and watched but neither planned or acted or reacted to those problems. Nowhere were the effects of this lack of coherent direction more obvious than in the Department of Agriculture's programs.

Mr. Speaker, when I became Minister of Agriculture, I inherited a Department that was listless and uninspired. There was little incentive and little opportunity for the staff to be involved in any real and meaningful way. There were, in fact, capable people in the Department who could contribute significantly to the development of agricultural programs but they were given no encouragement to develop their potential and little opportunity to display those talents that they obviously had. You can not go anywhere in Canada, anywhere in Canada, Mr. Speaker, particularly at the levels of the Federal Government and the other prairie provinces and find former residents of Saskatchewan and graduates from Saskatchewan's university who had been employed with the Saskatchewan Government but found that there was no scope for their expertise or their creativity.

One of the first things that we began to do in the Department was to change the atmosphere of no progress to one of structuring and carrying out new programs. Programs which would recognize the problems of Saskatchewan and our staff accepted with eagerness the challenge to make our new programs work. This is an area that cannot be developed over night but one in which we have shown a great deal of progress in eight months. We are now building a Department that will be exciting, a Department that will provide solutions to problems which farmers are confronted with in this province and have been confronted with for many years. I say this, recognizing that the Provincial Government can't solve all the problems that farmers are confronted with, but we can and we will solve many of them.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Messer:** — We will assure farmers and those who are related to the agricultural industry in this province that we will communicate and press the Federal government in a constructive way to co-operate and provide policies and legislation for the deficiencies that we are unable to rectify as a single province.

One of the first things I did in my Department upon taking office was to establish a planning and research branch so we would be able to analyse the proposals of the Federal Government regarding Federal programs and how they would relate to the Province of Saskatchewan. We want a capability also to analyse and consider how the programs of other provinces relate to the farming industry in Saskatchewan.

Mr. Speaker, perhaps more important, the planning and research branch was established so that agricultural policy and legislation in the province are implemented with a clear idea as to how it will affect farmers and how it will improve the farming economy in this province. I think it is most fortunate that I was able to employ one Doug. MacArthur as director of that planning and research branch.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Messer:** — Doug was born in Saskatchewan and did his schooling and some of his university degree here. His post-graduate studies were taken at the University at Chicago, the University of Toronto and he spent two years as a Rhodes Scholar at Oxford University, England. He has attracted a number of other creative and knowledgeable staff to the planning and research branch. We now have a branch that has brought a new sense of excitement and involvement to the entire staff of the Department of Agriculture in Saskatchewan. We shall communicate and establish dialogue with farmers so that the kind of programs that we are introducing will be well thought out, that have the feelings of the farmers incorporated into them before they become legislation.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Messer:** — Mr. Speaker, the type of problem that we inherited, the South Saskatchewan River Irrigation Project, I believe would have never come about if there had been a planning and research branch operating in the Department some years ago. If we could have planned development in that area so that we would know after building those expensive channels what farmers would be able to use them for and how they may be able to turn that area into a productive irrigated area as it should be, we should never have had such problems.

Since becoming Minister of Agriculture, Mr. Speaker, I've attended a number of very important meetings outside the province to confer with my counterparts from other provinces as well as to confer with Federal ministers with agricultural responsibility.

Mr. Speaker, this Government took office in late June of last year. In mid July a meeting of Ministers of Agriculture

was held in Edmonton. At that time and at that meeting I expressed my concern at the apparent lack of provincial involvement in the planning and development of Federal policies having an important impact on our respective provinces. At that meeting of Ministers we formed a technical committee of deputies from all ten provinces to undertake a comprehensive and detailed look at agricultural development in Canada today. The duties involved were to undertake research into the development of the problems and to report from time to time to the Ministers' meeting as a group.

Mr. Speaker, we are undertaking a very worthwhile pioneering experiment in making co-operative federalism work. My interpretation of the role of the Minister of Agriculture is that the Minister should not be involved in the administrative details of the Department. However, he should be knowledgeable as to what that administration is and what it is to do. I think he should find the time to acquaint himself with problems of farmers within the province. He should be able to discuss with some knowledge the production within the province so that he can relate to the administrators of his Department the kinds of wants and demands and the needs of agriculture in the province of which he is Minister. His knowledge should not be limited to the area of production. It should include ways the farmer can diversify his operation either into livestock or into processing, handling and packaging of basic agricultural production. In order for a Minister to do this he then has to acquaint himself with what is going on in the other prairie provinces and with what is going on in the world as a whole. It is my view that we can come up with rational plans for agriculture by understanding what is happening in other provinces and in other countries.

Our growth and our development depends on our ability to co-operate and work in harmony with all farmers in Canada. It also depends upon our ability to compete effectively in world markets. Never before in the history have all ten provinces gotten together and attempted to work out their common agricultural differences. Never before have they tried to come up with a mutually satisfactory approach to these problems. Canada is huge and it is a complex country. Agricultural resources are widely dispersed while consumers are concentrated in highly populated provinces of Ontario and Quebec. This creates many problems in the agricultural sector. Such conflicts tend to arise regarding the interests of producers in various parts of the country. We, as Provincial Ministers were determined to confront these conflicts head on. We resolved to obtain as much information as we could and to work out our differences in accordance with the co-operative spirit that led to the formation of our nation in the first place. This proved to be a difficult thing and at times, I must say, a discouraging process. Numerous meetings had to be held entailing much time, expense and travel. But, Mr. Speaker, none of the ten Ministers every once said in the face of all these difficulties and differences, 'I've had enough.' Never once was it said this was too costly and too time consuming. Never once did I hear a Minister say, Mr. Speaker, 'It can't be done'. Mr. Speaker, the Members opposite have implied that these meetings were not justified or significant. I genuinely wonder what that says about their commitment to federalism and their commitment to Canada as a nation.



Let us rise above these petty politics and work sincerely to do what is necessary to hold this nation together. Let us in this Assembly, Mr. Speaker, adopt the spirit of the ten Ministers representing governments of four different political faiths, the spirit that said, 'Let's go, let's go together and work things out'.

That is what the Provincial Ministers of Agriculture said at our meeting. A detailed paper was developed which was presented to Mr. Olson, the Federal minister of Agriculture in a meeting which was attended by all Provincial Ministers. This paper has been the basis of much fruitful discussion since then. We are working towards reaching agreement in such difficult policy areas as small farm development, farm credit, market development, market sharing and many, many others. I have no indication in a precise way as to how often the former Minister of Agriculture left this province. But I certainly believe it was not to the degree of regularity that it should have been.

Concrete solutions to agricultural problems can be achieved only if problems are considered jointly between respective governments. Dialogue must be initiated and I believe my endeavours today have some rewarding results.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Messer:** — The recognition, Mr. Speaker, that the Federal Government has given to Saskatchewan over the last months is a result of this increased communication with the Federal Government. We are having improved dialogue, not only on national problems, but also on prairie problems with the Governments of Alberta and Manitoba. One success of this dialogue is revealed in the fact that our three prairie Governments have come to agreement on the request for a grain stabilization program not only for Saskatchewan but for the three provinces in general.

The three prairie Governments have jointly discussed with the Federal Government possible solutions to the feed grain prices. We have had considerations and discussions with regard to rail transportation and grain-handling. We have established a committee that is now pursuing the development of a prairie farm testing organization. We have also discussed other areas like marketing boards and marketing developments.

Mr. Speaker, this has never been done before and consequently it was not only the Province of Saskatchewan that suffered when dealing with the Federal Government but the other prairie provinces. Ottawa took the position that if there was no consensus among the prairie provinces as to what the solutions were to common problems, no action need to be taken at all. Our dialogue has brought about some success now and I assure you that it will continue to do in the future.

As Members will know, Mr. Speaker, I spent some time in the latter part of 1971 visiting several countries in Europe. There have been some remarks made about the visit to Europe in this Legislative Assembly in the last few days. I spent several days in Denmark, several days in Sweden, several days in Romania and Italy.

In Denmark and Sweden I examined the land tenure system

that those countries have. Those systems in Sweden and Denmark are not the same as what we are proposing in our Land Bank Commission here. I did pick up a number of ideas for structuring our Commission and we intend on putting them into effect.

I spent some considerable time looking into the hog industry in Denmark. As we all know the Danes are the major pork producers in the world. They are the giant in the pork industry. I came back convinced that we must devote a great deal of our efforts to product research and market development. We hope to incorporate some of the things that I have seen in that country into a market development and promotion program in the Province of Saskatchewan and the Budget has indicated the kinds of funds that we are going to make available for that in the 1972-73 fiscal year.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Messer:** — Another benefit was the insight I got in the structure of the farm organizations in those countries. We have a number of commodity groups in our province, several farm organizations who all profess to speak for farmers. I think that we, in the future, are going to have to come to grips with the proposals that are being made in regard to the structuring of farm organizations in this province. I think that it is the job of the Minister of Agriculture in the Province of Saskatchewan to acquaint himself with all the alternatives that may be opened in this regard.

Mr. Speaker, I was also in Rome to attend the FAO Conference because I feel that the previous Governments erred in the past in never sending representatives to a FAO Conference. Canada is one of the largest contributors to the Food Aid Program and the FAO. Saskatchewan is the largest contributing province to the Canadian Food Aid program due to the fact that most of the aid is given in grains that are produced in this province.

As one of the 'have' countries surely it is our responsibility to participate in this great world effort.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Messer:** — And to contribute to FAO to improve the lot of the impoverished people that inhabit this earth today. I feel that we should not only attend with some regularity the FAO Conferences but we should have some meetings prior to the Conferences with the Federal government of Canada with regard to what we think our participation should be in the FAO and its related programs. I think it is a necessity to have representatives at these conferences so that we can keep well informed of the trends within the underdeveloped countries. It is most important that we plan our production and our production increases in line with the developing countries' green revolution which is increasing their productive capacity.

If we do not keep aware of this, Mr. Speaker, we shall find ourselves confronted with the same kinds of problems as we did in the last '60s by continuing to produce without relating ourselves in a knowledgeable way to what the potential exports and what the demands are for the kinds of agricultural

commodities that can be produced in Saskatchewan both in the short-term and the long-term future. That reason alone, I think, justifies our being represented at the FAO in Rome at their conference.

It is obvious from the debates and statements of the news media in the last several weeks that the Government is ordering its priorities in agriculture. We are also recognizing an increasing demand in other area. But I believe that agriculture is the major sector of our —province and the one that can affect our economy in the most significant way.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Messer:** — We recognize that if we are going to maintain the rural life and launch a program to improve and expand the kind of rural life that is the livelihood of this province, priority must be given to agriculture now and in the years to come. The activity of the Department of Agriculture in the past was limited simply to keeping the dust off the programs that were in effect and not rocking the boat.

In a minor way the previous Government launched some programs but they never really gave the assurance that farmers needed in order to expand their production in their farming operation. An example was the Hog Building Grant Program. There appeared to be no concern on the part of the Government that the international situation could result in a drastic lowering of prices. And, inevitably as hog prices came down, the farmer with his highly capitalized operation had to borrow heavily and was left to his own devices. There was no real incentive taken by the former Government to analyse the proposals of the Federal Government in relation to the Task force on Agriculture and the Federal Government's recommendations, policies and legislation in relation to that Task force.

The Federal Government's Grain Stabilization Plan was a prime example. The Grain Stabilization Program as the Federal Government proposed it was endorsed in a resolution in this House by the former Government of Saskatchewan in the spring of 1971, accepted wholly, completely and fully by that Government of the day. That hasty endorsement revealed clearly, most clearly, the shortcoming of the former Government in not analysing a program before they gave it their support.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Messer:** — It is obvious — it is not even the good old-fashioned free enterprise way. Even they study things, you know. It is obvious from the reaction of not only the —Provincial electorate in the Province of Saskatchewan but also from the by-elections at the Federal level, that the farmers do not want a stabilization program based on gross receipts.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Messer:** — Farmers want a stabilization program that relates to net income, one that gives some protection to farmers and one which would be funded by both farmer and the Federal purse.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Messer:** — The farmers want a stabilization program that would take out the dips and dives that they have suffered due to the fluctuations in the international market place. I doubt whether there could ever have been a farm adjustment plan as badly conceive as that one of Mr. Olson's if the former Saskatchewan Government had possessed the inclination and the guts to oppose the Federal Government's agricultural policies.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Messer:** — In contrast they are even different in Saskatchewan. In contrast to the do-nothing record of the former Government, the initiative of the new Saskatchewan Government was so effective that the farm plan proposals we turned down at the Edmonton conference by the Agricultural Ministers and not only the prairie Ministers but the Ministers from all ten provinces in Canada.

It appeared then as if there would be some considerable change in the farm adjustment proposal of the Federal Government. And there has been some change, some change for the good, Mr. Speaker, not only in the elections that were held since that time but unfortunately to this point in time, it has not all been altered to the point that it needs to be in a real meaningful and beneficial way to the Saskatchewan farmer.

I, however, had an opportunity yesterday to meet with Mr. Olson, the Federal Minister of Agriculture, to again talk to him and discuss with him some of the shortcomings of the Federal farm adjustment program. I think that we have real reason to believe that the adjustment program which has been proposed by the Federal Government will have some changes incorporated in it so that it becomes a meaningful and a helping program to the farmers of Saskatchewan.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Messer:** — The former Government neglected agriculture. Mr. Speaker, they have been every bit as negligent in Opposition as they were in Government in not voicing some concern for the problems of the agricultural industry of Saskatchewan as they were during that seven years of government.

The Government has been very aggressive in finding solutions but we have heard nothing from the Opposition in regard to the problems of agriculture nor the solution to those problems. If there is one obvious development in the Department of Agriculture and also in other departments of the Government it is involving the grassroots of this province.

The 13 meetings that we held on the Land Bank Commission gave, I think, ample evidence to the citizens of Saskatchewan that we want their involvement. We want their views and we want to have dialogue with them before we legislate any agricultural program.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Messer:** — Another action that we took was to hear the views of the farmers which the former Government failed to take was to establish a Special Committee on Agriculture. The special Committee held meetings throughout the Province of Saskatchewan and heard briefs and representations made to it, not only in regard to The Family Farm Protection Act which was passed by the special session of this new Government but also to hear the views of farmers in regard to a comprehensive crop insurance program. Now, that Committee should be commended. From the reaction of the Members opposite I almost interpret that it is not commendable to go to the people of the province and hear the kind of things that farmers want to express to them. We think that Committee should be commended on the jobs that it did.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Messer:** — I and the Members to your right, Mr. Speaker, commend them for a job well done.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Messer:** — The Government has taken the initiative to go ahead with a number of the Committee's recommendations in the area of crop insurance, at least. I will be studying the remaining recommendations for a possible incorporation in 1973.

Mr. Speaker, the new emphasis this government is placing on agriculture is evident in the increased budget amount to be provided to my Department. Rather than going into detail of the budgetary increases I want to mention some of the staff that we will not be able to hire, that should have been hired some good many years ago.

We now, at this point in time, have only five specialists in the Department of Agriculture in a province where we have 46 million acres in production. We shall add four more to that staff this year, one in horticulture, another specialist in pesticides and two in crops and soils.

We are providing funds for the monitoring of field insect pests as a thorough and systematic means of detecting outbreaks before they become serious. Our success last year was remarkable in dealing with the Bertha army worm but we want to be in a position this year with information, chemicals and equipment to deal quickly and effectively with insect pests.

Mr. Speaker, it was a sad commentary on the indifference of the former Government that there were 2.5 million acres of rapeseed planted last year and not a single acre was insured because the Government was negligent and inactive in regard to expanding its crop insurance program.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Messer:** — Losses that farmers suffered from the Bertha army worm outbreak would not have been as substantial if they had had the foresight to introduce and expand the crop insurance program to cover that most valuable crop for this province.

Our very important Farm Management and Economics and Statistics Branch will get new impetus from the addition of staff members and the doubling of expenditures. The market development thrust, which is a totally new initiative, will be back up by three marketing economic specialists. The milk manufacturing industry will be given co-ordinating assistance from several of our government's departments. Agriculture will assist producers with technical information and grants to convert production from cream to milk. This is our way to help build secondary industry related to our basic industry of agriculture.

The great energy and resources we shall be putting into the livestock sector are evident in our programs and policies in the amounts that we have budgeted for those programs and policies. We have provided for a new program of assistance that will help construct veterinary clinics to make veterinary services more readily available and to assist farmers in getting the best results with their livestock enterprises.

Mr. Speaker, the budget for agriculture is the budget for the Department that has made changes and is making changes of an immense significance. The favourable impact of our programs will be felt on the farms and in the small towns and small communities generally in this province.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Messer:** — Our farmers and residents of smaller towns waited far too long under the former Government for proper recognition for agriculture. Their patience, Mr. Speaker, ended last June in the failure at the polls of the Liberals. Last June reflected their failures for seven years to provide new programs and new hope for rural communities in this province.

Mr. Speaker, this Budget and revitalizing of my Department bring a much needed sense of expectancy and optimism to the producers in our basic industry and to young and old alike in our farm and rural communities.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to be part of a government which has now begun to put agriculture back on the agenda of the future of Saskatchewan. Having said that, Mr. Speaker, I will not support the amendment but will support the main motion.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. J. Wiebe** (Morse): — Mr. Speaker, I am pleased that the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Messer) brought to my attention that he occupied this chair for the past four years.

**Mr. Messer:** — Oh no, two years.

**Mr. Wiebe:** — Oh, pardon me. I should like to say to the Minister of Agriculture now that if he proposes and implements the present Land Bank the way he has now proposed it, that in three years' time he will be back in this chair.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Wiebe:** — The Minister of Agriculture also accused the Opposition of being negligent and not showing any responsibility in terms of this Land Bank. I can tell the Members opposite that we have talked to the people and that the people in turn have talked to us. I can always tell when the Minister of Agriculture has been one of this regional meetings and also when the CCF Party brass had their local meetings because for about two days afterwards my phone just about rang off the wall.

I won't tell the Members opposite the comments that I received as I think that some of the language is not permitted in this House but the general consensus of opinion was that they wanted us to use every effort possible in making sure that this Land Bank, as presently proposed, does not become law in this province.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Wiebe:** — I might as well mention to the Minister that after my maiden speech in this House I received very many letters and phone calls. . .

**Mr. Messer:** — Table them.

**Mr. Wiebe:** — I shall do that tomorrow if the Members wish. If the Members will give me the time tomorrow on radio I shall be pleased to read them to this House.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order, order! Unless the member quotes from letters he doesn't have to table them. And if he takes full responsibility for letters if he does read them he doesn't have to table them. If the members are asking him to table these letters it will have to be introduced into this House.

**Mr. Wiebe:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. If the members opposite will give me an hour and a half of radio time tomorrow afternoon I will read you those letters and I will then table those letters.

Now, Mr. Speaker, there are points of the Land Bank that we have a tendency to agree with. I think that every farmer in the province today should have the opportunity to sell his land. I also think that he should have an opportunity to sell his land at a fair and equitable price. I think that the Minister of Agriculture has already set this price to us. The way I understand it is that he will be buying the land at seven and a half times the assessed value.

**Mr. Messer:** — I never said that.

**Mr. Wiebe:** — No, you may not have said that, Mr. Speaker, but I believe your actions speak louder than your words. And I might suggest, Mr. Speaker, that an example. . .

**Mr. Messer:** — Mr. Speaker, on a Point of Privilege. I believe that the Member is quoting me. He is quoting me inaccurately. I have never, at any meeting in the country or at any time, said

we would purchase land at seven and a half times the assessed value. Never has that been said by myself, Mr. Speaker. If the Hon. Member is quoting me as having said that I would appreciate a retraction.

**Mr. Wiebe:** — Mr. Speaker, if the Minister of Agriculture could have recalled what I have said he would have realized that I said that he indicated in his actions that the price of land will be seven and a half times the value. Now if he is able and capable of a bit of mathematics, I should like to ask him if this is not action when he purchased land from Mr. Elmer Toby for a price of \$20,000, assessed value \$2,600? This was done by the Department of Agriculture and this is seven and a half times the assessed value. Now, if he is willing to deny this then I withdraw my statement. You are buying land for that price so you are setting a precedent.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Wiebe:** — Now, Mr. Speaker, may I be afforded the opportunity of continuing my address? I would like to mention as well some thoughts concerning the Land Bank. I had not planned on talking on the Land Bank this afternoon but the Minister has decided to raise a few questions on it and I have mentioned that we are in favour of this Government making available the purchase of land from farmers who wish to retire.

My main objection and our main objection is that we feel that farmers should have the opportunity to purchase that land from the Government and they should have the opportunity of purchasing that land immediately. I believe also, as I have mentioned in my maiden speech, that the rental fees which this Government is planning on implementing are way out of line and the average young farmer of today cannot afford to pay them. This government can show its responsibility to the young farmers of this province by allowing them to borrow money from farm credit corporations and guaranteeing that note. This is where they can show their concern for the young people of this province.

