

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN
Third Session — Seventeenth Legislature
16th Day

Thursday, February 15, 1973.

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

WELCOME TO STUDENTS

Mr. B.M. Dyck (Saskatoon City Park): — Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day I want to say that it gives me great pleasure to introduce and to welcome to this Assembly, 37 students from the Wilson school from Saskatoon, City Park constituency. I understand that they are accompanied by their teacher Mr. Waite. I hope the students have an informative and worthwhile afternoon and I hope that they return to this Assembly again.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. A.W. Engel (Notukeu-Willow Bunch): — Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day I should like to take this opportunity to introduce to you and to this Assembly the Grade Twelve students from the Glentworth High School. They are accompanied today by their principal, Mr. Ashenbrenner, and Mr. Walter Nelson a local farmer. I hope that they enjoy the deliberations and that you would welcome them here today.

Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. D.M. McPherson (Regina Lakeview): — Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day I should like to introduce to you and to this House 51 high school students Grade Eleven and Twelve from Hague, Saskatchewan. Hague is in the constituency of Rosthern. The Member for that constituency is ill, as you know, and as the students know. I explained this to them before the House sat today. They are here along with Mr. Reimer, the Principal, and Mrs. Reimer and Mr. and Mrs. John Gunther. Mr. Gunther is on the local board there. Their bus driver is Mr. Henry Foth. I should like to welcome them to the House and hope they enjoy their stay in Regina and watch democracy in action.

Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. J.E. Brockelbank (Saskatoon-Mayfair): — Mr. Speaker, I would like to introduce to the Chamber through you a group of students from St. Edwards school in the constituency of Saskatoon-Mayfair. I believe they are situated in the Speaker's Gallery. I understand they are accompanied by Mr. Fisher and Mr. Hudy. I hope that they have an enjoyable day in the Legislature and have a safe trip back to Saskatoon-Mayfair.

Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

CONDOLENCES

Hon. A.E. Blakeney (Premier): — Mr. Speaker, before Orders of the Day I should like to advise the House of the death today of the Hon. Frank L. Bastedo, former Lieutenant-Governor of the province. I am advised by wire from Mrs. Bastedo that the death occurred at Victoria this morning.

As Members will know, Mr. Bastedo was a person who served this province in many capacities over a good number of years. He was born in Ontario and went to Osgoode Hall Law School in Ontario and was admitted to the Bar in Ontario. He, as a young man, came to practise in Regina and practised law here for many years. I think it would be in excess of 50 years. He was a distinguished member of the Bar, known principally, I think, for his court appearances.

He became a King's Counsel in 1927; President of the Saskatchewan Bar Association in 1928 and 1929; President of the Law Society of Saskatchewan in 1941; a bencher of the Law Society of Saskatchewan from 1934 until 1946, and thereafter he continued as an ex officio bencher. He had taken many famous legal cases before the Supreme Court of Canada and before the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council in London, when that was the final Court of Appeal for Canada.

He became Lieutenant-Governor of this province in February of 1958 and served until March of 1963. Sometime thereafter he retired with his wife to Victoria where they have lived in retirement since that time.

I know that all Members of the House would wish to join with me in expressing our sympathy to the bereaved family and particularly to Mrs. Bastedo whom we particularly remember when she greatly assisted Mr. Bastedo during his term as Lieutenant-Governor. Each of them made a considerable contribution to the public life of this province.

I should like to ask the Assembly to join with me in paying tribute and in expressing our condolences.

Mr. D.G. Steuart (Leader of the Opposition): — Mr. Speaker, I should like to join with the Premier in paying a tribute to the memory of the Hon. Mr. Bastedo.

I had the honor of being involved with Mr. Bastedo — I think on his first official act on assuming the position of Lieutenant-Governor of Saskatchewan — and that was on the occasion of the visit of Princess Margaret to Saskatchewan. John Diefenbaker was then Prime Minister so by a strange coincidence he decided that Prince Albert would be the site of the visit of Princess Margaret to Saskatchewan.

Mr. Bastedo and the late Lochie McIntosh and myself became very involved in the planning for that visit and I got to know Mr. and Mrs. Bastedo at that time.

I have a great respect for them. He served, as the Premier pointed out, not only a long and distinguished career here in

February 15, 1973

Saskatchewan and he certainly graced the position of Lieutenant-Governor with intelligence and dignity.

Members on this side of the House join with the Premier and Members of the Government in paying our respects to Mrs. Bastedo and offering our sympathy to the family.

Mr. K.R. MacLeod (Regina Albert Park): — Mr. Speaker, I should like to add my words of condolence to the family of the Hon. Frank L. Bastedo, QC.

I got to know Mr. Bastedo when I came to Regina in 1956 to practise law and later our law firm had the good fortune to engage his services. He became associated with our firm and served with us following his retirement as Lieutenant-Governor of this province.

He continued to do this at a later date when he retired to Victoria. We were very privileged to have the opportunity of having him do briefs and counsel work for us during that period of time.

We particularly noted that his work was marked by, not only industriousness, but meticulousness. It was of a high quality. He was unfailingly courteous in all his doings.

I should like to say how much we regret the passing of Mr. Bastedo and wish at this time also to acknowledge the contribution of Mrs. Bastedo.

She was his constant companion. She, too, was unfailingly courteous. I should like to have it recognized that she had more than a little to do with the promotion of the Saskatchewan tartan, for the anniversary of the province.

Mr. Bastedo is the sort of person whom I enjoyed meeting and enjoyed working with, and he will be sorely missed.

QUESTIONS

ACT RESPECTING TECHNOLOGICAL CHANGES

Mr. D.G. Stuart (Leader of the Opposition): — Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day I should like to direct a question to the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Messer).

Last year we passed an Act in this House respecting technological changes and their effects on employees. Part of that Act, Mr. Speaker, calls for an employer whose employees are represented by a trade union, who proposes to effect a technological change and is likely to affect the terms, conditions and tenure of employment to do certain things; give them notice; advise them of the nature of the technical change and so on.

Now my question to the Minister of Agriculture is: Did he give such a notice to the employees and to the association that represent them, which is the Saskatchewan Government Employees Association, I presume? And, if so, whom did he give the notice

to, when did he give the notice and could he give us a copy at his earliest opportunity of such notices?

Hon. J.R. Messer (Minister of Agriculture): — Mr. Speaker, I know the Act that the Leader of the Opposition is referring to. I hardly think the decision in regard to South Saskatchewan River Irrigation Project could be referred to as a technological change. It is a shutdown. There has been no indication that the Government has laid off any personnel for that matter or that there is ultimately going to be any laying off of personnel.

We have told those people who are involved with that project both in Regina and on site, that it is the decision of the Government to stop further construction and that we are attempting to find placement for those 33 positions.

There has been no termination of jobs at this point in time.

Mr. Steuart: — Mr. Speaker, just a supplementary question. You had better check with your officials because they have given those people notice. Are you saying that those people have not been given notice, that there have not been 40 or 50 people that worked for the Department of Agriculture involved in the South Saskatchewan Irrigation Project? Are you saying that they have not been given notice that they will continue to be able to work for the Government?

Mr. Messer: — Mr. Speaker, firstly, there are not 40 or 50 people there are 33 people. The notice that has been given to them is that we are terminating the further construction of the project and we are endeavoring to do everything that is possible to find placement for those 33 people.

Mr. Steuart: — Mr. Speaker, I just want to say that he has not answered the question. Did he give them notice?

Mr. Speaker: — Order, order! We can't debate a question.

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 the Committee of Finance; and the proposed amendment thereto, moved by Mr. Wiebe (Morse).

Hon. J.E. Brockelbank (Minister of Government Services): — Mr. Speaker, I mentioned yesterday that it was a pleasure to take part in the debate on the Budget. It is my belief, Mr. Speaker, and I think it will be proven that this particular document, at the conclusion of the debate, will be passed by a very strong vote of support in this House.

February 15, 1973

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Brockelbank: — Between the presentation of the document and the final disposition of it at the vote, there is a great deal of debate taking place, Mr. Speaker. I have noted recently that some of the zip has gone out of the Opposition's debate in this particular Session. I have been trying to figure out, Mr. Speaker, why that has happened.

Usually someone in the Opposition, makes a verbal trip around the world to talk about socialism and how democratic socialism has been brought to its knees. I thought to myself, Mr. Speaker, why aren't they doing that this year? I did a little bit of checking. I find it all began in about 1969, when a New Democratic Government was elected in the Province of Manitoba. It happened on the same day in Saskatchewan, the constituency of Kelvington returned a New Democratic Member to this House. At that point, some of the more perceptive Members of the Liberal Government of that day reacted to the implications of those moves by the people in Canada. They realized that they were having some political slipping so they came in with another Bill to redistribute the constituencies of Saskatchewan. That was the famous gerrymander Bill.

It produced results, and I can give you an example very close to home, the constituency of Saskatoon-Mayfair which lies alongside the constituency of Saskatoon City Park. The gerrymander put the situation this way: the constituency of Saskatoon Mayfair had over 16,000 voters and the constituency of City Park had about 5,000 voters. This was their answer to the people of Saskatchewan and the fear that they were losing control of the political situation in Saskatchewan.

Even on June 23, 1971 when the election was held, this had not, generally speaking, penetrated the cranial cavity of the Liberal Party. The election was held on June 23rd and the New Democratic Party was returned to power in Saskatchewan with a landslide victory.

That, Mr. Speaker, was another first for the people of Saskatchewan. It is the first time in the history of Canada that a New Democratic Party, after having spent an interval in Opposition, was returned to government.

The third punch of this one-two-three combination, occurred when the people of British Columbia swept aside a Social Credit Government, giving the New Democratic Party 38 seats and 17 to the Opposition.

Mr. Speaker, this, I think, is enough evidence to show why some of the zip of debate has gone from the Opposition side. They are not able to put forward the type of argument that they had in past years. I think the people of Saskatchewan can draw their own conclusions. However, in order to keep the records straight, I should just like to refer to some other recent elections.

In November of this year the people of West Germany returned a Social Democratic Government with a 45.9 per cent of the popular vote. In November of 1972 the Netherlands re-elected a Labour party with an increase in their seats from 39 in 1971 to 43 in 1972. In December 1972 the Australian electorate

toppled the Liberal Party. The results — Labour 66, Liberal 58. Again, Mr. Speaker, in December 1972 the New Zealand electorate went to the polls. The end result, the private enterprise party was reduced from 44 seats to 32 seats, the Labour Party increased from 40 seats to 55 seats. Last, but not least, Mr. Speaker, Sweden still has a Social Democratic Party. I think that puts the cap on it for the Leader of the Opposition and his party.

The one unhappy aspect of this, Mr. Speaker, is that in Saskatchewan we have a weak, despondent and for all purposes, leaderless Opposition.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Brockelbank: — This Opposition has failed to heed the word of the people of Saskatchewan. They have failed to even heed the word of their own 171 organization in their moderate demands for reform. In this leaderless confusion, Mr. Speaker, they are digging up the old speeches of the '40s and the '50s and bringing them back into this House. I don't think, Mr. Speaker, that the people of Saskatchewan are prepared to accept that.

In this debate, Mr. Speaker, I want to spend some time talking about Saskatchewan Telecommunications. The major objectives of this corporation is to meet the demand growth in present served areas, to improve the quality of present services and extend services into areas unserved at this time.

In meeting the demand growth for present services in areas now served, there are incremental additions to customer equipment, local distribution plant, local and long distance switching and long distance transmission facilities to handle the annual growth rate of 4 to 5 per cent.

With regard to improving the quality of the present service, Sask Tel will complete the conversion of manual switching centres to dial by 1974. This, I am sure, the people of Saskatchewan will appreciate.

To ensure a dependable grade of long distance service open toll wire is being replaced by radio or cable in conjunction with dial conversion programs. Subscribers to Sask Tel on a multi-party service will have the "line fill" reduced and this will make for better and improved service.

Major multi-million dollar upgrading with electronic switching gear is planned for Saskatoon in 1974 and Regina in 1975. Extended area service is being offered in answer to demand and under this program two adjacent communities may elect to have toll free calling between their exchanges for an additional monthly charge.

Sask Tel as a member of the Trans Canada Telephone System, is participating in digital data transmission facility across Canada. The rural "Un-Served Area Program", a very popular program will essentially be completed in 1973. Coin telephone service and multi-party line service where appropriate is being extended to Indian reserves and resort areas over the next four years.

A program of great importance to the people of Northern Saskatchewan which the Minister of Finance mentioned in his

February 15, 1973

Budget address of last Friday, is the extension of a dependable microwave communication system to all settlements in the area designated as Northern Saskatchewan with a population of 50 or more by 1974. On the West from North Battleford to La Loche, on the East from Prince Albert via La Ronge to Uranium City.

With regard to cable television, the Government announced late in 1972 that they wished to see cable television developed in an orderly manner in the province. The Government felt that the viability of a cable television system which would be available to as many people as possible would have to be ensured by allowing the profitability of parts of the system to enable the maximum extension of the system.

I, therefore, announced the Government's basic policy late last fall as follows: The system will be non-profit, that is, provided as a subscriber's service. The system will be community controlled. In the plan, the cable television utility will be developed within Saskatchewan telecommunications. If any Members doubt the profitability of the system I refer to a couple of reports that have been done on the economics of the system. MacLeod, Young, Weir and Company of Toronto predicted that the \$54.9 million revenues in 1970 may become one billion dollars in 1980. Another Toronto firm, Baker, Weekes of Canada Limited predicted a good future for the industry. They noted that the Canadian cable companies earn higher returns on investment than their American counterparts, due to the difference in Government regulations.

This utility will prepare to serve the ten-city program beginning in the larger cities.

The integrity of the announced policy, that is "community controlled" and "non-profit" must, and I believe, will be preserved.

In due course I shall be in a position to announce further information to the public which will assist them in understanding and preparing for further development of the contact points that are by necessity made between government and the public, government and the Federal Regulatory Agencies, and the public with the cable utility.

The views of the Federal Regulatory bodies can, in my view, be regarded as sympathetic toward new innovative policy in the field of cable television.

I feel reasonably sure that the discussions with them in this area will be fruitful. I think the people of Saskatchewan have every right to expect maximum efficient use of the communication medium of cable television.

I want to thank those groups, Mr. Speaker, who have already given me the benefit of their thoughts about cable television. Their interest in presenting draft programs which attempt to meet the basic government policy priorities indicate a fair desire to move in the direction which we have indicated.

I want to speak about the Department of Government Services, Mr. Speaker, for a few moments. One of the major highlights of 1972 would have to be the creation of the Department of Government Services. This re-organized department has within it the old Department of Public Works, the System Centre, the Queen's Printer, the Purchasing Agency and the Central Vehicle Agency,

all now re-organized into five branches.

I want at this time to offer my sincere thanks to my departmental officials, branch heads, division heads and all the staff for their part in striving to improve the efficiency and effectiveness of this department in 1972. During the last three-quarters of 1972, the following projects were advanced, with the appropriate expenditures. The School for the Deaf in Saskatoon — \$242,000. The Saskatchewan Institute of Applied Arts and Science, Regina — \$930,000. Meadow Lake Vocational School — \$500,000. Provincial Office Building, Yorkton — \$510,000. Repair Depot, Swift Current — \$447,000. Equipment Storage Building, Regina — \$490,000. Nine other equipment storage buildings, — \$273,000. Service Centre for the Department of Natural Resources and a water system at the Battlefords Park — \$141, 000. Other park improvements — \$437,000. Educational improvement for the Department of Northern Saskatchewan — \$300,000. Various improved facilities for the Department of Public Health — \$287,000. Renovations for the Department of Social Services — \$356,000. These services were spearheaded by the Property and Planning Branch and the Public Works Branch. Central Services Branch and the System Centre provide vital services to all areas of government. The Administration Branch was successful in co-ordinating the ordinary administrative control over the branches.

The capital budget for 1973-74 amounts to \$13.6 million as announced in the Minister of Finance's statement last Friday. The capital construction program will be carried out for 11 departments in the Government. The most significant expenditures will occur in Continuing Education, Government Services, Highways, Natural Resources, Department of Northern Saskatchewan and Public Health.

Let me cite some examples. In the Department of Continuing Education, in Saskatoon, there is the swimming pool at the Saskatchewan Institute of Applied Arts and Science. If the present negotiations are successfully concluded with the city of Saskatoon, the Government will proceed with the construction of a 50 metre Olympic-size indoor swimming pool at a cost of \$1.2 million. Expenditures in that item for 1973-74 would be approximately \$480,000. The city of Saskatoon and the Saskatchewan Institute of Applied Arts and Science will share use of the facility on a pre-determined basis. The city of Saskatoon will share the capital costs on a 50-50 basis.

Other significant projects for the Department of Continuing Education will continue to be the Saskatchewan Technical Institute, Moose Jaw, \$610,000. The Saskatchewan Institute of Applied Arts and Science, Regina, \$337,000. In the Department of Government Services various buildings and renovations, carryover and new work, \$3.6 million. In Highways \$1.3 million. In Natural Resources, \$726,000. In the Department of Northern Saskatchewan, \$3.2 million. In Public Health \$1 million. In order to successfully move this ambitious program it was absolutely necessary that the construction program branches of this Department be strengthened. I am pleased to see, Mr. Speaker, that the Government has seen fit to do this. Along with the streamlining of the Department, I am optimistically hopeful that we will be able to conclude that program as much as humanly possible in the coming fiscal year. I want at this time to say, Mr. Speaker, that it gives me great pleasure to support this particular Budget.

February 15, 1973

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. T.L. Hanson (Qu'Appelle-Wolseley): — Mr. Speaker, it is indeed with great pleasure that I rise to enter this Debate on behalf of the people of Qu'Appelle-Wolseley. In my remarks this afternoon I shall point out to the Members of this Assembly, and to the listening audience, the remarkable effect that this Budget will have on my constituency. As I mentioned in an earlier address to this Assembly, Qu'Appelle-Wolseley is predominantly dependent on agricultural production and I'm therefore pleased that the direction or thrust of this Budget is toward revitalization of the agricultural segment of our economy. It has been a proven fact, but one that the Liberals ignored, that when agriculture flourishes, the economy of the Province of Saskatchewan takes a similar trend. Therefore, it is imperative that the Government stimulate the agricultural sector as a priority before attempting to develop the industrial sector of this economy.

I feel this Budget has taken giant strides toward this goal, Mr. Speaker. If the Land Bank program with this year's expenditure of some \$20 million, does nothing more than stabilize the number of farm units in the province, I will be pleased. But the new FarmStart program costing \$15 million this year, will certainly give a new incentive to those people wishing to establish as farmers. To remove Saskatchewan's dependency on grain production and sales, this FarmStart program will provide supervised loans of up to \$60,000 and grants of from \$1,000 to \$8,000 specifically for expansion into livestock production of approved potential. Money loaned or granted can be used for purchasing livestock, or equipment directly related to livestock production. Unlike Farm Credit, Mr. Speaker, FarmStart will place the emphasis on the applicant's potential to become a viable operator, rather than the assets available to him as collateral. Under FarmStart grants will be available to applicants qualifying for loans, should the applicant prove the additional need of the grant.

Mr. Speaker, this Budget also provides \$680,000 for the development of farm water supplies in rural constituencies like Qu'Appelle-Wolseley. The jumbo dugout grant of \$285 is available on a 7,000 cubic yard hole. This dugout has a storage capacity in excess of one million gallons and is certainly a welcome aid in establishing a livestock enterprise in areas where underground sources are not available. With our grant of \$285 and the P.F.R.A. grant of \$150, our farmers can now get an adequate water supply for roughly \$625, considering most of the contractors are charging \$1,050 for excavations of this type. \$150,000 is budgeted for our new program of assistance of drilling wells for the same purpose. In total, Mr. Speaker, the portion of the Budget allocated for Saskatchewan agriculture has climbed from \$28,755,000 last year to \$55,731,000 this year.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Hanson: — Our commitment to strengthen agriculture has doubled over last year, Mr. Speaker, without including another \$1,886,000 which we are contributing to the Crop Insurance Program.

I say to the Hon. Mr. MacLeod (Albert Park) that he, in his

criticism of this Budget is talking pure nonsense when he states that we have ignored agriculture and our senior citizens.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Hanson: — I congratulate this Government for the allocation of \$400,000 to the Saskatchewan Hog Marketing Commission. The Hon. Members opposite have criticized this move and started once again a movement in the country against orderly marketing. They say they support orderly marketing, but their actions and associations prove otherwise. Recently in Saskatoon, hoards of people purchased memberships in the Saskatchewan Hog Producers Association so as to obtain a vote at their meeting. Many of these people were attending, or supposed to be attending, a meeting of the Stock Growers Association, but chose to invade the Hog Producers meeting instead. Many farmers who voted and voiced opposition to the Commission at that meeting have never raised hogs in their lives, Mr. Speaker. If Saskatchewan is to capitalize on a market of one million carcasses per year to Japan, we have to act now. Their import companies have been trying to secure guaranteed quantity and quality contracts of this magnitude from us for several months.

This is why we acted to establish the Commission. A marketing board established by a positive producer vote and with producer control would probably have taken two years to become workable. In that two years, Mr. Speaker, we would have lost approximately \$100 million worth of hog exports to other countries. This is just assuming a market price of \$50 per hog. We must now secure co-operation between all of the western provinces so that the importers do not play one marketing agency of one province against that of another. Remember, Members of this Assembly, and ladies and gentlemen, this Commission does not and will not have the power to control production, only to control marketing. The days of hogs going to market through the back door in the Prairie Provinces will soon come to an end and farmers should finally receive a true price for their hogs.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Hanson: — Now, Mr. Speaker, I should like to turn my attention to another segment of our population. In my constituency I have the historical communities of Fort Qu'Appelle, Qu'Appelle, Indian Head, Sintaluta and Wolseley which were established in the 19th century by settlers mainly from Ontario and Eastern Manitoba. Many of the stately homes, with their unique character, built by these settlers, still stand proudly as examples of their faith in the future. Are these dwellings worth repairing and maintaining as comfortable dwellings, a testimony of their builder's character? Our Government says yes, and this Budget provides through the House Building Assistance Grant, 10 per cent of the cost of renovations with a maximum grant of \$800 available to those wishing to improve their homes.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Hanson: — This grant also applies to construction of new dwellings. In addition to this program, Mr. Speaker, is a grant of from \$200 to \$500 available to pensioners receiving the Guaranteed

February 15, 1973

Income Supplement which may cover the total cost of painting or renovating up to \$500. This grant is outright and not based on a percentage of expenditure.

Of equal importance to all townspeople and farmers in my constituency is the Property Improvement Grant for 1973. The Government estimates returning 18 mills, or in other terms, \$30.5 million to property owners this year. Mr. Speaker, this is indeed a meaningful program compared to the Homeowner Grant which cost the Treasury \$12.3 million under the former administration. Farmers are now eligible for a maximum of \$270, businessmen can qualify for \$180 on his business and up to \$90 on his dwelling which will make a maximum of \$270 available to him. Householders can qualify for up to \$144 or one-half of their taxes. This, Mr. Speaker, fulfils our pledge of decreasing the mill rate for school purposes to an average of 25 mills across the province. This program, coupled with an additional expenditure this year of \$10.2 million to school boards for operating grants, will hold the mill rates and meet our commitments.

True, Mr. Speaker, we did criticize the Liberal Government for their method in paying the Homeowner Grant and now find ourselves using the same method of repayment to the taxpayer. But by placing an upward ceiling on allowable assessment as we have done so that the wealthy receive no more than the average property owner, the only way to surmount the problem is to establish a central computerized property registry in this province. Then and only then could the principles of a ceiling on assessment for grant purposes and a tax credit on tax notices be implemented so that one would not have to pay the money into the property taxes before getting it back. I can just hear the pitiful cries of the Opposition if such a registry were to be established by us to save administration costs and benefit the property owner. They would call it an 'invasion of privacy' or 'another NDP political machine', being formed. Yet it is a sensible system for not only monitoring trends developing in property transfers and efficiently handling programs such as the Property Improvement Grant.

The Housing Corporation we are establishing will complement CMHC but make ownership of homes available to rural and lower income people at comparable subsidized rates to CMHC for the first time. This is a major breakthrough in re-establishing our rural areas.

As my constituency has a goodly number of elderly people in it, I was very pleased to have helped the community of Indian Head in the development of a 32-bed nursing home. I should like to express my thanks to those who co-operated as well in achieving this beneficial objective. I am also equally gratified to our Government for providing \$4.80 per day to patients in Level III care and \$1.80 to those in Level II care, which will, in nearly all cases, cover the costs of nursing care. Another promise fulfilled. This Budget also provides \$285,000 for support programs to those elderly people needing care but choosing to remain in their own home. Mr. Speaker, this Budget is indeed a humanitarian document structured to re-vitalize rural Saskatchewan and I truly appreciate the attentive ear the Cabinet has given the rural back benchers such as myself in designing programs and budgets to rectify our problems.

This Government, since taking office, has assisted nearly

every town in my constituency with projects such as the 8-bed extension to the Nursing Home at Fort Qu'Appelle; the Nursing Home and hospital extension in Indian Head; the gymnasium and fire hall in Montmartre, the Health Service Centre in Wolseley and the Town Hall renovations in that centre; a \$40,000 contribution toward the waiting rooms in my home town of Fillmore. Our actions soon muffle the hollow criticisms of the doom and gloom boys opposite.

I turn now, Mr. Speaker, to the important matter of the Qu'Appelle Basin Study. This document and the necessary actions suggested in it are not only important to Fort Qu'Appelle but to most of my constituency and to Saskatchewan. Time did not permit me to comment in depth when I spoke at the Winter Festival and I should like now to elaborate. May I suggest that everyone secure a copy of this report from the Queen's Printer before being critical of the recommendations. If we are to save not only the Fishing Lakes but the Basin as well, we must all do our share. Our Government has made a commitment of at least 10 per cent of the total costs to the cities in rectifying their sewage treatment facilities. This is a first step. Secondly this Budget provides for some \$250,000 to assist farmers in controlling run-off and manure so further pollution is curbed. Assistance will also be available for farmers to relocate facilities to reduce contamination of the valley.

