

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN
Third Session — Seventeenth Legislature
14th Day

Tuesday, February 13, 1973.

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

WELCOME TO STUDENTS

Mr. W.A. Robbins (Saskatoon Nutana Centre): — Mr. Speaker, I should like to introduce to you and to the Members of this Assembly through you, some 40 to 50 students from Holliston Elementary School in Saskatoon. They are seated in the east gallery behind me. They are accompanied by their teacher, Mr. Larry Laczki. They made the trip by bus and their bus driver is Mr. Fred Myers. I am sure that all Members of the Assembly wish this group of students an educational and meaningful day in this Assembly and a pleasant trip home.

Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. A. Matsalla: (Canora) — Mr. Speaker, through you I should like to take this opportunity to introduce to this House a fine group of 86 young men and women, Air Cadets and Grade Twelve students from the Canora Composite High School, located in my constituency.

The Air Cadets, who are not in uniform on this occasion, and some of the Grade Twelve students are seated in the Speaker's Gallery. The other Grade Twelve students are seated in the west gallery. I have a special interest in this group because my daughter Marianne is amongst them. They arrived in the city very early this morning to visit several of the points of interest in the Capital City, prior to coming here.

It might be interesting to the House that in the Air Cadet group there are 17 girls. This is the first year that girls participated in the Air Cadet program. And I am informed by their squadron leader that they are enjoying the program and are doing very well in it.

Accompanying the student group, I should like to introduce the teachers, Vie Schigol, Ken Rolheiser and Ken Graham. And representing the Kiwanians who helped sponsor this trip, we have Mr. and Mrs. John Jangula, the bus drivers Messrs. Len Hrywkiw and Paul Dereniwski are also with us. In your behalf, Mr. Speaker, and that of the Members of this House I want to extend a warm welcome to our young guests with the hope that they have an enjoyable and informative day as well as a safe and comfortable trip home.

Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. W.E. Smishek (Regina North East): — Mr. Speaker, I should like to introduce to you and to the Members of the Legislature a group of 26 students from the Wetmore School. They are a Grade Eight class and are accompanied by their teacher, Mr. George Achtymichuk, who is also the vice-principal of the school. They are seated in the Speaker's

Gallery. I extend to them a warm welcome and express the hope that their afternoon with us will be educational, informative and that they will have some memories of their visit to the Legislature.

Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. D.H. Lange (Assiniboia-Bengough): — Mr. Speaker, on behalf of Mr. Pepper, the Member for the Weyburn constituency and Cy MacDonald, the Member for Milestone constituency, I should like to welcome 28 Grade Eight students from Ogema School. They are situated in the west gallery and are accompanied by their teacher, Mrs. Iverson. It is not often that a group of students comes to the Legislative Assembly and is represented by three MLAs. This occurs as a result of Ogema being situated in one of the many corners of the Assiniboia-Bengough constituency. I have no doubt that their experience this afternoon, with Members of the Legislative Assembly, will be anything less than mind-bending.

Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

QUESTIONS

HEARING AID COSTS

Mr. G.B. Grant (Whitmore Park): — Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day I should like to direct a question to the Hon. Minister of Health (Mr. Smishek). In last evening's Leader-Post there is an article reporting the comments of a hearing aid dealer and in that article there were some suggested figures of the cost of hearing aids being proposed by the Government. I should like to have the Minister's comment on these figures which seemed pretty high to me. And, secondly, if the Minister has met with the hearing aid dealers and when such a meeting was held.

Hon. W.E. Smishek (Minister of Public Health): — Mr. Speaker, I agree with the Hon. Member for Whitmore Park that the figures quoted in the Leader-Post yesterday are extremely high. I don't know where the vice-president of the Hearing Aid Dealers' Association got those figures. They are certainly not our figures. Perhaps those are figures, that is, the cost of hearing aids when they are sold through the hearing aid dealers.

I can't say where he got those figures. If he is assuming that the cost of the hearing aid instruments is going to cost what is included in the Estimate, then I am afraid the gentleman is jumping to conclusions. I have one comment to make in regard to his statement which says that he hopes that it is not the intention of the Government to put the hearing aid dealers out of business. I agree with that statement it is not the intention of the Government to do that.

In answer to when we had met with the hearing aid dealers, I met with some of the officers of their association about ten days ago, where we had a discussion about hearing aids and I have also given them an undertaking that when the Government is ready to discuss our program, we will meet with the hearing aid dealers.

ADJOURNED DEBATES

BUDGET DEBATE

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

Mr. B.M. Dyck (Saskatoon City Park): — Mr. Speaker, before I move into the Budget proper, might I make a few observations.

I want to say that I was very disturbed to hear the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Steuart) criticize the Legislative Committee on Business Firms. I was very disturbed, Mr. Speaker, because I am a member of that committee and I know the enthusiastic response that we obtained from business people all across this entire province.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Dyck: — But the Leader of the Opposition was critical and he said words to the effect that these committees serve little useful purpose. He said these words when the Business Committee Report hasn't even been tabled in this House, Mr. Speaker. Comments like this simply serve to undermine the public confidence in the committee system. It is unfortunate that comments like this have to be made particularly by the Hon. Leader of the Opposition, and other Members of the Opposition have made some comments with respect to certain Members taking advantage of these committees.

Such irresponsible, unsubstantiated allegations hurt everyone in this Assembly.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Dyck: — Mr. Speaker, I will refrain at this time from commenting further on the merits of committees in obtaining the opinions of people. But I want to serve notice to the Leader of the Opposition and some of his colleagues right now that if they wish to debate the merits and validity of these committees, I am sure the Members on this side of the House would be more than happy to accommodate them.

Mr. Speaker, in rising to speak in support of this Budget, I wish to firstly congratulate the Hon. Minister of Finance (Mr. Cowley) for his excellent presentation. I know it was a proud personal moment for him when he rose to deliver his first Budget Address since being asked into the Cabinet. I know that all Members of this Assembly and all the people of Saskatchewan were equally proud of, not only his delivery, but also of the Budget itself.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Dyck: — It is a people's Budget, Mr. Speaker, once again we, on this side of the House, have honored a commitment made to the people of Saskatchewan.

Unlike our colleagues in Opposition, who continually found themselves in public disfavor because of their inability to relate to the needs of people, we on this side of the House, have been able to recognize those same needs, and we fulfilled those needs by having the courage and foresight to bring forward the necessary programs and policies to build a better economic and social climate in the Province of Saskatchewan.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Dyck: — Mr. Speaker, I sympathize with the financial critic, the Hon. Member for Albert Park (Mr. MacLeod), for finding himself in a position where, regardless of what he feels, he deems it necessary to criticize and condemn this document. I am sure the credibility rating of the Liberal Party would have been enhanced considerably had they displayed more courage in their reactions.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Dyck: — Mr. Speaker, the doom and gloom boys in the Liberal Party are once again helping to drive the final nail into their coffin by criticizing for the sake of criticism.

They would have you believe that we have failed, and failed miserably in our attempts to fulfil our commitments. Yet, the people know, the people appreciate and the people agree with the course of action we have chosen for this great province. And as a Government we respond to this public enthusiasm with positive programs and policies. This point is clearly shown when one looks at this latest Budget.

Before offering some personal views on the Budget itself, and since this is my first opportunity, Mr. Speaker, to participate in this debate on the air, may I make some comments with respect to the Saskatoon City Park constituency which I represent in this Assembly.

May I take this opportunity to thank the many people of Saskatoon City Park who supported me and worked so hard and tirelessly and painstakingly for me during this election campaign.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Dyck: — Over the years I have been involved in a number of different capacities, in a number of different elections, both provincial and federal. But never have I been associated with an election campaign where there was such a large and enthusiastic involvement and participation from people of all walks of life; working people, professional people, housewives and young people. I am proud and pleased to be associated with these fine men and women. I am proud and pleased to represent them and the constituency of Saskatoon City Park in this Assembly.

During the election campaign of 1971, three major issues emerged in City Park. Firstly, there was the problem of high property taxes which skyrocketed in the years immediately before 1971. There was the problem of completely inadequate housing

for our senior citizens. And during the campaign, I personally witnessed some of the difficult conditions in which many of our senior people live. Finally, there was the problem of inadequate recreational facilities, and the many people I talked to, made specific reference to the needs for an enclosed ice rink in my constituency.

At the outset, Mr. Speaker, I should like to take a moment to talk about these three issues. First of all, Mr. Speaker, what is the record of the previous administration in the area of property tax for education?

Let us turn to the city of Saskatoon. In 1964 the Saskatoon Board of Education raised \$6,279,000 for education. In 1970, just six years later, six Liberal years later, the amount of tax collected for education had skyrocketed to \$12,973,000 for education. A doubling of the taxes for education in just six short years.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Dyck: — The per capita tax rate went from \$56 per person, per year, to \$99 per person, per year and the mill rate went from 41.47 mills in 1964 to 46.03 mills in 1970. Now, Mr. Speaker, one of the major promises that our party made during the recent election, was to relieve the heavy burden of taxes from the home owner, from the farmer and from the small businessman. We said that we were going to reduce the property taxes to an average of 25 mills. That, Mr. Speaker, is just exactly what we did.

Mr. Speaker, let me make myself perfectly clear on this point. We did not say that the total taxes would be reduced. We did say that they would be shifted from the property owner to a tax base related to the ability to pay.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Dyck: — We said that the Property Improvement Grant Program would accomplish this by making direct payments to the property taxpayer.

Last year the Government of Saskatchewan increased the moneys for this program from \$11 million to \$23 million. This year it will be increased from \$23 million to \$35 million. Last year a farmer could qualify for a grant of a maximum of \$195; businessmen \$130; a home owner for \$78. This will again be raised, so that the home owner will now qualify for a grant as high as \$144, and this will surely provide much needed tax relief. A business firm can now qualify for a grant of \$180 and a farmer as much as \$270 per year. The tax on property is not the right tax to finance education. It is not the right tax because it is basically a regressive tax, it is not based on the ability to pay.

In the past, this position has been supported by the Saskatchewan Federation of Labour, by the Saskatchewan Teachers' Federation, by the Saskatchewan section of the Farmers' Union, by the Saskatchewan Chamber of Commerce and by the Saskatchewan School Trustees Association and by others.

I am pleased that our Government has taken some positive

action to shift taxes based on the ability to pay. To shift it off the home owner and onto other taxes. So that now increased revenues will be obtained from other sources, from sources related to income, from increased levies on corporations and increased royalties. This tax shift was another promise made to the electorate in 1971. This tax shift is another promise that was kept.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Dyck: — I want to cover, Mr. Speaker, the two other areas that I mentioned in my preamble, the areas of the need for more assistance to senior citizens and the need for more assistance for the development of recreational facilities.

I want to say, Mr. Speaker, how pleased I am that the Budget included a number of programs involving the senior people of our province. The Province of Saskatchewan has a higher percentage of senior citizens than any other province in Canada and I am informed that 60 per cent have no other source of income than their minimal pension of \$150 per month.

This less than subsistence income is readily apparent when one visits with these people in their homes. During the course of my campaign and subsequently, I have had occasion to call on many homes, including those of our senior people.

Some of these dwellings are very small and cramped and one room may serve as a bedroom, a kitchen and a sitting room, with the bathroom down the hall. I say that a society that continues to permit senior citizens to live in conditions such as this, is a society that is heading for trouble.

I was very pleased, Mr. Speaker, when the Minister of Municipal Affairs, Mr. Wood, announced recently that a new 120-unit senior citizen accommodation would be built in Saskatoon City Park constituency. This structure valued at approximately \$1.4 million will be built at the corner of 24th Street and 6th Avenue. I understand clearing of the site has already been accomplished and the project is expected to be completed and ready for occupancy later this year.

This project will be financed by a 20 per cent grant from the Department of Municipal Affairs, a 5 per cent grant from the city of Saskatoon and a loan from CMHC. Any operating deficits will be shared on the same ratio. Mr. Speaker, this project will solve in part the housing problem for senior people, but it does not solve it completely. I am sure that the creation of the Housing Corporation by the present administration will go a long way toward eventual solution to this very pressing need. Under the Senior Citizens Assistance Program grants up to \$500 will be made available for renovations or repairs to dwellings. Although, this program does not solve all the problems, it is a program that will be greatly welcomed by this group of people.

Another expenditure in the Budget involves a direct payment to people in Level III care homes of \$144 per month. In addition \$54 per month will be paid directly to people in Level II care homes. These, Mr. Speaker, are commendable and worthy programs and they are in the right direction for the right people.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Dyck: — We have seen organizations involving senior people develop in the last few years and I wish them much success. Because they are organized, I feel that in the future their opinions and their knowledge and their experience should be sought in the development of senior citizen accommodation and the development of recreational facilities and so on. I intend, Mr. Speaker, therefore to work in support of these groups.

Mr. Speaker, I had the pleasure in December of last year to participate along with many others in the official opening of the Archibald Park Rink in the constituency of Saskatoon City Park. This is a very unique project, Mr. Speaker. It is unique because the initiatives for the project came from the people of the surrounding community. It was unique because it involved the co-operative effort between the local people, the city of Saskatoon and the Government of Saskatchewan. On the platform that night at the official opening was His Worship Mayor Sears, Mr. Peter Zakreski, president of the Archibald Park Rink Association, representatives from the Saskatoon Kinsmen Club and officials from the Saskatoon Minor Hockey Association and there were others.

Each and everyone of these had a role to play in the organization of this fine project, and may I, Mr. Speaker, take this opportunity to congratulate everyone on a job well done.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Dyck: — I do not have to mention to the people of Saskatoon about the need for more recreational facilities in general and an enclosed ice rink in particular.

The community is not only richer because of the covered rink but it is richer because it has brought the community together. It brought the community together to get a job done and they got that job done. The result is not only a fine winter facility but a facility that can be used the year round for a variety of planned activities.

It is of real significance, Mr. Speaker, that the Budget for the Department of Industry and Commerce is greatly increased. And it was greatly increased in order to provide the much needed staff in the areas of marketing, product research and management services.

It provides for a completely different approach to the development of industry in this province. It includes the small and medium sized business firms. It includes public enterprise, particularly in the areas of resource development.

In this era of sophisticated technology, Mr. Speaker, it is not enough merely to attempt to 'woo' capital from abroad in large single investments. On the contrary, it is necessary to plan, to provide statistics on costs, transportation facilities, availability of power, of trained personnel and a spectrum of other data that is necessary in order to make sound investment decisions.

I believe that the Opposition deserves to be soundly criticized for the real downgrading of this very important Department of Government, the Department of Industry and Commerce.

February 13, 1973

This downgrading resulted in one of the major failures of the previous administration, the failure to develop industry and create jobs.

On my trip around the province recently, I spoke to a large number of small and medium-sized business firms. They talked to me about a number of their problems.

There is the problem of shortage of capital of various types. The problem of high interest rates. The problem of the large corporation moving in. The problem of lack of management services that would assist in the operation of their business.

These services in the past were just never offered through the Department of Industry and Commerce, because the previous administration believed solely in large inputs of capital coming in from across the line. The previous administration completely forgot about the small and medium-sized business firms in this province and the services that they require. Well, that has all ended.

The Department of Industry and Commerce is presently working on a program that will have business representatives out in the field talking with business people. Talking with people about their managerial problems, talking with them about their opportunities.

I think the small and medium-sized business sector will welcome the services of these business representatives. These reps will function very similarly to the Agricultural Representative service in the Department of Agriculture which most people are very familiar with.

One of the problems in the industrial development of this province is the matter of identifying clearly what products can be produced on this market and sold in the province or elsewhere. In other words, what products can be produced economically. I think it will be a large responsibility of the Research Section of the Department of Industry and Commerce to identify these areas where investments can take place and new products can be developed, manufactured and sold. For too long, small and medium-sized business firms across this province have been ignored. I know they appreciate the opportunity to discuss with our Committee on Business some of their ideas, some of their hopes for the future and some of their concerns.

Mr. Speaker, this Budget offers something for everybody. It is a positive document which recognizes several problems which exist within our boundaries and provides the necessary funding to solve them.

When we vote later in this Session on this Budget, I hope the people of Saskatchewan will watch with interest which Members rise in support of it. Members opposite, I am sure will be faced with their 'moment of truth'.

Do they vote against it to reaffirm their oath of allegiance to their corporate enterprise friends, or do they end their facade and support this Government in a sincere effort to build the type of society which we have always dreamed of.

This Government's commitment to build upon the agricultural industry and bring in programs which will promote greater

viability on family farms is a wise choice.

The development of the west came decades ago and was the result of a well articulated Federal policy calling on this part of Canada to produce to meet the food needs of the rest of the nation and other parts of the world.

Our forefathers met that challenge, satisfied the need and in the process built up a lifestyle which is unique and valuable by any standards. It is because of these factors that we, as a Government must do everything in our power to protect and strengthen this way of life.

This Budget pays homage to that philosophy. \$20 million for Land Bank operations. \$2 million for grants aimed at encouraging livestock production. Another \$15 million for a new loan program called FarmStart to encourage younger farmers to diversify into livestock.

That, Mr. Speaker, is only one of the major thrusts contained in this Budget. Major emphasis on resource development, reforestation programs, oil exploration and environmental studies form the basis for bold new thrusts in these areas.

In the field of Industry and Commerce the Budget clearly shows where our priorities are by the active promotion of secondary industry.

In the field of education, expenditures on our continuing education program will total \$64.8 million. Student loans have been increased by close to 35 per cent. Further funds for the expansion of the four pilot projects for community colleges, and for six kindergarten pilot projects are provided.

Are these good programs going to be opposed by our Liberal friends?

Time does not permit one to detail all the aspects of this vitally important document. Other speakers have alluded to the dynamic strides this Government is taking to improve health services, social services, housing and employment.

Mr. Speaker, it doesn't matter how you look at this Budget or how you analyze it. How you pick it apart, it still comes out the same. This is a good Budget, this is a just Budget, this is a Budget which deserves the support of all Members of this Assembly.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Dyck: — A vote against this Budget is a vote against social and economic progress in the great Province of Saskatchewan. I am confident, Mr. Speaker, that Members concerned as they should be, with improving the quality of life for our people will speak out in support of this Budget.

Mr. Speaker, obviously I will be supporting the motion.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. E.C. Whelan (Regina North West): — Mr. Speaker, it is an honor

to be associated with the vigorous, energetic people who make up the population of Saskatchewan's largest urban constituency, Regina North West.

Mr. Speaker, I consider it a privilege to speak for them in this debate on the floor of this Legislature.

This year, during the month of March, the City of Regina plays host to the Silver Broom World Curling competition. If held on the North American continent, it should be held in the Province of Saskatchewan, for Saskatchewan is the curling cradle of Canada. Curling has become a symbol of community activity. Community activity has built curling rinks, has developed this winter recreational activity to a point where young children and men and women of all ages participate in the game.

The all-out interest in this winter sport has resulted in Saskatchewan producing Canada's and the World's best curlers. This province, as a result, Mr. Speaker, has won time after time, the High School Boys' Curling Championship, the Ladies' Championship, the Brier — symbolic of the Canadian Men's Championship, and on a number of occasions, the World Championship. Names that have brought fame to this province over and over again on the world scene, such as "the Campbells" and "the Richardsons", have become household words in Saskatchewan.

As host to these world curlers, I think it would be proper, Mr. Speaker, to invite our visitors, our guests, to the floor of this Legislature. I would propose that the Government ask you, as the Speaker of the House, to name a committee of Members from both sides to work with those who are closely associated with curling in the province to make arrangements with this Legislature to adjourn, to hold in abeyance our other business long enough one day to recognize those who have made curling Saskatchewan's winter pastime.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Whelan: — Mr. Speaker, there is another group that I think merit recognition. This group celebrates one hundred years as a police force in the province and in this country. I am referring to the Royal Canadian Mounted Police Force. I raise this matter, Mr. Speaker, because they have been the main police force in this province for many years and their headquarters is located in my constituency. Their record of performance is legendary around the world, but in this province, they are men who have lived and worked among us. The men who make up the force come from every walk of life in Canada. Two Assistant Commissioners, whom I know very well, came from humble homes. One was a son of a section hand, the other a son of a day laborer. This has proven to me that the force picks its people for ability, for knowledge and for dedication. Criticism has been aimed at them, and always will be I hope, in a democratic society, but quietly, without fanfare and with little publicity, they've carried out their duties as a responsible police force for a hundred years. For this, I believe we should pay tribute to them. Some of the key personnel on the force were born and raised in Saskatchewan. Some of them have spent many years here. Mr. Speaker, I propose again that the Government ask you to name a committee from both sides of the House to arrange, in consultation with the personnel of the Royal Canadian Mounted Police Force, to have them attend

one day during the Session of the Legislative Assembly in order that we can give recognition of a hundred years as one of the world's most recognized and most capable police force.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Whelan: — Mr. Speaker, I should like to congratulate the Hon. Member for Biggar (Mr. Cowley), the Minister of Finance, for the way he presented this excellent Budget. He was a member for two years of our executive in Regina North West and taught school at Thom Collegiate in that constituency. When he taught there he was one of the most popular teachers in the school.

Mr. Speaker, may I turn to the Budget Debate and Budget itself. There are two problems confronting the people of my constituency that I feel have been adequately dealt with by the Budget. They are taxes on homes and the unemployment situation. Let me turn first to the unemployment situation and the manner in which it has been dealt with by the Housing Corporation, — this I shall describe in some detail in a moment — and the development of a Crown corporation for the North. This development, to develop the northern portion of our province, Mr. Speaker, over a period of time, locating secondary industries in the Northeast, North and Northwest parts of the province to eventually provide employment for 2,000 men, is, in my estimation, the kind of public activity by a government that is the answer to the unemployment problem. It is not new, although those on the Opposition benches will scream 'socialism'.

Mr. Speaker, processing of wood products, development of forest resources, utilization of the forests that we own as a province is an effective way through public ownership to provide jobs. Compare this, if you will, with the huge investments we made in a pulp mill the small returns and the few employed, and one can only come to the conclusion that free enterprise is not altogether organized for jobs but is organized for the exploitation of resources and for profit.

Mr. Speaker, the organization of a Housing Corporation in the Province of Saskatchewan will provide homes, employment and an opportunity to develop secondary industries. How will it do these things? How will it accomplish these things that I have set out? Mr. Speaker, I suggest by involving people from different walks of life in its direction by developing a program that is distinctly for Saskatchewan; by administering a Housing Corporation that will develop homes for lower income groups, for purchase, for rental, pre-built homes for farms, for the Northern areas, for hamlets, for co-operatively constructed homes for those who wish to invest some of their own labor as a down-payment. Last year, Mr. Speaker, the Province of Manitoba with its own Housing Corporation constructed 5,500 units located in all parts of that province. These homes rented at a reasonable rate and they provide good accommodation and stability in the smaller communities. And they provided as well 5,500 12-month jobs for the people of Manitoba.

With imagination, with a staff dedicated to attainable objectives, I'm sure this corporation can develop techniques for building, and find new methods of financing housing. If the province can set an objective each year for the construction of new homes and the re-construction of older homes. there is almost sure to be established industries, organized to provide

the manufactured parts that go into housing.

The introduction of a Housing Corporation brings a new approach to housing in the Province of Saskatchewan, opens a new era, provides new opportunities but, above all, the corporation board itself will guarantee that there is in existence in this province, at all times, a group of people studying, considering, measuring, working at the problem of supplying good housing for the people of Saskatchewan. The future of the housing program has some challenges, holds out great promise, but also exhibits some obstacles. For instance, Mr. Speaker, in other parts of the world, it would be unreasonable to expect to pay the kind of interest rates that we're paying for money to build economical housing.