I am sorry that the Minister of Education Mr. MacMurchy) is not here today. He had mentioned yesterday to a question in the House that if the school trustees decided on a certain wage scale that this Budget presented last Friday would adequately take care of all increases. The Budget last year as \$81.8 million for operations. Now I understand that this included teachers' salaries and this sort of thing. This represents an \$8.2 million increase. Now, if the Minister of Education has had an opportunity to discuss this with the President of the Saskatchewan School Trustees' Association he will know that a one per cent increase in wage scales will cost approximately \$1 million. This then means, Mr. Speaker, that he is talking about a seven and a half per cent increase in wages.

Now, has he made arrangements or a deal with the teachers of this province or with the school unit that the increase in salaries will not be above seven and a half per cent? Or, Mr. Speaker, has he also made allowances in his budget to look after increased costs for maintenance, increased costs for repairs to school buses, the increased cost for the minimum wage and also the new time payment? I don't doubt, Mr. Speaker, that if the amount allocated to the teachers by the trustees is above



seven and a half per cent, that the mill rates throughout this province will have to be drastically increased in order to meet their operating expenses.

I should also like to congratulate the Hon. Member from Saskatoon Nutana Centre (Mr. Robbins). I believe that he will probably be the future Provincial Treasurer for his excellent recitation of Budget figures today. I am sure that had he been given the opportunity to prepare the Budget which we heard last Friday, that it would have been a document that wouldn't have been quite so fuzzy-wuzzy but one of which would have not had the figures as fuzzy as the Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Blakeney) has tried to do.

I feel, Mr. Speaker, that this is a Budget which does not fill the needs of our province. One of the most glaring needs is the need for more jobs. This need was intensified by this Government's cancellation of job producing industries and its inability to stop businesses from closing down and moving out of this province. I see nothing in this Budget that will replace this loss. All that we hear and we heard it yesterday as the Government's announcement of industries that have already been in effect for a year or so.

Since the Members opposite assumed power our unemployment rate for this province has grown from one of the lowest in Canada to one of the highest. A modest amount has been allocated in this Budget for Public Works to supposedly reduce this rise in unemployment. I feel that this modest amount is not enough. Looking at their previous record I am afraid that this modest amount won't even be spent.

Let's look at that record. The CCF-NDP Government in 1960 to 1961, with unemployment on the rise, budgeted for \$5.3 million for Public Works. This, Mr. Speaker, was an election year. But they spent only \$3.8 million. In 1961-62 with unemployment not at its present level, not at five per cent, not at six per cent but a staggering 7.1 per cent, what did they do for unemployment then? They appropriated a magnificent sum of \$2.4 million and of this, again, they only spend \$1.2 million. The next year the unemployment had increased to 7.2 per cent, the highest it has ever been in this province, this NDP government allocated only 49.6 million. What did they actually spend? A whopping \$7.2 million. Is this an example of how the NDP act when a problem arises? Is this Budget going to be a repeat performance of what happened in 1960-64?

When the Liberals assumed office in 1964 they were able to bring the unemployment rate of 7.3 per cent down to 4.7 per cent. A commendable record, Mr. Speaker. Now, in only eight short months the Members opposite have increased that figure to one of the highest in Canada. If this Budget is any indication, in another eight months it will be up to the NDP high of 7.3 per cent.

This Budget also shows less revenue from petroleum and natural gas by \$1 million. I suggest that they are right on this estimate because there will be less development and less sales because of the opposite Members' attitude toward free enterprise. Oh yes, potash! They are going to flog that industry by increasing royalties. I wonder how or who would be capable of operating the Kalium Potash Plant if Kalium decided to close down. Even the Wafflers haven't got an answer

for that.

I presume now that the age for drinking has been lowered to 18 and that this will account for increase of \$3 million in liquor profits. Mr. Speaker, this Government does need the extra money as it needs it to pay those large salaries in the Executive Council and the Advisory Committee on Planning Priorities and Management. Or in short, Mr. Speaker, you could call it the ACPPM. A better name would be a collection of political propaganda manipulators. And the taxpayers of his province, Mr. Speaker, are paying the bill.

It is my understanding, as well, that another one of Mr. Romanow's friends or associates is to become Deputy Minister or, at least, Director of Culture and Youth, with, of course, an increased budget. Hopefully, the youth program previously instituted will be carried on and expanded and that the increased budget will not be for distribution of NDP propaganda.

Mr. Speaker, I should like to say a few words about the Property Improvement Grant. There are a lot of ifs, ands and buts about this program because it is noted in the Budget Speech and I quote:

Detailed regulations governing new grants will be published at a later date.

I hope that this later date is not after this Session is over. The way I understand this program, Mr. Speaker, is that any farmland assessed at \$15,000 or over will receive the maximum of \$195. I, for one, am very pleased to hear this as I am sure the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Messer) is as well. But I must also be concerned about the smaller farmer who farms two or three quarters of land. What will he receive? His total assessment is low so he will be receiving the \$70. Mr. Speaker, is that a very good deal? Under the former Homeowner Grant program he would by the end of this year have received \$100. This NDP Government which has given such great lip service to helping the family farm and small farmers is now cheating them out of \$30 by putting this limit on it.

Mr. Speaker, does the Treasurer also not realize that the mass majority of assessments in villages and towns throughout this province is less than \$5,000? I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that 90 per cent of the homeowners in towns and villages will not benefit from this program. You have done these people on fixed incomes and small rural villages and towns out of \$30. Is this a good deal?

Mr. Speaker, the Premier and Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Blakeney) has clearly indicated to the people of this province that he and his Government have no faith in this province. This is not an optimistic Budget. It is not a Budget which inspires pride in this province. It is not a Budget which forecasts an increase in the economy or an increase in jobs or an increase in development or an increase in population growth. Mr. Speaker, in my mind it is a stagnant Budget. All it can show is drastic increase in social welfare payments for the families of this province who are and will be on social welfare because of this Government's inability to inspire confidence, development and jobs in this province.

Because of this, Mr. Speaker, I cannot support this Budget.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. B.M. Dyck** (Saskatoon City Park): — Mr. Speaker, let me say how delighted I am to participate in this debate.

I am pleased to be associated with this Budget and I want to take this opportunity to congratulate the Premier and Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Blakeney) on his efforts in this regard. I think we have the most capable Premier that his province has had since 1905.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Dyck:** — And if he isn't one of the most capable, he is certainly one of the top three.

This budget is an expanded budget. It is a progressive Budget, it is a surplus Budget, it is a good Budget and an excellent document. Never in the history of the Province of Saskatchewan has the Government increased a Budget and at the same time reduced important taxes. There are still many gaps in the social services provided to the people of this province. This Budget will go a long way to close these gaps. I am thinking here, particularly, of areas like the Ombudsman, the Human Rights Commission, Consumer Affairs, Culture and Youth, Corporation and Co-operative Development and so on. In all these areas either new moneys or more moneys are being provided to close these gaps and in that sense this is a progressive Budget. In spite of these increases there is a surplus of almost \$1 million. Mr. Speaker, I would ask that the Members examine the philosophy behind this budget. There are reductions of important taxes and increased in others. This government is not talking about decreases in tax in total. We have never said that we would. You cannot significantly reduce taxes in total when there is an increasing need for Government services. But we have promised to shift taxes and shift we have done. Shift from the man least able to pay and on to those most able to pay. That, Mr. Speaker, is the most important concept behind this document.

The food tax has been removed on meals of \$2.50 and less. This will help the average man. Conversely, the claim on the large corporations in the form of mineral tax and royalties will be increased. This is the way it should be. It exemplifies in a very concrete way our Party's attempt to base taxes on the ability to pay. A very sound principle of taxation and one which I personally believe in. Unfortunately, it is not a tax philosophy that is concurred in by the old line parties. They have consistently over the years given preference to the large corporations as compared to the average man and as a result the bulk of the personal income tax today is derived from the lower income groups, those least able to pay.

The main purpose of Government taxes are essentially two in number, Mr. Speaker. One purpose is to raise funds to provide needed services. The other purpose is to re-distribute the income on an equitable and just basis. This Budget goes a long way to accomplish these ends. I have mentioned one example of how this Budget attempts to tax people on a juster basis. There are others. In my view the basic item of food, shelter and clothing should not be used to raise large amounts of money for the government. We have moved closer by removing the tax on food.

What about housing? I want to commend the Government of this province and more specifically the Premier and Provincial Treasurer on the announcement of the Property improvement Grant. Almost \$24 million will be used to take the heavy burden off the property owner. Let us compare this with the record of the previous administration. In 1970 under the previous Government approximately \$22.5 million was raised from corporation taxes — \$22.5 million. In 1971 under the same government the corporation tax was dropped to \$13 million. In 1972-73 the estimates of the present Government call for revenue from this source of over \$15 million.

Moving to the area of revenue from mineral resources, under the previous administration the tax revenue derived from this source in 1971 was \$2.5 million. Under the present Government the revenue from this source will be over \$4 million. These are, in my view, very interesting statistics and tell us a good deal about the philosophy of this Budget. Property tax is by its very nature a regressive tax because it is not based on the ability to pay. I believe that all governments should move to design tax structures based on the latter principle of capability to pay.

Mr. Speaker, the Property Improvement Grant program is another excellent example of this Budget's direction toward more equitable taxation.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Dyck:** — This program calls for an expenditure of almost \$24 million to be paid to homeowners, businessmen and farmers. It will have the desirable and needed effect of reducing the average mill rate by 13 mills.

In summary, I have said that the removal of tax on meals, the Property improvement Grant will reduce taxes for the average man. The increase in royalties and mineral rights will provide more revenue from other sectors. These are steps in the right direction.

I am very pleased, Mr. Speaker, to see in this Budget moneys available to provide more assistance to the small and medium sized business firms across this province. These are a group of people that were completely ignored by the previous Government. And of all the failures of that administration, perhaps the greatest was their failure to develop industry in our province and to assist the small business firms. The small business people are the ones that really need the help. These people live in our communities, their children attend our schools, they are an important asset. But they have problems and these difficulties can be summarized into a few major sections.

First is the problem of capital. The largest corporate organizations generate their own capital by ploughing back retained earnings or they can obtain relatively cheap capital in the money market. Not so with the small firm. So I am pleased that the Government will be moving to provide increased loans and other forms of financial assistance.

The second major problem facing this sector is the need for much more sophisticated market statistics and a whole spectrum of financial data. I am informed that the Department

of Industry and Commerce has been, in the past, sadly lacking in their ability to accumulate this information. The minister has said that much greater importance will be attached to this area. Anyone with a business idea or a desire to expand a present business will, in the future, have access to this information. A strong emphasis here, I am sure, will be to provide up-to-date information on various government programs available at the Provincial and Federal levels.

Finally there is the area of management. There are, no doubt, hundreds of people in this province that would like to start a new business and perhaps they have many good ideas, but simply lack the managerial skill and expertise. This is another necessary area for the Department to supply some leadership and develop new programs. And I know I shall be working hard in this area.

Unfortunately the previous administration completely bypassed these opportunities. They begged and they pleaded and they bargained with every large multi-national corporation they could contact. They appeared to have a fixation on the idea that if our resources were to be developed it should be done by large corporations and preferably by American corporations. It did not occur to them that Saskatchewan Power, the largest corporation in Saskatchewan with assets of over \$750 million is entirely owned by the people of the province and that is not to mention SaskTel, SGIO and I could go on. If this can be accomplished there, why not in other areas.

What was the end result of all these attempts to attract capital? They attracted a few giant corporations and ended up with an over-supply of potash, an over-supply of pulp, an over-supply of sodium sulphate and an over-supply of uranium. These champions of big business have failed in their own free enterprises back yard. They failed to bring in desirable industry, they failed to develop our economy, they failed to help the small businessman.

The previous Government paid little heed to economic planning and economic research and as a result they were in no position to provide assistance to these firms. I am pleased that more help will be given to these groups by the present Government in order to aid the development of secondary industry. This assistance is made more necessary by the encroachment of the large multi-national corporations, the tentacles of which reach out around the world. It is hard for this group to identify with the old free enterprise ethic of competition and so on. It is hard because it has become abundantly clear that there is very little, if any, effective competition in the market place. The corporate giants control the market place and nobody understands it better than the small and medium-sized business firms.

And what has been the result of the economic growth we have had? The result has been a bad distribution of income and bad allocation of resources. The bad distribution of income is so apparent that it requires little description here.

During the last campaign I personally called on over 2,500 homes in my constituency and I witnessed the plight of many people in our midst. It was pitiful and tragic. I have seen many examples where one tiny room served as a kitchen, a sitting room and with bathroom down the hall. I have seen people in tiny cubicles in basement suites. These are the people who have been

called lazy and deadbeats. Well, Mr. Speaker, this is simply not true. The truth of the matter, Mr. Speaker, is that these people for good reason have just not been able to compete in our very competitive society. In contrast to this we have homes with two car garages, a couple of extra dens and recreation rooms and in these, Mr. Speaker, reside the people who are successful in our society, the people, to use the vernacular, who have made it. Well, I say, Mr. Speaker, that these conditions are a sorry indictment of our society. By taking the tax off food, by reducing that very regressive tax, property tax, this Government has taken one small step to improving these conditions. The proponents of that antiquated free enterprise ethic shout wildly that everyone has an equal chance. But this again is simply not true. What are the chances of a son of a poor Métis or Indian or a poor white north of Green lake compared to the son of a doctor earning over \$30,000 a year in the cities of Regina or Saskatoon?

I have, Mr. Speaker, provided a rather tragic illustration of the effects of our bad distribution of income in our society. I want to move to the area of allocation of resources. In simple terms, this phrase refers to how labor, capital and materials are put to work and for what purpose. In the past few decades we have seen the development of a large tertiary industry, i.e. service industry, in our society. The proponents of the corporate enterprise ethic blandly pass this development off as a natural phenomena associated with maturing economies. A closer scrutiny reveals some interesting and at the same, time sad developments. I want to provide some very simply illustrations — illustrations that all members here are familiar with.

We have seen the growth of financial institutions by the hundreds — bank, finance companies, trust companies, mortgage companies, mutual funds, insurance offices ad infinitum with offices and branches in every part of every city. Each one is competing for deposits, each one is competing for loans. These firms are usually housed in comparatively luxurious office quarters and hundreds of people each day pass into these offices to keep records, collect accounts, make calculations and other minor tasks. We simply don't require this multitude of financial institutions and I say, Mr. Speaker, that this is a bad and wasteful allocation of resources. Instead of all the material going into these duplicating and unnecessary services why not build more and better facilities for the treatment of the mentally retarded, for the old, for the sick and so on? Why not build more and better recreational facilities for all our young people and old? Why not build more and better educational facilities throughout the country? And you might ask where would you employ the people replaced from these firms? The answer, Mr. Speaker, is to employ these people in the very areas that I have described. Employ more people to improve and expand health services, employ more people to improve and expand education services, employ more people to improve and expand recreational services.

Let me give another example of a bad allocation of resources. And here I am going to take a giant-sized swipe at the automobile industry and its ancillary industries.

I term the policies and tactics of the automobile industry as the biggest hoax every perpetrated on the North American society. Every year the three automobile giants come out with a new design. There are really no major improvements in

engineering, it is just that the new models appear a little flashier and a little classier and the last model suddenly seems to look old. Not only is there a new design each year but there are literally dozens of different models, different sizes, different price ranges and so on. What is the result of these auto giants changing the style each year and of producing so many different models? Firstly, it is necessary to re-tool the factory every time there is a significant change in design. The cost of re-tooling each year is fantastic and is passed on, of course, to the consumer in the form of a higher price for the finished product. Each new car requires extra testing to further add to the price. Then, of course, it is necessary to maintain a gigantic inventory of parts all across the continent, to repair all these different models, designs and makes. The simple maintenance of this inventory of parts is prohibitive in cost – not including the extra cost because the volume of production is smaller than if the parts were more standardized and interchangeable.

I need not belabour the members of this House about the high cost of auto parts and repairs. They are all too familiar with these.

Further, Mr. Speaker, in the last couple of years we have seen a wild proliferation of another costly and related industry, namely, the service station. These outlets have expanded to the point where it is not uncommon to see two or three stations at one given intersection. We are in dire need of funds to build better facilities for the mentally retarded, recreational facilities, senior citizen accommodation and so on. But there is no shortage of funds to build service stations and the gigantic oil conglomerates are turning them out by the hundreds in their efforts to increase sales. I could go on and enunciate many other problems associated with the present policies pursued by the auto manufacturers – the problems of auto safety, unnecessary air pollution, the high cost of highways, high cost of advertising associated with the industry and so on. Mr. Speaker, the auto industry has followed policies which run from the ridiculous to the absurd. The solution to this must come essentially from the Federal Government and this solution could involve the limiting of yearly design change to changes every five years or so. It involves the manufacture of more practical and economical automobiles that are not worn out in 60,000 or 70,000 miles and other major changes.

Mr. Speaker, in conclusion I would say that the millions of dollars that would be paid to the people of Saskatchewan and Canada through a rationalization of this industry could find a much better use in a whole spectrum of social services that people need and which would enhance the quality of life immeasurably. We need much more social capital and we need much less wasteful capital used in the private sector. I want to emphasize that many of the social problems facing our society and our world are caused by a bad distribution of income and a bad allocation of resources. I believe, Mr. Speaker, that this budget does assist as much as a relatively small provincial budget can assist in the solution to these monumental problems.

Mr. Speaker, I will support the motion and I will oppose the amendment.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. D.F. MacDonald** (Moose Jaw North): — Mr. Speaker, last Friday I sat in this House and listened to a Budget speech for the first time. I was quite impressed by the presentation of the Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Blakeney). It certainly sounded like a good deal for Saskatchewan. When it was over I was handed copies of the Speech and the Estimates and I hurried off to study them. What I found, Mr. Speaker, was that there was very little relationship between the truth and what our Premier said in the Budget Speech. It appears the Budget Speech was composed with the sole purpose of deceiving the people of Saskatchewan. Even the Estimates were prepared to create confusion for anyone looking for the real story. Item after item has been shifted throughout the Estimates to prevent a careful or easy comparison. The Premier has made statement after statement that have no basis of fact when the Estimate are examined. The Budget speech is nothing more than a collection of exaggerations and misrepresentations.

One of the first statement the Premier made – “This is a balance Budget.” Well, Mr. Speaker, if you consider that borrowing money to meet expenses will produce a balanced budget than I suppose you might call this a balanced Budget. Mr. Speaker, of course this is not a balanced Budget. And any statement saying that it is, is nothing more than a misrepresentation. The Premier admitted that a large part of the \$119 million, which will be received from Federal-Provincial equalization grants, is due to upward adjustment payments on account of underpayment in the previous year. This grant will not be recurring. This money is owing to us from previous years. Using this money to balance the Budget is tantamount to withdrawing funds from the reserves. This fact will soon be obvious to all of Saskatchewan.

Then, Mr. Speaker, talking about withdrawing funds from reserves, we see what the Premier has done with Crown corporation funds. He has simply adjusted the so-called dividends to make it appear that he has produced a balanced Budget. To use his own terms, he has robbed the piggy bank and he has carefully robbed it for the exact amount needed to give the impression that he has a balanced Budget.

You know, Mr. Speaker, the Premier could add \$10 million to the education expenditures today and still have a balanced budget. All he would have to do is have the Saskatchewan Power Corporation show an additional \$10 million dividend. This is exactly the method used by the Premier to produce this phoney balanced Budget. Mr. Speaker, you might ask, does it really matter whether this is a balance Budget, in fact, or whether it is a balanced Budget in fantasy? The answer is Yes. It matters a great deal whether or not this Budget is balanced.

In this Budget our Premier has established patterns of spending based on amounts of money that may not and likely will not be available next year. Once this pattern of spending is established it will be very difficult to break. This means two things in the next few years.

1. Taxation will have to be increased.

2. Our Premier will be dipping deeply into reserve funds as he has shown he is quite willing to do.

Mr. Speaker, this kind of so-called balanced Budget is a



dangerous matter. The Premier is fooling no one except himself and maybe some of his caucus. The Premier is relying on the sound financial picture left to him by the former Government.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. MacDonald:** — I think we can now see, Mr. Speaker, that sound finances are a thing of the past.

I should like to take a few minutes to talk about the Department of Labour. This is a department where we are promised such great things. This is a department which the NDP have said the former Government down-graded. This is a department that the Member from Regina North East (Mr. Smishek) used such beautiful adjectives to describe the wonderful ways that they would improve upon taking office. This is a department that in the Budget Speech our Premier said would be significantly increased.

Well, let's just examine this Department of Labour that was supposed to have been so badly down-graded. A quick look at the Department will show that personnel has increased from 172 to 211 which is an increase of 39 employees. However, playing the Premier's game of hide and seek we find that seven have been transferred from Public Health to the Department of Labour. We find that 17 have been transferred from the Workmen's Compensation Board. We find that two, three or four have been transferred from Education into Research and Planning Division of the Department of Labour for concerns such as manpower training. This last transfer of personnel was a stroke of genius in this game of hide and seek and it involves three department — Education, Labour and Indian and Métis.

What we find, Mr. Speaker, is that the Department of Labour has an increase of 11 personnel and not 39 as we have been led to believe. We also find that after playing the game, that Budget expenditures increased by less than 10 per cent or about \$350,000 one of the smallest increases of any department in this Budget. Mr. Speaker, this is not as the Premier says in his Budget Speech, a significant increase of a reorganized Department of Labour.