We, as a government, will do our share but, the urbanite, the farmer, the cottage owner and the townspeople must also do theirs. I urge the public carefully to read the report before getting up in arms against the proposals. The Basin is now and will be in the future, a vital asset to Saskatchewan's economy both financially and culturally.

I believe it is also time to investigate new means of sewage disposal as present plans being considered really show little promise of removing all the nitrates and phosphates which are the villains in the Qu'Appelle system. Some ideas of mine would be to pipeline the liquid remaining after the solids have settled out to an area such as the Tyvan Community Pasture to be used as a spray irrigation and fertilization system or we could pipeline the liquid to one of the several oil fields using the salt water displacement method of oil extraction. Sound a little far fetched? Possibly, but it is still a possibility when we read reports of development of sewage systems elsewhere in the world.

I would have thought the Hon. Members opposite would have presented this Government with a well documented proposal for a treatment plant for Regina. After all they are the experts at the practice of recycling garbage. They continually, day after day, Mr. Speaker, recycle the same old garbage in this House and out through the media. Garbage such as the fact that this Government may stop the use of purple gas for farmers in this province. This is the kind of nonsense these people are peddling out to rural Saskatchewan. I bring to their attention the fact that our program says nothing of the sort but says that we will consider allowing the retail outlets to sell purple gas through their gas pumps.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I am very happy that provision has been made in this Budget to begin the construction of No. 16 Highway from No. 1 to the town of Vibank, some 20 miles of regrading to be paved after proper curing. This is our start on the complete rebuilding of that highway.

February 15, 1973

The program of rebuilding No. 33 will continue — 24 miles from Francis to Fillmore and paving will be completed from Francis to Kronau. The actions of this Government in servicing rural Saskatchewan through a better highway system is certainly appreciated by myself and the residents of my constituency, Qu'Appelle-Wolseley.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, I should like to congratulate the Hon. Elwood Cowley for one of the best Budgets that I have ever heard presented or read.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Hanson: — I think he did a commendable job and I think it truly indicates this Government's intention of listening to all the Members of this House and what their problems are in the constituencies.

I wish to thank the Cabinet for preparing a people's program and a Budget that will benefit all of Saskatchewan.

Mr. Speaker, I will definitely support the motion.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. I.W. Carlson (Yorkton): — Mr. Speaker, it is indeed an honor to enter this debate and speak in support of this tremendous Budget, a Budget that offers something for all the people in the Province of Saskatchewan.

I should like to congratulate the Hon. Minister of Finance (Mr. Cowley) for preparing and presenting this document in such a creditable manner. In fact, Mr. Speaker, I want to congratulate each and every Minister and their departments for developing such a comprehensive and progressive Budget.

I want to also congratulate the other two new Members of the Cabinet. They too, have met the high expectations that we all held for them.

Mr. Speaker, let me now deal with a few subjects of particular interest to my constituency.

First of all, in the field of industrial development, I should like to mention a couple of new industries and some expansions that have taken place in Yorkton. Last year in the Budget Debate I spoke at some length of the manufacturing milk plant that was then being proposed for Yorkton. At this point, I am pleased to say that it is fast becoming a reality. It is expected to be completed and operating by the first of July. This plant will have significant impact not only on the city of Yorkton, but the surrounding communities for many miles.

Many farmers have indicated their interest in converting from cream producing to the production of manufacturing milk. Some have already expanded their herds, added to their barns and are in the process of building milk houses. The one problem that has arisen in this area is the shortage of suitable dairy cows. In response to this, the Government has taken the initiative and imported about 200 bred heifers from Ontario for resale in the Yorkton area. Mr. Speaker, this is a good example

of this Government's responsiveness to local needs. From a budgetary point of view I would say that this is an excellent example of the use of the Advance Account.

Another addition to our industrial scene in Yorkton is the pre-fab home factory of Beaver Homes. This plant employs 35 to 40 people, and sells pre-fabricated homes all over Western Canada. The other pre-fab home known is Weber Homes, also has a very impressive operation. A large number of their homes are sold to the extreme northern parts of Canada. Last summer, while the Premier was on tour of the province, we had an opportunity to visit these two factories.

The two farm machinery factories, Leon's Manufacturing and Morris Rod Weeder, have both expanded their operations and appear to be doing an excellent business.

The Saskatchewan Wheat Pool has expanded their livestock operation by building a \$400,000 modern livestock yard. The Pool has been handling an average of about 40,000 cattle per year. Last year they turned through 54,000 head which taxed their facilities to the limit. It is anticipated that the modern expanded facilities will increase their business to possibly 80,000 head per year. The Pool has also built a modern 95,000 bushel elevator on the same site as the stock yard.

Another new and welcome addition to our industrial area is the Yorkton Slaughter House, which opened its \$45,000 operation last fall.

Mr. Speaker, these many new and expanded industries are an indication that Saskatchewan business is indeed booming.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Carlson: — Secondly, I should like to deal for a few moments on the Department of Continuing Education, and more specifically, the \$82,600 provided in this Budget for the expansion of the Community Colleges Program. I am extremely pleased that the Department has seen fit to choose the Parkland Region around Yorkton and Melville as one of the pilot projects. There are many people in that area of the province who are keenly interested in continuing education. I am sure that this project will be a major success.

I should like also to congratulate the Hudson Bay Route Association who have seen fit to accept the city of Yorkton's invitation to hold their 30th annual convention in Yorkton this summer. I, for many years, have taken a keen interest in the Port of Churchill. I think we need to expand its use and I want to take this opportunity to invite each and every Member of the Legislature to take part in that convention next summer.

I should like to now comment on the most important industry of the province and, of course, that is agriculture. It is the most important industry not only because it is the largest industry, but also because it requires such a large input of goods and services. Not more than a month ago I was discussing with a friend of mine who is a businessman in the city of Yorkton the various methods that governments could use to improve our business community. His suggestion was, that if we wanted to help the small businessman, we should start by helping

February 15, 1973

the farmers. "When the farmers have money, we have money," he stated. Mr. Speaker, I believe he is absolutely correct. Farmers are good spenders, if not by desire, by necessity.

This Budget, with heavy emphasis on agriculture is a Budget designed to revitalize all of Saskatchewan.

Mr. Speaker, let me now deal with some of the specific policies that are part of the new package of programs evolving out of the Department of Agriculture. At this point I should like to congratulate the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Messer) and the staff in his Department for developing this package, consistent with the package of programs that we offered to the people of Saskatchewan in the election in our New Deal for People. At that point when the policies were developed by the Party, I was satisfied that we had a realistic, yet imaginative program to offer. Now that I see them in detail I am absolutely convinced that we are on the right track to revitalize rural Saskatchewan.

FarmStart is another program that I am sure the Members opposite will denounce, but the farmers of Saskatchewan will welcome. In fact, Mr. Speaker, the farmers of Saskatchewan have already welcomed it during the election campaign in 1971. Just to refresh the memories of all the Members of the House and the people of Saskatchewan, let me quote from our New Deal for People:

As first steps, an NDP Government will: Provide capital credit to farmers on terms at least as favorable as those offered to industry; specifically to enact an Agriculture Incentives Act which will make available low cost credit with loan-forgiveness features (similar to those provided in industry), for young farmers entering agriculture, for farmers making major shifts in productions and for under-capitalized farm enterprises.

Mr. Speaker, that is precisely what FarmStart is.

At this time there is a high demand through the world for red meat and it seems to be logical that efforts be made to diversify our agricultural industry. However, I believe of more importance is the need to diversify some of our individual farming operations. This may not make economic sense for some of the farmers at Rosetown, or in the Regina heavy clay areas, but it does make sense in the Parkland area of the province. We already have a fairly substantial number of beef cattle in Saskatchewan, but I believe it could be and should be increased. There is a lot of land that has been broken and is under cultivation that would return more per acre if seeded to grass for pasture and hay.

There is also room for our dairy herds to almost double, if we are to meet our own demands.

The area where the demand appears to be the greatest on the world market is for pork. The problem we face in meeting this demand is the uncertainty of supply. The major portion of our hog supply in the past has come from the many, many small farmers, most of whom are in production for a short time and then out. This is not only undesirable in trying to meet world demands, but it is probably also undesirable for the producers. By the time the farmer has expanded his production to the maximum, so have hundreds of other farmers and therefore, prices are in a slump.

This situation that we are in indicates the need for an orderly marketing system. I think the decision to set up a commission was a good decision. We must have some control of the market if we are to take advantage of the Japanese demand. We need the commission and we need it now. Mr. Speaker, the Members of the Opposition would have you believe that the hog producers do not want a commission. The Minister has already, on various occasions, listed the organizations including the Swine Breeders and Hog Producers Association, that have requested a commission. I have talked to Broiler Producers in the province who market through their own producer controlled marketing board, who actually wish they were operating under a commission. With a producer controlled board it is very easy for a few farmers who produce a large portion of the total product to band together and control the board for their own benefit. This is particularly true when some of the producers are integrated into the processing business. This gives them extra support from those farmers who supply their plants.

The Saskatchewan Sheep Producers have been trying to face up to their production and marketing problems, and they too have requested a sheep and wool commission.

Mr. Speaker, it is obvious that the farmers of Saskatchewan do understand the need for commissions. Once again, Mr. Speaker, I will take the advice of the farmers before that of the Members opposite.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Carlson: — Mr. Speaker, another real highlight of this Budget and indeed of the plans of this Government is the method used in the management of our natural resources. and more specifically, our forests.

The record of the former government in this area was deplorable. In fact, Mr. Speaker, their forest mismanagement was one of the factors that helped to defeat them in 1971. I am sure that the Members opposite will not disagree with that statement. Even the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Steuart) had to agree after the Liberal Convention, came to the very same conclusion.

During the campaign in 1971 I was approached by known supporters of the Liberal Party enquiring about our policy regarding natural resources. In fact one of these men had been an active worker for the Liberal Party for many years. He did, in fact, commit his support to us on the basis of our natural resources policy alone. During the summer of 1971, after the election, I made a tour of the north-eastern part of the province to observe firsthand what was taking place with our forests. I observed a few situations that are worthy of elaboration.

First, I drove into the Simpson Timber Company yard at Hudson Bay. The first thing that I saw was thousands of cords of spruce logs, cut in 8 foot lengths. Many of these were 12 inches in diameter and some bigger. It seems to me that it was a real waste of good material to saw these large logs into 2 x 4 studs, when many of them could in fact make excellent dimension lumber.

I later found out, that even these studs were not available to our Saskatchewan consumers. When the Premier and I toured

February 15, 1973

the two pre-fabricated home factories in Yorkton, last summer, we found that they were not able to buy Simpson studs. They were importing from Manitoba, Alberta and British Columbia. The Premier later used a little gentle persuasion on Simpsons and made a public statement criticizing them. Last week I phoned the Manager of one of these factories and I said, "I understand you are now able to buy Simpson studs, is that right?" He said, "Oh, yes indeed." He said, "Last fall we had a Simpson's representative call on us and enquire as to what our needs were for the coming year and we are now buying Simpson products which he tells me are excellent products and at a very competitive price."

Mr. Speaker, the Members opposite have criticized the Premier's tour. I want to say that this change in policy alone, as a result of that tour, made it well worthwhile.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Carlson: — The second situation that I saw that I want to comment on is the reforestation project, just south of Hudson Bay. This area was burned in 1961 and replanted in 1967. I don't know how big the seedlings were when they were planted but they were only about ten or twelve inches high when I saw them. The ground was completely sod bound with grass. My personal opinion is that these seedlings will be a long time growing into saw-logs because of the composition of the grass.

As a comparison, I stopped and looked at a shelter-belt of white spruce that was planted about 1910. This grove of white spruce was in the Endeavour area, just about 10 miles from the forest area. These trees, raised under cultivation, were about 70 years old, supposing they were maybe 10 years old when they were planted there and they now stood 60 or 70 feet high and were 10 to 20 inches in diameter. We normally think of 100 years to produce saw logs under natural conditions.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is time that we started some tree farming projects. About 10 years ago, for example, I planted about a dozen white spruce seedlings in our garden and today those trees stand about 8 feet high.

Let me make a suggestion from an amateur's point of view. Suppose we planted a quarter section with white spruce, in eight foot squares. This would enable cultivation and spraying, fertilizing or pruning or whatever else is necessary. In 10 or 15 years, every second tree could be cut for Christmas trees. In another 40 or 50 years if it appeared necessary to thin some more, every second one could be cut for pulp. I am not suggesting that we get into this in a wholesale manner, but I am suggesting we need to do more research. I think our forests have, for too long, been harvested and no attempt made to produce trees for the future generations.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, let me say that this is indeed a progressive Budget and a planned Budget. This Budget represents the second step of a four-year program to revitalize our economy and put Saskatchewan back on a course that is charted and planned in advance.

It is indeed an honor to be a Member of the Government that produced this Budget — planned to meet the needs of the people of all of Saskatchewan. Needless to say, Mr. Speaker, I will

indeed support the Motion.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. C.P. MacDonald (Milestone): — Mr. Speaker, rarely have I stood up in this Assembly with more concern to speak about a subject of more importance to the people of Saskatchewan.

I have just returned from the Regina Inn, at the meeting of the Saskatchewan School Trustees' Association, where between 1,200 and 1,300 people have gathered from as far away as Uranium City and Creighton to come with distress and with concern and with anxiety to protest what is proposed by the Minister of Education (Mr. MacMurchy) in the Province of Saskatchewan.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. C.P. MacDonald: — Mr. Speaker, I have remained silent. The Opposition has remained silent on the very controversial subject of The Teacher Salary Negotiations Act, but now, Mr. Speaker, the proposals of the present Government are widely known. They are made public to everyone in Saskatchewan, the Press is there, and on the way back to the Assembly I heard the radio blasting the latest news and reports from that assembly. I can no longer remain quiet; I can no longer in conscience remain silent.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. MacDonald: — Mr. Speaker, yesterday the Minister of Education in this Assembly stood on his feet and said with unparalleled hypocrisy, "I am here to extend local control in education in the Province of Saskatchewan." At exactly the same moment, Mr. Speaker, trustees by the hundreds were gathering from all over Saskatchewan to fight for their very existence.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. MacDonald: — Why, Mr. Speaker? Because at the same time this Minister had made a proposal that made a mockery of school boards in Saskatchewan. It made a mockery of local control. It made a mockery, Mr. Speaker, of parental responsibilities in the field of education.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. MacDonald: — Mr. Speaker, it effectively laid the foundation for the assassination, the death knell of school boards in the area of fiscal responsibility in the Province of Saskatchewan.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. MacDonald: — Mr. Speaker, the Toombs' Report came in a few months ago calling for the depoliticization of education bargaining in the Province of Saskatchewan and the proposal of Premier Allan Blakeney and that Government, has made it more political, more controversial and generated more hostility in two months than seven years of Liberal Government ever thought of doing.

February 15, 1973

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. MacDonald: — Mr. Speaker, this proposal of the NDP has effectively removed once and for all the rights of parents, through their local representative, elected school boards, first to bargain for the teacher's salary and second the right to determine other related matters that have been given to a new Teachers' Relations Board.

What is this proposal, Mr. Speaker? What is this proposal in its draft form? First of all, let me remind you that the present Teacher Salary Act, 1968, gives the responsibility for teachers' salaries and negotiations solely, without any interference, to the teachers of the Province of Saskatchewan and the school trustees elected as representatives of the parents. The new draft, Mr. Speaker, transfers that responsibility to the Government and provides token, and I repeat 'token' representation on the bargaining committee for the trustees. Let me read, Mr. Speaker, what this draft bill that is being rammed down the throats of trustees in this province, by the Minister of Education. Mr. Speaker, there shall be:

- (a) a teacher bargaining committee of seven members appointed by the Teachers' Federation which shall have exclusive authority and be the sole party to bargain collectively on behalf of teachers;
- (b) a school board government bargaining committee of seven members appointed pursuant to subsection (ii) which shall have exclusive authority and be the sole party to bargain collectively on behalf of school boards and the Government;
- (c) Section 2 — the school board government bargaining committee shall be appointed by the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council, three of whom shall be nominated by the Saskatchewan school trustees and four appointed by the Government.

No longer will teacher negotiations in the Province of Saskatchewan be done by elected officials, instead it will be done by appointed members if this draft bill is passed.

Mr. Speaker, I repeat, seven teachers, four Government appointees and three trustees. In the case of a conflict, Mr. Speaker, between the trustees and the teachers, there will be eleven members between teachers and the Government representatives and three trustees to stand up for the rights of parents and their belief. Mr. Speaker, the trustees in this draft bill, if put forward, will be nothing but observers; they will be stooges. Mr. Speaker, it is an insult to the very intelligence of school board members in this province when they know that this draft legislation makes their part in the school process meaningless.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. MacDonald: — Why don't they have the guts to say they don't want school boards? Mr. Speaker, the second aspect of this draft bill is the establishment of a Teachers' Relations Board. Mr. Speaker, it will decide if parties fail to bargain in good faith, it will

act in the place of Teacher Classification Boards, and it will recommend changes in legislation or regulations and the most important, Mr. Speaker, it makes its own regulations regarding bargaining procedures; set up mediation, conciliation and arbitration.

The foundation, Mr. Speaker, (this is what the Teachers' Relations Board is), a first step to an all-powerful judge and jury in teacher-trustee relations. It is not as all encompassing as the Toombs' Report but it is the next step in the final removal of trustee decision-making power in the Province of Saskatchewan. It handcuffs them once and for all.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. MacDonald: — But, Mr. Speaker, what is the most insidious part? What is the make-up of this board?

The teachers appoint two members Mr. Speaker, the Government appoints one trustee. It's not the Trustees' Association, but the Government. Imagine that the Saskatchewan School Trustees' Association in the Province of Saskatchewan does not even have enough authority and responsibility to appoint their own representatives. And then, Mr. Speaker, the trustees will appoint one and then the four members of the board will appoint a chairman. Its make-up will be two teachers appointed by the Saskatchewan Teachers' Federation, one Government stooge, one trustee and they will name a chairman. Mr. Speaker, and why are the parents of this province so concerned? Because they have had experience in the kangaroo courts set up by the Minister of Education in the town of Moosomin. Mr. Speaker, in the town of Bethune when the school board of that community would not even sit on the board because of the make-up appointed by the Minister of Education.

Mr. Speaker, another ridiculous provision is the fact that the teachers have the right to strike; and I don't deny them that right, but I deny the reason behind the move because of the fact that the Government will do the negotiations for their salaries and then the teachers will strike against the school boards. Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Education has imposed himself between the trustees and the teachers of this province.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. MacDonald: — He has driven a wedge. And why, Mr. Speaker? Because of a political promise. A political promise. He has driven a wedge; he has laid the basis of a confrontation unparalleled in the educational circles in Saskatchewan.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. MacDonald: — This, Mr. Speaker, is the advancement of local control by the Minister of Education, Mr. MacMurchy. Why are the trustees concerned? Mr. Speaker, because parents have the right to determine the education of their children.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. MacDonald: — School boards were in existence, Mr. Speaker,

February 15, 1973

before the Government of Saskatchewan. Yes, before the Government of Saskatchewan.

The trustees elect their representative and they are the representatives of the parents. Parents are not willing to surrender these parental rights and responsibilities to the NDP.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. MacDonald: — And I want to tell the NDP that they don't have the God-given right to decide what will be done to our children.

I also want to tell them that their election mandate does not give them the right to destroy the rights of parents and trustees in fiscal responsibility and education in Saskatchewan.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. MacDonald: — Mr. MacMurchy says to the trustees, "Oh don't worry, they'll have a new role in education." I want to ask the school boards in the Province of Saskatchewan, do their local districts that were there at the time of the larger school units have responsibility? Most of them are now defunct. They are not even in existence. They rarely meet because they have no responsibility, they have no control over budgets, they have no control over spending.

Mr. Speaker, I want to say a word to the Saskatchewan Teachers' Federation and the teachers of Saskatchewan, of which I am proud to be a member.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. MacDonald: — Teachers have a right to expect effective machinery to solve salary disputes. There is no question about that.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. MacDonald: — Next, Mr. Speaker, teachers also have the right to expect that this machinery will permit the broadening of scope in their legitimate aspirations in the bargaining process.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. MacDonald: — None of us, Mr. Speaker, will deny that there are problems with the existing machinery and that perhaps it does need reform, but I urge the Saskatchewan Teachers' Federation and the teachers of the Province of Saskatchewan, in pressing for changes, I urge them not to press for changes that will effectively destroy the very fabric of Saskatchewan education.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. MacDonald: — Mr. Speaker, and let me also say that the Teachers' Relations Board, or this kind of a Teachers' Salary Negotiations Act, which is dominated by the Government of Saskatchewan, can

backfire on them in a year or two or three or four or five or ten.

I want to say a word to the Premier and to the Government and particularly to the Minister of Education.

Stop and think. Avert this confrontation. Who's next? I wonder, Mr. Speaker, what the SARM officials are thinking about in the Province of Saskatchewan today. I remember when that government and that political party tried to destroy the SARM association in this province . . .

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. MacDonald: — . . and the battle that occurred. This is the second assault on local government in the Province of Saskatchewan and I predict they will rue the day.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. MacDonald: — Mr. Speaker, if provincial bargaining is right for teachers, why is it not right for university professors? Why is it not right for municipal officials? Why is it not right for a hundred other categories in this province? Is the 'big brother', the government, to do everything and look after us from the cradle to the grave?

I want to say that the Government is not the employer of teachers and, therefore, the Government has no right at the bargaining table.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. MacDonald: — This is not an industrial dispute. This model that has been proposed by the Minister of Education is an industrial model and let me tell you that the education of children and parental concerns in this regard are not the same as an industrial dispute.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. MacDonald: — I want also to tell the Minister of Education and particularly the Premier of this province that they got us in this mess . . .

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. MacDonald: — . . they are the ones who promised they were going to solve this problem. They were the ones who were going to do away with confrontation and chaos and distress in the field of education. I want to tell you, Mr. Speaker, that school boards in the Province of Saskatchewan have lost their confidence in Mr. MacMurchy.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. MacDonald: — They are concerned about his arrogance. He walked

February 15, 1973

into the School Trustees Association without consultation, without discussion and said provincial bargaining is in the books. Mr. Speaker, he will never retain or resurrect confidence by the school boards and parents in the Province of Saskatchewan.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I say it is Premier Allan Blakeney that is responsible and I call upon him to intervene as the Premier of the Province of Saskatchewan and to call both the Saskatchewan Teachers' Federation and The Saskatchewan School Trustees' Association and school boards and use his good offices to bring some common sense, to bring a compromise, to get the two parties together so that parents and children will not suffer the impact of the confrontation that he and his political party have generated.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. MacDonald: — I wish I had time to carry on this discussion, but my time is up. All I want to say, Mr. Speaker, is that it is the responsibility of Allan Blakeney, the Premier of this province, it is the responsibility of Gordon MacMurchy, as the Minister of Education to bring some sense to the negotiations going on between teachers and trustees in Saskatchewan and to forget the political motivation. I want to tell the teachers sitting over there, the 15 or 16 of them, in 1975 you may well rue the day that you attempted to destroy the rights of school boards in the Province of Saskatchewan, to negotiate the salaries and to carry out their fiscal responsibilities.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. E.I. Wood (Minister of Municipal Affairs): — Mr. Speaker, I take a great deal of pleasure in answering this debate at this time. The Hon. Member who has just resumed his seat, the Hon. Member from Milestone (Mr. MacDonald) has been endeavoring to indicate that this Government has no concern for children, parents or the trustees of this province . . .

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Wood: — . . and that we should abdicate all our responsibilities for expenditures of the funds which we collect. I want to emphasize, Mr. Speaker, that this is just not so but that we are interested in working out the best possible method of solving the problems that are facing education in this province at this time. Endeavoring to keep the parents and school boards in the picture and endeavoring to work out a solution that will solve the problems of negotiation which have been going on in this province ever since the Members opposite formed the government some years ago and created these problems.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Wood: — Mr. Speaker, I should like to say, that the Hon. Member from Milestone has indicated that some years ago this Government endeavored to destroy the SARM. I happened, Mr. Speaker, to be the Minister of Municipal Affairs at the time we were holding discussions with the SARM and the rural

municipalities of this province in regard to municipal reorganization.

Mr. Steuart: — County system.

Mr. Wood: — County system, there was a county act that was passed by the Government at that time with the concurrence of the Members of the Opposition at that time that still sits on the books of this province and was left there by the Hon. Members opposite.

I want to say, Mr. Speaker, that the relationships at that time with the SARM and myself were good.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Wood: — My relationships with the then president of the Association, Mr. Jack Hamilton were good, and at no time was there any thought that we were endeavoring to destroy the SARM. I want to say that at the present time my relationships I am very glad to say are very good with the SARM. We intend to keep them that way.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Wood: — Mr. Speaker, I should like to go from this discussion into a discussion of the Budget. I want to compliment the Hon. Provincial Treasurer who brought down this Budget. I think he did a very good job of it and presented not only a good Budget, but presented it in a very good way. I find myself in some difficulty in resorting to superlatives . . . I will say this, that the Hon. Provincial Treasurer is one of the best provincial treasurers that we have ever had.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Wood: — It has been my privilege to work with him on Treasury Board and I say this because I have been able to sit with him and see how he operates. I appreciate the mind of this young man, and I am sure that he will go down in history as one of the best provincial treasurers that Saskatchewan has ever had.

This is a good Budget, Mr. Speaker, and I think it is going to do things for the people of Saskatchewan, such as to mention a few, the FarmStart program — \$2 million in grants with \$15 million for loans to get farmers, especially young farmers started in livestock. The establishment of chiropractic treatment as a service under Medicare and the initiation of a hearing aid program to provide hearing aids at reduced costs. Establishing the Palliser Regional Library which will complete the regional library system and increasing grants to municipal libraries by some \$115,000. These are but a few of the good things for the people of Saskatchewan that are contained in this Budget.

One thing, Mr. Speaker, that I should like to mention in particular is the Property Improvement Grant program. In the 1971 election campaign we promised that if we were elected we would reduce the average property tax for school purposes to

February 15, 1973

25 mills, on farms, homes and small businesses. With the increase in school grants that should hold property taxes for school purposes to an average of 43 mills and with the increases in the Property Improvement Grant to 18 mills on farms with an assessment up to \$15,000, on homes with an assessment of up to \$8,000 and on small businesses with an assessment of up to \$10,000 we have kept this promise; also for the greater part of the farms and all of the small businesses if you use an assessment of \$10,000 as a criterion and all but the most expensive homes.

