

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN
Third Session — Seventeenth Legislature
15th Day

Wednesday February 14, 1973.

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

WELCOME TO STUDENTS

Hon. A.E. Blakeney (Regina Centre): — Mr. Speaker, it gives me a good deal of pleasure to introduce to you and through you to the House, a group of students who are in the Speaker's Gallery, 49 Grade Eight students from Herchmer School in the constituency of Regina Centre. Herchmer School is one of the oldest and finest schools in Regina. I think it is interesting to note this year that it is named after an early senior officer of the Royal Canadian Mounted Police; the North West Mounted Police as it was at that time. The students are accompanied by their teachers Mr. Peart and Mr. Needham. I know that you and all Members of the House will express the wish that their stay with us this afternoon is an enjoyable one and that their visit with us will help them with their studies.

Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. J.A. Pepper (Weyburn): — Mr. Speaker, it affords me great pleasure to introduce to you and through you to this Assembly a group of 28 students sitting in the west gallery. These students are the Grade Eleven class from the Lindale School at Oungre, situated just a few miles from the American neighbors to the south of us. They are accompanied, Mr. Speaker, by their teacher Mr. Ram Singh and their bus driver Mr. Bjorkland. This is their first visit as a school to our Legislative Building and I am sure, Mr. Speaker, that I am voicing the opinion of all Members when I extend to them a warm welcome. I hope their visit proves interesting and knowledgeable and that they will have a safe journey home.

Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. A.R. Guy (Athabasca): — Mr. Speaker, on behalf of my seatmate the Hon. Member from Whitmore Park, I should like to introduce to you and through you to the Members of this House some 70 Grade Eight students from the St. Matthew School here in the city. They are seated in the east gallery and are accompanied by their teachers Mr. Eger and Mr. Lund. I am sure that all Members welcome them and hope they have an educational afternoon while they watch our democratic process in action.

Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

STATEMENTS

**FINAL REPORT OF THE SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON THE REVIEW OF LIQUOR
REGULATIONS IN SASKATCHEWAN**

Mr. D. Faris (Arm River): — Before the Orders of the Day I should like to table a rough draft of the final report of the Special Committee on the

Review of Liquor Regulations in Saskatchewan. I think it is extremely unfortunate that parts of this report in a garbled manner were received by the Press. The only people who were supposed to have copies of this report at this time were members of the Committee, that means Members on both sides of this Legislature. I think that this early disclosure rather throws a cloud over the entire Assembly and it is a matter of great regret. I hope that it will not be made a matter of political dispute. I want to say that the reports in the Press are unfortunate because they are based on a rough draft — it is not a complete report — for instance, the reservations of Members from both sides of this House were not included with it. The report in the Press is not printed in a balanced manner either, and I intend to call a press conference for 9:30 tomorrow morning to let all of the members of the Press have a look at the report and a discussion and put it into some sort of perspective. I think this is extremely sad that this has happened. I don't know how it happened, I hope that it will not be seen to reflect upon the Committee's work or the value of the report, because I think it is an extremely important matter and one which should stay above petty disputes.

Mr. Speaker, I hereby table the final report of the Special Committee on the Review of Liquor Regulations.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. E.F. Gardner (Moosomin): — Mr. Speaker, I should like in reply to the statement made by the Member from Arm River (Mr. Faris) say that the Members of the Opposition and especially the Committee Members of the Opposition are naturally concerned that the material from this report would be made available to the Press and the public before it was made available to the Members of the Legislature. We have seen a series of cases in the past few days where copies of Bills or reports have been available to groups or individuals before we have seen them. We regret this. We only hope that the Government will tighten up their handling of all of this material and make every effort to correct and to control this situation.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Blakeney: — Nothing in the report of the Liquor Committee was in any sense government material.

BRITISH COLUMBIA COAST PILOTS DISPUTE

Hon. A.E. Blakeney (Premier): — My statement on the Orders of the Day is that I thought the House might be interested in a brief statement having to do with a potential dispute at the West Coast. I have been informed by the British Columbia Chamber of Shipping that a dispute between the Pacific Pilotage Authority, the Crown corporation responsible to the Minister of Transport, and the British Columbia coast pilots may result in the pilots withdrawing their services on Friday, February 16. The withdrawal of pilot service could and I emphasize 'could', cripple the movement of deep sea shipping in and out of our West Coast Ports and seriously affect Saskatchewan's vital grain and potash exports already lagging because of an inadequate supply of ships.

February 14, 1973

I am convinced that the seven weeks between December 25, 1972 when the new contract was first considered and February 9, 1973 when negotiations between the pilots and the pilotage authority were broken off, did not allow sufficient time for serious consideration by both parties of the issues involved. Therefore I have wired the Minister of Transport to request that the Pacific Pilotage Authority and the British Columbia coast pilots resume negotiations immediately. I believe that both parties to the dispute realized the great implications of any shipping tie-up in our Pacific coast and that the national interest demands this dispute be resolved amicably. I have a copy of the wire which I sent to the Hon. Jean Marchand which I won't trouble the House to read; it paraphrases my statement.

QUESTIONS

REDUCTION IN UNIVERSITY TEACHERS

Mr. C.P. MacDonald (Milestone): — Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day I should like to direct a question to the Minister of Continuing Education. I notice there is a headline on the third page of the Leader-Post, "Cost price squeeze means staff reduction." Seeing that the Minister of Education has given to the University of Saskatchewan the smallest grant in my memory as a Member of this Legislature \$2.4 million, it has meant a very substantial increase in student fees and now also indicates a major reduction in staff because of the lack of money provided by the Government of Saskatchewan. Could the Minister tell me if these figures are accurate, if there is this number of teachers from the University of Saskatchewan both full time, part time, being laid off as a result of this grant, and the cost-price squeeze?

Hon. G. MacMurchy (Minister of Continuing Education): — Perhaps the Member from Milestone has a short memory. I have not seen the report in the Leader-Post nor do I have any information from the Board of Governors with respect to their position on staff cuts. Until I have seen the report, until I have made contact with the university people, I shall not be in a position to make any comment.

Mr. MacDonald: — A supplementary comment. Mr. Speaker, I find that impossible to believe . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order, we can't have comments. The Member can ask a question but he can't comment on his own question.

Mr. MacDonald: — It is a supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Is this the beginning of the imposition of the new rigid student-teacher ratio in the University of Saskatchewan? Because it is impossible for the Minister of Education to tell the University the operating grants for 1973-74 without knowing the total implications, or he would be completely irresponsible.

Mr. MacMurchy: — I have difficulty answering the question because I don't think there is a question. I'll be delivering a speech this afternoon in which I talk to some extent about the grant to

the University which is in my opinion and the opinion of the Government substantial in light of present day conditions. Further I will comment on what we understand will be a tuition increase. If the Member from Milestone can wait till then, I will make some comments at that time.

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.

Hon. E. Kramer (Minister of Highways): — When we adjourned the debate last night, I had said a few things about the . . . We are getting some interruptions here, Mr. Speaker, that are a little hilarious. To get back to the subject at hand, I had said some things about the future of transportation in Saskatchewan and Canada. I had said some things to the Members opposite about their performance in securing the assistance or their not securing any assistance from the Federal Government while other provinces in Canada fared rather well. I mentioned to them that they probably should have been visiting Ottawa a little oftener rather than New York, worshipping at the throne of foreign enterprise that has to be subsidized after it reaches this country. In the words of former Premier Bennett of British Columbia these are little more than hot-house industries and as such will not stand the test of the severe climate of Western Canada at least.

Mr. Speaker, I congratulated our Minister of Finance (Mr. Cowley) on his Budget which I believe is probably one of the most far-sighted and well planned budgets — taking care as it does of all areas of Saskatchewan and all people of Saskatchewan; taking care as it does of the promises in the platform of the New Democratic Party prior to our election in 1971; taking care as it does of our pledge especially of reducing taxes for school purposes on property. I believe there are few people who will note this year when they receive their Property Improvement Grant, whether they be farmers, businessmen or homeowners that will not feel that that promise has been kept. There may be some exceptions, Mr. Speaker, but those will be the exception rather than the rule. I want to say that the Minister of Finance, the Member for Biggar, appears to be a worthy follower and a worthy successor to that great Saskatchewanian who represented Biggar for so many years, the late Woodrow Lloyd.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Kramer: — We are looking forward to great things from this very, very fine young man. We are very proud to have him on our Treasury bench and especially in charge of the Treasury.

Mr. Speaker, if I am going to get on with the highway budget, I am going to be limited by time and I regret that I don't operate very well within a tight time schedule because I have a tendency to get a little away from the subject once in a while, especially if there are rude interruptions. I hope that the Member for Athabasca (Mr. Guy) and the Member for Prince Albert (Mr. Steuart) will have had some second thoughts after last night when we were talking about the meeting, the

February 14, 1973

first Western Highways Ministers Conference held at North Battleford. They seemed to be trying to indicate that the absence of Alberta from that meeting was for political reasons. I am sure that that was not the case, Mr. Speaker. I know that the people of Alberta are very busy and they couldn't work it into their time schedule. I take a rather dim view of the Members of the Opposition, the Member for Athabasca (Mr. Guy) and others over there trying to leave that impression. I am sure that they are glad. I hope they are that the Hon. Jean Marchand saw fit to send a very able representation to that conference and I want to say that we appreciated the Ottawa representatives and they made a great contribution to that conference.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Kramer: Mr. Speaker, we have a highway budget this year of a little more than \$72 million which is a considerable increase, contrary to the purveyors of gloom and doom in the Liberal Party, a considerable increase over last year's budget. Last year's budget was some \$5 million less at \$67 million. The budget for capital construction will be \$48 million compared to \$45 million last year. And I know that the cost of inflation will rob this budget as it does rob the budgets of ordinary taxpayers, so that we don't get \$3 million more work done unless we can bring about some economies in highway building which we intend to do.

So it is without hesitation, Mr. Speaker, that I say that we will get more done, a great deal more done, with this Budget. And we would get more done even if it were the same amount of money as last year.

We will be grading 470 more miles of highway in Saskatchewan. We will be oiling 452 more miles of highway. There will be Amos treatment on 51 more miles and pavement of 310 more miles. A grand total, Mr. Speaker, of 1,283 miles of new construction in Saskatchewan. I think that is something that we can be proud of.

Mr. Speaker, it will not be, however, highly subsidized roads for the few rather than roads for the many. We will continue with our Operation Open Roads program which has been mentioned several times in the House and I need not dwell on it. Suffice it to say that program at the end of 1974 will have brought dust-free travel, dust-free roads not only to the access roads but to the main streets of nearly 500 communities in Saskatchewan and 283,000 residents which is more than a quarter of Saskatchewan's population.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Kramer: We will not be wasting millions, Mr. Speaker, on Primrose Paths, Anglo-Rouyn roads, pulp roads, the potash haul, No. 9, and various things like that. We will not be overbuilding in some areas and underbuilding elsewhere. We will not, Mr. speaker, be projecting ourselves into the future. I have here, Mr. Speaker, a \$200,000 project, it's a small item, but it's an indication to these people across the way that talk waste. We have an intersection survey done by a private consulting firm at Gull Lake, Highway 1 and 37. Construction

start for that \$40,000 survey job is after 1995. It was commissioned in 1969. I wonder what might transpire between now and 1995 at Gull Lake? There was another one in 1966 at Indian Head, 1995 for \$57,000. Highway 9 and 10 at Yorkton, 1995 again for \$38,000. Another one at Colonsay for \$41,000. And then there was another one at Prince Albert, No. 2 and 11 for \$30,000. More than \$200,000 in just these few items selected at random. Projected 25 years into the future, Mr. Speaker. Let some of the financial experts, if there are any over on that side of the House, project that money into just an ordinary bond or an ordinary investment. That would amount to \$1.6 million in 1995.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Steuart: — Why don't you table it?

Mr. Kramer: — I certainly would be very, very glad to.

Mr. Steuart: — The entire, complete report.

Mr. Kramer: — This is a report, Mr. Speaker, I would be quite happy to table.

Mr. Steuart: — We want the report, Mr. Speaker. He has picked something from a report out of context and he should table the whole report.

Mr. Kramer: — Mr. Speaker, I don't doubt that the Leader of the Opposition is uncomfortable and if I had time I would make him more uncomfortable.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Steuart: — Mr. Speaker, on a Point of Order. Will the Minister table the report? I've got the right to ask the question. Will the Minister table the report?

Mr. Kramer: — Mr. Speaker, it has been tabled.

Mr. Steuart: — When has it been tabled?

Mr. Kramer: — I just tabled it now!

Mr. Steuart: — It's not a report. you've tabled. It's one sheet of paper.

Mr. Speaker: — Order, order! The Member tabled what he was reading from.

Mr. Steuart: — He never tabled the report!

Mr. Speaker: — Order! You have full chance to make him produce any documents when the Estimates are up. He tabled what he was quoting from at the time. I have no authority to bring more.

February 14, 1973

Mr. Steuart: — If he doesn't want to table it, fine, and he hasn't tabled it.