The proposal contained in the Budget to give a grant to repair older homes, is an excellent idea. When the program gets under way, perhaps the Federal Government, because of the unemployment situation, will be persuaded to match the provincial grant in each case.

This grant will bring comfort to senior citizens. The money spent to repair these homes will provide employment. The extent and the effectiveness of this program can be realized when one stops to think that the homes, perhaps four to five thousand of them will be located the length and breadth of the province. Work can be done any month of the year except for some outside finishing which cannot be undertaken during the winter months. But this means that the program will provide employment the year round for many people, employment wherever the senior citizen's home happens to be located.

While the Opposition criticizes our employment record they think that the people of this province forget the exodus of people seeking jobs during their term of office, the 80,000 jobs they never found in this province. Assisted by the planned unemployment of the Federal Liberals, they, as represented by the Members opposite, set records for bankruptcies, loss of population, and give-away of resources, but not for jobs, Mr. Speaker.

Specifically, in the field of housing let us compare the records. Each year for seven years, while they were in office, we pleaded for a housing corporation but to no avail. Meanwhile, tradesmen fled, looking for work, housing starts hit new lows, a sash and door factory operating since 1912 closed its doors, but these Members opposite now have a solution for the employment problem! Mr. Speaker, the facts make them look foolish.

Mr. Speaker, I have dealt to some degree with one or two programs which will help solve the unemployment problem. I wonder if I might turn for a moment to the taxes on homes in my constituency.

The announcement that education grants will be increased is significant and I hope that they will hold the line on increased education costs in the city of Regina. Regina is expanding, the cost of education keeps rising. This past December when a vote for by-laws was taken, seven out of the ten by-laws were for new schools or extensions in my constituency. Those who are hard-pressed to meet their tax bills in my constituency, I'm sure will appreciate the Property Improvement Grant, now increased to \$144. Faced with the high cost of living, any

increase represents an expenditure that the taxpayer finds difficult to meet. This is why, Mr. Speaker, I am sure that the increase in property improvement grants to this figure, to \$144, will be sincerely appreciated.

For years in each Provincial Election parties have sought the ear of Regina voters, and probably Saskatoon voters, and have done so by promising them an increase in grants to cover increases in services. In 1964 to 1967 this was certainly the case and I am certain it was responsible for electing some Opposition Members to this House. Mr. Speaker, only this Provincial Government has taken the first step in developing a solution to the problems of the larger centres, by establishing an Urban Advisory Committee. The Budget sets out an expenditure to cover its operation. The need has been established. I compliment the Government on this expenditure. Mr. Speaker, let me set out the need for it as it applies to the situation in Regina, a situation that demands their immediate study.

Mr. Speaker, as the population of the rural areas is depleted and this is evidenced by the fact that in one rural municipality after another the population has dropped persistently, and consistently, year after year. As this has happened, the population in the city of Regina has increased, with this increase have come problems and increased costs. Why? Well, Mr. Speaker, many of the people in other parts of the province, perhaps in the North and perhaps in some of the rural areas, have been unable to make it economically. They have come to the city to seek work. They have been looking for a place to live, they have to have a place to educate their children. We are glad to have these people, because they are good Saskatchewan citizens, but with the increase in population comes increased expenditures. Let me list a few, an increase in the cost of building and extending streets and sidewalks; an increase in extending the transit services to the outlying districts; an increase in the cost of street cleaning, refuse collection, library service.

Let me list, if I may, Mr. Speaker, some of the increased costs and capital expenditures that face my city. There is a need for building a bridge across Wascana Creek. There is a need for building new schools and extensions to some of those that have been built for some time. There is a need, Mr. Speaker, for park facilities and recreational areas. Mr. Speaker, the area where I live has been allocated what is known as Wilson Park, which follows the Valley of the Wascana from the RCMP Barracks north and west, but it has been undeveloped and is unused because of a lack of funds. Finally, Mr. Speaker, in conjunction with the Federal Government, there is a need to develop an urban renewal plan for the downtown section of Regina, a section which is in need of repair and re-organization. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to see that the Urban Advisory Committee has been organized and I invite them to study the problems of the larger urban centres, beginning with Regina.

Mr. Speaker, let me turn for a moment to a controversial area that is being discussed by the Saskatchewan Urban Municipalities Association and that is the Ward or Divisional System.

After each civic election, in the Press and in other places, leaders bemoan the fact that there is a very low percentage turnout at the polls. If we look closer at the representation in the city of Regina, we will find that most or all of the aldermen

are located in one end of the city. They are elected with approximately 30, 35, 40 and at the very most 52 per cent of the eligible vote or less. A plebiscite regarding the division system was voted on by less than half the electorate. Many of those who voted on it, either for or against it, are not and were not thoroughly acquainted with the manner in which it operates or has operated in most Canadian cities. In my estimation the way to know whether it does or does not work is to put it into operation and then vote on it after we have tried it for a while.

Let us look at some of the arguments against the division, or, for the division system. Mr. Speaker, the rural municipalities are divided into divisions by legislation and they seem very happy with it. Opposition Members insist on having one constituency for one Member and yet do not object to a whole city for one alderman. If we are going to have representation by population, then I suggest it is reasonable to have the city divided by legislation into equal areas so that there is equal representation by each alderman.

Finally, the argument is made that by bringing the division system in by legislation, we remove from the city of Regina, local autonomy. Mr. Speaker, I ask you what local autonomy have the 20,000 voters in my constituency who have no alderman specifically representing them. I ask you what local autonomy have they? I ask you about the thousands of voters in the north half of the city who do not have an alderman designated for their whole area. What local autonomy do they have?

Mr. Speaker, legislation that will guarantee local autonomy makes more sense than just talking about it. At the present time, what happens? If no one wants a trailer court, it is put on the north side of the city where there is no representative to know what's going on, and then they let the people object. Or if there's a condominium that no one else in the city will have, they finally find a location for it on the north side of the city, and then the local people have to put up a howl after the space has been allocated to those who are going to build the condominium. Mr. Speaker, the people who live in that portion of the city feel that they pay taxes too but they get services last, such as the telebus. And they get the things that people don't want first. Why? Maybe because they are without specific representation on city council. It seems to be that the responsibility for guaranteeing that representation is our responsibility. I'm prepared to let it go to a vote after it has been tried.

When we brought in many of the programs that we have such as medicare, the Opposition yelled, 'Plebiscite' — after they were tried and found satisfactory, no one asked for a vote. I suggest that we bring in the division system by legislation and then have a vote at the end of a given period.

This type of legislation guarantees representation by population and local autonomy for every part of Regina. Without hesitation, I urge the introduction of the division system in the larger cities.

Mr. Speaker, this Budget promises development in the North of our forest products, spells out the plan for construction of houses, reduces taxes on home by the increase in the Property Improvement Grant. The Urban Advisory Committee holds

the promise to study the problem of cities like Regina. All in all, the Budget lays a blueprint for economic stability, employment, social services and new programs.

Mr. Speaker, I will support the motion.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. G.B. Grant: (Regina Whitmore Park) — Mr. Speaker, this is the first opportunity I have had to extend my congratulations to the new Members of the Cabinet on the Government side. I know from experience that their role is not an easy one and I wish them well. I also welcome my seatmate who was missing for awhile on a previous occasion and I certainly missed him. Things are much livelier when the Member for Athabasca (Mr. Guy) is in his seat and I welcome him back.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Grant: — Mr. Speaker, before commenting on the Budget, I should like to state that I feel that problems associated with law enforcement rates as one of the top priorities in Canada and only to a somewhat lesser degree here in the Province of Saskatchewan.

No responsible Canadian citizen can continue, in my opinion, to pay only lip service to what must be his business. I refer to:

1. Insufficient respect for law enforcement officers.
2. Insufficient financial and moral support to police forces.
3. Outmoded laws and penalties.
4. A very serious one, society's over-permissiveness to violators of our laws, particularly in the field of more serious crimes.
5. Gaps in co-ordination of Provincial and Federal jurisdictions and responsibilities.
6. Statutory limitations on judiciary.
7. Last but not least, leniency of parole boards.

Mr. Speaker, unfortunately, conditions must reach a desperate stage before the public react, as is now happening in Toronto after four police officers have been killed, I believe, in the past year. I'm of the opinion that Canadian people are not reacting as they should to this problem or to the hard drug problem. If the Members in this House have not read the February 10th article in the Canadian Weekend magazine, I would ask them to please do so. Please do not delay because you owe it to yourself and to your family to become informed.

Mr. Speaker, I don't feel qualified or prepared to expound further on this subject at this time. Suffice it to say that it is of great concern to me and I feel it is my duty to arouse concern in others.

Federal Members of Parliament and Senators are currently soliciting public opinion and I urge each of you to express your opinions to these representatives. Urge them to re-examine and act now on capital punishment for (1) killing of police

personnel; (2) hard drug traffickers; possibly they should be at the top of the list; (3) skyjacking. At the same time, I suggest you make your feelings known on the utilization of the lash and/or the paddle for serious offences such as violence involving sex crimes and personal injury.

I might say that in Japan and China I understand the hard drug problem is considerably reduced if not practically eliminated and I can tell you it wasn't through permissiveness but rather capital punishment.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Grant: — Mr. Speaker, it's high time the good guys got up on their hind legs and said, "We've had enough of the bad guys", "We want them treated the way they treat us."

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Grant: — Mr. Speaker, back to the Budget. I urge our Attorney General (Mr. Romanow) and Minister of Finance (Mr. Cowley) re-examine priority given to law enforcement and administration of justice in the current Budget. We must do better.

I would remind this House that a year ago I expressed grave concern over the tax bite taken by governments out of our gross national income. At that time, I suggested that it was in the neighborhood of about 33 per cent or 35 per cent and probably now is closer to 37 per cent. Mr. Speaker, one might ask what this has to do with the Government to your right. I suggest they are among the more guilty, if one can grade degree of guilt. Since 1971 they have shown little or no desire to do their share to curtail this growing monster, the government tax bite. Rather they have headed and are heading in the opposite direction. Spend, spend, spend. They feel they can spend the public's dollar better than the person who earned it by the sweat of his brow. The Hon. Member from Pelly (Mr. Larson) said he hopes to see the budget for this province reach \$1 billion. That's \$1,000 per capita or one-third of the per capita income of this province. He is welcome to have that view, I hope it never reaches \$1 billion, unless the population and the productivity of this province increases considerably.

One wonders how long a reducing population can stand these free spenders. I predict only until the next election. Our provincial Budget has grown by \$272 million in only two years. Governments howl about inflationary trends of business and private citizens, yet if this Government opposite isn't heading on an inflationary program I don't know what it is. They are feeding the fuels of inflation, have done so in the last two years and no doubt will continue.

They might justify a major increase if it aided our economy and created more jobs but this is not the case. The only significant increase in jobs is in the Civil Service, exactly where we don't need them. We now have roughly one government or Crown corporation employee for every 60 men, women and children. These are people directly employed by the Provincial Government and does not reflect teachers, hospital employees, doctors and others who are indirectly on the payroll of government.

Two years ago the Members to your right were yelling blue murder about job-creating government action, criticizing Ottawa, criticizing our Liberal Government, saying, "We would do much more if we were the Government." Well, Mr. Speaker, they now form the Government but, oh my, how quiet they are about unemployment. Even at a rate of seven per cent they don't consider it urgent. How little they do to create jobs except to import fuzzy-thinking planners and establish so many boards and commissions that even their experts can't keep up to them.

The Budget calls for over 400 new positions. One of their own Members recently when urging for a T-Bar in the Cypress Hill Park said, "We don't need a study that would get some egghead looking into his books for a plan that would take ten years to get started." Even he sees the fallacy of employing too many of these experts.

The Government hasn't neglected their own Members and there are few indeed in Government seats who aren't moonlighting as Legislative assistants, board chairmen, or in some special category. One only has to watch the daily papers to see the party-faithful being slipped into \$50 or \$75 a day and expenses advisory board positions, etc.

There seems to be great concern these days for the consumer and protection is emanating from almost every government but there seems to be little or no concern about the taxpayer. The Government opposite burns the midnight oil cooking up ways to spend money, as though they feared it was going out of style and then the Premier says:

So sorry folks, we must raise your income tax in order to pay for these wonderful things. You didn't ask for them but we're going to shove them down your throats so just relax while Uncle Allan gives you your pills and Cousin Cowley reaches into your pocket while you're swallowing.

What does the 1973 Budget say? Mr. Speaker, it says:

Your Saskatchewan Government is all wise, we'll take \$88 million more in tax dollars to pay for all those so-called experts we've hired to tell us what's good for winning votes in 1975, then we'll proceed to let you have it.

There is little or no indication of any help to enable the taxpayers to generate the additional dollars it must come out of that ever-shrinking 63 or 65 per cent left with the taxpayer.

Mr. Speaker, the Government to your right favors Crown corporations and government monopoly. At the same time they rush forward to be critical of private business profits, using strong adjectives to describe what a crime it is for a corporation to make a million, ten million or a hundred million, regardless of what this represents by way of percentage on sales or percentage on investment. Mr. Speaker, it's a different story, however, on liquor profits.

This Government shows profits of \$30 million on sales of \$85 million, 35 per cent, probably 300 per cent on the Government's investment.

This is a demonstration, Mr. Speaker, of Government participation in business without actually getting into the business of production. I realize, of course, that this so-called profit is a tax. Why not call it a tax and stop the window-dressing of calling it a profit? In the Estimates it appears as a profit. The sale of liquor in Saskatchewan is a Government monopoly and has no place in its structure for the term 'profit'.

Basically, my philosophy, Mr. Speaker, is that the Government should be kept to a minimum. It should provide rules for business to operate under, but should stay out of active engagement in business. Exceptions to this would be where businesses are monopolistic or not serving geographical areas adequately.

Canadian Governments have grown at a frightening rate since 1945 and this is particularly true at the Federal and Provincial levels. This growth has resulted in governments taking a tax bite of our national income, as I indicated, of over one-third.

Our Legislators have made inroads into almost every aspect of our business lives and, in some cases, have actually taken over major portions of the private sector. Frequently, our Legislators say they are acting in response to public demand, or in response to a mandate which they have received. I question this — it's more often a case of politicians building a political climate. Unfortunately, governments find it quite attractive to get into business but seldom indeed do they ever withdraw — even when their presence in business has served their purpose.

I sometimes wonder why any government wants to get into active business. By means of taxing powers, they can and have become major participants in the fruits of business, without any of the headaches and problems of management and ownership. They can freely use businessmen as their agents, as they do in Saskatchewan where businessmen collect \$137 million for the Government in two taxes alone, namely gas and sales.

To be fair, we can't put all the blame on the politicians. Individuals and companies are allowing it to happen by default. All too often we let governments forge headlong into more control of our lives and businesses without raising our voice in protest. It is only when we are seriously affected ourselves that we rise up and object. Even then, we don't speak with a united voice. Sometimes we don't speak at all for fear of offending the government of the day.

We are creating a government monster by default — default at the polls — default in participation — default in our interest in what our elected representatives do.

This is, in a brief form, a summary of where I differ from the socialists. They are quite definite as to priorities of business ownership, government, co-operatives and private. I would reverse this and say that business should be owned firstly by private interests, secondly, by co-operatives and lastly, if that be necessary, government.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Grant: — A small businessman recently was expounding his disillusionment with the present Government and I asked him to put it in

writing, so these are not my words, but these are his words:

Recent NDP Government tax increases have served to doubly penalize the small businessman in Saskatchewan, not only must he now pay higher corporation taxes on the business which he has worked to build up, but on the salary which he may, or may not, be able to afford to pay himself from his company. He must now pay higher personal income tax. What incentive is there for this man to continue in business with the prospect of ever-increasing taxes under a Government he has to compete with for the very business he needs to survive?

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Grant: — Many of these small businesses are incorporated under The Companies Act of Saskatchewan and owned by Saskatchewan people who want to remain in this province if it is at all possible. For example, there are companies which, among other services, provide burglar alarm systems to businessmen and homeowners in this province. Or rather, they provide protection to a smaller and smaller portion of the market in this field. They now find themselves faced with competition on a scale they can't possibly compete with. These companies can't even buy their necessary equipment to provide this service at a price at which the Government is selling it to the public. What private business can compete against Sask Tel? In all fairness can that same private business go into the telephone business? The answer is 'no' and it is 'no' too, when that same businessman asks himself if he can survive under these conditions. How can that private alarm company compete when they must pay the city of Regina Police Department an annual fee of \$100 per alarm system, plus another fee just to be connected into the ringing panel at the police station when Sask Tel is able to connect all of their alarm systems to that same police station with no fee whatsoever?

I defy, Mr. Speaker, anyone to find any worthwhile new incentive for people to work harder and create more, in Saskatchewan.

The Honorable Member from Saskatoon-Nutana says our education system is lacking — it's too work oriented. He thinks this is bad, I don't. Someone must educate us that work is not an evil, it's good, it's normal and it's necessary.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Grant: — I hope our education system continues to promote the merits of work to offset the initiative killing actions of Governments.

For some strange reason, the Government opposite thinks it makes sense not only to establish the rules for business but they seem to have an insatiable appetite to get into business, in competition with the very people generating their sources of income, as cited in the alarmed businessman's letter.

There's no doubt in my mind that if businessmen and the public don't stand up and say "Stop, government in this province has gone too far", they'll find government involved so deeply in

business and lives and their lives, that they won't be in a position to oppose the monster they have created by default.

From time immemorial, Mr. Speaker, governments have used tax cuts to get a slowed-down economy going, but not the NDP Government. They raise taxes, nationalize farm land and get into more business activities. I see no major financial help to our hard-pressed urban municipalities, and that is one area that the Budget is sadly lacking in.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Grant: — The Hon. Member from Regina Centre (Mr. Blakeney) says announcements by themselves mean little, only results count. I can't disagree with him. Our Premier continues to tell business people of this province, 'We don't dislike you — we want you to love us — tell us your troubles, we'll help you'. Well, actions speak louder than words apparently because businessmen do not trust socialist governments. How could they? The 1934 Regina manifesto was the start of it when it indicated that they would eradicate capitalism. I don't think the updated NDP policy did much to change this. Their national leader dragged reputable business firms through the election mud by calling them 'corporate welfare bums'. The Member from Saskatoon University (Mr. Richards) says, "Let's nationalize the Imperial Oil; the Potash Industry and other welfare bums". The Premier and Minister of Industry (Mr. Thorson) tells the oil industry, 'get cracking or we'll go into the business ourselves'.

Mr. Speaker, the Government opposite only pays lip service to the private sector, they don't love them. Ask the timber industry or the insurance business. Ask the farmers if they approve of government ownership of land.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Grant: — 1,300 parcels of land in this province, now being bought by the Government for some \$30 million, will not be owned by individual farmers again as long as the NDP are in power. They have no intention of selling this land off.

This Government, Mr. Speaker, has gone too far in delegating their powers to boards, commissions and bureaucrats. In some cases, they have even gone so far as to deny the right of appeal to the courts. This is basically wrong and, hopefully, can be corrected after the next provincial election.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Grant: — Another failing of some of these delegated authorities is that they don't have to produce written reasons for their decisions. Also, their rules of practice should be common and where practical follow the rules of the courts.

Mr. Speaker, Members opposite have, in the short period of 18 months, by various means, lost the respect of many organized groups, particularly in the field of business and agriculture and education, more recently. They have quickly become victims of that politicians' fatal disease — insensitivity. For nine long years I've listened to claims and

counter-claims across the floor of this House, claims of successes and failures in attracting and holding businesses. The Liberals still harp on the box and shoe factories, the NDP still harp on the heavy water plant or the White Pipe Company.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Grant: — I sometimes think the only thing we've accomplished is to convince the public that neither side has done a good job and it isn't likely that any government is going to come up with the answers for a stable and growing work force in Saskatchewan.

Having said this, I've pretty well burned my bridges for being critical of current Government claims by the Premier and Minister of Industry. I must, however, correct the Premier who classified Oxbow Industries as an agriculture-oriented industry which, along with others, he cited would assist the farm economy. Oxbow Industries, as I understand it, was a machine shop which made application for a grant to produce metal enclosures, supposedly for the Power Corporation, and for one reason or another didn't materialize, closed up shop, sold their machine shop on November 30th and there is no operation whatsoever going by the name of Oxbow Industries, and even if they had been successful they would not have been helping the farm economy, they would have been making enclosures for switch gear and transformers for the Power Corporation.

The Hon. Member from Gravelbourg (Mr. Gross) suggested these new businesses made work for 1,507 people. I defy anyone to find these 1,507 jobs or the 1,507 people filling them. The only way he can get the 1,507 is to include the new Civil Service positions created by the present Government.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Grant: — Mr. Speaker, I'm strongly of the opinion that party and political wrangling, claims and counter-claims, will do little to improve the business outlook, the business climate or economic diversification in our province.

Unfortunately both the Throne Speech and the Budget of the present Government indicate that it is launched on a program of state control of our economy. The Government is pushing forward at an increasing tempo to implement its programs of government playing a substantially greater, if not total role, in our resource industries. This, in itself, does not create the necessary economic climate so necessary for employment-generating industry. I don't really believe that anything that is said is going to change the course of the present Government, unfortunately. I say unfortunately because I am sure there are many Canadian business leaders in the class of Mr. Hal Wyatt of the Royal Bank who would be prepared to examine our 'short falls' in Saskatchewan and assist us in once again fulfilling our rightful role in Confederation.

Mr. Speaker, because the Government's Budget continues to grow too rapidly and places too much emphasis on government participation in business to the detriment of the private sector, I cannot support the Motion.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. W.E. Smishek (Minister of Public Health): — Mr. Speaker, may I, at the outset, extend a welcome to a visitor from the Province of Quebec. I understand that Hon. William Tetley, the Minister of Financial Institutions, Companies and Co-operatives, is in the gallery visiting our province and particularly taking a look at the Department of Co-operatives in the Province of Saskatchewan. I extend to him a warm welcome . . .

Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Smishek: — . . . and express the hope that his visit with our officials and his visit to the Legislature has been an educational and a productive one.

Mr. Speaker, at the outset of my remarks I should like to congratulate the Hon. Member for Biggar, first on his appointment to the Cabinet as Minister of Finance (Mr. Cowley). I want also to congratulate him on the quality of the Budget address he presented last Friday and in the manner in which he delivered the Budget address. To those who may not be aware, the Hon. Minister of Finance is the youngest Member of the Executive Council, he is the youngest Minister of Finance in the Dominion of Canada. Mr. Speaker, it is my understanding he is the youngest man to have ever been appointed to Cabinet in the Province of Saskatchewan.

Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Smishek: — More important than his youth, Mr. Speaker, is his ability. His ability to understand and grapple with the social, economic and the financial complexities of our province. My congratulations also go to the people of Biggar constituency on the quality of men they have over the years returned to this Legislature.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Smishek: — For 27 years, the Biggar constituency was so ably represented by one of Canada's outstanding citizens, the late Woodrow S. Lloyd.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Smishek: — Just as Mr. Lloyd left an indelible mark on the social, economic and political life of this province and this country, I know that our young Minister of Finance will, in the years ahead, make an important imprint on our province and its people.

Let me also congratulate him on the introduction this year of the gross budgeting system, a system which I have supported and advocated since I was first elected to this Legislature. Introducing the gross budgeting system means that another of our election promises has been fulfilled. We said that an NDP Government will 'simplify government budgeting to show the public as clearly and honestly as possible the true picture regarding revenues and expenditures from all sources'.