This program of repayment of property taxes to taxpayers was much increased last year over what was done by the former administration, and by making assistance available for many more purposes than under the old Homeowner Grant program, it became somewhat more complicated and its procedures were new both to my Department and to the people of the province. There were times last fall, Mr. Speaker, I am sorry to say, when we were weeks behind with our correspondence. The only way we could have done better would have been to greatly increase our staff, and this we did not think advisable.

I want to apologize if any of my listeners have been inconvenienced through these delays and to thank the people of Saskatchewan for their patience. I know that they have been rewarded in the end by the approximately \$6.5 million which was more than they would have been paid out under the earlier programs.

It is very difficult to estimate the amounts necessary to provide for payments under such a program as this. It is now apparent that the payments as outlined in 1972 did not require all of the \$23,400,000 allocated for that purpose last year. This year we will be increasing the payment to 18 mills on the assessment, as I have earlier outlined. This will mean that maximum payments on a principal residence will be \$144 or more than double that paid by the former Liberal Government. On a farm the grant will be increased to \$270 or nearly four times what it was under the Liberals. Insofar as businesses are concerned, we will be paying up to \$180 which is very hard to compare with what was paid by the Liberals, because they didn't pay anything. The same applies to owner residents in trailers, who now get the grant the same as other taxpayers on their principal residence, where none was given by the former administration.

This Property Improvement Grant in this Budget is much improved over last year, as last year's was improved over the year before that. Our Department has gained experience in the last year in dealing with this type of program and we hope to be able to give the people of Saskatchewan better service in the coming year. This Budget allows for \$30,500,000 to the Property Improvement Grant program which we trust will be sufficient to cover all the estimated expenditures.

I agree that it would in many ways be better if we could pay this 18 mill grant to all taxpayers across the board and have the program handled by municipalities or simply by making grants to municipalities or school units. This would mean that a much larger proportion of the moneys available would go to the larger operators who are not so much in need of this assistance.

Yesterday the Hon. Member from Morse (Mr. Wiebe) moved an

amendment to the motion now before the House, expressing regret at the Government's decision to increase personal income taxes. It is my understanding that the total increase in these income taxes, both personal and corporate will amount to something like \$8 million. As I said a few minutes ago it is very hard to determine exactly what the total increase in payments of Property Improvement Grants will be, but it is likely that they will amount to at least as much as the increase in income taxes will produce. This is to say nothing of the \$11 million more in school grants mentioned in the Finance Minister's Budget Speech. Practically some \$8 million is being paid in increased payments towards property taxes. This is the kind of a shift away from property taxes to those which are more related to ability to pay that our Party has promised. Someone from the other side the other day said that this was more of a 'shaft' than a 'shift'. Well, Mr. Speaker, if it was a shaft, it will be a shaft of light into the lives of the property taxpayers of this province.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Wood: — While I am talking about Property Improvement Grants, I should like to remind people of Saskatchewan today that this is the 15th of February and the last day in which to mail your application for payment under the 1972 program. If it is put off until tomorrow we won't be able to pay and we don't want people to miss out on a good thing. Sorry I just missed getting that out over the air.

Another program for which provision is made in the Budget and about which I should like to speak is that dealing with the housing and the establishment of a Saskatchewan Housing Corporation. It is the objective of this Government to provide all residents of the province with an opportunity to obtain decent housing accommodation consistent with their social needs. Where the private market is incapable or unwilling to meet this objective, the Government will act to translate this basic right into a reality. Within the next few weeks I will be placing before the Assembly legislation to establish the Saskatchewan Housing Corporation and other legislation dealing with housing. The Government recognizes that a variety of housing programs will be required in order to respond in a positive fashion to the needs of its citizens. Programs are currently being developed to provide increased assistance to families in meeting the initial costs of purchasing a home; to assist families of low income in constructing homes and meeting mortgage payments; to support co-operatives and non-profit groups in providing housing for people of limited means; to encourage the rehabilitation and improvement of the province's existing housing stock; to significantly add to the amount of rental accommodation for individuals and families at rents related to their ability to pay; to reduce and stabilize residential land prices; to improve amenities and community services related to housing and to provide mortgage financing where mortgage funds are not being made available through other sources.

At present, housing programs are largely administered through the Department of Municipal Affairs. While the Government has through this Department been able to assist individuals in purchasing homes to work with CMHC to provide low rental accommodation and to exercise some control over rising land costs, the need for a structure to be established to deal solely

February 15, 1973

with housing and be capable of responding to the needs of a rapidly changing society quickly and efficiently, is apparent. For example, this province, with a population of over 900,000, has just in excess of 2,000 public low rental units. This month I had the pleasure of attending the official opening of a low rental public housing project for senior citizens in Regina. Although the project contained 127 units, five times that number of applications were received from senior citizens of limited means, who were in need of improved housing at low cost. This situation is true of many Saskatchewan communities and is one to which the Government is committed to respond as quickly as possible.

Under the Department of Municipal Affairs we have already begun to increase plans for government activity in the housing field. At the end of 1972, 426 public housing units were under construction. Plans were also well advanced for specific projects providing 750 public housing units which will be started in 1973 and we fully expect to go well beyond this level of public housing starts in 1973. The Government will also be spending increased sums to assist families in purchasing housing units. In this regard, appropriated expenditure will be increased from \$850,000 provided last year under the Housing Building Assistance Act to \$1,050,000 for the 1973-74 fiscal year. The amount of grants which families will receive under this program will be dependent on the income of the families concerned. As now is the case, grants will range from \$300 for families earning up to \$9,000 per year to \$800 per family for families with annual incomes of less than \$7,000. It is felt that this arrangement results in a more equitable form of public assistance than the \$500 to all builders under the program begun by the former administration.

The Budgetary Estimates also provide for the expenditure of \$3 million to assist senior citizens to repair and improve their homes where the senior citizens are in receipt of old age security benefits and supplements. In addition to this, programs will also be introduced to assist families to repair or improve their homes. I shall be providing further details of these and other programs on a later date. However, I do wish to stress the increased government initiative in responding to the housing needs of its citizens, and the new government institution which will be established to co-ordinate and deliver provincial housing programs.

Last month, Mr. Speaker, I attended a conference of Federal and Provincial Ministers on Housing. Proposed new federal Policies and programs were discussed with Mr. Basford, the Federal Minister responsible for Housing. While the Federal Government's Housing program has benefitted Saskatchewan in many ways, and there is a good deal of merit in the new federal proposals, I was forced to point out to Mr. Basford that the federal programs contained a very strong bias towards serving large urban centres such as Toronto and have limited application in the Province of Saskatchewan. The Federal programs almost ignored completely the housing needs of small communities and rural areas. Other Provincial Ministers also expressed concern at the federal programs which do not take into account the differences in housing needs between regions and local areas and the need for housing assistance in rural areas. Mr. Basford acknowledged this problem and indicated that the Federal Government was prepared to consult with individual provinces about their specific housing needs and the requirements of federal

programs in responding to these needs. We are hopeful that we may be able to work something out with the Federal Government that is going to be of more benefit to the people of Saskatchewan in the future.

The Saskatchewan Housing Corporation will co-operate with the corresponding federal agency, the CMHC, in developing and implementing housing programs in Saskatchewan. However, where the Federal Government is not responsive to developing and implementing programs which meet the specific needs of Saskatchewan and relate to provincial policies and priorities, the Saskatchewan Housing Corporation will be directed to act to offset deficiencies in federal programs.

In summary, the Government will be taking considerably more initiative in responding to the housing needs of its citizens. Legislation and programs which I will be introducing at this Session together with the Budgetary Estimates presented by Mr. Cowley will be supportive of this new initiative.

Mr. Speaker, housing presents a real challenge to the people of the province at the present time. In the last few years we have slipped badly behind our neighboring provinces in house building. It is up to us to change this. It is our firm intention to do so. This is not just idle talk, Mr. Speaker, We have already gained some momentum. Last spring we increased to \$800 from \$500, the grant to those building a house whose income was under \$7,000. The \$500 grant to all house builders, regardless of incomes, started by the former government and continued by us, has some effect on increasing housing starts in the lower income group.

But people building a \$30,000 house would do so regardless of whether or not they received the \$500 grant. But by increasing the grant to \$800 for those whose incomes were below \$7,000 really gave an impetus to housing in this income bracket.

Since April 1st of last year, 1,713 applications have been received from people in this income range in regard to new houses and 447 applications for grants for structural alterations of over \$2,000. Last fall we extended grants although on a lesser scale, to those having incomes of \$9,000. We have, to date, received applications in regard to 49 housing starts from people in that income range.

All this is reflected in the housing starts in the Province. In 1970 there were only 1,743 housing starts in the province. In 1971 there were 3,560, a little more than twice as many as what there had been the year before. Last year, 1972, there were 4,845, an increase of some 36 per cent over the year before. I want to reiterate, Mr. Speaker, that we are making progress, but in comparison to what we should be doing, we are very far behind and it is our intention to make an effort to catch up to where we should be in regard to housing in this province.

The Opposition likes to talk about unemployment and I am not going to say that we do not have a serious situation in this province along with the rest of Canada. The fact that there are more jobs in the country does not make things much easier for those who do not have one. But the facts are that there are more jobs in Saskatchewan now than one year ago. In a province that is declining in population, this must mean something even though there are more applying for jobs.

February 15, 1973

According to Statistics Canada, on January 13th of this year, there were 12,000 more people working in Saskatchewan than there were on January 15th of last year. I want to say, Mr. Speaker, that housing is one of the forces that has promoted this situation.

Last summer our staff made enquiries among the construction firms and there was no doubt about it that trades people were in extremely short supply. They just weren't available. Even last fall it was almost impossible to find a carpenter, and I speak from personal experience.

When it comes to providing employment, I am not going to take a back seat either about winter works programs. Last year the Department of Municipal Affairs co-operated with the Federal Government in the administration of the two federal winter employment programs in which municipalities and other local government organizations were eligible to participate. This co-operation included, not only administration of the federal programs, but actual financial backing by the province of these programs. Behind the Federal Local Initiatives Program we had a provincial program which accepted all eligible municipal applications which had failed to get accepted under the federal program.

There were altogether 122 municipal Local Initiative Programs accepted by Saskatchewan last year. The first 61 were financed by the Federal Government and the remainder by the province. Sixty one out of 122, that makes it exactly half each way.

We also backed the Federal Loans Program by matching the Federal Loans forgiveness on municipal projects. In addition, when the funds allocated to the program by the Federal Government had run out, we ensured that no eligible municipal application was rejected. We accepted all applications unable to receive acceptance under the Federal Program and we not only accepted the responsibility for forgiveness on such loans, but we also paid the matching grants. Ninety-seven municipal projects were accepted under the Provincial Loans Program, compared to 72 projects under the Federal Loans Program.

Because the Federal programs were announced at a very late date, October 14, 1971, and most of the applications did not get processed until well into 1972, many municipalities found it impossible to complete their projects before the May 31, 1972 deadline.

Knowing that the municipalities faced serious financial difficulties if the actual grants or forgiveness under the winter works programs fell considerably below what they had estimated, the Government of Saskatchewan pleaded with the Federal Government to extend the May 31st deadline for support of winter works projects. In making this plea to the Federal Government, we announced in March 1972, the extension of the deadline to June 30, 1972, on all projects accepted under provincial programs.

The Federal Government at the last moment did agree to extend the deadline on the loans program to June 30th. By then we were becoming aware that, due to severe winter conditions, labor problems and particularly due to the late start, many projects would not be finished until mid-summer. Accordingly, we extended the provincial support date on many projects to August 31st. For the months of July and August, the province also assumed the loan forgiveness on federally approved projects.

We bent over backwards in endeavoring to make the federal and provincial programs of last year a success and provide employment and facilities for the people of Saskatchewan.

I should like to say in regard to the 1972 winter works employment programs that in view of the difficulty which arose through the late announcement of the winter works programs, we, along with other provinces, repeatedly asked the Federal Government to make known its intentions respecting winter employment programs at least by mid-summer, so that the provinces might tailor their own programs to blend with the federal programs, and so that the municipalities might have adequate time to plan their projects.

But the Federal Government again procrastinated. Unemployment rates last summer and fall throughout Canada were as high as in the year before and it was obvious to everyone that government intervention on a national scale was required to keep the unemployment rate from rising to very much higher levels in the winter of 1972-73.

We had proposed to Ottawa a cost-sharing program which would involve the participation of all three levels of government in a winter works incentive program. Receiving no response from Ottawa, we decided to put into effect a provincial program which had been developed some months before.

The Provincial-Municipal Winter Works Incentive Program was announced early in September, which gave the municipalities nearly two months in which to plan their projects before the November 1st starting date.

Under this program the province has allocated \$5 million for grants to municipalities and community service organizations which undertake in the winter months job-creating projects which provide useful community services or facilities.

The response from the municipalities and from community service organizations has been good. Last year we processed less than — that is in 1971-72 — we processed less than 300 municipal applications under both the federal and provincial programs. To date, February 7th, we have given approval to 468 projects under the provincial program. Applications are still coming in. We must admit that many of these projects are a good deal smaller than some of those of last year, because we had no floor as to the size of the project which we would allow people to undertake. We have a large number of small projects which will be found very useful on the local level. We expect that there will be more applications from the municipalities of others which have failed to get approval under the Federal Local Initiatives Program, when they submit their projects for approval under our provincial program.

The Federal Initiatives Program was started or announced at the end of September, with \$2 million for all of Saskatchewan, including municipalities, Indian bands, organizations and others. Since that time another \$2 million has been added. The Federal Winter Works Loan Program was announced on December 6, 1972, even later than the November 14th announcement of the Federal Loans Program in 1971. It was announced, Mr. Speaker, on December 6th. You can probably realize just how much effect this has had in the unemployment situation in Saskatchewan to this date.

February 15, 1973

We are pleased to co-operate with the Federal Government in assisting in the operation of this program. However, no applications have been received as yet, but there is some interest and municipalities have indicated they would be submitting applications. It is a two and a half year program and undoubtedly may have more impact in another year.

This would not appear to have had much impact as yet on the unemployment situation in the province. The programs that have had some influence in this regard have been largely provincial and they reflect the concern of this Government for the provision of employment for our people and for a better way of life in our communities.

Since coming to office, this Government has faced up to the necessity of helping to provide facilities in our communities, large and small, curling rinks, skating rinks, community halls, museums, swimming pools, municipal offices. We have helped provide housing, one of the necessities of life and the right of every man, woman and family.

We have helped provide days, weeks and months of employment to thousands. Mind you, I say 'helped'. I want to give full credit to the municipalities and organizations that have sponsored these schemes and paid at least half the cost. I also want to give credit to the Canadian Mortgage and Housing Corporation for providing the major portion of funds on some of our housing programs. I emphasize some, because in many of these programs we are in it by ourselves and there is no assistance from the Federal Government.

We have recently signed an agreement with the CMHC to enter into an agreement with the Métis Housing Group to build on an experimental basis some 50 houses where subsidies will be provided to enable these people to own their own good homes.

A year ago, the Federal Government, entered into an arrangement with the same group to build senior citizens' housing. However, this project did not get off the ground until the provincial government came to the rescue with added finances. Fifty units have been built under this scheme.

I grant that the costs of these projects have been high, but I have been to the opening ceremonies of two of them and it made me feel good to see the excellent workmanship on these complexes, with the work planned and executed almost entirely by the Métis group themselves. It surely has living on welfare beaten by many miles and helps to give these people a sense of dignity and accomplishment which bodes well for the future and the reduction of the frustration that has blighted the lives of many.

Again, I want to say that it was a three-way effort, CMHC putting up the bulk of the funds, the Métis people doing the work, but the Provincial Government provided leadership and encouragement and financial assistance when it was needed.

I should like now, Mr. Speaker, to outline some of the activities of the Municipal Road Assistance Authority. The Authority's function is to administer assistance grants to rural and urban municipalities.

In 1972-73 a sum of \$6,862,000 was voted to assist municipalities in constructing all-weather roads. Last year was a good construction year and a total of 1,501 miles of road were constructed. These include grid roads, main farm access roads, resort roads, oilfield access roads and roads in Indian Reserves.

Roads were constructed in 244 rural municipalities, 21 towns and villages, 8 Indian Reserves and 6 Local Improvement Districts. The mileage constructed was sufficient to construct a road from Winnipeg to Vancouver. More than 30 million cubic yards of earth were moved in this road construction. The grid road program was begun in 1956. The grid road system contains some 16,050 miles of which 15,208 miles have now been constructed.

In addition to the grid roads, a system of roads to provide all-weather access to as many occupied farm homes as was practical has been added to the municipal road system and government assistance is being provided in its construction. The main farm access system contains more than 16,000 miles, of which 5,838 miles have been constructed to the end of 1972. Altogether, since 1956, a total of 22,367 miles have been constructed to an all-weather standard and all but one rural municipality have participated in the program. Our 1973-74 budget proposes to continue assistance for the construction of these roads at the same level as last year.

A new program of providing assistance for roads to regional parks was begun this year. More and more people are enjoying the park facilities of the 74 parks throughout the province, with a consequent increase in traffic volumes on the park access roads. Most of this traffic volumes on the park access roads. Most of this traffic is concentrated in the summer months and the need for safer, dust-free, surfaced roads is apparent.

Under the new park access road policy, the Authority pays the grid percentage of the cost, plus 18 per cent, and the Government's share will be an average of some 75 per cent of the cost of surfacing. Almost all the roads leading to these parks are constructed to grid road standards, and surfacing at an average estimated cost of \$6,000 per mile is all that is required.

The park access road system will contain an estimated 270 miles when it is completed. It is proposed to provide assistance in surfacing these roads over a five-year period. In 1972-73 a sum of \$200,000 was provided and 30 miles of road was surfaced. In 1973-74 a similar sum is being provided.

In 1972-73 the Municipal Road Assistance Authority was asked to administer a street improvement program in towns and villages. This is an entirely new program, separate from the Department of Highways' Main Street and Open Roads program, in which the Government recognizes the need of the urban municipalities for assistance in their construction programs.

Under the proposed policy, the Government would pay 50 per cent of the cost of street improvement on any or all streets in any town or village, with the proviso that the Government's share would not exceed more than \$40 per capita over a five-year period.

The urban municipality can proceed to use all of its \$40 per capita allowance in anyone year, can pick the year or years in which it wishes to carry out construction, or can, if it

February 15, 1973

wishes, carry out construction on an annual basis; all subject, of course, to the funds voted by the Government in each year for this program.

The work which is eligible for assistance includes almost any type of street improvement, such as storm sewers, street shaping, street gravelling, sidewalks, curb and gutter, low and high cost paving, etc.

The sum of \$650,000 was made available in 1972 and all the towns and villages were advised of the policy in May of 1972. The response from the urban municipalities was enthusiastic. A total of 100 towns and 196 villages participated in the program on almost every type of work. Gravelling 313 municipalities; storm sewers in 8 municipalities; curb 1; curb and gutter 9; sidewalks 52; low cost surfacing 7 municipalities; high cost surfacing 1 municipality.

Due to the shortage of funds requests amounting to almost \$1 million, mainly for street surfacing had to be turned down in 1972. I am, therefore, very pleased to advise that \$1,650,000 is being provided as the Government's share for this program in 1973-74. Hopefully, this will take care of most of the requests from the smaller urban municipalities.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud of this Budget and what it will do for the people of this province. I am proud of the part to be played by our Department in providing to the people of the province the programs and services set out in this Budget. It is a challenge to which we are proud and determined to rise.

Mr. Speaker, I will not vote for the amendment but I will vote for the motion.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. H. Coupland (Meadow Lake): — Mr. Speaker, on entering this debate I should first like to thank a couple of Ministers that have already spoken, especially the Minister of Highways (Mr. Kramer) for the work he has promised to do on the roads from Peerless to Pierceland and from Loon Lake to Peerless. These are a couple of years behind but I am sure the people up there will appreciate the Minister getting into the act and doing something. We really were cut off. I was also interested to hear the Minister of Government Services (Mr. Brockelbank) this afternoon and I was happy to hear him announce the microwave going into the North. The people up there realize that some of these towers were already in there as a result of the pulp mill and I am glad to see they have continued on and haven't torn those down, even though they threw the pulp mill out. I also notice he was quite happy about his capital expenditure of \$13,665,000. It was interesting to look back in the last Estimates of the Liberal Government and see that they were at \$15,775,000.

You know, Mr. Speaker, I am sorry the Member from Touchwood (Mr. Meakes) is not in his seat because I had a word to say to him. He made a statement the other day and that is a statement that keeps coming from the Government side. He made the statement the other day about civil servants being able to say what they want after five o'clock and not putting their jobs in jeopardy. Well, Mr. Speaker, for the information of the Member for Touchwood and the rest of you fellows over there, I just want to say it makes me sick, these sanctimonious statements

coming from that side. You know, my daughter worked for the Department of Natural Resources. She had quit a job with the Department of Indian Affairs and was at home and hadn't bothered going out and looking for another job when they asked her to come in and help in the Department of Natural Resources in Meadow Lake. Actually, it was on a temporary basis until they could find someone to fill the position. So she said she would. And she worked for a couple of months. In the meantime the Government changed. Of course, she got notification right away because her name was Coupland that her services were no longer required. She was given a week's notice. The irony of the whole thing is that after she had been laid off for a couple of weeks and they still hadn't found anyone and the work was piling up so they came and asked her if she would come and help out. And she did. You can imagine, Mr. Speaker, what I would have told them. I give her a lot of credit. Of course, she comes from a Liberal family and she realized she wouldn't keep her job and she holds no grudge against the NDP. She realizes that she was a victim of the vicious NDP policy. And I can assure you it didn't enhance the NDP status in the town of Meadow Lake.

An Hon. Member: — I hope not.

Mr. Coupland: — I just mention this because you hear these things coming from the other side of the House all the time. Oh, they wouldn't fire anybody because they took a political stand. They do and they did!

You know, Mr. Speaker, on the first look at this Budget, it appears to be a pretty good one and I thought I was going to have to congratulate the Minister of Finance (Mr. Cowley) on a pretty good Budget. But you know, when you sit down and you take a look at it, you realize it's just a lot of frosting on the cake and when you get underneath it it's a pretty poor Budget. A lot of the Members on this side of the House have been pointing out the shortcomings and calling it a Vegas Budget. I've never been to Las Vegas but I understand that's where you can spend a lot of money and get nothing for it.

You know the Members opposite brag about charging everyone an increase of \$28 in their personal income tax. And they say they are giving a lot of money to the homeowners in the increase in the Homeowner Grant. I just want to show you what that amounts to for my family. I looked it up and if I got the maximum increase, it would amount to an increase of \$66. But we're a family of four so when I take this \$28 per capita that it's going to cost me, while the Minister is putting \$66 in this pocket, he's got his clammy hand in the other pocket extracting \$112.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Coupland: — And that's only taking the maximum. And the people in the province are realizing this and you are probably going to hear a lot more about it. Big deal! I'm minus over \$46 on the whole deal.

On top of this, Mr. Speaker, as has been pointed out by a lot of the Members, the towns and the villages and the cities have been starved in this Budget so that there are going to be increases in taxes so those people are going to have their hands in my

February 15, 1973

pocket taking a little more too. So, all in all, we haven't come up with very much.

Another thing, Mr. Speaker, I oppose in this Budget and I don't mind saying it, is the \$20 million of tax dollars that are going to be used to bring more farmland under state control.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Coupland: — If they keep on at this rate, Mr. Speaker, they'll soon have enough land under their control that they can eventually step in and say, well, look, boys, we'll take the whole works. They won't pay very much for it either.

You know, they made no allowance to ease the unemployment situation in the province outside of hiring a lot of extra civil servants. I don't know whether they figure this is the best way to take everybody off unemployment or not.

Mr. Speaker, in the Meadow Lake constituency we have received this winter almost \$800,000 in Local Improvement Programs that are going on throughout the Meadow Lake constituency. And this is Federal money, Mr. Speaker. You know, I just heard the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Wood) say there are a lot more jobs in the province. But who made them? Not you fellows! Those LIP programs in the Meadow Lake area have created roughly 500 to 600 new jobs for our workers.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Coupland: — Don't try to take credit for the Liberal programs from Ottawa. You know, Mr. Speaker, when one realizes that some \$295 million of this Budget comes from Ottawa, it's no wonder these Members opposite are prone to squander it. You know that saying, easy come easy go.

Now I want to say, Mr. Speaker, a few words about Welfare. I was pretty disappointed to see that the Welfare budget had increased by over \$10 million. That's just in the Saskatchewan Assistance Program end of it. You know, this doesn't speak very well of the programs of the Government opposite.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Coupland: — By doing this, it shows that they are forcing more and more people to go to the Welfare offices and have their hand out for welfare. I've said it before and I'll say it again, that people would far sooner work than seek welfare. This was shown when we had those work programs and industrialization in the Meadow Lake area. People were happy that the Government was trying to provide jobs for them and you people throw them out. I would suggest that instead of increasing that section of the Budget, they could have taken that and added some more to it and taken that \$20 million they are going to buy land with and go in there and set up some work programs for the people of the North. It would be a lot better than just straight handouts. Some of the Members over there, especially that one from Saskatoon Nutana South (Mr. Rolfes), you know, he says we shouldn't encourage people to work.

Mr. Rolfes: — I didn't say that.

Mr. Coupland: — We should quit nursing the work ethic.

Mr. Rolfes: — Mr. Speaker, I did not state that people should not work. I simply said that education should not stress jobs, training only.

Mr. Speaker: — Order! We don't want to get into a discussion as to what was said and what wasn't. I hope we can debate this back and forth without hitting it.

Mr. Coupland: — I'm sorry, Mr. Speaker, but I understood he said that we shouldn't encourage people to go to work. Governments for too long, Mr. Speaker, have been encouraging just this. And I think it's time we get back on the track and encourage people to accept their responsibilities and work for a living. And I am sure they will do this, Mr. Speaker, if they are given the opportunity. No one is arguing the fact that anyone who is disabled should not be given help.