The four Labor Standards officers which are to be added can hardly be expected to give a significant result in protecting our workers. The Executive Officer to be added to the Labour Relations Board could, in fact, be detrimental to the activities of the Board. I will have more to say about this later.

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

**Mr. Macdonald:** — At 5:30 I was discussing certain aspects of the Department of Labour and I pointed out some of the deficiencies. I should just like to say a few words about the two Industrial Relations Officers which are to be added to the Department of Labour. This is not only an insignificant increase, it is a joke. The NDP have repealed Bill 2 and have replaced it with nothing. There was no provision made to ensure settlements of disputes nor provision made to ensure the safety of the public. The Minister of Education (Mr. MacMurchy) is today proving that the NDP have no provisions to help settle disputes in essential services. Maybe it is the intention of the NDP to foster disputes and public inconvenience. Surely, the addition of two Industrial

March 15, 1972

Relations Officers will make no significant difference. It would appear that the NDP are going to adopt a program of the Federal Liberal Party. The Federal Liberal Government instituted a program in January 1970 for early mediation. This was a pioneering experiment of a new concept in Canada in 1968 and it proved moderately successful. The program operates by supplying early mediation through skilled mediators acceptable to both labor and management,. I should hope that our Minister of Labour (Mr. Snyder) takes note of the importance of such acceptability and expertise.

These industry specialists must effect a continuing relationship and to identify and encourage the solutions of problems before the real crisis is reached in the collective bargaining process. They must act during the open period of the agreement.

Mr. Speaker, this program has had moderate success, as I said, but has serious limitations noted in the recent serious and crippling strikes. The program doesn't preserve the security of the public as did Bill 2. However, Mr. Speaker, as I have already said, to attempt to institute such a program with the addition of two officers is nothing more than a joke. It is very obvious that this Budget contains no significant measures to do the job, a job that has become more important to the safety of the public because of irresponsible action by the NDP.

I should also like to take a few minutes to say a few words about an aspect of Welfare. On March 6, 1972 the NDP Member from Assiniboia-Bengough (Mr. Lange) had something to say on welfare. He used many, what he called, examples of welfare in our society. This was quoted in the Leader-Post of March 7, 1972 and I quote the NDP Member from Assiniboia-Bengough.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order, order! I don't think the Hon. Member can refer to a previous debate. He must refer to what was said in this debate and not the previous one.

**Mr. MacDonald:** — I wasn't in the House when he spoke and I read in the Leader-Post...

**Mr. Speaker:** — The same rule holds that it still refers to a previous debate.

**Mr. MacDonald:** — Well, at any rate, I will go on, Mr. Speaker, to remember some of the examples and I want to give the Member from Assiniboia-Bengough another example for welfare, an example that doesn't deal with the Armed Services. I think that the statement attributed to the Armed Services was very unfair. The example that I should like to contribute is that much has been said about the jobs and the fabulous salaries that have given to defeated NDP candidates and party workers. \$15,000 and \$18,000 seems to be the order o the day. But in all of the discussions one gentlemen has been missed. Most NDP candidates only have to be defeated once to get a job but in Moose Jaw we have a three time loser. This has to be a record and surely he must be rewarded and rewarded he was. Mr. L.H. "Scoop" Lewry was given a job and a salary befitting his three political losses. The NDP didn't even create a new position for Mr. Lewry by firing a man to make room for him. The NDP merely hung him on the end of the Local

Government Board as an extra member. That, Mr. Member for Assiniboia-Bengough, is an example of welfare that you can add to your list.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. MacDonald:** — Now, Mr. Speaker, I should like to turn my attention to the consideration of the Department of Municipal Affairs and in particular to that of urban centres.

The Premier, at the outset of his speech said, “In its Budget a Government reveals its sense of priority.” If this is the case then it is obvious that the problems of urban centres have the very lowest of priorities. It is significant that the Premier ignored the problem of cities in the Budget Speech. He never even mentioned them. He devotes half a page to the grain delivery system for which he does not have responsibility but when it comes to the problems of cities, which must be remembered are merely creatures of the Provincial Government, he completely ignores the problem. He avoids responsibility which is his. I don’t think the problems of urban centres have ever reached enough attention from senior governments in Canada but never has there been less priority than in this Budget.

Let’s take a look at grants for urban municipalities for police protection and snow removal. There used to be grants. Then in 1970-71 they reached half a million dollars. They were increased in 1971-72 to nearly \$1 million, still not high enough but quite an improvement. This meant nearly a mill of tax relief in Moose Jaw. So what is the increase this year? None at all! The grants are down. Not only are the grants not increased as they need to be and should be but they are cut back. Where is the help needed to ease the burden of public transportation in our cities? The Government must surely be aware of this problem as it has been well enunciated to them. Where is the relief for cost of public roads within urban centres? The Government is surely aware of the costs involved with streets, traffic control mechanisms, street lighting, street cleaning, snow removal, sanding, bridges, traffic control structures. These costs should not be borne by local taxpayers in a city to the extent that they are. The Province must assume more responsibility.

There are no further provisions made for the maintenance of Magistrates’ Courts in the cities. There is no help in sight to alleviate the high cost to local taxpayers for public recreation. In total, Mr. Speaker, the Budget is a dismal failure for urban municipalities.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. MacDonald:** — I should like to point out that the Property Improvement Grant Program is also a failure in the cities. For that matter it is a failure for all homeowners. The homeowner who last year received \$70 will this year receive \$78, a far cry, Mr. Speaker, from the \$100 he would have received from the Liberal Government.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. MacDonald:** — The other day the Member from Biggar (Mr. Cowley)

had some very fancy figures, about 13 mills. I should just like to show him what will happen in Moose Jaw. Last year a family with a home assessed at \$6,000 received the \$70 Homeowner Grant. This year that same family will receive \$78. But because of the poor deal Moose Jaw gets in this Budget, the municipal mill rate in Moose Jaw is going up this year by over five mills to 6.1. This means this family will pay more than \$30 more in taxes. So instead of getting \$8 more, as the Member for Biggar would have us believe, they get \$22 less. I would ask the Member for Biggar to come to Moose Jaw and explain how getting \$22 less means a mill rate reduction of 13 mills.

Mr. Speaker, this Budget discriminates against the homeowner. There is more yet for the cities. We don't know just how bad for the local taxpayers. Just last week the Department of Education knocked a half million dollars from the budget of the Moose Jaw Public School Board of Education. We no longer have budget review, we now have budget analysis and that analysis said to Moose Jaw, reduce by a half a million dollars.

Moose Jaw now has a choice. They can increase the mill rate by 13 mills to cover this cost or they can reduce services by a half million dollars.

**Mr. MacLeod:** — Voluntarily.

**Mr. MacDonald:** — Voluntarily they can, yes you bet. I should like to see our generous Minister of Education (Mr. MacMurchy) make that choice. And do you know what? I think he might suggest that the mill rate be raised by six mills and the services cut by a quarter of a million dollars. This would be a typical decision on his part.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. MacDonald:** — Mr. Speaker, grants for education are not sufficient in urban centres. The local taxpayers are not prepared to subsidize miserly Provincial grants for education and they are not prepared to see a downgrading of our educational system.

Mr. Speaker, I am not going back to Moose Jaw to tell the homeowner that he should be happy to pay more local taxes because a farmer up at Biggar will be getting a reduction of 13 mills. I invite the Member for Biggar to give that explanation in Moose Jaw.

Mr. Speaker, there is little suggest there will be any new jobs in Moose Jaw in the near future. The Government's attitude in this aspect is entirely negative. I got an insight into the reasoning of this attitude just the other day when the Liberal Member from Wilkie (Mr. McIsaac) was speaking. He was referring to what he thought the benefits of a pulp mill at Meadow Lake might have been. He said he thought the mill would have put millions into the pockets of hundreds of workers month after month, year after year. The NDP Member from Watrous (Mr. Cody) immediately yelled across the floor and I quote:

Yes, but also millions in Parsons and Whittemore.

Mr. Speaker, the Members opposite would rather see hundreds

of workers go on welfare than see a corporation make a profit. This to me is a case of intense hatred and jealousy. It is incredible that any man would rather starve than see another make a profit and it is even more incredible that a man would make a profit and it is even more incredible that a man would rather see his brother starve than see a man make a profit. This, Mr. Speaker, is the reason that we have an increase of 30 per cent in welfare spending. It is indeed a sad day when this province of less than a million people has to pay more than \$66 million for welfare. Mr. Speaker, I do not intend to support a Budget that discriminates against urban municipalities and I will be very interested to see what the member from Wascana (Mr. Baker) will do. No city Member, at least no city Member with a conscience, will support this Budget. I will support the amendment.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. I.W. Carlson** (Yorkton): — Mr. Speaker, it is indeed a pleasure to enter this Budget Debate. I am very proud to be a part of this new Government and proud to be part of the New Democratic Party.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Carlson:** — We have worked in earnest during those long, lean seven years developing policies and formulating them into a program that would mean a New Deal for the people of Saskatchewan.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Carlson:** — We are now observing that program becoming a reality. Mr. Speaker, when I say that this program has been developed over the past seven years I mean just that. It is not a collection of promises hurriedly put together. It is not the Premier's idea of what he thinks would be good for the people of Saskatchewan. It is not a collection of politicians' ideas and it is not the collective ideas of those of us sitting on this side of the House plus 15 more unsuccessful candidates many of whom should be here with us today, Mr. Speaker, if it were not for the former Liberal Government's gerrymander. Mr. Speaker, this program was developed by the people of Saskatchewan. Yes, Mr. Speaker, by the people and for the people.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Carlson:** — The New Deal for People is a good example of what one prominent Canadian would call participatory democracy. I well remember when we had an agricultural conference in Yorkton sponsored by the provincial New Democratic Party. We had members from all across the province and many who were not members. And some who were probably not even sympathetic to our cause, in fact, Mr. Speaker, we even had people from North Dakota. We were seeking to find new ideas and new approaches to our agriculture problems. It was at this conference that the idea of the Land Bank formally entered our pool of ideas. At that time it was just an idea, something to work on and to develop. Mr. Speaker, I use this just as one example of how our ideas were developed into a program. That conference in Yorkton was held over four years ago. We have discussed and added to and deleted and amended the Land Bank program many times since

in fact, the last time it was amended was just a matter of days before it went to press in our booklet the New Deal for People. Just over a year ago now our entire program was announced to the people of Saskatchewan. Everyone in the province had an opportunity to study our entire program. We did not try to announce our program on a piece-meal basis at opportune times. We wanted the voters of Saskatchewan to judge us on the entire package. Yes, Mr. Speaker, the people of this province developed that program. And on June 23 the voters of this province took the necessary steps to ensure that it would be implemented.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Carlson:** — Mr. Speaker, this Budget is the third great stride towards the implementation of our four year program of a New Deal for People. The program will not be completed this year or next year or the following year. It is a four-year program and an ambitious one at that. Mr. Speaker, it is in the hands of an ambitious Government.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Carlson:** — Mr. Speaker, at this stage of the Budget Debate most of the topics have been dealt with at least once and many several times. I want to deal with only a few topics that are of particular concern to my constituency of Yorkton. As you know, Mr. Speaker, the city of Yorkton in east central Saskatchewan is located in the heart of the parkland region. It is basically an agricultural service centre. There are two factories producing farm machinery, a large Pool stockyard, privately owned packing plant, a feed mill, a flour mill, creamery, poultry processing plant and various kinds of service industries. The economy of this city fluctuates with the agricultural economy of the area and the province. Basically the farmers of the area have always been diversified. There are some who specialize in cattle, both beef and dairy. Some of Saskatchewan's most prominent purebred cattle herds are in my constituency. There are a few large feedlots that help keep the demand for feeder cattle up at all times. We have several large poultry farms in the area and many, many straight grain farmers.

There is one type of farmer, Mr. Speaker, that we still have in the Yorkton area that is non-existent in many parts of the province. Here I am referring to the cream shipper. Yes, there are many, many farm families that milk anywhere from four to five cows in the summer time and up to 15 or 20 cows the year around. This Budget, Mr. Speaker, provides \$400,000 for farmers to help them finance the conversion to the production of industrial milk. Mr. Speaker, this is another example of this Government's willingness and eagerness to promote the agricultural industry.

The Department of Agriculture did a study of the Saskatchewan dairy industry and its future. The report indicates that in order to improve the income of the dairy industry in Saskatchewan optimum efficiency would be required in all sectors of the industry including the production, transportation and processing. Some area in need of adjustment include the following: The average milk and cream production per farm and per cow is low and we need to make improvements in this area. The existing creameries are not large enough to complete effectively in the

production of butter. The existing facilities cannot handle the processing of milk and therefore producers are not able to take advantage of the increased revenue from whole milk production. The labor requirements for butter production are very costly because of the low productivity of the existing plants. The peak milk production period is short and most of the equipment is underutilized for long periods of time. Saskatchewan is presently importing approximately 10 million pounds of skim milk powder, 600,000 pounds of cottage cheese, 6,900 pounds of cheddar cheese and 56,000 gallons of ice cream annually while we are only exporting 2 million pounds of creamery butter. The establishment of a centralized manufacturing milk processing plant would result in complete utilization of whole milk with higher returns to the Saskatchewan dairy industry and allow for higher quality and greater flexibility regarding new product development. You can see there are areas that need improvement and this Government is prepared to move in that direction. The study went on with their conclusions:

Conclusion No. 1. The per capita consumption of or demand for dairy products in Saskatchewan and the volume of production would warrant the construction of two centralized manufacturing milk processing plants in Saskatchewan.

Conclusion No. 2. A manufacturing milk plant be established at Yorkton as it is located centrally in the heavy dairy producing area.

Conclusion No. 3. Given a total overall production of the area, the plant would have an annual processing capacity of approximately 5.8 million pounds of butter and 5 million pounds of skim milk.

Conclusion No. 4. The existing creameries act as receiving stations for cream and/or milk where the cost of hauling is more economical than direct hauling to the plant. In other words, the small creameries in the surrounding areas would still collect the cream and then it would be trucked into the central processing plant.

They further recommended that a complete survey of all cream producers of the proposed area should be conducted and a commitment obtained as to the producers' intentions. This has been partially done. A farm survey of the Saskatoon and Prince Albert areas also to be conducted and the results of the survey published as a part of this report.

Mr. Speaker, this report indicates that the area around Yorkton has a large enough milk shed area to support a plant there and the possibilities of another one in the north western part of the province would still have to be finalized. The conclusions of this study and the commitment of the Government for financial assistance are an indication of better times to come for many farmers in the Yorkton area. It is anticipated that milk will be hauled from as far as 100 miles into the city. There have been more developments than just a study and a commitment of \$400,000. Saskatchewan Co-op Creamery has conducted their own survey in the area. They have an option on property at Yorkton and are presently making final negotiations in preparation for constructing a manufacturing milk plant there. When this plant becomes a reality and the possibility of a second one in Prince Albert or Saskatoon, then this Government will have helped to improve the standard of living for many

hundreds of farmers in Saskatchewan.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Carlson:** — Mr. Speaker, the second point from the Budget that I want to deal with are the provisions for the Department of Continuing Education and more specifically its responsibility for the development of community colleges. There is a group of education conscious citizens in Yorkton already planning and promoting a college for that general area. We have one of the finest comprehensive schools in the province. We already have some university classes offered at St. Joseph's College, we already have adult classes being taught not only in Yorkton but in the surrounding towns in any classroom or hall that is available. This, Mr. Speaker, is part of the concept of a community college, to meet the educational needs of a community when and where they are required.

I am pleased to hear, Mr. Speaker, that the Minister of Education has appointed an advisory committee to study and hold public hearings regarding the establishment of community colleges. Mr. Speaker, this is another example of participatory democracy in action. The development of community colleges does not imply building more physical facilities. In most areas there are adequate classrooms, laboratories and libraries or whatever facilities are needed. These may not necessarily be found in one city or town but in various places in the area.

Many of the decisions regarding community colleges are yet to be made. The basic goal, however, has already been determined in other countries and other provinces. It must strive to meet the educational needs of adults in a particular region through a program based on the following principles. A community college's major responsibility is to promote formal and informal adult education in a community. The programs are to be developed in response to the expressed concerns of a community which has identified and assessed its needs. A community college shall provide individual and group counselling in the establishment and achievement of educational goals. A community college shall assist the community development by offering programs of community education and service. In rural areas it will serve as a mechanism in the maintenance and the development of a viable way of life. A community college should not duplicate existing educational services or facilities for adults, rather it shall co-ordinate the delivery of all adult educational services in the community. A community college shall be governed by a council representative of the region. And finally, the operation of the community college shall be under the purview of the Minister of Education. One can see from these principles that a community college would provide an invaluable service to the people of a region at a modest cost as compared to the cost of building and operating a university or technical school. I don't mean to imply that it would be providing the same service. Mr. Speaker, these are the only institutions that it could be compared to. Provision in the Budget for the development of community colleges, Mr. Speaker, was expected and indeed welcome.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Carlson:** — Mr. Speaker, I should like to deal with another topic of great concern to many residents of Saskatchewan and that is



our natural resources and more particularly the big game or at least what is left of it. The former Liberal Government apparently did not follow a policy of providing for a controlled harvest that would maintain the big game population. Mr. Speaker, the former Government of which the Member for Moosomin (Mr. Gardner) was a Member apparently had a policy of selling our big game to the highest bidder. The policy followed by the former Government was very similar to an experience a friend of mine had when he was hunting moose. He got a hot tip from a pilot who had flown over the particular area so the next morning he headed out early to see if he could put a tag on one of those moose that were reported in the area. When he arrived at the appropriate spot and was about to depart into the bush a local native chap came down the road and stopped to talk. During the conversation the native said, "What are you doing around here?" This friend of mine said, "Oh, I am going into the bush here and I am going to shoot myself a moose." This Indian fellow said, "There is no moose in this area." "Well," my friend said, "I was just talking to a pilot who flew over here the day before yesterday. He tells me he counted 11 in this little area just south of the road here." "Yes," the Indian said, "but we sold ten of them yesterday." Yes, Mr. Speaker, this was the attitude of the former Government.

Now we are in the position where we must restrict hunting in order to allow the big game population to recover. To give you one example what has happened to our moose population, I want to give you a few statistics. Game management zone No. 22 just north of Hudson Bay, the ten year average moose count was .96 per square mile with some years the count being as high as 1.45 animals per square mile. This year the count is down to .68. The number of animals killed in the same area has increased from 750 in 1967 to 1,567 last year., Mr. Speaker, these statistics indicate that there was no policy of a controlled harvest. Many of these animals were taken by American hunters who paid licence fees of \$100. Let me say that I am not opposed to allowing foreign hunters to come and help harvest our game in Saskatchewan but I am saying, however, Mr. Speaker, that our residents must be given first priority. These resources belong to each and everyone of us and therefore our people must be given priority to hunt them. We are all going to help pay the penalty for the negligence of the former Government in the management of the big game in Saskatchewan.

Mr. Speaker, in conclusion I just want to say how proud I am to be part of this New Democratic Government which was elected on a pledge to give the people of Saskatchewan a New Deal. The Throne Speech and the Budget indicate that a New Deal is being delivered. This Government has new and imaginative ideas and is prepared to act on them. Mr. Speaker, I will indeed support the main motion but not the amendment.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order, order!

**Mr. A.R. Guy** (Athabasca): — The Hon. Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Messer) has been called to order for the first time this evening, it probably won't be the last.

Mr. Speaker, as I rise to participate in the Budget Debate, I wish, first of all, to congratulate the Premier and I am sorry

that he is not here. I guess his trip up to my constituency yesterday, from what I hear, was perhaps a little more than he was able to take coming from the city all the time. I want to congratulate him as the Provincial Treasurer for his consistency. The Throne Speech he presented as Premier provided no deal for the unemployed, the underprivileged, the overburdened taxpayer, and his Budget presentation as Provincial Treasurer was no better. It would not be surprising if Members of the Government were thinking that they should get either a new Premier or a new Provincial Treasurer. Our suggestion would be that you change both of them. Get leaders who will come down out of their ivory towers and present programs and policies for the people rather than the bureaucracy.

I would say that this is also true for every member on that side of the House who participated in this Debate. There has not been one of them who has gotten down to the bead and butter issues of what's facing the people of this province at this time. There has not been one Member over there who has talked about unemployment. There has not been one Member who hasn't stood on his feet and asked for more expenditures at a time when there are 20,000 people walking the streets of this province with no hope of a job under the NDP Government.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Guy:** — And I should like to say, Mr. Speaker, that if that Budget that was presented the other day by the Provincial Treasurer is the best this Premier's dream team that is costing the people of Saskatchewan more than \$500,000 can do, they had better get out of here. Let graduates from the Saskatchewan colleges take over those jobs. They will do twice the job at half the price.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Guy:** — The Provincial Treasurer has also tried to confuse the reader of the Budget by manipulating agencies and branches from one department to another, by changing the names of departments, by the creation of new departments, but regardless of how he shuffles the cards, there is still the same old message coming through loud and clear and that is that it is the same cold deck with the same old socialist jokers sitting along the front row and the people of Saskatchewan have been dealt a losing hand. The cards dealt in this budget by the Provincial Treasurer is not a New Deal for Saskatchewan people because like the Throne Speech, it's a New Deal for the few rather than for the many. The few being the many hundreds of new jobs in the civil service,, no doubt already reserved for those with NDP membership cards, and the many being the students, the unemployed, the underprivileged, the aged, the workers and the overburdened taxpayers of Saskatchewan.

