

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN
Second Session— Seventeenth Legislature
51st Day

Friday, May 5, 1972

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

WELCOME TO STUDENTS

MR. G. B. GRANT (Regina Whitmore Park): Mr. Speaker, I have pleasure today in introducing to the Members of the House, 30 students from Massey Road School under the direction of Mrs. Ellis. The thing that is of particular interest of this group of students, is that Mrs. Ellis, I believe, has had classes here on four or five occasions and some of the students indicated this morning that they had attended this Legislature about four times at various grades, and I think this is quite commendable considering that the school is very close to the Legislature Buildings. Sometimes there is a tendency for us not to take an interest in things that are close by. I want to extend a very sincere welcome on behalf of the Members to Mrs. Ellis and her group of students from Massey Road School.

HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. M. FEDUNIAK (Turtleford):— Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day I would like to introduce to all Members of the Legislature, a group of Grade Ten students seated in the Speaker's Gallery from the Spiritwood Public High School, accompanied by their teacher Miss Friesen and their bus driver Mr. Lang and his wife. This group travelled some 300 miles. I am sure that all Members will join with me in extending to them the warmest welcome and to express the very sincere wish that they will find their visit with us most enjoyable and educational. I wish to make an apology to them for the inconvenience which we have caused them due to the change in our regular time schedule this morning. I wish them a safe journey home.

HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. D. W. MICHAYLUK (Redberry):— Mr. Speaker, might I, Sir, too, express through you my sincere and warm welcome to the group of students from Spiritwood School, their teacher Miss Friesen and Mr. and Mrs. Lang who are accompanying this group. Spiritwood School, Mr. Speaker, is on the periphery of the Redberry Constituency, which I represent. And because of this, Sir, there is one student by the name of Miss Edie who is heir to the enviable reputation of being the only representative of all the student bodies for the current Session of the Legislature from my constituency. Mr. Speaker, because we have reached that point in time so close to prorogation that there is no likelihood that she will be dethroned from this position. I hope that the entire group gains an insight into our democratic process and that their trip home will be a safe one.

HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

QUESTIONS

COMMITTEE FOR SENIOR CITIZENS

MR. D. G. STEUART (Leader of the Opposition):— Before the Orders of the Day, Mr. Speaker, some time ago this Legislative Assembly received a petition on behalf of some pensioners and old age senior citizens and subsequent to that I introduced a resolution in this House asking that a Committee be set up to study and in effect look into and bring back recommendations to this House and indeed to the Government, regarding their request for changes to be made and the possibility of a Government Department for senior citizens.

It was passed unanimously and I wonder since we are getting close to the end of this Session, we have set up a committee to look into everything else under the sun, and I am not objecting, but let us not be accused of paying lip service to the senior citizens and then letting this Session or maybe even a whole summer go by without doing something.

Would the Premier please tell me what plans he has to set up this committee and have them go to work on this very serious set of problems which face our senior citizens.

HON. A. E. BLAKENEY (Premier):— Mr. Speaker, I did not understand from the resolution passed by the House that we were going to set up a Legislative Committee. If we had we obviously could have varied the terms of reference of the Welfare Legislative Committee slightly in order to cover this ground. I am not suggesting that the entire ground is welfare, by all means, but it is an important part of the services rendered for senior citizens.

The proposal is that we set up a Special Senior Citizens Provincial Commission, upon which senior citizens' organizations will have representation. This implied, certainly, that it would be a public commission rather than a Legislative Committee.

We, as a Government, have not had an opportunity to consider in detail the appropriate membership of such a committee or commission and, accordingly, I am not able to report as to when such a commission will be established. I anticipate that we will establish one and I hope that we will be able to do it before too long. There are a very substantial number of items which are going to arise to be dealt with out of this Session and I would hope that this is one which would get priority of treatment.

ADJOURNED DEBATES

RESOLUTIONS

RESOLUTION NO. 5— PROPERTY TAX REDUCTION FOR EDUCATION

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed Resolution by Mr. E. F. Gardner (Moosomin):

That the Government of Saskatchewan give consideration to taking the necessary steps to reduce the property tax for education to 25 mills.

HON. A. E. BLAKENEY (Premier):— Mr. Speaker, this Resolution

has been on the Order Paper for a number of days. It is one to which we have no particular objection, however, we feel that in its present wording it may be subject to some confusion. As we have indicated throughout the Session, we are dealing with the matter of reducing the property tax for education to 25 mills in a slightly indirect way by use of the Property Improvement Grants.

We propose to continue to do that. We propose to continue to attempt to get a mill rate which will approximate 40 or 45 mills and then to provide a Property Improvement Grant which would, if applied against the school mill rate, have the effect of providing the property tax for education being set at a 25 mill level.

We think that under all the circumstances, many of which will be familiar to Hon. Members, this is a good way to deal with this matter in this year as the Budget will indicate we are providing for some \$22 million or \$23 million in relief for property taxpayers, and which again, if applied against property tax for education will have the effect of reducing mill rates to the order of the low 30s and we would hope that we could continue the program if revenues are sufficient so that we can, indeed, reduce the property tax for education. Again, if these grants are applied to 25 mills.

This Government policy has been announced. In order that it might be set out with some clarity, I propose to move an amendment. I move:

That all the words after "that" be deleted and the following substituted therefor:

This Legislature commend the Government for the assistance to property owners announced in the Budget and urges the Government to give consideration to providing assistance to property owners which, if regarded as a credit against property taxes for school purposes, would reduce such taxes for basic school purposes to an average of 25 mills across the province, calculated on equalized assessment.

Mr. Speaker, just before I take my seat, and before I formally move that, I would point out that what I am proposing is that we give consideration to continuing the Property Improvement Grant Program, that we increase the grants or attempt to increase the grants over the years, sufficient so that if they were applied against school taxes it would reduce the school taxes for basic school purposes to an average of 25 mills across the province, calculated on an equalized assessment.

That in detailed terms, was the election platform of our Party, the platform which we hope to be able to fulfil in our first term of office. Accordingly we have no objection whatever to in essence to supporting the Resolution of the Hon. Member for Moosomin (Mr. Gardner) phrased this way.

The debate continued on the amendment and motion.

MR. J. C. McISAAC (Wilkie):— Mr. Speaker, just a very brief comment on the amendment put forward by the Premier.

It think it is very obvious to anyone reading the amendment

May 5, 1972

and anyone who has been reading the Press in the last several months, as school boards and urban municipalities particularly have set their mill rates, that the Premier and the Government are really only kidding themselves if they are trying to imply that the expanded Homeowner Grant has taken up the slack as far as mill rates are concerned and somehow are going to get down to 25.

School mill rates have gone up in something like half the school jurisdictions in the province. The urban mill rates have gone up, Mr. Speaker. We saw in the paper a few days ago where Moos Jaw went up by 8 mills. Here we are, as I say, admittedly expanding the Homeowner Grant which would have a two or three mill effect across the province. If you wish to apply it to school mills, school mill rates, that part is fine. But by the same token the total mill rate the property owner is paying continues to rise because of this Government's inaction in the field of providing sufficient municipal grants and municipal assistance in order that municipal mill rates could have been held or, indeed, reduced.

So it is certainly going to be a hollow promise, Mr. Speaker, even if we can by some stretch of the imagination or some change in phraseology reduce the mill rate to 25 mills in education by using an expanded Homeowner Grant, and at the same time see the municipal mill rates rise and rise considerably as they have done this year.

Amendment agreed to.

The debate continued on the motion as amended.

MR. E. F. GARDNER (Moosomin):— Mr. Speaker, our reason for proposing this Resolution was to bring to the attention of the people of the province— and I don't know whether this was really necessary because I think most of them already know— that taxes have not been decreased and mill rates have risen all over the province. The Property Improvement Grant is certainly no realistic reduction in mill rates.

Its limits are unrealistic. It has some very severe restrictions. A farmer, for example, living in town with a house in town loses the Homeowner Grant that he had last year even though he gets a Property Improvement Grant on his farm. If he has a farm and he gets the Property Improvement grant he gets no grant of any kind on his house in town. And for this reason he has lost, in one place, and gained in the other. It is not a 13 mill rate reduction. In no way a 13 mill rate reduction. If the total assessment of the province were calculated and you took 13 mills for this amount for the urban and the rural assessment of the province you would find that even by using the money that we had set aside for the Homeowner Grant and the extra money, it would in no way amount to what would be required to have a realistic 13 mill reduction across the province.

Mill rates are up all over and everyone knows this. Every time you pick up the paper, Regina, Moose Jaw— 6, 7, 8 mills and more. And these are up because the Government has provided inadequate grants to rural municipalities, urban municipalities and the school boards to keep these taxes in line.

As I say people all over the province have this message.

I don't believe we probably need this Resolution to bring it to their attention. The taxes are up, mill rates are up, not down. No relief was provided for renters. Over the past years the then Opposition suggested that there should be some relief for people who are renting suites, apartments or houses and this has not been done.

Our Homeowner Grant that we initiated several years ago was annually increased. Had we been the Government it would now be up to \$100 and at \$100 almost every home owner in the province would be better off with the \$100 Homeowner Grant than he is going to be under the Property Improvement grant.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. GARDNER:— So for this reason I think that people are clear as to the implications, that the taxes are up and not down and the amendment is just an attempt to get the Government off the hook. I am sure that the people are well aware that they are getting no benefits from the Property Improvement Grant and that mill rates are continually going up. I am sure that in another year when we have another round of mill rate increases they will be even more aware of this.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Motion as amended agreed to on division.

SECOND READINGS

HON. N. E. BYERS (Minister of Highways) moved second reading of Bill No. 141— An Act to amend The Highways Act (No. 2).

He said: Mr. Speaker, the second amendment to The Highways Act this Session and I don't anticipate more than three or four more.

The amendment is a very simple amendment. Section 2, subsection (m) of The Highways Act defines or lists a number of areas in which the Department of Highways can spend money under the headings of "public improvements" and public improvements are defined to mean highways, culverts, bridges, airdromes, ditches, drains and a whole host of things.

The purpose of the proposed amendment is to include railways as a public improvement on which the Department of Highways or the Government could expend public funds. The intention of this addition is that the Department of Highways would be able to share costs with municipalities that were contemplating undertaking improvements that involved the relocation of rail lines, these to be defined as a public improvement. And if the municipality and the Department of Highways came to an agreement for projects of that kind then the Department would have the statutory authority to expend such funds. That's the essence, Mr. Speaker, of the proposed amendment.

I would move second reading of a Bill to amend The Highways Act.

Motion agreed to.

May 5, 1972

HON. A. E. BLAKENEY (Premier) moved second reading of Bill No. 151— An Act to amend The Liquor Licensing Act.

He said: Mr. Speaker, this Bill is to amend The Liquor Licensing Act and follows on from the deliberations of the Special Committee of this Legislature dealing with liquor. I am going to take a little time to outline for the House what happened, if I may put it this way, what disposition has been made of the Report of the Liquor Committee and from that will follow the amendments which are proposed in The Liquor Licensing Act. I will also deal with the proposed amendment to The Liquor Act. I will introduce this to the House. It will come formally later.

Members will know of the appointment of the Special Committee of the Legislature to conduct an inquiry into all aspects relating to the sale, advertising and distribution of alcoholic beverages. The Committee was asked to review the present legislation and regulations and review the legislation in other jurisdictions and to review the production, distribution, advertising, sale and usage of alcoholic beverages. The Committee, as we indicated earlier in this House, did quite an outstanding job and an interim report was rendered which met with the unanimous support of the members of the Committee.

A number of the recommendations do not require any legislative action. And I will refer first to them. Perhaps I should phrase it, do not require legislative action by way of change to The Liquor Licensing Act or The Liquor Act, and I will refer first to them.

The first one dealt with that the Government of Saskatchewan reduce the age of majority from 19 to 18 years of age. You will know that this has been dealt with by that Act.

The second recommendation dealt with the proposal to issue identification cards on a voluntary basis to Saskatchewan residents over the age of 18 years. This does not require legislation but only administrative action. This matter is being pursued. The Government has made no final decision on it since we don't have all the information on hand, but we are, at this point, and with the information which we now have on hand favorably disposed to introducing an identification card system on a strictly voluntary basis.

Recommendation No. 5 dealt with the serving of liquor in provincial parks in accordance with the same rules and regulations as pertain elsewhere in Saskatchewan. This requires no legislative change and we propose to proceed with this in due course.

Recommendation No. 7 asks that the Government proceed with all convenient speed to convert Liquor Board Stores to the self-service style of store. This we will be doing, at least in part. New stores which are being established will, I think in most urban areas, be of the self-service kind. Again, we have made no final decisions on this but with respect to one or two stores which are under plan and one which is now actively under planning at Yorkton. (We have announced to the people at Yorkton that this will be a self-service store if they wish it.) They agreed with this, they meaning the Council at Yorkton, and we propose to proceed on that basis.

Recommendation No. 9, that the Government of Saskatchewan review the forenoon hours of the opening of Liquor Board Stores. This does not require legislation, I am advised, and we are looking at this and will probably act on it.

Recommendation No. 10 provided that the hours of licensed premises should be extended to be from 9:30 a.m. in the morning to 1:30 a.m. in the following morning with a half hour tolerance. This could have been done without legislation. The hours were currently dealt with in the regulations under The Liquor Licensing Act. We propose to deal with it by legislation and there are amendments in The Liquor Licensing Act effectively to do what the Committee recommends. We are making it, and I think this is in keeping with what the Committee had in mind, making the 9:30 to 11:00 voluntary i.e. the operator of the licensed premises can decide whether he opens at 9:30 or 11:00 o'clock or anytime in the middle, but at 11:00 a.m. he shall open. And we are providing that the hours from 12:00 midnight to 1:30 be voluntary i.e. the proprietor of the licensed premises can close at 12:00 o'clock if he wishes or stay open until 1:30 if he wishes but he must stay open until 12:00. We have consulted in an informal way with a number of operators of licensed premises and they felt that to make the hours from 9:30 to 1:30 a.m. mandatory would be probably undesirable. We felt that making it 11:00 a.m. to 12:00 midnight on a mandatory basis and the earlier and later hours at the option of the proprietor met the situation, perhaps, the best way. I judge from conversations with members of the Committee that this would not do violence with what they had in mind.

Recommendation No. 11 deals with the matter of operators of fly-in camps being able to get a restricted license to serve beer, wine and spirits. We propose to deal with that in the way recommended by the Committee.

I now turn, Mr. Speaker, to the amendments in The Liquor Licensing Act. There are a couple of housekeeping amendments. There is one to deal with the definition of "liquor" and that is in the nature of a housekeeping amendment to make the definition of liquor in The Liquor Licensing Act read the same as was put in The Liquor Act three years ago, 1969.

We have another amendment which we regard as a housekeeping amendment but I want to bring it to the attention of Hon. Members. As you know, The Liquor Licensing Act provides for a whole series of different kinds of licenses and one of them is a beer parlour licence and one of them is a beverage room licence. A beer parlour licence provides that you can serve male patrons only. And some of the older Members will recall that this was the way it was prior to 1959. The beverage room licence provides that patrons of both sexes may be served. There are now two and two only beer parlour licences left in the province. We are proposing to do away with the beer parlour category and make them into beverage rooms. We feel that with only two left and no indication that any more are coming. There has not been the slightest indication that anyone was going to apply for a beer parlour licence in the last ten years. We just thought we would wipe that one out.

The next amendment and this is a major one, Mr. Speaker. The recommendation that beverage rooms be permitted to serve spirits either unmixed or mixed only with water or soft drinks. We have given that some consideration. I had some misgivings

May 5, 1972

about it. But we have decided to adopt the recommendation of the Committee and that is in the Bill.

We have another provision. The Committee recommended that the serving of beer, wine and spirits with meals in licensed dining rooms on Sundays and holidays be permitted from 12:00 noon to 12:00 midnight and that recommendation is in the Bill.

We have put in some recommendations in the Bill with what might be called the New Year's Eve problem. And we have provided that where New Year's Eve falls on a Sunday, licensees may open at 8:00 p.m. on that Sunday evening if that Sunday evening is New Year's Eve. And we have further provided that where New Year's Day is a Sunday and New Year's Eve is a Saturday, that licensees may stay open until 2:30 o'clock on Sunday morning of what will now be New Year's Day.

These, Mr. Speaker, are items to provide in legislation because every time this happens the Board is deluged with applications by licensees to say that they would like to be able to serve their patrons on New Year's Eve. Whether New Year's Eve turns out to be the Saturday or the Sunday, there is always a problem and we have felt that to deal with the matter of providing that they could be opened from 8:00 p.m. until 2:30 the next morning is not objectionable. As I indicated the hours of licensed premises will be from 9:30 until 1:30 with the hour and a half in each case at the beginning and at the end voluntary.