Mr. Speaker, I was glad to see the additional help for the chronically disabled senior citizens in the Budget. Nobody argues against these. We can even give them more help. But, Mr. Speaker, when there's anybody that is 16 to 21, in that age group, getting welfare, living off the taxpayers, I say this is wrong, absolutely wrong.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Coupland: — Mr. Speaker, I want to turn to Meadow Lake for a minute here. I want to say a word about a rehabilitation centre that we have in Meadow Lake. This is run by the Indians, Chief Andrew Paddy and his staff, and they are doing a fantastic job. It's in its sixteenth month of operation and 450 people have gone through that centre. It handles six to 36 patients per month and could handle more if they had the finances to hire more counsellors. I should like to compliment the counsellors that they have there now. They are doing a fantastic job with long hours and no overtime just because they are sincere in their efforts to help their fellow man. It costs them over \$5,000 per month to operate this centre and that is aside from salaries. So you can see it's quite a load they're carrying. Now, Mr. Speaker, in view of the large revenue which we derive from the sale of alcohol in this province and since alcohol is the main problem that these boys are fighting, I would urge, Mr. Speaker, that the Government give centres such as this centre in Meadow Lake unconditional grants to help them in their very worthy project.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Coupland: — I should just like to read a paper I got from this centre, and it is:

To Whom It May Concern: Please note: Although budgets with the Alcoholism Commission of Saskatchewan were worked out with the Federation of Saskatchewan Indians, the Petapon Native Rehabilitation Centre (it is Battleford's Alcoholism Centre No. 1271 organized through

February 15, 1973

Battleford) does not accept any direction from any political organization or structure. The Board of Directors of this Alcoholism Rehabilitation Centre is an autonomous organization and will remain to be such. We are operating a health program and should not be directed by politicians. We recognize alcoholism as a disease and we would like to treat it as one. Therefore, we do not wish to be identified with political groups and issues. We are organized solely for the purpose of helping Native alcoholics to achieve sobriety as well as providing education on alcohol, drugs, plus early detection and prevention.

That's a very, very worthwhile program, Mr. Speaker.

Before I sit down, I should like to say a word on behalf of a lot of the farmers and cattlemen in northwestern Saskatchewan. A lot of you have heard about the reorganization of the Meadow Lake Provincial Park and a lot of these farmers have been able to lease pasture facilities in that park area. These farmers are really concerned now that their cattle are not going to be allowed to pasture in the park. I can't understand, Mr. Speaker, why this wouldn't be allowed because with the cattle pasturing in there it helps to keep the grass down and, therefore, it helps to prevent the forest fires. This is one of our main concerns in that area. If they are cut off from this area of pasture, there could be a lot of farmers put out of business in that fringe area. So I ask the Government when they are looking at that to take a real good look and not cut those farmers off their pasture.

Mr. Speaker, because this Budget has made no provision for lean years which could easily happen to us and because they have done nothing to help small business, the towns or the cities, I cannot support the Budget.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Michayluk: — Mr. Speaker, before the Hon. Member sits down would he permit a question.

Well, in the comparative statement of Budget expenditures we have figures in respect to Social Welfare in this fashion: 1964 a total expenditure is a little over \$18 million; in 1971 that is after seven years of Liberal Government, the total expenditure was \$28 million. I understand that that year there was \$7 million more spent, what is the reason for this?

Mr. Speaker: — Order, order!

Mr. Steuart: — Question. You are making a speech.

Mr. Michayluk: — I am not making a speech, I am asking a question. Can he answer it?

Mr. Steuart: — We raised the rates. The welfare people were treated better than the old CCF had treated them.

Mr. J.G. Richards (Saskatoon University): — Mr. Speaker, as with the Throne Speech I find much in the Budget that is good and, also unfortunately, some that is not so good.

I find, for example, to talk about the positive side, that FarmStart is a good program. I am glad to see it is channelling money towards smaller farmers. However, there remain serious questions as to whether the allocated funds in the Budget of \$2 1/4 million, which are approximately one-half of one per cent of net farm income in the province, are really sufficient to change the vision of corporate farming which the Federal Liberal Task Force held out before Saskatchewan farmers.

As for the Property Improvement Grant, Mr. Speaker, I find myself ambiguous. I find that it is good inasmuch as the property tax is a highly regressive tax, but what we should really be doing is looking at the totality of the tax burden, income tax combined with property tax, and that as socialists we should be concerned with lowering the total burden of these combined taxes on people.

Obviously the property tax is grossly regressive. I just quote two statistics, very briefly, to indicate it. These are statistics coming from an Ontario Government survey done in Guelph. They found that for people having a gross income of \$3,000 to \$3,500 on average, these people wound up paying an average fully 10 per cent of their gross income in property taxes. There was a constant decline in the percentage of gross income going to property taxes as you went up the income scale, until you come to the group of \$25,000 to \$50,000 and they are paying only 2 per cent of their gross income in property taxes.

Now, there is no question about the regressive nature of the property tax. However, if we merely attempt to reduce the property tax without taking account of those people who own no property, those who board, those who rent, and without taking account of the fact that we need a more progressive tax system, we should not be giving property tax rebates to many of the people in the pocket boroughs of south Regina. Then I think we can appreciate the need for a more comprehensive kind of reform. And in some sense we have to refer, unfortunately, to a Conservative Government, the Government in Ontario, which has taken some interesting precedents in this regard and I should like to quote into the record a passage from the Ontario Economic Review of March-April, 1972, an article on Ontario's property tax credit plan:

The Ontario basic shelter grants (which were the equivalent to the Homeowner Grants here) have partially off-set the regressivity of property tax by providing a flat amount of relief to all taxpayers on the basis of average municipal taxation. However, this program was not adequate, either in terms of vertical or horizontal equity. It did not provide sufficient relief to the lowest income groups, nor did it provide equal treatment to taxpayers in similar economic circumstances. The clear thrust of permanent reform, therefore, must be to link property tax burdens directly to the ability to pay of each individual and family in Ontario.

February 15, 1973

The Ontario Government's property tax credit plan (which replaced the former flat Homeowner Grant equivalent) aims to achieve this important goal with a more consistent and progressive incidence of property taxation in Ontario. Specifically this program has been designed to meet five objectives.

1. To relate the combined burden of income tax and property tax bearing on Ontario residents to their individual ability to pay.
2. To reduce the total tax burden on the lowest income families and individuals in Ontario.
3. To extend property tax relief to roomers, boarders, and others who do not presently benefit from provincial tax relief grants and to eliminate tax relief to non-resident and to taxpayers who can afford to pay.
4. To permit better control over the total provincial municipal tax burden on Ontario taxpayers.
5. To establish a flexible and efficient payout mechanism as the first step toward the eventual replacement of welfare and subsidy programs, with a general income support program.

Now, Mr. Speaker, in a certain sense it is embarrassing to have to look to a Conservative Government in Ontario for our ideas on tax reforms. Surely, we in Saskatchewan, should be prepared to take the lead in establishing reform in our antiquated tax systems. The Federal Government, tired, and exhausted, after the lobbying by the various vested interests of the country seems to have no further interest in this field. Because we need so much social reform and change in this country it falls to provincial governments to take on the burden.

The provincial Ontario scheme has replaced any flat grant with the following formula: they provide a credit to homeowners of \$90 plus 10 per cent of the property tax due, minus one per cent of taxable income, up to a maximum of \$250. An analogous formula is provided for renters, based on rent paid.

Ontario's property tax credit is hardly a revolutionary reform of achieving proportionality in the combined burden of property and personal income taxes. They have had to use this kind of combined income tax credit combined with the property tax formula in order merely to achieve proportionality. That is, everybody with gross income from \$2,000 to \$20,000 will pay approximately 10 per cent of his gross income in the combination of provincial income tax and municipal property taxes. It is hardly too revolutionary not to demand that we do the same here.

Now, Mr. Speaker, with respect to the Budget in general. I should like to make the analogy, with what I hope everybody here is familiar with the story but maybe because I grew up in England I am more familiar with it than some, and this is the old story of King Canute who sat on his throne on the beach and willed that the tide would not come up. The tide did rise and neither the Divine right of kings, nor the Divine right of provincial parliaments, could regulate the flow of the tide.

The analogy, in some sense, applies to provincial economic fluctuations. We, in the NDP blame you, the Members opposite, Mr. Speaker, for the depression from 1969 to 1971. The Members opposite were quick to take credit for the genius of their political administration, for the potash boom in the middle '60s. Now we are quick to take credit for the good times, economically, in Saskatchewan in 1972. And the Liberals, again, are quick to blame us for the increase in unemployment figures, up to 7 per cent in January 1973, an increase in unemployment from 19,000 to 24,000 from December 1971 to January, 1973, which also amounts, incidentally to a 3,000 increase in unemployment since January of 1972.

I would submit that what is needed is more partisan modesty on both sides of the House with respect to our ability via the provincial budget to regulate the economy. I think that we risk going too far in indulging ourselves with our political histrionics and we bring into very severe doubt our credibility. The whole credibility of politicians, if we continue to claim that our present mechanisms and present policies which both governments in the last decade have pursued that we are really seriously convinced that provincial fiscal and provincial taxation monetary measures have any significant effect upon the provincial economy, is called in question.

What is needed is a lot more partisan modesty, a lot more socialism in the provincial Budget, Mr. Speaker.

One specific example which might interest the Members opposite, I should like to refer to something which came to my attention recently. It is very reliable information about the potash industry. I would argue that one of the small modest reforms which we should be undertaking, Mr. Speaker, to get some more socialism into provincial policies, is the nationalizing of the potash industry.

I should like, for the edification of the Members of the House, to report some figures I gathered on the profits of this industry. I understand that one company, International Minerals and Chemicals, in 1971 earned profits on sales of nearly 40 per cent. I also understand that this company was guilty of administered prices in terms of charging low prices received by the Canadian subsidiary in potash sold to the American parent company. This was a mechanism by which they were keeping down their exorbitant profit figures in Canada.

I also understand they had huge management fees charged to the Canadian subsidiary and paid to the American parent. I also understand that IMC would qualify completely for a membership in David Lewis' honored role of corporate welfare bums. In 1971 they deferred their entire income tax on this exorbitant profit and paid nothing. These are very serious charges, Mr. Speaker, about the profits earned in this industry and I trust that we will be able, in the near future, to have complete open reporting of the income earned by this industry and that within the not too distant future we will arrive at the necessary goal of public ownership of this, one of our important natural resources of the province.

This is enough about economic matters, Mr. Speaker, for the time being. I should like to turn to an issue of major significance to the people of Saskatchewan, one that has been virtually ignored. It is the very controversial issue of women's

February 15, 1973

liberation.

By referring to the issue under the title of one of the more radical components of it, talking about women's liberation, I do not thereby mean to despise or denigrate the accomplishments and the hope and the goals of people such as in the status of women. But I think, however, that women's liberation expresses better the entirety in the breadth of what needs to be done in this cultural change. Because, surely, it is a question of liberating women. It is not merely a question of their status within a capitalist society, or be it there are important legislative changes which we should be considering, some of which will come before us during this Session, but it involves cultural change, psychological change and a whole host of areas above which we cannot possibly — and nor should we — try to legislate.

I feel embarrassed that it has to be myself who raises and discusses in some depth this issue. If we had anything like proportional representation there would be 30 women in this Chamber. However, women have only penetrated so far to the status of Deputy Assistant Clerk. Also we obviously have five Indian people. We have very serious credibility problems in this Legislature as we discuss this issue. My wife has not failed to remark upon them from time to time, as I am sure many of the wives of the Hon. Members in the House have had their wives comment on this rather exclusive male dominated club which has been characteristic of Legislatures of Saskatchewan.

Let me illustrate the problems, Mr. Speaker, by referring to a number of specific areas. I should like to begin in the area of education. I have a small quote for the Members of the House, which I would like to read into the record. It consists of a quotation from a Grade One Reader, in use in the schools in Saskatoon.

She cannot skate, said Mark. I can help her. I want to help her. Look at her mother, just look at her. She is just like a girl, she gives up.

Mr. Speaker, even in Grade One we've got sex attitudes being perpetuated in the schools. We have an image of, the boy is the one who can skate, but the girl is the one who gives up, and Mother looks approvingly upon the boy as he assumes his dominant role in helping the girl learn how to skate.

Surely, Mr. Speaker, our educational institutions should not, in this day and age, be agents for perpetrating attitudes of female sexual inferiority.

I should like to turn now to another area which is albeit very controversial namely the question of family planning and abortion. This is a highly controversial moral issue which poses highly complicated psychological problems for women involved in questions of family planning and abortion. It is an issue that has been with us for some time, and which we as politicians have skated around with a great deal of delicacy. I think that we have to look, and I look with approval on the decision of the United States Supreme Court recently, that the right of the woman to do with her body up to six months of pregnancy as she determines, means that anti-abortion laws in the United States will have to be repealed.

Although abortion in Canada is governed by Federal statute, I do not think the real problem lies there. We have responsibility at the provincial level for equitable administration of that law and for the availability of information to women about what are the legal means of procuring an abortion if such need be. I think we have an obligation to fulfil these requirements and I trust that our provincial policies will so do.

However, nobody could consider an abortion to be a desirable operation. Abortion is the family planning mechanism of last resort and it poses moral and it poses psychological problems. And that then we have the hypocrisy in a society which objects to abortion and at the same time refusing to fund and create adequate family planning mechanisms, adequate family planning programs in society. On the one hand we object to abortion as a moral evil, on the other hand we refuse to make available to the people in society the necessary information so that they do not get unwanted pregnancies. This kind of hypocrisy in our society is further degrading the political institution and I commend to this Legislature, and to us as individual politicians that we have the courage to come to grips with this issue.

What is the need for family planning in Saskatchewan? Well I shall quote very simple statistics. One child born in seven in Saskatchewan in 1971 was illegitimate. Illegitimacy is one of the indications of unwanted children. For native people the statistic is much higher. Over one in two Indian children born in Saskatchewan is illegitimate. And the problem does not affect all people uniformly. It unfairly is a problem which affects our teen age people. Teenagers account for only 15 per cent of live births in the province. They had 45 per cent of illegitimate births and they accounted for 31 per cent of abortions. There is a grave need among this group, among young people, that they have ready access in our society to information about family planning.

Let me now turn to the question of job discrimination, the question related to women in the economy. I don't want to refer to national statistics, I want to refer to some rather humble local institutions in my constituency, namely the University of Saskatchewan. There are some figures which I shall read into the record for which I owe a debt of gratitude to Gale McConnell who prepared them, about the relative proportion of women in various positions in the University. Among the full time student body, there are admittedly 38 per cent women. That is better than it was a number of years ago. However, once one comes to concern oneself with graduate training, this falls off to only 15 per cent. Albeit, certain credit must go to the Medical College which I understand this year admitted one-third of its entering class as women. When we look at the faculty we find that only one faculty member in eight is a woman; 12.1 per cent of the full time faculty of the University of Saskatchewan in Saskatoon are women. We look at the deans, out of 12 deans we have one woman. You can guess what college she is Dean of. We have the Dean of Home Economics who is a woman. When you come down to the lower ranks we do find that there is an increasing proportion of women. We find for example, 34 per cent of the instructors at the University are women; 36. per cent of the lecturers are women, so we have the situation that, one, there is discrimination in the sense that there are fewer women than men in the University

February 15, 1973

in any capacity. Also the higher up the ranks you go the fewer women you get.

Let's look at the question now, again within the University of some of the problems within the union of certain prejudice against women, I think we have to admit. I refer to the current agreement of the University of Saskatchewan Employees Union. There are some interesting anomalies. Why is it that a caretaker I starts at \$444 a month, whereas, cleaner I, a job classification which implies approximately the same work, starts at \$341, a \$100 difference? Just coincidentally, all caretakers are men, all cleaners are women. This is the kind of problem we face and I trust we will be able to do something about it with legislation coming forth in this Session about making more strict the provisions of equal pay for equal work. Another little interesting anomaly, why should it be that Clerk Steno I, again all women, start at \$341 when to be a Clerk Steno you have to have a grade 12 plus some business school training, none of which is required for a caretaker. Again dramatic little points about where we need to go in the economic sphere in order to get some kind of equality if we are going to take seriously the question of women's liberation. As I said, I think before, I am pleased to note in the Throne Speech mention of maternity leave and mention of stricter enforcement of equal pay for women.

The final area that I think is greatly worthy of note, is the question of Day Care Centres. The question of Day Care Centres borders on the Department of Welfare, Department of Labour, borders on cultural questions about what is the role of the mother in the family or whether she should be in the work place. These pose important economic questions about the number of jobs which we are prepared as a society to create. But for two very simple reasons, Mr. Speaker, we obviously need more Day Care Centres. One, I suppose if the academic one, that increasingly authorities are saying it is important for children to experience the kinds of group programs which a good Day Care Centre program can provide. I quote, for example, from the recently released Canadian Day Care Survey by the Federal Department of Health and Welfare.

Fifty per cent of all the factors that determine intellectual functioning are formulated by age four. We would expect the variations in environment to have relatively little effect on the I.Q. after age eight. We would expect the greatest effect likely to take place between the ages of one to five.

The quotation is from Dr. Bloom, past president of the American Education Research Association.

The second reason is a very mundane but very real need which working mothers have to have accommodation for their children. In 1971 the Women's Bureau of the Federal Labour Department estimated that there were 634,000 working mothers in Canada, 182,000 of whom had children under the age of six. This report found that in 1971 there were only 17,400 children of working mothers who were actually enrolled in Day Care Centres. This amounts to a mere one and one-quarter per cent of the children of these working mothers. There are 41,000 children in Day Care Centres across the country in 1971 and pro-rating according to our population in Saskatchewan, we

should have 1,600 children in such institutions. In fact, however, we have only 793 places, 35 of which are for handicapped children. Those 793 places of Day Care in Saskatchewan must be compared with over 100,000 children under age five.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to note there will be an increase in the Budget for Day Care Centres from \$75,000 to \$100,000 in this year's Budget. However, I think \$75,000 to \$100,000 is hardly an earth shaking increase. As we come to grips with the cultural changes and the social changes and the administrative and political changes which are involved as women change their definition of what it involves to be a mother, we are going to have to come to grips with it. We are going to have to spend a lot more money on this kind of program. Obviously we cannot legislate social change nor can we bury our heads in the sand and ignore it.

In conclusion, I hope that as women go through their rap sessions that they get rid of their complexes about being in any way inferior to men, that they insist upon breaking down the male barriers of control in politics and other institutions. As they scramble and fight to get the positions they deserve within our society, that they will not forget the rickety and rotten ladder up which they are climbing is the modern capitalist society under which we live. I hope as they strive to become active participants in our economy, in all ways, that they will nonetheless remain socialist allies in some sense. And maybe after they have conquered the University and they have conquered all the deanships and they have got the positions they think justified, they will come back and help us nationalize the potash industry. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. K. Thorson (Minister of Industry and Commerce): — Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to be able to join in this debate on the Budget. I first of all want to join with all of the other Members in the Assembly in congratulating the Hon. Member for Biggar (Mr. Cowley) the Minister of Finance, for his excellent presentation of a building budget in this Assembly last Friday.

I wish, Mr. Speaker, I could be so congratulatory in directing some remarks for the benefit of the budget critic in the Opposition. He led off last Friday with some statements which do him no credit, do no credit to this Assembly and certainly were no credit to the people he should be serving. The statement he made that the Department of Industry and Commerce has interfered with Regina's efforts to obtain a food processing plant is not borne out by the facts. But if there is any wrong doing, Mr. Speaker, it is the responsibility of the former administration. In fact, there are shades of the Castle Wine story in this little episode.

The facts are as follows, Mr. Speaker. In 1969 negotiations started with a food processing firm with a view to attracting it to a Saskatchewan location for a potato chip operation. The company favored a Regina location but as a result of the former government's insistence they did investigate very seriously a Moose Jaw location. Well, of course, the government changed with the election of June 23, 1971.

February 15, 1973

Following this investigation made by the company on February 8, 1972, the company informed the people of Moose Jaw through one of its officials that Regina was an optimum location for their purposes because of the distribution facilities available for Western Canada. The company prepared and submitted an application for a DREE grant specifying Regina as the location. In fact, DREE made an offer of a grant but the company by that time through some difficulties in its parent organization, particularly with internal financing, decided not to proceed at all.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the Member for Albert Park (Mr. MacLeod) went further in his accusations last Friday. He stated that the city administrations in Saskatoon and in Regina have instructed their respective industrial officers not to tell the Department of Industry and Commerce about their plans and their prospects. Mr. Speaker, the Member for Albert Park is dead wrong.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Thorson: — On Monday last, I telephoned Mayor Walker in Regina and Mayor Sears in Saskatoon. I asked them if the Member's statement in the Legislature is accurate. Both Mayors assured me that they had given no such instructions to their administrations.

An Hon. Member: — Wrong again.

Mr. Thorson: — Now, Mr. Speaker, I know that the Member for Albert Park had trouble finding something to say in this debate. I also know, Mr. Speaker, that there is a vast difference between having something to say and having to say something.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Thorson: — But as I said, he does no service to the people of his constituency or the people of this province by making false statements in this Assembly which have no bases in fact and which are calculated to deceive those who cannot be in possession of all of the facts.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Thorson: — Now, what are the facts about the relationship between the Department of Industry and Commerce and the city administrations in Saskatchewan. Mr. Speaker, they have certainly been improving and indeed they needed improving after the previous government had been in office. In my dealings with them I have made a very determined effort to be fair and to be frank in dealing with all city administrators in Saskatchewan. Last August the Department of Industry and Commerce sponsored a conference for all city industrial development officers in Saskatchewan. Every city was represented at the conference. Again, there was a full and frank discussion between these representatives and departmental officials. We expect to have another such conference next month. In the meantime, there has developed a good working relationship between city industrial development officers and the staff of the Department of Industry and Commerce. There is frequent communication between them and a spirit of harmony is developing.

Mr. Speaker, I regret that the Member for Albert Park tried to disrupt that harmony. I am confident that his irresponsible statements will not succeed.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Thorson: — Now, Mr. Speaker, perhaps I should not be so harsh in speaking about the Member for Albert Park. Because after all he has to follow the leader. It is perhaps the example of the Leader of the Opposition that has led him astray.

Let me just take a few minutes, Mr. Speaker, before 5:30 to point out a few of the activities of the Leader of the Opposition in the last several months. May I just say that it is difficult for the people of Saskatchewan to know where the Leader of the Opposition stands on almost any issue. But then he has many problems. Let me point to four of his problems. First, Mr. Speaker, his Party is committed to expediency to gaining or holding power at all costs at both the Federal and Provincial levels. I call to witness George Bain, a columnist in the Toronto Globe and Mail, writing January 11, 1973, who observed and let me quote:

Three Main Themes of Liberal Post Mortems.

He was talking about the reactions to the election results last October 30th.

One, was that there were grave faults in some policies but if the Government's communications had been better, no one would have noticed. Second, the various policies that were held on principle before to be unalterable would now be altered without the sacrifice of principle. Third, the Liberal principle is whatever may from time to time be declared to be.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Thorson: — Mr. Speaker, a second problem the Leader of the Opposition has is that he contradicts himself, and he gets on record doing it. Here is a clipping from the Saskatoon Star-Phoenix reporting an interview last August 5th, 1972 between a staff writer, Mr. Tom Cooney and the Leader of the Opposition. The Leader of the Opposition is quoted as saying.

I think all political parties now recognize that governments are playing and will continue to play an ever-increasing role in the life of people in business. I think we recognize the old idea of the free marketplace of total free enterprise, does not work any more and governments have a serious role to play, checking, guiding, controlling, where necessary, business and industry.

He goes on to say:

We now recognize the whole situation is different than it was 10 or 20 years ago. And governments must be more involved than they were then. We accept this and we are prepared to do it.

Says the Leader of the Opposition.

February 15, 1973

But, Mr. Speaker, here is the Leader-Post reporting an interview with the same Leader of the Opposition in the issue of January 26, 1973, just after the Throne Speech was read in this Chamber. Now we have the Leader of the Opposition saying, according to this story, he was particularly critical of a planned expansion of Saskatchewan Forest Products, a Crown Corporation. He went on to say,

No Government belonged in the timber business.

Well in August the Government should be doing more, have more responsibilities, but by January it should not be involved in the timber business or resource development.

The third problem the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Steuart) has is that his political manipulations don't work. Let me just read you three headlines that just sort of tell the sad story. Here is the Leader-Post of August 1, 1972 and the heading says, "Steuart Cites Master Plan to Gain Power." The Members, Mr. Speaker, will remember what happened on October 30, 1972. And so I now have a headline from the Leader-Post of December 4, 1972 that says, "Loss of Support Concerns Liberals". Then on December 29 the Star-Phoenix reports with the headline, "Liberals Concentrate on Regrouping."

One of the ways that this political manoeuvring was to be conducted was to send the Leader of the Opposition on a trip to Ottawa.

An Hon. Member: — Trying to get rid of him.

Mr. Thorson: — I don't know whether it was intended to be ironical that the Leader-Post should report that with a headline on January 18 of this year saying, "Steuart Ottawa Visit Termed Unusual". Here's a quote from that story with the Ottawa date line.

The provincial party leader conceded the partisan nature of his visit and agreed the goal was to enhance the party's position in the West. But he said most of the things he sought would have been asked by NDP Premier Blakeney as well.

But make no mistake about the purpose of the trip, according to his own testimony, Mr. Speaker.

Now the fourth and the most difficult problem of all that the Leader of the Opposition has and which is becoming increasingly apparent to the people of Saskatchewan is that in every political issue the Leader of the Opposition does not get the facts and does not check them out.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Thorson: — Who says so, Mr. Speaker? The Leader of the Opposition says so. Let me quote to you from the Leader-Post of September 18, 1972 in the column, 'Under the Dome', and here in quotation marks, quoting the Leader of the Opposition we have this amazing confession. Here he says:

If we waited until everything we had was documented and checked, Mr. Steuart said, there would be little left to say.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Thorson: — Little indeed, Mr. Speaker. Then is it any wonder, Mr. Speaker, that the Liberal Party is out of favor with the people of Saskatchewan.