However, we are indebted to the Attorney General (Mr. Romanow) who was the Opposition financial critic of a year ago for exposing the first example of fraud that appeared in this Budget by that Provincial Treasurer. The NDP financial critic a year ago said that the Liberal Budget was a bogus budget because it was not balanced by money generated by the Saskatchewan economy but rather by outside payments from other governments and our Crown corporations. I say this to the NDP opposite and I see there are a few capitalists still sitting along the front benches.

I know there is one in the person of the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Messer). I don't think there is anybody that could match his net wealth if you added all of ours from this side of the House. I don't even think that my Hon. Member who represents me could match his for his net worth. He's a wealthy man but I don't think he's that wealthy.

**Mr. Smishek:** — 20 apartment blocks or so.

**Mr. MacPherson:** — And, Walter, you're going to be looking after them too.

**Mr. Guy:** — The Attorney General claimed that to borrow money from Crown corporations and use funds that have come from other governments shows the desperate economic position that the province is in. I think those were the words used last year. The Attorney General, at that time, was violently opposed to this procedure. If you were to take last year's Debates and Proceedings, on page 451 you will see where Mr. Romanow was speaking in the Budget Debate as the Opposition financial critic at that time and he said:

It is very interesting about the sources of revenue by the Treasurer (Mr. Steuart) and how he balanced it. They are receiving \$70.6 million from the Federal Liberals. The Liberal boys have come in to bail out their Liberal friends here in Saskatchewan.

This is what he said.

The Treasury would be absolutely broke, this Province would be bankrupt or on the verge of it if it wasn't for the Federal Liberals handing our millions.

**An Hon. Member:** — Oh, Roy, you didn't, not really.

**Mr. Guy:** — Then he went on to say;

If it wasn't for Otto Lang and Pierre Elliott Trudeau, old fuddle duddle himself coming in to help, this Government would be broke.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Guy:** — Well, now, Mr. Speaker, I know that the Attorney General can twist things to his own liking, but I say categorically, that if the Opposition critic said that when we were receiving \$70.6 million in equalization, what is he saying today when we are received \$119.3 million?

**Mr. Smishek:** — Better deal.

**Mr. Guy:** — Yes, because if the Province was bankrupt when receiving \$70.6 million, what a calamity nine months of NDP Government has been if they need \$119.3 million from old fuddle duddle to save their hide.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

March 15, 1972

**Mr. Guy:** — I'm surprised that our sanctimonious socialists opposite will allow the Federal Liberals to bail them out of bankruptcy even if the economy did decline by \$50 million in the nine months they have been in office.

But you know, Mr. Speaker, that was only the beginning. The Opposition critic wasn't finished. After criticizing the Federal equalization payment as being a bogus way to balance a budget, he continued:

They...

Meaning the Liberal Government.

...say there is no taxation. I say this is false. They are putting into the coffers of the public from the Crown corporations a total of \$16.1 million. You know, if it weren't for the Crown corporations this Government would be flat broke.

If the Government was flat broke, Mr. Speaker, when they took \$16.1 million into general revenue, what are they after nine months of socialism when they take \$17.3 million into general revenue? On the basis of this type of figuring by the Attorney General, the NDP have plunged Saskatchewan \$51.2 million closer to bankruptcy in nine months and they have just started.

**Mr. MacPherson:** — That's right.

**Mr. Guy:** — Then, Mr. Speaker, the financial critic said last year:

I oppose this form of activity because it's a form of taxation. These corporations if they are making profits are there to provide a service at the least possible expense to the people of Saskatchewan.

These are strange words from a Party which has just raised the taxes on Saskatchewan people \$1.2 million. And it is strange for Members who in the Crown Corporations Committee over the last two days have voted solidly against decreasing the rates of SaskTel and Saskatchewan Power.

**Mr. MacPherson:** — No, not here.

**Mr. Guy:** — The Opposition critic concluded this remarks a year ago with:

They. . .

Again, meaning the Liberal Government.

. . .are taxing them through the back door, taxing them to the tune of \$86 million. So if you take away the \$86 million, what do you have?

The Attorney General asked last year. He said:

You have a bogus Budget 1971.

**An Hon. Member:** —Oh, oh!

**Mr. Guy:** — Well, Mr. Speaker, by the very words of the present Attorney General we have now been presented with a bogus Budget 1972 with a crushing tax burden of not \$86 million but \$136.6 million or a 59 per cent increase in eight and a half months. You know, it doesn't take much of an imagination to see what four years of an NDP Government will do if taxes increase at the rate of seven per cent a month.

The Opposition critic a year ago said:

The unemployed worker and hard-pressed farmer won't buy this phony bogus Budget.

Well, Mr. Attorney General, Provincial Treasurer and Members opposite, the people of Saskatchewan will tell you that they are not going to buy this phony bogus Budget either.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Wiebe:** — Well said, Roy, well said.

**Mr. Guy:** — Now, Mr. Speaker, never in the history of this Province has a budget been weaker than this one when it comes to approaching the problems of the unemployed. One would have thought, in view of Saskatchewan being the only province in Canada where unemployment is barely holding its own, that the Budget would have outlined some brave, new, imaginative programs to combat unemployment. Because if you remember listening to Members opposite when they were sitting on this side of the House, they had all the answers, they had all the panaceas for creating the programs to combat unemployment. Today we have nothing but apologies and cutbacks in the employment producing departments. So I thought, Mr. Speaker, maybe they don't realize how bad unemployment is in this province. Members opposite refuse to discuss it. Not one Member speaking in either the Throne or the Budget Debate referred to the unemployment problem that exists.

Let's look at the record of the NDP Government. In June when they became the Government of this province unemployment was 2.5 per cent. In less than three months, during the three best months of the summer construction season they were able to increase it to 2.8 per cent. No other province in Canada increased their unemployment in the three summer months except our friends opposite. By December they had done a fantastic job. They increased it again to 5.4 per cent. I want to remind the people of this province that one year ago, December 1970, when conditions were far worse than they were in December of this year, the unemployment rate in Saskatchewan was only 4.7 per cent. January it had climbed further to 6.4 per cent compared to the Liberal 6.2 a year ago. February, though, really tells the story. Last year from January until the end of February, the unemployment rate in Saskatchewan under the Liberal programs for winter works decreased from 6.2 to 4.6 per cent. And this year under the NDP it went from 6.4 just down to 6.1. And this again happened when every other province in Canada was seeing decreases and the lowest rates they have had for two or three

years but our friends opposite still have an unemployment rate of 6.1 per cent compared to our 4.6 a year ago.

**An Hon. Member:** —A bad deal.

**Mr. Guy:** — Look at Manitoba. In Manitoba 6.3 per cent, Saskatchewan 6.1 per cent and Alberta 5 per cent. I think there is one good lesson that you could get from those figures when you compare the three prairie provinces and that is that the NDP Government, I don't care whether it is in Saskatchewan or whether it is in Manitoba, do not know how to solve the problems of unemployment and what is worse, they don't care.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Guy:** — That is why, Mr. Speaker, just a few days ago the Opposition Party in Manitoba brought in and moved the same amendment to the Throne Speech that we have moved to the Budget, criticizing the NDP Government for failing to tackle the problem of unemployment in their province.

Mr. Speaker, our Budget has no answers, the Premier and his frontbenchers have no answers either. The Premier tries to throw it off as a bit of a joke and he puts the blame somewhere else. He said the current Budget had overestimated the budget for Public Works and that's why they didn't get it spent. This is complete nonsense and deliberate misrepresentation. The people of Saskatchewan know full well when the NDP took office only three months of the current fiscal year had passed. The construction season was just nicely starting. This means that they had nine full months, the best part of the summer construction season and a full winter season, assisted by a Federal Winter Works Program that wasn't in existence last year, to complete the construction program proposed in the current year's budget. The only reason that money was not spent was due to the incompetence of the Premier, his Cabinet and the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Wood). This incompetence was shown by the Provincial Treasurer's own words, if you want to check the Budget, when he said:

We could only accelerate one half million dollars to date.

Let's look at the fact, Mr. Speaker, and Mr. Attorney General. For two years when they were in the Opposition they berated our construction program as too little and too late. They gave numerous examples then of projects they would do if they were the Government. Surely, if they were being honest during that time with the people of this province those projects they had in mind then could well have been started within nine months. If there were sincere in spending money and providing jobs they could have given public works top priority last July 1st. They didn't do it. They didn't even give it a separate Minister. They lumped it all in with Municipal Affairs. The Minister himself, when he left that Department and became solely the Minister of Municipal Affairs in the fall, admitted that Public Works had received the short end of the stick during that time.

But when the new Minister, the MLA from Saskatoon didn't have the courage to admit that there had been a mistake made. No, he looked for a scapegoat and he blamed the employees of his

Department when he should have blamed the Premier and his Cabinet colleagues. If in July it was clear that they would have difficulties in getting sufficient projects under way, the obvious approach would have been to let more projects out to private consultants and to beef up their own design and planning staff. But they did neither. Projects that we had ready to proceed are still sitting on the shelf and their own staff is exactly the same at this time as it was last year. It is hard to believe under those circumstances that there were serious when they showed no great concern for speeding up the projects.

As I mentioned in the Throne Speech, the Winter Works Program would have been a fiasco if it wasn't for the planning and efforts of the Federal and local governments. Any work that has been created is due entirely to the sincerity of local government to provide work for their people and no credit can go to the Government opposite. The facts are such that it is clear that the NDP Government had no intention of spending the money that the Liberal Government had voted for public works.

That budget, Mr. Speaker, was deliberately under spent for two reason.

1. To try and embarrass the former Liberal Government when they got into the House this year.
2. They had another use for that \$6 million which they didn't spend. They wanted to hand it over on a nice silver platter to Parsons and Whittemore as a present and as a reward for not building a pulp mill.

That's the way our friends opposite create jobs in this province. They pay the industries to stay out and they pay the ones that we've got to leave. That's their idea of a New Deal for industry and a New Deal for People.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Guy:** — The effect of this NDP neglect and incompetence is that today 20,000 people in Saskatchewan are paying the price of having the Members sitting across the way. The outlook for the coming year is even worse. In all departments where there are construction programs which could provide employment the Budget has been cut drastically. Agriculture where our capitalist friend is the Minister has \$640,000 for administration of the Land Bank and \$10 million to take the land away from the farmer, but the Budget for capital projects which could provide employment for the farmers' sons after they have been forced off the land has been decreased by \$65,000.

**An Hon. Member:** — Oh, oh!

**Mr. Guy:** — Public Works has been renamed Government Services but it should have been named 'government chaos'. The one department, Mr. Speaker, in government with the responsibility and the opportunity to stabilize the construction industry and the professional groups associated with it as well as to provide summer employment for students and others and the one department which could help stop the spiralling rise of unemployment in this province, and its budget has been cut more than \$ million when it should have been increased. This is the one department

where an increase in staff in planning and design and project management branches would have been justified. But these are the only branches in that Department where there is no increase in personnel. It is evident the Government has no intention of carrying out its responsibilities to our unemployed. The architects and the engineers won't help them politically so they refuse to help them, hire them or provide funds so they can maintain their staffs.

Highways, grid and farm access roads are other areas where there should have been a major increase. A highway budget of \$45 million which is the same as last year means less work and I am glad the Minister woke up because I don't think when he brought that budget in he realized the costs had gone up, that labour has gone up and materials have gone up. So what it means is there will actually be less work than there was last year in the Department of Highways Grid and farm access roads budgets are cut by \$200,000 with the accompanying loss of jobs.

Then the Minister of Labour (Mr. Snyder) came out with all the fanfare that you can imagine, changed the name from STEP to PEP of his summer employment program. Well, I'll tell you there isn't much pep being shown in that Department by the Minister. The truth is that it is at exactly the same level as it was last year - \$1.5 million - so there will be fewer students employed this year than there were a year ago due to the increased costs, the new minimum wage and the 40-hour week.

I guess our Mineral Resources Minister (Mr. Thorson) isn't here but he may be forgiven because he is rather new to that Department. But here they have a fantastic new program that they revived from the good old 1960 days. That's the rebirth of the prospectors' assistance plan which was a failure prior to 1964. the Government has hired a defeated NDP candidate from July 16, 1971 at \$760 per month to devise this plan and will spend \$120,000 to put 16 prospectors in the field. By the time you pay the \$9,120 for the defeated NDP candidate and the \$30,000 that is budgeted for the program administrators to put 16 people to work. Well, I am happy at least 16 of my constituents will have a job, meagre as it may be, this summer. But the lack of prospecting, exploration and development by private companies as a result of NDP policies and harassment will mean that there will be several hundred fewer jobs in northern Saskatchewan for geology and engineering students as well as for the local residents many of whom are Indian and Métis ancestry.

Natural Resources, I am glad the Minister has come back from his little jaunt, in this Department there is an increase of \$573,000. This is far less than it should be if the Government was really sincere in wanting to solve the unemployment problem. Well, I'll tell you that the Minister of Natural Resources (Mr. Kramer) thought that it was tremendous. In fact, he thought it was so tremendous, the amount of money he was going to provide for regional parks, that it was worth giving it out one day before the Budget was presented in this House to the Legislature. He went down to the SARM and got up on the platform and said, "Well, folks I've got something for you this afternoon." He looked at his watch, told a couple of jokes I understand, looked at his watch again, then said, "I can tell you now there's going to be a \$30,000 increase in grants to regional parks and I am sure that the Premier has just finished announcing



it in the House.” Somebody sent him a note that said, “Mr. Kramer, the Budget is being delivered tomorrow.” That’s our wide awake Minister of Natural Resources. After I read the paper about what a fantastic sum it was, I did a little calculating. You know how it works out? This amazing sum that the Minister couldn’t wait until the Budget was delivered amounted to two per cent. Do you know how much each park is going to get? Do you know how much each regional park is going to get from this benevolent government opposite as a result of this increase? Would you believe \$410? Would you believe a measly \$410 to create jobs and to provide new facilities. It won’t even provide the paint to put on the benches that the Minister of Natural Resources sleeps on when he goes out there to visit.

**Some Hon. Members:** —Oh, oh!

**Mr. Guy:** — That’s the New Deal for regional parks!

Now we come to the University of Saskatchewan. The Premier tried to justify a decrease of \$3 million in the university capital budget by saying the enrolment is down but there is no justification for this action when unemployment is at its present level. Hundreds of jobs will be lost as a result of this massive reduction at a time when students need employment so they can attend university next years. If the NDP would provide jobs for all our students the enrolment would soon start going up again.

You know, Mr. Speaker, the total decrease in the four major employment creating departments of government is \$6.5 million. I suggest and Members on this side suggest that this is a completely irresponsible approach to the problem of unemployment and to the people who are looking to this Government to keep its promise to provide summer and full time employment. As though this isn’t bad enough, the Government in its New Deal for local governments has cut back on grants for construction of schools and hospitals, a decrease of \$4.4 million in school construction grants, \$.7 million in hospital construction grants, making \$5.1 million less for job creating projects by local governments. Add this to the \$6.5 million previously mentioned and you have a decrease of 11.6 million which makes it impossible for the people of Saskatchewan to believe the NDP are serious about providing employment. The unemployment figures today prove it.

We have seen the Government claim that the money included in the Municipal Affairs budget for Winter Works Programs will solve the unemployment problem. Of course, this is nonsense. Firstly, the money that is in the Budget for next year is to pay for the projects that have been under way this winter, thanks to the initiative and the efforts of the Federal and local governments. Any that is left won’t automatically be spent next winter and only if the local government can afford to participate. This is doubtful as local expenditures under this program invariably lead to an increase in mill rates to raise the necessary money. So when we put the whole unemployment package in its proper perspective we find a program completely inadequate, completely insufficient and completely unacceptable to the people of Saskatchewan.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Guy:** — I suggest it is significant that the Budget says:

We have urged the Federal Government to design programs for winter employment.

I tell you, Mr. Speaker, we hope the Federal Government will because it is obvious that the NDP opposite won't. In fact, we hope that they will devise a program for summer employment as well because it is obvious that our Provincial Government has neither the desire nor the capability to initiate or plan such a program for the people of Saskatchewan.

Instead the Premier and Provincial Treasurer has only one program and it is reserved for NDP supporters. A perusal of this Budget shows the Premier is trying to solve unemployment by putting all 20,000 of them in the Civil Service. One must admit, Mr. Speaker, that he has made a darn good try in this regard. Never in the history of the Province has a Budget been presented that provides for the addition of nearly 800 new permanent positions in the Government bureaucracy. I think it is significant to the future of our province to see where the majority of these positions are to be found. One would expect with unemployment at its highest peak in Saskatchewan, with industrial and resource development at a standstill, with taxes at an all time high, that the increase in staff would be in departments and agencies which would stimulate our economy, which would generate employment and produce revenue to the Province. But this is not the case. We find the greatest increase in both in the staff and expenditures in the departments which spend the taxpayers' money without generating revenues and in the departments that regulate and control every aspect of our social and economic life. Where the Liberal Government tried to promote initiatives and a minimum of control over the individuals in our society, the NDP Government in this Budget has emphasized policies and programs that will place a heavy hand on every shoulder and a watchful eye on every activity we undertake.

I think it is significant that the Department of Welfare has the largest increase in staff, 196 more staff to administer \$9.7 million more. Welfare appears to be the only answer the NDP Government will have for the problems of our unemployed. Health and Education Departments add 244 employees to administer an additional \$25 million of services and programs. The Department of Labour is even worse and I am not surprised that the Minister left at this stage. The Minister of Labour (Mr. Snyder) is going to hire 39 new people to spend an additional \$700,000. That means for every \$18,000 he is going to spend he is going to hire a man to spend it. It is obvious that this is another instalment in his pay-off to the Saskatchewan Federation of Labour. The Department of the Environment is worse again, as 22 new positions were created to spend an additional \$78,000 or \$3,550 for each man which won't even pay for the salaries and expenses. The pollution of NDP bureaucracy is growing worse every day.

We can go through the Estimates and the situation becomes almost unbelievable, it is so ridiculous. Mr. Speaker, would you believe that the Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Blakeney) is establishing 37 new positions to spend \$700,000 less money? What is the most frightening aspect of these new positions from an individual's point of view is that 30 of them are in

the Taxation Branch. This does not bode well for the future of our taxpayers as there'll be tax collectors on every door step breathing down their necks every second day and new taxes will be placed on our shoulders every time we turn around. But the Minister in Charge of Government Services (Mr. Brockelbank) he's the champ, he's the newest Minister and he's the champion. He is creating 33 new positions to spend \$3.6 million, less than he did last year. If you can figure this out, this is what it means; that for every \$110,000 he isn't spending, he's hiring a person not to spend it.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Guy:** — What is even more discouraging is that not one of these positions are in the branches which will provide work for our students and unemployed. The 29 new positions in the Executive Council have already been pointed out as being the most blatant example of new positions for political purposes that this province has ever seen. Mr. Speaker, when one adds up all the departments which have been created that have more than 10 new positions, we have 11 departments hiring 669 more staff to administer a mere \$36.8 million. And unfortunately, as I pointed out earlier, these 669 jobs are the only ones that are being created. As I have said, they have already got the tag put along side of them 'reserved for NDP supporters'. Then they say that this Budget is a New Deal for Saskatchewan. This is the most flagrant abuse of the Civil Service for political purposes and it's a disgrace that could bring the whole Public Service of our province into disrepute.

The Department of Industry and Commerce is a typical example of what could be a job-creating, development-oriented and revenue-producing department. At a time when these aspects are crying for attention, what do we find? We find that there is a cutback in Industry and Commerce of some \$100,000. We have heard of the great New Deal for business which turns out to be a branch of four people. The only consolation, Mr. Speaker, is that we think that these four people in the new small business branch will be Liberals because we know that the NDP will never find four businessmen among their flock to administer a business assistance branch. To go with the branch is a program to provide grants to business and industry. How much do you think the big spenders are going to spend assisting business: \$100,000! Do you know if we have 20,000 businesses in this province and I am sure we have got at least twice that many, they would get \$5 each. If we had 50,000 businesses and I am sure we have, that would be \$2 each. What a terrific program! I just hope that they will be careful and they don't go spending that \$2 where they don't need it. It is quite obvious our friends opposite have no concept of the needs, problems and requirements of the business economy of this province.

I should like to remind our business friends that while the NDP are begrudgingly providing \$2 a business or \$183,460 to their new branch, they are providing \$661,000 to the Co-op Department, an increase of \$190,000 over last year. The increase is more than the total budget for small business. You know the community haven't forgotten yet either, Mr. Speaker, what has happened prior to the sitting of this Legislature. They have not forgotten The Family Farm Protection Act, the increased minimum wage, the 40-hour week, the proposed estate tax, all of which when determined were introduced without consultation with

the business community. They know also that the failure of the Government in this Budget to provide sufficient grants to local governments will inevitably lead to higher property and business taxes which adversely affect their income.