With respect to the fines and penalties, the Committee recommended that the penalties can be increased. We have, in a sense adopted that recommendation and in another sense someone might say it is not so. We have provided that for a first offence, the fine will be not less than \$50 which was the previous rule, or more than \$200 which is twice the previous penalty. So we give the judge a good deal more discretion. We do provide that where the guilty party is a minor and for a first offence, there shall be no option to send him to jail. We have deleted the jail for a first offence where the person is a minor. For second offences there continues to be a jail penalty of 14 days or 28 days. And for corporations the fines have been increased from \$200 to \$400 range to a \$400 to \$800 range. This, essentially, for the most part, will deal with proprietors. These, Mr. Speaker, deal with the major changes which are in The Liquor Licensing Act.

I refer to Recommendation No. 8 which says that legislative provision be made to allow Liquor Board Stores in major centres to remain open until 2:00 o'clock a.m. That is in The Liquor Act and when that Bill comes back to this House, as it will I trust later this day, that will be the change there and that is The Liquor Act rather than The Liquor Licensing Act.

I think that deals with all of the substantial changes to be dealt with in The Liquor Licensing Act. May I say, Mr. Speaker, on this side of the House that we are acting as a government to deal with the recommendations contained in the Committee's report. We, of course, as a government take responsibility for the legislation which we bring forward. However, we make the point, firstly, that we are enacting the recommendations of the Committee very largely which were unanimous and secondly, we do not regard this as a matter of confidence in our Government and that Members on this side of the

House and presumably on the other side of the House, but certainly on this side of the House, are to feel free to vote on this matter as they see fit without there being any implication that there is any matter of confidence with respect to the Government. I think this has been a tradition in this House with respect to legislation of this kind and I accordingly break no new ground here.

I again wish to thank the Liquor Committee for what I think was a well reasoned and well put forward report. With those words, Mr. Speaker, I move second reading of The Liquor Licensing Act amendments.

MR. D. G. STEUART (Leader of the Opposition):— Mr. Speaker, let my first words be to point out that the Members on this side of the House also consider this as a free vote and the result of this vote is considered in no way a lack of confidence in the Government. This has been a tradition and it's a matter of individual, moral persuasion and outlook generally on this question how MLAs vote on both sides of the House. So what I am going to say here reflects my own feeling, my own thinking. It may agree or disagree with some Members on this side of the House. In fact, I know it does.

Let me say to begin with that I feel the responsibility of this Legislative Assembly is to reflect in law the desires, the wishes and the needs of the majority of the people of the province, where those desires or wishes can't do harm or are not in any serious conflict with individuals or minority groups. Generally speaking, this type of legislation I think falls in the category of attempting to reflect in law the wishes of the majority of the people of the province. By and large they do not necessarily, they don't have to conflict or do any harm to minorities, although there are people, minority groups in the province who feel very strongly about any change in liquor legislation.

Generally I agree with the Report and I support the Bill. There are one or two items which give me some concern. For example, although I agree with the principle of reducing the age of majority to 18, and thus giving to people who are 18 all the rights and privileges, and I might emphasize the responsibilities of adulthood, I still have some concern about the date. It's of very minor concern. I wish the Government would bring in, or I wish we would bring into Committee an amendment to make the effective date, July 1st, rather than June 1st. Not that I don't think that if the example of young people when we reduced the age from 21 to 19, they handled it in a very mature way, in fact conducted themselves very often in a better way than more mature or older people. There is a tendency, and there was the last time, and I presume there will be this time, for the first little while when the law is changed there will be sort of a great outburst of people who are now 18 and I presume some people who are 16 and 17 who feel they might get in under the wire, to frequent the beverage rooms and try this new freedom out for size. The month of June might be a rather bad month for this type of experimenting since exams are coming up and I just have one suggestion. I will probably incur the wrath of many 18-year olds who have been waiting breathlessly, or thirstily, or whatever they have been waiting for, for this change to take place, we might consider making it July 1st to just get them passed. It was a mother who brought this up to me, incidentally,

May 5, 1972

and I think it is a very good point.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. STEUART:— But I support the principle of reducing the age of majority to 18, including among the privileges, if it is a privilege, the right to buy and to consume alcohol legally in the right places. I have always felt that if we could put them in a uniform for on thing and ask them to defend the country which they have done from time to time we could also allow them to drink a little beer, a little alcohol in the official outlets or buy it in our liquor stores.

The other thing that concerns me even more though and that is the hour. While it's not unreasonable to say that the extension of the hours until 1:30, which in effect will be 2:00 o'clock; I think it is 1:30 they call 'time ladies and gentlemen' and they have half an hour to drink up and clear out, the effective hour will be about 2:00 o'clock. The effect, I think, of making this change in the legislation and making it permissive, will in effect be really to make the hour 1:30 or 1:30 to 2:00 o'clock. Because, and especially in the cities, the competition, if some of them decide to open until 1:30 the competition, and even in the small towns I think the competition can ignore this fact and close up. I just think they would take this chance, so I think the effective hours except in maybe some isolated communities, will be 1:30.

Now I have always been convinced, from observation and personal experience, that up till 11:30 or 12:00 o'clock, starting at 9:30 now, never had any problem of consuming enough, in fact too much on occasion. As I say this is from personal observation and experience. I really think that we are taking, that we may be doing some harm here. Especially, you know there are all kinds of problems, one being that from now on that from 9:30 to 2:30, that's an awfully long time, and I recognize that this is being done in other provinces. I don't think that should necessarily affect us here, or should necessarily colour our thinking. I just think that 2:00 o'clock in the morning, especially in the winter time is asking for some real problems. At least when the people come out of the pubs at a little earlier hour there are more people around and I think that when we change it to 2:30, especially in the winter time, we are asking for some trouble. I should like to see reconsideration given to not lengthening the hours quite as long. I am not really concerned about the 9:30 in the morning. It will certainly give a great break to those with a hang-over and it will also give a break to the travelling public who might want to move in before the sun crosses the yard arm, or whatever, but I do think at 1:30 or 2:00 o'clock at night, except on special occasions and I point out New Year's and one thing and another, is asking for trouble and that part I do not support. But I don't feel strongly enough about it to cause it to make me not support the Bill or to oppose the Bill.

So in general there are one or two changes in the Act that I am concerned about but in general I think the Committee did a good job and in fact this law reflects what the majority of people want in this province. For example, to have a drink with their meals, dining rooms on Sunday is a privilege that is available to people almost anywhere else in Canada and the United States and almost anywhere they travel and it should be

available to the people of Saskatchewan if they want to do it. This doesn't do any harm to anyone else. If they want to go into a café or dining room and not have a drink then they don't have to but for those people who want to they should have this freedom, this privilege.

So in general, with those reservations, I'll mention them again when we get into Committee, I individually support the Bill.

MR. T. M. WEATHERALD (Cannington):— Mr. Speaker, the Leader of the Opposition has basically put forward my point of view as well. While I support practically all, in fact I think all of the recommendations of the Committee, I do have some concern about the length of hours. I do not really think that, except on special occasions, I think that 2:00 o'clock is pretty late in Saskatchewan, particularly as he mentioned, in the winter time. And I think this shows a number of dangers. I know of two individuals in my own constituency who are missing limbs because of leaving the local bar very late on a very cold evening and suffering the hazards of the weather. I think that what he says about the situation of most outlets will come into the position of staying open. And I think that because of the competition and I think that while I supported the move towards allowing 18-year olds into the beverage rooms, I think that we are moving a little bit too fast if we extend the hours, the sitting hours of the beverage rooms as well.

So I just would say that my only complaint with this Bill is that personally I found that up until 12:00 o'clock at night usually gave enough time to consume as much as a person should, as much as they probably should in any event, and I really think that extending the hours to what will be a practical aspect of 2:00 o'clock in the morning is going a little bit further than what I would personally like to see and so I would support the Bill but I prefer a change on the length of sitting hours, as far as beverage rooms, with the possible exception of places where there possibly is live entertainment. I think there is a different type of clientele there. They are basically people who are on holidays and so forth most of the time, whereas the beverage rooms, or what we usually refer to as beer parlours, I think are in somewhat of a different category. I think that I should like to see the Government take a good look at the length of hours in the beverage rooms because I think that we are just going a little bit faster than what I think we should be at this particular time.

MR. W. A. ROBBINS (Saskatoon Nutana Centre):— Mr. Speaker, I should like to make a few remarks on the Bill. I am pleased that the Premier (Mr. Blakeney) and the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Steuart) stated that this would be a free vote. I intend to oppose the Bill, not that I think that everything in it is wrong necessarily. If it was not a free vote and it endangered the Government, brought about the defeat of the Government and the prospect that the Liberals might be sitting over here, I might even be driven to drink myself.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. ROBBINS:— I am basically in opposition because I do not believe

May 5, 1972

that making liquor more available will solve the liquor problem; in the same manner that I do not believe that having it under prohibition solved the problem.

I think we all admit that it is a tremendous problem in our society and an increasing one and I am personally of the opinion that simply to make it more available to the public does not solve that problem. Therefore, on that ground alone without going through in detail, relationship to the various items in the proposed Bill, I am in opposition to it. I just might make one further comment. I believe that if we could somehow remove the so-called social glamor related to the utilization of liquor, so-called social drinking, that we would at least partially solve this problem. My proposition is, and I repeat it again, and I know the Member for Regina Lakeview questioned me when I presented my brief before the Liquor Committee on this, and frankly I think it was a very good Committee that did a reasonable job. I think that if we could curtail that glamor approach, not only in the advertising that we get from liquor companies but generally throughout our society on television screens, etc., and I don't know just how you would accomplish that, but I think that's what is needed. And the other suggestion that I make is an increasingly heavy tax load on liquor, which is a luxury and we always need more revenue as you know.

I shall vote against the Bill.

MR. G. B. GRANT (Regina Whitmore Park):— Mr. Speaker, I regret that the hours have been extended in this Bill because it is about the only portion that I can't support and I feel very strongly about it.

One thing I noticed when visiting in Tokyo, there were two things really, one was the industriousness of the people and the energy of that race particularly in the factories. The other thing was that all the large drinking places, (I can't vouch for the small ones) closed sharply at 11:00 o'clock. I thought this was a pretty good practice because it meant that generally speaking the patrons went home and went to bed and possibly this accounted for their energy in the morning. And I so frequently heard people say, "oh boy, I wish I had known enough to go home last night." The unfortunate thing is that we are encouraging people to stay up half the night and I don't really think it's for the welfare of the people whether they are old or young. I know it certainly isn't to my welfare. But I am not taking this view purely because of that. I honestly feel that most of us whether we are young or old require a decent night's sleep and if you are going to stay in these beverage rooms or licenced premises drinking until 1:30 or 2:00 and expect to be on your toes the next morning, I don't think it can be done. So, unfortunately, and I will have to vote against the Bill for that reason, because there are some other features that I think are right.

There is one other item that I regret to see in here and I refer to Section 146A(2) and this is reference to the second offence where in default of payment the person is subject to imprisonment for not less than 14 days or more than 28 days. It seems to me that most governmental jurisdictions are doing their best to keep people out of jail because it is a very costly procedure and I believe some considerable progress has been made in this regard both by our Government and by yours. In this

particular case, it would seem to me that the greatest penalty you could give a person violating these provisions is to either cancel his licence or deny him the privilege of frequenting these places. I would strongly urge that the Government give consideration to the elimination of this imprisonment clause because I don't think it is going to accomplish anything and it is going to be very costly and there are other and better ways of doing it.

MR. A. THIBAUT (Melfort-Kinistino):— Mr. Speaker, I just want to add a few words to this Bill. I think I have to agree with some of the things that were said on the question of jail terms. I think we should look forward to the time when it is not left in the hands of a judge alone whether it's decided whether this person enters jail or not. I think that's too quick a decision to strip a person of his pride just for a short sentence of perhaps 8 days or 14 days and what do you do to him in that time. You do nothing, but destroy the person a great deal.

I am glad we are moving in that direction and I think if we move in another direction in trying to promote more alcohol education. I want to make it quite clear that I was raised in a home where there were 10 of us and the jug of wine was never hidden. It was on the floor. We didn't have to climb for it if we wanted it. But my dad, when he took the jug out, gave everybody a drink way down to the little one even if it was just a spoonful in a glass. And to my knowledge in this family of 10 there is no alcohol problem.

Whether we can control this by restraint is very questionable. I think we have got to pursue the education side and help people from becoming alcoholics. I don't think you can solve that by locking the doors.

So that's what I have got to say at this time. I hope we will try to pursue the problem in a different way than what we have been trying to pursue it in the past.

HON. A. E. BLAKENEY (Premier):— Mr. Speaker, I thank the Hon. Members for their comments. I think they have been most helpful. I comment first on the question of penalties and would say that an effort has been made to move in the direction indicated by some Hon. Members. The previous Act provided for fairly substantial penalties— 30 days for a first offence, 30 days to 60 days; and 60 days to 120 for a second offence. We have provided that with respect to a first offence there shall be no jail term but that the fine shall be regarded as a judgment and collected in the ordinary way and that for a second offence, the penalty not be 60 days to 120 days but rather 14 days to 28 days which is I guess a cutting of them in one-quarter. Just because I think a penalty of 120 days or 4 months for the second offence of being under age in a beer parlour is not likely to serve any useful social purpose and accordingly, we have made a very substantial move in that direction that Hon. Members feel we should move and I should like to see us develop alternative penalties and I think this is a very useful and very major step in that direction.

With respect to the hours, I have a great deal of sympathy for the comments made by Hon. Members opposite. And in considering the Bill in the Committee of the Whole to see what amendment we should consider favorably, a motion applying

May 5, 1972

perhaps to beverage rooms. Perhaps we should consider whether or not this should apply to cocktail lounges also. But for beverage rooms certainly, that the hours be cut back to 12:30 rather than 1:30. I am not wedded by any means to the 1:30 time and I am attracted by the arguments. I suggest that we should consider this in Committee of the Whole and I personally would be favorably disposed of it and I will be seeking the consensus of the committee on that point. With those remarks, Mr. Speaker, I will close debate and move second reading.

Motion agreed to and Bill read a second time.

HON. A. E. BLAKENEY (Premier) moved second reading of Bill No. 137— An Act to amend The Liquor Act.

He said: Mr. Speaker, in the matter of the recommendations of the Liquor Committee, I have dealt with them previously, in the earlier debate. This amendment to The Liquor Act does two things. It permits liquor stores in major centres, it doesn't say in words major centres, but it will only happen in major centres, to stay open until 2:00 a.m. The idea here would be that the Liquor Board would probably keep one Liquor Board Store open in Regina and Saskatoon and maybe in Moose Jaw and Prince Albert until a later hour. But I suspect in Regina and Saskatoon until 2:000 a.m. in order to deal with, rightly or wrongly, a demand for liquor at that hour of the night which is now being met by extra-legal means. Because of the fact that the supplying of liquor other than by legal means carries with it other overtones which are socially undesirable and because it has been found helpful in other jurisdictions to have one store open late, we are suggesting that we adopt the recommendation of the committee in that regard.

The other change is to deal with the matter of whether the liquor stores have to close on polling day. And here we are saying they do not have to close on polling day but they have to close when the polls are open. This is the same change as in The Liquor Licensing Act which I did not deal with in extenso. The law both with respect to liquor licensed premises and Liquor Board Stores say that these must be closed on any election day now. We propose to follow the provisions of the Canada Election Act which says that they can be open at periods during the day when it is otherwise lawful for them to be open when the polls are not open. Thus, while the polls are open the stores are closed and when the polls are closed the stores could open, if otherwise lawful to do so. I think that these are consistent with the committee recommendations and with the earlier provisions of The Liquor Licensing Act and accordingly I so move.

MR. C. P. MacDONALD (Milestone):— Mr. Speaker, just a very few comments. I should like to say why the Members on the Opposition side felt that this Bill should be referred back to the House. We felt there was a little basic different principle between Government liquor stores selling liquor than serving liquor to the public in beverage rooms, etc. We felt that this Bill should not go through a Non-controversial Bills Committee and it should have the opportunity to be involved in the debate. The Opposition I think is basically for, at least I am, for this particular amendment and this particular Bill. It was brought in to the Liquor Committee certainly at the very strong urgings of the

members of the police forces and the RCMP and so forth. As the Premier indicated it is specifically designed to control illegal sales and with that I just wanted to make that comment as to the reason it is here out of the Non-controversial Bills Committee, not necessarily because there is strong opposition to the principle of the Bill, but anything dealing with the liquor or the sale or consumption of liquor in the Province of Saskatchewan, we felt should be discussed in a public forum.