Now, Mr. Speaker, if I may, I should like to call it 5:30 and following the supper hour I want to say something about the activities of the Saskatchewan Power Corporation past and planned.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

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

Mr. Thorson: — Mr. Speaker, the Members will be aware that there is pending before the National Energy Board an application by Trans Canada Pipelines Limited to have its rates increased for the gas it carries from Western Canada through the provinces eastward to markets in Eastern Canada. I want to say something about that because it undoubtedly, however it turns out, will have importance for the Saskatchewan Power Corporation and all of us in Saskatchewan. The hearing before the National Energy Board on the application for an increase in rates has been divided into two parts. Phase I and phase II, I will call them.

Phase I of the hearing began in February, 1971. After the hearing which ended in August of that year the National Energy Board determined that Trans Canada Pipelines Limited should be allowed a permissible 9 per cent return on its rate base, as they call it, which is really the value of its physical plant. The total cost for service for Trans Canada was, therefore, found to be \$320 million per year which consisted of the return on its rate base (its physical plant) for depreciation and for operating expenses.

Now, Mr. Speaker, phase II of the proceedings, which has been called the allocation phase, involves determining how much each of Trans Canada's customers will contribute to make up the total sum of money. In March 1972 Trans Canada filed its proposed tolls and tariffs and the phase II hearing began in June. The hearing lasted 76 days and it concluded on November 30, 1972.

In these hearings the Government of Saskatchewan and the Saskatchewan Power Corporation have taken the position that rates must be based on costs incurred to serve each of Trans Canada's customers. Otherwise, there will be a misallocation of resources. If artificially low prices for gas are provided in Ontario and Quebec, then industry there may improperly locate when it should be cheaper to locate in Western Canada. Furthermore, artificially low prices in these areas would stimulate an artificial demand in the market for gas and accordingly a scarce and non-renewable resource such as natural gas would not be put to the best use.

The Saskatchewan Power Corporation has three contracts with Trans Canada Pipelines, two of them are gas purchase contracts. The other contract has to do with transportation. The rates, as filed by Trans Canada Pipelines with the National Energy Board, if applied to 1972 operations, would increase the cost to the Corporation by \$1.634 million which is a 19.5 per cent increase

February 15, 1973

in the cost of services provided by Trans Canada Pipelines. Now, Mr. Speaker, a major portion of this increase would be associated with gas delivered by Trans Canada Pipelines to Unity, Saskatchewan. This contract accounted for 25 per cent of the Corporation's gas supply in 1972. The Corporation was successful in negotiating a new contract whereby a subsidiary company of the Saskatchewan Power Corporation purchased the line from Trans Canada Pipelines and took the delivery of gas from Trans Canada Pipelines inside Alberta. As a result this gas purchase is no longer considered part of the Trans Canada Pipeline system and is not now subject to the rates established for that system. The new contract results in a saving of \$1.6 million per year at 1972 volume levels compared to the rates as proposed by Trans Canada Pipelines.

In these hearings the direct evidence on phase II has been presented and the hearing was concluded on November 30, 1972. Written arguments were filed early in January of this year. Verbal rebuttal to the arguments were completed before the end of January. We expect that the National Energy Board's decision will be rendered in March or April. If the decision turns out to be very unfavorable to Saskatchewan the ground work for appeal based on our interpretation of the Act with railway precedents has already been laid.

Now, Mr. Speaker, let no one think that while these hearings have been going on the applicant, Trans Canada Pipelines Limited, has been suffering. I have the company's preliminary report to shareholders for 1972. This report is dated January 26, 1973. In this report the management states that the company's earnings will fall sharply in 1973 unless it is successful in its application to the National Energy Board to, as the report says, 'permit certain additional increased costs anticipated in 1973 to be passed on to distributor customers'. That's the end of that part of the report. However, it goes on to set out some figures for 1972 and 1971, when the customers, including the Saskatchewan Power Corporation, made a very substantial contribution to the Trans Canada Pipelines system. In the words of the report, and I quote:

Net income applicable to common shares for 1972 was \$23,070,000 or \$2.77 per share compared with \$2.01 per share for 1971.

Is it any wonder, Mr. Speaker, that we protest the company's application for an increase in rates. And is it any wonder that Saskatchewan must continue to demand a national transportation policy in pipelines as in rail and air and road transport that is just and fair and which will favor our economic development and not burden us with unjustified charges for our people and our industries.

Mr. Speaker, I wanted to take a few moments to say something about the history of the gas system which has been built up and developed by the Saskatchewan Power Corporation. And to say just a word also about the plans the Board of Directors of the Saskatchewan Power Corporation has approved for the expansion of the gas system in 1973.

This gas system, owned by the people of Saskatchewan, began in 1952 when natural gas was piped into the first two communities, Brock and Kindersley. In the intervening 20 years there has been a tremendous expansion until at the end of 1972 there were over

157,000 customers served with natural gas in 336 separate communities in the province. More than 137,000 householders and 19,000 commercial customers enjoy the advantages of this premium fuel. In addition 676 customers which are classed as industrial are afforded the opportunity of using low cost natural gas in their processes. This latter group of customers range from the largest potash mine in the province to the small broiler operators. It's a very diverse group.

Despite our geographically widespread population and the very large distances, there is a higher percentage of Saskatchewan people using natural gas than any other province in Canada with the exception of Alberta. To expand this system to its present stage in the 20 years since its inception and to assure adequate long-term gas reserves for its customers, it has required the construction of 7,400 miles of pipelines at an expenditure of \$214 million. The Corporation has undertaken large expansion programs in each year since the beginning of the gas system back in 1952. The planning of these programs has not been without problems with respect to priorities and limitations on capital money available. Nevertheless, the objective was and still is to bring the advantages of natural gas to the greatest number of people in each year consistent with our financial capacity.

In the early years of the system this objective was much more easily met. The system was expanded toward the cities. Saskatoon was served in 1953; Prince Albert in 1955; Swift Current and Moose Jaw in 1956; Regina in 1957; Yorkton in 1958; and Estevan and Weyburn in 1959. The construction of pipelines to these major centres and to gas fields and to large industrial customers opened up new service areas and presented the opportunity of extended service to smaller communities along the routes and as extensions were made to the main transmission system. In those days the limiting factors were only availability of capital money and the amount of expansion work which the Corporation could physically undertake in the summer construction period in Saskatchewan.

In the past seven years 1966 to 1972 inclusive, the number of new towns and customers served with natural gas has been as follows: In 1966 there were 13 towns and 1,848 customers; in 1967 22 towns with 2,938 customers; in 1968 27 towns with 2,541 customers; in 1969 only 16 towns (one of the lower years) and 512 new customers; in 1970 25 towns with 1,761 customers; in 1971 21 new towns and we estimate that after the third year of service in those towns there will be 1,755 customers; in 1972 24 new towns were added and again, after the third year of service it is estimated that there will be 2,755 customers.

Today, the major centres of population have all been served and the Corporation faces quite a different set of problems in determining its future policy for expansion. There are very few unserved communities left within a reasonable distance of the existing transmission system. Most of those that do exist are of the extremely small variety, namely hamlets. The cost is high for a small number of potential customers. A potential market also exists in the rural areas of Saskatchewan but, again, costs of extending service are prohibitive in most instances. And so as distances increase and potential gas sales are smaller with future expansion projects, the Corporation faces the problem of selecting viable projects. A judgement must be made as to what point advantages of natural gas over acceptable alternate fuels outweigh the high cost of extending service.

February 15, 1973

The Corporation continually has this problem under review and is studying the possible areas of expansion in future years.

In 1973 the Corporation plans to extend gas service to a further 31 communities. The total cost of the program is estimated at \$3.45 million and will make natural gas available to approximately 3,000 potential customers. Programs subsequent to 1973 are less certain. Studies to date indicate that the investment per customer will approach \$2,000 or 75 per cent higher than the previous five year average. This is nearing the point where it is no longer reasonable to extend natural gas because the costs of providing gas exceed the cost of alternative fuels. The problem, however, is still under study.

Now, to give in detail the 1973 program, the following communities will receive service: Simmie, Mistatim, Crooked River, Prairie River, Margo, Archerwill, Marchwell, Wymark, Frontier, Climax, Chelan, Saw, Cadillac, Ponteix, Admiral, Scotsguard, Aneroid, Hazenmore, Kincaid, Central Butte, Simpson, Imperial, Porcupine Plain, Carragana, Weekes, Tugaske, Eyebrow, Brownlee, Krydor and Hafford.

Mr. Speaker, as I said, that makes a total of 31 communities which will be served with natural gas this year. The largest number of towns served in any recent years. Based on third-year estimates of the number of customers there will be about 2,360 but as I said, it could go as high as 3,000 customers being added to the system by-this year's program.

Mr. Speaker, there will be another occasion for me to say something about the activities of the Government through its existing Crown corporation, Saskatchewan Power Corporation, in proving up additional gas reserves to make them available for the customers of the Saskatchewan Power Corporation. There will be an opportunity, Mr. Speaker, for me to say something about our planned activities for a new Crown corporation in searching for oil reserves as well.

Let me just say a bit about what the Saskatchewan Power Corporation has been doing in this field. Since the fall of 1971, we have been actively pursuing a policy of finding more natural gas reserves in both Alberta and Saskatchewan. On December 31, 1972, we had expended \$1.69 million at this program; \$1.23 million was spent in Saskatchewan, \$460,000 was spent in Alberta. This program was carried on in joint ventures with privately owned companies and the results have been most gratifying. Out of the total expenditure of \$1.69 million, we have invested about \$1.08 million on projects where test drilling has been done. The remaining over \$600,000 has been spent on land or acquiring land where testing is yet to be done.

What reserves have we added so far by this program? Well, let me say just a word or two about what I mean when I say 'reserves'. If I speak of proven reserves I am talking about those, which in the industry, is thought to have every reasonable possibility of being produced. If I talk about probable reserves, again using the terms common in the industry, we are talking about reserves that are beyond the proved limits of a field but estimated on the basis of normal geological expectation will result in producing gas fields. If I speak about established gas reserves, again using the terminology in the trade, I am talking about the sum of proven reserves, plus half of the probable reserves. So with this program so far, in joint

ventures with other companies, we have proven up reserves for the Saskatchewan Power Corporation as its share alone, 35.8 billion cubic feet. We have probable reserves of 63 billion cubic feet. We have established reserves, that is to say all of the proven reserves plus one-half of the probable reserves, of 67.3 billion cubic feet, as a result of our program.

Now what is the value that has been added by way of this program? Well, a conservative estimate is that gas in place, as an established reserve and still in the ground, is worth 6 cents per million cubic feet. On that basis our 67.3 billion cubic feet has a value of in excess of \$4 million. We have, so far, spent a little over \$1 million on testing these projects. We expect to spend about another \$750,000 to prove up the probable reserves and that will make an expenditure of \$1.83 million but our value of gas, we expect, will be well over \$4 million, so we shall be ahead by more than \$2.2 million. Mr. Speaker, I think that has been good business from any point of view and it has certainly been worthwhile in terms of proving up additional reserves for the customers of Saskatchewan Power Corporation.

Now, unfortunately, I don't have time to give the details about where this work is going on. I will just mention the areas in Saskatchewan where we have been active with our partners in joint ventures. In the Porcupine Hills, northeast of the Quill Lakes, and in the Kamsack area and south of Fosston and at Cypress Lake. Let me just say a word about that. During 1972 the Corporation drilled 12 wells on its prospect in the Cypress Lake area at a cost of \$436,000. Out of that 12 we had five gas wells come in and a prospective where there is a showing of oil as well. We are also in Saskatchewan active in what is called the West Whiteside Prospect.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I should say something about the potential of the Milk River formation of gas in Saskatchewan. It is known to be there. It has not been economical to produce it at the prices for gas at the wellhead in the past, but there is every prospect that it will be economic to produce it as gas prices increase. The reserves are estimated to be at least as high in that formation as any of the known reserves now proven in Saskatchewan.

I could say something about our projects in Alberta, but again the story is similar to Saskatchewan except that we have not proceeded so far with the testing of some of our lands there.

Mr. Speaker, in the face of our good experience in the last one and one-half years in exploring for gas and proving up gas reserves by the Saskatchewan Power Corporation, I am confident that we can repeat that performance with our new Crown corporation in which we will explore for oil as well as for natural gas in joint ventures and by itself in the future.

Who, Mr. Speaker, in the face of the circumstances of today's world, the need for energy, the decline in available resources, the proven success of our experience with Crown corporations in Saskatchewan, who, Mr. Speaker, would be too timid or foolish to say that the Government should not be in gas or oil exploration on behalf of the people of Saskatchewan? The only people, Mr. Speaker, that I know of are the Members of the Opposition.

I began my few remarks in this debate, Mr. Speaker, by

February 15, 1973

pointing out the problems which the Liberal Party has because of its Budget critic's statements which were false in this debate and the problems it has with its leadership.

I just want to close by reminding the House of a demonstration we saw of that in the remarks of the Member for Milestone (Mr. MacDonald) today. It may be, Mr. Speaker, that some people believe that that kind of performance merits the support of the people of Saskatchewan. I doubt it very much. I pointed out the inconsistencies and the difficulties of the leadership of the Liberal Party. I think it is because of that that they were rejected by the people of Saskatchewan in June of 1971. I say, Mr. Speaker, that the inflammatory, destructive remarks of the Member for Milestone this afternoon were a sad and shabby performance, not worthy of the leaders of any political party in Saskatchewan, in the face of the difficulties which we face in school, trustee and teacher relationships.

Mr. Steuart: — You brought it on yourselves.

Mr. Thorson: — Oh, the Leader of the Opposition says we brought it on ourselves. Let's go back, Mr. Speaker, to the time when they were in office and remember what their performance was in teacher-trustee relationships. Who was it that continually caused this growing rift between teachers and trustees? Did the Liberal Party in the seven years it was in office demonstrate any leadership? Mr. Speaker, ask any teacher, ask any trustee if there was any leadership from the Liberal Party while they were in office or now while they are out of office.

Now, Mr. Speaker, in our day and age it is not uncommon to hear people lament the changing morals of our society, to find people who are worried about a permissiveness which they say has a bad influence on our young people. How can our young people take us seriously, if the Leaders in our political parties resort to false statements, resort to expediency for the sake of gaining power or holding power. Why should we worry about the young being permissive in any of their activities if they have this kind of example from the people who are active in our political life today?

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Thorson: — There may be, as I say, Mr. Speaker, some people apparently in the Liberal Party in Saskatchewan, who don't believe in the old fashioned virtues of truth and loyalty and honesty in dealing with people. I am glad to say that our Party adheres to those principles in its actions.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Thorson: — We don't claim to have all of the answers for all of the problems. We do claim, Mr. Speaker, that clinging to office or trying to gain office at any expense is not the way to conduct yourself as a responsible, political party. So in our Budget we have had to set some priorities and speak frankly to people about them as to where we think the tax burdens should fall; as to the way we should allocate the funds that are available for economic development; assistance to farmers and other activities in the province. We have had to make some decisions

and are prepared to discuss them freely and openly and honestly and fairly with any group about how those funds are allocated for social services, including our grants to schools and universities and the funds we make available for other purposes.

Mr. Speaker, I said when I began that this is a constructive Budget. I am happy to say that I will support it enthusiastically.

Mr. K.R. MacLeod (Albert Park): — Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Minister . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order!

Mr. MacLeod: — I wonder if the Minister would answer one question before he takes his seat. I wonder if he could tell me what the well head price is that he is talking about? He said the wellhead price of certain Milk River gas is not economic. The question I would like to ask of him is, what is he considering a reasonable wellhead price today for these fields?

Mr. Thorson: — When the Saskatchewan Power Corporation began acquiring gas at as little as 12 cents per Mcf (thousand cubic feet) and on up to 16 cents and now up to 18 cents, it was not economic to produce gas from those formations in Saskatchewan. The expectation is that the well-head price is going to increase beyond that point, beyond 18 cents.

Mr. MacLeod: — What wellhead price do you consider today as a fair wellhead price?

Mr. Thorson: — Now, Mr. Speaker, that clearly is a different question entirely. That's not seeking facts, that's inviting a discussion or an argument presumably to the disadvantage of our bargaining position with potential producers of gas.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. A.R. Guy (Athabasca): — Mr. Speaker, it is unfortunate that our kid from Estevan had to have his remarks which he had skirted very carefully this afternoon and again this evening spoiled by asking a very simple question. After all he referred to it two or three times in his speech. Before he dared answer he had to look up to see whether the Press were watching him or not because after all you know he is supposedly the 'great white hope' of the New Democratic Party and then he fluffed it. He didn't have the answer — he blew it. I am surprised that he blew it because after all he started out this afternoon with remarks very detrimental to our financial critic. You know, he said he didn't know too much about the Budget, the comments that he made weren't really in keeping with it. Yet the financial critic got up after listening to him for 20 minutes, asked one simple question and he didn't have the answer. That shows where our financial critic stands when it comes to the young Minister from Estevan. He couldn't answer a simple question about the price of gas, after he talked about it for fifteen minutes. I'll tell you, Mr. Speaker, I'll take my financial critic against the Minister of Industry any time.

February 15, 1973

You know that that surprised me this afternoon.

Mr. Speaker: — Order!

Mr. Guy: — Oh, let them go, Mr. Speaker, let them keep it up.

Mr. Speaker: — When I ask for Order, I want Order.

Mr. Guy: — Well, I know we have to have order and decorum but it would sure help my speech a lot if they would keep up the questions. I love this coming back and forth. You bet, ask a question.

Mr. Thorson: — I hope my colleagues will remain quiet because we want to hear from the authority on gas.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Guy: — In order to have lots of gas you would have to be the Minister from Estevan. The trouble is he doesn't know the price of gas. He doesn't know that the gas from this side is worth a lot more than the gas from the other side. But I had to laugh this afternoon when my colleague, Cy MacDonald, was speaking and the Member from Nutana Centre (Mr. Robbins) was going to make a few comments. He was going to do a little heckling from the back and I had to laugh at the Premier and the Whip (Mr. Pepper) from over there, very obviously said, "don't say anything while the Members are speaking." Well, it wasn't for the courtesy of the House, they knew that they didn't have any answers to what my colleague had to say this afternoon.

We listened to the Member from Estevan (Mr. Thorson) the Minister of Industry. It was a tremendous speech. We listened to the Budget and in the Budget there was mention of exciting new programs for business and industry. "Exciting new programs", it didn't outline them but the Finance Minister (Mr. Cowley) said, "my colleagues in the Cabinet will outline these new programs before this Budget debate is over". So when the Minister of Industry got up this afternoon we were expecting to hear about these new exciting programs for industry and business. He talked about, as I said, the financial critic from our side. Then he went on about the leadership of the Liberal Party. At least our leader has the courtesy to be here in the evenings when your leader seems to be absent most of the time. Then he went on to the SPC and the price of gas at the wellhead, which he didn't know. But I will tell you, Mr. Speaker, not once, not once did he refer to his Department with any of these new exciting programs that were going to be mentioned in his speech. All I can say is what the Hon. Minister of Finance put in his Budget speech and what is going to occur as a result of action by the Minister of Industry, are entirely two different things. In fact, I don't think the Minister of Industry was even in contact with the Provincial Treasurer or Minister of Finance when he drew up this Budget. I don't think he knows what these new programs are going to be because he certainly didn't have any answers or didn't have anything to say. (Now he is going to leave because . . .) Ah, I'll tell what

happened, we hurt his feelings. When he first appeared in this House a few years ago, he thought nobody could hurt his feelings because after all, he was Tommy Douglas' white-haired boy. Well, the voters showed him after four years whether he was a white-haired boy of Tommy Douglas or anybody else. I must say that since his return to this House his performance has lacked some of that lustre that he tried to portray when he was here in his first appearance.

Well, first of all before going into the Budget Speech I want to say that I am very happy to see my old friend the former Member from Prince Albert East, the former MLA (Mr. Berezowsky) here this afternoon. I had a few words with him. We both decided that we were the only two real debaters in this House when he was here, at least we used to debate our own comments very thoroughly. It is good to see the former MLA in good health, smiling and happy. I heard that he is ready to take on John Diefenbaker again anytime that the next Federal election is called. I wish him luck.

We heard from the Member for Saskatoon University (Mr. Richards). I must say that I agreed with some of the comments that he made as I usually do. I agree with some of his beliefs, but not in the way that he wants to bring them about in this province. I agree with what he said that the total tax burden on the people of Saskatchewan should be reduced. We have said this all through this Budget debate. I agree that there should be some partisan modesty on both sides, but I have to do that with tongue in cheek, because they haven't shown it, and at this late date I don't think we can afford to.

I did disagree with him that there should be more socialism in the Budget, because I think we saw more socialism in this Budget than we saw in the Budget last year or certainly when they were the government before. They have finally taken the turn, they have turned down the socialist path, maybe not as fast as some of our waffler friends would like to see, but I think the people of Saskatchewan will certainly say that we have got about all the socialism we need for one year. The public ownership of potash, even though other Ministers over there have sort of laid low on that and they don't want to refer to it, I am glad to see that the Member was honest enough today to say that it is the NDP's intention to nationalize the potash industry as soon as they can sell it to the people of Saskatchewan.

I don't disagree too much with some of his comments regarding women's lib. I must admit that for the first time since he has been a Member of this House, that some of his statistics today, and as a former university professor, I was a little surprised, just do not stand up to the light of more discerning examination. He tried to make the comparison between a janitor and a cleaning lady, or caretaker I think he said. There may be similarities, but I was surprised that he didn't recognize the fact that the caretaker in most cases, has to have engineer papers, plumber certificates and so on, which isn't usually part of the job of the cleaning lady. I think that some of the assumptions that he made this afternoon were not clearly borne out by the facts. It doesn't detract from the fact that he did make some comments about the lack of the feminine sex in this House and in the civil service of this province. We have had them in the past, but unfortunately we haven't any to keep us in line in the Legislature today.

February 15, 1973

As I mentioned, the Minister of Industry put on a performance which showed that there is very little in the Department of Industry that he could talk about, as he had to talk about what he thought were shortcomings over here on this side of the House. He referred to Dave Steuart's visit to Ottawa. Somebody said it was at public expense. Unfortunately this is not true, he went down there on the expenses of the Liberal Party. We never know what travels the Ministers opposite take on public expense, because we asked for an Order for Return over a year ago, about the travels of Ministers outside the province on public expense. I have asked three times in this House since the opening and we are now in our sixteenth day. Again I ask, when are we going to receive that return? When you see the number of people on research and working in the Premier's office, which is another return we haven't seen, along with four other returns, all dealing with travels of the Legislative Secretaries and the Ministers. Printing contracts that the government has entered into for the short period, nine months, from July 1971 to March 1, 1972, have still not been answered. The people of the province are saying, "What have they got to hide?" That's what we should like to know. What have they got to hide? Surely to goodness the Provincial Secretary and the Premier have got the courage to put these returns on the Table. Why haven't you? You shake your head, you don't hear anything, but you are still shaking it! Never in the history of this Legislature have there been returns from the year before that have come in as late as they have this year.

Mr. MacDonald (Milestone): — The open government!

Mr. Guy: — Yes, the open government! They are afraid to provide the returns with the answers to the questions that we have.

I should like to congratulate the Finance Minister on his performance the other day, he certainly presented that Budget with courage and distinction. I am sure that all Members in the House will agree with me on that.

Mr. MacLeod: — What about his tie?

Mr. Guy: — Oh, and his tie was excellent. But I can't help but feel a little sympathy for the Member from Biggar (Mr. Cowley). The Premier knew that this year there were going to be massive tax increases, so he sloughed the job off on our innocent friend from Biggar. You know I couldn't help but think that as I listened to the Budget Debate, that that red carnation that each one was wearing over there was very fitting to that Budget. I only wish that we had the time or had the money over here for ourselves and the people of Saskatchewan so we could have had a flower too. We would have had to take a blue one or a black one to show our feelings in regard to that Budget. Mr. Speaker, this was the first Budget Speech that I ever heard delivered from the third row. But after I heard it I knew it wasn't a speech that you would ever deliver from the front row. In fact it would have been better delivered from out in the corridor where the people of Saskatchewan couldn't have heard it.

I am not blaming that on my friend who delivered it, I am blaming it on the Premier who was the man who made the promises back in 1971 that he is now trying to keep. This is what really impressed me as I listened to the Minister of Finance, the

Minister of Health (Mr. Smishek), the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Messer) and the Minister of Labour (Mr. Snyder), they all wanted to stand on their feet and take some sort of credit for it being part of the New Democratic Party program. They said this was a commitment that we made to the people of Saskatchewan. They said it was a fulfilment of NDP promises and principles and that everything that was in that Budget has to be viewed in relationship to the 1971 platform and the record of accomplishment in 1972. Well, I'll tell you, Mr. Speaker, I am prepared to accept that at face value. I am sure that our Ministers opposite don't want to mislead the public or people of Saskatchewan. When they say that the things that this Budget has done for the people of Saskatchewan are in keeping with NDP philosophy and in keeping with the principles they proclaimed during the 1971 campaign, I am not going to contradict them because I am going to take a look at some of them. I hope the people of Saskatchewan will take a look at some of these, too.

First of all, I think, they had better take a look at the unemployment, because according to the Minister of Finance, if you take him at face value, he kept saying that he was proud and he was pleased to deliver this Budget. All right, if that is true, he is also proud and he is also pleased that there are 24,000 unemployed people in Saskatchewan today. This was the New Deal for People, that he said he was keeping as a commitment. He is proud of 24,000 people walking the streets with no jobs. I think he probably is because it was at the end of December that the Premier said that he was encouraged when there was a 3,000 increase in unemployment. I suppose you are far more encouraged today when there are 5,000 unemployed. That is right, he is encouraged when the unemployment rate is skyrocketing to 7 per cent, highest in the history of this province. That's the NDP commitment to the people of Saskatchewan. This is the New Deal for People that they are so proud of that they had to refer to it in the Budget Debate.