Mr. Kramer: — The item referred to, Mr. Speaker, it can be verified. It's a report from the Department of Highways staff regarding projected studies made by the Department of Highways in the past. The Leader of the Opposition is welcome to it. It's public property. Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Leader of the Opposition wouldn't know the truth if it hit him in the face. I'm still waiting, Mr. Speaker, for the Hon. Leader of the Opposition to give the information I requested twice from him when he stated that he could produce names of people in The Battlefords at the Saskatchewan Hospital whom I have been instrumental in hiring or firing and I am waiting, I'm waiting. And you know the penalty.

Mr. Steuart: — Mr. Speaker, I want to tell the Minister I will be speaking on Friday on the air and I'll table it and I'll give it to him, don't worry.

Mr. Kramer: — That won't be the truth, Mr. Speaker.

Well, Mr. Speaker, we'll continue with the highway program. What I was saying before I was so rudely interrupted was that we plan this year to proceed with a broad program of highways. Some of the plans and some of the work that we will do will not be listed here. A great deal of it is ready for announcing publicly now. We have had comments, Mr. Speaker, that the urban areas have been left out. I mentioned the small urban places a little earlier in Operation Open Roads. Studies are going on now and I am sure that the Members opposite and the large urban centres will be quite happy when we finally "dot the i's and cross the t's" on urban assistance policies that will be unfolded later. We are not, Mr. Speaker, going to be operating on a hit and miss basis that these people were. As we said earlier by the Hon. Member for Kelvington (Mr. Byers), the Minister of the Environment, these were programs that depended entirely on the politics of the situation rather than the principle.

Now I will list some of the main projects that will be undertaken. Number 1 Highway — the safety project at Sinaluta will be completed. Do you remember last year there was an accident prone area at Sinaluta. Completion of paving of that will be completed this year. East of McLean we will complete paving of the last two miles. East of Ernfold to Herbert which is moving toward the completion of the four-lane between Swift Current and Regina. And I want to say at this time that this is something that must be done. From a standpoint of need and traffic count that four-lane road should have been extended east of Regina rather than west in the original stages but there is no use changing horses in mid-stream. This road will be completed in an orderly manner and it will be completed to a good standard. East of Ernfold to Herbert grading 18 miles.

Number 2 Highway north of Simpson to Young, completion of grading and paving 27 miles. Safety area north of Prince Albert which we commenced last year on our safety program. We extended the four-laning some three miles and that will be

completed and paved this year. Waskesiu to La Ronge, initiating a program of gravel base servicing. This, we hope, Mr. Speaker, will cut down the cost if we are successful to about 25 per cent of paving costs that we are suffering now. That is a very, very costly piece of road. It carries the heaviest tonnage of anywhere in the province because of the concession that was made to the pulp haul, a 135,000-pound limit there where the ordinary limits in Saskatchewan are 74,000. If this experiment works there it will work anywhere. We will be doing 20 miles of this in an effort to cut down the costs. It is necessary not only for the ordinary commercial transport that is on that road but it is necessary to dust-proof that road for the tourist industry that we know will continue to grow. On one of the main arteries of northern Saskatchewan it is necessary to attempt to do something to improve that particular artery. So we hope, and I make no promises, our engineers feel there is a good chance that we may be able to proceed with this, and it is better to try to proceed on an economic base than not to proceed at all because that was the alternative.

At La Ronge itself grading and paving the main street area, providing the water and sewer system is to be completed there this year. Number 3 Highway west of Hudson Bay to Mistatim completion of grading 35 miles. Mistatim to Crooked River Amos 14 miles. Number 3 continued Crooked River to Tisdale completion of four miles. Tisdale to Melfort resurfacing 14 miles. Mont Nebo west of Shell Lake completion of grading 15 miles. On Number 4 Highway, Rosetown north, completion of grading and paving six miles. North of Cando to Battleford, completion of grading, bridges and paving 21 miles. Cochin to Glaslyn completion of paving 14 miles. That was rather a problem. That road had a lot of soft spots in it that were far worse than we expected because of the fact that that top hadn't been completed much earlier. It required a great deal more of excavation than we had thought and it did hold up that project. It will be completed this year.

Number 5 Highway, Rama to Wadena, paving 30 miles; Number 6 Highway, Pangman north, completion of resurfacing 17 miles; Qu'Appelle Valley to Southey, grading 12 miles; Pleasantdale to Resource, resurfacing 12 miles; Melfort to Gronlid, grading 20 miles; Gronlid to Saskatchewan River, completion of oiling 12 miles; Number 9 Highway, south of Reserve to south of Hudson Bay, paving 21 miles; Number 10 Highway, Manitoba border to Wroxton, paving 15 miles; Duff to Balcarres, grading and paving 22 miles; Balcarres to Fort Qu'Appelle, grading; Number 11 Highway, Bethune vicinity, completion of grading and paving four miles. This, Mr. Speaker, will provide four-lane traffic from Chamberlain into Regina. Many people thought it was a waste to leave a reasonably good highway that was carrying all the traffic two years before and suggesting that it, at this time, could continue to carry half the traffic. For safety reasons alone we feel that it is necessary to reactivate as much of that highway as is possible within our budgetary ability and that is why we are proceeding to work in that direction.

Number 13 Highway, Redvers to Carlyle, grading 26 miles; Consul to Govenlock, grading 16 miles; Number 14 Highway, Manitoba border to Saltcoats, completion of paving 35 miles; Insinger to west of Elfros, completion of paving 19 miles; Dafoe to Lanigan, completion of grading and paving 19 miles; Perdue to Biggar, paving 20 miles; Biggar to Wilkie, completion of paving, 31 miles; Number 15 Highway, Junction Number 2 to

February 14, 1973

Farradale, grading 20 miles, west of Farradale to Kenaston, oiling of 10 miles; Number 15 continuing Kenaston west, commencement of grading four miles. Outlook to Mildred, paving of 15 miles; Number 16 Highway, east of Vibank, grading 25 miles; Number 17 Highway, north of Macklin to Lone Rock Corner, 35 miles completion of oiling; Unity to Wilbert on a new north-south route, Oiling 22 miles. That's Number 21 Highway which now extends from Willow Creek to Lac des Isles in the North, popularly known as the Wild Goose Route. And I'm going to tell you, some areas of that take a wild goose to get over it.

Maidstone to the North Saskatchewan River, oiling 11 miles; Number 23 Highway, into Mowmy River vicinity, grading a couple of miles there and at Carrot River there's a short distance as well.

Number 26 Highway, Loon Lake to Peerless, completion of oiling 19 miles. Hon. Member from Meadow Lake (Mr. Coupland) ought to remember that Liberals talked about that and we are doing it. It's a promise kept after a long while. Rather surprising, the wrong people are keeping it as far as he is concerned.

Number 28 Highway, Lake Alma to south of Radville, completing of grading six miles; Number 32 Highway, Success to Cabri, completion of grading and paving 21 miles; Number 33 Highway, Fillmore to Francis, grading of 25 miles; Francis to Kronau, completion of grading 23 miles; North of Fort Qu'Appelle grading; Wadena to north of Hendon, completion of 13 miles; Rose Valley to Archerwill, completion of Amos 10 miles; Near Nipawin completion of grading and a bridge. And I could make a short speech on that one. It's in progress.

Number 46 Highway, Junction of Highway 4 to Climax, oiling of 26 miles. There was a rather hurried job done west of Yorkton on that one as an election gimmick. It didn't stand up so well and we are going to have to do it over again but it will be good top.

An Hon. Member: — Neither did their candidate.

Mr. Kramer: — No, the candidate didn't stand up either. I imagine he must have been about the same as the outfit.

Number 5 Highway Whitefox to Choiceland, paving 18 miles; Peerless to Pierceland, another 23 miles up in the great northwest. This will allow, Mr. Speaker, the tourists who are moving in and moving in great numbers through that northwest area from Edmonton and Alberta into Saskatchewan's great holiday area, to gain a little better access to that part of the country.

Number 56 Highway at the Qu'Appelle Valley, grading three miles; Number 57 Highway, Manitoba boundary east of Kamsack, completion of grading and Amos treatment. The whole package there for seven miles.

Wollaston Lake Road continuation of grading, 50 miles. Mr. Speaker, that will put that highway to more than 400 miles north of the city of Prince Albert. Incidentally, I say again and I am drawing to your attention once again that no one can help but have misgivings Over building a road into an area like that. It has very little development except the

Gulf Mineral site at the end. We sincerely hope that this will open up new areas both for tourism, for fisheries and probably more prospecting for minerals. I firstly believe that a highway going into new and virgin territory will help to create activity, industrial activity and certainly tourist activity. Even though it is costly to do this we feel it is a good long-term investment. The cost of that road has now come down to \$15,000 or \$16,000 a mile and the highway is traversable except during periods of washouts and that's the situation all the way from the Wathaman Lake area. We have a number of other smaller areas, Mr. Speaker, that I have given to the Press. I don't think I should take the time of the House to go on further. Other Members wish to speak and the major projects have been mentioned.

As I just wanted to mention one more and that is just north of Rosthern. We were trying to find something to do in Rosthern, Mr. Speaker, we just couldn't find anything left to do there. But starting in Redberry constituency which was sadly neglected for a number of years for reasons that were mentioned in this House, Hafford to Lilac, grading 22 miles.

Now, Mr. Speaker, as I said there are many more projects and programs that will be worked on and completed this year. I am proud of this program. One of the good reasons for supporting the motion that is before the House, I hope that the Members opposite will not stand in their places and oppose a forward looking highway program. It gives me great pleasure, Mr. Speaker, to support the motion.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. W.A. Robbins (Saskatoon Nutana Centre): — Mr. Speaker, in entering the Budget Debate, I hope I shall be able to offer constructive comments which will not merely reflect 'partisan patriotism' or 'Opposition obstinacy'. I compliment the Minister of Finance (Mr. Cowley) for his Budgetary Address. It was dear and concise and presented with a great deal of conviction. He had some excellent material to work with and he performed his task extremely well.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Robbins: — Mr. Speaker, a budget is a guide and a guard, a servant and not a master. The Opposition critic (Mr. MacLeod) who incidentally isn't in his seat, the Hon. Member for Albert Park, said he was against cyclical budgeting. Cyclical budgeting makes eminent sense particularly in a province like Saskatchewan, where the economic cycle is heavily dependent on a primary industry such as agriculture. Mr. Speaker, one of the major errors made by the previous Liberal administration in this province was the cutting of the sales tax from 5 per cent to four per cent and the institution of tax free purple gasoline in farm trucks in the 1965-66 budget.

Mr. K.R. MacLeod (Regina Albert Park): — Mr. Speaker, on a Point of Privilege here. The Hon. Member obviously wants to have it recorded in Hansard and over the air that I am absent from the House. That's the implication he gave and that is certainly totally false. I was discussing a matter with the Hon. Member from Wilkie (Mr. McIsaac) and he

February 14, 1973

made an implication that he wanted it in Hansard and he wanted it Over the air that I was absent from the House and it is utterly false.

Mr. Speaker: — I believe the Hon. Member said the financial critic wasn't in his seat. The financial critic was in another Member's seat at the time and not in his own but he was in the Chamber.

Mr. MacLeod: — A cheap political trick!

Mr. Robbins: — Mr. Speaker, the Member was not in his seat and I did not see him. He is rather insignificant character anyway and he is pretty hard to see.

The Provincial Treasurer at that time estimated a reduction in revenue of some \$12 million. Although Liberals are never too accurate when it comes to economics or estimates, let us accept that figure as being a true one. Inflationary tendencies probably increased the revenue loss from these sources in the succeeding budget for 1966-67 by some \$13 million. The 1967-68 budget would again, because of inflationary tendencies, result in a revenue loss in that fiscal period of some \$14 million. A total of approximately \$38 million to \$39 million. The administration of that day found itself in difficulty in the summer of 1967. The Premier of that time called an October election announcing to Saskatchewan voters that all was well in the new Saskatchewan. Some of us, Mr. Speaker, saw through that mirage of misinformation and misrepresentation. We warned voters all was not well in Saskatchewan. We warned of a substantial deficit, or conversely, heavy tax increases would be forthcoming in the 1968-69 budget. They did, \$38 million worth — deterrent fees, sales tax back to 5 per cent with a much wider application, and that came before this Assembly in this House through the then Provincial Treasurer, the present Leader of the Opposition, that noisy little nuisance from the northern woods, the Hon. Member for Prince Albert West (Mr. Steuart).

That 1967 election and the budget immediately following it in early 1968 was, Mr. Speaker, a form of 'practised deceit' on the residents of this province. That Liberal administration got caught in their own economic manipulations. When Saskatchewan grain exports slowed and grain piled up on the farms, retail sales declined, revenues from the consumption taxes slumped, and the equalization payments from Ottawa were reduced because of an approximate two-year time lag in the receipt of those payments. This all occurred at one and the same time.