We are pleased to see the increased funds made available for the promotion of tourism but I want to remind my friends opposite that tourism at its best is only a three or four month industry in this province and there have got to be jobs provided for these people for the rest of the year and there is nothing to show that there is in this budget.

Mr. Speaker, I should like to turn for a few minutes to some comments that were made by the Premier and the Minister in Charge of the Indian and Métis Department (Mr. Bowerman) regarding their approach to people of Indian ancestry. I was surprised that there has been a major reduction in programs and funds available for these people, however, I suppose we must take the assurance of the Minister-in-Charge of this vanishing Department that this reduction was at the request of the Indian people themselves. If there was one major concern of the last Premier W. Ross Thatcher it had to be his concern for the Indian and Métis people of this province and I don't think there is anybody on either side of the House who will deny this. For seven years he made every attempt to provide these people with the same opportunity and the same services that were available to the other citizens of this province. I am proud that I was able to be associated with him in these endeavours. Today we are told by members opposite that our approach was all wrong. I don't accept that accusation although I will be the first to admit that we certainly didn't have all the answers. We did make mistakes, unintentional as they might have been. I should remind the members of the House that we were the first Provincial Government in Canada to set up an agency for the co-ordination and introduction of special programs to assist our Indian people. We were prepared to do more than say that there was a problem, we were prepared to do something practical about it. One of our first steps was to establish a Task Force which involved the total community in the problems of our people of Indian ancestry. We believe then, Mr. Speaker, and we believe now that the problems are not going to be solved by the Indian people alone, the white man alone, by any Government, by churches, charitable organizations, service groups or anyone else working in isolation. To make any headway towards solving this serious problem all of these groups must work together and we must have a total community response if we are to create a just society for Indian people.

Now we have been accused by the NDP Government of not consulting enough with Indian people and of forcing programs upon them that they did not want. I'm the first to admit that we probably didn't consult as much as we could have or should have, although we did have regular meetings with Indian and Métis organizations, band representatives and individuals. It is also true that we perhaps moved too quickly and more quickly than our Indian people were prepared for and I make no apology for that. If we did move too fast it was because we had listened far too long to governments and others pay lip service to the need of helping our native people while doing absolutely nothing. Sometimes you have to over-react to get any action at all and I'm sure that no one will deny that the former Liberals Government did get some action. We did get the community involved and what was more important, we got Indian organizations and people

involved. Even if their involvement was only to say that what we were doing was wrong, it was a start towards thinking about what they really needed and doing something for themselves and for that reason alone it was worthwhile.

But the Task Force accomplished more than that. It got government departments, Crown corporations, industry, business, churches, service organizations and the Indian people working together to solve the problems of our native people for the first time in the history of this province. A new sense of awareness was created which resulted in suggestions for programs and policies to satisfy the needs which were established.

I want to take this opportunity to thank publicly all those who took the time and effort to make a contribution to the work of the Task Force and the Indian and Métis Department. Although the Indian and Métis Department will be disbanded and the Task Force will never meet again, I urge those who were involved to continue their efforts on behalf of our Indian and Métis people.

I cannot support for one minute the contention of the NDP that native people were forced by our Government to do anything that they did not wish to do. The Indian and Métis Department merely provided the framework and the policies to provide education and training programs, employment and job opportunities, housing, electricity, telephone, roads and other services and the opportunity to participate in and contribute to our province on an equal basis with anyone else if they wanted to. And I emphasize, if they wanted these programs they were available, if they didn't want them they didn't need to participate or accept them.

The programs included many that the Indian people has asked for, many that were obviously needed and many that appeared desirable to fulfil the objectives of making equal opportunities available to our native people. But none were forced on them and none affected their treaty rights and relationships with any other government. The many thousands of individuals who received jobs with our assistance, who entered and completed our educational and training programs, who received new houses and who saw their reserves and communities served with roads, electricity, telephone and other services, I am sure will say that the Indian and Métis Department helped them and that, in fact, that was all we were trying to do.

Another principle we believe in was that our programs and services should be available to every person of Indian ancestry in this province. We made it quite clear from the beginning that the Department was not run for the benefit of the Federation of Saskatchewan Indian, the Métis Society or any pressure or power group representing Indian or white interests. Everyone was welcome to sit down and discuss problems, suggest policy, programs and direction we should follow, but every decision made and every step taken had to be in the best interests of every person of Indian ancestry in this province. While I was Minister in Charge of the Department the only exceptions that might be pointed out and I make no apology for them, was that wherever possible I gave special consideration to our Indian people from northern Saskatchewan because of their unique economic situation.

Now we know that this approach did not sit well with the FSI or Métis Society who wanted to be the voice for all Saskatchewan native people and as a result we might even have lost some

of their support in the election campaign. However, as I have said, it was not my intention to compromise our position by bargaining with any individual organization and this was the policy that we tried to carry out.

When one reviews the Budget for last year and the present Budget, we find that there is \$2.8 million less for Indian and Métis programs. If the FSI and the Métis Society believe that it is worth \$2.8 million for them to have the Indian and Métis Department abolished that is their decision. They along with the Government opposite will have to explain to all the Indian people why the job opportunities and educational programs which they desire are not available this year.

One of the major reductions is the program of providing employment in the Government service which, since its beginning saw more than 1,000 young people of Indian ancestry receive training in the Public Service. This one-half million dollar reduction I'm sorry to see. Another major reduction of \$1.2 million is in the special training program. Now, it is true that money is provided for similar programs in the new Human Resources Department but there is no assurance that one native person will participate in this program.

We were the first to admit that the Indian and Métis Department needed some changes. All new departments must go through a period of trial and error until its objectives are achieved and we were prepared to make many of the changes that had been brought to our attention through discussions with the Indian people. We hope that abolishing this Department will not have a serious effect on the success that native people have made over the last few years.

We must in all sincerity suggest that it appear to us that the NDP Government are trying to get out of their responsibility towards our Indian people under the pretext of 'letting them do their own thing'.

I can only say in conclusion, Mr. Speaker, that when the Indian people get tired of the platitudes and the promises of the NDP to let them do their own thing, the Liberal Party will be here ready to do their thing with them. We have already shown that we are prepared to back up our promises with assistance, direction, leadership and cold cash to accomplish the objectives that our Indian friends set for themselves.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I had some other comments that I wished to make but I notice the time is going on so I think it is quite obvious from the comments I've made that I will not be supporting the motion but will be supporting the amendment.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. J.R. Kowalchuk** (Melville): — Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege to stand up once more in this Legislature to take part in the Budget Debate. A privilege that the people of the Melville constituency honoured me with in sending me once more to this Assembly with the greatest majority ever...

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Kowalchuk:** — ...to speak on their behalf. No amount of gerrymandering and no amount of 'good works' done in my constituency could change and all the remarks being brought to me to our side of the House at the last session saying, in effect, 'Kowalchuk, you're going to be defeated, we are going to see to it, that you get defeated', all that didn't help.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Kowalchuk:** — Mr. Speaker, it was the first time in the history of Melville constituency that a Member other than a Liberal has been sent for two consecutive terms of office to represent the voice of the people in this Assembly.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Kowalchuk:** — I am proud that they gave me that confidence, gave that confidence to a New Democrat, Mr. Speaker, and I am convinced that it will be another New Democrat, myself or some other one at the next election, but it certainly will be another New Democrat.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Kowalchuk:** — You know, Mr. Speaker, it's usual for a Member getting into a debate to comment on the remarks made by the previous speakers. I listened with care to many outlandish statements and many inaccurate statements made by Members to your left, Mr. Speaker. The Liberal Member for Moose Jaw North (Mr. MacDonald) made reference to the great number of defeated New Democratic candidates hired by this Government and, Mr. Speaker, we have to admit that a number of them excellent, well qualified candidates have been hired.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Kowalchuk:** — They are excellent men and they fill their positions ably.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Kowalchuk:** — But, Mr. Speaker, the New Democratic Party and this Government are pikers compared to the Liberals when it comes to dishing out goodies for defeated candidates.

**An Hon. Member:** — Who weren't any good.

**Mr. Kowalchuk:** — I wonder if the Member from Moose Jaw North was referring to the Hon. George Trapp, defeated Liberal Cabinet Minister in 1967 for whom a job was specifically created in the Saskatchewan Power Corporation?

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Kowalchuk:** — I wonder if he was referring to Walter Erb who was

March 15, 1972

virtually appointed to a 'senate seat' as Chairman of the Workmen's Compensation Board? I wonder, Mr. Speaker, if he was referring to Wilf. Gardiner, whom I had the pleasure of defeating in 1967...

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Kowalchuk:** — ...The second Cabinet Minister defeated at that time, Mr. Speaker, and believe it or not they made him a Deputy Minister of Co-operatives. Now, Mr. Speaker, talk about political patronage. One has to go a long way to bet the Liberal political handouts and political goodies.

As to the last speaker from the Opposition side to your left, Mr. Speaker, the Member for Athabasca (Mr. Guy), I really don't intend to reply to his vitriolic shouting. He toned it down at the end. I don't know if his shouting and fury accomplished anything, Mr. Speaker, except scare the baby up in the galleries.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Kowalchuk:** — All I wanted to say in regard to his comment that our Attorney General said last year that the people won't buy last year's Liberal bogus Budget and they didn't, Mr. Speaker.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Kowalchuk:** — They didn't and there are 45 Members on this side of the House to prove it. As to whether the people of Saskatchewan will buy this 1972 Budget, the people of Saskatchewan will be the judge of that, Mr. Speaker. The people of Saskatchewan will wait and judge the value of this Budget, not the Liberal Party, nor the Member for Athabasca.

**An Hon. Member:** — He won't be around.

**Mr. Kowalchuk:** — And may I add that I'm sure that come next election, Mr. Speaker, the Member for Athabasca won't be in this Assembly to witness any kind of budget presentation.

**An Hon. Member:** — He'll be long gone.

**Mr. Kowalchuk:** — I want to begin as is customary, to congratulate you, Sir, upon taking the sometimes arduous task of being Speaker of this House. I also want to add my congratulations, sentiments expressed by many before me, to all those who were elected and re-elected to this Legislature. I want also to add my congratulations to many who took on the big job of filling Cabinet positions. I also want to congratulate the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Steuart) for being elected to head the Liberal Party in Saskatchewan and I hope, Mr. Speaker, that he lives a long life leading the Liberal Party. It is the best thing that could happen for the New Democrats in Saskatchewan.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Kowalchuk:** — But mostly, Mr. Speaker, I want to congratulate the



Provincial Leader and Treasurer, Mr. Allan Blakeney, not only for the able and concise and clear delivery of his Budget address but for the far-reaching and positive contents of that Budget.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Kowalchuk:** — I shall have a little more to say about this a little later. But, Mr. Speaker, everybody has been congratulated and extolled and rightly so. These congratulations are certainly in order. However, Mr. Speaker, I want to reserve my greatest praise and offer the most warm and hearty congratulations to the people of Saskatchewan. Yes, Mr. Speaker, far too often in today's complex world the voter, the common man, the worker, the man far removed from the action of Government is taken simply as a necessary tool at election time. A sort of a convenient necessity every four years or so when the election rolls around but otherwise forgotten, neglected and listened to very little or not at all. Indeed, that is how the common voter has felt the last number of years, Mr. Speaker. The comments of the voting citizens are caustic in voicing dissatisfaction especially when there is serious parliamentary work to be done and when the democratic system degenerates into a circus performance as was evidenced in the week's Opposition Leader's ridiculous and time consuming shenanigans about radio time. Indeed, Mr. Speaker, it is a sad commentary on how low the purely political machinations are dragging down and destroying true, meaningful, democratic processes.

But, Mr. Speaker, every once in a while faith in mankind is restored and last June 23rd was an example. Mr. Speaker, the change wasn't instant and it wasn't chain lightning reaction, it was the strong, solid, dominating, persevering voice of the people pressing for one express purpose to replace that arrogant, Liberal Government with one that could be trusted and one that they could have faith in.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Kowalchuk:** — The people of Saskatchewan were not denied, Mr. Deputy Speaker. All the subterfuge and the smoke screen by the Liberals, if anything, served only as a catalyst in the people's minds to mould more firmly the already hard opinion that indeed something was very desperately wrong with the Liberal Government of Saskatchewan.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Kowalchuk:** — Mr. Speaker, the action of the people of Saskatchewan on June 23rd reaffirmed my faith in the process of the democratic system of government as I am sure it has done for many other people as well; and especially the young people, the young men and women who today are questioning everything including governments and rightly so, Mr. Speaker. The Opposition Members to your left will say as usual, we've heard it before — 'there you have it those socialists once again parading as saviours of mankind'. But that, Mr. Speaker, indeed is the last thought in my mind when I speak of the Liberal defeat on June 23rd.

It is true that the majority, the greatest majority ever, stood up on June 23rd and said, "Yes, far better democratic

March 15, 1972

socialism than the clawing hands of the materialistic exploiting, the greedy bottomless, so-called free enterprisers.”

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Kowalchuk:** — Far better for a political party that stands for people, for the old and the young and the sick and the poor. Far better to support the party that presents its program, good or bad, openly for public inspection. Far better this than what we have had for the last seven years. So said the people on June 23rd.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Kowalchuk:** — And yet, Mr. Speaker, not only for this am I proud of the people of Saskatchewan and their astounding and resounding No to the Liberal Party, to its harsh legislation, to its harsh and ill-conceived budgets, to that almost unbelievable arrogance and that total alienation from the worker and the common man, to the almost total subservience to that something mythical and mystical called free enterprise, to the blindness towards the wishes of people. All this alienation and cleavage in the space of seven, short years, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Kowalchuk:** — Mr. Speaker, that Opposition Party to your left lost every vestige of credibility in the eyes of the people of Saskatchewan in seven short years.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Kowalchuk:** — Mr. Speaker, it may well be that some other political party with the right kind of program, other than the New Democratic Party, may just have been accepted by the people of Saskatchewan on June 23rd, but the Liberal Party — never.

**An Hon. Member:** — That’s right.

**Mr. Kowalchuk:** — Mr. Speaker, I recall so clearly two years ago when the Hon. Woodrow Lloyd, then Leader of the Opposition, made a number of changes with the seating arrangement the great hue and cry of scorn and derision that emanated from the Liberal benches, none louder than that braying Member, the Hon. Member from Athabasca (Mr. Guy), saying that after the next election the socialists will be so few in number that they will all be sitting in the front seats. Do you remember that?

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Kowalchuk:** — Mr. Speaker, it was like an omen predicting the Liberals’ own future. I know that I said as did other Members of the Opposition at that time that this is exactly what would happen to them and it did. You know, Mr. Speaker, it was written on the faces of the people of Saskatchewan that that would happen. The Liberal Party under the late Ross Thatcher had broken the greatest bond of all — lack of respect for their own mankind.

The people's belief in the democratic right to change was firmly predictable last June 23rd. Mr. Speaker, even Liberals who sat in the House last winter knew, they knew that they had lost confidence in the eyes of the people. They knew long before June 23rd that there were going to lose in spite of the outrageous gerrymandering of boundaries, that the democratic right of people to change would be upheld. Yes, Mr. Speaker, it is the people of Saskatchewan who are to be congratulated most of all. As long as people exercise that right to say 'enough' and through democratic processes turn to other people and other parties, we can indeed say that democracy does work.

Mr. Speaker, the people knowing that democracy does work also said, "We want it to be democratic socialism. We have indicated by the kind of vote that has never been cast before that you democratic socialists who gave us The Farm Security Act, Hospitalization, Medicare, gave us compulsory car insurance (the cheapest and the best in the North American continent), who gave us the Saskatchewan Power Corporation to light up these darkened prairies, providing power for homes and industries, who gave us the Saskatchewan Transportation Company, the Timber Board, the SGIO and many other humanitarian services in the past, we give you a mandate to do even more for the people of Saskatchewan. We, the people, give you the opportunity of serving us by putting into practice that great slogan called a New Deal for People."

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Kowalchuk:** — This is a challenge, this is the challenge we New Democrats face, Mr. Speaker. This is what this new 1972 Budget is all about, the beginning of programs that we are committed to strive for in the next four years. And the task will not be easy. And it shouldn't be easy, Mr. Speaker. It is the difference between New Democrats and the old line parties. The New Democrats are willing to innovate, to try new ideas in an exciting, challenging world; the old line parties are bound by the manacles of the old, free enterprise tradition, all the while realizing that free enterprise is not free at all and in itself and by itself is unworkable in today's technological society.

You know, Mr. Speaker, I have sat and listened to that handful of Opposition Members attempting to analyse and offer criticism about the Budget. May I say, Sir, it was very obvious from the special session in August how hopelessly inept and out of touch with realities of life they really were. Here today, there is a difference. When I hear the few remaining Members of the previous 1971 Government Party criticizing things that they had the power to change and transform only a few months back, their words and deeds sound hollow and incredible indeed. The Hon. Member for Wilkie (Mr. McIsaac) bleeds about superannuation changes in The Teachers' Superannuation Act, yet when we begged him a few short months ago to lower the penalty clause to make early retirement for teachers easier without taking a substantial loss in income, he did nothing. All of a sudden you hear cries of 'supply hearing aids, free dental care, lower taxes, lower the power rates'. All of this was in the hands of the Liberals to do something about a few months ago but they did nothing. Now, completely reversing themselves, they come charging and shouting, "You do it now, you do it now." A most deceitful performance, Mr. Speaker. I assure you, Mr. Speaker, that the public will not be fooled. We have said it many times before, the public give all parties, all governments a chance. Changes

will be made. The Budget is a blueprint of the beginning of those changes, proof that this Government is on the march to honor its commitments.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Kowalchuk:** — You know, Mr. Speaker, I had expected the Opposition to be Her Majesty's Loyal Opposition, to present other aspects of the Budget, to offer alternatives, to expose the shortcomings of the Budget, but, Mr. Speaker, the most of what I have heard so far falls simply into the category of philosophical differences (and not too much of that) and hue and cry that we will all go broke, you are spending too much money. It sounds much like the same old argument used many years ago in regard to the Hospitalization, Medicare, Saskatchewan Power and other good CCF programs.

Mr. Speaker, the Opposition is so inept, so weak, that it is quite obvious that any constructive criticism is going to have to come from the Members of the Government side of the House. After having been in Opposition for four years, Mr. Speaker, I realize as I am sure all members do, the value of a good Opposition. There is need to expose all questions and problems to every angle of criticism. We are not going to get that kind of job done by those Members to your left, Mr. Speaker.

As indicated to the media by the Premier and our Provincial Treasurer, that is a sense this was not a traditional Budget draft, that this was an outline of the 1972 expenditures based on the priority basis, based on the needs of the people of Saskatchewan. Individual rights and human development is the keynote throughout the people's Budget. The whole Budget revolves around a healthy, strong, dynamic, agricultural industry. This government has pledged itself to the preservation of the family farm. If the Federal government had made similar commitments to that of our Provincial Government by joining forces together, the preservation of the family farm could well be assured. Instead, with the exception of the so-called two-price wheat system and a number of other policy changes to the improvement of the Wheat Board and its grain sales (and we gladly accept those improvements), the Federal Government has in its other agricultural policies contributed in reality to the extinction of the family farm.

Mr. Speaker, I could go and repeat once again, as has been done by Members on this side of the House, the many, many facts and figures given in this Budget to prove our case that this is a people's Budget. Figures that give proof that this Government is committed to the programs outlined and advanced in the party platform prior to the June election. This is what the people of Saskatchewan were waiting for, this is what they had voted for. Mr. Speaker, by and large the people of my constituency of Melville will be very pleased at the trend and the shape of this Budget. Melville constituency is mostly a rural constituency with the exception of one city, Melville. They will indeed be pleased to see the formation of the Land Bank. They will be pleased at the introduction of the Property Improvement Grant program where the homeowner, the small businessman and the farmer will get a grant to equal to 13 mills of assessment. They will be pleased to be given careful consideration in the Winter Works Program, in fact, they are expressing their pleasure right now. Loans and initiatives, especially where these were denied by the Federal government, are accepted totally and

approved by our Provincial Government. They will be pleased at the great educational grants, especially the increase in operating grants for schools, some \$12 million. They will be pleased at the possibility that their students in leaving the comprehensive schools will be able to avail themselves of enrolment in the technical schools where some 900 new places have been provided for. They will be pleased at the opportunity to work for a community college set-up. The people of Melville will certainly be pleased to see the depletion of the Grade Twelve examination fees, the removal of the nuisance tax on meals of \$2.50 and under. They will be pleased at the increase in their resource revenue yielding an additional \$6 million. They will be pleased at the creation of anew Department of the Environment with a stating budget of over \$2 million to ensure that our children will have a future in a cleaner environment. Yes, Mr. Speaker, the people of Melville constituency as will all the people of Saskatchewan I am sure, heartily endorse this budget.