The Premier said he was glad that there are more employed today than there were a month ago. Yet a month later there are 12,000 less employed today than there was at the end of December. He is pleased about that. According to the Finance Minister and the Minister of Health who also referred to it, this is concrete action of the NDP Government to increase the unemployed in Saskatchewan as one of the priorities of the NDP Government. It was stated in their Budget.

We look through the Budget, and what is there to correct the situation. Nothing! The Student Employment Program was cut. The University of Saskatchewan construction was eliminated altogether, except for projects which are already under way. The Minister of Municipal Affairs today tried to tell us that there was a new great deal in winter works programs. Well, I'll admit that there are some winter works programs, but the municipalities are bearing the brunt of it. They are getting some benefits I don't deny it, but we all know the fact that they have to pay two-thirds of this Provincial-Municipal Winter Works Program which is going to increase the mill rate for every citizen in this province. They didn't tell us that today, but it is a fact. I am against a government that tries to put the responsibility on the municipalities when they should take it themselves and provide a program that is at least 75 per cent paid for by the Province of Saskatchewan, especially after they are the ones that have created the unemployment problem. But after all, you know, the Finance Minister says, this is the NDP program that we

February 15, 1973

are committed to, to provide unemployment to the people of Saskatchewan. It is a funny program, but I will tell you the people of Saskatchewan are not laughing about this program to provide unemployment. They are not laughing because the Premier is saying that he is encouraged as the unemployment rolls go up every month. Yes, the research officers and those who have gone on the public payroll probably think that it is not that bad a deal because it will keep them in business trying to solve a problem.

As I mentioned earlier we had the Minister of Industry (Mr. Thorson) trying to provide some insight into these brand new 1972 programs and he was going to add to the commitments that had been made in 1971. Do you know, Mr. Speaker, that there has not been one new industry in this province in 1972 and again the Finance Minister is proud of this fact. He said so in his Budget. He was proud that there is not one new development and this is the New Deal for People. The ones that have been mentioned in this Debate were all started under the Liberals, or else they were started as a minor expansion to existing plants. The Roumanians are still coming to Saskatchewan according to our friends opposite. We still haven't seen them, because they were here and they have gone. The reason they are not here today is because of the actions of the Government. They fought over the location of the plant, they fought over the DREE grants. The Premier said I don't agree with DREE grants. Now all of a sudden he wants one. Then, of course, the main thing that even for the Roumanians coming from over there was the investment climate provided by these socialists which was more than they could stomach.

We are going to have the same thing happen again. We heard the other day . . we were pleased to hear that Robin Hood was going to establish a plant in Saskatoon. We weren't surprised to hear the Minister of Industry say, 'as soon as I heard they were coming I sent my officials up there to talk to them'. That's the record of that Minister. Once somebody says they are coming, then he is ready to go and talk to them and take some political credit for them. He'll never go and bring them in. They come in spite of him.

But I am not sure that they'll come after all, because the Minister of Labour (Mr. Snyder) has been getting into the act. "Snyder asks company to reconsider decision." They get an industry and then one of the Ministers has to get into the act and say, "Why don't you come to Moose Jaw." If you are going to come, it is a wrong deal to go to Saskatoon. First of all Robin Hood are going to say, if we have got to put up with fighting with the Minister of Industry and fighting with the Minister of Labour, we can easily go to Winnipeg, Edmonton or Calgary. This is probably what they'll do before they are finished. "Snyder asks the company to reconsider decision," Who is the Minister of Labour to tell any company who has come in here without consulting the Provincial Government at all, where they should go. He tells them everything else. Mind you, he'll make it so difficult for them through his Labour Department that they will probably reconsider even without his comments regarding the location. This just shows that the Government opposite don't want industry in this province. They do everything they can to chase it away. I know there will be some who will say that the Minister from Moose Jaw was only doing this for political expediency. But there has to be a limit where political expediency starts and when it stops. When

it comes to either having an industry or not having an industry, why doesn't he keep his mouth shut and let the industry come in if it wants to come, instead of trying to chase it out.

Well, it is unfortunate that the NDP principles as outlined by the Minister of Finance all appear to be opposed to industry and the actions of the Minister of Labour and the Minister of Industry show it. We can show in this Budget that the only incentives to industry are through studies, through supervision and control. There is no incentive for an industry to help itself, it has either to give up some of its control to the Government or else there is not assistance for it. There is no stimulation of the economy, no new development program, or else the Minister surely today would have stood up and boasted about them as he has tried to do in the past, even when his material was very limited.

Then we turn to the oil industry and we have heard several comments. It is supposedly going to be a great thing to have our own Saskatchewan oil industry, our own Crown corporation. In fact the Premier, on an earlier occasion said, 'we are going to have an oil industry similar to the 1950s.' I had several phone calls from the people of Saskatchewan and they said, "We hope not." Because they recall the NDP companies that were set up, that received land at one cent an acre, that were quick buck artists who came in, took their bucks and then they left by night and the only people that received anything from that were the friends of the NDP. Surely to goodness we are not going to have a return of that situation. However, we know that this move into the oil industry is only an attempt to justify the resolutions of the NDP convention, the pressure of the Wafflers, and that this is the first step (as the Member from Saskatoon University — Mr. Richards said) and supported by the Member from Cutknife (Mr. Kwasnica), I might add, for the complete integration of the oil industry. The Member from Cutknife was also critical of the Liberal mineral incentive program. He said in 1969, you know what those dirty Liberals did — they spent \$2.2 million to get companies into this province. What he didn't say was what that \$2 million did. It created \$8 million of assessment work and exploration and prospecting. It resulted in Gulf Minerals, it resulted in the Matka Development and it resulted in several other developments which my friend (formerly from Prince Albert East — Mr. Berezowsky) was standing up and supporting to the hilt and I give him full credit for it, this summer, to try and get Studer Mines and National Nickel involved in a government program — but they received a deaf ear from our friends opposite.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Guy: — So they said, we've got the answer to the mineral development in the North. We don't like this \$2.2 million investment to get an \$8 million program and two or three mines. They said, we want to do it alone. We're going to put up big money — we're going to put up \$500,000 for a prospectors' assistance program. You know that's not going to generate any outside capital because anything they find and anything they stake will become the property of the Government and the Government will have to put up the money to develop it and they won't get into any agreement with private industry or private companies. That's the type of a program that they are going to foist upon the people of the North when they could have gone into a program similar to

February 15, 1973

the Liberal program that would have provided jobs, incentives and provided some investment in our North.

But the Finance Minister (Mr. Cowley) says, this is all part of the NDP philosophy. The decline in 1972 of mineral exploration in northern Saskatchewan is an NDP commitment to the people. Well I'll tell you that it's far different than the Liberal commitment which was to attract industry and create jobs.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Guy: — Then we come to taxation. Now I must say that the Minister of Finance must be proud — well he said he was proud, so I take his word for it. He was proud of the tax policy of this Government. The 'New Deal for People' is going to increase the taxes on our already overburdened taxpayers by \$38 million. He was proud of that. That's part of the commitment to Saskatchewan people. This is part of the New Deal. Even the Member from Saskatoon Centre (Mr. Robbins) said that he was proud of the deal where you increase the taxes by \$38 million. And you know, that's on top of \$16 million in the current year, giving you a \$52 million increase in two years. This is the new commitment of our Finance Minister to the people of Saskatchewan. This is the NDP 'New Deal for People'. All you have to do is turn to the page that shows the taxes that were collected last year and the taxes that are going to be estimated this year and you will find that there is a \$38 million increase. You may have to put on your glasses but they are there.

Then you know, the province was given a break by the Federal Liberals in Ottawa. They were given a three per cent break in income tax. And what did our Finance Minister do? I think actually it was the former Finance Minister who did it. He took that three per cent away from the people of Saskatchewan and then said, well we've already taken three per cent that the Federal Government gave you in relief of taxes, and put it on your back, now we want to match it. We want to put another three per cent on, so you can have a six per cent increase.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Guy: — After all, this is our philosophy and we want to do what is good for the people of Saskatchewan.

Mr. C.P. MacDonald: — We know how to spend your money.

Mr. Guy: — Yes, we know how to spend your money. We know what to do for you. Well I'll tell you, it's unfortunate, Mr. Speaker, that when they went to the people in 1971 they promised they were going to reduce the taxes. They said, we don't believe in this heavy taxation that you have been burdened with and yet in two years \$52 million in taxes has been added. This doesn't include fees and licences and a few of these others.

I had to laugh when the Minister of Health (Mr. Smishek) got up and he said, oh yes, I support this Budget because it's a commitment that we made in 1971. But did he tell you that he was going to reduce the Hospital and Medicare premiums to \$54 like he promised in the election campaign? Oh no! Today he says, no,

no, our program is to increase taxes, not reduce them, we made a mistake in 1971. Then did the Minister in charge of SGIO stand up here and say we are going to keep our promise that we made in 1971 to reduce the automobile premiums? No! The Attorney General (Mr. Romanow) last year increased them, even though he hated to admit it. Well I suspect that this year you are going to have an increase that even the Attorney General won't be able to quibble about and yet the Minister of Health got up and said, this is a commitment that we made to the people and we are going to keep it. We are not going to reduce the Health and Medicare premiums, we are not going to reduce the automobile insurance premiums because we made a commitment to the people that it's increased taxes we are going to give you. That's what the Finance Minister told us. Then the cigarette tax went up. Now the gas and oil royalties are going to go up. Then there is a threat from our dear friend from Estevan (Mr. Thorson) who has already threatened there will be an increase in the power and the gas rates. The estates tax was thrown on last year. This is all part of the New Deal for People under the commitments made, as according to the Finance Minister, by the NDP and the NDP Government.

Then there was a \$34 million liquor tax, an increase by \$4.3 million. He took credit for that. He said, 'this is part of our commitment to the people to get some more liquor taxes'. You know the Minister from the Power Corporation was speaking today, I thought he was going to say, I stood up in this House, with some of my colleagues prior to 1971, and we said, 'any government that would take revenues from the Crown corporations is deceitful'. We should provide the services of power and gas and telephones at the lowest possible rates and if there is any profit it should be returned to the people of the province. Now last year I gave the direct quotes — I'm not going to do it again this year — it's on the record. Everyone knows that the Premier, the Minister from Moose Jaw (Mr. Snyder) and the Minister of Health (Mr. Smishek) all made those promises before 1971. Now what have they done this year? They took \$21 million from the Crown corporations and that's another \$21 million of tax which they said they were going to eliminate if they became the government.

The Finance Minister said, "Oh, this is part of our commitment to the people of Saskatchewan. This is part of our program". The result is that we are the heaviest taxed people in Canada today, as a result of this New Deal for People.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

An Hon. Member: — Sounds like Ross Thatcher's speech of 1965.

Mr. Guy: — It may be Ross Thatcher's speech from 1965 but it's still applicable today when it concerns you people, I'll tell you that.

At least we made an attempt to lower the taxes when we were the government and we did lower them. I'll tell you, never in the history of any government has there been . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order, order!

Mr. Guy: — Oh! I'm sorry the Premier is leaving.

February 15, 1973

Well, you know, Mr. Speaker, the Finance Minister then said, 'we are proud of this Budget because it increases the number of people on welfare and the payments under the Saskatchewan assistance plan from \$35 million to \$51 million.' That was last year. They are going to increase it \$11 million more this year. This is the commitment to the people of Saskatchewan. We are going to get more people on welfare than we have ever had before in the history of this province and I'll tell you they have been amazingly successful in this regard.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Guy: — Yet, that's what the Finance Minister said. This is a Budget that keeps our promises and carries out the commitments to the people of Saskatchewan. Well, their commitment must be to have more people on welfare, pay out more welfare money than ever before in the history of this province and not only has he done it, but he is proud of it.

The Minister of Health is proud of it. He said, I agree with the Budget 100 per cent. So did the fellow from Saskatoon, the one who played Bingo up in Uranium City. He also agrees with this Budget. He said so the other day.

Mr. Rolfes: — You're a liar!

Mr. Guy: — Oh! Mr. Speaker, that's a term that I understand is very unparliamentary.

But this is the New Deal for People. Welfare in place of jobs. And I'll tell you why they like this. This is why the Member from Nutana Centre (Mr. Robbins) in Saskatoon likes it, because he was up there in the Athabasca election campaign and he found out that when people are on welfare they are subject to the threat — if you don't vote NDP we will cut off your welfare. That's why he's a little nervous. That's why he's a little nervous here tonight. They've also got 247 more happy little welfare workers running around the province selling the gospel. 247 in two years. Unbelievable. More people on welfare in the Province of Saskatchewan per capita than any province in Canada and the Minister of Finance says that's our commitment to Saskatchewan people. That's our commitment to the Saskatchewan people to get more people on welfare than any other province in Canada. They had a mandate to get more people on welfare than any other province in this country.

Well, I want to turn for a minute to education and I'm sorry that the Minister of Education (Mr. MacMurchy) has left, but I'm not surprised because he left this afternoon when my colleague from Milestone (Mr. MacDonald) spoke to him. Oh, he's in the galleries. Well I don't blame him for trying to get up there. Mind you, I'll say that there are a lot of people in the province that say that he should be going down rather than going up.

You know, this again is another reflection on an NDP commitment. Again the Finance Minister said, 'I am proud of this Budget that deals a mortal blow to the University of Saskatchewan — I'm proud of it. It's a commitment to the Province of Saskatchewan.' He said, I'm pleased that the fees are increasing from 10 to 15 per cent. This is another New Deal for university

students. He's pleased with the staff reduction which adds up to 81 in Saskatoon and 64 in Regina. He's pleased because it's 145 more unemployed and after all as I showed they have a commitment to increase the unemployed in this province. And he's doing it. He's doing it. And then he put a freeze on new construction and he criticized the Liberals when we didn't increase the construction budget by more than \$4 or \$5 million each year. Now they've cut it out altogether, because this is a commitment to the people at the university.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Guy: — And he also said I'm proud that 1972 was the worst year in the history of this province for teacher-trustee relationships. You know some of the 1972 agreements were not settled until October of this year. 1973 negotiations can't start because the Government is fooling around with the Minister of Education involved. You know I said last year, Mr. Speaker, that the Minister of Education was the worst Minister that this province had ever seen in that portfolio and I'll tell you that there is nothing that has happened in the last twelve months that has made me change my mind. In fact, there have been a lot of things happen that have shown that he is, without question, a man who has lost the support of teachers, trustees, parents, children and everybody concerned with education in this province and he should resign forthwith.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Guy: — I thought when he left his seat tonight that perhaps that's what he was doing and when the Premier left I thought they were getting together and he was going to submit his resignation. However, we can still hope for it because if there is ever one resignation that is deserved in the province today it's that of the Minister of Education. And I'll tell you, the Premier is not far behind him and after all he is the one who has been goading him into these actions and he should probably get up there and send his resignation in because I'm sure that we've got some people over here that would be prepared to take over where they leave off.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Guy: — The Minister of Education spoke for 45 minutes yesterday when everyone in this House and everyone in the province knows that one of the most complicated problems is that of coming to an agreement that will satisfy teachers, trustees, parents and children. He never even mentioned it — never even mentioned it. Instead he told us about a program that he is going to implement dealing with TV. What he didn't tell us was that neither the trustees or the teachers asked for this program. And because of that they are (the Province) is going to pay 100 per cent. You know this is the first program where the province has ever offered to pay 100 per cent. Usually they go to the teachers and the trustees and the school boards and they say we'll pay 50 per cent, we'll pay 60, we'll work out a formula. But now, without any consultation with trustees, teachers, school boards or anyone he says we are going to put in colored TV's and tapes in the school and we'll pay 100 per cent. You know why? You know why he is going to pay

February 15, 1973

100 per cent? Because he's afraid that the trustees and teachers may not want it, but he wants it because he made it very clear this last paragraph when he said:

The Department of Education will eventually produce original programming and establish an educational television system.

That's why they want it, they want to take over the control of every student's mind in this province through educational television.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Guy: — And the Finance Minister has already approved the Budget and says that's the New Deal for our Saskatchewan students. The fellow from Saskatoon South (Mr. Rolfes), who was a Bingo player in Uranium City and who wants to be the Education Minister, has a pretty good chance if he will just stick to his guns I think he will get it.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Guy: — Well, again, Mr. Speaker, this is a reflection upon the fact that the Finance Minister said, 'this is a program for Saskatchewan people.'

Now I should like to turn for just a minute to the municipalities and I'm sorry that my friend from Swift Current (Mr. Wood) isn't here tonight, because I'll tell you that if there is any disappointed group in this province that thinks they have been short-changed, it's the urban municipalities.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Guy: — We've got lots of proof — 'Budget disappoints Mayor of Regina'; 'Provincial Government Budget Criticized in Weyburn' and I would suspect that our Hon. Whip (Mr. Pepper) from the other side supports the council in Weyburn. I suspect that he does and if he does he can't agree with this New Deal for People that our Finance Minister has brought in for the urban municipalities. Regardless of what they try to tell us about taking the Liberal Homeowner Grant and using it for their own political convenience, which nobody will buy, they have made the poorest contribution to the urban municipalities at a time when their problems are increasing, than any government in this province has ever done. And yet our Finance Minister says, "This is our commitment to the municipal people of Saskatchewan. I'm proud of it and I am glad that we have treated them this way. I am pleased that this is part of our program, the NDP program".

Now the MLA for Regina North West (Mr. Whelan), he is missing tonight too, in fact, there is a lot of them missing over there. He is more concerned that they force a ward system upon the municipalities of Saskatoon and Regina than he is about giving them any assistance in their policing, in their snow removal and with some of the other problems that they have. The same can be said for the Saskatoon MLAs, I listened to them all. I listened to Wes Robbins (Saskatoon Nutana Centre), Herman Rolfes (Saskatoon Nutana South) and Bev Dyck (Saskatoon City Park), all of them,

not once did they mention the fact that the city of Saskatoon was being short-changed in this Budget. They were far more concerned about the ward system being involved where the NDP might make some political gains than they were about providing any financial incentives to the cities. I suspect that if the Member from Saskatoon Nutana becomes Education Minister, that it will be a very short stay in office because of his attitude towards the city of Saskatoon.

Now I should like to refer to some of the comments of the Minister of Highways and I see that he has left the House, I suppose he has got an auction . . he wouldn't have an auction at night would he? Oh he does, I noticed that the plane made several trips up there the day before his auction sales, but I didn't know that they were at night. Well, I will tell you, if there has ever been a sad situation in this House, Mr. Speaker, it has to be regarding the highways in this province. And again I have to refer to the Finance Minister and the NDP Members opposite, who said, we are proud of the highway program. What are they saying when they say they are proud of the highway program? They are proud and they are happy that the death rate on Saskatchewan's highways increased 25 per cent last year. The New Deal for Highways, has reduced the standards as enunciated by the Minister of Highways. His attitude to the highways of this province have made the situation far worse than it was this year. I want to quote some of the comments of our Hon. Minister of Highways (Mr. Kramer). It is unbelievable that a man of even limited intelligence would make the comment that he made to the press in North Battleford on January 19th and still say that he is a responsible Minister, concerned with the death rate on Saskatchewan highways. He says:

The province can build roads at \$45,000 a mile as opposed to \$70,000 and get by quite nicely.

Now anybody in his right mind knows if you are going to cut the construction costs in half, you are going to cut the quality of the highway in half. And this at a time when there is a 25 per cent increase in deaths on Saskatchewan highways. He said:

I want to go the economy route.

You will go the economy route all right and I hope your conscience will bear it.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Guy: — He said the travelling public could enjoy just as good a ride and be carried just as efficiently. I am glad he didn't say just as safely, Mr. Speaker. He said that while more people will be employed in patching and maintenance it would compare favorably to the extra cost involved in building a no-fault highway. He is prepared to patch the highways when we know that it is the patches on the patches that cause most of our accidents today. Yet he wants to start building a highway of patches. He is not even content with building a highway that has to be patched later on, he wants to build some patches on the patches. Mr. Kramer, mind you he was honest, when he said, and admitted there could be some failures in the proposal, especially when the public sees a maintenance crew patching a recently completed section. But he says it is a difference between patching and extra cost. It means a selling job has got to be done.

February 15, 1973

Now, Mr. Speaker, what he is trying to tell the people of Saskatchewan, we have got to sell them with the proposition, be prepared to die on our highways because we want to save some money and do some patching. That is the selling job that our Members opposite, the Premier included, are going to sell the people of Saskatchewan. It is better to die as long as we can save money on highway construction. I hope they will be able to live with their consciences when the accident rates continue to grow over the next few years. He says, we must build roads to suit the traffic now. Every province in Canada is building roads for the future as the automobiles become faster and more powerful and the campers and the trailers and the heavy trucks increase on our roads. Every province and every State in North America is building roads for the future and then all of a sudden we have got a Minister of Highways who wants to start building roads for the past and present. Doesn't he know the fact that there is no traffic on a road today is probably because the road is in such condition that you can't travel on it; Then he says, I want to build a road if there are only ten vehicles a day, that they can use because there are only going to be ten vehicles a day. They are going to put the pressure on the good highways we built and they are not going to build anything that will withstand what we know will be the increasing traffic. Then he said, we had a meeting the other day and Alberta wasn't present. I said, "I am not surprised when you consider there were three NDP provinces." But I know what Alberta was doing, they were home planning how to improve their highways. They know they are going to get all the traffic on their highways. The only people that will stay on the roads of Saskatchewan will be those who have to go through the province. They will go through the quickest, the straightest, the shortest road to get out of here before they get killed on our economy highways.

I will tell you, Mr. Speaker, that if the people of Saskatchewan tolerate this new attitude towards highways in this province, there won't be enough left of them in the next election to even vote for the NDP Government.

I have heard a lot of sad things in my life in this Legislature, but I will tell you the attitude of the Minister of Highways and the Government towards the safety factor on our highways is something that I never contemplated seeing or ever hearing in this House.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Guy: — And yet, Mr. Speaker, this was the program that the Finance Minister said he was proud. He was pleased with it. This is the commitment that we have made to the people of Saskatchewan, he said. We are going to build highways that will kill them as quickly as they can. This is the attitude, this is the commitment that our friends opposite have made to the people of Saskatchewan.

Well, at last I have come to a Minister that is in his seat, the Minister of the Environment (Mr. Byers). He made a great show the other night of what his Department has accomplished. The truth is that his Department has done nothing since its inception. The Qu'Appelle Study, the Saskatchewan-Nelson Study, the Souris Study, the Peace Athabasca Delta Study, the Athabasca Native Fisheries, were all started under the Liberal government and he knows it. He knows very well that that's the truth. He

also knows that for 20 years under the NDP, Saskatoon and Prince Albert put their raw sewage in the river and they never made any comments about that. It was the Liberal government that corrected that.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Guy: — You know it is true we didn't start the Churchill River Study, because we didn't intend to destroy it with power dams from one end to the other. I still say that their concern today is a death bed repentance. And I suggest further that extreme vigilance will still be necessary if we are going to save that river system, because, regardless of the study and regardless of setting up an economic advisory council, there is no assurance that the Government is going to listen to them. I just want to point out a precedent. We always hear about the NDP saying, an NDP in Saskatchewan is the same as an NDP in Ottawa, same as an NDP in B.C., same as an NDP in Manitoba — in other words an NDP is an NDP.

Mr. Blakeney: — Tell us about the Liberals.

Mr. Guy: — Yes, I will tell you a little bit about . . . I won't tell you about James Bay. I'll tell you what I will do. We are not comparing Liberals and NDP tonight, we are comparing NDP and NDP.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Guy: — All right, will the Minister of Finance stand on his feet and say that an NDP in Saskatchewan is different than an NDP in Manitoba?

Mr. Cowley: — Certainly.

Mr. Guy: — Ah! Listen to him in the back row, he says 'certainly' That is not what the Premier said on other occasions, an NDP is an NDP. And I want to tell you about the Premier of Manitoba.

An Hon. Member: — A Liberal is a Liberal.

Mr. Guy: — Yes, a Liberal is a Liberal and an NDP is an NDP. I want to tell you about the Premier of Manitoba. You have all heard about the Nelson Basin Study and the program there. Premier Schreyer says, "the Nelson project to go forward". This was in the face of tremendous pressure, he says. The Manitoba Government will press on with its billion dollar Nelson Study or development because the scheme benefits far outweigh any potential ecological damage. Mr. Schreyer said the need for additional power is the most important priority in days when a North American energy crisis is looming. Then he goes on to say it would be completely irresponsible for Manitoba to ignore the overwhelming evidence that shows the benefits (the economic benefits) far outweigh the disadvantages. Then you know, the NDP Government set up an environmental council in Manitoba, the same as our Minister did here in Saskatchewan. But does the Minister in Manitoba pay any attention to that council. Well I will tell you what it says:

February 15, 1973

The Manitoba Environmental Council set up less than a year by Environmental Minister Mr. Green to advise him on environmental matters, has come out against the Government's Churchill River diversion plan.

In reply to a letter to the council from vice-chairman, Ken Aranson, opposing the plan, Mr. Green said, he found it interesting that Council was concerning itself with the issue when the Government already had a firm policy on the Churchill River scheme. "I do not wish your Council" said the Minister in his letter, "to leave the impression with our invited guests and the public that the proceedings which you are taking are being taken at my initiative. I feel the council may be helpful to me in this program." I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that that is what is going to happen here in Saskatchewan. You can have all the councils you want, you can have the Power Corporation which has already spent hundreds of thousands of dollars putting the economic benefits ahead of anything that concerns the environment and I say again, the Members on this side of the House, the general public and those concerned with the environment will have to be more vigilant than ever. Mr. Whip do you want me to stop? I have about another three hours here but I'm being pressured from the back here as to . . . Oh, I know the Premier wants me to stop because I had a few things to say about him. I am only going to make a couple more comments.

I want to bring to the attention of this House first of all some of the examples of government bureaucracy, hirings, firings and so on. A lot of it has been covered and I don't want to repeat it. But there is one thing that I do want to bring to the attention of this House and that is the treatment of our long term civil servants who have done a good job over the years. They have been non-political, they have been efficient, they have worked for both governments. They are concerned with the public of this province and I want to bring to your attention the way they are being treated by this Government.