Mr. Speaker, the 1971 provincial election saw the rout of the Liberal Party and the election of a New Democratic Government. The economy was improving in the 1971-72 fiscal year and Federal equalization payments to the province began to rise because the 1967-68, 1968-69, 1969-70 years in the Saskatchewan economy had been severely depressed ones. Equalization provides increased revenues in the succeeding years. As 1971-72 and 1972-73 have been reasonably good years in an economic sense and 1973-74 will likely continue the trend in a general provincial economic improvement. Federal equalization payments to the province will probably decline in fiscal years 1974-75 and 1975-76. This is the only accurate assumption I could locate in the Opposition critic's entire discourse. Incidentally, Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Member is not in his seat and he is not

in the House. It is simply prudent to make provision for this probability in adjusting tax rates now to meet probable eventualities and yet, Mr. Speaker, the financial Opposition critic says he is against cyclical budgeting. Little wonder, Mr. Speaker, he evidently doesn't understand it and he even experiences some difficulty in attempting to pronounce it.

Mr. Speaker, this year the province went to a gross budget, which much more clearly indicates total receipts and expenditures and he now berates the Government for Federal receipts which total 40.37 per cent of the total governmental revenues. Somehow, he attempts to show that the Saskatchewan Government is a cap-in-hand mendicant parked on the doorstep of Capital Hill in Ottawa. Does he not know that we are a province in a federal system of government? The Liberal Provincial governments of Nova Scotia and Prince Edward Island receive considerably larger percentages of their total annual budgets in the form of Federal Equalization payments than we do in this province. Incidentally, Mr. Speaker, Prince Edward Island brought down their budget last week. They have total revenues of \$117.9 million and \$64.9 million or 55.1 per cent of it comes from the Federal Treasury. A similar situation holds true in Conservative provinces like New Brunswick and Newfoundland. In the latter case more than 80 per cent of their revenues flow from Federal coffers. That, Mr. Speaker, is what the federal system is all about. Equalization to attain a national average is the goal. If Ontario and British Columbia, two of the 'have provinces' and they have some budgetary problems, raise their provincial tax rates as they may well do this year, our equalization payments from Ottawa will rise. What's wrong with that, Mr. Speaker? Does the financial critic not realize that Saskatchewan purchases of industrial and commercial goods from these regions increase the revenue inflows to those regions? Surely he isn't that naive? Or perhaps he is, since he appears to swallow the Liberal line, hook, line and sinker. Last year the Opposition was advertising in the daily press for provincial organizers. I suggest they would do well to advertise for a financial critic.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Robbins: —

The Budget came down
The Libs were laid low
They may never recover
From this body blow
The critic collapses
It's a pitiful sight
The one thing he knows
The Library closes each night.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Robbins: — Another ploy utilized by Liberal spokesmen is their deliberate manipulation of statistical data. Last year the Federal Income Tax was amended. The Federal-Provincial agreements are based on general agreement to follow the federal rules. Indeed they must be adhered to. The exemptions for single persons was raised to \$1,500 and for married persons to \$2,850. These exemptions represented increases from the \$1,000 and \$2,000 exemptions which previously applied. The same exemptions must apply in Saskatchewan. The 34 per cent rate of provincial

February 14, 1973

income tax which was applicable under the old rate, became 37 per cent and the applicable rate under the new exemptions. It did not, in fact, represent an increase at all. I doubt if the Member for Albert Park (Mr. MacLeod) didn't know that to be a fact. The 37 per cent rate applicable to the Federal tax rate brought approximately the same amount of revenue to Saskatchewan as did the previous 34 per cent rate applied to more income because of the smaller exemptions. The financial critic looks at the estimates and says the increase in income tax revenue, which he attributes to a rate increase of 6 per cent is some \$25 million. Approximately \$17 million of that amount will come in increased revenues through the Equalization payments by reason of the fact that income tax rates in other provinces, the 'have provinces' such as Ontario and British Columbia may well be increased appreciably in the current fiscal year. Part of that estimate is based on national trends and provincial probabilities.

The change from 34 per cent to 37 per cent as previously explained, did not represent an increase at all. The announced 37 per cent to 40 per cent by the Minister of Finance applicable to the Federal tax rate does represent a revenue gain to the province of some \$7 million to \$8 million. The remaining differential in the Estimates is based on the inflationary factor, national trends and other changes very likely to occur in the 'have provinces' in their budgetary presentations for the next fiscal year. To get the Opposition financial critic to understand those facts, Mr. Speaker, is virtually impossible. He appears to be an economic and financial illiterate. Trying to educate him to understand budgetary revenue and expenditure estimates is like trying to nail a piece of jelly to the wall.

The tax shift which occurs in this Budget, securing revenues from income tax, which is soundly based on the 'ability to pay' principle and reducing property taxation for school purposes, makes eminent economic sense. The increases in these offsetting grants to alleviate property taxes are very substantial. I do regret, Mr. Speaker, that we are unable to have these grants deducted from the tax bill at the municipal offices. I do understand the problem — a Central Registry becomes a necessity when a taxpayer may secure the grant in relation to his home, his farm and his business or a combination of all three. There is also an income tax implication which I would explain to Members opposite if I could detect any possibility that they would understand it. However, I have concluded that that would be an exercise in futility. At least, Mr. Speaker, I can say the Property Improvement Grant cheque now goes out to the taxpayer without any accompanying 'love letter' from the Premier's office. That practice from an earlier era was also a form of 'practised deceit'.

The major thrust in the 1973-74 Budget is in the agricultural sector. As a representative of an urban seat — Saskatoon Nutana Centre — I welcome the realism of that approach. One of the promises I made to my electorate in the 1971 campaign was to work hard to revitalize the rural economy. Mr. Speaker, the Land Bank, the FarmStart program, the Hog Marketing Commission, Operation Open Roads and Operation Main Street programs, the Property Improvement Grant increases, the extension of Crop Insurance, are all landmarks along that route. A route which, Mr. Speaker, holds definite prospect of resulting in a different type of rout for the Saskatchewan Liberal Party when next the electorate exercises the opportunity of expressing its opinion.

Mr. Speaker, non-renewable resources are self-explanatory, even the Opposition should understand that. Provincial revenue from such resources needs to be maximized because of the non-renewable nature of those resources. Liberals scoff at such a proposition. They contend it means no development. It was a Liberal Member of this Legislature who at one time asserted, "There would never be an oil well discovered in Saskatchewan as long as the CCF was in power." He was wrong, 5,337 times. That's almost a record, even for a Liberal. Currently that same individual is leading an attack on any alteration in the teacher-trustee collective bargaining process in the province. The Liberal Opposition will no doubt encourage him in the process. The evidence of history has no impact on them whatsoever.

Liberals, no doubt, Mr. Speaker, will continue to attempt to confuse the public mind with their irrational irrelevancies in relation to this Budget. The financial critic called it the Las Vegas Budget. He knows the sharp rise in total revenues and expenditures is basically related to the gross rather than a net budget approach, which he, incidentally admits he supports. The \$723,710,110 in estimated revenue comes, of course, from varied sources. He neglects to inform the House that Federal taxes collected in Saskatchewan exceed \$240 million.

Mr. Speaker, the Opposition financial critic tried to make much of the percentage of federal participation in the cost of Hospitalization and Medicare. He conveniently forgot that Saskatchewan pioneered Hospitalization and carried the total cost of that program on its own from 1946 to 1967 and he similarly forgets that we pioneered Medicare and carried the total cost of that program from 1962 to 1968, without any federal cost-sharing. Other provinces, with the possible exception of British Columbia, did not have to carry those total costs, as we did. Mr. Speaker, really we should submit a bill to the federal authority for approximately one-half the total costs of both those programs throughout those pioneering years. I think I will speak to my colleague the Minister of Finance (Mr. Cowley) with respect to that approach.

Consumption taxes are expected to raise considerable sums of money for the Provincial Treasury in the next fiscal year. Education and Hospital Tax — \$80.3 million; Gasoline taxes — 457.1 million; tobacco tax — \$6.8 million; Liquor profits — \$33.8 million. People across the way say that resource revenues are limited because this Government does not support the development of our natural resources. Nevertheless, we anticipate \$60,756,820 in resource revenues in the next fiscal year. \$17.1 million is anticipated from motor licences and \$61,240,210 from other revenues.

On the expenditure side \$186,742,710 will be expended on health and \$88,693,180 for social services. People across the way are very critical of the expenditures on social services yet they fail to notice that less than \$10 million of that amount is allocated to people who are unemployed, who may be classified as employable people. The Budget allots \$117,082,250 for education and continuing education; \$88,148,140 for highways and grid roads; \$48,086,040 in Municipal Affairs Budget and the bulk of that expenditure, Mr. Speaker, goes for the Property Improvement Grant — a figure in the range of \$30.5 million. Government services will require \$24,044,670; Agriculture \$22,618,190. It should be noted, Mr. Speaker, that \$15 million for the FarmStart program and \$20 million for the Land Bank

February 14, 1973

actually raise the agricultural budget to approximately double the figure of last year. Resource development will take \$15,421,300. The Department of Finance requires \$1,621,720 to pay interest on public debts and \$70,316,890 is available for other government services. It's a large Budget. Yet, proportionately, Mr. Speaker, no larger than that of other provincial governments. It is a responsible Budget — a Budget which seeks to soundly build on our base economy in a reasoned and a rational manner.

There is help in this Budget for the people of Saskatchewan. There is help here for the unemployed in a winter works program outlined in September, prior to the arrival of winter — unlike its federal counterpart, announced in December — well into the winter season. There is help here for the elderly and those unable to finance adequate shelter, in residence repair assistance and new housing. For the property owner in tax relief, through the Property Improvement Grant. For reasoned resource development of non-renewable resources; for the basic industry in FarmStart and Land Bank allocations; for library assistance and improved environmental controls; for aid for nursing homes and guests on the basis of major help to those who have major need; for an improved quality of life in community development and an emphasis on reasoned economic growth. It's a good Budget. A commendable presentation was made of this Budget.

Mr. Speaker, may I again use a bit of verse:

Cowley and Company, Blakeney and Wood,
Brought in the Budget, just as they should.
With vigor and vim and direction well planned,
The boys to the left are all set to be canned.

They wince and they squirm, they zig and they zag,
All the bright things are packed in the NDP bag.
The end of the trail appears for the 'Libs',
They get cracked on the chin, and jabbed in the ribs.

They wander in mesmerized, lost in the maze,
They have been in this state for a number of days.
The lesson is evident, the results are quite plain,
The boys to the left, Sir, have gone down the drain.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Robbins: — It's a good Budget, Mr. Speaker. A commendable presentation was made of that Budget. I will support it.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. G. MacMurchy: (Minister of Education) — Mr. Speaker, on entering this debate I want to congratulate my colleague, past as Legislative Secretary in my office, and presently as Minister of Finance, on his Budget Speech to this Assembly last Friday.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. MacMurchy: — I was proud of him, I am proud to have been associated with him in the past and now in the present. It was an

impressive speech both in content and in delivery. The people of Biggar and the people of the province are very fortunate to have Mr. Cowley's talents available to them.

I should also like to congratulate my colleagues, since this is the first time I've spoken in this House, from Humboldt (Mr. Tchorzewski) and Kerrobert-Kindersley (Mr. Taylor) on their entry into the Cabinet and to the Member for Athabasca (Mr. Guy) for his return to this Legislature.

Mr. Speaker, the 1973 Budget is a budget for people. It provides money for many progressive measures that will directly help our Saskatchewan citizens. It will bring chiropractors under Medicare and it will bring the FarmStart programs; it provides help to pensioners to repair their homes and it provides for supplying hearing aids at low cost; it enables us to start the community college program; to put regular long distance phone service into the North; to increase student bursaries; to expand the kindergarten pilot projects and so on and on.

Mr. Speaker, I recognize it is the duty of the Opposition to criticize the Government. The Opposition's job is to scrutinize government plans and to propose alternatives they think are better. A good Opposition is needed if our parliamentary system is to work and to work well.

All the Liberal Members who have spoken so far in this debate have been critical of the Budget. They have made two main attacks: one, they say the Budget is too large, it's too big; and two, they say too many people are being hired. Mr. Speaker, this sort of criticism could be legitimate and reasonable. If the Liberals seriously believe we are spending too much money, it is their duty to suggest an alternative. What do they suggest? What would they do?

Let's take a look at some of the programs, just some of the programs. If the Liberal Members think we should spend less, what programs would they cut? Would they cut off chiropractors under Medicare? Do they oppose community colleges? Should school boards receive smaller grants? Of course not. Their criticism, Mr. Speaker, is irresponsible. One of the chief reasons the Liberal Party is so ineffective today is that it is negative; against everything, in favor of nothing!

The Member for Albert Park (Mr. MacLeod) who is Opposition financial critic in that postage stamp riding, spoke on Monday of the growth in government hiring. He says he is against that, Mr. Speaker. Well, let's take a look, just a little look at where people have been hired. Let us look, for instance, at the new Technical Institute here in Regina. This year 83 new people were hired to work there — to teach in the nursing program, to teach in the dental technology program. Is the Member for Albert Park opposed to the Technical School? Is he opposed to dental care for children? Is he opposed to the training of these nurses? Is the Member for Albert Park opposed to the 28 new people in the Ag. Rep. service? Is he opposed to beefing-up our assistance to farmers? Or what about the seven new staff people at the Provincial Library — does he oppose a better library service?