MR. BLAKENEY:— Mr. Speaker, I just want to say in closing the debate that on reflection I think that the view taken by the Hon. Member from Milestone (Mr. MacDonald) is the correct one. I think there is a sufficient difference in principle to suggest that it should come through the House. I think that the Non-Controversial Bills Committee took the proper position by routing it back through the House.

Motion agreed to and Bill read a second time.

HON. MR. BLAKENEY (Premier) moved second reading of Bill No. 150— An Act to amend The Superannuation (Supplementary Provisions) Act.

He said: Mr. Speaker, this is a Bill to amend The Superannuation (Supplementary Provisions) Act. This Act has been one which has been dealt with from time to time. There has been a realization over the years that the pensions paid to superannuated persons, particularly those who have superannuated some years ago, are inadequate.

We have had some consideration of this area yesterday when we considered the Teachers' Superannuation provisions. The ones before us dealt with in this particular Bill, deal with the Public Service employees, Liquor Board employees, Workmen's Compensation Board employees, Sask Tel employees and Sask Power Corporation employees. Those five classes of employee are dealt with by this Bill. This is my understanding. The teachers are dealt with by the teachers' Bill which we have already debated. The formula contained in this Bill is very similar to the one contained in the teachers' Bill. First, superannuates who have a pension of less than \$4,000 or widows or dependents of superannuates who have a payment of less than \$2,000 qualify. If they qualify when the table of additional allowances set out on page two of the Bill applies to them. Thus, if they superannuated prior to April 5, 1951 they shall be paid an additional allowance of \$16 per month. And those who superannuated from 1951 to 1954, \$14 a month. 1954 to 1958, \$12 a month, 1958 to 1963, \$10 a month, 1963 to 1968, \$8 a month. Again the same formula as applied with respect to teachers, the same basic formula. This is a further recognition that the superannuation arrangements with respect to employees of the Government of Saskatchewan are not satisfactory, particularly with respect to persons who have been superannuated a number of years ago. This is a patchwork arrangement as the Acts over the last number of years have been a patchwork arrangement. I know that Members on both sides of the House will concede that we need something a little more comprehensive in dealing with these problems. We are all of us, who have had anything to do with superannuation arrangements, very conscious of the fact that they are enormously complicated and accordingly it takes a great deal of study to come up with formulas which are fair and equitable to the

May 5, 1972

various classes of people involved. And various governments and now our Government is resorting to what is essentially a temporary expedient. Be that as it may I think it is a useful and timely expedient. I think that \$16 a month is a very significant increase in pensions if you are getting a pension of say \$200 or \$250 a month. Some of the people who have been superannuated years ago are getting rather small pensions. This is not to be thought that this is the only amount which has been added. There have been over the years a number of additions and I would think that some of the people who superannuated in 1951 are now getting substantially more money by way of additional allowances which have been voted than they got by reason of their first superannuation allowance. This is, I think, as it should be. We believe that this is a useful and timely, we concede that it is probably not all that it should be, but as everybody is aware not in any comprehensive way of what we should be doing. We think that this will make a very substantial difference to a very large number of superannuates. I believe some 80 per cent or more of existing superannuates will benefit from this and some 95 per cent of existing widows of superannuates will benefit from this Bill. This indicates that the Bill will have a very marked impact on a large number of people who are superannuated employees of the Government of Saskatchewan or its agents. I think it will commend support generally from all sides of the House and I move second reading.

MR. K. R. MacLEOD (Albert Park):— Mr. Speaker, I have a word or two only in connection with this Bill. I assume that we are in the closing days of this Session and this will undoubtedly bring about a degree of unanimity and concord that may not have been observed earlier in the Session. But I do agree considerably with what was said by the Premier in presenting this particular Bill.

There are several basic problems when you deal with the Superannuation Bill. The first one is the amount of money to be paid and the rationale for paying that amount. I have felt, as does the Government obviously, that the amounts being paid to our superannuates particularly those who have been superannuated for some time have been inadequate. Secondly, I believe that there is in this Bill, and in all our superannuation Bills, a technical set of rules which in some cases operate foolishly and unfairly.

The Hon. Attorney General yesterday in this House rectified one of those anomalies. I believe that in such Bills as the Members of the Legislative Assembly Superannuation Act there are silly provisions which work anomalies and hardships and unfairness upon persons who might have otherwise been entitled to receive pensions. I should like very much to assist the Government and the Assembly in dealing with these problems and these anomalies. I should like to know what is an actuarially sound plan. I should like to know what is done in other provinces. I should like to know what are reasonable and proper circumstances under which people would receive amounts of superannuation. All of these problems and many more are those which I think ought properly be brought to the Assembly. Quite frankly I am not able to do so. These studies are far beyond the resources of a private Member and I simply voice again my approval of the intention indicated by the Government to give this study. I will then support the Bill.

MR. W. A. ROBBINS (Saskatoon Nutana):— Mr. Speaker, I should just

like to say a brief word on this. We all realize there is a severe problem here. The problem is created by inflation, which pension plans themselves cannot necessarily very easily solve. I notice the Member from Albert Park (Mr. MacLeod) mentioned the fact that he didn't feel capable in the terms of an actuarially sound plan making an analysis of it and of course most of us I presume are in that position. You can have an actuarially sound plan very simply by simply having a plan which deducts a certain sum from the employees' pay matched by the employer and what that sum plus its accrual will buy is his pension. Now whether or not they will meet his pension needs in an inflationary period no one can determine. Most plans, of course, are set up on a unit benefit basis and the argument is that the employer is going to meet a certain commitment in the future and we have continuously changed these plans to say, you know, it will be their ten best earning years or six best earning years or five best earning years and we are solving the problem in this respect and we will not solve it in that respect because of the mobility of people, going out of plans, withdrawing their equity and losing the employer's portion. In other words, it doesn't become vested in them and we will never solve it until we do get the employer's portion vested in the employee and used for the purpose intended.

I simply suggest that this is something that we might reflect on. It is not as complicated as people think it is. It is simply a case of convincing both employees and employers that it is logical to look on employer's contributions to an income tax approved pension plan for what it is— a deferred wage to look after him when he can no longer work.

Motion agreed to and Bill read a second time.

HON. A. E. BLAKENEY (Premier) moved second reading of Bill No. 152— An Act to Authorize the Government of Saskatchewan and agencies thereof to Enter into certain Agreements that will Assist the Province or areas of the Province.

He said: Mr. Speaker, this Bill now before the Legislature entitled An Act to enable the Province and others to Enter into Certain Agreements that will assist the Province or areas of the Province might be called the Federal-Provincial Agreements Act. The Act is a technical Act. It deals with certain technical aspects of the important field of inter-governmental relations. It is designed to provide a generalized framework within which agreements with the Federal Government may be initiated, negotiated, executed and implemented. More specifically the Act will provide general authority for the Government of Saskatchewan to enter into agreements with the Government of Canada or its agencies in order to take advantage of special programs which may be available for a limited time to implement special programs of financial assistance to stimulate employment and advance regional development and to approve agreements which provide for flexible financial arrangements. It has been the practice to authorize agreements under existing legislation which was not always appropriate nor designed for the purpose or to pass special legislation at subsequent sessions of the Legislature. Such is the Municipal Development and Loan Act whereby we took advantage of the Federal program without any statutory base and then didn't pass the Act in order to authorize the expenditure and the borrowing which had been undertaken without statutory base.

May 5, 1972

It has been the practice for the province to borrow all loan funds from the Federal Government and relend them to local authorities. This was because for the most part when the Federal Government was offering loans to local authorities they in some cases had no authority to accept the loans. They had no authority to borrow from the Federal Government. This can result in unnecessary duplication of municipal and provincial securities where the municipal body might borrow directly from the Federal Government and give municipal securities. Federal decisions on the nature and scope of Federal programs are often made without adequate consultation with the provinces with little advance notice and subject in many cases to imposed deadlines. A particular difficulty arises from the timing of these programs and the Federal-Provincial winter works programs are a well known example and they have been over the years.

The Federal Government, in some sense necessarily, must make its decisions late on these programs and it provides a situation whereby almost instant actions are required. At the present time there is no specific legislation authorizing agreements to deal with these special programs. The agreement, particularly those involving the Federal Department of Regional Economic Expansion concern activities in more than one department. The Meadow Lake Special Area Agreement, for example, covered projects and programs which were implemented by several departments, some Crown corporations and municipal agencies. Administrative difficulties arose in part from the fact that authority to implement the various projects did not lie with any one minister. The financial conditions established by the Federal Government do not always take into consideration problems arising from Provincial financial practices and procedures. In certain programs of the Department of Regional Economic Expansion Federal grants are conditional upon the benefiting areas excepting loans from the Federal Government for the difference between the total cost and the grant. This is true of a program which is now under discussion. Such circumstances where no provincial funds are directly committed, no appropriation by the Legislature is necessary and there is no authority to accept the loan. The Act is designed to conserve time, often a critical factor in negotiating and implementing such programs by providing authority to act and by identifying the establishing relationships and procedures.

Mr. Speaker, I have here an outline of what the Act will do; it will give authority to enter into agreements, authority to designate one or more members of the Executive Council to co-ordinate the negotiations to ensure that the special circumstances of the Province of Saskatchewan are adequately considered, it will give power to vest overall program authority in a designated Minister, power to borrow notwithstanding that an appropriation may not be necessary, power to local government authority to accept loans and to enter into agreements to implement the programs even when there is no other statutory authority but, of course, subject to the limitations of the local government board. There will be specific power to ratify existing agreements and loans made under agreements already implemented. It is a precautionary provision in case of conflict with other legislation and there is appropriation authority for provincial aspects of the program, ie. that the money will be that which is appropriated by the Legislature.

This, Mr. Speaker, gives a general outline of the Bill and I think any more detailed consideration can be dealt with best in

committee and accordingly I move second reading of Bill No. 152.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. K. R. MacLEOD (Regina Albert Park):— I have a remark or two in connection with this. We have in times past acted as the Premier has indicated, that is we have made legislation retroactive or we have put legislation in which has confirmed an existing situation. That has been the case through most of the history of Saskatchewan and by and large has worked rather well. Now I appreciate that there are additional agreements being made with the Federal Government and with other governments and those agreements are being made more frequently than in the past.

We do have concern with any Bill that simply gives the Province of Saskatchewan the power to enter any agreement at any time. I appreciate the limitations of the Bill and the limitations of the Government without the Bill. While we support the thing generally in principle we are not entirely pleased with the trend. We are ever mindful that the duty of the Legislative Assembly is to scrutinize the affairs of the Government and the activities of government and any agreements made by government and consequently, while we are not prepared to oppose the Bill, we should like to express to the Government our intention to insist that each and every agreement entered into by the Government pursuant to the provisions of this Bill be scrutinized by this Legislature.

Motion agreed to and Bill read a second time.

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

WELCOME TO STUDENTS

HON. G. R. BOWERMAN (Shellbrook):— Mr. Speaker, this is like the old adage which says that you leave the best to the last is true in the case of the students that are here today in the Speaker's Gallery. The students whom you see, Mr. Speaker, and Members of the Legislature, are 27 students from the Grade Eight class at Debden School. This is the first class that has been here during this Session from the Shellbrook constituency and from the Parkland School Unit. They are accompanied by their principal, Mr. LePage and their teacher, Mr. Jenzen. I want to welcome them to the Assembly this afternoon, Mr. Speaker, and to offer them the invitation and the welcome of the House and hope for them that their stay here will be enjoyable. We hope what they see this afternoon will not only be an inspiration to them but an encouragement to them that they, when they return to their community, might be led and instructed that the trip has indeed been a wonderful one. I hope, as well, that their return home will be safe and that their journey will be successful indeed.

HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

FIRST REPORT OF SELECT STANDING COMMITTEE ON LAW AMENDMENTS AND DELEGATED POWERS

MR. J. R. KOWALCHUK (Melville):— Mr. Speaker, I move seconded by my seatmate Mr. Baker, that the first report of the Select Standing Committee on Law

May 5, 1972

Amendments and Delegated Powers be now concurred in.

Motion agreed to.

WELCOME TO STUDENTS

MR. D. H. LANGE (Assiniboia-Bengough):— Mr. Speaker, I should like to introduce a group of twelve senior students from the Mossbank High School. They have come here this afternoon they say to view democracy in action. Let's hope that they can discern some motion. They are accompanied by their teacher, Mr. Cliff Bone who is a native of Arm River Constituency having been born in Tugaske. Since they are the graduating class of my own alma mater where I was valedictorian many, many years ago, I should like to welcome them here this afternoon and hope that they have an enjoyable time and leave them with this one single thought— you, too, may be MLA but hopefully in someone else's constituency.

HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MOTION

SITTING OF ASSEMBLY FRIDAY FROM 7 UNTIL 9:30 P.M.

HON. A. E. BLAKENEY (Premier):— I want to before we move into further second readings I wonder if I might move, seconded by the Hon. Mr. Messer, by leave of the Assembly:

That on Friday, May 5th being today, Rule 3, subsection 3 be suspended so that the sitting of the Assembly may be continued from 7 o'clock p.m. until 9:30 o'clock p.m.

Mr. Speaker, I don't think we need any lengthy explanation. It looks as if we will be able to wind up the House tomorrow or perhaps tonight and we should perhaps take advantage of tonight.

Motion agreed to.

SECOND READINGS

HON. A. E. BLAKENEY (Premier) moved second reading of Bill No. 143— An Act to amend The Workmen's Compensation Board Superannuation Act No. (2).

He said: Mr. Speaker, this Bill an Act to amend The Workmen's Compensation Board Superannuation Act, is exactly the same as the number of other superannuation Acts which were introduced.

It was referred to the Non-controversial Bills Committee because the debate on these changes and the consideration of them took place when the amendment to The Public Service Superannuation Act were considered. It now appears appropriate that this Bill should be the subject of a House amendment dealing with a different matter. Because of that I asked that the Bill be withdrawn from the Non-controversial Bills Committee and accordingly it stands on the Order Paper for second reading. With respect to the contents of the Bill I think they have been fully debated in the debate concerning the amendments to The Public Service Superannuation Act and I do not propose to repeat

the debate.

With respect to the House amendments they will deal with the situation which has arisen by reason of a resignation of a person who as it now stands appears not to be qualified for pension and who given all the circumstances appears appropriate to make a small amendment to the Act so as to ensure that the pension rights will continue. This amendment of course is not before the House and I will not discuss it except to say that's the nature of the amendment we intend to introduce and it can be debated in Committee or indeed in the House when the amendments are read a first and second time, if you so wish.

With that explanation I would move second reading of Bill No. 143.

MR. C. P. MacDONALD (Milestone):— Mr. Speaker, I only have a very slight comment to make on this Bill. It would seem that this is another Bill that certainly carries out one of the election promises of the NDP and a resolution that originated in their convention relating to a certain fellow. All I can say is that at least this does give him consideration and a little justice and we will certainly support the Bill.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Motion agreed to and Bill read a second time.

ADJOURNED DEBATES

THIRD READINGS

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion by the Hon. Mr. Messer that Bill No. 110— An Act to facilitate the Acquisition and Disposition of Farm Land in Saskatchewan be now read a third time.

MR. C. P. MacDONALD (Milestone):— Mr. Speaker, I have no intention of prolonging the debate. Our position or the position of the Liberal Party of the Opposition has been made very clear in relation to this Bill, the Land Bank or the Land Grab, as we have referred to it in the past. I should just like to make one or two comments and I wish to do so to re-emphasize the areas of objection of the Liberal Opposition and to summarize the points of objection and to clarify them on behalf of the public. We have taken exception to the Land Bank Bill for five specific reasons. 1. This Bill is designed as a land rental scheme, not a purchase plan. The scheme itself is designed to discourage the purchase of land but rather to encourage the rental of land. 2. The high cash rental required by the plan will ensure perpetual poverty to all farmers who enter into a rental lease agreement as outlined by the Minister in Third Reading. 3. The practical application of this Bill will result in state ownership of Saskatchewan agricultural soil and make our farmers sharecroppers or tenant farmers, not independent owners. 4. The Bill gives to the Cabinet of the Province of Saskatchewan and the Minister massive regulatory power and control over the people of Saskatchewan. 5. The Bill has the potential for political involvement and interference of the allocation of the agricultural land of Saskatchewan.

May 5, 1972

Mr. Speaker, I just wanted to clarify and summarize the points of Liberal opposition to the Land Bank Bill. I would once again point out that we did propose a practical alternative where the Government of Saskatchewan could have guaranteed farm credit loans and encourage the independent ownership of farm land in Saskatchewan.