Unfortunately, because of legislative restrictions under the Hospitalization and Medical Care Insurance Acts it was not possible this year to show the \$15 million in medical and hospital premiums as part of the budgetary cash flow, nor are the premiums, revenues, which are assigned to SHSP and MCIC shown as part of the health expenditures. When these moneys are added, and expenditures made by the Department of Government Services on behalf of the Department of Public Health, these are included, we find that this year the Government will be spending over \$204 million on health services or almost \$225 for every man, woman and child.

When the Minister of Finance presented the Budget for the coming year, he said there are two sets of commitments which people expect a government to fulfil. One of these is the written commitment found in the party platform.

There is often a cynicism about politicians and political parties fulfilling their promises, and so far as the old line parties are concerned that cynicism is usually justified.

Mr. Speaker, our party has always taken a different attitude towards election platforms and programs. For one thing, Mr. Speaker, we have a tradition of printing and publishing our platform prior to any election campaign. And we have another tradition, we make every effort to fulfil our commitments, Mr. Speaker.

The Budget address of last Friday, indicated to the people of this province, that this Government is serious about its four-year program, its 'New Deal for People'.

I can still recall the scorn which the Liberal Government spokesmen showered on our 'Program for Progress' when we unveiled it in the winter of 1971. They claimed it was pie-in-the-sky, just socialist propaganda — unrealistic.

Mr. Speaker, this Budget and the one presented by the Premier last year testify to the serious intent of our Government to fulfil its commitments to the people of the province.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Smishek: — I recall when I took part in my first Budget debate in 1965 when I first entered this Legislature, I said that to me a Budget is a setting of priorities, a place where political promises should take concrete action. That's what this Budget is all about, Mr. Speaker, concrete action — action to improve the economic and social well-being of our province and our people.

Mr. Speaker, let me make brief reference to some of the remarks that were made by the Hon. Member for Whitmore Park (Mr. Grant). He made allegations that what this Government is 'hepped' on is more tax increases. Well, Mr. Speaker, let us look at the record. In the last 18 months of office what has been the tax increase? Facts are that the only tax increase that has taken place in the term of office is the current increase in corporation income tax and personal income tax. Those two taxes are going to yield somewhere in the order of \$8 million. Compare this to the benefits that people will derive, in announcing this tax increase in income and corporate tax, we said we

wanted to make a tax shift. A shift so that we can more equitably distribute the taxes to our people. What are we doing with the increase? Well, Mr. Speaker, that increase is going to be given to the property owners, to the farm people, to the small business people. These are the people who are going to be the beneficiaries not only of that total tax increase but additional funds will be made available in order for us to hold down the property taxes in this province. A commitment that we made to the people of Saskatchewan, a commitment that we intend to keep.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Smishek: — Mr. Speaker, I don't know how the Hon. Member arrived at a figure of \$272 million increase in government expenditure. Obviously he must not have added up his figures properly. If he is interpreting that by going into the gross budgeting system there is all this additional money being spent then I would suggest that he do a little bit of studying and perhaps consult with some of his colleagues who have supported in previous years the idea of gross budgeting system but have not had the courage to implement it.

Mr. Speaker, if he is that opposed to taxes, then why did he support the tax increase on all the sick people of this province to the tune of \$8 million in deterrent fees during the Liberal term of office. The Liberals imposed a tax on meals, they taxed hot dogs, a new tax on hotel rooms, on soap, they taxed practically every item that they could lay their hands on. They increased practically every license fee, every premium that they could possibly tax. He made reference to the liquor tax. Well, Mr. Speaker, let's take a look at the record. In the last 18 months this Government has not increased any liquor taxes. We are still functioning on the same taxes that were established by the Liberal administration. Under the Liberal administration every 12 months or even shorter periods of time there was an increase in the liquor taxes.

Mr. Speaker, when we introduced our four year program — The New Deal for People — Liberal party spokesmen claimed that it would bankrupt the province.

I recall the Hon. Member for Whitmore Park (Mr. Grant) standing in his place when he was the Minister of Public Health and he got an adding machine out and proceeded to add up what it would cost to remove the deterrent fees. What it would cost to provide free medical and hospital care for the Province of Saskatchewan. What it would cost to provide chiropractic services. Cost of dental care for children and provision of reduced cost of hearing aids to the people of Saskatchewan. He said at that time that this would bankrupt the Province of Saskatchewan. It was almost the same kind of rhetoric that we heard today. The Hon. Member is of the belief that the only good money is private money but public money in his judgment is bad money. I don't accept that notion, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, many of the things we promised have now been acted upon. Other programs are at various stages of implementation and Saskatchewan is not bankrupt. In fact the Minister of Finance has demonstrated that the Saskatchewan financial situation is in better shape now than it ever has been.

While on one hand they argued that our four year plan will bankrupt Saskatchewan — on the other hand, one month after we took office the Liberals introduced recommendations urging that the programs that we promised be introduced immediately, not in four years, but they urged us to take immediate action.

The Members opposite exhibited then, as they do now, a measure of cynicism that boggles one's imagination.

They may feel that election promises and party platforms are toys with which to play politics, but the New Democratic Party regards these commitments very seriously.

We are willing to stand or fall on our program and how well we have lived up to it.

We invite the Members of this House and the public to examine the record; What has been promised — and what has now been accomplished.

Mr. Speaker, we promised a Land Bank Commission to promote the maximum number of viable family farms in Saskatchewan. The Land Bank is in operation today. Some \$10 million expenditure was made last year with \$20 million to be advanced for Land Bank purchases in the current Budget.

We promised to provide capital credit to farmers. The FarmStart program does that, Mr. Speaker. \$15 million in the current Budget with grants up to \$8,000 for individual farmers, if they qualify to subsidize livestock production. We expanded crop insurance. We agreed to establish a producer controlled Hog Marketing Board and research to assist forward production planning by the farmers. All of these are designed to improve and stabilize the farm economy. All promised, all acted upon.

Mr. Speaker, we promised to enact a new Trade Union Act — to repeal Bill 2, and to guarantee free collective bargaining. That has been done. We promised to improve and upgrade the Department of Labour and strengthen conciliation and mediation services. That has been done. We promised to increase the minimum wage to \$1.75 per hour and to re-organize the Workmen's Compensation Board and increase benefits. And that has been done, Mr. Speaker.

We promised to undertake capital building programs and winter works incentives to create new jobs. We did that and we are continuing programs to create more jobs. As the Minister of Finance pointed out, we've created 19,000 jobs in the last year alone.

We promised assistance to small business. The Government established a business assistance branch within the Department of Industry and Commerce to provide management advice as well as direct grants and loans to eligible business concerns.

We promised a sharp reduction in property taxes, a reduction in mill rates for basic school operating costs on homes, farms and small business. We said that reduction would be to an average 25 mills. Last year the Members opposite attacked us for not meeting that figure in the first year. Government Members replied that we would make the reduction in stages. I can still recall the sarcasm of the Liberal spokesmen.

Well, Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Finance has shown in detail in his Budget how the Government plans to meet this 25 mill average this year. \$30.5 million is provided for the Property Improvement Grants, up to \$144 for home owners, \$180 for small business, \$270 for farmers, a dramatic increase designed to help keep property taxes down.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Smishek: — Further, \$10.2 million will be provided to increase the amount of money to school boards to ensure that property taxes for school purposes are not increased this year.

We promised a Housing Corporation. It will be set up this year with a \$9.5 million fund. Home building grants will be made available for low income families up to \$800 for anyone who wanted to build a home.

A \$3 million senior citizens home repair program will be launched this year. Another NDP promise will become a reality.

The Members opposite just don't seem to understand what has been happening. They can't keep up with the new developments that are taking place in Saskatchewan, new programs, new opportunities, new jobs, security for the old, the young, the farmers and the workers.

Liberals are so accustomed to playing fast and loose with the public, that when our party makes a promise and keeps it, the Liberals look for some hidden motivation.

Mr. Speaker, the financial critic for the Opposition, the Hon. Member for Albert Park (Mr. MacLeod) revealed his lack of knowledge or his inability to keep up with the programs when he was interviewed on television on the Budget day last week. Perhaps it might have been his extreme bias that was showing.

The Hon. Member said that the NDP has done nothing for senior citizens. Mr. Speaker, let me remind the Hon. Member of just a few things the NDP have done for our senior citizens in our first year and a half of office.

Mr. Speaker, we removed the notorious Liberal deterrent fees, a tax saving of \$2 million for those 65 years and over. We gave them free medical and hospital care, another \$3 million for the senior citizens. The Budget just brought down last Friday commits \$3 million to covering the nursing component of Level II and Level III care for nursing home care for our senior citizens. Another promise fulfilled, Mr. Speaker. Perhaps the Member for Albert Park missed the Finance Minister's announcement of a \$3 million program for home repairs for our senior citizens.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Smishek: — It may be that he was taking a nap when my colleague, Mr. Cowley announced a further \$500,000 for nursing home construction in the coming fiscal year. Much of the \$9.5 million of low cost housing program announced last Friday will be directed towards helping and will benefit our senior citizens as well. No doubt, he similarly failed to notice the senior citizens' commission that is proposed under the Department of Social

Services. The extension in Level IV care that will be provided in this Budget. There is the program to reduce the cost of hearing aids. All of these programs will in a major way benefit the senior citizens of the Province of Saskatchewan.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Smishek: — Mr. Speaker, I challenge the Liberals to show us when they were in government, in any 18 month period, did a fraction of this for the senior citizens.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Smishek: — I am sure, Mr. Speaker, that the Hon. Member for Albert Park (Mr. MacLeod) overlooked these programs for our senior citizens inadvertently.

Perhaps the pressure of being on television rattled him.

Mr. Speaker, I can't help but continue with reminding the Hon. Members of some other promises that were made and were kept.

We promised to provide bursaries for university and technical school students. This has been done and this year the amount is being increased by 50 per cent.

We said we would increase employment opportunities for students. We've done that in our summer employment program. We promised regional community education centres to bring educational opportunities closer to the people of Saskatchewan. We've made a solid start on that program, Mr. Speaker.

Promise after promise in the health section of the New Deal for People has been turned into reality. Others are in the various stages of development. The hearing aid program. The dental program for children under 12. Chiropractic service ensured. Deterrent fees abolished. Medicare for senior citizens provided free. The development of alternate methods of delivery of health care, in communities where Liberals closed hospitals. Five health and social centres are in operation and another three in various stages of development.

We promised and established a department of government to have overall responsibility for pollution control and maintenance of the quality of our environment.

We established a new department to pay special attention to the needs of our consumers and this promise has been fulfilled.

We said that we would set up a government information and referral centre with a toll-free 'hotline', to give citizens ready access to information about Government services and to assist in dealing with problems. This is in action, Mr. Speaker.

Citizens of this province phone in every day to the Provincial Inquiry Centre with their questions and comments.

We promised to restore democratic representation in the Legislature. We set up an Independent Electoral Boundaries Commission to complete a fair redistribution before the next

election and periodically thereafter.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Smishek: — That has been initiated, Mr. Speaker. We look forward with interest to the results of that redistribution. Perhaps, Mr. Speaker, he probably would like to represent a meaningful constituency rather than a pocket borough.

Mr. Speaker, this list of NDP promises fulfilled is only a partial list. The list that I have recited is not exhausted. But I will spare the Opposition any further embarrassment. I believe I have made my point.

Our party contested the last election on the basis of a comprehensive program. The Minister of Finance's Budget Address and that of the Premier during the Throne Speech clearly indicate this Government's intention of fulfilling the promises we made in the 1971 election.

Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Member for Athabasca (Mr. Guy) when he spoke made reference in this House to the provision of dental services in Uranium City. He implied . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order, Order!

Mr. Guy: — The Hon. Member knows full well he can't refer to a previous speech.

Mr. Speaker: — Order, Order! When the Speaker is on his feet I will make the decisions. He can't refer to a previous speech during this Session.

Mr. Smishek: — Well, Mr. Speaker, I want to inform the Hon. Member from Athabasca of what has been done. Let me put him straight. On September 1st I announced a two-fold program for Uranium City. I said the program provides for a dental clinic to begin in mid-September and for the services of a dentist for at least four months of a year starting in mid-November 1972. In a press release I said the dental clinic was to be staffed by a registered dental hygienist, nurse Helen Wiens and a certified dental assistant, Miss Donna Bartel, both of the Department of Public Health were in Uranium City from September 15, 1972 to October 4, 1972. They saw 541 children for dental preventive purposes.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Smishek: — Mr. Speaker, a dentist, Dr. Dennis Lanigan, Dental Resident, University Hospital, Dental Department, completed his first tour of duty from November 13 to December 18, 1972, in Uranium City. Dr. Lanigan is a Regina native and was the top prize winning student graduating from the Saskatoon Campus last fall, winning both the President's Gold Medal and the College of Dentistry Award. Dr. Lanigan saw 111 children and 64 adults between November 13 and December 18. Dr. Hamilton, the other dental resident will commence the next tour of duty tomorrow, Mr. Speaker, February 14. Subsequent visits are planned for

mid-May and mid-September of this year. We further plan to establish Dental Nursing Services in the North on a permanent basis when graduates from the Dental Technologists Training Program become available for placement. Mr. Speaker, I challenge the Hon. Member for Athabasca to indicate where in all of this we have misled the people of Saskatchewan. As usual we delivered the program that we promised. I invite the Hon. Member to check his facts. Visit Uranium City between elections, it is your constituency. Don't rely on informers who do not know what is happening. I might just add that during the year when the Liberals occupied these benches, they never spent a penny on dental care for Uranium City. Mr. Guy's concern for dental care in Uranium City is touching, Mr. Speaker. All of a sudden he is concerned. But I ask him what did he do about dental care for citizens of Uranium City when he occupied the Treasury Benches?

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Smishek: — Mr. Speaker, one of the programs highlighted in the Budget address is the Saskatchewan Hearing Aid Plan. In terms of dollars this is not a large program. It will not benefit all the people. But those who are in need of hearing aids will appreciate the program. The greater percentage of those requiring hearing aids are senior citizens, most of them are on fixed incomes. As the incomes of senior citizens are squeezed smaller and smaller by the rising cost of living major items such as hearing aids take a larger and larger bite out of an already shrinking dollar of the senior citizens. Those with hearing defects have little choice in most cases. It is either buy a hearing aid or suffer an increasing loss in communication with your friends, your neighbors and your relatives, and being able to listen to radio programs, television or be able to even go to the theatre and enjoy it.

Everyday exchanges which you and I take for granted present serious difficulty for the person who is hard of hearing. One can be almost completely isolated in the midst of a sea of conversation. It is a loneliness few of us can imagine. In most cases, the isolation can be broken by the use of a hearing aid. But increasing numbers of citizens, particularly senior citizens, cannot afford the cost. A hearing aid can cost \$300 or \$400, some of them are more. On a pension of \$150 per month, that is almost an insuperable barrier. All too many of the hard of hearing have to choose between an improvement in hearing or being able to eat properly.

Our researches indicated that the price of hearing aids can be drastically reduced. Since the private sector has failed to respond to this particular need, the Government must, Mr. Speaker. The details of the hearing aid program will be announced in the near future. However, at this time I can promise the hard of hearing that we anticipate being able to provide quality hearing aids at prices well below the average offered today. Mr. Speaker it should be emphasized that our program will not sacrifice quality in order to reduce price. A hearing aid that is cheap in price but doesn't measure up to proper standards of quality would be of little value to the hard of hearing. No doubt we shall hear the usual cries from those who will choose to oppose our plan. I notice in last night's paper that one of the officers of the Hearing Aid Dealers Association has already started jumping to conclusions. Let me assure him and this

Legislature that the cost of our hearing aids will not be \$400 each. The \$448,000 appropriated in the Budget in part provides for capital expenditures on equipment and necessary facilities which we anticipate will last for 10 years or more. We will also require a supply of aids and other supplies, we anticipate several models and types of aids will be available. All will be of proven high quality performance. I should advise this House that some 85 aids have already been tried and tested. May I advise the vice-president of the Hearing Aid Dealers Association not to fly off the handle too soon. I don't particularly want him to see himself embarrassed. I want however to advise this Legislature, as I have advised the Hearing Aid Dealers Association that at an appropriate time I will discuss our proposal with them. Mr. Cavanagh is correct on one point, it is not our intention to put private dealers out of business. We have one thought in mind and one thought only, that is to provide top quality hearing aids, different types and models, properly tested and fitted, for people who can benefit from the use of a hearing aid, at greatly reduced cost.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Smishek: — Mr. Speaker, may I also say that our program will not only be for the benefit of the senior citizens, it will be for the benefit of all the citizens of Saskatchewan who need the hearing aid.

From the hundreds of letters that I have received in the last 18 months, I am satisfied that there is a need for such a program and that need will be met in 1973.

Mr. Speaker, the inclusion of chiropractic care under the Medical Care Insurance Plan effective February of this year was significant not only because it meant the fulfilment of another commitment made by the New Democratic Party to the people of Saskatchewan, but because it represents another first for Saskatchewan. The Saskatchewan plan is unique in Canada, being the only one that does not impose limits on the number or dollar volume of services an individual family may receive. There are no deterrents, no deductibles. The one-year agreement between the Government and the Chiropractors' Association of Saskatchewan is also unique. It introduces a new method of payment. A contract payment based on the number of years a chiropractor has been in practice since graduation and the number of services provided by each chiropractor. A fee for service basis of payment for office visits and a special formula for X-ray services.

We are pleased, Mr. Speaker, to be able to provide this kind of a comprehensive plan, a universal plan for chiropractic services without any deterrents. This is in keeping with our Government's philosophy that health benefits should be equally available to all citizens of Saskatchewan without regard to their ability to pay.

I am concerned, however, Mr. Speaker, about a recent report which indicates that approximately a dozen chiropractors have not signed the agreement with the Medical Care Insurance Commission. During negotiations with the Chiropractors' Association of Saskatchewan, I was assured that only three or four chiropractors at the most, may oppose the agreement that they negotiated. That indicated to the Government that the vast majority would be

very satisfied with the agreement. It would appear that the officers of the Chiropractors' Association misjudged.

It should be pointed out, Mr. Speaker, that although some chiropractors are reported to have failed to sign agreements with the Commission for one reason or another, some two-thirds have signed the agreement. This indicates to me that the sizable majority of chiropractors are willing to work under the Government's plan. I am not surprised that they are willing, the new plan will provide an average gross payment of \$30,000 per year to chiropractors in the province. My information is that between 20 and 25 per cent of their gross payment is used for operating expenses. I believe this is fairly good pay for people who are on their own admission claiming to work an average of 35 hours per week. I think the agreement offered to the chiropractors is a good one. I believe with the sizable majority of the chiropractors accepting agreement, they also agree. I am hopeful that those chiropractors who have not yet signed agreements will soon join the majority of their colleagues. I might add that the department has been receiving phone calls from patients to provide them with names of chiropractors who have signed agreements and who accept the Commission payment as full payment. Others have suggested that we advertise the names of the contract chiropractors in the newspaper. We have not reached any conclusions on these requests and suggestions.

Mr. Speaker, I want to say a few words about the Saskatchewan Hospital Services Plan. The Hon. Member for Lumsden (Mr. Lane) will be particularly interested in what I have to say. He has become something of an expert in recent days on the question of hospital beds. He alleges, so it is reported, that our Government since taking office have reduced the number of hospital beds available to Saskatchewan people. I must advise the Hon. Member that he is correct. The number of hospital beds has been reduced. By how much, Mr. Speaker? By one. In July 1971 when this Government took office, there were 6,677 active treatment beds in Saskatchewan hospitals. On December 31, 1972, 18 months later the number of active treatment beds is 6,676. A reduction of one. That reduction of one bed, Mr. Speaker, we can all be grateful that the Hon. Member has drawn our attention to his concern. However, the Hon. Member for Lumsden did not see fit to give this House and the people of Saskatchewan the full story. Let me put that reduction of one bed into its proper perspective. While there has been a reduction of one bed in the last 18 months, there will be an anticipated rise in expenditure by the Hospital Services Plan of some \$10 million in the coming fiscal year. I have already mentioned that it was not possible to include the gross figure for the operation of Hospital Services Plan in the Estimates due to the existing legislation. The present legislation provides that hospital premiums be deposited to the Hospital Services Fund and this income therefore was left out of the Budget Estimates. For the fiscal year 1973-74 the total budget estimated for the Hospital Services Plan is \$116 million. This is some \$10 million more than is printed in the Estimates. In January of this year, I met with representatives of the hospitals to outline the Government's plan for hospital programs in the coming year. I indicated to the hospitals that overall hospital planned spending in the calendar year 1972, increased approximately 13 per cent over 1971. I pointed out to those present that some of our neighboring provinces had announced sharp cutbacks in their allocation to hospitals. I have in front of me, Mr. Speaker, a clipping from the Regina Leader-Post

of November 24th, which reads this way in part.

Sharp financial restraints were imposed on Ontario hospitals and institutions of higher learning, Thursday. Health Minister Richard Potter told the Legislature active treatment hospital beds will be limited to an eventual four per thousand of the population. Hospital operating budgets will be held to a maximum increase of 5 per cent in the coming fiscal year.

Mr. Speaker, after considering all the factors, our Government has decided to provide an increase of approximately 9 per cent to the hospitals in the coming year. This includes funds for the opening of the South Saskatchewan Hospital Centre later this year. In 1973, hospitals with a bed capacity of 50 beds or more will operate on a global budget system. This will provide financial incentives to those hospitals that economize in the cost of their operations.

You will better appreciate the need for economies when I tell you that while our population decreased from 1968 to 1972 by some 27,000 people, the number of staff employed by hospitals continues to increase. During the same period the rate of hospital admissions increased from 209 per 1000 of population in 1968 to 232 per 1000 population in 1972. This is the highest rate in the country, Mr. Speaker. Based on Federal statistics for the year ending December 31, 1970, our rate of hospital admission of 223.1 was almost double that of Quebec, of 112.6 per 1000 population. The Canadian average for that year was only 151.8. I am told that there has been no appreciable change in that comparison in the subsequent two years. Our rate has risen to 232 per 1000 in 1972. For the period 1968 to 1972 the number of patient days in hospitals increased by over 71,000 while our population declined by 27,000. Mr. Speaker, I have asked the Saskatchewan Hospital Association, Saskatchewan College of Physicians and Surgeons, Saskatchewan Medical Association, to carefully examine this unrealistic situation we face in Saskatchewan and ask them to co-operate with us, to bring the hospital utilization closer to that of the national average. I am hopeful that we can get their co-operation and achieve the desired results. I should point out to the Members of the Assembly and the public that control of hospital admissions is in the hands of the medical profession and the hospitals.

Mr. Speaker, while this Government has emphasized the search for alternative methods of health care delivery, we have not neglected improvements in our hospital system. Saskatchewan people enjoy a standard of hospital care that is second to none. While looking for economies in the delivery of health services, we have no intention of sacrificing quality, Mr. Speaker.

During this past year, we purchased the Grey Nuns Hospital and launched a comprehensive study of hospital needs and facilities in Regina under Dr. Graham Clarkson. With the opening of the new Base Hospital expected later this year, Regina will have a complete range of hospital services. More than \$500,000 has been budgeted to complete construction of the new hospital which will be used as a training facility for medical students in southern Saskatchewan. The total cost of the hospital is expected to be close to \$16 million. When the results of the Clarkson study are received, we expect to be able more fully to integrate hospital services in the city of Regina.

A major expansion and renovation project for the University Hospital at Saskatoon was announced a few months ago. The project involves an \$18.3 million addition to the hospital and \$7.3 million for renovation and approximately \$2 million for construction of a clinical dental facility. Some \$2 million has been included in this year's estimates for the project which will provide extended out-patient facilities, more research space and expansion related to the need of the College of Medicine and the Dentistry. A further \$6.5 million is included in the cash carry-over for future expansion of this project. The Saskatoon project will not include more beds, rather the emphasis will be on ambulatory care, improved diagnostic services and expanded research facilities. Permanent clinical facilities for the Dental College in Saskatoon are part of the project.