Mr. Speaker, I don't want a Budget that caters to certain constituencies, that caters to certain groups of influential people that call themselves free enterprisers, yet consistently at the doors of SEDCO waiting for your money and mine. By this I don't mean that there isn't room for assistance to industry but it seems, Mr. Speaker, that the record has been of consistent hand-outs of people's money from the time of the Hudson Bay company and the building of the CPR lines. The assistance, I think, should have been bigger in this area. Industry incentive offered by this Budget is rather small. Our diminishing rural and urban communities need every assistance possible to make themselves viable if we are able to preserve the family farm, Mr. Speaker, and thus preserve the towns and the villages. If we can but accomplish that, we will have done Saskatchewan people the greatest service of all.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Kowalchuk:** — Our commitment is to see that justice is done to the many small community hospitals that are in trouble, mainly due to the lack of doctors and also due to new trends in health treatment. We must see to it that these buildings be used to accommodate people for other purposes like nursing homes. As I indicated before, if these buildings cannot be used as hospitals they should be used in other forms of caring for people.

I am happy to note that services such as telephones and gas will be put into many new areas of Saskatchewan that haven't had it before. I am particularly pleased that the four Indian Reserves north of Lorie in my constituency will be getting the telephone service, Mr. Speaker. I am pleased to see contributions to urban municipalities where streets and roads are being given top priority, Mr. Speaker. All of these are of the utmost importance in preserving and making viable our Saskatchewan as we know it. I am very appreciative that this Budget is permeated with just these kinds of considerations, Mr. Speaker. Yes, I should have liked to have seen greater recognition given to a number of other areas of difficulties. I hope that the Provincial Treasurer's projected improvement of Saskatchewan's economy will take place in the very near future. I am sure that when this happens further consideration will be given to hurry up the program of a New Deal for People.

Mr. Speaker,, the people of Saskatchewan are not disappointed I assure you. The Provincial Treasurer, our Premier has done an outstanding job on the budget that we are debating. Personally I didn't think that so much could be accomplished towards the programs that we are committed to in the New Deal for People as this Budget is doing. You will have gathered by now, Mr. Speaker, that I will be supporting the Budget and not the amendment. I am very hopeful, Mr. Speaker, that this House will give unanimous approval to this budget. I consider this a real possibility with the Leader of the Opposition not being here. I would even consider Mr. Leith, the leader of the Liberal 171 'Wiffel' group a vote because I am sure he would be voting for the Budget.

Mr. Speaker, I repeat, I will oppose the amendment and I will be voting for the motion.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Hon. N.E. Byers** (Minister of Highways and Transportation): — Mr. Speaker, I want to associate myself with the congratulations offered to you on your election to speaker. I know that the high respect that you hold for the British Parliamentary system coupled with your firmness and your sincerity and impartiality will certainly foster fair and productive debate under your guidance.

I also want to extend my congratulations to the new Members elected in the by-election last December. My associations with Mr. Thorson, the Hon. Member from Souris-Estevan, go back many years. Now my colleague and desk mate in this Legislature, he is a man for whom I have great respect and confidence in his ability. This view was evidently shared widely by the constituents of Souris-Estevan who elected him to this Legislature with such an impressive majority.

I am sorry the Hon. Member for Morse (Mr. Wiebe) is not in his seat tonight. I want to extend my sincere congratulations to the new elected Member from Morse and invite him to take part fully in the debates and discussions of this Legislature. Although he may sit as an Opposition Member it is my hope that he will feel free to bring the problems of his constituents before Ministers in order that he may justify the trust which the people of Morse have placed in him.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Byers:** — I want to congratulate all Members who have participated in the Debate earlier. What we are really debating at this time, Mr. Speaker, is phase 2 of the New Deal for People. Last summer the Legislature undertook to restore to the people of Saskatchewan a number of the services and securities that were eroded and wiped away. I refer to this first 100 days or the period of the early days of the New Democratic Party Government as the restoration when the services and securities that once characterized Saskatchewan have been restored almost to full bloom. We are not on phase 2 of the New Deal for People program, Mr. Speaker, because about one year ago the New Democratic Party unveiled to the people of Saskatchewan our Party's platform which was called the New Deal for People. We sought and obtained a majority, a mandate from the people of Saskatchewan to launch that New Deal program in our first term of office. That program

was released well in advance of the Provincial election so that the Saskatchewan people had ample time to read it and to criticize it and to discuss it with their neighbours. Yet, Mr. Speaker, in spite of all the harsh warning from the Liberal Party that such programs were unrealistic, the facts are, Mr. Speaker, that in the election held last June, thousands of people in this province cast aside their traditional political loyalties to the Saskatchewan Liberal Party. Many of them voted New Democrat for the first time. Let me say to the people of Saskatchewan, particularly those who supported the New Democrats for the first time, that by their actions in the Legislature this Session, the Liberal Party in this Legislature is not about to forget nor are they about to forgive those good people of Saskatchewan who endorsed the New Deal program at the polls. We, who make up the New Democratic Government of this province are determined that we will use every ounce of energy at our command to justify that trust that was placed in us.

Why was this New Deal program so widely accepted? Now, this program was not conceived, Mr. Speaker, in the smoke-filled room of an Eastern advertising agency. I didn't contain the label 'made in Toronto for prairie export'. Instead, Mr. Speaker, the formulation of the New Deal program is an example of participatory democracy.

You know, sometimes Liberals talk as if they invented participatory democracy. Fortunately, Mr. Speaker, the numbers who cling to that myth are few and the numbers who participate in the formulation of Liberal policy are even fewer. What has attracted the imagination and the attention of Saskatchewan people is the fact that the New Democratic Party is the only Party in Canada where the ordinary individual can put in his two-bits worth of idea, ideas large or small, ideas significant or insignificant and be accommodated and appreciated.

The New Deal program was not formulated by an Eastern advertising agency. The formulation of the New Deal program involved thousands of hours of debate and discussion and dialogue by thousands of Saskatchewan people. It is truly a people's program because it represents the hope and the needs and the desires of our present day society. In using this process it can be truly said that the New Democratic Party is the only Party in this province and in this country that is tuned to the times.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to be a Member of this Legislature and to be part of a political structure that encourages and allows the ordinary citizen the opportunity to chart the course of his society and his province. And whatever tactics Liberals may use to discredit the New Deal program, they may wring their hands in fear that the New Deal program will not be implemented. The facts are, Mr. Speaker, that the greatest fears that Liberals harbour is not that the New Deal program will become a reality, rather it will be implemented and they will continue to be rejected by the voters of Saskatchewan.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Byers:** — Mr. Speaker, reference has been made in the course of this debate to the efforts of this Government to increase employment opportunities through public works' spending. Let there be no mistake that we in the New Democratic Party believe

that governments at all levels require continuous programs of public spending in an effort to provide jobs. That view may not be widely shared by members opposite but one has only to examine the Public Works' budget presented to this House last year. That was a budget padded with \$17 million worth of projects. But most of these projects would never become reality. In most cases there were two catches – the projects had not been allocated funds from the treasury and there were no blueprints ready. Without funds, without blueprints action is impossible. These projects were merely slipped into the Budget to make Liberals look good in an election year if that is possible. This kind of performance in public spending is not good enough for New Democrats.

Your new Government, Mr. Speaker, began early in July to launch a massive public works' program with a view to creating jobs because we were concerned about the unemployment problem. One of the first steps taken by your new Government was to establish an inter-departmental committee headed by the Minister of Public Works. Every Government department and Crown corporation was asked to search every corner and cranny for projects for which blueprints were ready and which could be given the go ahead. Projects that were on the books for 1972-73 that could be advanced a year or two were started.

As Minister in Charge of Saskatchewan Telecommunications I want to say that programs in that Crown corporation involving taking additional service to the unserved areas, buried cable projects were accelerated, projects to the amount of over \$700,000 in 1971 were launched. That is in one Crown corporation alone.

I want to say something about the public works' program underway this winter. The fact that local governments responded almost instantly to the hastily conceived Federal Winter Works program should indicate at least two things. First, that there is in this province a great backlog of public works' projects to be undertaken, whether it is in building new rinks or fire halls or civic centres or whatever, there is a lot of necessary work to be done. I don't think that we ought to discount for one moment the willingness of local governments to participate in more rational schemes. Actions by the Provincial Government on this to contribute up to \$6 million in the Provincial employment and other loans programs have been graciously received by the local governments.

I want to quote, Mr. Speaker, from a brief article in the Wadena News of March 2nd where a correspondent comments and I quote,

A Provincial employment loans program for 1971 has made possible a number of district projects which would have taken long months or even years to obtain under municipal finance. These projects designed to alleviate winter unemployment must be completed by May 31, 1972 to be eligible for the employment loan.

And the writer goes on,

It means that almost any man able to handle a hammer will be assured of a job in this part of the province judging by the recent approved projects.



And it goes on to list the projects and I will table this article in a minute.

Another story in the same article says,

The community of Margo promised to be. . .

And this is a village of 200. It happens to be in my constituency.

The community of Margo promises to be a buzzing centre for the next three months with a program of construction which has been unequalled in its past history. Government grants under three programs have made this much needed construction possible. Had the village been forced to wait until the work could have been done under municipal financing it might have been months or years until the necessary funds were available.

The best features of these grants and forgiveness programs is that the money advanced by the Government doesn't have to be paid back. The village must raise only a small portion of the cost.

Mr. Speaker, I gladly table the quotes from the two articles that I have just read.

I want now to turn to a few programs within the Department of Highways. I know there are many Members wishing to speak in the debate tonight and I am going to defer to them and I will make further announcements on the operation of the Department of Highways and other programs during the consideration of Estimates at a later time.

I want to say a word about a change that is being made — you might call this a part of the New Deal for the truckers or for a New Deal for all segments of our society. I refer to a reduction in the spring ban period. We know that to protect the public's investment in our provincial highway system it is essential to impose the spring ban on specified highways. Traditionally the length of the spring ban has averaged about 65 days. Due to the decline or the disappearance of rail service in recent years, all segments of the provincial economy rely to a greater extent on the provincial highway system.

The Department of Highways has recently completed an intensive study in which the effects of the spring ban period were reassessed. Effective in the spring of 1972 the period in which the spring ban period applies will be reduced from an average of 65 days to a maximum of 45 days on a district basis. It is our belief that this shorter ban period will benefit fuel dealers, machine dealers, raw milk producers, dairy farmers as well as the movement of seed grain and livestock. The maximum 45 day ban period, however, will not be fixed across the province. It will come into effect on the date our field staff feel that it is necessary to impose the ban on individual sections of highway.

Mr. Speaker, we are aware that a shorter ban period will increase maintenance costs for the Department of Highways, however there will be an improved social and economic benefit to the motoring public .

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Byers:** — I want to comment briefly on another area of work undertaken by the Department. Mr. Speaker, rural Members will be aware that the Department of Highways performs the legal survey work for authorized grid and main farm access roads. But over the past seven years in virtually every rural municipality odds and ends of unfinished legal survey work have accumulated. While two, three and four mile sections waited for the survey crew to arrive, anxious councillors and impatient farmers awaited the arrival of construction grants. As a conservative estimate my Department officials estimated last fall that a backlog 1,250 miles of survey work had accumulated due to the budget restraints of the former Government.

Mr. Speaker, a policy that restricts the provision of an adequate road system to serve our rural population will not be tolerated by a New Democratic Party Government. Now, it is impossible to eliminate the backlog in one year. However, my Department has acted quickly to accelerate survey work to remove this backlog neglected for so long. Under the Winter Works Program, funds were approved to survey about 400 miles of the backlog this winter and 4,300 man days of work are being provided under that program. It is expected that this program will provide work for at least 40 men until spring.

The Budget now before the House requests an increase of \$125,000 for the Survey Branch. This increase will enable our Department to undertake an additional 400 to 500 miles of survey work above the normal requirements of some 1,600 miles which is the required level. This is a manageable amount and if we could do a further acceleration of 400 miles in another year my Department would be able by then to eliminate the backlog that has piled up after eight years of neglect.

I want to turn to the highway program proposed for the coming year. I want to draw Members' attention to some of the characteristics of this year's highway program which I will announce and table shortly. Our Government, Mr. Speaker, recognizes the importance of the good transportation system to serve all segments of our society. To develop a transportation program for this year and future years, demands that the road needs of our population be assessed accurately.

Before I place the specific details of this year's program before you, I want to indicate some of the transportation objectives this year's program sets out to accomplish. It is no secret in this province that the major emphasis on road construction by the former Government was in northern road development and four-lane constructions. This government does not quarrel with spending highways dollars in these areas. In Opposition and in Government we believe that necessary road construction in other parts of the province should not be sacrificed or delayed at the expense of northern road development and four-lane projects. I will have more to say about those two matters later.

This year's capital program, Mr. Speaker, provides considerable emphasis to the development of main traffic routes such as the Yellowhead Route. Our Government regards the development of the Yellowhead Route as a high priority item. In addition to serving local, inter-city and regional traffic, this inter-provincial route will provide an alternate loop to the Trans-Canada Highway. Running through the scenic parklands that

contain a variety of recreational facilities and provincial parks within a short distance of the Yellowhead Route, this new route when completed in 1973 or 1974 is expected to attract additional tourist traffic to all areas along this route from Manitoba, Yorkton, Saskatoon and Lloydminster.

With respect to four-laning, Mr. Speaker, it is our intention to continue four-laning but at a decidedly reduced rate. It is our intention in the coming year to undertake paving of sections of No. 1 Highway that are presently constructed. On the other hand, this year's highway program proposes to shift Highways spending substantially to service our local rural areas and our agricultural industry. A good example is the emphasis that will be placed on rebuilding dilapidated highways such as No. 5 between Canora and Wadena. Mr. Speaker, I was reading the records the other day of the Minister of Highways in 1964. In the Budget of 1964 the Minister of highways announced construction in 1965 of No. 5 Highway from Watson to Wadena, a distance of 30 miles. And the construction of that 30 miles has been going on for the last seven years. Tenders have been awarded recently to pave over 20 miles of this road in 1973. In seven years the Liberal Government proved to be incapable of grading and paving a continuous 30-mile section of highway. And we say that this approach to highway building must stop. We must strive for an objective where when a section of road is undertaken that construction ought to be continuous so as not to inconvenience the local people and the motorist.

With respect to northern roads, the construction of northern roads will be part of our program. You may recall, Mr. Speaker, that at the session last July I announced that a New Democratic Government had awarded a contract to complete the construction of the road into Sandy Bay. Work has been proceeding well on this project and it is expected that construction of the road to Sandy Bay will be completed in 1972 to end the isolation of that community. At Frobisher Lake we plan to construct a commercial fish haul road from Turner Lake village to Frobisher Lake to give direct aid to the people of the Turner Lake village.

I want to draw Members' attention to an increase in the maintenance budget in the Estimates before you. To preserve the large investment that Saskatchewan people have in their highway system, our Government believes it is essential that adequate funds are provided for maintenance work. We can ill afford to follow maintenance practices that allow a highway system to deteriorate rapidly into a dilapidated condition. I mentioned a good example of the kind of neglect was certainly Highway No. 5 between Canora and Wadena under the former Government. It will be our objective to maintain our highways in a state of good repair so as to provide the motorist with a safe, convenient and economical transportation system. I wish to draw to the attention of all Members that over the past four years the maintenance allotment per mile by mile class of highway system has not been adjusted for cost increases. Our Government has recognized and acted on the obvious need to add funds to the maintenance budget. There are several reasons. Wages and sustenance allowances to employees have increased, a 10 per cent increase in capital and equipment rental has occurred. Due to the closing of two refineries the cost of asphalt has increased about 12 per cent and freight rates on asphalt have risen about \$35,000 a year annually.

With a continuing oiling program the number of employees required for maintenance work will expand. The labour requirement to maintain oil treated highways is substantially higher than for gravelled highways. In the Yorkton district field maintenance activity has been under-managed. Some highway maintenance foremen have been required to supervise as high as 589 miles whereas the desired mileage is from 400 to 430 miles. This Budget provides for one additional foreman to serve the Yorkton highway district. Because our Government believes that adequate funds be voted for maintenance work, the Budget now before the House requests an increase in the maintenance budget from \$13 million to \$14.5 million or an increase of \$1.5 million.

Mr. Speaker, it gives me a great deal of pleasure to announce the details of an extensive highway program for 1972-73. The allocation for maintenance and construction of highways will exceed \$67 million, the allocation for capital spending is \$45 million.

The grading program will include 146 miles of carryover from last year added to 418 miles of new work to be commenced in 1972-73 for a total of 564 miles of grading.

The paving program includes 36 miles of carryover from last year and 333 miles of new paving work to be commenced this year for a total of 369 miles.

Oiling and oil treatment will be applied to 263 miles. In addition, 60 miles will be undertaken under the capital re-oil program — that figure does not include miles that will be re-oiled under special maintenance.

AMOS treatment will be applied to 50 miles. It is planned to lay 325 miles of base course. Plans are to gravel 220 miles of main sub-grade plus 305 under special maintenance for a total of 525 miles of gravel. This figure does not include any mileage of traffic gravel behind construction.

I draw to members' attention that we shall be spending a considerable amount in the coming year on bituminous structural improvements. To protect our large investment in both our paved and oil surfaced highways it is essential that adequate steps be taken to resurface these highways at regular intervals. It is proposed that bituminous resurfacing will be carried out on 103 miles of highway. Seal coats will be applied to 48 miles of pavement and to 902 miles of oil treated highways. Funds provided in this year's budget for resurfacing bituminous surfaces and applying seal coats are greater than provided last year.

Under miscellaneous construction projects, I draw Members' attention to the fact that the capital budget provides over \$442,000 for several miscellaneous construction projects. Proposals to level land slide areas and apply clay cap to sub-grade or build minor erosion control devices are not designed to excite Members of this House.

I draw to members' attention that the largest expenditure under special construction will be an expenditure of \$35,000 to stabilize 800 feet of runway at the La Ronge Airport. That's a project that has been neglected. Improvements there are long overdue. The Department of Highways is the licensee for the

La Ronge Airport. Under the former Government there were studies and there were plans and there were schemes to improve this essential northern airstrip. Apart from the application of oil to the runways in 1967, there were no concrete steps in seven years to make substantial and adequate improvement to this airstrip. It is a major point for northern air transportation. The safety of the airstrip was questionable. I personally inspected this airstrip in mid October 1971. Citizens were complaining about the actual safety of this airstrip. The runways had deteriorated seriously, even the trees nearby had been allowed to become a safety hazard. The shorter strip No. 1 was often being used illegally since strip No. 2 was in such bad condition. Drainage around the No. 2 strip was so poor that at some points the water table was within one and half feet of the surface. Mr. Speaker, this situation was not acceptable. Last fall our Department arranged for the installation of runway lights supplied by the Department of Transport. Under the Winter Works Program the bush along the runway is being cleared. Improvements proposed to stabilize the runway of this airport are long overdue. There has been more work done on this airport and there will be more work done on this airstrip by the New Democrats in one year than was done under the Liberals in seven.

Cost for the acquisition of property, severance payments, property damage and other factors related to new construction in this Budget are estimated at \$1.5 million. Bridge construction at \$1.9 million.

To improve the facilities with our provincial parks our Trans-Canada campsites and other tourist spots in the coming year, the Department of Highways proposes to spend \$325,000 on such improvements as access roads, dust-free internal roads and parking lots.

We have recently compiled a list of specific locations on Saskatchewan highways which tend to be accident prone. The study identifies the locations where three or more accidents have occurred in any one year since 1965. Wherever possible analysed to determine whether the accident rate resulted from some fault or flaw in highway design. The Department of Highways has budgeted for an expenditure of approximately \$301,000 for individual improvement projects at these accident prone locations. These projects in many cases will be simple and straightforward improvements, better signing, installation of lighting, erection of guardrails on curves and bridges, constructing traffic islands, removing hazardous approaches and relocating sharp curves and so on.

One final item, Mr. Speaker, I want to say a word or two about amortization of the cost of four-land public highways constructed in 1967 and 1968. There is an item for \$650,000 the highway budget that will not be available for visible road improvements in 1972. This expenditure of \$650,000 is the Liberal legacy of debt which we inherited last June 23, 1971.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Byers:** — All Members will recall the wild claims by the Opposition Members that they were the balanced budget boys who operated on a pay as you go basis. In the Department of Highways that claim was simply not true. All members will recall that in 1967-68

the former Government launched an accelerated four-lane program at an estimated cost of \$6.5 million. Apart from their failure to allow adequate time for pre-planning and pre-engineering they launched this program before the long-term investment needs were evaluated without adequate funds on hand to finance these projects. Stated very briefly, Mr. Speaker, the former Liberal Government financed their grandiose four lane schemes by borrowing \$6.5 million that is to be repaid as a charge against the Department of Highways budget at the rate of \$650,000 each year for a 10-year period. This is the Liberal legacy of debt inherited by the people of Saskatchewan and by this Government on June 23rd. Our Government, Mr. Speaker, will be well into its next term of office before this debt is eliminated.

Mr. Speaker, I have here today the details of the very large highway improvement program that we anticipate for the people of Saskatchewan. I will, with the consent of the members, not read it all out. I want to assure you that there is a characteristic in the program that I hope is more characteristic than that of previous years in that this highway program provides a new deal for the Opposition, in that there will be some sizeable and good works undertaken in at least a number of the Opposition ridings.