HON. J. R. MESSER (Minister of Agriculture):— Mr. Speaker, I also just want to make a few short remarks in regard to the statement made by the Hon. Member opposite.

I am surprised that he is still stating some of the reasons for their non-support of the Bill. I assumed when we went through Committee of the Whole last night that a number of areas were clarified to the Members opposite as to how the Bill would relate to the purchase and the leasing of land in the Province of Saskatchewan.

We feel quite confident because of our closeness to the Bill during the drafting stages and with the contact that we had, the dialogue that we had with farmers and farm organizations that it will be a Bill that in fact will remove and provide for better transfer of land in the province that has not yet been available to farmers. We have never said that it would be a solution to all of the problems that are confronting farmers in this Province but it is a start so that we will be able to provide a base from which to work from. That's what we said some time ago and that's what, in fact, the Bill will do.

There is an opportunity to, I think, to enhance and improve that Bill if the Federal Government wanted to give some recognition to it, by making some amendments in regard to the Small Farms Adjustment Program. We have consulted with them to do that and at this point in time they have still not seen fit to make some amendments so that we could in fact dovetail the two programs. We are hopeful that that may still come about.

May I simply close in saying that I take particular recognition of the Hon. Member from Cannington's (Mr. Weatherald) remarks last night in Committee of the Whole when he wished us well, and I think the Hon. Member from Cannington has seen the light in regard to the Land Bank issue. I am certain that he realizes that the farmers of Saskatchewan are expecting the Bill to do exactly what we said it will do and we assure him that it will do that. I am disappointed that the Member who just took his seat has still not seen fit to support the Bill but still continues to want to make a political issue out of it.

Motion agreed to and Bill read a third time on division.

STATEMENT

SURFACE RIGHTS ARBITRATION BOARD

HON. R. ROMANOW (Attorney General):— Mr. Speaker, while I have you in the Chair and while the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Steuart) is here, you will recall that a few days ago in Estimates the matter of the sitting on the Surface Rights Arbitration Board of one of the members, Mr. Harry Flooding was raised by the Leader of the Opposition. I undertook at that time to have this matter looked into by the

officials of my Department and I have a lengthy legal opinion from them which I think can be fairly summarized to say that it is possible that some legal question could be asked in courts without admitting, Mr. Speaker, that such would be successful, as a result of certain correspondence released by Mr. Flooding. I should like to advise the Members of the House that I have received today a letter from the said person, Mr. Flooding, which I should like to read:

Dear Mr. Romanow:

With the deepest regret I must ask you to accept my resignation from the Surface Rights Arbitration Board. I do so not because I feel I am guilty of any wrongdoing. I neither knew of nor authorized the letter of March 20, 1972 which has brought about this resignation. That letter was sent out without my knowledge and does not bear my signature. In spite of the fact that I have no knowledge of this letter I am nevertheless resigning because I believe that the effect of that letter cannot be completely erased in the minds of those with whom I would have to deal. In the many public offices I have held I have always put fair play above all else. I am resigning so that no one who comes before the Board will have any suspicion that it is anything other than an impartial tribunal. I want to express my appreciation for the honour of being asked to serve on this Board. I wish the remaining members every success in their endeavor.

Your truly, Harry Flooding.

I don't have a copy but I have read it into the records and I trust Members will accept it. That is the report and I believe that the matter, by Mr. Flooding's action has resolved itself. I wanted to report that simply.

MR. D. G. STEUART (Leader of the Opposition):— Mr. Speaker, my only comment on this would be that the letter or a copy of the letter that I tabled in this House has a name at the bottom of it, a signature— I can't say it's his signature— at the bottom is written H. Flooding, just the same way anyone might sign his name but whether it is his signature or not, I don't know. I received the letter in good faith from someone who received the letter about their surface rights. So whether he sent it out or signed it or not I certainly am not prepared to argue. I did receive the letter, or I was given the letter by someone who received it who had surface rights. The letter I tabled in the House was signed H. Flooding, whether it is his signature or he had any knowledge of it, I don't know. I just wanted to make that point clear.

SECOND READINGS

HON. A. E. BLAKENEY (Premier) moved second reading of Bill No. 154— An Act to amend The Legislative Assembly Act.

He said: Mr. Speaker, it will be recalled that some days ago, some weeks ago now, we established by resolution of this House a commission to review salaries paid to Members of the Legislative Assembly and we asked the commission to do the same work

May 5, 1972

that was done previously for this House by two committees by Chief Justice Culliton. We asked it also to deal a little more extensively with the remuneration of Members of the Legislative Assembly dealing with superannuation, the possibility of building in some annual adjustment and generally to deal with allowances, expense allowances and other perquisites relating thereto. I am pleased to report to the House, or was pleased to report to the House some days ago, that Mr. Justice Woods had been selected and agreed to serve as chairman of the Commission, and Mr. Turner, the President of the Saskatchewan Wheat Pool, Mr. Hale, the President of the Saskatchewan Federation of Labour and Dr. Koester, formerly Clerk of this House and now a Professor at the University of Saskatchewan, Regina Campus, agreed to serve on the commission. The commission has reported to us, they have not been able to deal in the time that was available to them with all of the matters. They have specifically set aside some of the more complex matters dealing with the intricacies of The Legislative Assembly Superannuation Act and the possibility of an annual adjustment or escalator. They have, however, dealt with the general matters of indemnity, expenses and other particular sessional expenses. I want at this time to thank Mr. Justice Woods and his Commission for the expeditious and thorough way that they have dealt with the matter and for their report which I had the pleasure to table in this House some days ago.

As I indicated it was not possible for the Commission to deal with all of the matters. The Commission in its report indicated that it had not dealt with some of the matters and indicated in effect that they would proceed to deal with these matters if it was the wish of the House. I propose, with the concurrence of the House, to ask the Woods Commission to continue to pursue the matter and to report at the next session of the Legislative Assembly on those matters which they were not able to deal with in their report. I do not think we need a separate motion. The motion which we moved is adequate for the purpose of asking them to continue to deal with the matters they are not able to deal with. I would not, of course, do that unless Members felt it was appropriate. I now say that I propose to do that and invite Hon. Members to comment if they think it is appropriate or inappropriate.

Mr. Speaker, the Woods Commission report has been tabled. I shall not take the time of the House to read it in detail. It recommended substantial increases in salaries, indemnities and expenses for Members of the Legislative Assembly and in particular it recommended for Members of the Legislature a salary of \$6,000 per annum, payable monthly; an expense allowance of \$5,000 per annum, payable monthly; and an indemnity of \$4,000 payable in respect of full attendance at the annual session of the Legislative Assembly. It further recommended that for the Members for the constituencies of Athabasca, Meadow Lake and Prince Albert that an additional salary of \$500 per annum and an additional expense allowance of \$250 be paid. It recommended that for all Members living more than 25 miles from the Legislative Building a payment be made of \$35 per sitting day to defray costs of attending the session when it is actually in session. It recommended that all Members be allowed to claim reimbursement at the current rate for civil servants for every mile driven from their place of residence to the Legislative Building up to a maximum of 20 round trips per year. It recommended that a telephone credit card valid for calls to and from points within the province be issued to Members of the

Legislature charges to be limited to a maximum of \$600 per annum. It further recommended that the allowance for Speaker to increase to \$6,000 per annum; for the Deputy Speaker to \$3,600 per annum; that the payment to the Premier be \$25,000 per annum; That Cabinet Ministers be paid \$18,000 per annum; the Leader of the Opposition \$18,000 per annum and Legislative Secretaries \$3,000 per annum. Those were the major recommendations contained in the report.

Mr. Speaker, we as a Cabinet, have studied that report and we as a caucus of Members on this side of the House have given it careful consideration, and we feel that the recommendations of the Wood Commission may well be justifiable. There are a good number of reasons for suggesting that there should be substantial increases of the order of those outlined by the Woods Commission. There have been no increases of any kind since 1968, a period of something more than four years. There have been substantial increases during that period in costs, costs of serving constituents, costs of operating motor vehicles, rather conspicuously the cost of postage and other expenses incurred by Members of the Legislature and generally costs of travel and accommodation. There have been increases in remuneration of people in other sectors of the economy. We all are aware of the relatively rapid rate of increase of salaries and wages because of the unfortunate ravages of inflation on our economy. There has been an increase in the range and complexity of government and accordingly an increase in the demands and requirements of constituents.

This latter development, this increase in the range of complexity has caused an anomalous situation to develop, has caused the question to be asked as to whether or not an MLA can be a part time MLA. Clearly numbers of MLAs can be part time MLAs. Those who have farms, or businesses which can be combined with sittings of the Legislative Assembly and combined with serving their constituents. But it is for some people increasingly difficult to be part time MLAs. People such as teachers are finding it increasingly difficult to obtain teaching positions when they have to spend such a very substantial part of the year away from their teaching duties. This is fully understandable on the part of the school boards that they wish to shy away from having on their staff a person who might be available only half time. Questions and legitimate questions can be asked as to whether that is fair to the students but it leaves the teacher in a difficult position. The same thing might be said of professional men who may not be in partnership and they may find it very difficult to establish a professional practice where the expenses in effect continue for 12 months but where the earning potential continues for only, say six months and the other six months must be devoted to the duties as a Member of the Legislature.

So we are seeing an increasingly difficult and an anomalous position for some people in this Assembly. I look back on my 12 years in this Assembly and I don't recall an occasion when we have had as many people who are in effect full time MLAs, as many people who do not have outside employment. I know that some of these people do not have outside employment because they have found that in their particular vocation it is not possible for them effectively to combine work in their vocation with the work as a Member. I think we also can, without self gratification or glorification, recall that being a Member of the Legislature involves very real personal sacrifices, particularly for wives

May 5, 1972

and families because for many Members of the Legislature it is in a very peculiar sense a job requiring participation by both husband and wife, which involves extra expenses and extra demands. I know that this has been true for me whether I have been a Cabinet Minister or a Premier, or been a private Member or Leader of the Opposition. In all of those roles I have found it a frequent occurrence that constituents and others felt that my wife should accompany me on a good number of occasions on which I was performing public duties. I and many other MLAs have young families, this involves a good deal of extra pressures and extra expenses particularly if the visits are of the overnight variety. When we have to go to a three-day convention and my wife attends with me there is a matter of considerable logistical problems for anyone who has a young family. So I think there are many reasons why we could legitimately say that the Woods Commission recommendations are reasonable.

Nevertheless, I and Members, I think, generally felt that the recommendations were probably higher than they would wish to recommend to this Assembly. And we reached the conclusion that we would wish to recommend a substantial scaling down and one of the reasons why we recommended a substantial scaling down was that we hoped that the Woods Commission will continue its work and will recommend the next session an escalator arrangement or an automatic increase arrangement. If this be true we did not wish to legislate a high plateau from which an escalator would be based. We, therefore, are not thinking that we are now legislating for four years. We are thinking that the proposals which we are now putting forward are designed for a period from 1968 to 1972 and perhaps for 1973, but we look forward to at least a careful consideration of an arrangement whereby there would be an escalator which would provide automatic, probably modest, but at least automatic, modest increases so that we would not be faced with what is for all of us a rather difficult and in some sense distasteful task of assessing our own worth, setting a price on our own services. I do not mean to suggest that this would not ever happen in the future again. Clearly the nature of the occupation will continue to change and we shall have to assess that but increases attendant upon general increasing costs and increasing salaries paid in the private sector would presumably be covered by an escalator.

Accordingly we have put forward to the House this Bill. It recommends not the package of \$15,000 for Members of the Legislature which was recommended by Judge Woods but a package of \$12,500 in the form of an MLA indemnity of \$8,500 and an expense allowance of \$4,000. We are suggesting that that amount be paid for the current Session, the one we are now concluding. This is in accordance with the custom which has grown up indicating that when the indemnity matter was considered that the session at which it was considered should be taken into account in arriving at the payments.

All other changes in the Bill are effective July 1st, or substantially all other changes. These changes are as follows. Of the \$12,500 referred to above, \$10,000 will be paid at the option of the Member on a monthly basis. We hope that the option will permit Members who wish to take a monthly salary effective in July and for those who wish to arrange their affairs to continue to get the annual payment ought to get the annual payment which they could get anytime after the payment. Of course they cannot get it before the next session but they can get it in the way that we have traditionally got it by asking for it at the end of the session. We believe this to be the

effect of the clause. The other changes are also to provide a payment to Members other than Cabinet Ministers and the Leader of the Opposition of an amount of \$20 per day while the Legislature is sitting. We are conscious that there are extra expenses when the Legislature is sitting. A good number of Legislatures across Canada have attempted to deal with this matter by providing for a daily amount. Judge Woods recommended a daily amount of \$35, we felt that this was perhaps larger than necessary and we have recommended \$20. The Bill provides for mileage of up to 20 trips per year for Members from their constituencies to Regina. This would not apply to Cabinet Ministers but would apply to the Leader of the Opposition. We make this distinction because the Cabinet Ministers have Government cars and we think that the Cabinet Ministers no doubt use Government cars to go back and forth to their constituencies on occasion. We should not add to that a mileage allowance but to those Members including the Leader of the Opposition who do not have a Government car assigned we think the mileage is appropriate.

We have determined that probably the formulation of that in the Woods Commission report was not the way we wanted it. They suggested from the place of residence to the Legislative Building. It may be that some Members, and I can think of the Member for Watrous (Mr. Cody) or the Member for Prince Albert West (Mr. Steuart) for example, would equally even though they live in Regina have a real requirement to go to their constituency. They obviously have a requirement to go there if they hope to continue to represent that constituency for long. This is hardly an optional expense for they really have to be in their constituency from time to time, at least 20 times a year, or else they are not going to be able to serve their constituents or serve their continued presence in this House. Accordingly we have drafted it so that it reads, "from the place of residence in the constituency to Regina, or from a place in the constituency designated by Mr. Speaker, to Regina." There is a problem of deciding where it should be, there is not much difficulty with say Prince Albert West but a constituency like Prince Albert East I think, Mr. Speaker, should probably designate the major point. Now it happens that the Member for Prince Albert East (Mr. Feschuk) lives in his riding so that won't arise, he will come from his residence to Regina. But the Member for Athabasca (Mr. Guy) for example, if in fact there is a Member for Athabasca, I haven't checked the Press lately, does not live in his riding and there will have to be some way of computing it and we have decided that Mr. Speaker should designate. Those who are familiar with the Act know that in a number of cases Mr. Speaker does make the decision.

We have in effect put into the Act the telephone credit card rights suggested by Judge Woods. Again that effective July 1st payments to other persons would be adjusted as follows: Mr. Speaker, \$5,000, rather than the \$6,000 recommended; Deputy Speaker \$3,000, rather than \$3,600 recommended; Premier \$20,000 rather than the \$25,000. That's an increase from \$18,500 to \$20,000. Cabinet Ministers \$15,000 rather than the \$18,000 recommended. That's an increase from \$13,500. Leader of the Opposition \$15,000, rather than the \$18,000 recommended. That similarly is an increase from \$13,500. Legislative Secretaries \$3,000. That is an increase from \$2,000. In addition we propose to deal with a matter dealt with by the Woods Commission and to provide for a grant of \$1,000 per annum to the Government Whip and \$1,000 to the Opposition Whip. I think all of us would recognize that in the duties that the

May 5, 1972

Whip performs, this is something of a gross underpayment, but we think that this is something more than a token and acknowledgement of the work done by the Whips, without whose work we all know the House simply could not operate in any manner which would do credit to any of us. There will be an increase of payment to the Leader of the Opposition from \$1,800 per month to \$2,000 per month.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that the proposals contained in the Bill are fair and reasonable and in the light of the Woods Commission recommendations, after the evidence which they have considered, I feel that they are moderate. We make them because we believe that we could not find a better way of dealing with the salaries and expenses of Members of the Legislature. We look forward to the possibility of an escalation, and we do not wish to build a high plateau from which this escalator would take place. So I think the proposals are fair and moderate. I think at the same time they recognize the increased possibilities and time commitments required by Members. I know that some Members of the House will think that they are too large, others will feel that they are too small. I feel they are reasonable even though they represent a substantial scaling down of the Woods Commission report. Mr. Speaker, I move second reading of this Bill.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. D. G. STEUART (Leader of the Opposition):— Mr. Speaker, I should like to rise at this time in support of this Bill and in support of the statements made by the Premier. He has gone over, in some detail, and outlined in some detail the changes, or the important changes made in this Act to the pay and the allowances and to expenses paid to MLAs, Cabinet Ministers and to the Leader of the Opposition.