Completion of these major hospital projects in Regina and Saskatoon will ensure in the years ahead to the citizens of this province continued excellent care and services equal to any services elsewhere in Canada.

Mr. Speaker, I note with interest how quickly the Opposition chose to point out the sizable increase in the Department of Social Services. So far, however, none of the critics have made mention that \$8.5 million of the Social Services budget is a transfer of programs from the Department of Public Health, the Moose Jaw and Prince Albert Training Schools, the Level III Riverside Home at North Battleford. Our Budget also includes many small health items which I think by themselves do not represent a lot of money, but they are significant in the development of better health facilities.

The province will provide funds to operate the Alvin Buckwold Centre at Saskatoon. For five years this pilot project was paid by the Federal Government. The cost of the Oxbow Dental Pilot project will be assumed by the province at a cost of \$102,000. These two projects are good examples of how Ottawa is prepared to provide start-up funds, but after the program is developed, and accepted by the people, the province is left holding the bag.

The Budget provides for 57 beds at North Battleford and an additional 10 beds in Yorkton. I might add that the Government is closely examining Level IV bed needs in Saskatoon, Moose Jaw and other smaller communities. We proposed to provide at the Regina General Hospital a separate facility and staff for treating patients with alcohol and drug problems. This is estimated to cost some \$32,000.

A special out-patient program for psychiatric patients will be developed at the University Hospital at a cost of some \$50,000 to the Government. A cardiograph rehabilitation program will be initiated at the Regina General at a cost of some \$14,000. The orthopedic clinic for patients suffering from deformities, disease or injuries of the bones and joints will be started at Wascana Hospital. A respiratory disease program has received high priority by the medical staff at the University Hospital. A trained chest physician has been placed on the hospital staff. His main job will be the development of new methods of treatment for respiratory diseases. The cost of this program too will be underwritten by the Government. Other smaller programs have been approved and are included in our budget.

Mr. Speaker, in September 1972 we started the first dental therapist training program in Canada. The first group of 36 students were enrolled. They will graduate in 1974. This year we propose to start the dental program for children. We propose to increase the size of the training class in 1973. An advisory committee on dental care has been established and will be recommending how the dental program for children is to function. It is expected the committee recommendations will be received by the end of March, this year. Legislation will be introduced during this Session for the registration and licensing of dental technologists. The program has aroused the curiosity of every province in Canada. And in fact, we have had many enquiries from south of the border. When the program is initiated it will be another first for the people of Saskatchewan. Mr. Speaker, after seven years, seven lean years of Liberal administration where Saskatchewan stood still and in some cases fell behind in health development, now after 18 months of NDP Government, Saskatchewan is again taking its rightful place in regaining its leadership role with new, experimental and innovative health programs.

Mr. Speaker, I support the Budget presented so ably by my colleague, the Minister of Finance.

I support it because, in so many areas, the Budget testifies this Government's intention to honor its election commitments.

Ours is a party which regards the electoral process as an honest and useful way of presenting alternative programs to the public. We are prepared to debate the issues on their merits. We invite the Members opposite to either present their reasonable alternatives to the Government or to join in supporting the worthwhile programs outlined in the Budget address.

However the Opposition judges us, Mr. Speaker, I am confident that the electors will judge us on how well we have done in implementing our 'New Deal for People'.

Mr. Speaker, I will support the Budget.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. H. Owens (Elrose:) — Mr. Speaker, I rise to say a few words in support of the Budget presented by the Hon. Member from Biggar, the Minister of Finance, Mr. Cowley, the gentleman with the flashy tie.

Before speaking about this fine document I should like to congratulate the Hon. Member for his appointment to the Cabinet and to this important portfolio of Finance. I would also congratulate him on his commendable presentation of this unique Budget, unique because it is his first Budget, it is the first gross Budget for Saskatchewan, it is the largest ever Budget for Saskatchewan, it provides far more opportunities for Saskatchewan citizens than any previous budget in Saskatchewan history.

Mr. Speaker, this Budget is an assurance Budget, an assurance that funds will be provided so that the programs announced in the Throne Speech will be carried out, an assurance that the NDP Government promises to the people of Saskatchewan are not idle promises but genuine commitments that will be fulfilled.

Mr. Speaker, presenting the Budget on a gross basis will be more meaningful for more people, at least more people, like myself, will be able to get a meaningful understanding of actual revenues and expenditures. I commend the Minister for acting on the recommendation of the Public Accounts Committee to change over to the gross budgeting basis.

Mr. Speaker, it is refreshing to hear from the Minister the continuing successful recovery of our economy from the recession experienced in the 1960s. It is heartening to hear and know that our economy has the resources to reverse its direction so rapidly. Is it a coincidence that recessions occur during times of Liberal administrations and recoveries occur during NDP administrations?

There is really nothing so startling about these recoveries, they merely magnify the fact that we have a great province with exceptional opportunities and untapped resources. Foresight and planning along with good leadership by Government provide the initiative and desire for people to strive for their peak potential and reap the benefits of resources and work for themselves and their neighbors.

Our depressions, Mr. Speaker, have been the inevitable result of bad leadership and no planning Liberal administrations in Saskatchewan, aided by capitalistic philosophies in Ottawa. Under free enterprise governments, our province has been the Mecca of the millionaire money moguls of Bay and Wall Street.

The people of Saskatchewan realized the true facts of give away programs to industrialists and grants in aid of outside investors and in 1971 decided they had given enough. The programs and planning projected by this NDP Government, demonstrated by the reversal of direction of our economy, is positive proof that they made the right decision. Mr. Speaker, we have barely scratched the surface although significant progress is evident in just twenty months.

It is gratifying, Mr. Speaker, to learn of the significant amount of funds allocated to aid our agricultural resources development. The Minister of Finance stated a new package of programs is to be initiated by the Department of Agriculture. Here, Mr. Speaker, is what our rural people have been looking for. The new program called FarmStart to provide grants and loans to young farmers willing to diversify into livestock, assistance in the development of farm water supplies, extension of veterinary services to control animal diseases, improved grazing leases, assistance to control livestock pollution. All these and more, such as the Hog Marketing Commission, when combined with the \$20 million provided for Land Bank purchases by, the now famous Land Bank Commission, is providing the base for an unprecedented healthy expansion and stability, not only for the farm community but for all Saskatchewan. Mr. Speaker, the bright and rosy future I see for our province is unprecedented growth and prosperity.

Mr. Speaker, the Opposition decry the trust this Government is placing in the agricultural sector. Their extreme opposition to the Land Bank program shows their concern over the popularity of this land transfer system. They rant and rave about the arrogant take-over of our farms by the Government and the impossible position into which the farm sector has been forced against their wishes, forced against wishes into a voluntary

program, how ridiculous! Mr. Speaker, I cannot understand the attitude of the Members opposite, when they oppose such a popular program, not only do they oppose it, but they distort the facts and misinform the people regarding the regulations. Mr. Speaker, they castigate the Government for legislating a program that was promised to the people and judging from the representation in this Legislature, was acceptable to a large majority. In reality, Mr. Speaker, they are degrading the people of Saskatchewan by inferring they were irresponsible in their choice in 1971. However, Mr. Speaker, they are acting true to form. Their action is consistent with their similar actions in times past on such progressive and popular legislation as Hospitalization, Medicare, Saskatchewan Power, Public Automobile Insurance and now the Land Bank Commission. To them the status quo is good enough, in fact their speeches in this Legislature are broken record performances of past Legislatures. Mr. Speaker, their performance indicates this could be their last Legislature.

Mr. Speaker, the Public Health, Social Services and Medicare and Hospitalization Departments of Government each receive a substantial increase in funds for ever expanding services, such as the recent addition of chiropractic services, now available to all persons insured under our hospital and medical plan. Further extensions of services are being planned and will include a hearing aid program, a pilot dental program for children. Extensions of care for disabled and senior citizens, along with others. Provision for financial responsibility for the Alvin Buchwold Centre in Saskatoon will be welcomed by everyone interested in this most valued service. Continuing studies into the costs of present services and the possibility of providing acceptable care through new and different types and styles of service is essential to keep our operating costs within reasonable limits while providing quality health programs in all departments. Saskatchewan has a long established record as leader in the provision of health services for its citizens and continues to hold this leadership role.

Mr. Speaker, I note with satisfaction, the Government proposes to establish an Agricultural Implements Board, with representation from government, manufacturers, retailers and users. It is my hope this board will fill a very basic need by investigating complaints into the farm machine business, from the quality of workmanship at the factory, to the service provided to the user. I hear many stories of the problems encountered by equipment users, usually farmers, some of which are hard for me to comprehend. In many cases, it appears to me, that the local dealer is attacked unfairly. Mr. Speaker, local implement dealers are part and parcel of our Saskatchewan scene, and it is necessary that they continue to be just that. As in all occupations, including farming, we have some duds, but by and large dealers are good business men trying to provide a satisfactory and acceptable service to the public. A few days ago, I sat in at a 'problems' session of the Saskatchewan-Manitoba Implement Dealers Association Convention. I heard, we as a Government have some public relations work to do with this association. Instead of currying favor, we have created hostility. It is my sincere hope that this Agricultural Implements Board will perform to satisfactorily improve relationships. I am sure their legislative committee will be meeting with Government officials to discuss several key problems. I hope they will be cordially received, as I am sure they will, and their proposals heard with open minds. Mr. Speaker, I await

with eager anticipation the recommendations forthcoming from the Legislative Committee on Small Business, for this particular group.

A few years ago, Mr. Speaker, the Agriculture Department operated a branch called Agricultural Machinery Administration, chiefly for the purpose of testing agricultural machines used in Saskatchewan. This was a very worthwhile and highly acceptable service for farmers. But, the previous administration discontinued this technical service. I urge the Government to re-instate this program at the earliest possible date.

Mr. Speaker, the education program is very much in the news, and the Government is receiving criticism from several quarters. Criticism for what has been done, for what has not been done and for some of the proposals for what could be done. The establishment of the Department of Continuing Education has opened up opportunities for those interested in furthering the learning process beyond the graduation from formal learning institutions. As well as the instituting of pilot projects in kindergarten, the starting level of the education process. These are being followed and assessed with considerable interest. I commend the Minister of Education for the thorough evaluation and the great amount of change that he has initiated in the total education field, and feel reasonably sure that indicated further change will be readily accepted when the people have the opportunity to see the new programs in action. Mr. Speaker, it is interesting to note the Minister of Finance has estimated the 1973 expenditures by local school boards to reach \$181.9 million. Of this figure \$96.2 million will be provided by school grants and \$30.5 million by Property Improvement Grants leaving \$55.2 million or approximately 30 per cent to be financed by the local taxpayer.

Mr. Speaker, could I record my concern about the teacher-trustee relationship that has appeared on the Saskatchewan educational scene. It is my sincere hope that these very necessary and influential organizations will accept their responsibilities as representatives of their respective sectors of our society in education and strive to reach a solution to their differences without direct involvement from senior government.

Mr. Speaker, the Budget proposes to ask for a moderate increase in income tax from individuals and corporations and here again, Opposition Members misrepresent and distort the facts. An 'increase in tax' pill is always difficult to swallow, but if the prescription can be justified, the pill is not so bitter, and this time, that is the case, with the added revenue to be channelled into the area of relief from property tax for school purposes. A substantial start was made last year in the Government's commitment to reduce property taxes to an average of 25 mills for school purposes by introducing the Property Improvement Grant program, which for the first time extended rebates to farmers and small business men, as well as homeowners. The Budget proposes to fulfil this commitment, the effect will be a reduction of 18 mills on taxable assessments up to prescribed maximums. Eligible assessment for the householder will be raised to \$8,000 and provide a grant equivalent to 50 per cent of his municipal taxes to a maximum of \$144. The maximum for a farmer will be \$270 and for a business man \$180.

The improved economy will provide substantial increases in

revenue from taxes on gasoline, tobacco, alcoholic beverages and royalties. A modest increase is expected from the education and health tax. Receipts from federal payments and grants represent a substantial source of income.

Mr. Speaker, the Minister has presented a Budget that is a challenge to every Department of Government. Provision of increased revenues challenges the Government through its various departments for increased services and benefits for Saskatchewan citizens. Opposition Members are disturbed by the popularity of the Government programs and services.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Owens: — Through this very opposition, indications are that Government programs are receiving more acceptance from the people.

Mr. Speaker, the comments from the people on this Budget indicate the enthusiasm with which it is being received. Leaders of some of the more important organizations agree that the Budget proposals are what Saskatchewan citizens have been expecting. Financing thrust has been put into those areas that require the most help and that will produce the most benefits.

Mr. Speaker, I congratulate the Minister for his foresight in planning and compiling this proposed program. Again I congratulate him on the presentation in such a masterful manner.

Mr. Speaker, all Members interested in a bright and fruitful future for our Province of Saskatchewan will have no alternative but to support this Budget.

Mr. Speaker, I will.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. J.K. Comer (Nipawin): — Mr. Speaker, I should like to join with those people who have spoken before me in congratulating the Minister of Finance (Mr. Cowley) on his very capable presentation of the Budget and on the Budget that displays our optimism in the future of this province.

As was mentioned earlier the Hon. Member from Biggar may be the youngest Minister of Finance in Canada, but the Budget and the Budget Speech show that he is extremely capable.

Last Saturday in the column 'Under The Dome' some of these capabilities were recognized. I should like to quote a few passages from it. It begins by saying:

Elwood Cowley, Saskatchewan's 28 year old Minister of Finance has done a lot of home work since a day last spring when he confided to a reporter he really did not know much about financial matters. A few days after his appointment last May he said he had already learned how much he did not know. And that his closest connection with high finance was that he once taught high school economics. He has obviously learned a considerable amount of what it was he needed to know.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Comer: — I think that that compliment which was paid to him in that column is a compliment that was well earned. The column goes on to contrast the Budget Speech of this year with the budget speeches that were presented in those seven years. And I will quote again.

Predecessors such as Mr. Steuart and former Premier Ross Thatcher, made political comment a major theme of their budget speeches. Last year when Premier Blakeney was Provincial Treasurer, he cut back on such comments. There was even less partisan comment in Cowley's address.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Comer: — I think this indicates our outlook towards this province. Our outlook towards government. It is not something to play politics with. It's a job, a serious job with many problems that must be solved and probably one of the major reasons that the former government opposite was not returned was that for seven years they forgot about the province and played their games. Probably the most active in that game was the Hon. Member from Athabasca. You know, today the Minister of Health (Mr. Smishek) was attempting to tell to the people of Saskatchewan and to the people in this House some of the attempts that are being made to bring better dental care to the people of Uranium City. And the Hon. Member from Athabasca rose clucking like a mud hen attempting to stop the Minister's explanation. It was a feeble attempt — keep clucking . . .

Mr. Guy: — I always follow the rules and I want everybody else to.

Mr. Comer: — When did you start following the rules?

An Hon. Member: — When did he start to know the rules?

Mr. Comer: — Last night in the Star-Phoenix there was an article commenting again on the activities of the Hon. Member from Athabasca.

An Hon. Member: — What did he do now?

Mr. Comer: — I'll quote from the article. It's headed, "Natives Criticize Probe Plan".

A letter which prompted Allan Guy to call for an investigation of the Department of Northern Saskatchewan has been severely criticized by the Ile-a-la-Crosse temporary School Committee.

It goes on to say:

The School Committee has sent a letter to Premier Allan Blakeney which criticized both the nun's motives and the mission in Ile-a-la-Crosse. We did not appreciate, the Committee said, being used as political

footballs. The Committee said it felt that the urging of an investigation of the Department of Northern Saskatchewan by Mr. Guy has been done for political ends.

An Hon. Member: — Oh, never! You wouldn't do that.

Mr. Comer: — It continued:

The letter concluded there are many things to be desired about the new Department of Northern Saskatchewan but indicated it felt the concept of local control is a positive goal.

We have heard on different occasions the Hon. Member from Athabasca talk about consultation. Even though Ile-a-la-Crosse may not be in his constituency I would suggest that when he talks about it he consult.

Yesterday we were treated to a display by the Hon. Member from Albert Park (Mr. MacLeod). He accused the Government of sabotaging Medicare. He suggested that it was a federal program. Where was the Hon. Member from Albert Park in 1962? Was it a federal program then? And yesterday the Hon. Member from Moose Jaw North (Mr. MacDonald) got into the act. He talked about the decline in the quality of care that was going to begin with the chiropractors coming under Medicare. The decline in the quality of care with chiropractors under Medicare. You'll remember in 1962 Medicare was going to bring about a decline in the quality of care. Hospitalization was going to bring about a decline in the quality of care. And if you will look into the historical records you will find that the reactionaries in the 1870s and in the 1880s were saying that public education was going to bring about a decline in the quality of education.

Mr. Speaker, this Budget, as I mentioned earlier, shows our confidence in the future of this province and I think that confidence, in fact, I'm sure that confidence is shared by all the people of this province except possibly 15 of them. Looking at some of the areas of the Budget we see a 30 per cent increase in expenditures by the Department of Agriculture, a department dealing with our most important industry. We see a doubling of the amount of money that will be made available to buy land under the Land Bank.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Comer: — We see that the Government is going to go into a grant and loan program to allow farmers to diversify into livestock. I think this shows our determination in contrast to federal and provincial Liberal indifference to do something about the problems of agriculture.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Comer: — I'd like to turn for a few minutes and talk about a specific problem that occurs in my constituency which I believe comes under the purview of the Department of Agriculture. Last spring many of you will remember that the Carrot River south of Nipawin flooded and flooded a large area of land.

An Hon. Member: — Too bad Guy wasn't there.

Mr. Comer: — I would recommend to the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Messer) that the Department take a serious look at doing works in this area, brush clearing along the river, cutting off the loops, to move the water through this area, to save what is some of the best farmland in Saskatchewan.

Mr. Speaker, the Budget also talks about the tax shift, the increase in the Property Improvement Grant. The Liberals in 1971 talked about a \$100 Homeowner Grant. Under the Property Improvement Grant we've already surpassed them for homeowners by 44 per cent.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Comer: — Farmers, some of whom were not included before get much more than \$100. Businessmen who got nothing get much more.

We are glad to see that the Government is moving ahead forcefully in developing the Department of the Environment. At times in this House we have heard discussions about pollution. We have heard talk about how the Liberals cleaned up the Saskatchewan River, that they cleaned up the pulp mill. And what did the pulp mill do? They put a bunch of egg beaters south of Highway 55 who were supposed to clean up. It's because of the NDP, because of action that we have taken, that this summer for the first time commercial fishing will be allowed in Cumberland Lake since 1968.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Comer: — Liberal talk, New Democratic action.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Comer: — I'd like to turn for a moment and look at highways. There have been suggestions in the Press, on TV and at different times in this House that our highways programs is a 'poor road' program. I invite those critics to go to those communities that have been served by oiled roads under Operation Open Roads and Operation Main Street and ask the people there is this a bad road or a poor road program. You'll get your answer.

Mr. Guy: — Yep!

Mr. Comer: — And it won't be "Yep". In my constituency two communities are now served by oiled roads, Aylsham and Ridgedale. These communities are the farthest communities from a highway in my constituency. They tried for years, especially Aylsham, under the former government to get an oiled road and they never could until just before the 1971 election it was promised by word of mouth, not on paper, and now under the New Democratic Government they have it. They have an oiled road into town and on the main street. Ridgedale is the same. And there are literally tens and dozens and scores of communities in this province that are now served by oiled roads which were not served before, communities which really had no hope of being served.

Mr. Speaker, while I'm on highways, I'd like to thank the Minister of Highways (Mr. Kramer) for sorting out the mess that the Liberals left the Nipawin bridge project in and for going ahead to build it. Some day I would like to spend some time and deal with the prices they paid for land. Some of it was swamp, some of it was garbage pile, but they paid a lot for it.

An Hon. Member: — They value garbage.

Mr. Comer: — The Hon. Member next to me here says they value garbage, they keep it beside their desks.

Mr. Speaker, one other area in the Budget that I'd like to talk about is tourism. We have seen in the last year a number of new programs come out of the Department of Industry and Commerce which make grants available to tourist operators, which make grants available to communities wishing to host various tourist events. We see that the budget for the Department of Industry and Commerce is increased. The staff, which is most important, has been increased. And these are very important in my constituency. I hope that the Department of Industry and Commerce will continue actively to pursue the event of the Cumberland House Bi-centennial next year. We are very hopeful that many people will hear about our area of the province because of this and many of them will come to this area because of this.

I'd like to deal with one other topic which has been mentioned quite a bit here in the House and that's the fact that the NDP is allowing civil servants to be active in politics. It's supposed to be a terrible thing that civil servants become people, that civil servants have civil rights. You will all remember what happened under the Liberals opposite. A civil servant didn't dare have an NDP membership. If he got the Commonwealth he had to have it going to his neighbor or wrapped in brown paper because the Liberal bagmen went around and if they saw it it was "Out". But mind you, if the fellow was a Liberal they turned the other way. It was an official party policy that civil servants were not equal with the rest of the people of this province.

An Hon. Member: — Terrible!

Mr. Comer: — I was very pleased when the Premier made a statement some months ago telling the civil servants of this province, and I had a number of them ask me what the policy was, that they could participate in politics if they so wished.

Mr. Speaker, we've heard a lot about advertisements how this Government is misusing advertisements. I have here three issues of the Nipawin Journal of May 1971. The first, May 5, what's the advertisement on the front page? "Cabinet Meeting May 10, 1971 In Nipawin". To go on to the second page — "The Government of Saskatchewan Will Help You Build A New Home". You go on to the third page — "The Government of Saskatchewan Will Help You Hire A Student This Summer". And it goes on and on. You go on to the May 19 edition. There is a picture from Government Information Services concerning one of the Liberal election gimmicks, the Choiceland iron mine, and it's interesting who's in the picture, Stephen Roman, he signed the agreement, Frank Radloff, he was the MLA who lived next to the mine. The Hon. Member from Prince Albert East (Mr. Feschuk) knows the other

gentleman better than I do, Fred Tratch, Liberal candidate from Prince Albert East. And then we go on to the issue of May 26, the headline "Provincial Election June 23". Inside there's an ad.

An Hon. Member: — Listen to this one.

Mr. Comer: — "Special Committee On The Review of Liquor Regulations In Saskatchewan Briefs Requested". The committee had been dissolved but they still had the ad.

Then we've heard about the special committees here, how awful they are. The Liberals don't like them either except when there's an election on, then they appoint some to tell people how interested they are in listening to them. If you re-elect them they'll listen.

An Hon. Member: — I wonder if it had anything to do with liquor and the election date called.

Mr. Comer: — You know, Mr. Speaker, this Budget, as I have said, shows our faith in this province. I am very proud to be able to say that I will support it. I know that the people of this province support it and I urge others to support it.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. F. Meakes (Touchwood): — Mr. Speaker, my first words are to congratulate the Minister of Finance (Mr. Cowley) for bringing in a terrific Budget. I also hand with it my compliments to the Cabinet whom I am sure helped him draw it up. I want to say that I am proud to have a group of Ministers and the Minister of Finance in particular, who are as capable and able. I might go on and say that I am very proud of the young men who come to our caucus. As one of the older Members I feel very happy that we have young men ready to take over the fight when we old codgers are going to quit.

I listened yesterday with — I don't know whether you could call it interest or what it was — but I listened very carefully to the financial critic, the Hon. Member from Albert Park (Mr. MacLeod). I wish he was in his seat because I have somewhat to say to him.