**Mr. Kramer:** — There can't be any more done in Rosthern.

**Mr. Byers:** — Oh, I am surprised, Mr. Speaker, there is still some work to be done in Rosthern and New Democrats are glad to do it.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order, order!

**Mr. Byers:** — Mr. Speaker, I have attempted to give the House a brief view of some of the intentions of the Department of Highways. Because the Department of Highways will be doing its share to bring a New Deal and a better deal to the people of Saskatchewan and it is typical of the kind of program that is being undertaken by all departments of Government, I will be supporting the motion and voting against the amendment.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Weatherald:** — On a Point of Order, Mr. Speaker, Does the Minister have a copy of the program? Usually it is distributed to the Members.

**Mr. Byers:** — Yes, I didn't want to take the time of the House to read it out.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Hon. W.E. Smishek** (Minister of Public Health): — Mr. Speaker, I see the Hon. Member from Cannington being very anxious to find out how many hundreds of miles of roads we'll be building in his constituency.

Mr. Speaker, the New Democratic Party Government was elected to office to provide positive leadership. Leadership to overcome the consequences of seven years of Liberal mismanagement, leadership to get Saskatchewan back on the road to progress, leadership to prove to the people of Saskatchewan that public programs and government can be well organized, responsive and effective. The Budget presented a week ago by the Hon. Premier is positive proof of the leadership we are providing of effective government organization, responsive to the needs of the people, ensuring the people that they will get their best value for their tax dollars.

Mr. Speaker, during the last election the Liberal Party and their defeated colleagues resorted to fear tactics to undermine the public confidence in the New Democratic Party. In their panic the Liberals ran around the Province and to the Press talking about all the Public Service dismissals that would take place and other terrible acts that would follow with the election of an NDP Government. Mr. Speaker, this nonsense has got to be the biggest joke of this Session. Just think about it. There are the Liberals talking about the mass dismissals that would follow the election of the NDP Government when it was those very same Liberals who proudly announced to the public that their Government had fired between 100 and 150 public servants in the first six months of their office. It was the same Liberal Government which publicly scorned the public servants. It was the same Liberal Government that drove out hundreds of most able public servants from the Province of Saskatchewan in 1964. Mr. Speaker, it was the same Government which held down the wages of public servants, the same Government which introduced arbitrary and meaningless restrictions on the awarding of merit salary increases to civil servants. The Liberal Government's relationship with the workers of Saskatchewan was so bad that Saskatchewan faced one strike after another during their seven years of office. Mr. Speaker, I am surprised that the former Government Members with such poor performance would dare to raise the issue of public confidence.

Mr. Speaker, let us look at the NDP record in the last eight months. Obviously since the former Liberal Government had padded the public payroll with their friends, some dismissals were necessary with the change in government. Early in this Session the Premier tabled in the House a complete list of all public servants who were dismissed by the Government. This list totalled only 31 employees. Most of these employees had the right of appeal on their dismissal. I must point out, Mr. Speaker, that in no case was the right of appeal exercised by the dismissed employee. I suggest to this House that the Members draw their own conclusions why the employees did not appeal their dismissals. No one in the Government service has been dealt with unjustly. Where some of our program changes made certain jobs redundant, we made every effort to find alternative employment in other Government departments and agencies for the incumbent employees. We are proud of the way we have been able to deal with our public employees, Mr. Speaker.

You know that the Saskatchewan Government Employees' Association represents about 5,500 employees in government

departments and agencies and another 2,000 in the labor service. This is a total of about 7,500 employees. We have negotiated new contracts with this union and these negotiations were conducted in an atmosphere of trust and confidence. The new agreements called for an increase in salaries of eight per cent in the first year and seven per cent in the second year of the two-year collective bargaining agreement. The salary increased to the public employees are higher than given by any Liberal administration. Salary settlements will narrow the gap between the wage rates paid by the Saskatchewan Government and other Governments in Canada and particularly our two neighbouring provinces to the east and the west of us. Our public servants also were awarded improved annual vacation benefits and other important changes in the general terms of their collective bargaining agreements. We have negotiated equally fair and reasonable contracts with the Canadian Union of Public Employees and unions of several of the Crown corporations. The number of additional employees affected by these substantial improvement benefits are in the order of 6,700. Mr. Speaker, we have been equally successful in our bargaining with other unions. At the time I took office as Minister of Public Health the former Government left with us 19 unsettled hospital contracts. I should like you to note that within six months of taking office, all contracts were settled peacefully and there were no strikes and no strike votes taken.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Smishek:** — If the Liberals had bargained in good faith they too might have been able to have a success record but the fact is that the Liberals despised collective bargaining and resorted to smear tactics of employee unions. Mr. Speaker, when we were elected we promised to raise the minimum wage \$1.75 per hour and by appropriate steps increase this to \$2 an hour. This was a four-year commitment by the New Democratic Party. Our Government set an example by raising the minimum wage for the public employees and the hospital employees to \$2 per hour effective October 1, 1972. In respect of labour and public service the NDP record is one of positive action.

Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Member for Athabasca (Mr. Guy) during his participation in this debate, made reference that what the Budget proposes is to build a larger bureaucracy. He suggested that the new Budget proposes the creation of some 800 new jobs. I would in particular like the Hon. Member from Albert Park (Mr. MacLeod) to pay attention to this because he made some of the same kind of references and since he is the Budget critic I would suggest to him that he do a little more work on studying the Estimates and familiarizing himself with really what the Budget and the Estimates are all about.

Mr. Speaker, you may recall that when the Liberal Government took office in 1964 they said that what they would do is reduce the bureaucracy. They said that they would trim all the fat that there was around the Government. They said they would cut unnecessary expenditure and streamline the Government. Well, Mr. Speaker, how well did they do? How did they trim the fat? I have with me, Mr. Speaker, a list by all departments and the number of employees that were employed in these departments on June 30, 1964. Those that were permanent employees by Order-in-Council. The list here shows 7,086 employees on June 30, 1964



and on June 30, 1971, the same group, there were 7,591. Now, in the case of temporary employees – remember these are employees who are also working full time but are listed as temporaries – June 30, 1964, 698, June 30, 1971, 1,145, an increase of 65 per cent in temporary jobs, Mr. Speaker. In total the increase in the case of the Public Service and as I said excluding the labour service of 952 or a percentage increase of 12 per cent. Now, Mr. Speaker, when the Liberals talk about employees and that the employees have been living in fear and insecurity when we took office, may I suggest to them that there was no group that lived in more fear and less security than those, 1,145 temporary employees. May I also advise the Budget critic that it is true that the number of employees are going to increase but what we are doing is reducing the list of 1,145 temporary employees and including them in the regular service. It is this group that has not been listed in the Estimates in the past, the temporary employees will not be listed. It is time that these employees got some security. Some of them have been on temporary employment under the Liberal administration for a period of seven year, if you please. Seven years on temporary employment. The majority of that 1,145 group have worked for two, three, four, five and up to seven year, Mr. Speaker. We propose to absorb many of these employees into the permanent Public Service. True, there will be more employees shown in the Estimates but the fact is that the employment will not increase. It is about time these employees got some security. The cost to the Government will not increase since the wages are not affected except that they will come under the scope of the superannuation plan.

Now, Mr. Speaker, this is what we propose to do and I would suggest that the Hon. Member for Albert Park (Mr. MacLeod) also advise his colleague from Athabasca (Mr. Guy) of where the increase is.

Mr. Speaker, I would also like to refer to the Liberal accusation that the NDP Government is too concerned with planning. During the election campaign the Liberals tried to suggest that there was something wrong with a government that plans. Since taking office I have become fully aware of just how much the Liberals did not believe in planning. They did not have any plans except they had some form of a plan worked out with McLaren Agencies of how they might get re-elected but even this plan did not work as we all know.

Because of the former Government not believing and not bothering with planning, they created chaos with many of our public services. One example of the disorganized state of the liberal Government's capital public building program was urgently brought to my attention with a matter of a few days of taking office. The Liberals had begun to build the South Saskatchewan Hospital Centre at a cost of \$16 million. In order to stimulate the economy just prior to the election, they proposed to start construction and began digging a basement for the Regina Technical Institute located right behind the South Saskatchewan Hospital. Their plan called for a technical institute to cost in the order of eight and a half million dollars. In typical Liberal form they had merely set these two huge buildings down in the middle of a field. They had not asked the Wascana Centre Authority or the Public Works Department for any co-ordinated plans for services in the area. Oh yes, there was another public works scheme. They immediately started, because of an election, started building the over-pass on the way to

to the hospital crossing No. 1 Highway. Once it crossed the highway it came to a dead end because the Liberals had not acquired enough property to provide a road to allow people to get to the hospital and the technical institute. Can you imagine, Mr. Speaker, the Liberal Government had committed itself to spend nearly \$25 million on buildings. Thousands of people would have to have access to these buildings on a daily basis and the Liberals had not even provided a road to get the people to these facilities.

Mr. Speaker, the NDP Government immediately took action to acquire additional property for road construction so that these two huge facilities could be used by the people. In buying sufficient land for the road we looked at the future and decided to extend the boundaries of the Wascana Centre for future public needs. We are planning now for tomorrow and for the future and for our children and the future of their children that will follow.

Mr. Speaker, planning is our Government's view of using one's brains. The NDP Government intends to plan. A Liberal Government didn't believe in planning. Let the people decide which is the right course of action.

Mr. Speaker, I should like to turn your attention now to the resource allocation for health services. We are recognize that resources for health are scarce. The challenge for the NDP leadership is to utilize these scarce resources to obtain greater benefits for all people. I believe that domination of expenditures for hospital and physician services has encouraged people to think that Saskatchewan has a health service because it pays a lot of money to overcome sickness. As I have said many times before, we do not have a health service in Saskatchewan, nor in any other province in the Dominion of Canada, we have a sickness service. To illustrate this point, you can get an idea of the imbalance in resource allocation by looking at the number of employees working in sickness services as opposed to preventive health service. There were 13,480 hospital workers in treatment programs in Saskatchewan in 1971 excluding those in private practice and non-governmental organizations, but there were only 460 employees employed in the public preventive program. As you can see, only 3.4 per cent of our health workers are directly involved in preventive health programs, that type of a program which I call a health service. In dollar terms, in 1970-71 only 2.8 per cent of the total Provincial expenditures for health services was assigned to preventive health service.

Mr. Speaker, it is the policy of our government to develop programs which will assist all the people to remain healthy so that they do not require the expensive treatment service, but when people do become sick we shall assist them to overcome their health difficulties without discrimination or penalty.

I'm aware, Mr. Speaker, that the development of programs to help people remain healthy requires a great deal of effort. It requires substantial change in our health delivery system. Because it will take time to create a health service in Saskatchewan and obtain the benefits of a healthy society, we, as a Government, must take action in the meantime to provide treatment services as efficiently as possible.

We do not want to waste our resources in unnecessary services or duplicated programs. We will attempt, wherever

possible, to rechannel the cost savings from our treatment services into programs for health services. We shall be looking for real cost savings through operating efficiently. We have already demonstrated that the NDP Government will not tolerate the Liberal health financing tactics of taxing the sick, limiting the number of hospital and physician services to the people.

I have already informed the House of the substantial list of taxes that our Government has already removed from the sick, the total is in excess of \$11 million. The cost of providing health and hospital and physicians' services in Saskatchewan are alarming. Let me illustrate, Mr. Speaker. We expect to spend \$178.5 million for health services in 1972. This is \$192 for every man, woman and child in this province. When we examined these expenditures we realized that the most costly program is our hospital services. For the first time the hospital program will cost over \$100 million. Hospital services have been increasing at a rate of 10 per cent per year not counting extraordinary program changes. I think the people of Saskatchewan should know, Mr. Speaker, that I was recently provided with an estimate of costs of providing hospital services in Saskatchewan for 1981. I was told that it would cost close to \$215 million to provide hospital services within the nine-year period. I was cautioned that the cost estimate might be low. Believe me Mr. Speaker, that this kind of information has caused me to start doing some serious thinking and looking at what can be done about having some controls on the costs or at least shift the program in a way that our costs will not escalate that rapidly.

Mr. Speaker, I want to draw your attention to what has been happening and where the costs have been rising. I looked at the period from 1960 to 1970 and looked at what has happened. The number of hospital beds has increased by about 600. This is an increase of slightly more than nine per cent in a 10-year period. The average number of patients in hospital at any point in time has not changed significantly since 1960. The population of employees in hospitals has increased only slightly, however the number of employees in hospitals has increased by 22.6 per cent, that is from 8,742 in 1960 to 10,722 in 1970. The number of administrative staff increased by 25.5 per cent, the number of professional nurses has increased by 38 per cent, the other nursing personnel over 40 per cent, the number of employees performing diagnostic services has increased by 42 per cent. What this means, Mr. Speaker, is that although we have more hospital beds in Saskatchewan, there are no more patients at the present time. In addition, since salaries account for about 70 per cent of the total expenditure of hospitals, the increase in the number of staff and the quality of staff accounts for much of the rapid increase in cost acceleration. There are other things that should be known.

Mr. Speaker, how many people know that in 1972 it will cost close to \$14 million to run the University Hospital? How many people realize that it will cost more than \$12 million to operate the Regina General Hospital in 1972? How many people realize that when they spend one day in the University Hospital it will cost \$77.64 on the average for the bed and related services. Then, naturally there are the additional costs of physicians' services. Do you realize that if you go across here to the Regina General Hospital and spend a day in a bed in a general ward on the average it will cost in 1972 \$49.66 per day?

Mr. Speaker, I doubt whether the citizens of Saskatoon know that the Government presently pays almost \$2.5 million a year for laboratory services in that city. There is considerable duplication on laboratory services among these three hospitals and the major private laboratories in that city.

A recent study of the situation indicated that if we merely rationalized and co-ordinated the lab services in Saskatoon we can realize substantial savings. Mr. Speaker, the lab services in Saskatoon cost four and a half times more than the Liberals saved by closing 11 hospitals in our small communities. A Government which would close hospitals thereby reducing the availability of hospital services to many residents while allowing wasteful duplication of services in major centres deserves the fate of the electorate of this province that they gave them on June 23rd.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Smishek:** — Our Government will strive for true savings, for greater efficiency and elimination of waste in all areas of hospital programs. What is important for the people of Saskatchewan to know is that they cannot wait any longer before taking definitive action to stop the unacceptable rate of increases for hospital and physician services. Mr. Speaker, this is particularly so in light of the Federal Government proposing to alter and change drastically the cost sharing formula. Time does not permit, Mr. Speaker, to deal with the Federal proposals, but it does mean that if it were accepted, Saskatchewan would be losing about \$13 million a year if that formula was accepted that the Federal Government has proposed.

Mr. Speaker, since becoming Minister of Public Health I have been asked by a great many people if I intend to alter the method of remuneration to physicians. I have explained to these individuals as well as to the College of Physicians and Surgeons and the Saskatchewan Medical Association that I am anxious to explore alternative methods of payments for physicians' services. I was pleased to read in the January issue of the Canadian Medical Association Journal that the Saskatchewan Medical Association, this doctors' group in our province is, in fact, in favor of alternative payment studies. Dr. Hindmarsh, President of the Saskatchewan Medical association was quoted as saying that he favors experimentation in the area of alternative methods of payment for physicians' services. In the same article Mr. Speaker, Dr. Deering, the Executive Director of the Group Health Association of American had this to say about the fee for service system. Let me quote,

The whole system of compensating doctors through a schedule of fee for service rendered at the time of illness puts a premium on illness rather than on health. It provides for more incentive for technical procedures in surgery than to the practice of preventive medicine.

Mr. Speaker, we have been actively exploring alternative methods of payment. I would like this House to know that I shall be advising the Members about our definitive action in this regard in a few weeks of time.

Mr. Speaker, I want to draw attention to the Estimates and the improvement for the cities of Saskatoon and Regina in the

per capital grants for preventive health service. The per capita grants are being increased from \$1.25 to \$1.50 per capita. In the Estimates the absolute dollar amounts to the two cities have not increased by 20 per cent. I would like the Members of this House to know that in recent years the population estimates of the cities of Saskatoon and Regina were inflated. The provincial grants accordingly were larger than they should have been. This year the census data is now available and the population was found to be lower than the previous estimate. Naturally the Provincial grants to the cities would have been lower and would have undermined their progress. I can assure the members of this House that there is a 20 per cent increase in per capita from \$1.25 to \$1.50.

Mr. Speaker, in closing I should like particularly to make note of this year's Budget in regard to the alcohol program. This aspect of health has become a relatively major concern over the last few years. The incidence of this disease has by all techniques of measurement shown significant increase. The Government is concerned about this health program and will substantially increase the grant to the Alcoholism Commission to extend its rehabilitation services. The larger grant will enable the Commission to provide in-patient services in the Saskatoon rehabilitation centre. Up until now only out-patient services have been available in Saskatoon. The grant to the Alcoholism Commission will amount to \$887,000. This is an increase of more than one-quarter of a million dollars of just about 40 per cent over the previous year. The greatly increased grant will also permit, for the first time, the development of an alcoholism program for persons of native ancestry. \$120,000 is allocated in this respect. Mr. Speaker, in order to strengthen the Alcoholism Commission it is my proposal that the Commission be enlarged from the present eight to 12. I should like to see the new appointments to the Commission to include the views of employers, employees, native people and women. The appointments that I shall make to this Commission will ensure that these additional viewpoints are heard.

Mr. Speaker, I have heard mutterings from some Members that financing provision has not been made for chiropractic services, particularly the Member for Lumsden (Mr. Lane). I want to assure you, Mr. Speaker, that nearly \$1 million has been provided in the budget for this program. I suggest that some Hon. Members study their Estimates more carefully to locate these items.

Mr. Speaker, I will oppose the amendment and I will support the original motion.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Hon. G.T. Snyder** (Minister of Labour and Minister of Welfare): — Mr. Speaker, it's always a joy and a pleasure to take part in the debate at a time of night when everybody is keen and eager and attentive and prepared to listen at some length to a presentation by a person who has a contribution that he proposes to make. My first words, Mr. Speaker, must be to extend my sincere congratulations to the Premier and the Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Blakeney) for the Budget which he presented to this House on Friday last which I believe established a set of priorities in keeping with the philosophy of this New Democratic Government and a Budget which is in tune with the needs of the people of Saskatchewan in 1972.

It is my intention for a short while this evening, Mr. Speaker, to devote the time at my disposal to the specific purpose of giving a resume of the Department of Welfare or the Department of Social Services as it is to be known in the near future. This Department is, I expect, Mr. Speaker, the one area of activity that touches more deeply the lives of a greater number of Saskatchewan citizens than any other agency or department of Government with the possible exception of the Department of Health. It is this Department, Mr. Speaker, that is charged with the responsibility of assuring that no resident of Saskatchewan shall be allowed to live in economic circumstances below those which are described as minimum standards. It is this Department, Mr. Speaker, which is responsible for assuring that the young and the old are provided with adequate care and sustenance. It is this Department which is responsible for those who have run afoul of the law and have been confined to one of our provincial correction institutions or have been placed on parole or on probation.

Because of the very sensitive nature of the functions which are performed by this Department, Mr. Speaker, and because of the large amount of public funds which it administers on behalf of the disadvantaged residents of the province, it is probably subject to closer scrutiny and a harsher degree of criticism than other agencies of Government. I expect that the Member for Milestone (Mr. MacDonald) and the Member for Rosthern (Mr. Boldt) would be quick to agree that the provision of these services will undoubtedly be accompanied by accusations and charges that some clients of the Department are receiving too much in the way of public assistance while others are receiving too little.

I expect, Mr. Speaker, that there is no mature adult person in Saskatchewan today who does not have a very firm conviction relating to the administration of welfare. Some will be convinced that the schedule of payments provided for the needy is too generous. To these people I suggest to them that they attempt for one month to live on the amount allotted for the necessities of life through the Saskatchewan assistance plan. There will be those who contend, Mr. Speaker, that allowances for food and other needs have not kept pace with the rising cost of living. To these people Mr. Speaker, let me say that it will be our burden in this Department to keep abreast with the current inflationary trends and to attempt to adjust allowances accordingly. There will be those, Mr. Speaker, who will look upon the Department with scorn and distrust and contend loudly that assistance is being provided to 'drunks, deadbeats and people too lazy to work'. This kind of criticism, Mr. Speaker, does a disservice to welfare recipients and does a disservice to those who are attempting to administer honestly a complex and a delicate program. It must be acknowledged, Mr. Speaker, that we have always had with us a minute group whose irresponsibility or inability to fit into socially acceptable circumstances has been the subject of criticism.

However, Mr. Speaker, the vast majority of those who are in receipt of public assistance are those who are socially disadvantaged for a host of reasons and are unable to extricate themselves from the very unfortunate predicament in which they find themselves. Among this group will be those who will in some instances need assistance for extended periods of time and some who must have assistance for as long as they may live. Society, I suggest, should be willing to accept this obligation

as a legitimate and an actual function of any civilized society.

The most disturbing element as it relates to the administration of public assistance has been the sharp increase in the numbers of able-bodied, employable recipients in recent years. Unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, there are in Saskatchewan proportionate numbers of those who make up the 600,000 plus who find themselves without work in Canada today. This is the predominant feature which has caused the sharp increase in expenditures of the Department in recent years.