Again, I should just like to reiterate some of the things that I said when the Commission was set up, that the situation hasn't changed as far as MLAs are concerned and as far as Cabinet Ministers are concerned and as far as the Premier is concerned. Obviously when we look at 155 Bills in this Session and we have been sitting, it may not be a record, but we have been sitting much longer than the average. Now when we are talking about two sessions, we are talking about intersessional committees, three and four times as many as we have had in the past, then I think that it is fair and reasonable to say that the entire situation as far as MLAs are concerned, MLAs on both sides of the House, has changed and it has changed very drastically even from last year. I think the Woods Commission took all this into consideration and also the fact that since it is a distasteful, difficult thing for Members of the Legislative Assembly or Members of Parliament from time to time to in fact raise their own wages and does bring on some public debate and public censure from some people. He was probably recommending something that he felt would last for another four or five years. However, I do agree with the Premier that while in the report put forward by the Commission they did justify the increases that they recommended.

In view of the fact that we are talking about an escalator clause and I think this is very sound and very wise that the changes as proposed in the Bill are probably more reasonable and more acceptable not just to the public but to the Members of the Legislative Assembly who are in fact responsible people.

I also agree that questions like the pensions were too complicated to be dealt with in the time taken by the Woods Commission, Justice Woods and his committee. They should be looked at over a little longer period. There are changes that are necessary if a pension is justifiable for MLAs and I think it is, then for example one situation that I think needs changing and looking at and there are several situations in the pension plan that need looking at.

If a Member were to die before he goes on pension, the day before he becomes pensionable, then the pension which normally if he lived and received even one payment of the pension, would be paid at least half of it to his widow, would die with him and all his widow would receive is the amount of money that the individual MLA paid in plus some small interest payment. Now I don't think this was ever the intent of the pension plan and so this is just one example of some things, why it needs to be looked at and needs to be looked at seriously. We on this side of the House appreciate the fact that the Premier and the Government have recognized the need to upgrade or in fact pay more money to the office of the Leader of the Opposition for research and for help and I am confident that when the Woods Commission makes their final recommendation that if they do in fact, and I am hopeful and confident they will recommend another increase for the office of the Leader of the Opposition, that the Government will give it sympathetic and serious consideration. Again the example of this Legislature with 155 Bills and 15 Members it is not the fault of the former Government that we only have 15 Members but the Government does have within their jurisdiction the fact that we have 155 Bills to deal with and even if we had 20 or 25 Members the work load would be extremely heavy and with intersessional committees I think it is recognized and it certainly was recognized by many Members of the Government who made presentations or representations to Justice Woods and his committee that they were sympathetic to a sharp increase to the Leader of the Opposition's office so that they could in fact employ more people and more research staff and more staff generally to assist the Members of the Opposition and the work they must perform if the democratic process is to work and work properly.

I think along with the Premier, that the recommendations that are made and are contained in this Bill, are reasonable and I think the fact that to Whips and to the Members who live outside of the immediate vicinity of the capital city this has been a step in the right direction. Mr. Speaker, I will support the Bill.

Motion agreed to and Bill read a second time.

HON. A. E. BLAKENEY (Premier) moved second reading of Bill No. 155— An Act to amend the Legislative Secretaries Act.

He said: Mr. Speaker, I beg to inform the Assembly that his Hon. the Lieutenant-Governor having been informed of the subject matter of this Bill recommends it to the consideration of the Assembly.

Mr. Speaker, this is a very short Bill as I indicated in my remarks on The Legislative Assembly Act. The proposal is to increase the annual payment to Legislative Secretaries from \$2,000 per year to \$3,000 per year. That is what this Bill does, it does no more. On that basis, Mr. Speaker, I move second

May 5, 1972

reading of Bill No. 155, An Act to amend the Legislative Secretaries Act.

MR. D. G. STEUART (Leader of the Opposition):— Mr. Speaker, having come full circle on this from both sides of the House often finding ourselves in different positions of the circle, certainly I would agree that if Legislative Secretaries are necessary, and I don't doubt that with the increased work load given to Ministers they will find it necessary and helpful that their work should also be recognized, and in accordance with that particular philosophy I will support this Bill.

Motion agreed to and Bill read a second time.

SECOND AND THIRD READINGS

HON. A. E. BLAKENEY (Premier) moved second reading of Bill No. 156— An Act for granting to Her Majesty certain sums of Money for the Public Service for the Fiscal Years ending respectively the Thirty-first day of March, 1972, and the Thirty-first days of March, 1973— be now read a second and third time and passed under its title.

He said: Mr. Speaker, you will be aware that under the new proceedings in this House the Appropriation Bill provides an opportunity for debate on the Budget, on the contents of the Budget and on the general conduct of the Session. It is a special order debate of the kind of the Throne Speech Debate and the Budget Debate. And it gives me a great deal of pleasure to enter this debate by moving second reading of this Bill.

It will enact into law the Budget which was first introduced nearly two months ago. When I introduced this Government's first Budget I said it revealed our sense of priorities and not our priorities alone, I believe they reflect the priorities of the vast majority of the people of Saskatchewan.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. BLAKENEY:— Now what are those priorities? Let me list a few of them. A better deal for Saskatchewan farmers . . .

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. BLAKENEY:— . . . including some new approaches, some basic new approaches to meet the problems of farm people. A better deal for working people, organized and unorganized. More employment opportunities. More support for students. Greater opportunities for all our young people. Greater protection for the rights of the individual and the creation for new opportunities for human development. Greater equality for the consumer in the market place. Some assistance for small businessmen. More support for schools and greater equity in the distribution of that support. Substantial relief for property taxpayers. These are some of the priorities, Mr. Speaker, and the people of Saskatchewan and these are some of our priorities. This Appropriation Bill gives some muscle to those, a great deal of muscle. I have no desire at this stage, Mr. Speaker, to review the full span of the new programs, the new directions which are

found under this Act. In debate and in Committee we have described them in detail. But let me quickly touch on a number of the highlights.

For the farmer this Bill provides an increase in the Department of Agriculture budget of 18 per cent. We are expanding and improving farm management services and production and marketing services. We are moving to stabilize prices for feed grains should that be necessary. We are introducing a new program of assistance to milk producers. These funds will provide for the operation of the Land Bank Commission.

Mr. Speaker, the Land Bank represents a bold new move to deal with some, certainly not all, but some of the problems facing farmers in farm communities.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. BLAKENEY:— We believe the Land Bank will help maintain a maximum number of families operated farms in Saskatchewan. It will do this by providing a market for land which retiring farmers want to sell; by providing a retirement income for the retiring farmers; by enabling young farmers to enter farming with a minimum of capital; by cutting down speculation in farm land. The Land Bank is one of many indications, Mr. Speaker, that this Government places the highest priority on preserving the family farm and improving the lot of farmers. This Bill gives substance to a second set of priorities, Mr. Speaker, to restore first-class citizenship to working people in this Province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. BLAKENEY:— We are strengthening the Department of Labour to give greater protection to all working people, whether members of trade unions or not. We are increasing the level and duration of benefits under The Workmen's Compensation Act, something long overdue. We are taking steps to do something that the Federal Government promised to do years ago and conveniently forgot. We are going to provide some warning and some protection for workers faced with loss or reduction of jobs due to technological change.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. BLAKENEY:— We are moving in many ways to increase employment opportunities, through public investment, through seasonal employment programs. These programs, combined with our earlier moves to improve labor standards, to repeal Bill 2, will be welcome by working people across this Province. People who for seven long years saw their rights undermined and their working conditions downgraded by the Party opposite.

Funds provided by this Bill will also be welcome by our students, Mr. Speaker. They will provide at long last a comprehensive bursary program for post-secondary students and other improvements in student aid.

There may be good reasons for not pursuing post-secondary education, but this Government believes that lack of money to pay fees is not one of them. After seven years of drought

May 5, 1972

deserving Saskatchewan students can now obtain non-repayable bursaries to further their post-secondary education.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. BLAKENEY:— For our primary and secondary schools, Mr. Speaker, this Bill provides the largest increase in school grants in the history of this Province, an increase of over \$13 million to a total of \$93 million.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. BLAKENEY:— Now with our school grant formula this year we are making a determined effort to bring about some equity in the distribution of the tax burden for education. This problem has been with us for years and has been ignored for years.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. BLAKENEY:— Not only equity in taxation, Mr. Speaker, through the new Property Improvement Grants this Government is taking a giant step towards providing relief from the burden of property taxation for schools. These grants will reduce property taxes for homeowners, for farmers, for small businessmen by over \$23 million this year.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. BLAKENEY:— Mr. Speaker, in one year that doubles the amount the previous Government paid out in its Homeowner Grant. It represents about \$25 for every man, woman and child in this Province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. BLAKENEY:— Let me note, Mr. Speaker, that the major new programs and shifts in direction which they represented are being accomplished without imposing any new taxes, without imposing any new taxes which will be felt by ordinary taxpayers. Indeed, we are removing the annoying hotdog tax, we are removing that nuisance tax on young people who write Grade Twelve exams.

True we have enacted succession duty and gift tax legislation. We have taken steps to increase public returns from the mining industry, but there are no tax increases for persons of average income.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. BLAKENEY:— There are many other new and changed priorities represented by this Bill, Mr. Speaker. I could mention new programs for the protection of consumers. I could mention the Ombudsman, the extension and protection of individual rights. I could mention the new programs of assistance to small business and the recurring emphasis on improving our small communities and many more.

We have debated these issues at length. The direction of our program is clear. This very busy Session, Mr. Speaker, has

launched the Government firmly on the path of bringing in its four year program of providing a New Deal for the people of Saskatchewan.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. BLAKENEY:— Mr. Speaker, I said earlier that the Budget and this Bill reveals the priority of this Government. If that is true it is equally true that the debates in this House and in the Committee clearly reveal the priorities of the Opposition.

I submit, Mr. Speaker, that they have paraded for all to see their historic, their unflagging, their unreconstructed number one political role. That number one political role of the Liberal Party is to protect the privileged, to defend the wealthy, to champion the overdog.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. BLAKENEY:— Now let's look at their performance, Mr. Speaker. The Members opposite to a man opposed any tax on large accumulation of wealth. Oh, they tried all sorts of weasel words and embarked on diversionary excursions, but their performance in the succession duty debate boils down to one single concern, to protect those who have at the expense of those who have not.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. BLAKENEY:— Or let's look at the position of my friends opposite with respect to the Land Bank.

They opposed the expenditure of funds for the Land Bank, Mr. Speaker, and what alternative did they propose? Why, they said that the Government should provide low cost long-term loans to enable farmers to buy land.

Some of us, Mr. Speaker, may be excused if we question the sincerity of our Liberal friends. They sat on this side of the House for seven years, Mr. Speaker, seven long years for the farmers of Saskatchewan. In those seven long years, did they make a single move to provide low cost credit to farmers for land purchases? They did not.

As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, the last time our friends opposite even talked about low cost farm credit was when they were promising and promising and trying to get elected in 1964. And there they were very clear and very specific. Let me quote from a Liberal advertisement in the Leader-Post of April 18, 1964. Here it is, Mr. Speaker:

Are you voting for the first time on April 22? Well, think Liberal. Here are 11 reasons why a new Liberal Government is right for Saskatchewan.

And right up there, number three:

A Liberal Government will provide farm loans at low interest and long-terms of repayment.

Now what are they saying that we should do? Don't put in

May 5, 1972

the Land Bank. Our policy is to provide loans at low interest and long-terms of repayment.

Mr. Speaker, that was their policy in 1964, when they were in Opposition, and their policy in 1972 when they are in Opposition. It just happens that between 1964 and 1971 when they were in Government it wasn't their policy.

So much for their concern for farmers and the family farm. Or let's look at their opposition to legislation designed to assist working people. They opposed The Trade Union Act, not only that, they opposed legislation to protect workers from the effects of automation and technological change. In the debate on this issue they revealed very clearly that their concern was not with the worker who would be displaced. They were concerned only with the effect on the corporate employer and his profits.

They even opposed, in the guise of opposing bureaucracy, they even opposed the strengthening of the Department of Labour to provide better protection for unorganized workers. And I emphasize that, Mr. Speaker, to provide better protection for unorganized workers. Let me make no mistake, this isn't any question of labor bosses, unorganized workers in restaurants and laundries don't have labor bosses. They are just ordinary people who need some protection, could get it from the Department of Labour, but the expenditure to do that job was opposed by Members opposite.

Mr. Speaker, like their fellow Liberals in Ottawa, our Saskatchewan friends demonstrated their complete lack of concern for foreign control of the Canadian economy. They even took the position that the foreign ownership of land was such a trivial matter that it shouldn't even be looked into by a Legislative Committee of this Legislature.

Mr. Speaker, seldom have the Liberals revealed their true colors as they have in this Session. Their numbers in the House, small as they are, are at a proportion to the numbers of people they represent.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. BLAKENEY:— I am sure that the views that they put forward represent only the views of the privileged, the wealthy, the overdogs, the small fraction of the population of Saskatchewan.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. BLAKENEY:— The vast majority of the people of Saskatchewan will wholeheartedly support this Appropriation Bill and the measures it is designed to implement. They will support the program of this Government as they supported the New Democratic Party at the polls last June.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. BLAKENEY:— Mr. Speaker, those people want, and they expect, a New Deal for People and because this Bill goes a long way to providing them with that New Deal for People, I take great pleasure in moving second reading.

MR. G. B. GRANT (Regina Whitmore Park):— Mr. Speaker, I hope the Members opposite aren't so anxious as the Attorney General (Mr. Romanow) is.

This seems to be, or at least it is starting out as a rehash of the Throne Speech and the Budget Speech and all the debate that has gone on in this House. I suppose it is an opportunity to give the public a last kick or last show of what we have been doing here for the last ten weeks.

The Hon. Premier says that the Appropriation Bill or the legislation, I am not just too sure because he was covering such a wide scope of things, puts muscle into the legislation and into what we are doing here. Well, believe me there has a lot muscle been put into the Attorney General and to the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Messer). In doubt whether there are any two Ministers in Canada with as much muscles as these two gentlemen have following this legislation.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. GRANT:— This previous speech suggested that the Opposition only represents a very small portion of the population. I should like to point out to the Hon. Premier that we represent the people of Saskatchewan just as much as he does and he knows that perfectly well. Our vote percentage may have been less than yours but believe me it is our responsibility to represent the people of this Province in total and not in any other way.

It is odd that the Government still tries to defend their action on the Foreign Ownership Bill. I don't know why they are not big like the Attorney General was on the increase in licence plates insurance and admit that they made a mistake in introducing this Bill, but they are going to fight it through right to the end and make out that it was sort of a White Paper in disguise and they had no intention in the first place of giving it third reading.

There is no doubt about it that the people of Saskatchewan do not support this Foreign Ownership Bill and if you haven't found it out already you will certainly find it out between now and the next session. There is no doubt about it I hope, in the minds of Members opposite, that we on this side cannot support the Bill before us. As far as I am concerned it emphasizes the wrong priorities. It is not a job-creating Appropriation Bill. It provides for unnecessary departments and agencies. It is too heavy in special research groups and additions to the Civil Service. The Premier said that it represents a New Deal for People, well it certainly does, Mr. Speaker. The people of Saskatchewan are beginning to find out what kind of a New Deal they are going to get from the Government opposite and all they have to do is look at some of the legislation, some of the 156 Bills, that have been dealt with in this Session.

To me there is no concrete evidence in the Budget and the Appropriation Bill of any intention on the part of the Government opposite to point their ship in the direction of cost saving. There is certainly no evidence that I could see of an indication that they plan to materially reduce the, for instance, escalating cost of MCIC and SHSP to merely take two examples. It is quite evident that they have been too reliant on Ottawa and they seem to fool themselves that Ottawa is not going to

May 5, 1972

pull the rug out from under, but believe me as far as cost sharing on the health schemes, they know as well as I do that it is coming. The axe is swinging over their necks and they might as well be prepared for a smaller sharing from Ottawa. Well, they might have got away with minor tax adjustments this year, minor in quotation marks I would say, that eventually their sins are going to catch up to them.

Now in my opinion, Mr. Speaker, the Appropriation Bill does not show enough support, either spiritually or physically, for the business interests of this Province. It is unfortunate that the Government opposite seems to feel that every time we use the word 'business' we are thinking of big business. They can't seem to realize that the farmers are probably the most numerous group of businessmen in the province, but they can't seem to associate the word of business with anybody except big business when we use that expression.