Mr. Guy: — I'll take notes for him.

Mr. Meakes: — Okay. One of the things I wanted to question at the beginning was when he talked about this Government spending buckets of money from Ottawa. I really feel, and I say this as a Canadian, not as a New Democrat, not particularly as a Member of this Legislature, but I say it from the bottom of my heart, that it's extremely important that we have a strong government in Ottawa, a strong federal government. It's extremely important that we have a nation that's a loosely knit group of provinces. I think it's important that we have a federal government that taxes us and turns around and passes that money out to the provinces that are in need, the "have not" provinces. I have never bothered digging up the figures but I am very certain that

we pay a lot more into Ottawa, that is the people of Saskatchewan, than we get back, and I am not complaining about this, Mr. Speaker, in the slightest bit. This is the way it should be. If we are a “have” province, we won’t get as much and if we are a “have not” province, we’ll get more. I think this is one of the hopes for making a strong, united Canada. But if we are going to fragmentize ourselves then I think this is going to be bad for Canada and Canada may not survive. It has enough problems as it is. This is a small, picayune kind of a charge to make. I have always been glad whether we were the Government or whether we weren’t that we did get assistance from Ottawa when it was needed. I think they have a duty and a responsibility to do this. I really think the remark of the financial critic was extremely uncalled for.

Then he talked about — maybe it was someone else today — who talked about the chiropractors’ contract and complaining that it wasn’t a good enough one. Well, at least we got a contract signed. For seven long years of the previous government the Members that sat on this side of the House, they wouldn’t even consider bringing chiropractic care under Medicare.

Mr. Wiebe: — . . . as the . . .

Mr. Meakes: — Yes, I am very sorry for the Member for Morse. I am sure that if he had been here he would have had a good influence on those fellows who sat in the front bench from 1964 to 1971. I listened to him yesterday and he complained violently about the two-minute spots for each Member. He quoted how many minutes but I didn’t bother checking how many the Liberals would get and how many minutes the Government would get.

Mr. Speaker, this Legislature does not consist of two political parties, it consists of 60 Members of the Legislature. The people of Saskatchewan, on June 23, 1971, decided how that time should be spent when they elected 45 on one side of the House and 15 on the other. I, for one, have no apologies and I am proud that the people of Saskatchewan chose it that way and I am not going to apologize in this House that we got 45 and they got 15.

I want to say a word or two about my hon. friend the Member for Whitmore Park (Mr. Grant). I just have one thing to say. I listened to the Member when he talked about capital punishment and my mind went back, and I thought to myself how easy it would be to imagine we are back prior to the time of Christ when the rule was ‘an eye for an eye and a tooth for a tooth’. And I am not one who claims to be extremely religious, but I do say I will challenge anyone to show in the New Testament where that philosophy is suggested by that great teacher, Christ.

Then the Hon. Member for Whitmore Park went on and complained about the Power Corporation, about the Government being in favor of corporations. Well, they were in power for seven years and they didn’t do away with any — not many — in fact I believe the Hon. Member was the Minister-in-Charge of Saskatchewan Power at one time. Then he said that small business did not trust this Government. Let me tell you it was a lot of the small businessmen of Touchwood constituency that supported me in the last election.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Meakes: — They went out and actively worked on my behalf and I wasn't too pleased about it, for I made it clear what we stood for.

One other thing I want to say before I get into the main text, is to agree with the previous speaker on "Open Road" and "Dust Free Main Streets". The Hon. Member from Athabasca (Mr. Guy) quipped across the floor, 'bad road program'. Well I just challenge anyone of the Members across the way to come out and talk to the village councils, talk to the town council of Kelliher, or Lestock or of Leross. Incidentally, some of these men have supported your party, but they are telling me — and I am not asking — they are telling me that it is one of the greatest programs brought in to assist the small businessmen and small villages and towns. For too long, Mr. Speaker, the small village was forgotten. I say this is kindness. They have been forgotten for 25 years and I am proud of the fact that the Minister of Highways brought in this program.

Mr. Speaker, I have listened to the Hon. Members across the way and they have given their reasons why they are not going to vote for the Budget. I just want to look for a minute or two and look at what they are voting against.

Well, they are voting against the continuation of the Land Bank, the most popular program to come before the people of Saskatchewan since Medicare. They are scared of its popularity. They know if it gets going they will suffer politically. You know, Mr. Speaker, those gentlemen across the way remind me of a bunch of old hens clucking around the yard.

They are scared of its popularity, they know that if it gets going, the Liberal party will be done. A recent random questionnaire that I sent to my constituents — and I will show them to the Members if they don't believe me — showed that close to 85 per cent of the returns — and many are not saying and I don't know what their politics are — are in favor of the program. And I ask, how will the Hon. Members from Moosomin (Mr. Gardner) from Cannington (Mr. Weatherald) or Morse (Mr. Wiebe) explain, when they tell to their constituents that they voted against this? I suggest they should think about it.

Let us see whether they vote against a comprehensive agricultural program, which will provide \$2 million in grants towards making viable farm units. Grants which will range from \$200 to \$8,000.

Mr. Wiebe: — . . . same program as we had.

Mr. Meakes: — Yes, the same program as they had and yet he is going to vote against it! It showed both equity and incentive for young farmers to engage in livestock production. Added to the grant system, will be a loan program with a maximum of \$60,000. Let us see whether the farm Members across the way will vote against that. Yet a vote against the Budget is a vote against these programs.

Then we have FarmStart, with \$15 million to back it up, a program designed to start young farmers. Then a program to assist farmers find water supplies — \$680,000, for jumbo dugouts and drill tests. Let those Liberal farm MLAs explain to

their constituents why they voted against these programs.

Then there is \$720,000 toward improving community pastures. Increased emphasis on assisting in the management of livestock herds and the development of viable farms. I really dare those Hon. Members to oppose these programs. A vote against this Budget is a vote against the new programs for farmers. Let them tell their young would-be farmers that they oppose programs to help them to get started. Yes, Mr. Speaker, they will be voting against the Budget, for cheap political gain. In hopes of gaining power, regardless of whether the programs are good, up will go their hands in opposition. By their actions, they will show themselves for what they are. It will be easy for the Members from Albert Park (Mr. MacLeod), Prince Albert West (Mr. Steuart) and Whitmore Park (Mr. Grant) to vote against it. They have very few farmers to worry about. But somehow, I see the possibility of those Liberal Members finally supporting the Budget.

Let us look at education. They will be voting against an increase in school grants of some \$11 million to school boards, plus an increase of over \$10 million in Property Improvement Grants to taxpayers. Let them explain that to the property owners of this province. I would enjoy hearing their feeble excuses. I ask again, Mr. Speaker, of these Hon. Members, dare you vote against the Budget? I admit, I hope they do. They will be digging their own graves!

I could go on and on listing things like increased assistance to Special Care Homes, subsidies to private paying residents in these homes, a \$2 million start on an addition to the University Hospital in Saskatoon, or the \$133,000 to the Palliser Regional Library, or \$2 million to Operation Open Roads and Operation Main Street. How are those Members to your left, Mr. Speaker, going to explain to the people of Saskatchewan why they voted against it?

I can well imagine that they will say something like this: "Oh, we are in favor of these programs, people need them, but we can't support a socialist Government. If you had elected us as the Government we would have done all this, but, we would have done it in the name of free enterprise".

Mr. Speaker, on June 23, 1971, Saskatchewan people said, in no uncertain terms, "We are not scared of socialism. We don't care, we are interested in programs for people. If the NDP programs are socialism, then we like socialism. All we want is a Government that puts people before profits". After all, Mr. Speaker, 45 out of 60 Liberal candidates were rejected, many of them kicked out and the programs of the New Democratic Party were accepted. Members to your left, Mr. Speaker, have never seemed to realize that they and their policies were rejected. So I say, I challenge those Members across the way to vote for rejection of the Budget and all the programs it represents.

Mr. Speaker, I did a little comparison, I looked at the pie at the back of the Finance Minister's speech and I read the one of 1971-72, the last one that the Liberals brought in. I should like to put on to the records of this House, a few comparisons.

Let us look in 1971-72 and that circle says \$16,368,990 for agriculture. When you look at the pie and read the speech of the Budget address, instead of \$16 million it is \$22,618,190. There is \$20 million for the Land Bank; \$2 million for the

development of viable farms; \$15 million from FarmStart. This makes a total of \$59,618,190 for the coming year in comparison to \$16,368,990 in 1971-72. Mr. Speaker, the financial critic had said that agriculture had been neglected!

Mr. Speaker, this is what I call performance. Let us look at Education. In 1971-72 education was \$151,580,750; Property Improvement that has returned to the people, they called it Homeowner's Grant — \$12,800,000, making a total of \$164,380,750. Then let us look at 1973-74, budgeted to pay in Education \$177,082,250; Property Improvement \$30,500,000. In other words we are putting into Education \$207,582,250 in comparison to \$164,380,750. Mr. Speaker, that is what I call performance.

Mr. Wiebe: — How much did you spend in 1961?

Mr. Meakes: — I am not talking about 1961 my friend, I am talking about — just two years apart, your last budget and our second one.

Mr. McPherson: — Great Budget, Frank.

Mr. Meakes: — Well I am glad to see one Member over there that realizes it is a good Budget, but he hasn't told us about it yet. I am sure that he will take his opportunity and tell us what a good Budget it is.

Then, Mr. Speaker, we turn to the third department which I explored in the two budget addresses, and I turn to Health. I realize that my hon. friend from Whitmore Park (Mr. Grant) doesn't believe in spending money. But let us look at 1971-72, the last Liberal Government budgeted for \$147,489,100. Look at the Budget for this year — \$186,742,710, a difference of practically \$40 million. Mr. Speaker, that is what I call performance!

One of the things that I am proudest of in regard to our Government is its record of consulting with the citizens of our province. Let me explain.

First, we on this side of the House, are directed by our annual constituency conventions. This is where our Members suggest, argue and finalize their suggestions to our annual provincial conventions. Here suggestions from the 60 ridings are made, argued and finalized, which becomes our guide. That is as democratic as one could wish. But that is only one step. We take heed of the advice of our people's organizations. Groups like the Federation of Agriculture, Federation of Labour, the co-operative movement, SARM, etc. This is what the previous government failed to do. All their suggestions are weighed and listened to.

And then we have another step of consultation, that of the intersessional committees. I realize that the Liberals don't like these committees. They are scared of them, they don't really believe in them. I think of the Member from Cannington (Mr. Weatherald) who said — and I am not referring to what he said in this debate or in the last debate — but I heard him say it a number of times, that we held too many public meetings and that it costs too much money. I say that real participatory democracy cannot cost too much money. I say that real

participatory democracy cannot cost too much money. The cost of the four special committees that crossed this province last summer is very little in comparison to the waste of the previous Government's give-aways of our natural resources, mineral resources, etc.

Sure, in the committee that I served on last summer, Government Members got a bit of heck. That I don't mind, at least we gave our citizens an opportunity to express their gripes, fears and praises. That is more than the previous Government did. They hid in their ivory towers, issued orders with no consultation or consideration. Yes, and they were defeated over their attitude.

In this complex society we are in, we must find ways and means to see that all of our citizens are given an opportunity to feel that they have some share in the decision-making process of those things that affect their lives. As far as I am concerned, I don't care what the Members of the Opposition say, I am for continuing the practice of intersessional committees.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Meakes: Mr. Speaker, before I turn to another subject can we call it 5:30?

The Assembly recessed from 5:30 p.m. to 7:00 p.m.

Mr. Meakes: — I was hoping that the hon. financial critic (Mr. MacLeod) would have been here now. In fact I saved some of my remarks hoping he would be in at 7:00 o'clock. In fact, I might have been able to finish before 5:30 but I had really hoped he might be back in his seat.

I just want to deal with a couple of things in what he said yesterday according to the Leader-Post. He talked about New Democratic Party Members lined up at the pork barrel. Then he went on and talked about civil servants working politically. The sauce pan should never really call the frying pan black. I am thinking of the by-election my hon. friend from Kelvington (Mr. Byers). I remember the Kelvington by-election when the then Attorney General's executive assistant, Mr. Bierchank, spent two or three weeks in Kelvington constituency and I remember running into him particularly on election day hauling votes for the Liberal party in Fishing Lake Reserve.

But I want to make my stand clear as far as civil servants are concerned. I don't care if civil servants work against this Government after 5:00 o'clock. They are citizens of our society and there is just no reason . . .

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Meakes: — . . . why they shouldn't be allowed to take part in political activity. I remember when I was a Minister of a previous government that I had one or two in my department who I knew supported the Liberal party. They worked actively after 5:00 o'clock. They did a good job in their department during working hours. They took no political actions during their working hours. I for one, and I know that our party stands for civil servants being able to take political action, if they so

feel.

Let me now turn to another subject, Mr. Speaker As I say I am sorry that the Hon. Member from Albert Park is not here. I want to deal for a few moments with the Federal election last fall. The Liberal party in Saskatchewan didn't do very well last fall. They ended up with only one seat. When one looks at the total votes they lost in Saskatchewan, nearly half of those votes were lost in Regina East. The figures show very clearly that there is no real difference between a Liberal and a Conservative. There is no doubt that the real power behind the scene is decided upon a fairly strong Conservative candidate and a very weak Liberal candidate. I do not believe it, but there are those who have been so unkind as to say there was a working relationship between the Conservative candidate and his law partner. I really don't believe the Hon. Member would do such a thing. Nevertheless he must have found it kind of hard to throw himself into the battle. Why did the power structure decide on this? The main reason in my opinion was that they were determined to get rid of John Burton, one of the able young MPs sent to Ottawa in 1968.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Meakes: — Liberals would sooner see a Conservative down in Ottawa than a New Democrat. You're really just carrying out what I was saying that there is no basic difference between them. Absolutely no basic difference between them.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Meakes: — Mr. Speaker, those gentlemen across there, I said before supper and it really sounds like it again are like a bunch of old hens clucking around a bunch of grain on the ground, scratching.

Mr. Wiebe: — Frank you said you would be nice.

Mr. Meakes: — Oh, I am, you ought to see me when I get ugly. Independent observers of the political scene in Ottawa, said Mr. Burton was one of the up and coming Members and the power structure issued orders to get him. No matter if they destroyed a good Liberal candidate. That was nothing, as long as they reached their goal. And I will say for the Hon. Member from Albert Park (Mr. MacLeod) he worked for the Liberal candidate, that's more than some of the other Members I ever heard of, of coming out in the country from Regina East. He spoke several times in Touchwood including my home town. I hope he comes back several times. The following day, he had spoken the night before, in my home town of Lestock, we sold five new NDP memberships to Liberals who had attended the meeting.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Meakes: — I might even consider paying his expenses next time. I really appreciate his hard work which really channelled more support for us.

Let me come back, Mr. Speaker, to this unholy marriage, a marriage of convenience. All one had to do election night was to compare the Liberal support of 1968 to 1971 to see that the whole south of Regina the long time strength of the Liberal party fell right into bed with the Tories. It was tweedle-de-dum or tweedle-de-de. Both parties have the same philosophy and the same master. It will be interesting to see what happens in Regina East in the next election. I can well imagine the long faces of some of the dedicated Liberals on election night back in October. Certainly the Hon. Members across the way have my sympathy. They know, we know and the people know that the Liberal party is on the way to becoming extinct like the dodo bird.

Yes, indeed, it will be an interesting occasion watching the next election. People may be fooled once and occasionally twice, but Canadians are well aware that the good programs and policies of the Trudeau Government that they are now talking about will only come about because David Lewis and his group behind him are forcing the Liberals to act for once for the betterment of ordinary Canadians. Sure the New Democrats would defeat the Liberals and then the Conservatives. What good would that do for Canada? It is far better to see that some good things happen to our old people and to our youth, to our farmers and to our fishermen and to our workers.

Mr. Lane: — And the unemployed.

Mr. Meakes: — Yes, to the unemployed. You certainly have got nothing for the unemployed out of the Trudeau Government, other than to think only in terms of political gain.

I was amused last Sunday evening watching TV. It was said that the Conservative Party in Ontario had been holding its annual convention, that is the first one held in three years. How could it be annual convention if you don't hold one every year. I am reminded what the Leader of the Opposition here in Saskatchewan said last fall when he talked about their fall convention. He said it had been called the 65th Annual Convention. Talk about hogwash. For years and years they went without a convention except when they chose a new leader. In fact, it was only when they got a leader who had been trained in the CCF that he said he democratized the Liberal Party. Incidentally, he failed to do it and the failure brought destruction in 1970. I am very sorry that my hon. friend from Albert Park has now just come in when I am finished. I hope he will read my speech and note his remarks.

Mr. McPherson: — I put a note on his desk.

Mr. Meakes: — Mr. Speaker, I am sure that you have gathered that I am going to support the Budget.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. T.M. Weatherald (Cannington): — Mr. Speaker, I always enjoy listening to the Member for Touchwood (Mr. Meakes). His logic is a little difficult to follow at times. I think one of the most charitable things I could say for him on his comments about the election in Regina East was they didn't think they could win it themselves so

they wanted us to win it for them. Apparently he thought that the Conservative candidate shouldn't have won the election. That the NDP Member should have won the election and since the NDP Member couldn't manage it on his own that we should have gone out and campaigned to try and ensure that he would win, which I think is a pretty bad indictment if you don't think you can win it on your own. I think if you can't win something on your own you shouldn't worry too much about what everybody else does.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Weatherald: — Mr. Speaker, I listened with some interest to the Member for Nipawin (Mr. Comer) this afternoon and I must say that I was up there doing a little fishing in the summer. I saw his picture right there in the middle of the paper saying he had resigned his job as a teacher and was a full time MLA. Lo and behold, one of the DNR was out front taking his picture cleaning up the Tobin Lake, with about three-quarters of the money coming from Ottawa which he didn't mention. His face is getting a little red because I must admit he made quite a speech in that Nipawin paper about the great clean-up job the province was doing but not once did he mention three-quarters of the money came from Ottawa under an ARDA program.

It was noted by various people around the town because I happened to be there for two or three days. It was noted around the town that this was the same party which had flooded the whole lake full of water, left the trees there, then took credit for cleaning it up with three-quarters of the money from Ottawa. I gained a little political knowledge when I was in Nipawin about the Member's activities in that particular area.

Mr. Speaker, one other insight I have had this afternoon. In debates the Member from Touchwood (Mr. Meakes) and the Member for Nipawin (Mr. Comer) touched on it a little bit. They are on the subject of political patronage. The theme of the subject seems to be that it is quite all right for the Civil Service to take part in politics, I think they should have added on as long as it wasn't on the Liberal side. Because I think any promotions or activities undertaken for Liberal members by people in the Civil Service are obviously already looked on with a very dim point of view from the Members opposite. I think it is a pretty well acknowledged fact that political activity in the Civil Service is quite all right as long as you are on the right side when you are doing it.

Mr. Blakeney: — How about . . .

Mr. Weatherald: — Well on that particular aspect I could say something, Mr. Speaker. The one thing that amazes us on this side of the House is the speeches that emanated from many of your Members when they were over here before about political patronage appointments and so forth. In fact, you even convinced one of your own supporters about that. One of them phoned me up about three days before the election to tell me that if we lost the election, which he predicted, and which he was correct about, then all of this advertising in papers, political patronage etc., etc., was going out the window. The very same man, I might add, who was one of your supporters, I am not too sure now, but he is very disillusioned with your performance and had anticipated something much better than what he got.

I might say, Mr. Speaker, that the Minister of Health today in speaking brought up something that was of interest to our side. If I misunderstood him I will be pleased if he can have one of his Members correct it at a later date. But he stood up and said today that since we were in power, the Liberals, the number of beds in Saskatchewan has been changed by one less. Which I would suggest is very inaccurate. The number of beds in Saskatchewan hospitals has only changed one, but the grants paid on the number of beds has changed substantially downward, as many rural hospitals in Saskatchewan will recognize. Many of them are having financial difficulties in this respect.

Mr. Speaker, I think it will be well proven when the Department of Health Estimates come up that the many rural hospitals are running at pretty substantial deficits. They are getting paid for less patients in the hospitals. Sure they may have 20 beds available there and they are getting grants for 15 of them, so running a deficit on the other five. I think the Hon. Minister of Health tried to sidestep that issue by making a dramatic announcement that there was only one bed change in the hospitals but I don't think he was talking about the grant program.

Mr. Speaker, I want to talk a little bit about this Budget because it is pretty obvious that the Government is continuing a spending spree which was started last year. The spending spree, Mr. Speaker, which is in a province, our province which is experiencing one of its most prosperous years.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Weatherald: — I might say I don't think it is due to anything you have done, if it is, it is not very readily seen. I would think, Mr. Speaker, the Member for Whitmore Park (Mr. Grant) adequately outlined today the concerns of many people in expressing their concerns about this Budget.

The Government's spending program has gone up by \$272 million in two years, Mr. Speaker. The Government has showed its true colors by greatly expanding the Civil Service to the extent of my calculations which I have totalled up in the Estimates book of 471 new jobs without counting pay increases in the Crown corporations. This, Mr. Speaker, should be remembered comes upon the substantial increase in the Civil Service jobs last year and it can be readily seen in our province which already had practically the highest ratio of Civil Service jobs to people served in Canada, that the Government is headed very rapidly into putting us into worse position in regard to this situation.

Mr. Speaker, it should also be remembered that many of these jobs are political jobs. And certainly I think it is of great concern to the people of Saskatchewan that 40 per cent of this Budget is coming to the NDP in Saskatchewan from the Federal Government.

Despite, Mr. Speaker, the Finance Minister's philosophizing this Budget takes more revenue from individuals than it does from corporations. We get all the NDP political propaganda about corporate rip-offs and various sorts of corporate welfare. Mr. Speaker, what do they do when they really get into office? Well in this Budget they have taxed every man, woman and child to the extent of about \$26 more, Mr. Speaker. \$25.2 million from

individuals this year is the increase in taxes that the people of Saskatchewan will pay. That is \$26 for every man, woman and child, Mr. Speaker. Over \$100 a family as my colleagues say.

Now, Mr. Speaker let's take a look at what the corporations are going to pay. They are going to pay about \$3.5 million more in corporation income tax this year. That is from a party that talks about the great corporate wealth and the great corporate profits, and actually all the Minister of Finance can do is take another \$26 million out of the hard working people in Saskatchewan and about \$3.5 million from the corporations.

I don't call this, Mr. Speaker, a corporate rip-off, I call this a worker rip-off which I think is much more accurate.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Weatherald: — Mr. Speaker, it is also fairly obvious that while the Members opposite stand in their place and talk about the property tax rebate, it is also equally obvious that the rural municipalities and the urban municipalities have been sadly short changed in this Budget.

They have not got the customary increases that they had come to expect when the Liberal Government was in, particularly rural municipalities, which constantly received very substantial increased grants.

An Hon. Member: — Ah, come on.

Mr. Weatherald: — Well, Mr. Speaker, the Member is new in this House but if he wants to go back he can look at a lot of grants and equalization grants to the rural municipalities, snow removal at 50 per cent of the cost. He talks about it being new, well he is fairly new here and he won't remember but I have quite a few towns in my area that got \$25,000 or \$35,000 for fixing up their main streets and they didn't get it since the NDP came in. They got it when the Liberals were in, Mr. Speaker.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Weatherald: — This Open Road policy is only new to the Members who came into the House this year. I think the Minister of Highways did a good job. This new policy is only new to the Members who weren't here before. The Minister of Highways (Mr. Kramer) did a good job of brainwashing them even if he didn't convince many other people.