Mr. Speaker, responsible criticism means you must accept the consequences of your attacks. Either the Liberals are saying these projects should be abandoned, or they are going to vote

February 14, 1973

in favor of the Budget. To the Members opposite, the moment of truth is coming on Friday and the people of this province will be watching.

I should like to turn to that part of the Budget that deals with school grants.

Honorable Members know that the Saskatchewan schools are financed from two sources: school grants from the Provincial Government and money raised by the boards from property taxes.

Two years ago when the Members opposite held office, less than half of school costs were paid by the province — 48 per cent. The rest was raised by an increased and increasing property tax.

Mr. Speaker, the 1973 Budget shows how much things have changed in the last two years. Under this Budget, the Provincial Government will pay a full 70 per cent of the costs of running our schools.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. MacMurchy: — The net burden on the property tax will be reduced to only 30 per cent. The 70 per cent provincial share of school costs is made up of direct grants to school boards, over \$96 million in direct grants and in indirect compensation to the ratepayers over \$30 million. And I would remind the House that the direct grants will go up by over \$10 million — an 11 per cent increase for 1973. This increase will stabilize the provincial tax mill rate at 43 mills. Property Improvement Grants are increasing from a 13-mill rebate to an 18-mill rebate. In 1973, Mr. Speaker, the average school tax will, therefore, be reduced to 25 mills in Saskatchewan.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. MacMurchy: — But may I say that in discussions with other Ministers of Education from across the country, they are interested and they are looking at this program in Saskatchewan.

Mr. MacMurchy: — The \$96.2 million in grants to schools is distributed according to a formula. Last year our Government implemented a new formula, a foundation grant plan that equalizes between low assessed and high assessed areas. It was Saskatchewan's first foundation grant system.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the Liberals, when they were the government had a foundation grant plan too. They passed the legislation, but, Mr. Speaker, they were afraid to use it. They were afraid to equalize, afraid to give more to low assessed areas as against the highly assessed areas. What did the Liberals do? They used the pupil-teacher ratio to distribute grants. They gave out grants on the basis of so much per approved teacher, and they cut down the number of teachers in the province severely.

An Hon. Member: — Shameful!

Mr. MacMurchy: — Their lack of courage, Mr. Speaker, and their pupil-teacher ratio are two major reasons the people threw them out on June 23rd, 1971.

The New Democratic Government has abolished the pupil-teacher ratio. We introduced a new formula, Mr. Speaker, based on grants per pupil. The results are outstanding. Today, there are more than 220 teachers in our schools than there were two years ago, on a full-time equivalent basis.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. MacMurchy: — Mr. Speaker, the new grant formula also increased the autonomy for school boards — autonomy that the Liberals took away. Under the new plan, Mr. Speaker, the provincial Government hands its equalization grants over to school boards. The board can then spend less than what was suggested in the budget reviews; spend more than was suggested; hire fewer or more teachers than was suggested; raise or cut the mill rate; change their priorities, and all of these can be done without any effect on the size of the grant.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. MacMurchy: — Those who question increased autonomy of boards need only to examine the differences between the budgets suggested by my staff and those actually adopted. There is no question that school boards have more autonomy, and they exercise it.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. MacMurchy: — In 1973, Mr. Speaker, several changes will be made in the formula in light of our experience last year. The allowance provided for transporting students will be changed. More emphasis will be given to mileage travelled by the school bus, and less emphasis to the number of students conveyed. This will give more help to rural areas where the pupils are widely scattered. We are prepared to make adjustments for rural school units with these kinds of special problems.

A second change will be made in recognition of debt charges. For 1973 the formula will pay the greater of \$25 per pupil or actual debt costs. This change will avoid penalizing school systems which have low debt loads.

A third change will provide more money for handicapped students. Last year the recognition was \$1,012 per student. For 1973 the rate for the low-cost handicapped will be about the same, about \$1,000 per student and for high-cost pupils, \$1,400. The low rate will be applied for a standard percentage of pupils while the high rate will be paid on identified pupils.

The fourth change, and a most important one, will increase the basic per pupil allowances. Last year the basic rate was \$506. For 1973 that will go up by roughly 13 per cent and there will be emphasis placed on elementary education on the early grades and early childhood education.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

February 14, 1973

Mr. MacMurchy: — Final details in the 1973 changes and the grants will be known to school boards early in March, and they will be available to boards in time for their budget area work.

Mr. Speaker, let me turn to the University. Operating grants to the University last year were \$35.75 million, again this year there will be a good increase of additional funds, \$2.9 million or 7 per cent more than 1973.

The construction grant for university buildings will be \$5.5 million, this will permit completion of all projects now under way.

Mr. Speaker, I understand the University Board, in order to meet their budgetary requirements, will increase tuition fees by about \$50 this year. This is a relatively small increase. However, to ensure that a needy student is not kept out of university we have allocated an extra \$425,000 in the Provincial Bursary Plan.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. MacMurchy: — This extra money will raise the total for bursaries to more than \$1.3 million. In addition the maximum bursary will rise from \$500 to \$850 and the maximum combination of loan bursary will be increased to \$2,100 per year.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. MacMurchy: — The New Democratic Government believes the bursary increase is preferable to abolishing tuition. Some people say tuition fees should be abolished, but if tuition fees were abolished the reduction would be the same for all students. Those with high incomes who live at home in the city would get the same benefit as those students of low income who have to live away from home to attend university. This is not assistance on a basis of need. By contrast, Saskatchewan bursaries are awarded entirely on the basis of need. Those with the greatest need get the largest bursary. To put extra money into bursaries is much more effective, in our opinion, in helping those who need it than a tuition cut or abolition of tuition fees.

Mr. Speaker, two years ago when the Liberals opposite were in power, when they were sitting on this side of the House, this bursary program did not exist. In fact there wasn't a bursary program at all.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. MacMurchy: — In 1973, because of NDP action, over \$1.3 million will be paid in direct grants to students. This is a major achievement and it fulfils yet another plank in our 1971 program.

Saskatchewan's library system will receive a very substantial boost from this Budget. The regional libraries have labored under a financial handicap for several years. Nevertheless, they have given good service and I congratulate them for it. Evidence of this is the tremendous increase in the demand for library services experienced in the last two years.

This year, Mr. Speaker, the last of the library regions will be established. The Palliser Regional Library extending from Moose Jaw, south to the American border, will receive \$113,000 in start-up and operating grants. This completes our regional library system, with six functioning areas.

Each of the six regions receives its funds from a municipal contribution, and from the province. For 1973, operating grants are to be raised 20 cents per capita to \$1.50. The establishment grant will be raised by 25 cents to \$1.75 per capita. City libraries will receive a 25 per cent hike in provincial support, to 50 cents per capita.

Our Provincial Library serves as the central hub for the six regions. Demand for provincial services has skyrocketed in the last 18 months, and the staff has been hard-pressed to keep up. An even greater demand will be made on the central system and on the regions when the community college program is in full swing.

Mr. Speaker, this Budget provides funds for seven new staff at the Provincial Library. The new people have been urgently requested by the Saskatchewan Library Trustees Association. For that reason, I sought Treasury Board approval for a special warrant to meet the need in the current fiscal year. For 1973, provision is made to fund these positions on a permanent basis. Of the seven, four are librarians or library technicians; three are clerical staff to speed up processing.

In addition, an amount of roughly \$3,000 was included to install a photo-charging machine. This new equipment will cut down staff time taken up by routine tasks.

Mr. Speaker, the increases for library services are among the largest in the Budget, and well they should be. They reflect the high priority our Government places on this service, in particular as it benefits rural people. Over \$300,000 of new money is allocated this year, money that is well spent.

Mr. Speaker, when we came into office Saskatchewan was one of the few provinces without a publicly supported kindergarten program. I think Alberta and Saskatchewan had that distinction. This, despite the fact that the early years are the most important in developing a child's basic abilities.

Our Government has taken action to correct this. An advisory committee was established and it heard opinions on kindergarten. Last fall six pilot projects went into operation to experiment with alternatives and solve problems such as transport for young children, scheduling and program content. We expected the major questions would involve operating the kindergartens, the physical problems.

Indeed, Mr. Speaker, the pilot projects have shown that operating kindergartens even in our rural areas is not a serious obstacle.

The difficult aspects, our experience has shown, are the problems of coming up with a program that is distinctive in early childhood education and not merely a downward extension of grade one. If kindergarten is no more than allowing pre-school children to listen in on the grade one class, if kindergarten is no more than learning one year earlier, then it is of little value. Kindergarten must offer something new and distinctive

February 14, 1973

if it is to be worthwhile. We cannot possibly justify the cost of simply putting children into the regular school pattern a year earlier. In the rural areas, where enrolments are low in the early grades, many kindergartens will have to operate in an integrated program with grade one. In light of this it is very important to develop a unique and worthwhile kindergarten course that can stand on its own feet and not be absorbed by the Division 1 program.

Another serious matter is the extent of parent involvement. Unless good communication is established between kindergarten and the home the program could be of little value and even hinder a child's development. Furthermore, parent participation is needed to give kindergarten its own special and distinct orientation. More work needs to be done in both areas. For that reason the 1973 Budget provides funds to continue the pilot projects and to expand their scope. This reflects our concern with quality rather than quantity. It will enable a solid, functioning kindergarten program to be developed before, not after, money is made available for a provincial plan.

Our Government, Mr. Speaker, has taken action at both ends of the school spectrum. Learning is more than a formal process that ends at Grade XII, or after technical school or university. Education is life-long and we have moved to recognize that fact.

Mr. Speaker, four regional community college pilot developments are now under way. The community colleges will concentrate on the rural areas. Educational opportunities have far too long been centralized in urban centres. People should not have to move out of the rural areas to have access to education.

The Cypress Hills Community College will develop ways to serve the sparsely rural population spread over the large area of southwest Saskatchewan. The Parkland Community College, with its office located in Melville, will develop the concept in a twin city area.

The Humboldt Region Community College will experiment with the concept in a region with no large city, but a dense rural population and numerous small centres. The Northern Community College, with its office located in La Ronge, will develop the concept in ways that will meet the unique needs and circumstances of northern people.

College developers are presently working in these four areas. Community colleges will be governed by regional boards and we hope to have boards established in each of the four areas very shortly. The boards will determine program needs. We anticipate the boards will have programs operating in the fall of 1973. We have provided \$675,000 in the new Budget to cover the costs of operating the new programs.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. MacMurchy: — Mr. Speaker, Saskatchewan has waited a long time for community colleges. We listened to continuing promises, continuing talk from the Members opposite about community colleges. It is not talk and promises only with the New Democratic Government. The NDP Government has taken action and it has made community colleges a reality. I will have more to say on community colleges when I introduce the Bill in the House later on this Session.

Mr. Speaker, one of the aims of our party expressed during the last election campaign was to put more emphasis on the content of education. For seven years the Liberals spoke only of how much the schools and the university cost us. Everything had a money orientation. I suggest that more attention needs to be paid to what is really going on in the schools, to what is taught, and how it is taught. We need more emphasis on programs.

In response to this need we have taken action on several fronts. On Tuesday I announced that a special program improvement grant of \$439,000 will be set aside to place video-tape machines in our schools.

Mr. Steuart: — Whether they want it or not!

Mr. MacMurchy: Machines consist of a monitor that can record television programs as they are broadcast and a play-back unit that will permit these programs to be shown at the teacher's convenience. Basically it is a 17-inch color television with a recording unit. We were able to cut the cost by about 30 per cent by making a bulk purchase. One hundred per cent of the cost will be covered by the grant. It is the first time, since 1963, it is the first time, Mr. Speaker, that such a program has been available to school boards.

In addition to placing the video-tape machines in schools, funds are provided to establish a central dubbing centre for reproducing tapes and we won't charge for the dubbing service either. A video-tape library will be set up. Eventually I hope we can co-ordinate our production facilities and produce our own material in the province. We have on contract a media specialist who is preparing comprehensive recommendations in this regard.

Mr. Speaker, this special grant is designed to upgrade the quality of education in our schools. It will be of particular benefit to the small town schools that have not been able to afford modern high-cost equipment. Grants for the video-tape units are being scaled to put more aid into the rural areas. One complete unit will be provided for every 750 rural students and for every 1,500 students in the urban system.

Some questions have been raised regarding copyright laws and how they may affect recording programs. To overcome this problem two steps are being taken. 1. We will make representations to the federal authorities seeking the necessary rulings and changes in procedures. 2. The Department of Education will approve for recording, only those programs on which the copyright question has been resolved.

I do not foresee the copyright laws as a major obstacle in light of these two moves. Furthermore, until more educational programs are aired, the greatest use of the video-tape machines will involve play-back of cassettes from our central library.

In the last 18 months several initiatives have been taken to introduce new courses and new programs into the schools.

At the last session of the Legislature, the Department of the Environment was created. My department is co-operating with the new department in setting up an environmental education program. We have a small joint committee working in this area.