There is no doubt in my mind that many pieces of legislation, many Acts of Budget control this year, appear to discriminate against the business person. There are not enough dollars in the legislation and some of the legislation certainly discriminates in many ways. There seems to be a strong desire on the part of the Members opposite to promote the public sector and if the private sector limps along behind that is fine, but don't break your back for the private sector.

We are never going to settle that difference of philosophy in this House. It is just one of those things that we will have to agree to disagree. I feel that the less government we have the better and the Members to your right, Sir, feel that the more government we have the better.

There is no doubt about it that the legislation and particularly the Land Bank overshadows the private sector and is a demonstration of what I am referring to. There is little or no encouragement for job-making business establishments. In fact there is discouragement. Their new taxes, restrictive legislation, and too big a tax bite being taken, as I have said previously in this House. Governments, and this one in particular, seem to think that there is a never ending elephant to bite on as far as tax is concerned and that there is little or no desire to reduce taxation, but rather to keep doing more things for more people.

I heard a person the other day, somewhat flippantly say, that a certain man wasn't bad looking if it wasn't for his face. Well, Mr. Speaker, in this Bill it is not a bad looking Bill if it wasn't for the dollars involved in it. There is nothing for the cities and I think the Members opposite, particularly the Hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Wood), indicated that he was sympathetic to the plight of the cities. There has been emphasis put on the assistance to the rural part of our province and to farming parts of our province for a number of years and I think this has been to the detriment of the cities and that we have passed the point at which we should start to consider the cities in a more equal manner to that of the rural areas.

Property taxes are up. If the Premier thinks they are not up just wait until he gets his tax notice in about a month or so from the city and he will find that they are up. The Homeowners Grant and the likes of that helped a little bit, but they still don't seem to have sufficient sources of revenue for

the cities and I strongly urge that next year when you are making up your Budget, that you give this serious consideration.

Mr. Speaker, for these reasons I cannot support the Bill.

MR. T. M. WEATHERALD (Cannington):— Mr. Speaker, the Premier today rose in his seat and he told us about what the Liberals did and what the Liberals didn't do. There used to be a well known person in this Assembly once who said, "Socialists talk one way and act another." I hesitate even to bring this subject up, Mr. Speaker, but I will because the Premier brought the subject up first.

You know if we ever had an example of people who talked one way when they are the Opposition and how they talked when they got to the Government side we certainly saw it today. I remember standing in this very Assembly, when we had an Act come in which provided for small liquor outlets in rural Saskatchewan. The Premier sat in these benches in those days and his whole Party stood up and voted against it and talked against it because they thought it was politics then. Today, we got a substantial revision in the liquor regulations by the very same man.

Today we got a substantial increase for Members of the Legislative Assembly. Two of the Members who apparently thought it was all right today, and grace those benches in the Cabinet, spoke against it only about four years ago. Now, Mr. Speaker, if you ever want to talk about people who talk one way and act another, we have a pretty adequate example sitting in those middle benches right now, Mr. Speaker.

Now, Mr. Speaker, let's go on for a few more examples of how the socialists talk and what they do when they change sides. That's two good examples, one is liquor and the other is increases in legislative indemnities. Mr. Speaker, this Government has taken unto itself in this Session of the Legislature more power than any government probably that grace a provincial capital in this country. It's got a Land Bank scheme that has possibilities for unlimited influence over the lives of Saskatchewan people. It has developed a budget which has no new ways of creating jobs in the Province of Saskatchewan. It is like the old socialism that we have seen for many, many years. They can talk about how to divide up the wealth but they don't know how to create any.

The war on business will have a substantial deterrence on jobs in the Province of Saskatchewan in which it won't be a big business that will be suffering. Big business can move, any kind of business can move, but the people of Saskatchewan don't want to move, they want to live here, and in order to live here they have to have jobs and that Government over there doesn't have a way of creating jobs, Mr. Speaker. That Government over there—the only way they have of creating jobs is to hire more and more people onto the Government payrolls and more and more regimentation of the people of Saskatchewan.

They don't have any economic policies. Next year, I predict, they will be in a very severe financial condition as far as the Province is concerned because this Government is on a spending spree. This Government is on a spending spree that the people of Saskatchewan will soon find out about in the next year or two when the tax bills start coming in. We have had tremendous increases in costs in the Premier's office and

May 5, 1972

throughout the Government at large and it won't be long before the farmers and the people of Saskatchewan will be paying those costs because we have now reached the situation where people are expecting more and more, the situation which has prevailed in the country for some time but being escalated by the Government opposite. I predict that in the next year or two the people of Saskatchewan will suffer massive tax increases by this Government. The only thing that will prevent it is if we have a tremendously buoyant economy in the Province of Saskatchewan due to the improved grain sales which we are now experiencing.

Mr. Speaker, this Government has tinkered a bit with the system. And I must admit, to my surprise, that they have turned out to be a true socialist Government. They are true socialists. The people of Saskatchewan used to say about Tommy Douglas, "Well, he gives a socialist speech." And that's what he did do and then he proceeded to mostly run a fairly orthodox free enterprise type of system with a few modifications. The Government opposite is going to be a true socialist Government. They have the Waffle group which is telling us to nationalize oil. And there is substantial intervention into the land system in this Session. This Government opposite is going to take more and more power and control over the economy than the Province of Saskatchewan has ever seen. And, Mr. Speaker, that is the one significant point of this Session. This Government is a true socialist Government for the first time in the history of the Province of Saskatchewan and the people of Saskatchewan have the evidence right on the statute books before us right now. There has been some question up until this Session as to the type of administration they would put forward. It is very obvious that this is an administration that does not believe in any type of free economic development. It is an administration which believes in more and more social welfare, a division of the pie. It brings everybody down to a very poor level, that's what it does, that's what socialism does. It doesn't bring us up, it brings us down here. We are coming down and we will keep coming down too because there is no incentive left for anybody in Saskatchewan.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. WEATHERALD:— Well, Mr. Speaker, it is pretty obvious that I won't be supporting the Budget.

MR. ROMANOW:— You had me worried there for awhile.

MR. WEATHERALD:— Well, you're a little sensitive, it's all right. The Attorney General is a little sensitive. He has had a pretty rough time in the news lately. He loved this side because he waved his arms every day and called us everything he could but now he is expected to do a little something himself and he is finding it a little tougher on that side than he used to over here. He used to say whatever he felt like on this side and he never had to do anything about it. But that's all right, Mr. Speaker.

In summary, it is obvious that the aspirations and the hopes and the dreams that the NDP and the Party opposite built up during the election campaign will not materialize for the people of Saskatchewan and this will not only continue in this

direction but will in all likelihood get worse, Mr. Speaker, in the future. I think that the prospects in Saskatchewan for the economy, for people who have ambition, incentive and enthusiasm to work and get out and do something for themselves, their prospects are pretty dismal indeed, at least for the next three years, but shortly after that they will increase very substantially.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. E. C. WHELAN (Regina North West):— Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Member for Cannington (Mr. Weatherald) tells us he knows what a true socialist is. After seven years of their kind of Government, I am sure everyone, including the Members opposite, would have difficulty recognizing a true Liberal.

Mr. Speaker, they say that we defend the Foreign Ownership Bill. Well, Mr. Speaker, there is a defence for the Foreign Ownership Bill. But I ask Members of this House, is there a defence for shackling workers to their jobs? Is there a defence for chasing people out of Saskatchewan looking for 80,000 jobs? Is there a defence for granting foreign ownership of our resources for ever and a day? Is there a defence for pouring millions into industry while ignoring the economic plight of the farmers? I say, Mr. Speaker, there is no defence for this sort of thing.

Mr. Speaker, when we expound policies our sincerity is always measured not by what we say but by what we do.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. WHELAN:— The most meaningful, accurate, realistic measure of our policies and our sincerity in carrying them out is backed up, yes, verified in writing, I suggest, by the financial entries in the Budget.

When the party opposite was in power their expenditures and their budgets are readily available for scrutiny. Let's take some examples. Co-operatives are recognized as people's organizations. They help fight the cost of living. They develop leadership. They are economic democracy in action. We have increased our interest and our expenditure in this area. The Liberals talk sympathetically yet they cut the staff and reduce the vote. For Co-operatives, this is a better Budget and more acceptable than last year's. The figures verify the statement. We maintained it represents accurately the policy of this Government.

Mr. Speaker, problems of the consumer were the subject of the Batten Royal Commission Report. All Members in this House, when we were the Opposition and they were the Government agreed that it was an excellent report. The chairman was someone known very well to them, highly respected by everyone in this House. The former Attorney General was proud of his consumer legislation. The mail boxes in Lumsden had to be rebuilt to hold the high powered propaganda that went out by the truckload. But the staff was small and the expenditure was smaller and the talk was big. Mr. Speaker, this Budget puts money on the line, writes it down, sets up a consumer department. Mr. Speaker, we mean business.

May 5, 1972

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. WHELAN:— Legislation gives the power to clobber the high binders. Red faced and furious they defend him. They defended the man who is the high binder. Two voted against the Consumer Department. We say, in writing with figures and staff, that we will help the consumer, Mr. Speaker, and we mean exactly that with this Budget.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. WHELAN:— Always, the Party opposite, pleads its sympathy for labor, and yet they passed restrictive legislation. They set up boards that hardly represented a fair show for the labor man. They reduced the Department of Labour staff. This Session saw legislation amended to give working people rights recognized for decades in the fields of Workmen's Compensation and Trade Union legislation. These expenditures regain rights and restore workmen's dignity that was taken away and guarantee their observance, guarantee that that observance will be enforced because a staff has been set out in the expenditures. The figures are there. We keep the commitment. We compare our position with theirs, our record and theirs. We look forward to a political test with enthusiasm, perhaps in Lakeview, where this will be tested.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. WHELAN:— Mr. Speaker, the expenditure to assist homeowners has been increased by about five times. We plan to spend the allotment. In Saskatchewan this last year over 2,600 homes were built. Their record was pitiful compared to this. They built homes, voted much money and never spent it. We will build homes, we will spend money, we will provide large subsidies for low income people both for rental and for down payment.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. WHELAN:— Mr. Speaker, with facts and with figures, we guarantee this. Our record makes theirs look bad. Mr. Speaker, their record in this area was bad, very, very bad.

Mr. Speaker, plagued by the Federal LIFT Program and reports that recommended their demise, I say that farmers can now look forward with hope to the Land Bank. It presents a challenge, a new adventure in farm tenure, a procedure in ownership that promises a solution for the young farmer and the seasoned veteran farmer. The problem is not new and neither is their criticism, nor is it constructive. Their criticism— they say it's communistic, and there is other Liberal jargon. Foolish nonsense! This vote of money for the Land Bank is historic, is an investment in the agricultural community, Mr. Speaker, there was no such leadership in their budgets, no such challenge, no such courage. They gave us only tattered old cliches of sympathy. Our financial expenditure measures our courage and our desire to help the farmer. Their inaction, I suggest to all of us, Mr. Speaker, seated them exactly where they are seated today.

In the fields of health, education, superannuation for civil servants, in the organization of new departments for the North, youth and culture, for environment, expenditures are set out to begin a foundation for future programs. Committees to study the foreign ownership of farm land, small business, welfare will be consulting the people of Saskatchewan and recommending action.

The expanded activity in the Co-operative Department, Labour Department, Consumer Department, in house construction, in the field of land tenure, establishes clearly, I suggest, the philosophy of this Government. All expenditures, I submit, hold the promise of a bright future, strong economy, a healthy, happy life in this Province. Legislation with expenditure and staff verify, I suggest, our sincerity in introducing policies during the election campaign.

Opposition Members must be embarrassed and I am sure they are embarrassed by voting against it. To relieve their consciences I suggest, I urge them to vote for it. As a Member of the Government I am proud to support this motion. If there is a by-election or a Federal general election, I shall quote these expenditures with enthusiasm, with confidence, and, Mr. Speaker, I am sure with success. I will support second reading of this Bill.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. J. C. McISAAC (Wilkie):— Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Member who just took his seat is as unconvincing as ever. Certainly, this evening more unconvincing than I have heard him a good many times in this House.

We have concluded the study of the Estimates before us. Bill 156 is sort of the final chapter in that sequence of events. The criticism initially levelled at this Budget by the Liberal Opposition and by many others in this Province has certainly been demonstrated to be valid as we study the Estimates of the various departments. There is nothing in the Budget to promote employment, work opportunities for the high rate of unemployed that we now have in the province. The only effort in this regard, Mr. Speaker, are more government agencies, more new departments, I think a total of 22 Cabinet Ministers now possible. In short, more and more government. The greatest concentration of window dressing legislation than we have ever seen in a session in this Province.

I think, Mr. Speaker, the fears aroused in many parts of the province by this Budget when it was initially brought down, some of the legislation that was then suggested and has since been brought forward, those fears have certainly been confirmed in the people of the province when we did examine the Estates for such items as the Land Bank and many other things scattered throughout the various departments. The suspicions of the Liberal Opposition with respect to these and other things certainly have been confirmed.

In Agriculture, the Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Blakeney) boasted we have seen an increase of 18 per cent in spending. We have seen the Government in this Session, Mr. Speaker, threaten the long time principles of land tenure in Saskatchewan, the very principles that attracted thousands of people to settle

May 5, 1972

in the rural parts in this Province in the first instance, the very principles of land tenure which many of these people fought for before they came here so they could take part in this process of land tenure. They left serfdom behind now to come to Saskatchewan to find in 1972 we are seeing a reintroduction of serfdom and feudalism in the Province of Saskatchewan.

The Premier talks about what they are going to do in the field of agriculture. There is nothing whatever in this Budget to tackle the basic problems of the family farm unit, the family farm operator. Nothing whatever! The Treasurer spoke also in his remarks of a New Deal for the people of Saskatchewan and I want to remind the Government and the Members that sit on that side, Mr. Speaker, while their mandate on June 23rd was a strong one, they are making a mistake if they think that people are prepared to accept some of the major changes in land tenure that they have proposed in this Session. They are making a mistake if they think that people are prepared to accept the kind of attack on industry that we have seen all the way through this Session; they are making a mistake if they think the people of Saskatchewan are prepared to accept the kind of growth of bureaucracy, the growth of Cabinet power and indeed the growth of this Government's arrogance in ten months, Mr. Speaker, has been unmatched again in the history of this Province.

I think, Mr. Speaker, that the Members opposite, the Government opposite, should seriously reconsider the directions that they've established in this Budget and the debates and the various estimates that have gone with it.

One thinks of the powers of the new Minister of the North, more power by far than that ever held by any territorial governor before the Province of Saskatchewan even became a province.

I have mentioned that there is little, if anything, in the Budget for unemployment. It is a known fact, Mr. Speaker, and bears repeating, that the rate of unemployment in Saskatchewan today is higher than it has ever been since seven or eight years ago, when our friends opposite were the Government, prior to the Liberal term of office. The School Grants Formula, we again discovered in Estimates, is a non-formula. It is not a formula; it has not and will not produce any greater equity. It, in the meantime, has caused greater inequity by the rapidity with which the Government moved in this direction and I suggest that that formula has cost the province millions of tax dollars in support of education. Because I suggest this, that the money allocated in support of education this year is not being made use of to the best advantage, to the best long-term interest of improvements in education.

Taxes all over Saskatchewan, Mr. Speaker, local taxes, municipal taxes, school taxes, are increasing this year at a time when the Government in power, promised and was elected a year ago, on reducing school taxes to 25 mills across the province. We have seen no move whatever to implement this particular promise and as I think I mentioned earlier, in another debate, Mr. Speaker, any moves in this direction are certainly going to be nullified by the fact that they have failed to do anything to stop the rise in urban and rural municipal taxes which is going on because of the reduced grants in some cases for rural and urban municipalities, grants certainly insufficient to meet the rising costs of local government operation.

This Budget certainly, Mr. Speaker, again demonstrates that the war on business of the NDP continues and again I can certainly point out we're not concerned about big business or corporate business, we are concerned about the small business which is the backbone of the business community in this Province, but their attitude and the atmosphere created by the socialists opposite, Mr. Speaker, and the utterances of some of their Members both in this House and outside, has certainly done much to destroy the confidence of investors in this Province, to destroy the opportunities thereby to create employment for our young people and the Socialist Government opposite are going to carry on, I am sure, in this regard. I don't know what steps they can take to try and change that climate and I regret that they have taken such a short time to create such a serious climate for business and investment in this Province. There have been increases in spending in most of the areas, most of the Government agencies, most of Government departments, many of them normal, inflationary type increases I think we can say. And how has this Budget been balanced, Mr. Speaker? I think this is rather an interesting point and it deserves to be made again at this time. The Budget the Provincial Treasurer brought in has been balanced by the increase in Federal equalization grants which were due to this Province from the more difficult economic times we have gone through about two years ago.