I think, Mr. Speaker, also noteworthy, is the reliance of this Government's Treasury on heavy liquor profits. This year, Mr. Speaker, the Finance Minister is taking about \$34 million out of liquor and I think that it should not go without notice that the Provincial Treasury is depending a great deal upon liquor to assist in financing many of its programs. \$34 million, Mr. Speaker, this Government will get in order to try and balance their treasury in this Budget.

Mr. Speaker, I think that it is very disturbing to note that in what is obviously . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order, order! There's too much noise. Order!

Mr. Weatherald: — Mr. Speaker, I think that it is noteworthy that in a very prosperous year, this year in our province, that the Government has not been able to budget the financial accounts without increasing taxes. We have had a very substantial increase in taxes.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Weatherald: — Let's just take a look at what taxes have gone up — well, first of all the individual tax has gone up to the extent of \$26 for every man, woman and child. Then we have had the Attorney General mentioning we are going to have licence fee increases, possibly some insurance increases for automobiles and various other fees and sundry expenses that the Attorney General can squeeze a few more dollars out of. Then, Mr. Speaker, we have the old NDP promise that has been thrown in the ashcan that we should have free tuition at the University. I never did agree with that one personally, I see that they have ditched that one themselves because they finally turned around and headed in the other direction and even in a good financial year for the province, Mr. Speaker, they decided the students should pay a little more money for the privilege of going to University. They have already recommended to the Board of Governors that this take place.

Well then, if you like to smoke, you're going to have to pay a little bit more for that too. And then the corporations, Mr. Speaker, are going to pay about \$3.5 million more in and I might add in most cases, Mr. Speaker, people agree that most corporation taxes are just simply passed on to the consumer.

Now, Mr. Speaker, this Government has failed to set an example for the people of Saskatchewan. They have failed this year in a fairly prosperous year to be able to budget our accounts and, in fact, have gone for very, very substantial and heavy tax increases providing the necessary revenue for the extension of programs and for massive increases in the Civil Service in jobs. I think that my colleague from Albert Park (Mr. MacLeod) well dubbed this a Las Vegas Budget because they are certainly squandering much of the people's money in our province.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Weatherald: — I would just comment for a moment, Mr. Speaker, that the Member for Touchwood (Mr. Meakes) says that we are afraid that the popularity of the Land Bank is so great, that it would wipe out the Liberal numbers in this House.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I would tell the Member for Touchwood, and I would tell him in all sincerity that I would oppose the Land Bank if I didn't get one single vote in the next election and be delighted to do it.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Weatherald: — Mr. Speaker, I would oppose the Land Bank, . . . I might

add, I'll tell the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Messer), I'm not the least worried in that because I think I'll get thousands of votes on opposing that Land Bank and what is more, I would oppose the Land Bank on a matter of principle because I do not believe the Government should be intervening and getting into the land business in such a manner. That, Mr. Speaker, separates the Members from this side of the House from the other side, and it is very obvious . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order! Too much noise.

Mr. McPherson: — It's across there, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Weatherald: — Yes, I could really get along with a little less help, Mr. Speaker.

I want to talk for a few minutes about the Property Improvement Grant, much heralded reduction in education taxes. It can only be said that this reduction will be more of an illusion to the average taxpayer than it is of any substantial financial help.

The NDP Government, in an effort to meet political promises, has practically and totally eliminated any increase in assistance to the urban and municipal governments. It has told them that any more revenue that you need you will have to raise it yourself.

Now the Mayor of Regina, I would think, (the former Mayor of Regina, Mr. Baker) would stand up and tell us about the difficulty that this will cause for the city because I'm sure he has had a first-hand practical knowledge of no grants to the city and what this can do, and I would look forward to his reaction to this lack of any substantial assistance to the city in the very near future in this Debate. I wouldn't even be surprised that the Member might even vote against this Budget because there is no assistance of any kind for the rural and urban municipalities that will be of any consequence.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Weatherald: — Mr. Speaker, I suggest, in all realism that the results that were brought on by last year's budget, a very, very substantial mill rate increase, in the city of Regina, I think here it was 7, that this will again be duplicated this year and probably even in a more serious manner. This Government, in an attempt to try and make themselves look good, has budgeted all of their money into the education property tax rebate and has cut off the urban and rural municipalities, Mr. Speaker, and has basically told them to go it alone. These municipalities will be forced to bring about a very, very substantial tax increase for most of the citizens and the average taxpayer this year will be paying as much, or more, property tax than he has at any time in the past.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Weatherald: — Mr. Speaker, we on this side oppose this Budget because it fails to set a good example in what are reasonably prosperous times and fails to be responsible.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Weatherald: — The NDP Government, Mr. Speaker, has failed to set an example for the people of Saskatchewan of prudence and careful spending. Let's look, for example, at assistance to the Qu'Appelle River study, the various problems outlined in regard to pollution control. The Minister for the Environment (Mr. Byers) tells us that he has set up another committee to investigate this matter. Well, I think that it is pretty obvious, in reading this study, that the cities of Moose Jaw and Regina are responsible for about 70 per cent of the pollution that's going in the Qu'Appelle River system and I don't think we need any further study. I think this is well documented and it's most surprising a party that talked so much about pollution before the election, now are confronted with the facts of the problems by this pollution and unfortunately last summer when I visited my colleague from Albert Park (Mr. MacLeod) at one of the lakes there, it looked like 'Green Pea Soup Lake'. I should have brought a sample of that water up and given it to the Member for Cut Knife (Mr. Kwasnica) because one time he brought in a sample from the . . .

Mr. Lane: — It was Snyder who did that.

Mr. Weatherald: — Oh! I'm sorry, I should have brought them both one. In any event, next summer, I think, because of lack of any initiative by this Government, that next summer I will bring in a quart of water for them to take a look at because it's obvious by the amount of assistance provided for Regina and Moose Jaw (both desperately need some financial help to bring about this pollution control) that the Government is mostly going to solve this problem with rhetoric, they are not really interested in putting dollars up, they are mostly interested in words, talking, but intending to do nothing. And I think that it will not go without notice by the people of Saskatchewan that they have failed to put up the necessary funds to get pollution under control as far as the cities of Regina and Moose Jaw are concerned, Mr. Speaker.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Weatherald: — Again, I think this is an example of the Government's attitude towards the cities and they have not provided any financial assistance to the cities and basically said to the rate payers 'this is your problem, you look after the best way you can'.

Mr. Speaker, I want to say in conclusion that the most noteworthy thing about this Budget is the Executive Council under the Premier. I think now, in counting planning and various people in his Department, there are now 44 people in that Department, under Executive Council at about \$450,000. I think it is notable that many people in Saskatchewan were absolutely amazed last year to find that the administration cost for the Land Bank was nearly \$700,000. I think they will be even more seriously concerned to find out the administration of the Land Bank this year is over a million dollars.

An Hon. Member: — Over a million bucks!

Mr. Weatherald: — That's what you have budgeted. You have a little over a million dollars in your Estimates.

Mr. Speaker, I don't know if the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Messer) knows it or not, but that's the book that they presented to us the other day and he can read it for himself if he wishes.

Mr. Speaker, the civil servants have increased, without counting Crown corporations, to an increase of 471 people. In this Budget the Government will be remembered for having substantially increased taxes, increased the Civil Service and wasted money high, wide and handsome in this Las Vegas Budget. It has placed the Province of Saskatchewan in a very precarious position, Mr. Speaker. It's a precarious position because the Government has not attempted to be careful with the province's finances. They have gone on a wild spending spree and I might suggest, Mr. Speaker, that if this year's crop in Saskatchewan is not a really good crop and it turns out to be a dry year, the Government of Saskatchewan, Mr. Speaker, the Government of Saskatchewan will be in a very, very serious financial position because they have not controlled financial expenditure.

Mr. Speaker, the one thing that I would do if I was the Minister of Finance, I would listen to every weather forecast beginning this spring because I could tell him that if Saskatchewan does not have a good year for agricultural production, his finances are going to be in very, very bad shape in a very short period of time.

Mr. Speaker, this is a risky Budget. It does not set a good example for Saskatchewan and Mr. Speaker, I will have no difficulty whatsoever, and, in fact, it will be with great pleasure that I will oppose this Budget.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. A. Oliver: (Shaunavon) — It is always enlightening to have the Member for Cannington (Mr. Weatherald) give his oration and wisdom to this House . . .

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Oliver: — He talks about this Budget as a Las Vegas Budget. I think that perhaps with the remnants across the House, they have been playing Russian roulette.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Oliver: — Mr. Speaker, I wish to congratulate the Minister of Finance on the construction of a Budget that is not only exciting and bold, but it is a blueprint of this Government's plan to revitalize the Saskatchewan economy.

This Budget is an example of democracy in action. It is the culmination of grassroots ideas. Ideas such as Land Bank, FarmStart and the Agricultural Implements Board, to name only a few. They were conceived by people at the grassroots, or constituency level. Their feasibility was proven after much

discussion throughout the province and are now realities under their Government, the NDP Government. Mr. Speaker, man has always been skeptical and self-centered.

Today, when a new program or idea is announced, many people ask, "What's in it for me?" Mr. Speaker, I'd like to try to answer that question by taking a cross-section of the people of the Shaunavon constituency and show what's in this Budget for them.

Since the backbone of our economy is agricultural, I'd like to begin with a typical father-son farming operation. Many of these units are not large enough to provide the father and his son with any degree of economic viability. The Land Bank makes it possible for the father to transfer the land to his son and be able to retire with sufficient finances to enjoy his well-earned retirement without financial worry. This was not the case in the past as the father couldn't afford to give much of his property to his son and retire with any form of financial security; and the son didn't have the resources available to him to buy out his father. The Land Bank is the key to this dilemma.

To make this farm more viable, this young farmer may borrow up to \$60,000 at a low interest rate with payments spread over a long term and he would then be eligible for a grant ranging from \$200 to \$8,000, depending on his needs and the potential for such an expansion.

The expansion of his livestock enterprise probably will create the need for a greater supply of water and hydro facilities and related equipment. This Budget provides him with a grant for the digging of a jumbo dugout. This jumbo dugout program was very popular in the past years, and it will be now. He will also be able to get free technical and financial assistance from Family Farm Improvement Branch to install modern water works. To further assist this young man in making a successful start, technical and managerial assistance is available at no cost. Improved veterinary services to control livestock diseases and losses are also made available in this document. If he should experience financial loss due to unreasonable delays in obtaining machinery parts or because the manufacturer has failed to fulfil his warranty obligations, he will have recourse for damages and compensation through the new Agricultural Implements Board, comprised of farmers, dealers, manufacturers and the Government.

The gradual improvement of main farm access roads will take the place of the Grid Road Programs as it nears its completion. While this is being done, more of the highways are upgraded and oiled, allowing him all-weather roads to town.

In addition to taking advantage of existing programs such as Medicare (and its latest inclusion of chiropractic care under MCIC) and the Property Improvement Grants, which, Mr. Speaker, will give about 26 per cent rebate on his taxes, and his children will also be able to benefit from the new Denticare program.

Assuming this young man's father would buy a house in town, there are benefits in the Budget for him also. As a property owner he may have 50 per cent of his municipal taxes refunded to a maximum of \$144.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

He would appreciate the new programs sponsored by the Department of Highways, called Operation Open Roads and Operation Main Street as well as the cost-sharing program of oiling the side streets to keep them dust-free.

The Budget also shows concern for the businessman. Mr. Speaker, there is a great deal of confusion regarding the types of assistance that are available to the local businessman. This was verified by the Special Committee on Business that went about the province listening to the needs of the businessman.

Mr. Speaker, I was very disappointed to hear reports from the Member for Cannington and his vicious attack on the Government Members of all the Special Committees that took government to the people.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Oliver: — His unwarranted attack shows how shallow and irresponsible the Members opposite really are. Every time this Government introduces legislation that is obviously going to be a success and beneficial to the populace of Saskatchewan, the Members opposite begin their basic tactics to destroy the program for cheap political gain. His typical shot-gun approach has caused considerable casualties among his own bedfellows. I thought you had more scruples than that, Tom. You certainly disappointed me. My respect for Members opposite took a further decline when the Member for Albert Park (Mr. MacLeod) made a rude and unparliamentary remark about the Member for Touchwood (Mr. Meakes) in his speech yesterday. They must be really down in the gutter, Mr. Speaker, to resort to these tactics. They've got no place to go but up.

Mr. Speaker, the Special Committee on Business was enthusiastically welcomed by all the communities they visited. I'm sure they will welcome the establishment of The Business Assistance Branch which will provide consultative services linking the Department and the business community.

This Budget provides an increase in the Property Improvement Grant to a maximum of \$180 for the businessman. That, I suppose, is called war on business.

The senior citizen is also taken care of in this Budget through Special Home Repair grants varying from \$200 to \$500 according to the Guaranteed Income Supplement he receives. In addition to this he is eligible for the Property Improvement Grant to a maximum of \$144. If he has a hearing impairment he may take advantage of the new hearing aid program. If he doesn't own his own home, he may want to take advantage of the Low Rental Housing provided for senior citizens. The Budget provides a grant of \$1.80 per day for those requiring level II care and \$4.80 a day for those needing level III care in a Special Care Home.

The student seeking to further his education may receive a bursary provided for in the \$1.3 million appropriation in the Budget for the Bursary Program. He will no doubt be taking advantage of the \$64.8 million being spent on the Department of Continuing Education and also the University.

The Government has budgeted \$1.5 million to employ students

in Government during the summer months. This is in addition to the \$1 million appropriated to the Provincial Government Employment Program, more commonly called PEP, that was so popular last year.

The laborer will also benefit from such programs as the Home Repair Loan Plan where the loan, spread over five years, will be partially forgivable.

The Provincial Winter Works Program will also provide work for some people who may be unemployed during the winter. In the Shaunavon constituency alone this program will create 65 jobs with a total cost of \$136,325, with grants amounting to \$36,402 which will be paid by the Provincial Government towards these projects. Mr. Speaker, this creates an unknown amount of economic spin-off in these communities for the local merchants.

This Budget will have the effect of stimulating the entire Saskatchewan economy, which is in direct contrast to the Liberal philosophy of putting all the emphasis on one or two large industries such as the Athabasca Pulp Mill which do not create many jobs and where the profits go to large foreign corporations. Mr. Speaker, I'm proud to be part of a Government that has the courage to challenge the philosophy of the old line parties and to show them up for what they really are. This Budget is designed for the people and by the people of Saskatchewan.

Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the people of the Shaunavon constituency, I take great pride in supporting the motion.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. M. Kwasnica (Cut Knife): — Mr. Speaker, before dealing directly with this Budget on behalf of the people of Cut Knife constituency, I should like to take a minute to express my sincere thanks to the Premier and his Government for all the things that are happening in Cut Knife constituency and have happened in the last 19 months.

Mr. Speaker, since this vibrant NDP Government has taken office, the people in my riding continue to be extremely pleased with all of the accomplishments that have taken place. The Government has abolished the deterrent fees; increased aid to our elderly citizens in senior citizen homes; medicare has now been paid for our senior citizens; chiropractic care for all those who need it; an 18 mill reduction in property taxes this year; smaller hospitals no longer being closed arbitrarily unless there has been some discussion; the Land Bank program which has already been so thoroughly discussed in this Debate; the increased aid to small businessmen; the oiling of roads to Regional parks — a beautiful program, Mr. Speaker; Operation Open Roads and Main Street; increased royalties from minerals and oils; a new bursary and loan program for our university students; abolition of the pupil-teacher ratio; and this year, Mr. Speaker, we will be settling the salary negotiation problem once and for all, we hope. All these accomplishments, Mr. Speaker, in 19 short months. All I can say is thank you, Premier Blakeney, thanks to the NDP and its grass roots for making all these things possible.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Now I have already alluded to several exciting things that have been happening right in my own constituency. I am extremely pleased that we have now two gymnasiums in the Lloydminster school unit since that glorious day the Liberals across the way were defeated. We have one at Maidstone and one at Neilburg now.

While under the seven long years of Liberal Government, our students suffered while not one gymnasium was built. Mr. Speaker, as a matter of fact the students in Lloydminster School Unit No. 60 never saw a gymnasium until the NDP Government was elected.

Mr. Speaker, by showing what has happened in my constituency we can draw a parallel to what has happened across the province and I should like to take a few more minutes to show you more of what has happened in my riding. Another major accomplishment was achieved last October, when the last highway mile in Cut Knife constituency was finally oiled — 202 highway miles in my riding — every mile oiled or black-topped, Mr. Speaker. Just as a corollary we have 21 miles of oiled grid roads as well. That's performance and I am proud of that record.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Kwasnica: — Mr. Speaker, it was through the efforts of local people and myself that our Government assisted with yet another fairly necessary project. This time it was in the field of care for the handicapped in the Lloydminster area. A grant of \$15,000 was given toward a sheltered workshop which can accommodate up to 40 people. It is interesting to note, Mr. Speaker, that I was invited to a meeting of the workshop committee to discuss the plans, and they were well underway, when they called me in. Within one week of the date of that meeting the Minister of Social Services (Mr. Taylor) announced a \$15,000 grant in support of that program. A further operating grant of \$9,000 was given to this worthwhile project to assure its success.

Under our new program, Operation Open Roads and Operation Main Street, two towns in my riding have already taken advantage of it. Neilburg and Paynton have had their main streets oiled as well as the access to the nearest highway. The town of Cut Knife has applied and is next in line for this program assistance. Also ten miles have been oiled to Silver Lake Regional Park, north of Maidstone.

Mr. Speaker, I shall be supporting this Budget with enthusiasm because somewhere in the Estimates is a sum of money set aside for extended bus service from North Battleford along highway No. 40 up No. 17 to Lloydminster, by the Saskatchewan Transportation Company. This route will serve the cities of North Battleford and Lloydminster and all the centres along the way including the smaller ones like Cut Knife, Wilbert, Baldwinton, Freemont, Neilburg and Marsden. I am hopeful that if the people use this service to the fullest, it will be a financial success. This is proof positive that we said we would help save the rural communities and this we are doing.

I shall support this Budget also, Mr. Speaker, because in the Estimates we see some \$58,000 for renovations to a hospital in my riding in the town of Neilburg. These improvements will greatly improve the quality of health care offered to the

residents of the area. Compare this, Mr. Speaker, with the action of the previous government who closed down the Lashburn hospital and did very little more to help health care in our area

Mr. Speaker, there are a host of other accomplishments in my constituency in the first 19 months of NDP Government. I want to show Members opposite that I have researched everything very thoroughly and it is really quite amazing. That is why I take time in this Budget Speech to put it on the record of this House.

We also have had a new bridge across the Battle River, south of Paynton, installed just this fall. Several rural municipalities have built maintenance sheds — the RM of Hillsdale, RM of Wilton and RM of Cut Knife. A Department of Highways maintenance shop and its crew will be moved into Neilburg and will increase the population of that town by some three or four families. Lighting grants have been given to the Lloydminster airstrip in the amount of \$2,000. Several thousand dollars in grants have been given to the Barr Colony Museum and Weaver Park also in Lloydminster. Finally, Mr. Speaker, plans are now going ahead to prove also that we in the New Democratic Party believe in what we say in the spirit of co-operation, for there are now joint plans being made for a community college venture in the Lloydminster-Vermilion and Maidstone area in co-operation with the Alberta Government.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I am sure that if accomplishments were tallied up in each of the 60 constituencies across this province, you would find a similar situation. Yes, Mr. Speaker, Saskatchewan is booming again, thanks to our newly elected NDP Government. New Democrats will be elected over and over again in this province because they make promises, they keep them and they enact them as soon as possible and not just prior to an election as the Liberals have always done.

Mr. Speaker, Liberals across the way often complain about the lack of action by our Government to stimulate our economy and create jobs. Our Winter Works Program has been a tremendous boost to our people across the province and it was announced early in September, well in advance so that all interested organizations could take advantage of this program. \$5 million has been allotted to this Budget to create some 4,200 man-months of employment. I have taken the time out to summarize all the grants that have been approved in my constituency up to February 1st and I do want to place them on the record for the benefit of all Members.

There is a total sum of money devoted in this Budget to the Cut Knife constituency under the Winter Works project of almost \$100,000. This will create, Mr. Speaker, 128 jobs, a total of 889 man-weeks of work in this winter season. Now this is what the Winter Works Program has done for the people of Cut Knife constituency.

Mr. Speaker, I want to take a minute out to talk about some of the things the Members opposite have been saying about our Budget and to set clear and straight some of the comments they are making.

The financial critic in his rebuttal of our Budget made the comment that the NDP didn't seem to know where it was going on the income tax situation. He said our Federal Leader, Mr. Lewis,

says one thing about income tax and the Provincial Government does another. Now there has never been any doubt about where we stand on income tax. We say those who earn money should pay. Those who earn more should pay more. But what was the Opposition critic trying to say? He is trying to say that Mr. Lewis was saying that he was trying to reduce the income tax. What Mr. Lewis is saying is that we want to raise the exemptions. We asked for \$2,000 exemption per person and what did we get, Mr. Speaker, \$1,500. He says this is a discrepancy. There is no discrepancy. We want to increase the exemptions so that the little fellow has a break and then we can charge after that. That is exactly our stand on the income tax.

Mr. Speaker, these Budget programs now being implemented as promised, must have blown their minds. Mr. Speaker, if they had a mind to blow — judging by the behavior of some Members opposite and in particular we could mention the behavior of a certain Member from Athabasca who rants and raves and screams and hollers and upsets the whole House, breaks in on radio time, causes bells to be rung. Why is he doing this, Mr. Speaker? All he is doing this for is publicity. He stands up and he says, “I’ll defend the Press and I’ll defend the Press until I die”. It is quite a performance, Mr. Speaker. What has he got constructive to add to the debates? Nothing. Just like all Members opposite they get up and they deal in trifles. I didn’t hear one single constructive bit of advice from the financial critic. Not one, it was all garbage right from the beginning to end. Two hours of garbage. No philosophy. He doesn’t know where he is going, he’s jumping here and he’s jumping there. Typically negative of the Liberals.

The Member from Cannington (Mr. Weatherald) who spoke earlier this evening, had a comment about the number of civil servants we have hired. Well, Mr. Speaker, if you want a job done you have to hire good people to do it. We make no apologies for the excellent civil servants that we are hiring at this time. Our civil servants will be the best in the country once again as they were before 1964. There is proof of this, Mr. Speaker, because many of our civil servants after 1964 were grabbed up by either Ottawa Liberals in the government ranks or other provinces of other political beliefs. They didn’t worry about whether they were NDP or not, they took our best civil servants. Once again we will build up the best Civil Service in the country and we make no apologies for it.

Mr. Speaker, I should like to take a minute to discuss the matter of resource development in our province. This Budget will be supported by the people of Saskatchewan because of the responsible approach toward resource development taken by our Government.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Kwasnica: — It has always been the philosophy of socialists that the natural resources of a province belong to the people of our province, that they be utilized with an eye to good management and pollution control, that royalties and fees be increased to a more reasonable return to its people. We believe that if private enterprise won’t develop our resources within the sensible framework that we have set, then the public collectively should, through the efforts of government, explore our resources and utilize them wisely through Crown corporations.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to see that moneys will be set aside to establish a Crown corporation to carry out exploration for petroleum and natural gas in our province. This is a small start to perhaps build a truly Saskatchewan owned oil company, beginning at the oil well site on through a refinery, distributed by Saskatchewan owned service stations — whereby people of Saskatchewan can be proud to say, “I’m buying Saskatchewan oil for the benefit of Saskatchewan people instead of foreign corporations”.