February 14, 1973

They will involve interested members of the public in their work through four workshops this spring, to be held in Melfort, Rosetown, Fort Qu'Appelle and Cypress Hills. School trustees, wildlife and conservation people, teachers, representatives from the Man and Resources conferences and others will participate in the discussions on what an environment program should contain.

The same sort of public involvement is being generated in our consumer education work. The Department of Education and Department of Consumer Affairs have a small joint group that will hold similar public workshops this spring in North Battleford, Humboldt and Regina. We hope to develop a broad consumer education program for use in the schools, based on ideas that come forward from the workshops and from other sources.

In the area of physical education, we have been fortunate to engage the services of John Campbell of Wynyard as a consultant. Mr. Campbell's work at Wynyard has earned him the high regard of sports and physical education enthusiasts around the province. His work is directed at improving physical education in individual schools, and John is on the road visiting school trustees, visiting teachers, visiting sports people to develop new ideas that they can use in their areas. We have many good reports on the success of Mr. Campbell's work so far.

Another very important area which may interest the Members opposite, where action has been taken, and that is action in the area of agricultural education. For years the school agriculture courses have been of low status, backward programs. As in the physical education field, we have contracted the services of Laurie Monsees from Swift Current to develop a better and more substantial agriculture course. Mr. Monsees is working extensively with farm groups and teachers to come up with a course that treats farming as a profession and recognizes its importance to the Saskatchewan way of life.

Mr. Speaker, I could go on at great length. The 1973 Budget fulfils many of our 1971 election programs. It is designed for the benefit of Saskatchewan people. It provides for many new and many constructive advances in education. Mr. Speaker, I will support the motion.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. J.C. McIsaac (Wilkie): — Mr. Speaker, I have listened with a great deal of interest to the many speeches we have heard so far in the course of this Budget Debate. I must say I listened with some amazement at the Minister of Education and many of his remarks. Not only what he had to say more particularly what he didn't say.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. McIsaac — The Minister in my opinion is living in a make-believe world of his own creation. He got up here today with more than his usual eloquent vehemence, went on to point out the great achievements of the present Government in education. Talked about the issues they had resolved, never talked about the one they are creating right now or what they are going to do to solve that one.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. McIsaac — There is nothing new in his foundation grant formula, Mr. Speaker. It is not a new formula. The formula was there and brought in and enacted by the former government.

Mr. Speaker, there may be a number of things he can charge this Opposition with when we were the government but I will tell you one thing, lack of courage wasn't one of them.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. McIsaac — He still believes that the pupil-teacher ratio is gone. Now, Mr. Speaker, he and his colleagues opposite are the only few in the province who share that belief. Last year in the Estimates the Minister's own figures show a pupil-teacher ratio of about 28 to 1 rigidly built in all schools across this province. There is no way of course that a per pupil grant which is a natural evolution of the foundation grant program, there is no way a per pupil grant can be given without some calculation for the instructional part. And of course this is what was done. The Minister, as I say, is kidding only himself and his colleagues when he tries to pursue that idea.

School boards all across the province tell me they would like to see a return to another Liberal policy, the policy of budget reviews, Mr. Speaker, because they don't like the autocratic budget analysis that is carried out by the present Government.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. McIsaac — The Minister took some time to try and point out what their Government has done to increase the autonomy of trustees. Well now, Mr. Speaker, once again he need not speak to us, he had better direct some of those remarks with some action to the trustees. Tomorrow morning might be a good opportunity for him to try and do just that. Let me say, Mr. Speaker, when we were in government the school boards, trustee organizations of this province did not lose autonomy, in fact, they did gain autonomy and strength in our term of office. That has not been happening under the present administration.

Mr. Rolfes: — . . . living in a dream world.

Mr. McIsaac — The Member sitting at the back, the misguided guidance counsellor from Nutana. I will be anxious to see some of the details of the school grant budget if there are any new programs in this year's budget, Mr. Speaker, they would be the first from the Government opposite.

The Institute in Regina is not an NDP program. I am glad to see they are carrying it on. They still don't know what they are going to do with some of the people they are training over there. I find it hard to understand how a course can be designed and set up when there is no objective set out for those graduates as to what they are going to do when they do graduate.

February 14, 1973

Mr. Speaker, they are not kidding anybody, they are not kidding teachers, or trustees or students or anybody else. This is one area in the whole field of education where the NDP have floundered and they are floundering more so every day.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. McIsaac — The only new program the Minister could mention dealt with the provision of tape recording machines and other gadgets designed to solve really nothing. And one that is foisted on the school boards as far as that goes.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the Budget was introduced, compliments have been paid and I will certainly pay mine to the new Minister of Finance (Mr. Cowley). It was introduced with a great deal of flair. And surely spending money the way he did last Friday called for some degree of flair.

Mr. Speaker, the Budget shows increased provincial spending of about \$77 million. Better than a 10 per cent increase over last year. An increase greater only than the present rate of unemployment in Saskatchewan. Now, at a time when unemployment has never been higher one would have thought the NDP would have something new or imaginative to offer in trying to resolve this problem. What do we see? A winter works program, an old and a patchwork approach, one that used to be criticized, I recall, by Members opposite when they were in the Opposition. One that is a very limited approach in Saskatchewan with the tough winter climate that we have and yet winter works is the only thing they can point to. The only other effort that is obvious when you study the Estimates and that is the increase in the number of permanent civil servants. This again, Mr. Speaker, is not a new initiative because they began it and they pioneered it last year. Indeed it has probably been their most successful venture since taking office. I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that it is a very clear demonstration of two prime objectives of the party opposite.

Firstly, the NDP belief that the Government should and must be involved in every facet of a citizen's life. More agencies, more thrust groups, more commissions and advisory groups each and every day.

Secondly, it is an indication that the party opposite is determined to continue hiring every party worker in some capacity on the public payroll.

Mr. Speaker, the NDP here and elsewhere in Canada howl, never ending cries really, about the continuing rise in the cost of living. It has been clearly demonstrated that one of the greatest contributing causes to the growing inflation problem is government spending itself. This year this Government will be increasing its spending by an amount, as I say, equal to about \$77 million and at a time when the number of unemployed people in our province has never been higher.

The one direct program that is in the Budget for summer student help is even reduced from last year. And if I read the Estimates and the Supplementaries correctly, Mr. Speaker, the STEP program or the PEP program has been slashed by well over 50 per cent.

This is the Government that has had such concern prior to June 1971 for the young people of the province. We have just had Institute tuition fees raised and the University tuition fees and assistance for job creation at the same time reduced by over 50 per cent.

Now there is one other point in the Budget that all Members have been speaking about, all Government Members opposite, and that is that they have boosted the homeowner grant in total this year over last by about \$7 million. To do this, the NDP have seen fit to increase income tax rates. Last year, provincial individual income tax went from 34 to 37 per cent of federal tax. This year 37 to 40 per cent, an actual increase in rate, Mr. Speaker, of about 17 per cent.

This has been described as a tax shift. Now that is a very interesting shift. Because the Budgetary Estimates show an increase of about \$25 million in receipts from individual income tax. And as my friend from Cannington (Mr. Weatherald) pointed out yesterday, an increase of about \$25 per capita or \$100 per family in extra income taxes paid by every Saskatchewan citizen. That's quite a shift, Mr. Speaker, to shift \$25 million from the income tax source to \$7 million in Property Improvement Grants.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I have been trying to decipher and decide what it is that the Property Improvement Grant is designed for. I want to quote from the Swift Current Sun where the present Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Wood) wrote a column. I will quote from that article right now, Mr. Speaker.

The Property Improvement Grants peculiar name was chosen to indicate that it was not to be considered simply as a tax reduction payment. For farmers and businessmen this would have meant that it would have been subject to income tax. As a capital grant for property improvement it can be spent for nearly any legitimate use, but it is not expected to be subject to income tax.

Then of course we have an advertisement that has been referred to in earlier debates. This one was in the Leader-Post in October. A large ad and it says, "It is money back on school taxes, use it any way you want." I am not sure what this grant is designed to do. I am convinced that the Members opposite are trying to make it accommodate and account for about half a dozen of their various promises.

Mr. Speaker, it is a flexible one, it's a fine program and a good one. And it is one of the many good Liberal programs that the Government opposite has kept. You note of the \$78 people received last year, the urban homeowners, \$70 of it was coming to them under the former Liberal administration. Even this year the NDP will have nothing more than doubled the previous homeowner grant. Mr. Speaker, to think that an NDP convention a few years ago, some of my colleagues will recall, the NDP almost decided to scrap that program. And now they not only kept it but as I say they are using it as their answer to at least a half dozen promises. Mr. Speaker, the NDP will never be able to convince property owners that their mill rates have gone down by 18 mills in the last two years.

What about the municipal mill rates since the NDP came to power? Whether it is city or village or rural, the mill rate went up last year almost all across this province.

February 14, 1973

In 1973, Mr. Speaker, mill rates are going to go up again all across the province. They are going to go up in rural municipalities, they are most certainly going to go up in the cities, as high as four and five mills according to reports I have had in discussions with city officials.

The rural municipalities may not go up as much as the cities for the very simple reason that rural municipal councillors, Mr. Speaker, will probably cut back on road services and road expenses because they have always believed it their duty to try and hold the tax line. There is no increase over the previous Liberal municipal road construction grants and over the previous many grants providing for all-weather roads to every rural resident. These roads will be destroyed by this Government unless it increases their grants to rural municipalities.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to deal for a few moments with the Government's efforts at agricultural diversification. I want to welcome the change of heart of Members opposite, the Premier and his Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Messer), who are now recognizing that agricultural diversification is essential to the development of Saskatchewan. Oddly enough in May and June of 1971, the now Minister of Agriculture was going around the province condemning diversification as was the Premier and other Members of the Government opposite. Now they recognize the evil of their ways and they are trying to correct that and they are out promoting efforts to diversify agriculture. I will welcome any programs and I am sure that goes for other Members on this side, that the Government will develop that will assist in the expansion and development of the livestock industry in this province.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. McIsaac — I have yet to be convinced that NDP policies will be helpful, Mr. Speaker, because so far we can only judge in the main by two such policies. I refer to the Land Bank Commission and their initiation of a hog marketing commission. The livestock industry, Mr. Speaker, has a long history in Saskatchewan and the future of this industry today has never been brighter. I think this is noteworthy at a time when the market for grains of all kinds is perhaps brighter than it has been for many years.

Saskatchewan stockmen, Mr. Speaker, have traditionally been the epitome of independence, if we can put it that way. They have built a great industry in the main with very little government interference through the years. It was Saskatchewan cattlemen themselves, as an example, who pioneered the export market for breeding stock, Herefords were flown to Japan and Russia last summer. These are only two markets for breeding stock that will prove, I am convinced, of real benefit to the purebred breeders of this province. These and other markets for breeding stock is a new facet of the cattle business in Saskatchewan. An additional one to the finishing of beef and the feeder cattle trade.

Certainly adequate long-term credit is essential to livestock enterprise and I hope the Government's FarmStart program will be of value in this regard. We haven't had any details of it yet but adequate long-term credit is one problem in either establishing or expanding a livestock enterprise. Mr. Speaker, of equal importance is adequate management. Management, care

and the feeding of livestock has always been a key factor in the success of any stockman. Today, with the higher value of livestock, the importance of good management, good nutrition and disease control and handling practices has never been greater.

Mr. Speaker, I am convinced that a total provincial veterinary force considerably larger than we now have is essential if we are going to develop the livestock industry to its fullest potential here in Saskatchewan. I am convinced that drastic changes must be made in the entire structure of providing veterinary service to livestock owners, before we will see an increased number of practitioners out in the field in the rural areas.

The present scheme is one that has been with us for many years. It was brought in by the former CCF Government. It was changed somewhat by them before they left office. It was amended and approved and changed a number of times by the Liberal administration and the one move made by the Liberal administration to provide government support for clinic construction was improved upon by the present Minister and the present Government.

The problem with all of these moves, Mr. Speaker, is very simple, we have been trying to patch up a scheme that is outmoded, outdated and not doing a job for anyone. We have at the moment the poorest scheme of any province in Canada insofar as provision of veterinary service to rural areas is concerned. I don't blame the present Government or the present Minister for this, we, as the former administration are also partly to blame. The veterinary profession is partly to blame, the livestock people also to some extent. But I can assure the Minister that he will get full co-operation of veterinary Members on this side and our association in studying and assessing an improved approach to the delivery of veterinary service to rural areas.

Mr. Speaker, there is one other step that also needs to be taken and one that can be taken immediately in this regard, that is, an increase in the capacity of the Western College of Veterinary Medicine. This College was one of the first steps in inter-provincial efforts in the field of post-secondary education. Surprisingly enough I was in on discussions for the construction of this school 10 or 12 years ago. As I say despite the success of that venture and the success of provincial co-operation in that school, we haven't seen the example followed by many other institutions over many fields of learning.