MR. ROMANOW:— Liberal hard times!

MR. McISAAC:— Not necessarily Liberal hard times, Mr. Attorney General. Hard times all across the Prairies, hard times in any grain exporting nation. And as a result of the adjustment from those years an extra \$50 million with which the Provincial Treasurer was this year able to balance his Budget. The kind of a windfall that will not likely be coming to the Province of Saskatchewan next year. The kind of a windfall, Mr. Speaker, that enabled this Government to start on a spending spree of hiring hundreds of new staff and new people, initiating many little programs some of them, more planners, more research than we have ever seen before, the kind of programs that are certainly going to cost money in years to come and a pattern, therefore, that's going to result in taxes and tax rates in years to come, again the like of which we haven't seen in the province.

I thought the Member for Regina North West (Mr. Whelan) made one statement that I'd like to just put a different inflection on, when he said, "We mean business." From what we have seen of this Government, Mr. Speaker, they mean 'no business.'

For that reason, I will not be supporting this Motion.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. F. MEAKES (Touchwood):— Mr. Speaker, this is one of the proud moments of my life.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MEAKES:— Back in 1957 or 1958 I spoke in this Legislature and I talked about the danger of the erosion of the family farm. Down

May 5, 1972

through the years I continued to talk in this fashion. I have seen farms and farm families vanish from the scene and so when I say it's a proud night for me tonight because we have in this Budget launched the Land Bank scheme.

I am sure that it is not going to cure all the ills of agriculture that we have been saying all along, but it is a chance and it is a hope that we may be able to stop the outflow of young people off the land. We hope that it may bring back some young people to the land.

I am proud too, because the Estimates of the Department of Agriculture show such a large increase. As the Premier said, an 18 per cent increase.

Along with that, I am extremely glad that we have set up, this House has set up, a Select Committee on Agriculture to study the problem of foreign ownership, corporate ownership in this Province. All one has to do is to study what has happened in other places. One can study and see what has been happening to our province of people coming in from across the line, buying up large chunks of land, so this is another reason why I am extremely pleased to support this Appropriation Bill.

Another thing that this Government has done in its first winter, it has really taken some action on Human Rights, another subject which I, along with many more of my colleagues, talked about for years and I have great hopes that we may do something to assist towards a better society through the Human Rights Commission.

I am proud to take part in a Government that takes into consideration property and improvement grants. Certainly it is going to be a big assistance to my constituency, to my electors.

I am pleased too, with the increased cost, increased grants to our schools. I look at it and I see that every unit in my constituency has increased grants. This, too, is going to be an assistance to my constituents.

You know, one of the little acts, I am sorry he is not in his seat right now, the Hon. Member from Cannington (Mr. Weatherald), said that this was a socialist Government and I am proud that it is a socialist Government. I am proud that it is a democratic socialist Government.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MEAKES:— This is what I have stood for for close on 30 years and I am proud to see a government going the way we are going.

The Hon. Member for Wilkie (Mr. McIsaac), in fact they all did, but in particular the Hon. Member for Wilkie, reminded me of the old saying of a tempest in a teacup. There was a lot of tempest but it didn't create too much waves. He went on and he talked about the Government, that we stood for more and more government. Certainly the people of Saskatchewan last spring when we went to the people of Saskatchewan with a 'New Deal for People' this is one of the things that we talked about and the people accepted it. And so I am extremely proud that this Government is moving the way it is. It is only our first year.

I was checking over the list of our promises on last June 23rd. You know I just got through thinking that if we keep up at this rate we will have fulfilled all our promises in two or three years. I don't think the people of Saskatchewan need to worry, we'll find lots of other things to do.

So, Mr. Speaker, I am extremely proud to support this Appropriation Bill. An Appropriation Bill that will give new hope to the people of Saskatchewan.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. E. COWLEY (Biggar):— Mr. Speaker, it is with a great deal of pleasure that I rise to take part in this debate, a debate which will be the last major debate in this Session. It is with pleasure because we'll soon be heading back to our constituencies. I feel extremely confident as I go back to my constituency with our program card and our program and I look through it and check off those things which we have accomplished in less than one year.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. COWLEY:— I am going to do my best to meet every Liberal in my constituency, that should take a half an hour or so, talk to each and every one and show them what we have promised and show them what we delivered. I am willing to compare our record in ten months to the record of the Liberal Government when they were the Government, in the seven years that they had control of this Province.

Mr. Speaker, the Member from Wilkie (Mr. McIsaac) pointed to us across here and he said, we are making a mistake and we never made such a mistake as the Liberals did previous to last June 23rd and the people called them to order. As I watched that dejected, bedraggled, wandering little group sitting opposite, I have mixed feelings about us, Mr. Speaker. I have mixed feelings. I feel bad you know when I see how little they have to say. The very few things they can point to with pride when they were the Government. It shows how much Saskatchewan was short-changed by seven years of Liberal Government.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. COWLEY:— You know, Mr. Speaker, I feel good though because there is still some justice left, last June 23rd they got their just desserts.

Mr. Speaker, I look though our program and I looked at our record and the Members opposite should. I note that the Member for Lumsden (Mr. Lane) had a program card. We said we'd relieve the burden on property owners with respect to property taxes and we've got a property improvement grant. We said we'd fight the Task Force Report. We beat the Grain Stabilization Bill. We said we'd establish a Land Bank Commission and we've done it. We said we'd curb foreign and corporate ownership for farms and we've set up a Committee to look into it. We said we'd defend and develop our rural communities and we are doing that. We said we'd assist small business and we are doing that. We said we'd abolish deterrent fees and we have done that. We said we'd have prescription

May 5, 1972

drugs and we are started. We said that we would bring Chiropractic care under the Medicare Plan and the provisions to bring this about are in the Bill. We said we'd eliminate hospital and medicare premiums for people over 65 and we have done that. We said we'd stop resource give-aways and we cancelled the Meadow Lake pulp mill. We said we'd develop Saskatchewan resources for Saskatchewan people and we are moving to get more royalties from our resources for the people of Saskatchewan. We said we'd create a special department of Northern Saskatchewan and we have done that. We said we'd work to help organize labor and repeal Bill 2 and increase the minimum wage and we have done that. We said we'd create jobs and we have done that and we will continue to do that. We said we'd upgrade the quality of education, remove the pupil-teacher ratio and we have done that.

Mr. Speaker, I am going to be extremely proud when this Session is over to take back our record to the people in my constituency and I am sure they are going to be pleased with the record of our Government to date.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. L. LARSON (Pelly):— Mr. Speaker, I, too, take a great deal of pleasure in rising for a few moments in the closing of debate on Bill 156. I do so for probably the same reasons as many of my colleagues who have enunciated very clearly what we have done, but I also do so for another reason. The other reason is that we have seen, during this Session, the complete difference that exists in Saskatchewan. The difference when it comes to philosophy, the difference when it comes to how you do things.

We have heard 'wolf' and 'scare' cried almost at every item of expenditure. We have seen a scare program. Yes, we have seen a scare program that the Province of Saskatchewan probably has not seen the likes of since away back in the late '30s or early '40s. The only message that the Liberal Party has had to offer the people of Saskatchewan is to try to scare them and frighten them.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. LARSON:— They try to paralyse the Government by its fear tactics in doing nothing. Very, very fortunate for the people of Saskatchewan, these tactics have not worked. It does not work.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. LARSON:— The other very great difference that has emerged is the philosophy of dealing with people. When we have looked at the expenditures and where they have gone, we have seen the complete distinction one side big business, the other side you look at people. The Ombudsman, oh a great human cry, this man was a terrible ogre. He was going to do everything that was wrong. That he wasn't going to do anything right. Unnecessary. Enough MLAs so that we didn't need this kind of a man. But yet, the fundamental purpose of this man is to protect the little man who has difficulty in protecting himself. Completely overlooked

by the men to your left, Mr. Speaker. A very clear distinction between the philosophies and beliefs. The people of Saskatchewan ought to know this and they ought to take account of what has happened. Public health, yes, we'll tell them this summer. Public health, a direction and a move that started with the last Legislature, carried on during this one. Certainly it again distinguishes where you want to tax the sick, tax those that are flat on their backs. We have moved in the other direction completely and we are prepared to move even further. Criticism because of these humane and fundamentally necessary things for people.

Welfare, again a hue and cry, a scare tactic. Welfare is something that no one is very proud of or likes. Yet we must have it. We have at this Session tried and are going to take a realistic look at this whole unpleasant problem of welfare, this whole unpleasant area of welfare. Certainly there is no politics to be made out of welfare, certainly the Members opposite ought to realize this. Certainly when someone is reduced because of economic conditions to a level where he requires assistance, he should not be exploited politically one way or the other. We are prepared and this Budget is looking in that direction. I could go on, Mr. Speaker.

I want to mention labor particularly. We have seen the return to a sane and sensible collective era again in Saskatchewan, rather than the bag stick, rather than the threat, rather than Bill 2, rather than the threat of compulsory arbitration and we have moved in the other direction. We have come through and shown that we recognize and respect our fellow workers by the minimum hours and The Minimum Wage Act.

Education. Yes, a lot of criticism, a lot of unwarranted and bitter criticism because of the grant formula. The honest truth as every Member in this House must know is that an attempt was made to start on an equalization formula that had to come, that ought to have come years ago and that certainly is long overdue.

The other thing that has emerged out of this Legislature is the difference in the role of government today and in the role of government yesterday. People today demand very much more, they are prepared to pay and are paying, they demand more in government. We have seen the day and are seeing the day when governments are going to be called on to give more and be prepared to give more. The Members opposite say less government, the people of Canada, the people of the world say more government. Who can be right and who can be wrong? Some very great differences have emerged out of this Legislature, some very fundamental principles have emerged. I am proud and happy, Mr. Speaker, to go back to my constituents, go back to the people of Saskatchewan. I believe in the direction that we are going, the principles we believe in and if necessary can point out the difference between the two parties and the two philosophies in Saskatchewan. It gives me a great deal of pleasure to support this Bill.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

HON. K. THORSON (Minister of Industry and Commerce):— Mr. Speaker, I just rise to take a few moments to say that I am confident that the people of Saskatchewan, particularly people engaged in family-owned businesses are expecting a great

May 5, 1972

deal from this Government, expecting things from this Government which they knew from seven years of experience with the previous Government they could not get.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. THORSON:— We are pleased that in this Budget we are appropriating funds to begin the establishment of a small business assistance branch. I want to say that in our Department of Industry and Commerce we are going to concentrate on building up the resources in the province and working with the people who are here in Saskatchewan who are trying to make a contribution to the economic welfare of Saskatchewan.

Now I was prompted to say something in this debate, not only because I am proud of Saskatchewan and its people. I am confident about its economic future and I believe the people of Saskatchewan are confident of its economic future. But when the Member for Wilkie says that nobody believes there will be any businesses in Saskatchewan, I could not let the opportunity pass without saying a word or two. Apparently he has forgotten about the announcement of Inter-Provincial Steel Company that they are going to double their capacity for the production of steel in Saskatchewan.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. THORSON:— About 10 days ago I announced that Canadian Tire Corporation from Toronto is going to expand its facilities in Saskatchewan, with a warehouse to be built at Saskatoon which will employ some 30 or 40 people in a 25,000 square foot new warehouse. Today Scott National Company Limited, with its head office in Calgary has announced that it is going to build a new warehouse in the city of Regina on Dewdney Avenue. It will cost about \$750,000 and they expect to build it this year. It will have 50,000 square feet of capacity. It will have the most up-to-date of facilities for a warehouse of this kind.

MR. ROMANOW:— Gordon Grant got that warehouse.

MR. THORSON:— I guess he forgot to mention it.

Mr. Speaker, I am confident there is evidence to show that people in Saskatchewan and outside Saskatchewan have confidence in its economic future. I am proud to be part of this Government, I expect to fulfil some of the expectations of the people of Saskatchewan.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

HON. J. R. MESSER (Minister of Agriculture):— Mr. Speaker, I just want to make a few short remarks in regard to some of the statements that have been made by the Members opposite in the winding up of the Session and their closing remarks pertaining to Bill No. 156. They have tried to leave the impression, Mr. Speaker, that this Government has done nothing for labor or for students, or as the Member for Wilkie (Mr. McIsaac) stated in his address, for small businesses

in the Province of Saskatchewan. He then attempted to relate the small businessman to the farmers in this Province. We do recognize, Mr. Speaker, that probably the largest number of small businessmen in this Province are in fact farmers. We have taken that as a priority in regard to the legislation and consideration that we have given them in the Throne Speech and in the Budget and the legislation that we have passed during the 51 days in the sitting of this Legislature.

I want to remind some of the Members opposite of some of the legislation that we have passed, some of the legislation that we have passed that has enhanced and encouraged and further stabilized the economy of the farmers in this Province. I want to remind the Members opposite of the passing of The Margarine Bill which brought about the expansion of the Agri-Vegetable Oil Plant in Nipawin, with another 40 or 50 personnel being employed there. I want to remind the Members opposite of the assistance that this Government is giving to the milk producers to establish a milk manufacturing plant in this Province, \$450,000 made available for this.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MESSER:— I want to further remind them, Mr. Speaker, of the negotiations that we carried out with the Federal Government which eventually led to a Bill which was introduced during this Session which reallocated the 1.5 million pounds of milk quota that was lost by the former administration due to the negligence of that Government and that Department of Agriculture. I want to remind them of The Natural Products Marketing Act that was brought in during this Session which will allow the farmers to establish a feed grains floor price. I want to remind the Members that in Opposition we moved resolution after resolution in regard to trying to stabilize a floor price for feed grains which was turned down at every occasion when they were the Members on the Government side of the House. I want to remind them of the other kinds of resolutions that we attempted to pass when we were in Opposition that they turned down, that we have now passed in this House that they care not to recognize. This is the kind of Government that takes action, that attempts to, and I think has proven, to give to the people of Saskatchewan in advance the kind of legislation and the things that they will be doing for them before they in fact legislate them.

We have heard a great deal of debate and comment in relation to the Land Bank. I simply want to close by making a few statements in regard to that program, Mr. Speaker. The Member from Wilkie along with other Members opposite continually tried to leave the impression that this is serfdom in the Province of Saskatchewan. Let me remind those Members opposite that a good many of those people who he said fought for and strove to establish farms in the Province of Saskatchewan lost those farms in the last three or four years because of the poor economic conditions related to agriculture which their Government did nothing to correct. The Land Bank recognizes that and we will not tolerate another generation of farmers going through the hardship that they went through in the last seven years. It is obvious, Mr. Speaker, that I will be supporting this Bill.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

May 5, 1972

MR. W. A. ROBBINS (Saskatoon Nutana Centre):— Mr. Speaker, I only rose in this debate because I guessed that the House would prorogue at 11:00 o'clock, and I only have two and a half or three hours to go.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. ROBBINS:— My remarks will be relatively short. I know that many Members in the Opposition have from time to time mentioned that Members on this side of the House made specific promises. I dug out one of my old campaign leaflets and I should like briefly to go through it in relation to what has been accomplished so far since the election last June 23rd, in relation to those promises.

1. Removal of taxes on the sick, the deterrent fees. This has been done.
2. Removal of sales taxes on basic necessities for food, clothing and shelter. A start, of course, has been made in that respect.
3. Work to reduce retirement age from 65 to 60 to increase job opportunities. Some start has been in that respect with the presentation of superannuation bills in this House during this Session.
4. Security for the family farm, which I contend is absolutely essential and vital to the cities. We have made a start in this respect with the Land Bank. Some people are going to argue that this is not the proper road, but time will tell. We do believe that it will bring some revitalization to the rural areas.
5. Retention of Homeowner Grant and their expansion and this has occurred through the Property Improvement Grant which has been appreciably increased and this is one measure which is particularly useful to rural Saskatchewan in terms of small businesses and farms.
6. An Independent Electoral Boundaries Commission which was essential for removal of gerrymandering in terms of getting ready for elections. Those are the promises I put on my leaflet and practically all of them have either been already achieved or in process.

I contend that one of the real problems we have with the Liberal Party is that they simply do not learn. One definition of a conservative is a fellow who will fight to the death to prevent from passing out what his father fought to the death to prevent from coming in. The Saskatchewan Liberal Party is a conservative party.

MR. ROMANOW:— Conservative, how about reactionary!

MR. ROBBINS:— Yes, it is a reactionary party. It is a party with a conscience to which it pays absolutely no attention. I think we have to face up to the fact that the Liberal Party simply does not seem to learn. I feel a bit sorry for some of the fellows over there because I have some respect for some of them at least.