Compare our approach, Mr. Speaker, to the one used by the Liberals in 1969 toward resource development. I chose 1969 because that is two years after the previous government was in office. In their budget address on page 432 of 1969 they said:

The Legislature will be asked to provide funds for the mineral exploration incentive program in the form of \$1 million supplementary appropriation for 1968-69 fiscal year, and a further \$1.1 million appropriation for the 1969-70 fiscal year. These amounts will provide for the Government’s share of the cost of exploration . . .

Now, Mr. Speaker, that was \$2.1 million in handouts to foreign oil companies to explore for our oils and minerals. What did these companies do? They took our \$2 million, did very little to find anything new in resources, had a good time in Saskatchewan and walked off with \$2 million bucks. Mr. Speaker, this is the famous Liberal give-away — sell out to foreign companies. It will be a long time before the people of Saskatchewan trust Liberals to handle the mineral resources of our province again. Contrast this arrogant misuse of public money to our responsible position of exploring by ourselves, of increasing the oil and gas royalty and fee structure to bring in additional revenues of \$7 million to the people of Saskatchewan in the coming year. Since taking office we have increased our resource royalties by \$18.4 million. This is where we get a good portion of the money for the whopping increases in the Property Improvement Grant.

Mr. Speaker, as far as I’m concerned our current royalty fee of around 25 cents a barrel for crude is still nowhere near enough when a barrel of crude sells for anywhere from \$1.75 to \$2.50 in the market. And I would remind this House that the Middle East countries charge a flat 50 per cent royalty on oil and minerals and still foreign countries are clamoring for their oil. If we were to increase our royalties to 50 per cent, why we could probably reduce property taxes for school purposes altogether.

We’ve presented the people of Saskatchewan with an 18 mill reduction in property taxes and have reduced the average mill rate for school purposes to 25 mills just after a short 19 months in office. Compare our record, Mr. Speaker, with the Liberal record of 1966. In that budget gasoline tax was increased by one cent. That year’s budget showed a surplus of \$9.3 million. Now, Liberals wanted to be generous and they proposed a list of additional sales tax exemptions to help our already over-taxed taxpayers. Mr. Speaker, 13 items were exempted to help our farmers, so that budget said in 1966. What were these items that they exempted, Mr. Speaker? Egg-room coolers and controls, water line medicators, poultry nests, egg coolers, incubators and accessories, farrowing crates, livestock trays, cow trainers. And what else that every farmer

in Saskatchewan uses first thing every morning — turkey saddles!

Mr. Speaker, and in the same breath they imposed a four per cent sales tax on soaps and detergents and all cleaning powders. It appeared that the Liberals objected to cleanliness in 1966.

That's not all, Mr. Speaker. That was the year the Liberal Government refused to pay the residents of Lloydminster, Saskatchewan the \$50 Homeowner Grant.

An Hon. Member: — Oh, oh!

Mr. Kwasnica: — That's why I picked 1966. I'd like to remind the Members opposite. Mr. Speaker, the Premier of the day had a special section in the budget. It was entitled "Lloydminster", that famous city. And I want to read what it said. To quote that budget about Lloydminster:

Last fall I announced that the Government would be obliged to seek a solution to end the situation whereby the people of Lloydminster were receiving full provincial benefits but not paying a fair share of Saskatchewan taxes. Today, for the most part, these citizens pay little or no sales tax, no tobacco tax and not the full gasoline tax. We have met with the Lloydminster City Council and representatives of their Chamber of Commerce several times and we have invited these bodies to come forward with alternative proposals. No acceptable solution has been reached.

Of course, what a negotiator.

We therefore intend to exclude property owners in the city of Lloydminster and rural areas in the immediate vicinity . . .

I don't know how they are going to draw the line . . .

. . . from receiving the Homeowner Grant.

Mr. Speaker, the people of Lloydminster will remember the generosity of the previous Liberal Government for the next 25 years.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Kwasnica: — They will remember the arrogance of Liberals, the attempt to turn Lloydminster into a police state to try to collect the tax and to try to punish them afterwards by refusing to give them the Homeowner Grant. However, after considerable pressure from the MLA for Cut Knife at that time, the Hon. Toby Nollet, the Liberals relented and saw the error of their ways and paid Lloydminster residents the grant the very next year. You can't trust them.

Mr. Speaker, I want to take a minute to discuss and lay on the record of this House and mention that I am extremely pleased with the farm program as laid out in this Budget.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Kwasnica: — I want to congratulate the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Messer) for his foresight and his imagination in bringing in many new programs.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Kwasnica: — And of course, I think the reason he chose some of these programs and realized the need for diversification and is helping in that regard and is suggesting that the whole province needs to diversify is because he had had an opportunity to come to the constituency of Cut Knife and he knows that area is probably one of the best balanced agricultural areas in Saskatchewan. It's diversified.

The number of applications to the Land Bank Commission indicates the obvious success of that program. I was glad to see the department spend its allocated funds of \$10 million last year. Several farmers in my constituency, however, expressed their fear that the leasing fee of 7 or 8 per cent would be far too high and make it too difficult for farmers. The Minister listened to the public as he did when he was drafting the Land Bank legislation and he brought the leasing fees down to five per cent in spite of the fact that we may have to subsidize them a little bit.

If we can assume that doubling the amount of funds to \$20 million for land purchases in the coming year will mean that twice as many young farmers will be established in the coming year then some 700 new and young farmers will get started without huge sums of capital investment; this is progress.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Kwasnica: — Mr. Speaker, it would perhaps be appropriate at this time in the progress of the Land Bank program for us to examine the feasibility of a special pension plan for young farmers starting out. In 20 or 30 years when these lessees begin to look at their retirement, they may find that their assets may not be sufficient to retire comfortably. Therefore, I would recommend that the Minister begin to examine the different methods of financing a provincial pension plan for Saskatchewan farmers. Many occupations have a second pension plan in addition to the Canada Pension Plan. Why shouldn't farmers? Industrial workers, civil servants, all municipal employees, many union members, school teachers and others, all have their own pension plans as well as the Canada Pension.

Mr. Speaker, this Budget stresses diversification as a method of stabilizing the farming economy. Anybody knows that straight grain or straight cattle or straight hog production could be a risky proposition. Therefore, it is necessary to assist farmers to diversify. Our Government feels that diversification into cattle would be the wisest move at this time. But the problem for many of our smaller family farms is that they do not have the necessary collateral to secure a loan from the usual lending institutions or the Farm Credit Corporation. Therefore, our new program FarmStart will fill a very important need in the farming community. With some \$15 million to be advanced to FarmStart for lending we shall be able to assist hundreds of farmers to diversify. This program will offer

outright grants of \$200 up to \$8,000 depending upon the need of the individual farmer. Loans of up to \$60,000 with reasonable repayment terms and interest rates and security requirements will be made available. Mr. Speaker, it is expected that the benefits of FarmStart would not be available to large, well established farming operations.

Thus, Mr. Speaker, our Government is fulfilling yet another of its promises, that of saving the family farm and helping to preserve the rural way of life in Saskatchewan. This Budget will go a long way to doing just that.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Kwasnica: — Now, Mr. Speaker, there is much more that I could mention that's in this Budget but I am concerned with what the Opposition is going to do about all of these positive, meaningful programs for our people. Are they going to vote against a hearing aid program for our senior citizens? Are they going to vote against chiropractic care? Are they going to vote against the Agricultural Implements Board? Are they going to vote against our program to triple our reforestation in the province? Are they going to vote against a program to accelerate the tourist industry and the oiling of streets and roads? Are they going to vote against the seven per cent increase for universities? The \$1.3 million bursary program for students? Are they going to vote against the \$10.2 million in operating grants to school boards? Are they going to vote against the Saskatchewan Housing Corporation that will provide grants to our senior citizens of up to \$500 for renovations?

Mr. Speaker: — Order! There's too much noise. Order!

Mr. Kwasnica: — Will the Liberal Opposition vote against an 18 mill reduction in property taxes? The \$270 Property Improvement Grant for the farmers? \$180 Property Improvement Grant for the small businessmen? And \$144 for the homeowner? Mr. Speaker, I want to know what the Opposition is going to do. If they all vote against these wonderful programs they will be doing the people of Saskatchewan and of my constituency with all its winter works programs a disfavor. They have been totally negative in this debate, destructive, and I want the people of the province to know it, Mr. Speaker. We'll have to wait till Friday to see what happens in that vote. Whether some of the boys over there are going to become men and vote for a Budget that is sound, a Budget that will take Saskatchewan into a new era.

Mr. Speaker, without a doubt, I will be supporting the motion.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. N.E. Byers (Minister of The Environment): — Mr. Speaker, as I rise to take part in this Debate I first want to take this opportunity to congratulate the Minister of Finance (Mr. Cowley) for the Budget which he presented to this House last Friday. As I listened to his presentation, I was impressed with his immense knowledge of the complex matters of public finance and I think that he clearly

demonstrated that he will give leadership in a capable way as custodian of the public purse.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to support the Budget now before this House because it represents another milestone in the New Deal for People which was laid before the people by this party in 1971 and heartily endorsed by a large majority of the Saskatchewan people.

Before I discuss some of the plans of the two departments for which I have charge, I want to discuss four or five minor items that do pertain to other departments.

The New Democratic Party, Mr. Speaker, is renowned for the progressive policies which it advocates and which it implements in the field of education. As we promised in the book, the New Deal for People, this Government acted very quickly to eliminate that pupil-teacher ratio. This edict was imposed by the former Government. It succeeded in closing, as you are aware, Mr. Speaker, many rural schools, it forced many of our young teachers to leave Saskatchewan to find jobs, and it virtually strangled local autonomy in education.

Another program which I want to discuss briefly is the Saskatchewan Student Loan Plan. In its first 100 days of office this Government demonstrated its concern for and its confidence in our young people by reviving the almost defunct Student Loan Plan. This plan was implemented in 1949 by the CCF Government. It had expanded to \$5 million by 1964. But it certainly was not taken very seriously by the former Government. Funds were extracted from it to balance their budget almost on a yearly basis. It was not used sufficiently, Mr. Speaker, to assist needy students, particularly those enrolled in the technical institutes who were not eligible for loans under the Canada Student Loan Plan. In fact, Mr. Speaker, in the fiscal year 1969-70 the former Government assisted only some 31 students with loans amounting to \$19,035 under the Saskatchewan Student Loan Plan. Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Education (Mr. MacMurchy) in this Government barely had his feet under the desk when he remedied this situation. He expanded the Saskatchewan Student Loan Plan to benefit some students who were excluded from the Canada Student Loan Plan. Consequently in 1971-72, when the plan was beginning to breathe again, 231 students, and not 31 students, as in 1969-70, received \$184,000 in loans.

To provide additional incentive to needy students this Government has launched a non-repayable bursary scheme ranging from \$50 to \$500. In the fiscal year 1971-72 some \$627,500 was advanced to over 2,000 students under this program. These two programs have benefitted Saskatchewan students for a total of \$811,906 in the fiscal year 1971-72. Mr. Speaker, the launching of a non-repayable bursary scheme combined with the revival of the almost defunct Saskatchewan Student Loan Plan with regulations to make them work and dollars to give them life means a New Deal and new hope to Saskatchewan students with limited financial resources.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Byers: — Mr. Speaker, I want to discuss some of the programs in this Budget that tackle the problems of transportation in rural Saskatchewan including our towns and villages. If there was one

outstanding characteristic of the former Government, it was the absence of any tangible form of long term planning to revitalize our small urban centres. It is tragic that with all of our resources, both human and otherwise, that for seven years Saskatchewan had to endure such a low level of construction activity and a high level of unemployment. For seven years, Mr. Speaker, skilled and unskilled workers joined small contractors and fled the province in droves because we had a Government that said you have no claim to the resources of this province. During those seven, long, Liberal years there was an almost anti-small town attitude. It was an atmosphere that was not conducive to investment by the province in our small urban centres. But today, Mr. Speaker, the prospects are brighter.

For many years, Mr. Speaker, the New Democratic Party has stressed the need for longer term planning so that the province and local governments can work in harmony to revitalize rural Saskatchewan. As we believe that local governments would respond and co-operate in positive plans for community betterment, the New Deal for People contains this commitment. And I quote:

A New Democratic Party Government will make communities better places in which to live by providing funds for street paving, sidewalk construction, park and recreational facilities.

Mr. Speaker that is on page 4 of the New Deal for People. That promise has not been swept under the rug. The Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Wood) deserves credit for the new program launched last year and expanded this year to provide a new financial deal for street improvements in our towns, our villages and our hamlets.

Under this program the Provincial Government will cost-share street improvements in the residential areas of our towns and villages and hamlets on a 50-50 basis, with a maximum provincial contribution of \$40 per capita over a five year period.

In 1972-73, \$650,000 was allocated for this program. I have been advised that applications have come in from 100 towns and 195 villages. We are confident, Mr. Speaker, that over the next four or five years local governments will undertake major street improvements, that will result in more jobs for local workmen and contractors because the Provincial Government has recognized that our small centres are good places to live and to raise a family and to retire.

I want to say just a few words, Mr. Speaker, about the Operation Open Roads and the Operation Main Street. It is a policy, Mr. Speaker, that seems to baffle our Liberal friends. They call it a back roads policy. Some of them think it is the same old policy, some of them think it is a new policy. Well, if they can't make up their minds on this one I think the voters will likely lead them to the dead end road.

Mr. Speaker, the urban assistance program was certainly one policy that needed to be reviewed, and it was reviewed by this Government. It is true, as the Hon. Member from Cannington (Mr. Weatherald) indicated, that a number of towns did benefit under the old urban assistance program, which was essentially a 50-50 cost-sharing program. But it is also true when you analyze how that program worked throughout the province, that

there were very few towns with populations of 800 or less, which were able to take advantage of that old program because the financial input by the province was not sufficient. The new Open Roads Program has been upgraded so that now the Government pays 70 per cent, and not 50 per cent of the cost of the main street, and the province now shares in the maintenance costs, which was not formerly the case.

I want to draw to the attention of Members how this policy differs from the former policy. Under the former Government there was no definite policy with respect to connecting towns to the provincial highway. All of these connections, Mr. Speaker, were decided at ministerial discretion and you can look over the records of this province and you will see that for some towns, the Department of Highways paid 100 per cent of the cost of the connection. In other towns they paid 50 per cent of the cost of the connection and in other towns they weren't even in the program. There was no uniform policy.

Well, I think that local governments disapprove, and rightly so, of this lack of uniform policy. They want to know what the general rules are. And under the Open Roads policy they now know what the normal rules are.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Byers: — Mr. Speaker, this Budget does acknowledge the commitments which we made to the people of Saskatchewan with respect to agriculture. I want to comment on two or three programs.

First, the Land Bank Program. I am very pleased that the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Messer) has recognized that the fine people of Saskatchewan recognized this program as a valuable program to give young farmers access to farm land to keep them on the farms. I think that Saskatchewan farmers accept the program. In my own constituency I believe there are approximately 25 or 30 units of land that have been offered to the Land Bank for sale in its first year.

I have often referred to this plan, Mr. Speaker, as the 'How do you keep them down on the farm plan', of the New Democratic Party program. Because anyone who represents a rural constituency — and I am sure the Hon. Member for Wilkie (Mr. McIsaac) runs into this problem, and I am sure that the Hon. Member for Cannington (Mr. Weatherald) and Moosomin (Mr. Gardner), as do Government Members who go about their constituencies, continuously come upon this type of problem. The young farmer who wants to farm, who has some assets and land and farm equipment, and he has applied to the Farm Credit Corporation. But time after time his application has been refused because his assets did not come up to the level required by the Farm Credit corporation. So he has been forced either to eke out a meagre living or his father has had to give up some of his land to allow his son to farm or he has had to abandon the farm as a potential farmer and join the labor market elsewhere.

I know that the Land Bank program, when it is combined with the FarmStart are most ambitious programs. I am sure that they will succeed and they will succeed in keeping, in rural Saskatchewan, many hundreds of young farmers whom we need to keep this land and province viable.

Mr. Speaker, there are a number of other matters that I should like to talk about but I want to turn now to the two Departments for which I am responsible and discuss some of the accomplishments and future plans of both the Department of Co-operation and the Department of the Environment.

The Department of Co-operatives. First the role of the Department. Mr. Speaker, our Government recognizes that the people of Saskatchewan possess both the desire and the know-how and the mutual concern for their fellow men to tackle many of their social, economic, and financial problems by co-operative action. It is true that in the final analysis, the true test for the success of any co-operative, is related to the loyalty and the support that is provided by its members.

Nevertheless, our Government believes that we have a responsibility to provide leadership and guidance in the formation of new co-operatives, as well as support service to sustain co-operative ventures.

The Department of Co-operatives, Mr. Speaker, faced an uncertain and unpredictable future under the former Government. The former administration refused to articulate clearly its ultimate plans for this Department. While final orders to abolish the Department had not been issued on June 23, 1971, it is reasonable to assume, Mr. Speaker, that this Department was destined either to be dismantled by the former Government or to be shunted or fragmented into several departments with limited support.

Let there be no mistake about our Government plans. This Government believes that co-operative development is an important part of life in Saskatchewan. We believe that the potential for the organization and operation of co-operatives is, literally, limitless. Our Department staff will be working closely with other departments of the Government, such as Agriculture, Human Resources Development Agency, Saskatchewan Housing Corporation, Social Services, Industry and Commerce.

We recognize that additional co-operative promotion will require additional staff. But we believe that co-operative development is of such importance as to warrant the retention of a separate department. The Department of Co-operation and Co-operative Development will certainly remain under this Government.

All Hon. Members will recall that in November 1971, the Government appointed a committee comprised of Mr. Chris Hanson of Regina as chairman, Dr. Leo Kristjanson and Mr. G.T. Tallus, both of Saskatoon, to study the role and structure of the Department of Co-operation.

This Committee has submitted its report to the Government and the report is now available to the public.

I want to pay tribute to the members of this Committee for their perception of the potential value of co-operatives in the province and to those persons and associations who submitted briefs to this Committee. Their recommendations are now undergoing intensive study and examination by the Government. The Government will certainly give serious consideration to their recommendations as a means to provide new impetus to co-operative development in Saskatchewan.

Permit me, Mr. Speaker, to comment briefly about the 21 new producer co-operatives incorporated in the calendar year 1972. Sixteen new co-operatives were formed for the purpose of improving agricultural production; farm co-ops, feeding and feed-lot co-ops. One group of farmers report that by organizing a machinery co-op they have reduced their operating expenses from \$8.34 per acre to \$5.34 per acre, a significant saving of 32 per cent.

Other impressive examples are: the Waterhen Handicraft Co-op. They set up a handicraft centre to train producers to market native handicrafts. Canoe Lake Fisheries. Here the producers organized primarily to establish fish gathering stations to pack products for shipping to markets. Wood co-ops at Beauval and Dillon, both northern communities, as well as at Reserve, Saskatchewan. Here workers have formed make work projects in lumbering and bush operations.

Mr. Speaker, our Government believe there is a great potential and desire amongst farmers and other groups in society who want to organize and operate new co-operative undertakings. The Department of Co-operation is gearing up to provide tangible assistance to these interested groups.

Mr. Speaker, I want to say a word about Athabasca Native Fisheries, because the matter has been raised, I admit, in previous debates. But the impression may have been left that the Federal Government was solely responsible for the construction of this plant and that the Provincial Government's participation was negligible.

It is not my intention to discredit the Federal Government's part in building and financing this plant. But I want to place on the record, the contribution of the Department of Co-operation towards that fish plant. I am advised, prior to 1971, that the native fishermen in the Athabasca region made numerous requests to the former Government for assistance to develop a co-op enterprise. But these requests fell on deaf ears. Subsequently, in the fall of 1971, staff of the Department of Co-operation and Co-op Fisheries worked closely with the Athabasca fishermen. Disillusioned and disappointed by the disinterest of the former Government, the Department of Co-operation and Co-op Fisheries launched an educational program amongst the Indian and Métis people in the scattered lakeshore communities. They were encouraged to send representatives to meetings of Co-op Fisheries. The Government paid the cost of bringing leaders from other communities to hold information meetings. The staff of the Department of Co-operation drafted the bylaws and held numerous meetings to familiarize members with it. Co-op Fisheries now manage this plant under contract. The staff of the Department of Co-operation are available for consultation when requested and required. Mr. Speaker, this is only one example of how this Government is prepared to assist northern people, particularly, to improve their economic conditions, compared with the do-nothing approach of the former administration.

Mr. Speaker, I want to comment on the accomplishments of the past year. and future plans for the Department of the Environment.

When The Act to establish the Department of Environment was debated in this Legislature last year, one point that this Government made abundantly clear was, it would put its money

where its mouth is, with respect to environmental protection.

The Budget of last year provided for a considerable expansion of program and staff in the areas of air and water pollution control. The decision to strengthen our planning and policy development capability was of vital importance. I say, vital, because I think that for too long we have reacted to pollution problems after they occur.

With proper planning we should be able to anticipate emerging problems and take corrective action before our soil, air and water resources are damaged.

On water management, Mr. Speaker, several important studies have been completed recently, setting the stage for action programs. First, the Qu'Appelle Basin Study. It is not my intention to take the time of the House to discuss the findings of the important Qu'Appelle Basin Study Report. This report recently released to the public has received excellent coverage by the media. Its recommendations are undergoing careful study by residents of the basin, interest groups and all levels of government. Our Government has made clear its desire to negotiate an implementation agreement with the Federal Government. I want to inform the House that these negotiations are now under way. We believe there is ample justification for Federal participation, because we believe that the corrective programs recommended will benefit Saskatchewan and Canada as a whole. We are not waiting for these negotiations to be completed before taking action.

What about Regina and Moose Jaw? Sometime ago, Mr. Speaker, we advised the cities of Regina and Moose Jaw that they should be examining alternate ways of providing tertiary treatment of their municipal sewage. I am pleased to report that so far we have had excellent co-operation from both cities. Both Regina and Moose Jaw are in the final stages of designing the first stage of tertiary treatment.

Under The Water Pollution Control Assistance Act, the province provides financial assistance towards the cost of pollution control for cities to the extent of 10 per cent of the cost to a maximum of \$500,000. Some Members have said that there is nothing in this Budget for Regina or Moose Jaw for these works. I want to inform Members of this House that there is \$100,000 provided in this Budget, in the event that Regina proceeds with phase I of its tertiary treatment for algae removal at an estimated cost of \$1 million in 1973-74.

Moose Jaw. In addition the Department of Environment is negotiating with the city of Moose Jaw on the feasibility of a pilot project for effluent irrigation. We are willing to co-operate with them on that pilot project, if we can work out a plan.

When this Budget is approved, our department will have authority to hire additional land use specialists who will work with local governments to design long-term land use plans for the Qu'Appelle Valley. When this Budget is approved, Mr. Speaker, my colleague the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Messer) will have additional staff resources to assist feed lot operators in the Qu'Appelle Basin to minimize the effects of livestock wastes on water quality.

Mr. Speaker, the stakes in the Qu'Appelle are very high, if we join together to combat pollution, control flooding, to provide for future recreation needs, the Qu'Appelle can be one of Canada's beauty spots. If we do not grasp this opportunity the Qu'Appelle can become a system of weed and algae choked lakes, decreased property values, and diminished business opportunities.

~

The Saskatchewan-Nelson Basin study. The Saskatchewan-Nelson Basin study is another important water study that was completed a few months ago. That study provides complete information on the technical feasibility and the approximate costs of those projects that may be required in the future to ensure that prairie people always have a supply of water to meet all our legitimate needs. During the coming year we will turn our attention to the gathering of water demand information and to developing a better system of water quality monitoring on the important inter-provincial streams in the Saskatchewan-Nelson Basin.