I do point out that the College is there to serve all four Western Provinces. And while on the one hand it is true that we have not been keeping graduates here, even if we did retain our fair share of the graduates, Mr. Speaker, the present capacity of the college is inadequate to meet the demand for graduates and that demand will exist for many years. This is one instance where I would certainly have no objection to the Government opposite seeking federal help. The Federal Government was heavily involved in the capital costs of the present school and I am sure that federal authorities are aware of the shortage of trained veterinarian staff because they are always seeking men. They would be, I think, receptive to any proposal by the Government opposite to increase the intake in that college.

Mr. Speaker, I have more specific criticisms to make on various aspects of the Budget which I will do during Estimates.

February 14, 1973

You will judge, Sir, that I will not be supporting the motion.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. H.H. Rolfes: (Saskatoon Nutana South) — Mr. Speaker, I want to say at the outset that I take great pride in participating in this Budget Debate. I want to congratulate the Member from Biggar (Mr. Cowley) for presenting probably the best Budget that this House has seen at least for the last eight or nine years. I want to say at the outset, Mr. Speaker, that I am certainly going to support the Budget and I want to make it absolutely clear that I am very proud to be a Member of the Blakeney Government. It is certainly setting a new trend in the Province of Saskatchewan.

Before I turn to the Budget proper, I want to make a few remarks about the Member for Wilkie (Mr. McIsaac), the former Minister of Education. The Member said that at least they had courage. I think that one of the things that he should have done, or that the Member from Turtleford should have done, is to give the former minister a dictionary. Courage doesn't mean arrogance. Courage doesn't mean that you impose on others. Courage means that you stand for a principle and that you will abide by that principle when confronted by a problem.

The former minister said that trustees didn't lose any autonomy. 'Oh, no, they didn't lose any autonomy when I was the Minister'. Well, I want to refer to a few clippings from the Saskatoon Star-Phoenix. The names will be very familiar to the people opposite, very familiar. (The Member was in this House just a few minutes ago.) "Budget Emphasis Concerns Leier," I want to read parts of that article:

A Saskatoon school trustee has expressed concern that emphasis on budget review will produce the lowest average in school programs, rather than reflect the needs of a community.

This was January 26, 1971.

Now, Mr. Speaker, these people say that they did not interfere with local autonomy. One of the trustees, Mr. Leier, seemed to disagree because he said that budget review would not reflect the needs of the community.

I want to read further:

Mr. Leier, making a strong pitch for school board autonomy said that trustees must be governed by economic guidelines, but added, that it must be left to boards and administrators to set their own priorities on that basis.

Mr. Leier said that decisions made by boards within government guidelines should be respected, citing cases where the Government has cut back board grants, if that board decided to de-emphasize staffing in favor of instructional materials.

He goes on to say:

Unfortunately when you scrutinize a budget, you eventually begin to administer it too.

Gentlemen, don't tell us that there was no interference with local autonomy when you were the Government.

I have another clipping here. "Trustees warned to Watch Budgets" January 26, 1971. And the former minister said, "We had courage." He didn't have the courage to go before the people. Whom did he send? R.B. Currie, the Department's Chief of School Finance. He outlined the current budget review system and told trustees that the department was finding it necessary to question any and all increases in expenditures. No interference, no erosion of local autonomy!

Here is another one, "Education Cost Scapegoat for Liberals Sacrificial Altar."

Recent developments indicate that the Provincial Government is singling out education costs as a scapegoat for the Liberal sacrificial altar in preparation for the pre-election propaganda drive.

Star-Phoenix, A.K. Klippenstein.

I want to have it on the record and it was put on the record last year what a well known educator had to say. I noticed just a short time ago in this House, the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Steuart) was having a conversation with this gentleman. I think he is a well respected educator and I think that his words do carry some weight. This is what Dr. John Egnatoff had to say in 1968, "The lights in education have never been lower in all the years that I have been associated with it." That is under your regime! And he went on to say this about bargaining:

Premier Thatcher would not be heading Saskatchewan's Government today if recently proposed education legislation had been indicated during the election campaign last fall. I find it difficult to believe that a Liberal Government would try to enact such reactionary legislation.

This was in the Star-Phoenix January 13, 1968.

Mr. Steuart: — . . . tomorrow and see!

Mr. Rolfes: — Yes, I agree there is a problem, but you people created that problem.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Rolfes: — You people created it. You, without asking anybody whether they wanted it or not, imposed it on the people and that is why we have a problem today.

And if you remember, Mr. Leader of the Opposition and I am sure you do, in one dispute the Liberals stepped in with legislation to make compulsory the voluntary services performed by teachers, such as noon hour supervision, extra curricular activities and so on.

I wouldn't say anything, Mr. Leader of the Opposition if I were you about democracy. From your past performance the people of this province well remember you, especially the teachers.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

February 14, 1973

Mr. Rolfes: — We all remember the 6 per cent guidelines that the Leader of the Opposition imposed on us and just last week he had the audacity to go on television and say to the people of Saskatchewan that the \$10.2 million in operating grants would not be sufficient if the teachers had asked for a reasonable increase. Do you know what your school operating grants were in 1969 when you made those statements? About \$5 million, that is all they were. In March of 1970, the Leader of the Opposition stated that, "We will not contribute toward the costs of excessive wage settlements." Six per cent was the limit you fixed. I remember when we were about to settle in Saskatoon all you had to do was to make a phone call to the trustees in Saskatoon and tell them, "If you sign we feel no obligation to increase your grants for next year." Those were the words that you used. Oh, no, they did not interfere with local autonomy! Not the Members opposite.

Mr. Leader of the Opposition, if you want to do a service to the Members opposite, don't ever say a word about education because we know what you thought about education, it is on the records. Don't say a word and you will benefit the people.

Mr. Speaker, I want to turn for a few minutes now to the critic of the Budget, the Member for Albert Park (Mr. MacLeod). He criticized the Government for increasing the salary for the Members of this House. I want to remind him that there was not one dissenting vote in this House when that particular Bill was brought in. He knows, I know it and everybody in this House knows it. Had there been a dissenting voice, no increases would have been made. They supported it and I think they should stand up in this House and say, yes, we supported it and we'll keep on supporting it.

The Leader of the Opposition goes about this province saying, "This Government is hiring civil servants for \$20,000" and I agree we hire them for \$20,000 per year, but we get considerable benefits from them. If you don't think that they are worth \$20,000 then I say to you, you are not worth the \$27,500 that you are getting.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Rolfes: — Add on to that the \$24,000 that this Government gives you to run that office of yours and you are getting about 200 per cent too much for what you are accomplishing right now.

Mr. Steuart: — Herman you are earning more money than you ever earned in your life!

Mr. Rolfes: — Mr. Speaker, I want to say that some of us had some reservations about MLA increases, but we all supported it. We all supported it and I think at the time when it was introduced we were all fully aware that the MLA work was going to increase. We were going to demand more of the people in this House. Let me say to you Mr. Leader of the Opposition, that the performance on that side, up until now, has been miserably weak. And one of the reasons is that because so many of you are concerned — too concerned — about your own matters rather than with matters pertaining to this House.

Mr. Steuart: — Take a look at that side!

Mr. Speaker: — Order, order!

Mr. Steuart: — 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 15, 16 . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order, order!

Mr. Steuart: — 20 Members!

Mr. Speaker: — Order, order! Will the Leader of the Opposition if he wants to speak, rise and speak on a Point of Privilege or wait until his turn comes. We are getting too much interference.

Mr. Rolfes: Mr. Speaker, I am glad I am not on radio time so I will not be limited, as the Minister of Highways has said, due to rude interruptions.

Mr. Speaker, I do want at this time to urge this House to strive for consensus government. I know you call me a hypocrite . . .

Mr. Guy: — And you are!

Mr. Rolfes: — . . . but no bigger one than you yourself.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Rolfes: — Mr. Speaker, I also want to make a few statements about the Press. I must admit that my past experiences with the Press have been that they seem to have a certain bias in reporting. I am not now pointing an accusing finger at the reporters here. I don't blame the reporters because they don't have the responsibility of placing the articles in the paper. But when the Star-Phoenix and the Leader-Post try to make some credibility out of the Opposition sitting over there, then I think they have gone just a little too far.

I just want to put it on the records that I have gone through the trouble of getting clippings for the last seven years of the Star-Phoenix and how they have covered the Address-in-Reply to the Speech from the Throne.

In 1966, on page 10, Cy MacDonald, the Member for Milestone made the Address-in-Reply to the Speech from the Throne. This is the caption that he received:

Government influence seen necessary for flourishing industrial growth. Modern capitalistic economy could only work at top efficiency with government influenced interventions.

Cy MacDonald said that!

Now, in 1967, page 96, Mr. Hooker gave the Address-in-Reply to the Speech from the Throne and they even gave him a personal picture in the Star-Phoenix and it says, "Hooker attacks labor for evading obligations."

February 14, 1973

In 1968, on page 3, Star-Phoenix, D.A. McPherson gave the Address and he said, "Mobilization of independence suggested by Liberal speaker." Page 3, 1969, the Address was given by J.J. Charlebois, "High standard of health plan cited." In 1970, the Address was given by A.G. Heggie and he has the caption, "Agro land use planning urged." In 1971, page 3, Alex Mitchell gave the Address and the caption was, "Strong anti-drug laws advocated." I think those of you who have kept a record out of the first five or six, only one of those Members remains in the present House. Maybe the moral of the story is, don't get the Press and you might remain in the House.

Mr. Speaker, in 1971, the Address was given by the Hon. Member of City Park, Bev Dyck, a New Democrat, and he is on page 3, "Drug makers prey on sick." In 1972, the Hon. Alex Taylor gave the Address found on page 18, "Put bickering aside," Taylor says. In 1973, page 21, that was one of the last pages, "Legislature urged to imitate Ottawa's Minority Government." I don't think you will be able to see it, but if you could, you will notice it is on the classified ads.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Rolfes: — When talking to the editor I said I didn't know that you people felt that the substance of the Throne Speech was so good that you had to put it in the classified ads.

Mr. Faris: — Did they charge you for it?

Mr. Rolfes: — I am still waiting for the bill.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Rolfes: — Mr. Speaker, I hope that the examples that I have used will show that when Members on this side of the House get on this side of the House get annoyed with the Press that there is some legitimacy in that annoyance.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Rolfes: — And I want to single out a colleague of mine. Last year I sat with some amazement through the Speech that he made on the Budget. I thought it was one of the best speeches in this House, given by Wes Robbins from Nutana Centre. Not one word, not one word, appeared in the Star-Phoenix! Let me say this that I think the Star-Phoenix did a great disservice in the 1971 election when on the Saturday before the election they had big headlines, "Nutana Centre and Nutana South should remain Liberal." And they gave the reasons as to why it would remain Liberal. They got fooled that time and it didn't remain Liberal. But that is one of the reasons they will not give press coverage to certain MLAs. Hoping that the constituents will not find out what they have to say in the House so that there will be a slim chance for their re-election. But, Mr. Speaker, the people of this province are not going to be fooled.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Rolfes: — Mr. Speaker, in turning to the current Budget, I want to say that this Budget like our previous budget is a positive declaration of this Government's belief in a strong viable agricultural economy.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Rolfes: — As the Minister of Finance has indicated, we can only expect economic stability in Saskatchewan through the development of a stable and diversified agricultural industry; secondly, by the development of our primary resources, and thirdly by the creation of secondary industry.

The Budget indicated that a number of programs will be implemented to arrest the rural-urban shift. These programs will assist young people to get back into farming and for small farmers not only to maintain their present operations but to improve it to the extent that it will become a viable operation.

The establishment of a hog marketing commission; the \$15 million to be advanced to FarmStart; the \$2 million in grants to assist in the development of viable farm units; the additional \$20 million allocated to the Land Bank, all these are ample proof that this Government is committed to maintaining a strong diversified rural economy.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Rolfes: — In addition to these measures, this Government is also assisting farmers and rural people by substantially increasing the operating school grants from what they were under the previous government.

Community colleges, Operation Open Roads, Operation Main-Street are further evidence that we want to stop the rural-urban shift. As I have demonstrated a substantial percentage of this Budget will be expended on agriculture and smaller rural communities. Mr. Speaker, that is the way it should be if we are serious about sustaining the rural way of life.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Rolfes: — Although the Budget only indicates a 3.13 per cent expenditure for agriculture, we must, Mr. Speaker, as the Star-Phoenix has pointed out, also add the following. I quote.

Ordinary agriculture expenditures amount to \$22.6 million. But to that must be added \$20 million for the Land Bank Program and \$15 million set aside for loans under FarmStart.

If you work this out I think you will come somewhere in the neighborhood of 8 per cent of the budget for agriculture. If we add to these the large school grants, moneys allocated for Operation Open Roads and Main Street and other programs referred to in the Budget, that is a much greater percentage than has been allocated in most previous budgets handed down in this House.

February 14, 1973

In the New Deal for People we stated that we would sharply reduce property tax mill rates for basic school operating costs on homes, farms and small businesses. And I invite the Members opposite to check the New Deal for People on pages 10 and 11. We felt that just in case you missed page 10, maybe you would catch it on page 11. It says, for basic school purposes the significant increases in the Property Improvement Grant have reduced the property tax burden for school purposes to an average of 25 mills.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Rolfes: — Mr. Speaker, a promise made and a promise kept. Mr. Speaker, the move away from regressive taxation to the principle of ability to pay is a good socialist principle. I urge the Finance Minister (Mr. Cowley) to continue this shift in taxation in the future.