Yet they follow the same old rhetoric that has been on the wave lengths for the last 20 or 25 years.

MR. ROMANOW:— How about for the last 100 years?

MR. ROBBINS:— Perhaps I could no better describe them than with a bit of verse.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. ROBBINS:—

Here's to the Opposition
That valiant band
With the grease on their mind
And the pen in their hand.

They swear and they sweat
But they end with a song
For when the Government's right
They know they've been wrong.

They are just few in number
The situation is grave
But don't worry about that
Just leave it to Dave.

And when they depart
And to 'hades' draw near
I feel certain, Mr. Speaker,
They'll feel mighty queer.

For Dave is their leader
A gassy wee goat
But a heart of pure gold
Beats beneath his grey coat.

When the devil looks once
Turns them back from his door
Saying— keep on going up boys
You've been through here before.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

HON. R. ROMANOW (Attorney General):— Mr. Speaker, two minutes to say that to me this has been a very exciting and memorable Session for a number of reasons. From Opposition to Government I think generally will be always a memorable occasion. Who knows if the Member from Lumsden (Mr. Lane) is around in politics long enough he might even some day experience it, but I doubt that very much.

It has been a memorable Session for me because I have been part of a government that has, as the Premier has indicated, introduced a record number of Bills. They are not Bills, Mr. Speaker, that are housekeeping Bills in order to just come to a figure of 156 or 157, whatever it is going to ultimately end up. There are at least, I am sure a dozen Bills if not more, Mr. Speaker, any one of which could have been the subject of a major piece of legislation or a major debate in any other normal session, certainly of any session that I have been a Member of

May 5, 1972

the Opposition in four years. I refer to the Ombudsman Bill, the Human Rights Commission, Pyramid Franchise Bill, Department of Consumer Affairs, Collections Agents Bill, one could go on and on in human rights and consumer affairs legislation. My colleague, the Minister of Agriculture, also draws to my attention another Bill that I think that everybody in this House can be very proud of and that is the Independent Electoral Boundaries Commission Bill.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. ROMANOW:— These are terrific accomplishments for any Legislature and I think terrific accomplishments for the government of any Party. That sounds like a lot of self-congratulatory remarks, if it does, that's exactly what it is, self-congratulatory for a very good job done. I am very proud to be a Government that has launched this new ship in the Province of Saskatchewan. In 10 months, I venture to say in 10 months, Mr. Speaker, we have probably taken more steps legislatively to fulfil the commitments and the promises that we made to the people of Saskatchewan than the Liberals did in seven years or any other Party has done in a comparable period. I am very pleased indeed.

What of the Opposition and what of the future? Of the future, Mr. Speaker, I am looking forward to an Appropriation Bill next year which continues on in the tradition of this one that we are debating now, only even more so. I am looking forward to new and exciting programs. I regret that this Session does not give any indication that the Liberals will be stepping with us or stepping with the people of Saskatchewan in achieving their great aspirations. I regret that the Liberals and the Opposition, yes, I do sincerely regret that, because I think good government means good Opposition. But I look opposite me, Mr. Speaker, and I ask, where are the new ideas from the Liberal party? I see none. Where is the concern for labor or for working men, or for the farmer? I see none. Where is the concern for young people in education? I see none. What I see is the same old bunch of men, the same old ideas, the same Opposition party, the same Party that has doomed Saskatchewan to seven years of poor government, poor administration, in effect, delayed the progress of the Province of Saskatchewan.

I should say now, Mr. Speaker, that the Liberals say we should 'stay alive until '75.' I say to the Liberals, because there are so few of them that that's a good exhortation. Make sure you stay alive, at least to make sure that they come back, the 15 that are here in the Opposition, after the next election in 1975. But I'll simply be asking the people of Saskatchewan from here on in: why should they in 1975 or any subsequent election re-elect a political Party that they turfed out in 1971? I think that they could consider that question if it was a new party with new leadership, with new ideas, with new and of bold imaginative programs. But it isn't. After 10 months in Government it is proven conclusively that it is not in 1971, it is not even in 1961. It is an Opposition which regrettably does not deserve, and I am sure will not receive, the support of the people of the Province of Saskatchewan.

I am also very pleased to say, Mr. Speaker, that I am part of a Government that this Appropriation Bill represents, a Government and a team that has confidence in Saskatchewan. A

Government with confidence in the farmers and the average person of our province. That I don't belong to a Party that is going around with doom and gloom, that I don't belong to a Party that criticizes every positive measure that comes before this House, that I don't belong to a Party that goes about seeking to scare our farming people, to scare the average person of the Province of Saskatchewan. I say that all citizens of all political groups should join behind Premier Blakeney and the new Government and exhibiting confidence in the people of Saskatchewan that this Province so rightly deserves in 1972 and put an end to Liberal doom saying and Liberal gloom saying.

Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased, indeed, to say these few words in support of what I consider to be a very important Bill, this Appropriation Bill, capping off probably the most important Session in the history of the Province of Saskatchewan.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. J. G. LANE (Lumsden):— Mr. Speaker, we have watched the end of this Session, the last ditch efforts of some of the backbenchers to try and get in line for a Cabinet post, and the last ditch efforts of some of the Members in front to keep the jobs that they have done so poorly in this Session. We have heard the Hon. the Attorney General talking about launching a new ship and I think, if we are a believer in reincarnation, we have the Captain of the Titanic back with us.

We have had the Member from Regina North West (Mr. Whelan) state that he is going to quote the expenditures in this motion with pride to his people. We notice his latest release very, very obviously lays out the Government expenditure. We can't see why he is so proud of them. We note, too, that his latest release makes no mention of the Foreign Ownership Bill and we find that very surprising in light of the remarks made by the Members opposite.

Mr. Speaker, we have had, and I agree with the Attorney General and the Premier in this, the end of one of the most momentous Sessions in the history of our province. This Session has determined the direction that our province is going to take in the next four years. We have seen the Government opposite under the guise of stating our land as being our natural resource lay the cornerstone for the recapture of that land by the Government itself. Succession duties, gift taxes, Foreign Ownership Bill and the Land Bank legislation are all interlocking touchstones of the plan to bring the land of the people of Saskatchewan under Government ownership. I agree with the Members opposite when they state that our land is a natural resource but I don't agree with the Members opposite when they say that it is our most important resource. The people of Saskatchewan and their abilities are our most important resource. The Liberal Party favors a society in which individual abilities are maximized and utilized to the greatest degree. We do not believe in a society where individual abilities are taken to the lowest common denominator as the Members opposite propose. Yet this is what we have been asked to do in this Session. We have been asked to approve a planned society which will bring every person in the Province of Saskatchewan to the lowest common denominator of ability.

We have seen the first steps and a disincentive program, a disincentive to individual initiative program under the

May 5, 1972

Blakeney Government. We have seen, Mr. Speaker, the first steps in the long-range plan to establish a democratic socialist society in Saskatchewan. We have seen in this Session the Government with no plans to establish an economic base in Saskatchewan, and a Government which has deliberately set out on a course of action which will ensure an agrarian socialist society for the Province of Saskatchewan. A Government that has deliberately ignored the economic realities of confederation by bringing to the House legislation which encourages an exodus of people from the Province of Saskatchewan and in particular to the Province of Alberta, and a program which encourages potential immigrants to the Province of Saskatchewan to forego consideration of this Province.

The effects of this Session will be felt by the people of this Province for a long, long time. A Session that sees our population drop to nearly the 900,000 mark, a Government that plans and purposely plans to fight the next election with a population of less than 900,000 the first time since prior to 1960. We have seen a Session, Mr. Speaker, where all business has been under attack by the Government opposite. The priorities are not set out by the Premier opposite, the priorities of this Government have been set out by the Blakeney four-year plan, the priorities as set out in the Budget Speech are to make Saskatchewan a begging province, a mendicant province under our Confederation system under the control of the Government opposite.

He says, a better deal for farmers, Foreign Ownership Bill, Succession Duty, Gift Taxes, to reduce and purposely reduce the value of farm land so that the Land Bank can begin its expropriation procedures. More employment opportunities he's had. We have listed the industries throughout this debate, that have left this Province since June. We can reiterate some; Quaker Oats, Smith-Roles, Robin Hood, Imperial Oil. No new major manufacturing industry has even been proposed by the Government opposite. We have had a promise for three different cities, three different Roumanian Tractor plants and not one of them done. And all the Opposition is told whenever the question is raised about the Roumanian Tractor plant, is please be quiet because anything you are going to say is going to drive them away. Trying to muzzle the Opposition when it comes to building a financial base for the Province of Saskatchewan. He states a great concern for the consumer, the removal of business from Saskatchewan lessening the competition which will increase the cost of goods and services. No deal for the consumer. A better deal for the working man? Not one new manufacturing job for the working man in the Province of Saskatchewan. A better deal for people of average income? Succession Duties and a decrease in grants to many school units which have many average people in them. Substantial relief for property owners? And yet the taxes are up in just about every municipality in this Province. The only good deal in this Session, Mr. Speaker, has been a good deal for the Province of Alberta and a bad deal for the Province of Saskatchewan.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

HON. A. E. BLAKENEY (Premier):— Mr. Speaker, I will say very little. The Member opposite complains about us muzzling the Opposition. I know nothing that could more effectively muzzle the Opposition than when they asked the Member for Lumsden (Mr. Lane) to speak. No one will certainly listen when he speaks. I simply want to make one point

and one only. Members opposite stated as clearly as they could their philosophy of government. The Member for Whitmore Park (Mr. Grant) put it clearly and succinctly, that the least government is the best government. They believe that government is bad, perhaps necessary but certainly evil and as he says, that's right. Now we don't believe that. We believe that government is a device by which people can join together, join together to support the weak, to assist the aged, to encourage the young and to act to solve the problems of the people by common action.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. BLAKENEY:— I believe that the public of Saskatchewan and indeed the public of Canada reject the view put forward by Members opposite. I believe that the public accepts that our view is right, that our Government is a way where people can join together to solve common problems, that it is a way that offers new hope and new horizons for the people of Saskatchewan. I believe that this Bill incorporates our belief and I believe that it will accordingly be widely accepted by people of Saskatchewan. Accordingly, Mr. Speaker, by leave of the Assembly and under Rule 48 (2) I move that the Bill be now read a second and a third time.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Motion agreed to and Bill read a second and third time.

SECOND READINGS

MR. BLAKENEY (Premier) moved second reading of Bill No. 157— An Act to amend The Sessional Indemnity Act, 1971.

He said: Mr. Speaker, I beg to inform the Assembly that His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor having been informed of the subject matter of this Bill recommends it to the consideration of the Assembly.

Mr. Speaker, this Bill deals with a small technical problem. It will be recalled that when we had our Special Session last summer we set up some intersessional committees and it will be recalled that we adjourned the House and did not prorogue the House. We, in fact, prorogued it when we commenced this Session.

A question accordingly has arisen as to whether or not the committees could sit and receive the \$35 per day allowance because the House was technically in Session and had merely adjourned. I am sure that all of us regard those committees as intersessional committees and, of course, we spoke of them in that way at all times. The funds were, in fact, paid and the thrust of this Bill is to say that the Members can keep the money and says that the payments are ratified and confirmed and we declare them to have been lawfully paid and they shall not be deemed to have disqualified the Members from sitting or voting in the Assembly. Since, in fact, they have been busy sitting and voting and since this small matter should be tidied up and is proposed to be tidied up pursuant to an amendment to The Sessional Indemnity Act, 1971, I move second reading.

Motion agreed to and Bill read a second time.

May 5, 1972

HON. R. ROMANOW (Attorney General) moved second reading of Bill No. 158— An Act respecting the Organization of the Government of Saskatchewan to provide certain other amendments to the Statute Law.

He said: Mr. Speaker, I should like to inform the Assembly that His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor having been informed of the subject matter of this Bill recommends it to the consideration of the Assembly.

This Bill is the traditional Statute Law Amendment Act, 1972, that turns out in this case the absolutely last Bill of the Session. This Statute Law Amendment Bill takes a somewhat slightly different approach than the other Statute Law Amendment Bills inasmuch as a great bulk of the provisions therein contain corrections as a result of the Government re-organization in new Bills. For example, you will see in Section 2, subsection (2): "Upon the coming into force of the Department of Social Services Act, any reference to the Minister and the Department of Welfare, etc., etc., shall be constituted to be a reference to the Department of Social Services." The same thing is done with the Department of Finance that has been changed now from Treasury to Finance. The same thing with the Department of Government Services, water rights, water power, Air Pollution Control Act.

Now in addition to that, in other words, in addition to organizing and dovetailing the names of the various Ministers, it also contains primarily references to changes with respect to the Ministers themselves. For example, in The Air Pollution Control Act the Minister there was named. Throughout we have sought to make it Minister meaning a particular Minister defined by either the Cabinet or particularly the Minister of the Environment in the case of The Air Pollution Control Act, that's an example where we named him directly as Minister of the Environment and so on.

In short the thrust of the Bill is, where reorganization of Government departments have taken place, to make corrections in names or terms, and bring them into accordance with the second readings that we have now carried out in respect to the various Bills effecting these changes or reorganization.

With those few words, Mr. Speaker, I would move second reading of this Bill.

Motion agreed to and Bill read a second time.

ROYAL ASSENT AND PROROGATION

At 9:08 o'clock p.m. His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor, having entered the Chamber, took his seat upon the Throne and gave Royal Assent to the Bills presented to him.

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

Mr. Speaker, Members of the Legislative Assembly:

It is my duty to relieve you of further attendance at the Legislative Assembly. In doing so, I wish to thank you and congratulate you on the work you have done.

You have worked hard and long to initiate a great many new programs which will be of significant benefit to our province. You have deliberated for 51 days and have considered and passed a record number of Bills—some 160 in all.

You have approved legislation to assist in the solution of many of the problems facing agriculture and the family farm, such as the Land Bank Act which ease the transfer of land from one generation to the next and will facilitate the entry of younger men into farming.

To assist the producers of livestock, you have extended the Livestock Loans Guarantee Act, approved legislation to assist in the construction of veterinary clinics and make provision for veterinary inspection of all feeder cattle and hogs sold at auction.

You have approved new laws to improve consumer protection and enhance individual rights.

These include an Act to establish a Human Rights Commission, an Act to provide for an Ombudsman, legislation to establish a new Department of Consumer Affairs, and measures to give greater protection to consumers in their credit transactions.

As well, you have recognized the increased responsibility given to young people by lowering the age of majority to 18.

You have taken important steps designed to enable the Government to respond more efficiently to the needs and aspirations of the people of Saskatchewan.

These include legislation to set up six new departments and agencies:

The Department of Continuing Education to give greater focus to the need for adult education;

The Department of Culture and Youth which will lend support to cultural organizations in our province, while giving added recognition to the more important role of youth in our society;

The Department of Consumer Affairs;

The Human Resources Development Agency which will assist disadvantaged segments of our society to fashion their own solutions to the problems they face.

For the people of the North, whose needs and way of life often differ from the rest of the province, you have approved legislation to set up a Department of Northern Saskatchewan.

And you have passed legislation to set up a Department of Environment to give leadership in the protection of the environment.

A number of bills have been considered and passed by you in the field of education, including legislation to increase aid to students and to expand student bursaries.

You have approved a new Trade Union Act, restoring many important rights to working people. And you have taken steps to raise benefits under The Workmen's Compensation Act.

May 5, 1972

By approving a major expansion in benefits under The Automobile Accident Insurance Act, you have kept Saskatchewan in the vanguard of no-fault accident insurance.

The Property Improvement Grants program, approved by you in this Session, will result in a more equitable distribution of the tax burden, as will the new Succession Duty and Gift Tax Acts. By amending The Education and Health Tax Act, you have removed the five per cent tax on meals of a value of \$2.50 or less.

You have established an Urban Advisory Commission to give leadership in dealing with the increasingly complex problems associated with urban centres.

You have approved funds to extend the opportunity for summer employment to an increased number of people, particularly young people, through the Provincial Employment Program.

By the passage of amendments to various superannuation acts, you have given additional and much needed benefits to a large number of retired public servants.

The fixing of constituency boundaries has been removed from the influence of partisan politics by the establishment of an Independent Electoral Boundaries Commission.

In an effort to provide more opportunity for the people of Saskatchewan to participate in the decisions of Government, you have established a record number of intersessional legislative committees— on welfare, agriculture, small business and changes in the liquor regulations.

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

In taking leave of you, I thank you for the manner in which you have devoted your energies to the activities of the Session and wish you the blessing of Providence.

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

Mr. Speaker, and Members of the Legislative Assembly:

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