I have some returns, we haven't got them all yet because you know how they are when it comes to returns. But we did get some where I asked about Deputy Ministers and people like that. I have one here from the Department of Social Services. Deputy Minister, Mr. Sihvon, more than 30 years of government service and a typical example of what a good civil servant really is. You know what he is being paid today for these 30 years of dedicated service to the people of Saskatchewan, \$17,249 a year.

Mr. Snyder: — Nonsense!

Mr. Guy: — Well, you say nonsense. I have got the return right here. The question was, the salary of the Deputy Minister. The reply shows a salary of \$17,249.94. If your Minister is lying to this House, let him stand up and say so now. Let him stand . . .

Mr. Snyder: — What date?

Mr. Guy: — January 30, 1973, smart alec! All right?

Mr. Blakeney: — For what period? Is that for 12 months of the year?

Mr. Guy: — This is the rate of salaries.

It is the salary for the year of 1972.

Mr. Blakeney: — I don't believe it.

Mr. Guy: — All right, don't believe it.

Mr. Steuart: — . . make one up . . .

Mr. Blakeney: — I'm not reading it.

Mr. Guy: — All right! That's all right, we asked for the annual salary but it doesn't matter, as a similar comparison can be made for Mr. Beaudry, Deputy Provincial Secretary — \$17,000 for him; \$22,000 for Mr. Burton. We all know that John Burton is getting \$22,000. We all know what the . . Oh, no, this is the return that I got and I asked for the annual salary. This is the reply that I got.

Mr. Snyder: — You are comparing 1969.

Mr. Guy: — No, I am not, I am comparing 1972 with 1972. Yes, Sessional paper No. 144, Return 144. The intent of that question was the salary of that man who has been employed in that position. This is what I am given. I don't know whether they know what they are doing or not. All I want to say is, that it is regrettable that the Deputy Minister, like Mr. Beaudry, who is in the Provincial Secretary's office, are receiving \$17,000 for many years of service, when you have people who have come into the Department like Henry Campbell Gemmel, who is receiving \$23,000 as his salary. Surely to goodness a man who comes in for four months in a little department where there is only \$666,000 spent a year and 46 posts, shouldn't be paid \$23,000 when people who have been here for 30 years are receiving \$17,000. Well, I don't know but it is regrettable. These are the returns that were set out in this House and if they haven't been answered according to the question, that is not my fault.

Mr. Blakeney: — Would the Member quote the number of the returns.

Mr. Guy: — Return No. 144, 142, 126 and 128. And as I say, if these returns . . the questions were identically put on the Order Paper, if one return is given one way and one return the other, that is not our responsibility. We asked for the salaries on that basis and this is what we were given. That is all we can go by. We have trouble enough getting the returns let alone trying to understand them when we get them. And then we see Mr. Churchman getting \$22,500 and Mr. Towhill \$18,000 and all I am saying is the people who were here the longest and who have done their job are being treated the most shabbily by this Government. It is something that has created the lowest morale that our Civil Service has ever seen.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Guy: — The only other thing I want to say is related to these returns, and that is the contempt of our friends opposite for the people of this Legislature. Five returns ordered in March

February 15, 1973

of last year have not been presented to this House. The Attorney General, just a few days ago, waited for six days before he took a question and made it an order for return. Now he knew whether he had the answer or whether he didn't. The only reason he did it was to deliberately shorten the period of time in which we could get these answers. And I think the time has come when the people of this province should be made aware of the contempt that our friends opposite have to the whole democratic process. We look at the money going to Service Printing, we look at the return that we received where the Commonwealth received a great sum of money from the NDP for printing services. It all adds up to the contempt of this Government for the people of Saskatchewan and their elected representatives that is unparalleled in the history of this province.

I have a few things I wanted to say about the Department of Northern Saskatchewan but the Minister isn't here. In fact, it's almost remarkable, Mr. Speaker, that there is only one Minister in this House that hasn't spoken in this debate and that's the Minister of Northern Saskatchewan (Mr. Bowerman). Whether he is afraid to take up the challenge to some of the things that have been said about the department, whether he is afraid to explain the programs that he is going to be involved with, that we don't know.

Mr. Messer: — He'll be talking.

Mr. Guy: — Well, I hope he will because the time is running short, and if he doesn't get up soon he won't have time to say very much.

Well, Mr. Speaker, as you can obviously see, my appreciation of the Budget and what's in the best interests of the people of Saskatchewan doesn't agree with my friends opposite over there who believe that high taxes and death on the highways is part of their commitments and, therefore, I cannot support the Motion.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. J.A. Pepper (Weyburn): — Mr. Speaker, I find it very difficult to follow the act and the performance that just has been displayed by the Hon. Member from Athabasca but I am sure that most Members just consider where it comes from and I can assure him that we won't hold it against him.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Pepper: — However, Mr. Speaker, I hope that I can demonstrate a little better use of my time in presenting to you some of the programs that are being implemented in 1973 and the many ways that the Government is providing assistance to meet these programs by bringing forth this comprehensive and well-planned Budget.

Mr. Speaker, it is indeed a proud moment for me to be able to rise and speak in support of this Budget. At the outset I should like first to congratulate our Finance Minister (Mr. Cowley), the Hon. Member from Biggar for the excellent job that he did in delivering the Budget.

I should like to congratulate this Government on behalf of the residents of Weyburn constituency for the contents of it.

The Hon. Member for Albert Park (Mr. MacLeod) likes to refer to it as a Las Vegas Budget. However, Mr. Speaker, I assure him that the odds are much better insofar as this document is concerned because everyone becomes a winner.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Pepper: — Now, Mr. Speaker, this Budget can best be described as responsible. It clearly maps out the direction we, as a Government, will take in the months that lie ahead. Our priorities are clearly defined and I am confident that when this fiscal year concludes, this Government will have honored many more of the election pledges which were made to the people of Saskatchewan during the last election campaign. Already we have noted an encouraging upswing in the economy. While we cannot take all the credit for this, Mr. Speaker, I sincerely believe that many of the economic improvements which have been taking place over the past year may be directly linked to the policies and the programs of this New Democratic Government.

The recent optimism in the agricultural sector clearly reflects this confidence. I agree that much of this confidence is the result of a high volume of grain sales recently and I congratulate the Canadian Wheat Board for their recent efforts. However, while the Wheat Board has shown increased initiative, it has been the foresight and the action of this Provincial Government which has come forward with the necessary support programs that assist the family farmer in his time of need.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Pepper: — Now, Mr. Speaker, this Budget bears out this claim. I am sure we shall remember the negative statements made about the Land Bank program. Critics continually claim that it is a bad program, a program which the people of Saskatchewan will never accept. Mr. Speaker, this disinterest is remarkable because so far the program has attracted well over 350 offers to sell. Activity has been tremendous with officials, at times, unable to keep pace with the individual inquiries which are made by farmers across the province. That is why I was pleased, Mr. Speaker, that this Government set aside an additional \$20 million for land purchases this year. The program does have the support of the people. The program is working and will, I am sure, go a long way towards solving many of the serious land tenure problems which farmers have been faced with in years previous.

Any comprehensive agriculture program must include provisions to encourage farmers to diversify and build up their individual farm units. Our Government recognizes this need by providing \$2 million for grants under an agricultural development program and encouraging livestock production. Individual farmers will be eligible for grants ranging from \$200 to \$8,000 under this program.

Another is \$15 million for a new loan program under the title FarmStart. This will be welcomed by farmers in the province. Low interest loans to our younger farmers to encourage

February 15, 1973

diversification into livestock shows clearly where this Government stands when it comes to our family farmers in Saskatchewan.

I am also very pleased that our Government is encouraging a greater emphasis towards secondary industry, particularly as it relates to processing. For too long we have been satisfied to produce and to export our primary produce and then buy it back in the finished form. I say, Mr. Speaker, it is vital and accepted by this Government that this cycle should be changed in order to give farmers a greater input into the total agricultural economy.

I was also very pleased with our Government's fulfilment of its election pledge to shift school taxes away from property so that mill rates would average 25 mills on homes and farms and small businesses.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Pepper: — By substantially increasing Property Improvement Grants to effect an 18 mill reduction in taxes we fulfilled a commitment which literally affects every citizen of this province, either directly or indirectly. Farmers will receive up to \$270. Small businessmen are now eligible for grants up to \$180. And householders will now receive up to \$144. Mr. Speaker, these increased grants are indeed welcomed and just another indication that our Government delivers when it makes a promise to the people of this province.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Pepper: — Mr. Speaker, I should like also to make a few comments in regard to the Budget commitments in the field of transportation. Over the years, due to the unique structure of our province, governments, through necessity have had to commit huge sums of money towards road construction. In the process, we've built up a transportation system which annually becomes more expensive to maintain. These costs hit especially hard on the municipalities and local governments. As a Government committed to strengthening and preserving the rural society, it is only natural that we should provide assistance to these municipalities wishing to maintain these roadways. Mr. Speaker, "Operation Main Street" and "Operation Open Roads" are good programs and programs which every Member of this Assembly, I am sure, endorses wholeheartedly. Too often we have seen our highway program used as an election gimmick to attract votes. A very good example of this was witnessed in the Weyburn constituency. One particular stretch of highway, Highway 28, continually was used as a political issue at the expense of the very people who year in and year out had to battle this stretch of road dodging pothole after pothole. Just before the 1967 election and again just before the 1971 election we had the former Liberal Government telling everyone who would listen that right after the election the rebuilding would begin. But, Mr. Speaker, these promises were nothing more than just that. It took a change in Government to get action. And I am happy to report that this road has now been rebuilt along with resurfacing of the road between Ceylon to Radville. Another promise made but with a difference, the promise was kept.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Pepper: — I should also like to mention another important development which has taken place within my constituency. As a Government we have always said that we would be bringing in the types of programs which would assist all of our communities, programs which would make these towns and villages attractive places to live. Our natural gas extension program is just another example. I am sure I speak on behalf of all the residents in the centres of Radville and Ceylon and adjacent area there when I thank this Government for assisting these two towns in getting this service installed.

Yes, Mr. Speaker, this Budget recognizes and encourages the youth of our province to become involved with our society. Too often our young people are overlooked and oftentimes credit is not given when credit is due. I am particularly pleased with the attention this Government gives to individuals or teams which excel in their specific fields.

We have heard several speakers mention the summer games held in Moose Jaw. I want, at this time, to congratulate the Weyburn Sportsman Club who were successful in capturing the silver medal in competition which was very keen. Several other athletes were also successful from the Weyburn constituency and to them I should also like to offer congratulations on behalf of this Assembly.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Pepper: — Mr. Speaker, I am sure that many Members of this House are unaware of the achievements of another team from the city of Weyburn, a team which this summer gained national prominence in the field of Senior A Softball. Weyburn has always boasted a fine team, the Weyburn Molson Canadians. But in years past they were unable to capture any provincial championship. But this was changed this past summer when the Weyburn Canadians breezed through the provincial championships undefeated. They represented the Province of Saskatchewan in the Dominion finals in Edmonton and when the 12-team event concluded Saskatchewan, represented by Weyburn, brought back the Canadian championship to this province.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Pepper: — And I should like to mention Mr. Speaker, that the remarkable thing about it was that our softball team took on tremendous odds in capturing first place. They played Ontario in the championship final, winning 2-0. Ontario was represented by Richmond Hill, just outside of Toronto. This team, Richmond Hill, just once earlier had captured the World Championship at a 47-nation tournament in Manila.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Pepper: — I am sure that all Members wish to join in congratulating the Weyburn Molson Canadians for their fine efforts on behalf of this province and we wish them well when they defend their title in the coming year.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

February 15, 1973

Mr. Pepper: — Mr. Speaker, another important issue dealt with in this Budget revolves around the senior citizens. The Province of Saskatchewan has a higher percentage of senior citizens than any other province in Canada and about 60 per cent of these have no other source of income than their minimal pension of \$150 per month. Mr. Speaker, any Government which does not take the steps necessary to provide the services and assistance necessary to allow these senior citizens to enjoy their remaining years in dignity and comfort does not deserve to be given the reins of power.

I am proud, Mr. Speaker, of the progress this Government has made in the short time it has been in power and this latest Budget is just another indication that we in the New Democratic Party put people first.

In the housing field this Government's decision to institute a program to assist senior citizens in repairing their homes is a good program. I am sure these people will now be able to improve their dwellings with the help of these grants of up to \$500. Another expenditure in the Budget involves the direct payment to people in Level III care homes of \$144 per month. In addition, \$54 per month will be paid directly to people in Level II care homes.

Now add to this our hearing aid program, along with the other programs previously dealt with by this Assembly, I am sure, Mr. Speaker, that we get the clear picture, the clear picture that this Government has a concern for people, a concern which almost daily is reflected in the Legislative course that we follow.

Mr. Speaker, when the people elected this Government, they did so because we, on this side of the House, promised to do things differently.

In the areas of agriculture, health, education, labor, resource development and others we said we did not agree with the direction which this province was taking. The people responded to our philosophy, the signified support for the policies of the New Democratic Party and the results, Mr. Speaker, speak for themselves.

In closing, I urge Members opposite to accept the results, reassess their position and join forces with Members on this side of the House in helping to build the type of programs which the people want and expect. Might I remind them, Mr. Speaker, nothing is gained by playing politics especially when the stakes are people.

Our Legislative program is a good one. I sincerely believe that Members opposite inwardly feel the same way, but yet due to party pressures find it necessary to oppose for the sake of opposing.

I again challenge the Opposition to be constructive. This Government does not have all the answers. We admit and we accept that, however, let me remind you that we feel our course is closer to the needs of the people than the course plotted between 1964 and 1971.

In conclusion, I again repeat my support for this Budget.

I find that the people of Saskatchewan are also in agreement with our programs. It is obvious, Mr. Speaker, that I will be supporting the motion.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. E.F. Gardner (Moosomin): — Mr. Speaker, I am sure that the Members opposite will be disappointed to learn that I am not going to speak tonight on the Land Bank, however, I should like to correct one statement made by the Hon. Member from Weyburn (Mr. Pepper). I believe, he said, that the Land Bank had attracted 350 offers to sell.

Now we know that it is a disaster but I don't think that it is that bad. I am sure that the Member would like to correct this if he takes a look at the record. I am sure that it is substantially more than 350.

Mr. Speaker, when the Finance Minister (Mr. Cowley) delivered his Budget speech last week, those of us who are interested in agriculture were watching very closely. And we were watching very closely because past experience with the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Messer) indicated that his actions needed to be watched very closely. We had hoped to see some worthwhile assistance for this basic industry. It was not there. I suppose we should not be too surprised.

At the time we read the Budget speech we were puzzled by the reference to irrigation. This was an unusual situation because we didn't know then that the Minister of Agriculture was about to kill this great program. It was difficult to understand why he had bothered to mention a hay cubing plant, which of course, is a relatively unimportant development. It is apparent now that he was merely preparing us for the blow that was soon to fall. But this example was typical of the Budget.

The Budget was noted for vague references to imaginary programs, flowery phrases, misleading and deceitful examples and tables, huge increases in the number of civil servants, but nothing for the taxpayer except for the privilege of paying some more taxes.

Other speakers have, and will be going into detail on the disaster at Outlook. But I should like to emphasize one or two points.

The Minister said that getting started in irrigation is expensive and, of course, we agree. It was expensive in Alberta, California, Arizona and other places that now have successful irrigation programs. It takes time to develop the skills, the canals, the equipment, the auxiliary industries and the markets. Alberta, many years ago, faced a situation we are facing today. They, too, had their doubts about irrigation but they had men of vision and determination and they now have a prosperous irrigation economy. We know that it takes research, it takes money and it takes imagination. The Minister has demonstrated a deplorable lack of foresight in cancelling this great project.

The Minister must be aware that in stopping the work on the west side he is putting the kiss of death on present development on the east side. A successful irrigation project should be of sufficient total size to attract auxiliary enterprises such as

February 15, 1973

canneries or sugar beet plants. The Minister gave us a figure of \$400 per acre to prepare land for irrigation. I don't know where he got this figure because it is, of course, substantially less than this. He must have included the \$100 million plus, that it cost to build the dam, in the figures for preparing the land for irrigation.

Technical advisers and research facilities cannot be maintained for the small east side project and I am sure the Minister is aware of this. If the east side farmers find themselves in difficulties in the future it will be largely due to the action of agriculture Minister Messer in shutting down the west side works.

A wave of pessimism and depression is sweeping over the irrigation community in our province and the Minister of Agriculture is responsible. The entire area has planned for years on the development of an irrigation economy. People have changed their residence, they have changed their way of life, they have invested their money because they believed in the future of irrigation in the Outlook area.

They had faith in the future of irrigation, but apparently the Minister of Agriculture and his Department did not. They have pulled the rug out from under them by cancelling the project. I am sure that everyone knows that there is a vast difference between dry land farming and irrigation farming.

Irrigation is an intensive type of farming as opposed to the extensive dry land farming type. Those who did not choose intensive farming have sold their land over the past ten years because they were promised that irrigation was coming. Others who wanted to farm this way moved in and acquired land. Both groups believed that all governments would honor commitments to go ahead with irrigation plans. No one ever dreamed that a government, or an Agriculture Minister, would ever come along and scuttle the program that so many had worked so hard to initiate.

The Minister's order means that the great canals and reservoirs will be abandoned. To future travellers it will look like the remains of some ancient civilization in this vast area. People may well wander among these ruins of the irrigation works and they could well be known as Messer's folly.

The agriculture portion of the Budget, Mr. Speaker, contained many amazing items if you look at it closely. We see, for example, that it is going to take over \$1 million for the operation of the Land Bank and \$20 million is allotted to buy the land. Now if they spend \$20 million on the land, and I believe they will and perhaps more, and if they lease it out at 5 per cent and if everybody pays the rent, they will get \$1 million back.

Now I suppose to a socialist this sounds like good business. All the rent money that you get in and more besides is going to be used to administer the plan. Nobody is left to pay interest on the \$20 million that has been invested to buy the land. The taxpayer is again going to be stuck to pay for another inefficient NDP scheme.

We note also in the Estimates an item of \$60,000 for payment of taxes of cancelled leases on provincial lands. Now at a tax rate of a little over \$1 per acre this means they are expecting to pay the taxes, next year, on about 50,000 acres. This is a

pretty sad commentary on a land lease scheme when you expect such a failure rate that 50,000 acres would be in default in one year.

We note also that \$144,000 has been budgeted to look into grain handling and transportation facilities. \$144,000, Mr. Speaker, to rehash a few studies that have been done and redone over the years by the Federal Government, the Wheat Pool and other agencies. I can guarantee that the farmer will get little benefit from this \$144,000.

But what about some of the worthwhile agricultural programs? \$500,000 last year for payments to hog producers, nothing this year. In the C and D Branch \$127,000 this year, \$54,000 next year; in the forage development \$328,000 this year, \$61,400 next year; community pasture development \$960,000 this year, \$780,000 next year; flood control and drainage \$1,300,000 this year, \$930,000 next year. Many other items in the Budget of a similar nature. Total for agricultural earned assistance \$516,000 last year, \$184,000 budgeted for next year. Programs to help the farmers slashed in many branches, but lots of money available for the Land Bank to grab the farmers' land for the socialist state.

Mr. Speaker, I will, of course, be voting against the Budget. A number of Government backbenchers have wondered why we would vote against it and they have said so in this debate. So I should like to tell them.

I am voting against a Budget that destroys the irrigation program on the South Saskatchewan River. This alone would be enough to cause me to vote against the Budget. I will vote against a Budget that curtails needed programs in agriculture and I have listed many of them in this speech. A Budget that will hire over 450 civil servants that are not required in many, many instances. And a substantial number of these people hired will be hired not on the basis of merit, Mr. Speaker, but merely because they have been active NDP supporters. I am voting against a Budget that fails to recognize the need for assistance in cleaning up the Qu'Appelle Basin. The cities of Regina and Moose Jaw face huge expenditures for sewage treatment. No help is forecast in the Budget.

The NDP Government are apparently prepared to put pollution before people. It is a Budget, Mr. Speaker, that squeezes another \$25 million in income taxes out of the hard-pressed working people of this province. I am voting against a Budget that further threatens the business community. It is a Budget that takes absolutely no notice of the fact that we have one of the highest rates of unemployment in our history. For these and other reasons, Mr. Speaker, I will be opposing the Budget.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. D.W. Cody (Watrous): — Mr. Speaker, I must say that I am pleased and proud to take part in this Budget debate. I am proud because I am identified with the Budget and I am pleased because of the assistance and benefits that will be derived for the people of Watrous constituency. I congratulate my friend and colleague the Hon. Elwood Cowley for the thought and judgement he put into this document. It goes without saying that the people of the Biggar constituency can be proud to have sent a man like Elwood Cowley to this House.

February 15, 1973

Mr. Speaker, I just want for one moment before I get into my main remarks, to say a few words about what the Member for Athabasca (Mr. Guy) said. He's gone, as usual. Mr. Speaker, he said previously that the Minister of Industry and Commerce (Mr. Thorson) didn't even as much as make a move towards going to meet the Robin Hood Mill people when they were trying to locate in Saskatoon. Well, I'm sure if the Hon. Member from Athabasca had been the Minister, he would have probably gone out to Sherwood Forest to find Robin Hood Mills. That's about the place he would go. Another thing he was saying, talking about the Member from Saskatoon University (Mr. Richards) saying that the Wafflers were pushing us towards the oil industry, they were pushing us towards socializing the potash mines, and who knows what. Well, I can tell the Hon. Member and the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Steuart) that 171 and the Wafflers of the Liberals have moved into town today. I understand that Mr. Leith moved to town today. He was to have told people in the corridors, "I'm coming to watch Davie and the boys to see that they don't do the wrong thing." Mr. Speaker, another comment he made, when speaking about the highways program; the Member said, "The worst thing I have ever heard/in this House was this highway program." Well, Mr. Speaker, the worst thing I have ever heard in this House was the day that you had to say that the Hon. Member was able to take his seat.

Mr. Speaker, this Budget, as I see it, will go down in history as one of the great ones. It is a record Budget. This province will have some \$723 million in expenditures. To see the significance of this Budget one must analyze carefully the various programs that it contains. This Budget extends assistance to all facets of our economy such as a substantial increase in agriculture, expansion of the Land Bank program, FarmStart and others. A \$10 million increase in grants to school boards; additional funds to industry and commerce, continuous expansion to the highway program; \$1.35 million earmarked for Operation Open Roads; \$756,000 for Operation Main Street; expanded health care programs, chiropractic care; hearing aids at greatly reduced prices; a new program of grants to our senior citizens for housing and house repairs up to \$500.

Mr. Speaker, I think the most significant area in this Budget is the increase in Property Improvement Grants to where our promise to shift school taxes away from property has been fulfilled. This increase in grant payments will put thousands of dollars into the homeowners' hands, farmers' hands and in the businessmen's hands in my constituency. Mr. Speaker, Liberals would like to take credit for instituting the homeowner program. Well, if that's the case, let them have that credit. But let's check the record and see where they stand and see what their performance was when they instituted the program. 1966 — grant \$50, homeowners only; if you didn't live in your home, nothing; if you didn't live on a farm and rented a home, nothing; if you had a business, nothing. In 1967 no increase. In 1968, no increase. In 1969, no increase. In 1970, Mr. Speaker, an election is rolling around, a \$10 increase, homeowners only, you must live in your home. If you are a farmer living in a rented house, no grant. If you are a businessman, no grant. In 1971, a \$10 increase.

Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Member from Albert Park (Mr. MacLeod) who isn't in his seat at this time, said that this is a stand pat Budget. If I have ever seen a stand pat government, it was the former Liberal Government.

Property Improvement Grants did not increase more than \$20 in five successive years. Of course, why should it change? Who was the Treasurer at the time? None other, Mr. Speaker, than the Hon. Member from Prince Albert West (Mr. Steuart). What is the record of the New Democrats? 1972 — Property Improvement Grant to homeowners \$78, businessmen \$130, farmers \$195; 1973 — homeowners \$144, businessmen \$180, farmers \$270. Mr. Speaker, two increases in two successive years and the Member from Albert Park (Mr. MacLeod) has the audacity to say this is a stand pat Budget.

Mr. Speaker, this is what I call action by a government that cares, a government that cares about farmers. A government that cares about businessmen; a government which cares about homeowners.

I want for a moment, Mr. Speaker, to turn to agriculture, which we all know is still our basic industry in this province. The Budget earmarks \$20 million for purchase of land by the Land Bank Commission, an increase of \$10 million from last year.

Mr. Speaker, last year the Opposition said, “What can you buy with \$10 million. This won’t go very far.” Let me quote from the Debates and Proceedings of last year, page 1954, the Hon. Member from Morse (Mr. Wiebe) said:

Another drawback is the fact that only \$10 million has been allocated for the purpose of buying the land. While it sounds like a lot of money, in a province of this size and the average age of present farmers, this money will not go very far.

Mr. Speaker, that was last year. What did they say this year, when we increased it to \$20 million. He says the same as the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Steuart) says, “This is a land grab scheme. You want to buy up all the land. You are chasing the farmers from the land. Soon the Government will own all the land.” Mr. Speaker, the Opposition can’t have it both ways, either we are not going to buy very much or we are going to buy it all. Which do they say we are going to do?

Mr. Speaker, the Leader of the Opposition and the Liberal Party of this province have been against the implementation of every major program introduced by the CCF and now the New Democrats. They were opposed to compulsory auto insurance; they were opposed to the larger school units; they were opposed to hospitalization and they were opposed to medical care. Mr. Speaker, the people of Saskatchewan won’t forget the opposition to the medicare program. They won’t forget the Opposition today, Mr. Speaker. They stand against the Land Bank and they stand opposed to the Hog Marketing Commission. Mr. Speaker, two more programs which the Liberal Party in this province stand opposed to. The only thing, Mr. Speaker, as the Member from Biggar (Mr. Cowley)said, the only thing that the Liberal Party stands for and what they have ever been consistent on is to be negative. That is the only thing where they have been consistent.

Mr. Speaker, the Budget also contains \$2 million for grants to encourage livestock production. Individual farmers who qualify will be eligible for grants from \$200 to \$8,000. \$15 million for a new loan program called FarmStart. This program will allow young farmers to diversify and they will be able to obtain up to \$60,000 in loans. Mr. Speaker, this program will

February 15, 1973

allow young farmers to diversify and they will be able to obtain up to \$60,000 in loans. Mr. Speaker, this program will once again put Saskatchewan in front for giving aid to our young farmers and another promise fulfilled.