The sharply increased Property Improvement Grants will more than offset any increases that may be necessary for purposes other than school costs. In any event the increases in Property Improvement Grants will mean a significant property tax relief for the low income and for the senior citizens. Another factor which greatly relieves the burden for property taxpayers is the amount that school boards receive in operating school grants.

In our first two years in office, operating school grants amounted to \$20 million or over as compared to only \$40 million in seven years under the Members opposite when they were in office; \$20 million two years, \$40 million under the Members opposite in seven years. Mr. Speaker, these increases, \$10 million a year for this Government \$5.7 million a year when they were the government.

Mr. Speaker, what this simply means is that if those Members opposite were the government, the people would be receiving \$30 million less in school operating grants than they will be receiving under this Government. Check your own figures. That is where I got them from, from you people.

Mr. Speaker, \$10.2 million operating grants should not only provide school boards with sufficient funds to maintain the present mill rates, but it should also allow a reasonable increase for teachers' salaries and at the same time maintain the high standard of education that we have come to expect from our school system.

Mr. Speaker, I was somewhat annoyed, yesterday when the Hon. Gordon Grant (Whitmore Park) spoke on education. His definition of education is about 50 years behind times.

An Hon. Member: — Is that all?

Mr. Rolfes: — Well, I was going to be generous. If education is going to meet the challenges of the '70s, and prepare our youth to face the perplexing problems that they must in our North American society, then the present emphasis on preparing our people for jobs must be de-emphasized. Education can't be viewed as a process that begins in Grade One and ends when one leaves a formal learning situation. The Minister of

of Education must be commended for recognizing that education is a life-long process. He demonstrates this belief by expanding present pilot programs for kindergarten and the provision he has made for community colleges for rural Saskatchewan.

Too much importance in the past, has been given to training our young people for the world of work. Our education system must place more emphasis on the development of the individual. Our young people must learn how to adjust to a changing society.

Mr. Speaker, the capitalist free enterprise system has failed miserably in providing jobs. Mr. Speaker, for the foreseeable future there will not be enough jobs available for our graduates. And I am pleased that this Government is going to be taking the co-operative approach between private enterprise and co-operatives to try and find jobs for our graduates. Winter works projects and capital building programs are only stop-gap measures. We must find more permanent solutions.

Mr. Speaker, and Members opposite, I have made reference to the action taken by Premier Barrett's Government in implementing a \$200 pension for senior citizens. We sincerely hope that the Federal Government will soon follow the example set by the NDP Government in British Columbia, so that all senior citizens of Canada will be receiving at least a guaranteed annual income of \$200 per month.

Mr. Speaker, this Government also has shown its concern for senior citizens. Since it has taken office, it has removed deterrent and hospitalization fees, removed medicare premiums, increased Property Improvement Grants, will be providing financial assistance for hearing aids. The nursing component for Level III will be paid for. Establishment of a Housing Corporation is indicated in the Budget. Expansion of community services for such activities as meals-on-wheels and home makers. Also, Mr. Speaker, the establishment of a senior citizens' committee.

Last year the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Steuart) seconded by the Member for Whitmore Park (Mr. Grant) introduced a resolution in this House concerning the setting up of a committee for senior citizens. This resolution was unanimously supported by all Members of this House and the committee has since been formed. But I want to point out how hypocritical certain people can be. In September 1970 the Star-Phoenix editorial reports the following:

The Saskatchewan pensioners and senior citizens met with the Hon. Member for Whitmore Park and they asked him to abolish utilization fees on Medicare and Hospitalization Plan. And they asked him for other things, Mr. Grant said after the confrontation. We said there would be no change. Every province is crying murder at the rising health costs and some method must be found to curb them.

In other words what he was saying is, tough luck senior citizens, you will be paying your share and more.

Mr. Speaker, this Budget in my opinion is a progressive Budget. It recognizes the importance of a strong viable agricultural economy. It attempts to stem the rural-urban shift. This Budget shows its concern for the plight of low income families and our senior citizens. This Budget recognizing the

February 14, 1973

failure of a free enterprise system supports a co-operative approach to development of our resources.

For these reasons, Mr. Speaker, I strongly support the motion.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. J. Wiebe (Morse): — Mr. Speaker, I was a bit amused by some of the remarks made by the Member from Saskatoon Nutana South (Mr. Rolfes). He gave the impression that his feelings were hurt because he didn't make the front page of his home town paper. I can tell the Members opposite, don't blame the Press. Once you people start saying something in this House that has content in it, then you are going to start making the front pages.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Wiebe: — Mr. Speaker, I should like to congratulate Mr. Cowley on his appointment as the province's first Finance Minister and also on what could be called the first major politically presented Budget ever recorded in this House.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Wiebe: — I cannot however, congratulate him on the content of his Budget and the way in which he plans on obtaining and dispersing the people's money. In his remarks and the remarks of the Members opposite, they have stated that they are extremely proud of this Budget. Over and over again they have said that they are proud of the content of the Budget and what it will do for this province. Proud of what, Mr. Speaker? They are saying that they are proud of the fact that after two years of managing and planning the future of this province that they are only capable of mustering 60 per cent of the money required to run this province. How can anybody be proud of the fact that this Government has to be bailed out by another government to the tune of \$295 million. They are also proud, Mr. Speaker, that this province is turning into a welfare province; that we must rely on big brother to keep Saskatchewan alive. They are also saying, Mr. Speaker, that they are proud that this Government is unable to contribute to the general well-being of Canada and that they have to rely on the initiative and good management of other provinces to contribute 40 per cent to their own spending spree. They are saying as well, Mr. Speaker, that they are proud that 7 per cent of our labor force in this province can't find a job. They are proud, Mr. Speaker, that there is nothing in this Budget to create jobs and to encourage industry and development of this province. They are saying that they are proud that our population continues to decline and that while this Government is incapable of keeping these people here in this province with jobs, our neighboring provinces are able to absorb these people into their working force, provide them with jobs and still have a lower unemployment rate, than we have in Saskatchewan.

They are also, proud, Mr. Speaker, of the fact that with the taxpayers' own money they are building one of the largest political machines in the history of this province.

They are saying as well, Mr. Speaker, that they are proud of our buoyant economy and the \$10 million surplus of last year. They are proud that even with this prosperity and this Government's Las Vegas spending program that in just one year they have hit each and every wage earner and farmer in this province with one of the cruelest and massive increases of personal income taxes ever perpetrated on the taxpayers of this province.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Wiebe: — And they did this all in one year, Mr. Speaker. A six per cent hike in personal income taxes this year alone. In light of the \$295 million they are receiving from Ottawa they will take an additional \$25 million from the pockets of our already overburdened taxpayers. I can assure the Minister of Finance and the Government Members opposite that while you may be proud of this Budget, the people of Saskatchewan certainly are not.

I must comment as well, Mr. Speaker, on some of the arrogant remarks made by the Minister of Health yesterday afternoon when he addressed this House. Here again, Mr. Speaker, he spoke to the House and over radio. Once again he showed how this Government opposite tries to mislead the people of this province. He said yesterday in glowing terms that the NDP have only had two tax increases since they became the Government. Two tax increases. I never expected a statement like that from the Minister of Health (Mr. Smishek) so I thought I had better listen to the program last night. Sure enough, he once again, very arrogantly said that we have only had two tax increases and that it's a tax shift. I might just remind the Minister of Health (Mr. Smishek) that last year they increased the personal income taxes, that's one increase. This year they increased the personal income tax, that's two. This year as well, they increased the corporation tax, that's three. Now what do you call the \$2.8 million that they are going to be receiving in Succession Duties, that's another new tax, Mr. Speaker, now that's four. How about the cigarette tax? How about increases in university fees? Licence increases? Every department, I imagine that they will be working on the insurance as well.

Mr. Speaker, and in very glowing terms as well he mentioned yesterday that they had created something like 17,000 brand new jobs for this province. But he stopped there, Mr. Speaker, he forgot to mention how many old jobs that they had cancelled. How many jobs that were here before but are no longer in existence. How come, Mr. Speaker, can the Minister stand up and say that after we have had over 20,000 people leave this province since they became the Government, we now have an unemployment rate of 7 per cent, that they have created more jobs. Again, Mr. Speaker, he is misleading the people of this province.

In order, Mr. Speaker, not to disappoint the Minister of Highways (Mr. Kramer) I should like to direct some of my remarks to his Department. I am very sorry that he is not here today and that Mr. Romanow is not here to take notes. I imagine that some of the other Members will certainly look after it for him. It is quite interesting to note that Mr. Kramer has received a promotion and he has become the critic of the Highway critic. Hopefully his accomplishments in this new role will prove to be more fruitful than in his role as Minister of Highways.

February 14, 1973

His short stay in the Department of Natural Resources I think was justified. It was a dismal record, Mr. Speaker. For the first time he allowed the killing of Canada geese adjacent to the wild life sanctuary around Regina. For the first time he allowed the killing of coyotes from snowmobiles. His department had no rhyme or reason for the sale of hunting licences to Canadian or to American hunters.

Mr. Speaker, after he had just about slaughtered all the wild life in this province, it became imperative for the Premier to move him. But I wonder why he picked the Department of Highways. Possibly a new department should have been created called 'the Department of Aero-Dynamics' to deal with hot air and corny jokes, Mr. Speaker. I was beginning to wonder as well whether this Government still had a Department of Highways and whether it still had a Minister to run that department. I notice that the desk normally occupied by the Minister is vacant more than occupied. This House is usually favored at least every other day by a five minute visit by the Minister of Highways (Mr. Kramer). I imagine that this visit is to get his name on record as having been in attendance. I realize that he has a busy time with auction sales, travelling all over the country. He had over 53 of them last year in 1972. What job does he have, Mr. Speaker, is he a farmer or is he an auctioneer or is he a Cabinet Minister? Mr. Speaker, he is being paid by the people of this province as a Cabinet Minister, not as an auctioneer.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Wiebe: — As well, Mr. Speaker, we have had an opportunity to look at the question which was answered last night on the use of the executive aircraft by the Minister of Highways. They only listed eight trips but I must note that of the eight, five are to North Battleford. We have not had time to confirm all of them but on June 13th the Minister went up to North Battleford to attend one of his auction sales. Here again the people of this province are paying his wages to be a Cabinet Minister and they are also paying his transportation so he can auction off his wares. As well, Mr. Speaker, it seemed rather obnoxious that no mention of highways was made in the Throne Speech nor in the Budget presentation. I wonder if they are trying to hide or forget or just ashamed of its dismal record.

I wonder, as well, what is happening within his department. It seems rather strange to me that the Minister of Highways doesn't even know the total mileage of provincial highways in this province. You would think that a competent Minister would at least know how many miles of highway he has built in his term of eight months as Highways Minister. But how can you expect him to know this when he is out in the country running auction sales instead of running the Highways Department. I wonder what he is doing over there with all the executive and management staff which he has.

At the opening of this Session, Mr. Speaker, I asked the Minister the following questions:

What was the mileage of provincial highways as of December 31, 1972 (a) in total; (b) according to surface treatment (i) paved? (ii) oil treatment? (iii) gravelled? (iv) dirt?

This is the answer I got on January 30th, "Statistics not available at this time."

The majority of work on our provincial highways, Mr. Speaker, is normally completed by the end of November. This would give the Minister 30 days time prior to the end of 1972 to calculate how many miles of highway that he had actually built during that year. Surely by January 30th of this year, the date that I received this ridiculous answer, that he would by then have had some idea of what his department has been doing. He has authorized construction of highways in this province and he doesn't even know what he has authorized.

I wonder, Mr. Speaker, besides auctioneering, what is he doing with his time, besides making sure that his picture appears in every newspaper in this province. I imagine that soon we will see his smiling face crowned with his white Stetson appearing on every television station in the province. One might wonder, Mr. Speaker, does he wish to expand his auctioneering service, expand it to the rest of the province instead of just the limited North Battleford area.

Mr. Speaker, let's look at some of the other questions which I asked the Minister. Again on January 30th I asked:

What was the mileage of provincial highways paved in 1972 by the Department of Highways under the capital program?

Programs which he, himself, endorsed and which he had complete control of. Here again, answered on January 30th, "Statistics not available at this time."

Again on January 26th I asked him another question:

What mileage of highways was oiled in 1972 by the Department of Highways under the capital program?

The same reply on January 30th, "Statistics not available at this time."

One more question, Mr. Speaker, which I asked on January 26:

What was the total mileage of grade constructed by the Department of Highways under the capital program in 1972?

Same answer, "Statistics not available at this time."

Mr. Speaker, I should like to deal for a few moments with the Minister's new 'Bad Roads Program'. He has stated publicly that from now on he will reduce the standard of road construction and build roads only according to the bare necessities — what the traffic will bear. He used the so-called term, "No more champagne highways." No more well-built highways that are capable of handling heavy traffic and heavy loads. No more highways that will have a long life under this type of use. No more roads that have made this province the forerunner in good solid construction which we can all be proud of.