Let me say, Mr. Speaker, that I regard myself as exceedingly fortunate to have been surrounded by good, able and conscientious people within the Department of Welfare. Without the loyal and faithful service of the immediate staff at 2240 Albert Street and throughout the regions of the province the job of the Minister would have been exceedingly difficult if not impossible.

I want to take a few moments of the time of this House, Mr. Speaker, to outline briefly the intentions of the Department as it relates to legislative changes during this Session of the Legislature. At this Session the Government, as you know, has proposed an Act which will change the name of the Department of Welfare to the Department of Social Services. This change is being made in recognition of the fact that the meaning of the word 'welfare' has gradually been narrowed to the point where in the minds of many welfare is synonymous with assistance.

Mr. Speaker, the needs of the people of this province are much broader than monetary needs. Therefore, it is the intention of this Government to stress that the services of the Department are more varied than those involving financial assistance only. The Department provides programs and services for families who need special assistance to function with our society. We offer assistance to those who have found themselves in conflict with the law. We provide programs and services designed to meet the special needs of the elderly in Saskatchewan. A variety of programs exist to meet the needs of those who are socially, economically, mentally or physically handicapped. Mr. Speaker, I believe the name Social Services gives a more accurate representation of the functions and objectives of the Department.

The fundamental aim of the Department is to offer social services to those who are in need and to provide those services in such a way as to maintain or strengthen their capacity for self-respect and self-dependence. To this end, Mr. Speaker, we will continue to streamline existing programs of the Department. In addition we will evolve new programs in order to meet the changing needs of the people of this province.

In order to provide better services to clients, Mr. Speaker, the Government intends to authorize an increase in the ratio of departmental staff to clients within the 11 regions. This budget will provide for an additional 24 new positions to be spread over the 11 regions because of the excessive case loads that have been carried by individual workers in a large number of cases. In addition, Mr. Speaker, and importantly I believe, 38 positions which now exist on a temporary basis will be converted to permanent positions which the former Government refused to convert in order to keep projected numbers of employees at a low figure and to deprive employees of certain benefits. Those 38 positions in essence, Mr. Speaker, have been permanent positions for a

number of years. The reclassification, Mr. Speaker, of temporary personnel will provide a better service through greater stability and increase job security. The Member for Rosthern (Mr. Boldt), when he made his remarks the other day, should make himself acquainted with the facts before drawing attention to circumstances of which he appears to have very little knowledge.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Snyder:** — Mr. Speaker, it's important that we continue to extend the number of departmental staff as needs arise. It is of equal importance to ensure that our staff is of a highly professional calibre. The proximity of the School of Social Work in Regina on the Regina Campus to begin its first class in the fall of this year will undoubtedly have a positive effect on the professional people employed by the Department of Social Services.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Snyder:** — Rather than recruiting at the BA level the Department will have the opportunity, if they so desire, to recruit from a group of MSW graduates and it is anticipated that the school will also provide an opportunity for the attainment of professional education for the people who are presently on staff.

Mr. Speaker, I want to spend a moment or two with reference to the Saskatchewan Assistance Plan which Members will know that since April of 1966 has been the only program in this province to meet the needs of people who require financial assistance. The Budget deficit method, the principle of needs minus income has been used to determine needs since that time. Under the Saskatchewan Assistance Plan regulations, Mr. Speaker, the total amount of any pension or allowance of every recipient is considered as income. We believe that it is the responsibility of Government to ensure that all recipients be given an adequate amount of assistance and we suggest also that by giving special concessions to specific groups we may be doing so at the expense of others. There is provision within the Saskatchewan Assistance Plan to meet needs arising from special circumstances or conditions. We, therefore, do not feel that it is necessary to single out for special consideration those people who might have more public sympathy than others.

Public assistance expenditures under the Saskatchewan Assistance Plan for the fiscal year 1971-72 are expected, Mr. Speaker, to reach \$42,200,000 and this is an increase of \$7,008,000 or 23 per cent over the 1971-72 fiscal year. In comparison the increase of the previous year was 39 per cent.

Mr. Speaker, the former Liberal Government was well aware that the cost of public assistance was rising sharply. Despite this fact, the former Liberal Government under-budgeted in the full knowledge that the cost for the Saskatchewan Assistance Plan would far exceed the amount voted for that purpose. Cost and cash-load projections indicated that expenditures would exceed \$39 million. The former Liberal Government voted \$35 million for that purpose, yes, \$35 million, Mr. Speaker, when they knew the cost would probably be in the area of \$40 million. One can only conclude, Mr. Speaker, that they under-budgeted deliberately in order that it would not be brought to public attention that the cost of welfare, the cost of providing assistance to



people in Saskatchewan had risen sharply because of severe economics conditions.

This Government, Mr. Speaker, as well as the previous Government is aware that three factors are largely responsible for the increase in public assistance costs. First of all, the rapid rise in unemployment which has deprived largely employable people of jobs and have left many able-bodied persons out of work. At least half of the increased expenditures can be attributed to this cost. The increase of the general cost of shelter, utilities and household furnishings along with the increases in food and personal allowances went into effect in April, 1971, and will account for a large part of the increase. This and the escalating cost being charged to clients residing in special care homes some of which are assisted under the Saskatchewan Assistance Plan has accounted for a further increase in cost. The remaining major portion for increased expenditures is the continuing trend of social and family breakdown. There has, I am afraid, been a large increase not only in the number of people requiring assistance because of separation or divorce but also in the unmarried mothers who require assistance initially. In view of the fact of the continuing rise in the cost of living, Mr. Speaker, the Government has decided that an increase in the allowance for basic needs and, in particular, an increase in the allowance for food is imperative.

In setting the new rates, Mr. Speaker, top priority was given to ensure that a single person living alone such as the elderly people in our province receive an adequate allowance per month for food. Our rates, Mr. Speaker, are now equal to those in the other provinces and in some instances are somewhat higher. This brings them up to a level which the Liberals in the previous administration failed to do. In addition to increasing food allowance, Mr. Speaker, we have eliminated the practice of reducing the rates for larger families. Under the previous administration a family of four received less per person than a family of three. The theory behind this practice, I suppose, was that buying in quantity reduced the cost per person while in actual fact, Mr. Speaker, we have found that when a family is working on a very minimum budget very little saving is realized because the opportunity for buying in bulk quantities is next to nil. Under the new rate structure, Mr. Speaker, a single person living alone could receive an allowance of \$100.25 per month to meet his total basic needs in comparison to \$95.25 under the previous schedule. A family with two parents and four children could receive a maximum of \$302.50 depending upon the ages of the children. The rate for the old schedule would have been \$280.45 for this same family of six for their total needs.

Mr. Speaker, the Saskatchewan Public Assistance rates now, as I suggested, compare favourable with those of other Western provinces. As an example, two parents with two children, ages one and five receive \$258 in Saskatchewan, in British Columbia the same family would receive \$241, in Manitoba the rate would be \$257.

Mr. Speaker, this Government recognizes the increasing interest of the people of Saskatchewan in public assistance and in social programs in this province. In order to better inform the public of the operations of the Department I have arranged, through the co-operation of the Department, for the publication of a quarterly statistical review. The review, which I understand the second of which will appear tomorrow, provides for a

review of the expenditures of the Department and will indicate any trends that have become apparent for the forthcoming quarter. It will be distributed to the Press, to municipal officials and will be available to anyone who requests it.

Mr. Speaker, for those who contend that the Department of Welfare provides assistance to drunks, to deadbeats and people too lazy to work, I want to quote the following statistics which are contained in the December quarter review,

1. In September of 1971, 52 per cent of the family heads and one-person units who are receiving assistance because of age or because of some disability.
2. That 18 per cent of those receiving assistance were women and dependent children.
3. Five per cent of those receiving some amount of assistance were employed full time but were receiving an insufficient amount of income in order to meet their basic needs.

Our most recent statistics indicate that approximately 16 per cent of those on assistance are unemployed and looking for work.

Mr. Speaker, it is the intention of this government to take steps to ensure that the Saskatchewan Assistance Plan continues to meet the needs of the people of this province. An inter-sessional Legislative Committee will be appointed during this session, Mr. Speaker, to undertake a thorough review of all aspects of the plan during this coming summer. This committee will be asked to look at the criteria for eligibility, it will be asked to examine the level of allowances, it will be asked to look at and to recommend on the process of making applications for assistance. Consideration will be given to the present municipal involvement in the program and to the implications of Federal-Provincial cost-sharing.

Let me say just a word or two, Mr. Speaker, with respect to Child Welfare. The Department, as you know, is charged with the responsibility of ensuring the well being of many children in this province. We believe that one of the basic rights of every child in Saskatchewan is the right to have a suitable home. Mr. Speaker, I suggest to you that the day of the orphanage is long past. If a child is without parents or when the parents are unable to care for him or her, the Department provides that that child shall live to the very best of their ability in a foster home which will provide for their basic needs. A foster home and foster parents will continue and in an increasing way to form the backbone of any child care program. Additionally, Mr. Speaker, it is the belief of this Government that rates which are presently being paid to the foster parents are not realistic in the view of recent increases in the cost of living. We are therefore increasing the rates for children of all ages by ten per cent resulting in an additional expense of some \$119,265 in the Child Welfare budget.

The Department is continuing to expand the special foster home program which began operation some time ago. The program is designed for children with special needs which were not being met either by the foster home or by institutional facilities. During the past year a total of 44 children were placed

in the 23 foster homes which were in operation in the general Regina area. The Department is expanding the program to the Saskatoon region in the coming year and the provision has been made for 40 children to participate in that program. Additionally, Mr. Speaker, the Department is continuing its efforts to find adoption homes for those children who have special problems which often result in a delay in their adoption. The adoption services are such that the child with no problems seems to be quite readily placed in a home with very little difficulty. In fact, Mr. Speaker, the supply of homes in some instances exceeds the demand for the number of children who are available for adoption. However, there is a continuing need to relocate and develop resources for the child with special problems. Regardless of the nature of the handicap, difficulties continue to be experienced in the placing of these children in suitable home situations.

Let me just say a few words, Mr. Speaker, in connection with the Corrections Program. At the present time you will know that the Government is giving careful consideration to the recommendations made by the Corrections Study Report. The Study was the first of its kind to be conducted in the province since 1946. It is jointly financed by this government and the Federal Government Department of the Solicitor general. The Chairman of the Study Committee was Dr. Henry Matheson, the Deputy Director of Corrections for the Province of British Columbia. Current trends in correction indicate, I believe, Mr. Speaker, a major shift in emphasis from large impersonal custodial institutions to small individualized centres which stress rehabilitation and wherever possible community-based programming. There is a major attempt, Mr. Speaker, to remove corrections subjecting offenders to isolation and giving them, as far as possible, equal access to the wide range of community services and resources available to other people. In keeping with this trend the government intends to place increased emphasis on probation as alternative to institutionalisation and to this end, Mr. Speaker, the Department has already begun the expansion of probation services with the recent addition of seven new full time probation officers. In addition a full time Chief Probation Officer will be appointed to give direction and implementation of a probation program in this province.

The Government will continue to expand the concept of the work-training program and in addition to the funds allocated to the Regina and Prince Albert work-training program we are approving \$27,000 for the establishment of a work-training residence in the city of Saskatoon. It is anticipated that the work-training program will begin operations in July of this year. The work-training program which began operations in 1968 enables the inmate to re-enter the community on a daily basis while still under the sentence, to undertake employment or to further vocational or academic training. At the same time, Mr. Speaker, he is given professional counselling to help him deal with the problems he encounters with his re-entry into community life.

The Government believes, Mr. Speaker, that work-training makes good sense economically. The inmate who is employed and pays income tax, supports his dependents and he contributes towards his room and board. During the 1970-71 fiscal year 193 inmates participating in work-training earned \$48,000. many inmate families who previously had to depend on the Department of Welfare for financial support are now being supported by the inmate himself. But most important, Mr. Speaker, is the effect

of the program in decreasing the rate of recidivism and increasing the rate of employment of inmates on discharge. These are numerous examples of a striking improvement in the functioning as a result of services being improved by the work-training staff. In an effort to involve the community more closely with the rehabilitation of inmates we have relocated the Regina and Prince Albert work-training residences. In the past year both residences were moved from the correctional centre grounds to a location within the community.

Let me say just a few words, Mr. Speaker, concerning the Community Special Care Division of the Department. In the 1971-72 fiscal year some \$525,000 was allocated for the Community Special Care Division to assist in the construction of new special care homes and providing additional facilities for existing homes. In this current Budget, Mr. Speaker, in the 1972-73 fiscal year the Government has allocated in excess of \$700,000 for this purpose. These increased funds will provide in excess of 200 additional beds as well as additional facilities in centres such as Canora, Kindersley, Shaunavon, Tisdale, Fort Qu'Appelle, St. Walburg, Hudson Bay, Foam Lake, Watson, Wynyard, Coronach, Estevan and Maple Creek. In addition, Mr. Speaker, the Community Special Care Division is currently considering requests for new homes and expanded facilities from a number of other communities in the province.

Some months ago, Mr. Speaker, I believe it was in late July, the Department of Welfare established a study committee charged with the responsibility of conducting an in-depth study of the special care home program and its operation in Saskatchewan. The report of the committee is receiving careful study by the Government at the present time. The findings of this committee will undoubtedly form the basis for future policy decisions in this area.

I should like to review for just a moment, Mr. Speaker, the general situation regarding special care homes in the Province of Saskatchewan today. The number of special care beds that have been developed to date along with those in the construction and planning stages will make available to the citizens of this province slightly under 7,000 beds by the end of this current year. This number of beds is far in excess of what has been recommended for the province in relation to its population. At this time, with one or two exceptions, most areas of the province have sufficient beds to meet existing and future needs. In spite of this Mr. Speaker, it is become apparent that the demand for beds is not diminishing appreciably. In recognition of this situation the government intends to pursue a policy of providing assistance in the development of community services which will curb the demand for institutional care and will permit elderly citizens to remain in their own homes and actively participate in the community. Current programs and services being provided for senior citizens of this province are numerous and varied. A 'meals on wheels' service is being operated in Estevan, Maple Creek, Melfort, Moose Jaw, Prince Albert, Regina, Saskatoon and Weyburn. Senior citizens' activities centres and senior citizens' care centres are located in Lucky Lake, Moose Jaw, Prince Albert, Regina and Swift Current. Many community agencies are now operating such programs as homemaker services, information and referral centre, senior citizen taxi services and aid to independent living services.

In the forthcoming year, Mr. Speaker, we expect not only

to increase the number of services but also to move into a number of new areas. In addition, efforts will be made to streamline those services developed in the past year in order to reach more of the elderly citizens of our Province with these kinds of services.

The Government has adopted a policy of providing 40 per cent of the cost of financing these services. When additional funds are obtained through cost sharing agreements with the Federal Government these funds are passed on to the agencies providing community services for the aged. While we're looking at methods of increasing the Government's proportion of financial assistance we would still expect that considerable input would come from the community involved.

Let me say just a few words, Mr. Speaker, with respect to day care centres and indicate that the Department continues to encourage the development of day care centres in the province. From the beginning of the 1971-72 fiscal year to this date the government has spent \$4,600 on development grants and \$17,665 on operating grants and excess of \$9,000 or almost \$9,000 on parent subsidy. The Department continues to provide an operating grant for each day care centre utilized and we are continuing to subsidize parents up to 50 per cent of the cost for day care. The total day care spaces in the province has increased to 622 and is expected that at least 100 more spaces will be developed during the next year.

Mr. Speaker, the day care regulations were recently expanded to allow children under the age of two admission to day car centres. It had become increasingly apparent that by limiting day care to children over the age of two, we were creating hardships for parents who had children under that particular age. Parents with one of their children under the age limit were forced to see separate services for that younger child. Under the new regulations day care centres which meet the special requirements set out for providing services to children under the age of two will not be able to provide a total service to many families.

Let me say a word, Mr. Speaker, in connection with vocational rehabilitation for disabled persons. It will be known that the agreement has been continued on a yearly basis since 1962 in connection with the vocational rehabilitation services that I speak of. I have recently received a proposal to continue that agreement to March 31, 1973 and we have concluded that this is what we propose to do. The Government, through the Departments of Health, Welfare and Education, has spent \$1,780,000 during the 1971-72 fiscal year under the agreement. In the fiscal year 1972-73 that figure will be increased by approximately \$200,00 to \$1,975,000 indicating the government's emphasis on rehabilitation services for the handicapped.

Services and programs for the handicapped will continue to be expanded during the coming year. At the present time there are eight community shelter workshops in operation in the province serving the need of slightly under 500 clients. The Kinistino Farm Training Centre has facilities for an additional six clients.

Mr. Speaker, the Provincial Co-ordinator of Rehabilitation is currently assessing proposals for new workshops in several

Saskatchewan communities. It is anticipated within the next year accommodation in special care, sheltered workshops will increase by approximately 20 per cent. Funds have been allotted to provide 13 additional spaces in the Battlefords' workshop. There will be an addition of 12 to Moose Jaw and approximately 13 to the prince Albert workshop. The Counsel for Crippled Children and Adults workshop will increase by 12. Weyburn will have facilities for an additional four clients and the opening of the Lloydminster workshop will provide services for another 20 clients.

The Government recently approved a capital grant of \$12,000 and operating funds in the amount of in excess of \$9,000 for the construction and operation of a sheltered workshop in Lloydminster. Grants and an equal amount were provided by the Government of Alberta in light of the fact that this city straddles the Alberta, Saskatchewan boundary. The combined efforts of the Government of this province and that of our neighbour to the west will result in facilities for an additional 40 handicapped people. \$12,000 was recently allocated for an expansion program at the Swift current sheltered workshop which I had the honour to officiate at this afternoon at 4:00 o'clock. A grant of \$2,500 was made available to the Battlefords' workshop to assist in establishing the pilot project within the workshop. The project will prepare the handicapped worker for living within the community through training in domestic and life skills. Two new activity centres for the severely handicapped were opened in the last year, Mr. Speaker, one in Regina and then another in Redvers. The total accommodation available at Cosmopolitan Industries in Saskatoon increased by 50. There are, at the present time, Mr. Speaker, three activity centres in operation service the needs of approximately 200 clients. My colleagues and I, Mr. Speaker, are most concerned for the welfare of the severely handicapped and therefore I anticipate that additional resources for moving these programs ahead are going to be made readily available.

Government expenditures on work activity programs during the 1971-72 fiscal year amounted to \$189,000. during the fiscal year 1972-73 the Government intends to spend in excess of \$300,000 which is a further indication of the Government's position on rehabilitation to the socially disadvantaged of this province.

The objective of these programs, Mr. Speaker, is to motivate and to provide basic educational work and social skills to adults who are physically and mentally capable of becoming employable and useful members of society.

At the present time, Mr. Speaker, there are work activity centre programs at Prince Albert, Meadow Lake and Yorkton currently serving the needs of approximately 45 clients. Officials of the Department are developing a program, Mr. Speaker, which will, I believe, serve an expanded need in this particular area.

Let me conclude, Mr. Speaker, by saying that the disadvantaged people of this province continue to become more vocal and I suggest you today that this is the way it should be.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Snyder:** — Client groups are being formed in many centres of Saskatchewan and the Government encourages this kind of citizen participation. It's important to have all clients speaking with a unified voice about the needs and wants of the welfare recipients. To this end the Poor Peoples' Conference was held in Regina in October of 1971. The government supported this conference and provided additional financial assistance to those who wished to attend. Representatives from client groups across the province from Regina, Saskatoon, Yorkton, Kamsack and Prince Albert were assisted in joining together and electing the Saskatchewan poor Peoples' Council. The Government encourages continuing dialogue between the Department, client groups as represented by the Poor Peoples' Council and we recognize that the general aims and objectives of the client groups are the same as those of the Department and most enlightened members of society, that is to improve the conditions of the poor people, of the disadvantaged people of this province.

The think, Mr. Speaker, that the Budget indicates clearly is that the plans of the Department of Welfare or the Department of Social Services as it will be shortly know, reflect the concern which this Government feels for disadvantaged people in the Province of Saskatchewan. I think this concern is reflected in a very tangible way in the 1972-73 Budget and I will be exceedingly pleased to support the motion and vote against the amendment.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Hon. J.E. Brockelbank** (Minister of Public Works): — Mr. Speaker, I've been listening to the debates this evening with keen interest.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Brockelbank:** — I want to say, Mr. Speaker, that I've learned a lot about debates this evening.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Brockelbank:** — The debates began rather gustily from across the floor with little direction and less purpose but they settled down after a while. I was quite pleased to see that they did settle down. I want to say in all seriousness that I really enjoyed the presentation of the last two speakers. They have important and large departments and the information they've volunteered to the House was good information, it was good debate.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Brockelbank:** — I think it's unfortunate that we couldn't have expanded their time a little longer . . .

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

March 15, 1972

**Mr. Brockelbank:** — . . . to report more fully. I realize, Mr. Speaker, that my words this evening are the most sought after words today since they will be the last and in order that I may remain in the good graces of my peers, I think I will beg leave to adjourn the debate.

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear, hear!

Debate adjourned.

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