There are many more programs, Mr. Speaker, that one could mention in agriculture such as \$680,000 for water supplies; \$720,000 to improve grazing capacity on leased lands; \$34,000 for the Agricultural Implements Board to review complaints for implement parts which are not available. Mr. Speaker, this is the largest slice the Department of Agriculture has ever received in the history of this province. But let me say, Mr. Speaker, we in Saskatchewan can't do it alone. We need some help from Ottawa. But do we get any help from Otto Lang? No, we don't get any help from Otto Lang. Just let me turn to the Leader-Post of this evening, what does it say. The Leader Post, February 15th, and if the Hon. Member for Lumsden (Mr. Lane) and the supposed highway critic (Mr. Wiebe) could listen for a moment I will quote from this Leader-Post:

Lang defends Government wheat selling job. It is the lowest price for wheat in five years since Mr. Lang took office. Since 1968 when farmers made \$1.81 a bushel, prices have dropped to \$1.70, \$1.68, \$1.67 and finally last year to \$1.58.

Mr. Speaker, would you believe Otto Lang received the prize for being the salesman of the year? Well, Mr. Speaker, who couldn't be the salesman of the year when you are selling a product at 50 cents or 60 cents lower than what the going rate is. We sold our wheat in this province at the expense of the American producers. Mr. Speaker, it is just about time that we rid ourselves of the Liberals in Saskatchewan and the Liberals in Ottawa.

Mr. Speaker, in the area of resource development, I am pleased to see the acceleration in the reforestation program for our northern forests. This will not only put our forests in good shape, but will also give jobs to many hundreds of Indian and Métis. Jobs, Mr. Speaker, which they were not able to get from Simpson Timber Company. Jobs they were not able to get from the Prince Albert Pulp Mill.

Mr. Speaker, the \$500,000 earmarked for mineral investigation, as well as a new Crown corporation, seems to be a real problem to the Opposition and especially to the Member from Whitmore Park (Mr. Grant). He said the other day:

You shouldn't be interfering with the oil corporations.

You shouldn't be interfering with private enterprise.

You should be giving them incentives so that they can develop and the Government should stay out of business.

That's right the Hon. Member would like us to give our resources away.

Let me ask the Member from Whitmore Park if he thought the oil companies deserved incentives when they closed the refinery in Saskatoon, when they closed the refinery in Moose Jaw; Does he think they deserve an incentive when they put up the price of gas in spite of making millions of dollars profit? Mr. Speaker, I certainly wouldn't hope that a responsible Member in this House would think that is the kind of deal we should give to the corporations. But I guess if you are a Liberal and I guess if you are from Whitmore Park that's the way you have to talk.

Mr. Speaker, let me turn for a moment to an area which appears to be receiving a tremendous amount of criticism, that of the personal income tax increase and the corporation tax increase. Mr. Speaker, since we have come to office 18 months ago, the only increases in taxation which I am aware of is the three per cent income tax on Federal tax payable and one per cent on the corporation taxes and a minute tax on tobacco. As one Member over there said the other day, if you want to call it a tax, increase in licences last year for new cars. The other day the Hon. Member from Athabasca (Mr. Guy) said, "At least we made an attempt to reduce taxes." Let's look at their record, Mr. Speaker, particularly Black Friday. I am sure everybody in this province remembers Black Friday. Mr. Speaker, this is the Liberal record.

A sickness tax was introduced at a cost of \$7.4 million. Education tax \$12.3 million. Gasoline Tax \$7.9 million. Motor Licence Tax \$2.3 million. Tobacco tax \$1.8 million. Insurance tax \$.5 million. Pari-mutuel tax \$.2 million. A grand total, Mr. Speaker of \$32.4 million of tax increases on Black Friday. This was an increase, Mr. Speaker, of \$34 for every man, woman and child at that particular time. And then what do we hear? We hear the Member from Whitmore Park (Mr. Grant) and the Member for Prince Albert West (Mr. Steuart) and the skier from Lumsden (Mr. Lane), saying that we are the people who know how to increase taxes. Mr. Speaker, the people of this province in 1971 didn't forget Black Friday and they won't forget Black Friday as long as you people are around.

I took the time, Mr. Speaker, just to have a look at who actually voted for this Black Friday budget. Nine of them are left out of 35. That's what the people of this province thought, that's what the people of this province said when they brought in a budget like that with massive increases in taxation. Mr. Speaker, for the record I just want to read into the record who these men are. Who are they over there? The Member from Prince Albert West (Mr. Steuart) tops the list. The Member from Wilkie (Mr. McIsaac); the Member from Athabasca (Mr. Guy); the Member from Rosetown (Mr. Loken); the Member from Whitmore Park (Mr. Grant). I wouldn't have expected a man like the Member from Whitmore Park to vote for increases of taxation of that nature. The Member from Milestone (Mr. MacDonald); the Member from Cannington (Mr. Weatherald); the Member from Meadow Lake (Mr. Coupland). The only reason the Member from Meadow Lake voted for it was because he knew the taxes were going to be taken off of turkey saddles.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Cody: — Mr. Speaker, the last Member, the Member from Regina Lakeview (Mr. MacPherson).

Mr. Speaker, you know that wasn't bad enough in 1968. By the time the Liberal Government had left office in 1971 they had increased 1,466 taxes in this province not mentioning Black Friday. Then the Member from Morse (Mr. Wiebe), the Member from Lumsden (Mr. Lane) and the Member from Athabasca (Mr. Guy) had the audacity to say that we know how to increase taxes.

Mr. Speaker, in 1971 we went to the people of this province with a program. We promised there would be a shift in taxation away from property owners. Under this Budget it has been done.

February 15, 1973

We promised to increase school grants. Under this Budget it has been done. We promised aid to senior citizens. In this Budget it has been done, Mr. Speaker. We promised to extend health care. In this Budget it has been done. We promised to give assistance to university students. In this Budget it has been done. We promised to expand the tourist industry. In this Budget it has been done. And, above all, Mr. Speaker, we promised programs to maintain rural Saskatchewan. In this Budget we have made great and significant strides to achieve this goal. Mr. Speaker, this is a Budget which implements our program. This is a Budget which keeps faith with the people of Saskatchewan and for that very reason, Mr. Speaker, I am most pleased and happy to support this motion and vote against the amendment.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. M. Feschuk (Prince Albert East): — Mr. Speaker, I want to join with others in congratulating the Minister of Finance, the Hon. Elwood Cowley, on the making and presenting of a Budget that lends itself to the betterment of rural Saskatchewan and to the economy of Saskatchewan as a whole.

Never before have we had as we do in this Budget, the opportunity to bring in and emphasize programs designed to increase economic activity in this province. A constituency such as Prince Albert East, that has such a wide range of diversity, no doubt will receive many benefits of this Budget.

Mr. Speaker, rather than deal directly with the Budget, I should like to express, on behalf of the people of Prince Albert East, my appreciation to this Government for the many things that were accomplished in our term of office and recognize the commitments made for 1973 for my constituency.

Mr. Speaker, Prince Albert East constituency is one of those constituencies that has only one small hospital located at Smeaton. This hospital serves a large area, above all, to the north, the nearest hospital is at Flin Flon, Manitoba, over 230 miles. Yet, on the first of April, 1971 the former Liberal administration saw fit to close this Smeaton hospital. They closed this hospital knowing that during the summer season hundreds and thousands of people travel on the Hanson Lake Road. They closed this hospital knowing that north of Smeaton there were people working in our forest, cutting pulpwood, power poles, trapping and people who provide services along the Hanson Lake Road. Yet the Liberal administration closed that hospital to their everlasting shame and disgrace.

On behalf of these people I want to thank this Government for opening the Smeaton Hospital again. I want to say that I am happy that the Smeaton Union Hospital is again serving the vital role in emergency cases, and a vital role in the health needs of that community and area.

In the area of Choiceland where the farmers tried desperately to build and operate an Alfalfa Dehydrating Plant, the former Liberal Government charged them \$50,000 towards the capital cost of the gas line. Surely this unnecessary burden and inconsiderate gesture made it impossible for them to operate after paying the costly installation of gas and power. I am happy to see that with the help of this Government they have

overcome this problem.

Mr. Speaker, the settlement of Deschambault Lake was isolated for many years. This is a settlement of some 200 or 300 people. Some Members in this House will recall when my predecessor, W.J. Berezowsky, appealed to the Liberal Government opposite for seven years to build a road from the Hanson Lake Road to the settlement — a short distance of 18 miles. For seven years the Liberal Government denied the people of Deschambault Lake a road to the generally settled areas of Saskatchewan.

Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the Hon. Minister of the Department of Northern Saskatchewan (Mr. Bowerman) who upon taking office immediately approved the building of a road to the Deschambault Lake settlement. I commend the Department of Northern Saskatchewan for building the connecting road from Choiceland to the Hanson Lake Road and for taking the necessary steps to move the village of Molonosa to Weyakwin Lake and in providing for these people some decent housing, power and an opportunity for employment.

Mr. Speaker, during this season the constituency of Prince Albert East is benefiting from several winter works projects. The total man days of these projects amounts to 7,914. I want to congratulate this Government for making these projects possible. I congratulate this Government for making this employment possible.

Mr. Speaker, in the constituency of Prince Albert East, we have a community and a village of Paddockwood. The Member who represented them and the people of Paddockwood and district appealed to the Liberal Government during their term of office to improve the condition of their main road to the No. 2 Highway. They presented briefs, they presented petitions to the former Liberal administration, but like many other people in the Prince Albert East area constituency they were completely ignored.

Another example, Mr. Speaker, of the arrogance of the former Liberal Government was when the people of Creighton and Denare Beach appealed to the then Minister of Highways, the Hon. Member from Rosthern (Mr. Boldt) for a short distance of 10 miles of dust-free road. They appealed to the Liberal Government, but they were totally ignored.

Mr. Speaker, when the New Democrats formed the government of this province, I first spoke to the Minister of Highways, the Hon. Neil Byers and I told him about Paddockwood, Creighton, Denare Beach. I have mentioned these problems to the Hon. Eiling Kramer, these Hon. Ministers didn't require petitions, no, Mr. Speaker, this Government recognized the problems and announced a program of Operation Open Roads and Operation Main Street. I am happy to say that last summer the road from the north side of Paddockwood was oiled, the main street of Paddockwood was oiled as well. And for 1973, I am happy to know that Villages such as Albertville, Meath Park, Weirdale, Foxford, Shipman, Smeaton, Snowden, Choiceland and the main arterial roads in the Emma and Christopher Lakes area will be oiled, providing dust-free roads and main streets. I am pleased that in 1973, Creighton and Denare Beach will have a paved road, a paved road that they have long waited for.

Mr. Speaker, speaking of roads in my constituency, may I

February 15, 1973

say that there are other roads in Prince Albert East that will be improved and paved in 1973. No. 2 Highway north from Waskesiu junction, Choiceland to White Fox and seven miles of grading on Highway No. 106, known as Hanson Lake Road.

Mr. Speaker, on the matter of northern highways, I find it essential that I direct a few remarks to this Legislature and particularly my friend the Minister of Highways (Mr. Kramer). There is no question the Minister and his Department have visions of future concerning transportation and development. It is worthwhile in the public interest to hear of what may come or should come in the 1970s and 1980s. But I hope that the experts are not overridden by meaningless gratification of what might come. Granted, there is a new age, granted there are great possibilities for transportation and other developments.

Yet, with these concessions, as a simple backbencher close to the earth and reality, I feel I must offer a few signs of warning. It is simply my opinion and that of many other people that some of these in high positions sometimes get lost in their dreams, their exuberance and their prognostications. In doing so it is easy to overlook the day to day needs of our contemporary society. In such a case it appears urgent and essential to persons like myself to raise certain basic needs of our particular communities or constituencies. I am not happy with what I have to say, yet it must be said. I am not happy to challenge the capital or maintenance program of my colleague and friend the Minister of Highways. But in spite of all the good that he has done in my constituency I must remind him that it is a constituency that is one of the largest in this province. I must tell him and this Government that it is my first duty to those people who have placed their trust in me and others and in this New Democratic Government. Because mistakes have been made by governments which accidentally or by error of judgement create their own destiny and this Government should avoid future mistakes, and some may have been done already, either by acts of performance or non-performance. Therefore, I feel that I am duty bound and I must submit at this time what appears to be, lacking in a highway program outlined by the Hon. Minister in his latest speech.

Mr. Speaker, I specifically refer to what is known as Highway 106, or the Hanson Lake Road, a road built jointly by the Federal and Provincial Governments of the 1950s. My predecessor fought for this connecting link between Creighton and our southern communities of Prince Albert, Nipawin and all the settled areas of our rural Saskatchewan. My predecessor fought with good reason and with acknowledged success, and it was a good road. It is sad to say, that the former Liberal Government, during their term of office, were more concerned in spending tens of millions of dollars to provide roads and highways for Carl Landegger and his pulp mill. It is sad to say that the former Liberal Government ignored our Saskatchewan people, our tourist camps, fishermen, trappers and general citizens of our northern communities. The Liberals did little more than carry out minor repairs on Highway 106. So it continued to depreciate and get run down. It was so bad that last August the newly appointed Minister of Highways had to place a ban on trucks on this important highway, as it was unsafe for public use. So I say to this Minister who is presently in charge, that Highway 106 is in bad shape, really in bad shape. With the generous budget proposed by this Government the people of the North, the people of my constituency and the people of Saskatchewan will not

appreciate this Government's patchwork program on this highway. I understand from the Minister's general statement that priority of this Government was not to be the super Liberal highways program, but a realistic sound policy of essential highway construction and maintenance for travel, access and essential needs of Saskatchewan citizens. I submit that a program to improve seven miles out of a total mileage of 230 is indeed an insult to the people of my constituency. It is not in line with the general statement, the intent that has been made by the Government. It is a disappointing program for such a main northern area. It is a program that could only be matched by the former Federal Government, the lack of government concern that is shown for Highway 106.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Feschuk: — Mr. Speaker, one can argue one can urge and demand and I think I have done that. Only one more thing must be said to smarten up those in the department who plan the highway program. The Minister and his planners must be told why highways are built. Highways are built based on the needs of our people. Highway No. 106 not only joins the northeast of the province to the heart of this province, it is also a resource road. That is why we made the original \$6 or \$7 million investment. If the Members of this Legislature are really concerned about the responsibilities of government to the people of Saskatchewan, then they cannot but back me up in asking that an intensive rebuilding program of Highway 106 be undertaken forthwith.

Mr. Speaker, are not the Members of this Assembly aware of the resource potential along the Hanson Lake Road, the possible development of this northeast in many areas? May I point out, Mr. Speaker, that not only is this highway essential to provide access to timber areas or to tourist areas or as a round trip via Creighton and Flin Flon, but also that there is every indication that the Anglo-Rouyn mine complex may be rejuvenated. There are reports that point to negotiation between Anglo-Rouyn and Memorial Gardens, for a \$2 million deal. I am not disturbed to hear that the so-called worthless mine is contemplated for purchase. The Minister of Mineral Resources will know of the potential claims by mining companies in those areas along the Hanson Lake Road. Deep Diamond Drilling is indicated by Hudson Bay Mining and Smelting, and Highway 106 is essential for research of that part of the province in and around Deschambault Lake and Pelican Lakes as well. Silica sand is being required by Hudson Bay Mining and Smelting in the Deschambault Lake area. Unless this highway is intact, this product will be obtained from elsewhere. Mr. Speaker, in summary we have a \$10 million investment going to pot! It is not being given proper consideration in the Budget.

Failure to rebuild Highway 106 will hurt our recreation revenues. It will reduce job opportunities, it will hurt the tourist business established along the Hanson Lake Road and in outlying areas such as Jan Lake and Pelican Narrows. We shall slow down northern development rather than accelerate its growth. We shall continue to discourage primary industries such as trapping and fishing. Directly or indirectly, lack of real government concern will hurt every main northern community and every commercial business be it in Prince Albert, Nipawin, Melfort, Saskatoon or Regina.

February 15, 1973

Mr. Speaker, my research has not been completed, but I have tried to bring the problem into its proper perspective. Today I have outlined to you a serious situation and I urge my friend the Minister of Highways to examine the 1973 highway proposals. If he agrees, as I think he must, that there has been a mistake, or an error in judgement of priorities, that he will advise the planners within his department to correct a serious planning error, for the sake of Our province, for the sake of our people.

Mr. Speaker, as I said in the beginning, nevertheless this is a good Budget for Saskatchewan. This Budget has many wonderful programs that my constituents will appreciate. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I will be supporting the motion.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. D.L. Faris (Arm River): — Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to rise to give characteristically brief comments in this debate. First of all, I agree with the previous speaker that not everything is totally improved under this Government. There are in fact some things that are as bad as they were under the Liberals. I want to refer first of all to the question of extension of bus service in some areas of the province, particularly in my constituency along Highway No. 2 and a continuation of that old Liberal policy of dropping people off out on the connecting roads of these small towns. I just can't understand this policy at all. I understand it was inherited from a Liberal Government. I hope both of these matters will be re-examined.

Things are not all as bad as they were under the former government, certainly for the people of Arm River in general they are a great deal better. They had the feeling, I think quite rightly so, that for many, many years they were considered a Liberal stronghold and were ignored. But we have had a great deal of action in the area in the last couple of years and I am very proud of it.

I want to thank the Department of Natural Resources for taking action in regard to returning the land around Lovering Lake to the ownership of Canadians. I think this was necessary because this was an issue that arose shortly before the last provincial election and local Liberals at that time assured people that — “Well you know the owner (who happened to be an American) did have the right of trespass.” “Okay, you people have maybe been swimming and boating and so on in that Lake for 60 years, but you know if he wants to get a fish farm going you can't be sure that you are going to have the right to get in there”. I took the position at the time that there should be guaranteed public access to the Lake and in order to gain this, this land is now in the possession of the Crown. It is unfortunate that in many southern parts of the province there isn't even a Crown reserve around lakes. I think that the department should continue with this program, identify problems where there is possible alienation of the recreation rights of the Canadian people and see that this is solved. In many cases this will mean taking this land back into ownership of the people of this province.

I want to thank the Minister of Education (Mr. MacMurchy) who is the Minister-in-Charge of Regional Libraries for finally getting the Palliser Regional Library going. Back in 1965 they had a vote in that region and the people understood that there

was large scale support and that this was going to go ahead. Then they were given no explanation whatsoever for this cancellation. Some of them have asked me if the reason for delay at that time was that they had a Conservative MLA. I can't tell them. I don't know what the reason was, but it is the last region in this province to have this service and I know that the present Minister of Education is extremely pleased to see this service cover the entire province.

I am also extremely pleased to see again in this year's Budget some more work on Highway No. 15 between Kenaston and Simpson. This year this entails some 20 miles of grading, some 10 miles of oiling. If you were to pick up a provincial highway map and look at Highway No. 15, crossing the province, you would find a strange phenomenon that right in the very heart of the province there was 36 miles of — it was called highway — it was built to 1955 grid standards. This section of gravel was there for many, many years. I won't say the Liberals didn't do anything, they had a 4-year staking program. The people there looked forward to action on that, believe me. There was no action until our Government has undertaken the grading and eventually the oiling of that stretch of highway. This is indeed good news. This is an extremely important stretch of highway. For instance, when I was living in Davidson and in the winter we wanted to get around to Liberty or some of the communities on the other line, a person would have to go all the way down to Findlater and back up the highway to get across. Now between Regina and Saskatoon, this is a main road. Once that road is put into shape and really made into a highway that it is supposed to be, I think we shall find a great number of people travelling it again. One of the Members of the Legislature told me of an incident when he travelled it — he wasn't acquainted with the road and he found himself going up and down these hills and all of a sudden ending up in what appeared to be a lake. He got pulled out of this by a local farmer and he went along again up and down and ended up in another lake. If it hadn't been for that same farmer coming along and pulling him out he might never have got out of there. This work is going ahead full pace and it is going to be a good thing, not for that district only, but for the province.

I was glad too to see the announcement of the opportunity for the people of Simpson and Imperial to say whether or not they wanted to have natural gas. I am sure they will look forward to that. Many, many of the communities in my area have benefited in this last year from Operation Main Street and Operation Open Roads. I want to say that having sent a questionnaire out to all of my constituents that there are some 80 or 90 per cent of the people of my constituency who approve very heartily of that program. I just can't understand what the Members opposite are saying when they are attacking it. The one question that is being asked by those people is: why was that program not carried out earlier? That is the one thing they want to know.

Mr. MacDonald: (Milestone) — Come to Milestone!

Mr. Faris: — Yes . . . I think the Hon. Member is quite correct in saying that. Milestone and Wilcox and Rouleau had it. Towns in my constituency did not have it. That was the objection. They are extremely pleased to have it right across the province, right now. The Hon. Member from, is it Moosomin, one of those irrigation areas anyhow, was expounding on the great shame of

February 15, 1973

what was happening in the irrigation district. I should like to have him come up and visit the farmers in that district sometime and talk to an irrigation farmer, and ask the irrigation farmers what was the Liberal policy in regard to irrigation farming. You know what the answer was, you just said it, nothing. There was no policy and the first thing those people want and need is an irrigation policy. And I want to say they are happy to see the Government making, while it may be some difficult decisions, making some decisions to try to see whether or not it can be made a paying proposition for the farmers who are actually irrigating right now.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Faris: — We have heard a lot about what goes on in this Government in a political way, their spending money and so on. I want to talk a little bit about some of the tax decreases that we have under our present Government compared to the former Government. In order to fully understand this, I have some very authoritative material. I have a pamphlet here on education in Saskatchewan and on the Homeowner's Grant and utilization fees. I received these from my constituents and they were given to them by Liberal campaign workers in the last election. The one in education is authorized by J.C. McIsaac, Minister of Education. It is published by the Saskatchewan Government Information Services.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Faris: — Interesting Liberal pieces of campaign literature paid for by the public. This one on Homeowner's Grants, has the name on the back, Hon. Allan Guy, Minister of Municipal Affairs, again a Liberal, a piece of Liberal campaign information at public expense. And this one on utilization fees, the Minister of course was Gordon Grant, again published by Saskatchewan Government Information Services. But at least we received this good information and it is fully in accord with the Liberal advertisements. They are very good indeed on education. On June 4th and 5th, 1971, in the Leader-Post, they ran two of these right one after the other, really making a good point. The first one asks a very interesting question.

Who ever heard of school mill rates going down?

That is June 4th, 1971. Well I want to tell you that the people in the school units in my area heard of the school mill rates going down. They went down strangely enough in 1971, that is right. They went down in the Watrous Unit from 41.5 to 39 mills in '71. They went down in Outlook Unit from 38 mills to 36 mills in '71, and in Davidson Unit they went down from 40.5 to 38 mills in '71. If you had asked them the year before, "Who ever heard of school mill rates going down?" they could have told you an interesting story. If you look what happened from 1963, the last complete year before there was a change of government, to 1970 to see what happened to mill rates, it is very interesting. In Watrous Unit the mill rate went from 32 to 41.5, an increase of 9.5 more than one mill year after year after year. In Outlook Unit they went from 28 mills to 38 mills, 10 mills in seven years. And in Davidson Unit they did a little better than that, they went from 26 mills to 40.5, an increase of 14.5 mills in seven years, over two mills a year. That's performance, Cliff!

Mr. McIsaac: — That's a modest increase.

Mr. Faris: — That's what the former Minister calls a modest increase. I am sure compared to some others that was a modest increase. But then this other ad on June 5, 1971, this really takes the cake because this said what they were going to do for the people in the future. Don't look behind you, let's look to the future for something good.

Your Homeowner Grant — just one of the things at stake in this election.

Ah, yes a great point they made there. They say right here at the bottom, it is very clear.

The Liberals are pledged to increase the Homeowner Grant in their next four year term of office to a minimum of \$100 annually.

I want to tell the Hon. Members of this Assembly, that I believe them. I believe they would increase it to that minimum of \$100. And I believe that it would take them four years to do it. I just want to show you what that would cost the people of this province. The Liberal Homeowner Grant in '72 would have been \$70, in '73 would have been \$80, in '74 would have been \$90 and in '75, strangely enough an election year, it would have made that \$100. I believe it would have happened. I trust their word on it. That would have meant that a homeowner over those four years would have received \$340. Tremendous, over four years. Now, you take the situation of the farmer now, the fellow who has a house and a farm at the assessed value of \$15,000, in 1972 he received \$195, '73 he received \$270; now assuming that there is no increase, he gets \$270 again in '74, he gets \$270 again in '75. Instead of \$340 he gets \$1,005.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Faris: — There certainly was something at stake in this election, a matter for that man of \$665. I want to tell you that this wasn't the only saving that was made when the people of this province decided to vote New Democrat. He would save \$665 and that's a gain over having a Liberal Government but as this other pamphlet indicated on utilization fees indicating their tremendous success, by removing deterrent fees from families, they only had to pay \$180 a year but over four years that would mean that a couple would save \$720, is that right? Pretty close. Now what if they are senior citizens, this couple? Over the four years having the premium removed from them they save a further \$280. Now those are absolute gains by having a New Democratic Government here in Regina. And it adds up for that couple in absolute gain in those four years to \$1,673.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Faris: — Now that is not too bad. There are many other savings that could be spoken of. I don't want to go on in great detail but I do want to draw attention to some seeming difficulties on the other side of the Legislature. Why is the Opposition so ineffective? Well, obviously there is a growing problem of leadership. I want to suggest that a significant change has

February 15, 1973

taken place for the Member for Milestone (Mr. MacDonald). We remember his difficulties last year having to teach till 2:00 o'clock every afternoon and not being able to fully apply himself. But this year he has been put on the party payroll to organize. And the rumors have it that he is doing a good job of organizing. But the question is, what he is organizing? If some of the Hon. Members opposite would tell us what he is organizing and if they would tell the Leader of the Opposition what he is organizing I am sure we would all be interested. Mr. Speaker, there are many more remarks I could make. I would like at this time to adjourn the debate.

Debate adjourned.

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