The previous government, Mr. Speaker, had a proud record of building long-lasting quality highways and we gave priority to superior maintenance on these highways.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

February 14, 1973

Mr. Wiebe: — Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased that in his announcement today of the work which will be done on highways this year that he has decided to do a bit of construction in the Morse constituency. I must say, however, Mr. Speaker, that last year the former Minister of Highways (Mr. Byers) at least had the courtesy to give the highways critic a copy of the highways which he had proposed for 1972. This year, of course, the present Minister of Highways (Mr. Kramer) did not have that courtesy so I asked the page who looks after us here in this House to go over and ask Mr. Kramer if it might be possible for me to have a copy of the highways he was going to be building this year. The answer I got back was, sorry you'll have to get it from the Press. You'll have to get it from the Press — so the page went up to the Press and I was fortunate enough to get a photostat copy of the highways that he is proposing. Just another example where everybody else in the country knows what's going on except the Members of this Legislature.

Mr. Speaker, in his remarks today he mentioned that very little would be done on Highway No. 1 East. But he also admitted that top priority should be given to this highway. We all realize that this is a high traffic highway especially in the summertime. The traffic is heavy with campers and tourists but there is very little mentioned in the Budget. All they are going to do is a little bit of paving to finish off the construction that they did last year.

Mr. Speaker, on January 25th I also asked the Minister of Highways (Mr. Kramer) a question. I asked him how many fatal accidents occurred in Saskatchewan during 1972 on Saskatchewan highways. I wanted to know the location of those accidents. Mr. Speaker, I have yet to receive an answer to this question. From the Press reports that we have had during the last year Highway No 1 East is a highway which has had a tremendous number of accidents last year and a lot of fatalities. If the Minister of Finance (Mr. Cowley) and this Government are concerned about traffic safety in this province then that's where the emphasis should have been placed on highway construction.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Wiebe: — If they are concerned about spending a \$22 million increase on Welfare, why didn't they spend an extra \$5 million on the Trans-Canada Highway. Mr. Speaker, if we have to build champagne roads to afford safety in this province by all means let's build them. If we have to spend \$5 million to save one life on our public highways well then, let's do it.

I might just mention here as well, Mr. Speaker, that while the Hon. Member from North Battleford sat in the Opposition he was quite critical of the Provincial Government's highway program and especially of Highway No. 4 in his constituency, the highway from Glaslyn to Cochin. He just about stood on his head in this House when he condemned the Government for having the gall to do construction work on that piece of highway during the tourist season.

Mr. Meakes: — Were you here?

Mr. Wiebe: — No, I didn't have to be here, Mr. Meakes, I was capable of

reading it in the Debates and Proceedings. I'll tell you it was very interesting reading. The new Minister of Highways tried all last year to fix that highway. He spent thousands and thousands of dollars on that stretch of highway and when did he do that construction, right in the middle of the tourist season. Here again this year that highway is still in a mess and he is going to take another full summer to try to fix that highway and again right in the middle of the tourist season.

Mr. Speaker, before I end my remarks I should like to make a few comments on some of the actions of the Minister of Highways (Mr. Kramer). During the time that the Member from The Battlefords was in the Opposition and during his campaign for re-election in 1971, he told all who would listen that he was the champion of the little man, that people came before profits, that people came before money, that everything must be done to help the small farmer.

How strange it is, Mr. Speaker, that now that he has been re-elected and made a Cabinet Minister, that he no longer has this concern for the little guy, that people do not, in fact, come before money. He no longer believes that everything must be done to help the small farmer. Mr. Speaker, let me just tell this House a story which certainly proves this point, and also proves that this Government says one thing and does entirely the opposite. To them, Mr. Speaker, the means justifies the end.

Just after harvest, Mr. Speaker, I received a phone call from one of my constituents living near Ernfold. I don't think that mentioning his name is necessary. I have discussed this with the Minister of Highways and he knows whom I am talking about. If any of the Members opposite wish to know, I am sure that he will fill them in.

Mr. Larson: — Does he have a membership?

Mr. Wiebe: — Just on the comment of the Member from Pelly, I don't believe that he does have a Liberal membership and I didn't ask him if he had one. I don't ask any of my constituents what membership they have got.

An Hon. Member: — Larson always asks them before he'll help them!

Mr. Wiebe: — In my mind that is not the priority. The Members of my constituency come before any membership and I represent each and every one, not just the NDP as the Member from Pelly does.

This gentleman who phoned me was a small farmer. He farms two quarters of land. He was having trouble with the Department of Highways who are planning on building a four-lane highway through his property. He asked me to call in and talk to him regarding this problem, which I did. The Minister of Highways is planning on taking 60 acres of his land to construct this four-lane highway. I might just fill the Members in a bit. He is a young man and he has a growing family, he has 30 years of farming left ahead of him. He has a mixed farm, he raises cattle and grain and he does all this on two quarters of land. This young man came over from the old country, Mr. Speaker, worked for a while in the neighborhood district and then decided

February 14, 1973

to buy these two quarters of land. I might say that these two quarters of land are now paid for. He is proud of his accomplishments, he is proud of his farm and he is proud of his independence.

Mr. Speaker, by building this highway through his property, the Government is taking over 20 per cent of his best productive land and over 30 per cent of his income. This action alone will force him off the farm and into some other line of work. Mr. Speaker, he doesn't want to leave the farm. He has put his life's saving and his life's work into that farm and is extremely proud of his accomplishments. When I called at his farm he told me that he had no success with the Department, that they were going ahead with the highway regardless. He asked me to call in and see the Minister in Regina. He had asked that I ask the Minister if the highway could be moved and, Mr. Speaker, it was not an unreasonable request. He asked that the width of the four-lane highway be moved over just the width of the four-lane highway. By moving it over that width . . .

Mr. Engel: — Onto another man's property!

Mr. Wiebe: — Yes, onto another man's property. Just wait until I get to that, Mr. Engel. That was his request. Now that isn't an unreasonable request. So I spoke to the Minister of Highways and I presented this proposal and asked him to consider it in order that this young farmer could keep his farm intact. Of course, the Minister was very polite and advised me that he would look into it and see what he could do. He would send someone from his department out to advise this farmer on his decision.

Well, Mr. Speaker, about two or three weeks later, the man from the department arrived. He advised this farmer that they would not move the highway under any circumstances and they would compensate him with a few hundred dollars for his loss of income. It was difficult, Mr. Speaker, for me to understand this decision made by the Minister of Highways in light of the statements which he has made that people come before money and that everything had to be done to help the small farmer.

I decided to investigate this decision a bit further. By moving that highway over, Mr. Speaker, there would be a bit of an additional cost of surveying but it is not that much when you consider the livelihood of a man and his family. As well the new route would go through poor quality land, a few more hills, but with the type of machinery we have today there would be no problem to level these hills, very little extra expense, Mr. Speaker, but the livelihood of that young farmer I felt was worth that little expense. Then I thought, Mr. Speaker, in answer to Mr. Engel's question that by moving that highway over that another small farmer with the same situation might be involved. I checked into the ownership of that land that would be affected by this move. I found that the 60 acres required for the new location would not be taken from a small farmer, but rather from four brothers who farm between 50 and 60 quarters of land. Certainly, Mr. Speaker, with close to 9,000 acres of land these brothers could afford to lose 60 acres, and it would have no effect whatsoever on their livelihood or their farm operation. In light of this, Mr. Speaker, I couldn't see why the Minister was really justified in denying this small farmer his request. At this point I inquired as to who these brothers

were. Immediately, Mr. Speaker, my questions regarding the integrity of the Minister of Highways were answered. One of the brothers just happens to be the defeated NDP candidate who ran against Ross Thatcher in 1971.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Wiebe: — Just one more example where the Minister of Highways is playing politics with his highways. What he said during his election campaign and in this House about being concerned about the little guy is just a bunch of baloney. I maintain, Mr. Speaker that this is just one incident in many that will follow. I think it is about time that the Minister of Highways began tending to the business of building highways, that he start to find out how many miles of highway he actually is building, that he quit playing politics in his department and start showing his concern for the little man.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Wiebe: — Mr. Speaker, because of this arrogant attitude, because of this Government's lack of concern for the little man, because of the lack of content in this Budget, I should like to move an amendment, -seconded by Mr. Lane (Lumsden).

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

this Assembly expresses its regret

- (a) At the Government's decision to increase personal income taxes at a time when the Government is receiving huge revenues from other sources;
- (b) At the failure of the Government to give more than token recognition to the serious problems of retired people, and other citizens in similarly difficult situations;
- (c) At the decision of the Government to institute long-term or cyclical budgeting without designating in advance the length of the cycle;
- (d) At the failure of the Government to take effective action to combat unemployment which has reached the highest level in many years;
- (e) At the failure of the Government to deal effectively with pollution in the Qu'Appelle Basin.

The debate continues on the motion and the amendment.

Hon. J.E. Brockelbank (Minister of Government Services): — Well, Mr. Speaker, it is near the shank of the day, and I really don't want to take too much time of the House, although the Member from Cannington (Mr. Weatherald) was calling on me to speak a while ago.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

February 14, 1973

Mr. Brockelbank: I had intended putting forward some comments, this evening, Mr. Speaker, but unfortunately the Member for Morse (Mr. Wiebe) has crowded me off the end of the plank.

I do want to take what brief time is available to me today to say, how pleased I am that the three new Members have been added to the Cabinet, how much we appreciate their views and their experience and their qualities in the Executive Council. With regard to this particular debate that is before us, I must say that I am especially pleased to see the Hon. Mr. Cowley, as the person who initiated this debate with this New Democratic Party Budget. I want to take this opportunity also, to welcome the Hon. Member for Athabasca (Mr. Guy) back to this Chamber. I know that he will honor the rules of this House, as he has always honored them. I look forward to his participation at all times in this House.

I notice, Mr. Speaker, that the Members across the way have been talking about hiring civil servants who have some political tag attached to them. Quite frankly, Mr. Speaker, of the civil servants that have been hired, I was sorry that I didn't get there to hire them first. Some of them are very well qualified, for example, I need only think of Mr. John Burton, who has a great deal of formal education, a great deal of practical experience and a great breadth of experience. I know his services will be appreciated in this Government. I think it is really foolish to attack one government or another for hiring somebody who has a political tag on him, I really don't see anything wrong with it, Mr. Speaker, if the person has got the qualifications and does the job.

I believe the most recent government elected in Canada was the Federal Government. I have a news article dealing with the defeated Liberals. It quotes two headings on it, "Defeated Liberals Still Prominent," the bottom heading is, "Robin Hood Might Not Have Bothered." You can apply whichever heading you want when I refer the evidence that is in this article to the House. It says that in Prime Minister Trudeau's office, there is former Labour Minister Martin O'Connell, also John Roberts, former MP for York Simcoe. In other ministries, Murray McBride, the former MP for Lanark-Renfrew is now with Andre Ouellet, Postmaster General; Bruce Howard, formerly MP for Okanagan-Boundary is executive assistant to Mr. Marc Lalonde. Another defeated candidate employed by Ministers is Gervis Black defeated in Frontenac, Lennox and Addington employed by the Transport Minister Jean Marchand. Peter Connolly, executive assistant to Consumer Affairs Minister Herb Gray, who ran unsuccessfully in Oshawa-Whitby. Mr. Ray Perrault, former leader of the Liberal Party in British Columbia, who lost his seat in Burnaby-Seymour is working for Environment Minister Jack Davis. Robert Borrie defeated in Prince George-Peace River, is the Housing Consultant for the Urban Affairs Department. Jerry Pringle, former Member for Fraser Valley-East is special advisor to Agriculture Minister Whelan. Mr. Speaker, I am sure there are a lot of these men working for the Federal Government in Ottawa, and if they are qualified, and if they do the job, I really don't see too much wrong with it. Mr. Speaker, if I have heard it 15 times, I have heard it a couple of dozen times.

The people across the way talk about equalization money and all the money Saskatchewan is getting from the Federal Government . . .

Mr. Speaker: — . . . Attention to the time . . . It is now 5:30.

Mr. Brockelbank: — I'll just wind up the sentence, Mr. Speaker. I am sure the Hon. Members will bear with me, since they compressed me into a small space of time. I am not going to be able to give them all the gems of wisdom that I had for them. I did want to say in my final remarks something about the equalization payments. They in this House attempt to portray that equalization payments come from the Federal-Liberal Government. The fact of the matter is, it's not true, Mr. Speaker. The equalization payments come from the rich provinces of Canada . . .

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Brockelbank: — . . . I didn't think I would get extended applause for that from across the way. However, I have hit the point. This money comes from the rich provinces of Canada, not one of which has a Liberal Government.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Brockelbank: — Mr. Speaker, I have a number of comments which I should like to make at a further time in this debate. I beg leave to adjourn the debate.

Debate adjourned.

The Assembly adjourned at 5:30 o'clock p.m.