The Peace-Athabasca Delta report. The filling of the large reservoir behind the Bennett Dam on the Peace River coincided with the drastic declines in the water levels in Lake Athabasca and the Peace Athabasca Delta. The Saskatchewan Department of the Environment participated in a joint study of these problems. This study report was also made public recently. The report recommends certain works to control water levels in these critical areas. It is my view that the responsibility for any corrective measure should be with BC Hydro and the Federal Government, — BC Hydro for not considering the downstream effects of this massive dam, and the Federal Government for not insisting that BC Hydro take such things into account when the project is planned. However, Saskatchewan is willing to co-operate and assist in any reasonable way to insure future stability of water levels on Lake Athabasca. My department will be working out implementation details during the coming year.

Mr. Speaker, I should like to inform all Members of the House of some other important new initiatives that I expect the Department of the Environment to take in the coming year. This will only be a partial list. I will announce others when I present new legislation at this Session.

On Water Pollution Control. This Budget provides for a modest addition to the program and staff capability of the Water Pollution Control Branch. Our mobile laboratory will be fully operational this year and it will greatly assist our surveillance program. With some additional staff we will be in a better position to improve our technical help to municipalities. We will assist in the training of operators of municipal treatment facilities. We will provide technical advice to any centre experiencing operating problems with their treatment facilities.

I want to say a few words about air pollution control. First, Urban Air Monitoring. In co-operation with the Federal Government, a number of air monitoring stations have been established in the province. At present eight monitors are being operated in five cities. The Federal Air Pollution control directorate have agreed to an expansion of this program which will result in a total of 18 monitors being operated in the province. These monitors form part of the National Air Pollution surveillance network. The sampling equipment and laboratory services are provided by the Federal Government, but the

operation and maintenance of the equipment is the responsibility of the province. This year we will proceed with the first phase of a three-year program to install monitoring devices to measure smoke concentration and suspended matter in all cities in the province. This Budget requests funds to purchase equipment to expand the monitoring programs to three more cities in the province. It is hoped that additional equipment can be obtained in 1974-75 to complete the expansion of this program to all of the cities in the province. The cities not presently being monitored are not large enough to be included in the Federal program so the expansion of this program to these centres will be a provincial responsibility. This is a long-term program designed to provide information on the quality of the air as well as to indicate any possible trends in the level of pollution.

A word about our potash monitoring program. To measure the levels of potash dust fallout, we have established a network of monitoring systems around each of the 10 potash mines in the province this past year. Dust is collected in a standard fallout jar on a monthly basis for 12 months a year. The main purpose of the monitors is to maintain a surveillance on the fallout levels around the mine, to ensure that provincial standards for potash dust fallout are being met. In addition, the data collected is also being used by the University in studies of soils in the mine area.

The addition of a mobile air quality laboratory unit that is presently on order will make it possible to monitor air quality in industrial areas. It will allow for a more thorough evaluation of complaints and it will allow the department to conduct investigations into suspected problem areas.

I want to say a word about the Souris Basin study. A comprehensive study of the Souris River Basin will start as soon as final approval is obtained from the Governments of Canada and Manitoba. This Government is making Canadians aware of the unique blend of resources, people, oil and coal that exists in southeastern Saskatchewan. This study will ensure that water supply will not be an inhibiting factor to development.

Mr. Speaker, I have recently named a 12-member Environmental Advisory Council. The need for an advisory council to the Minister was clearly identified by the Task Force Report which led to the establishment of the Department of the Environment last year. That Task Force recognized the importance of public involvement in environmental protection and provision was made to establish this council in the Environment Act approved at the last session. I want to draw to the attention of the Hon. Member for Albert Park (Mr. MacLeod) who apparently misunderstands the function that this committee is to perform. I want to correct an impression that he gave the House yesterday. I want to point out to him that this council, is not, as the Hon. Member for Albert Park stated yesterday, a committee appointed by the Government to do a further study on the Qu'Appelle Report. This council will not meet once or twice a year to rubber stamp the activities of the department. I am confident that it will be a working council. I met with it first on the weekend. The Environmental Advisory Council will review not only the policies and programs of the Department of the Environment, but the policies and programs of other departments that have major impact on the environment. In some cases, this council will act in response to requests of the Minister, in other cases it will act

on its own initiative, resulting from the concerns of other people. We expect this council to identify the environmental priorities of the people of Saskatchewan and to communicate these priorities to the Government. Headed by Dr. Stanley Rowe of Saskatoon, ecologist, author and lecturer, I anticipate the council will be a great asset to my department and to the people of Saskatchewan.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I want to say a few words about the Churchill River. Perhaps the one single thing in this Budget that most dramatically shows the difference between our approach to the environment and that of the former Liberal Government, is the money provided for the environmental studies on our northern rivers. The Member for Athabasca (Mr. Guy) has called this a death-bed repentance. Had the Liberals still been in power, he would have been correct. Remember their way of doing things. The Athabasca Pulp Mill was announced, the deal made. Then the Liberals said they would look at the environmental effects of having half the flow of the Beaver composed of the pulp mill effluent. At Prince Albert, the pulp mill went in with no environmental effect studies at all. It operated for some five years before a barely adequate level of effluent treatment was provided. The Member for Athabasca has suddenly discovered the environment. I am sure we are all pleased that he has. We realize he is uncomfortable with his new discovery and that it will be some time before we will be able to make any real sense of his rufflings.

What are the facts about our northern environmental studies? The first fact is that this Government recognizes the North has a particularly delicate ecological system and any development must be carefully assessed and designed before it is allowed to proceed.

Secondly, the north as well as the south part of this province needs development. Some of the possible kinds of development are recreation, power, and mineral development. We are requiring Gulf Minerals to do a complete base line study of the surrounding environment and to show us the effects of their Rabbit Lake development before we approve their waste treatment plans for their Uranium project. There have been proposals for national or provincial parks on the Churchill River. These will be fully assessed from both an environmental and a social-economic stand point before any decision is made. We can anticipate that park development might protect the environment but it could have severe implications for the native people in terms of traditional hunting and fishing practices.

Similarly, Saskatchewan Power has identified a number of potential power sites on the Churchill as well as the Elizabeth Falls site on the Fond du Lac River. Rather than follow the practice of the previous Government and proceed with development, this Government has said that we want all the facts on how these developments will affect the environment and the social and economic life of the region before we make any decision on the project. I can appreciate how difficult it might be for some of the Opposition Members, particularly the Member for Athabasca to understand such logic. I also understand he objects to the study being co-ordinated by a government department. But this is precisely what we set up the Department of the Environment to do. Indeed, we have asked and it seems virtually certain that the Federal Government will join with us in the study of the Churchill.

It is a typical Liberal insult to the integrity of the biologists and other professionals employed by both the Provincial and Federal Governments to imply that these professionals can be bought off. Perhaps that is why there was such an exodus of good professionals from the Saskatchewan Public Service after 1964. I can inform this Legislature that these Environmental Social and Economic studies will be co-ordinated by the Department of the Environment. The actual sector studies may be done by experts from Provincial or Federal Governments. Or from private consulting agencies whoever has the best talent available.

Once the facts are gathered and analyzed the resulting reports will be made available for public review and comment before our decision is made on these proposed developments. The proposed studies and the public participation process envisaged represents the most ambitious and detailed environmental effects examination carried out in any province in Canada. This Government is very proud that our new Department of the Environment has established its leadership in this important area in less than one year after it has been created. For that and many other reasons, Mr. Speaker, I will be supporting the Budget.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. E. Kramer (Minister of Highways): — Mr. Speaker, I rise in the House tonight to say just a few words about the Budget and especially to congratulate our new Minister of Finance. I for one, am proud to be associated with the many fine and dedicated people in this Legislature. There are none finer or more dedicated than our young Minister of Finance (Mr. Cowley).

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Kramer: — In his Budget Speech he has put forward the warmth and the humility that is inherent in the man and the sensitivity of this Government. He has presented the Budget so well planned and tailored to the needs of all our people that I can't help but conclude that if this were an election year, Mr. Speaker, very few of those people opposite would be returned.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Kramer: — I noticed, Mr. Speaker, that the Hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Steuart) left the House rather hurriedly when Mr. Cowley was half way through. I wondered where he went. And why it took him so long to get back. There is a conclusion one can draw but I don't think it would be permissible in the House. I saw a few more that were squirming uncomfortably, they seemed to be bothered the same way.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Kramer: — This is not an election Budget, Mr. Speaker, only Liberals bring down election budgets by two year budgets. The big problem is the people have to wait three years under a Liberal Government and then get a lot of promises that they don't keep after they are elected. Sometimes they go three years

because they know they can't really wait that long. There is a story about Ole, he couldn't wait.

Mr. Speaker, we have a different approach. We honor our platform, we honor our pledges and that, Mr. Speaker, is what this Budget is all about. It's about promises, programs and a better quality of life for all of our people, all the people of Saskatchewan, including the Members opposite.

Mr. Speaker, as the Members of this House probably know we sponsored a Western Highways and Transportation Conference during the past two days at North Battleford, in historic Battleford. I had an opportunity to hear comments on the Budget, Mr. Speaker, from many people of The Battlefords constituency, including some friends of the Members opposite. I think they were converting quite a number of those people up there, because we got compliments on the Budget from sources that are not always politically friendly to us. Once again, I think it is a credit to the planning and the work of the Hon. Member for Biggar (Mr. Cowley).

People of northwestern Saskatchewan at least are pleased and proud of this Budget. Time permitting I will say a few words either later on this evening or tomorrow regarding some of the programs that will benefit the people of The Battlefords and the northwest.

While I am on the subject, I should like to give you some highlights from the Western Highways Ministers' Conference that was held at North Battleford. I think that the House would like to know what the conclusions were, probably what some of the topics were. I think in order to acquaint them, I should like to paraphrase the joint communiqué that was given this afternoon, Mr. Speaker, to the Press conference.

The first step in solving several mutual problems has been reached here in this two day conference in North Battleford. We explored during these discussions some of the areas in which mutual co-operation between the four western provinces and the Federal Government is needed and has been lacking in the past. I want to say at this time that we were unfortunate in not having representation from Alberta at that conference. They were not able to attend or send representation.

Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Members opposite chuckle. I think the Alberta people were honestly not able to attend. It is strange that they would chuckle. They seem to think it is a good idea, and they are suspicious that Alberta had ulterior motives for not attending. And they laugh. I should like to draw their attention to the fact that the Hon. Jean Marchand sent representatives who made a great contribution to that conference, Mr. Speaker. So if the grinning 'critter' from the North could just contain himself a bit. He had better advise the Hon. Jean Marchand that he shouldn't send representation either.

Such areas as uniform speed limits on national highway routes, creation of additional inter-provincial highway systems to complement the Trans-Canada to Yellow Head route are matters that we will now assess. During this meeting the participants from Saskatchewan, Manitoba, British Columbia and Ottawa reached the bench mark, from which further development and planning can take place and more concrete proposals can emerge.

Discussions included a need for a firm policy on access roads to Indian reserves. Also provincial participation in Federal Government planning and the freezing of rail line abandonments and determining provincial aid to municipal road systems.

One area in which full co-operation must be determined, the meeting concluded, is the standardization of vehicle weights and dimension regulations across Canada, certainly in Western Canada. Certainly it is time after all these years and a change in transportation, Mr. Speaker, we stop balkanizing Western Canada. A miserable little limit there and little problem here, where people are stopped and harassed and so on because there's a little too much on a truck. This is really what has happened and the truckers have been harassed. We must arrive at uniform and sensible arrangements whereby the transport on the roads can be accommodated and accommodated fairly and squarely knowing exactly where the common rules are.

Such a move will require the careful consideration of each province partly to determine its own special needs. There are inter-provincial problems.

Yes, Mr. Speaker, we have our own provincial problems. We have highways in the North that we have accommodated according to agreements that were made. 130,000 pound loads for the pulp truck, the wood trucks in the North. These require a tremendous subsidization of road. But we are obliged to stay with those agreements. We can't really stay with a 74,000 pound limit on those roads as long as we have those kinds of agreements.

The conference also emphasized the need to ensure that maximum safety measures are being taken. This is especially directed at the manufacturer's responsibility to design safer vehicles. And at the government's. And we agreed again that it is largely the Federal Government's responsibility to set high standards.

Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that one often reads about accidents and an inquest being held or not held concerning the unfortunate person or persons who were involved in the accident. It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that possibly we ought to be taking a look at holding an autopsy on the automobile that may have caused it. We ought to be finding out if it was one of these many vehicles that are being recalled or maybe if it was a vehicle that should have been recalled, before that accident was caused. It isn't only holding inquests on the people to find out just how they died. There ought to be a careful examination of the vehicles that are involved in the accidents as well. This was commonly agreed to.

Mr. Speaker, some might ask why we held such a conference in North Battleford rather than Saskatoon or Regina. It would certainly have been more convenient to many of us to have had it right here. But, Mr. Speaker, it is a fact that North Battleford, on the Yellow Head route, is an historic area that is celebrating this year, its 60th anniversary as a city. It is also a historic area as far as the North West Mounted Police are concerned who are celebrating their centennial. The people of North Battleford thought that this would be a good gesture to hold that meeting, that historic meeting, in historic Battleford.

I want to say at this time how pleased the visitors were to have had the opportunity of visiting that area. Now they enjoyed the hospitality of both the city and the town and of the elected officials there. And what a thrill it was to sit at our Press conference yesterday at the old North West Territories Legislature table in the barracks of the North West Mounted Police and Indian Museum in Battleford. It is all part and parcel, I believe of that feeling of reaching out and touching history and possibly a small part in making history and trying to establish better communications that will bring about and better bring about a national entity for Canada. We talked about such things as a third Trans Canada corridor through the Boreal Forest area. There was a great deal of interest on the part of the representatives from Ottawa and certainly Manitoba and Saskatchewan. Because that particular route and that road if it comes into being will veer off and be more concerned with the North West Territories than it is with British Columbia.

I see no reason, Mr. Speaker, why we cannot contemplate that kind of a road. It seems to me that a road such as that through the Boreal Forest area, possibly closely following the old route of voyageurs, would be an attractive route for tourists as well as opening up areas that could bring forward mineral finds as the years go by, not only in Saskatchewan but in Alberta and Manitoba and Northern Ontario as well. I think it was a good exercise and I was proud to have played my part as Minister of Highways for Saskatchewan in that particular conference.

Mr. Speaker, there were other things discussed and we once again raised the question of more federal participation in highways generally. There are many phases that they can participate in. The past seven years the Federal Government has spent \$464 million through various programs, highway and transportation systems. Most of this money was spent in Eastern Canada. And I don't begrudge Eastern Canada that money. They have areas that need development and they have areas of poverty that are greater than ours. Saskatchewan received .6, a little more than one-half per cent or \$2.7 million of that \$464 million.

Certainly we in the western provinces, even though Alberta and Manitoba received a great deal more, some \$8 or \$9 million between them, have a right to ask for greater participation. I say this, Mr. Speaker, that I wish when the former Government was dashing and shuttling back and forth between New York and Regina to visit the corporate interests there in an attempt to bring large industries of one kind or another, I wish they had dropped off at Ottawa occasionally and asked what programs they had that Saskatchewan could participate in. Because I find in talking to the Federal people that the fact that Saskatchewan didn't receive its share, was largely for the lack of asking. It was also for another lack, it was for the lack of competent people in the Civil Service in many cases that do the planning and the assessing of the programs that were there for us, if we had had the foresight the common sense to participate. It is a tragedy, Mr. Speaker, that some of those millions of dollars couldn't have been spent here. The first participation that we had in some of that Federal money was in the Last Oak Development where there is a recreation development which was officially opened this winter, north of Broadview, completely run by the Indian bands there and a credit to those Indian people. That was the one staggering step that was made by the former Government to assist in some of the development programs that were available to us at that time. I suggest that we missed the

boat in many places, through not putting forward our ideas and our requests from Saskatchewan, even though Manitoba and Alberta received less than their share, at least they received four and five times as much as did Saskatchewan.

We talked about another area and that was the area of safety, the uniformity and the need for a total look at many of the areas of modern transportation that are causing problems today. More and more we have a nation on wheels, not only on wheels, but pulling large trailers, diffident people behind the wheel, people who have to pass larger and meet larger and larger trucks. The wind drift and the vacuum quite often cause accidents.

There was also a suggestion that before we move or allow too much development of campers, trailers and various other vehicles that there ought to be a good look by safety people at how these are constructed.

It was brought to our attention that a good many trailer companies because they are cutting corners for economic reasons, quite often are not hiring and employing first class welders for the frames and hitch construction of the various types. Quite often they are using these areas as a training ground for welders and as soon as they get experience they move on and out to a better paid job. This again creates a hazard and I suggest to the Attorney General or the Minister of Consumer Affairs that a careful examination be carried out regarding the trailers and the rolling stock that is being manufactured in Saskatchewan. I don't think that we want to have any more wrecks on the road than we can help. I believe if we make the safeguards now, and enforce regulations now that some of these accidents many not occur.

I want to deal for a moment with another area. The construction and maintenance of roads and provincial airstrips come largely under my jurisdiction and I want to deal with some problems in the context of northern Saskatchewan. More particularly I want to touch on the role of the Federal Government in the development of northern Saskatchewan transportation. It is clear that much more money must be spent in the North on transport facilities if we are going to develop our resources and service our northern communities.

It has been recognized for some time that Federal participation is necessary for the development of our vast hinterland. Not only in the Yukon and the Northwest Territories, but also in the northern sections of the western provinces. The Federal Department of Public Works and the Department of National Defence maintain the Alaska Highway within British Columbia from Fort St. John to the Yukon border. The MacKenzie route was built from Peace River, Alberta, to Hay River with federal participation. The Stone Lake Railway was built entirely with Federal funds. The Roads to Resources programs some years ago gave large scale federal financing to open provincial northern resource areas, \$80 million was spent during those 10 years. The Stewart-Cassiar Road in British Columbia and the Hanson Lake Road, and the Stosquen Road come to mind. In fact, the period 1958 to 1965, during that period, nearly \$5 million of Federal funds were made available for northern Saskatchewan resource access roads by Ottawa.

What has happened since 1965. I have looked at the

estimates of gross expenditures in the national estimates for the years 1969-70, 1970-71, 1971-72 and 1972-73 in the following departments: Energy Mines and Resources for contributions to the provinces to assist in the development of roads to resources, 1969-70, \$347,000; 1970-71 nothing; 1971-72, 1972-73 some \$7.5 million and that went to the Newfoundland Mineral Development program. The Department of Transportation Services, capital estimates, air programs, 1969-70 \$44.6 million; 1970-71 \$36.3 million; 1971-72 \$48.6 million and 1972-73 \$53.7 million. What proportion, Mr. Speaker, of these capital expenditures which do not include Montreal and Toronto International Airports, where \$130 million was estimated for the final 1971-72 and \$80 million for the 1972-73 program — what proportion of all of that was spent in Saskatchewan? The answer is practically nothing! The list of major capital budgets in 1972-73 estimates show \$612,000, a little more than half a million for Regina and Saskatoon airports compared with \$1.7 million for northern Manitoba airports, which isn't much either. So of the \$54 million estimated for 1972-73 and runway and terminal construction, Saskatchewan received a little over 1 per cent of the total. In 1970-71 and 1969-70 we were not even in the ball park, unless you consider the purchase of the Regina airport as a major improvement. As far as northern Saskatchewan is concerned, some small expenditures have been made with the Department of Indian Affairs and Northern Development on airstrips associated with Indian Reserves, but federal transport presence is non-existent as far as northern Saskatchewan is concerned.

In the meantime vast sums are being spent or are projected in Eastern Canada, in the Territories on roads and airports.

I have not mentioned navigational aids and other air services, but as most of us are aware, with the exception of Uranium City or Prince Albert, they are practically non-existent in the North. The lack of adequate air facilities holds down the quality of air services. We are the only province, Mr. Speaker, in Western Canada with no north-south jet service or even adequate turbo-prop services. There is a faint hope, I might add, in the fact that the Minister of Transport officials recently began discussing these problems with our people and we may be working something out.

Once again I suggest that the people opposite over the years probably were talking somewhere else when they ought to have been listening, they ought to have been going down to Ottawa and finding out what was available. Apparently the provincial governments of other provinces were able to do far better. In this respect, the upgrading of the LaRonge airstrip is foremost in our mind so that a class I schedule service may be established from Regina to Uranium City. We have heard a lot about western alienation, and it is a fact of life but the cold arithmetic shows it only too clearly. Under the Roads to Resources program of the Diefenbaker regime, at least Saskatchewan got something approaching a proportional share of the allotted money. The Federal Liberal Government has ignored the transport needs of Saskatchewan regardless of which party has been in power in Regina, although I must say, once again that the previous administration there didn't rush them too much. This, Mr. Speaker, has got to be changed, we must go and ask for a massive federal and provincial cost-sharing program which will give us the air and surface facilities we require in the North, and to meet the needs of our people.

I think too, it is timely to draw attention to a clipping and a letter from James Gray of the Hudson's Bay Route Association. I have often thought that the Hudson's Bay Route and the use of the Hudson Bay Port, (the excuses for not using it rather, Mr. Speaker,) were largely something that has been conjured up in the mind of the Board of Transport Commissioners, or some other people in Eastern Canada, and especially those people who have a vested interest in the St. Lawrence Seaway, the exporters and importers of Eastern Canada, that have blocked the proper development of the Churchill. That too is transportation that is needed in Western Canada, Mr. Speaker, and we ought to be getting off our 'rears' and doing something about it. I should like to read a paragraph or two from the St. Paul Dispatch, Tuesday January 30, which Mr. Gray enclosed with his letter.

Moscow. The Arctic trip took nine Soviet ships through ice 20 feet thick in weather of 60 degrees below zero. After 17 days and 1,300 miles of polar adventure, the first winter sea link between Northern Siberia and Murmansk was secured. The flotilla of five ice breakers and four cargo vessels reached Murmansk on Monday, the government newspaper, Izvestia said. It set out January 12th from Yenisei River Estuary on a trip that takes five days in the summer. The unprecedented winter voyage ended the usual six-month winter shut-down of Arctic shipping and extended the annual period in which Northern Siberian coal, nickel, timber and copper can be transported by sea.

Mr. Speaker, it seems rather sad that over here in North America where we have the know-how and have the ability, that we let a Canadian Government be stymied by a few wealthy lobbyists in Eastern Canada, to maintain their interests while the farmers of Western Canada go begging for the Port of Churchill that they deserve and need if they are going to use their shipping. It has been a crime for years that this kind of thing should go on. I for one am not going to sit idly by and see it go on much longer if I can help it.

I believe the time is now for us to go to Ottawa, not with hat in hand, but with ideas and suggestions regarding the furtherance of the Port of Churchill. Mr. Speaker, it is common knowledge that a few million dollars spent on the diversion of one fresh water river that runs into the straits that create the greatest hazard in the Bay, could be diverted so that that salt water would not be diluted with fresh water that freezes rapidly. Certainly if we moved as a national government in this direction, and if we, the Western provinces, were able to persuade the national government to do this, and persuade them not to listen to the lobbyists, the Saint Lawrence Seaway Lobbyists, I am sure that with those kinds of developments — the kind of developments that the Russians are using — the Port of Churchill could probably be used for four and five months which would bring prosperity to Western Canada that it needs and sadly lacks and to use this transportation route to get our grain out where it should have been going for the last 25 or 30 years.

Mr. Speaker, I will have a few more things to say more pointedly regarding our highway programs tomorrow and beg leave to adjourn the debate.

Debate adjourned.

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