

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN
Third Session — Seventeenth Legislature
17th Day

Friday, February 16, 1973

The Assembly met at 2:30 o'clock p.m.

On the Orders of the Day.

WELCOME TO STUDENTS

Mr. Wiebe (Morse): — Mr. Speaker, it gives me a great deal of pleasure today to introduce to you and the Members of this Legislature approximately 30 Grade Twelve students from the Herbert High School. They are accompanied this afternoon by their teacher, Mr. Jake Sawatsky and Mr. Frank Brown, a very able bus driver. I might mention that these students, some of whom were up as early as 5:30 this morning, arrived in Regina at 10:00 o'clock and from what I understand have had a very busy afternoon and morning. They toured the computer centre this morning, the RCMP Barracks, the RCMP Museum and have also had a tour of the Legislative Buildings. I understand they are planning on spending the entire afternoon watching democracy in action and I am sure they will enjoy it very much. I should like to wish them all an enjoyable journey home and trust that they will be impressed by the conduct of all Members of the House this afternoon.

Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Michayluk (Redberry): — Mr. Speaker, it is with a great deal of pleasure that I rise to introduce to you and through you to the Members of this Assembly, a fine group of 29 students, Grade Eleven and Twelve students, accompanied by their teacher, Mr. J. Wenzel, now seated in the west gallery, from the Central Mayfair School, not from Saskatoon Mayfair, but from Mayfair in the Redberry constituency. This group, since 6:00 o'clock this morning, has travelled almost 275 miles in a chartered Saskatchewan Transportation bus to be with us this afternoon. Mr. Speaker, I extend to them through you, Sir, a warm welcome to this Assembly. I sincerely hope that their day in the Capital City will be educational and rewarding and that their presence with us gives them an insight into the democratic process of government. It is my fond hope that their return trip home is safe.

Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Flasch (Maple Creek): — Mr. Speaker, we have with us today in the west gallery some 16 students from the high school of which I am usually in charge, when I am not here, namely the Mendham High School. My son Brian is also a member of that group. They are accompanied by their bus driver, Mr. Glen Innis and his wife Darla and by a colleague of mine, Mr. Jim Miller. They have visited several places in Regina this morning. On your behalf, Mr. Speaker, and on behalf of this Assembly, I should like to welcome them here this afternoon and we hope that they will have an interesting and enjoyable time.

Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Mostoway (Hanley): — Mr. Speaker, having been born in Mayfair, and that is about all, I, too, would like to welcome the students from Mayfair School. I would just ask that when they do go back after what I hope will be an enjoyable day, that you will mention the name and see if there are possibly any relatives in the area.

Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

RULING AMENDMENT TO BUDGET DEBATE

Mr. Speaker: — Before the Orders of the Day, I have a point I should like to raise with the Members. On Wednesday, last, the Member for Morse (Mr. Wiebe) introduced an amendment to the Budget Debate. I find on having had more time to peruse the amendment that clause (e) which deals with pollution in the Qu'Appelle Basin also is a topic which is discussed under Resolution No. 12 which is placed on the Order Paper by the Member for Albert Park (Mr. MacLeod). I think that the Members are aware that Beauchesne points out that any substantive motions standing on the paper blocks the discussion of an amendment.

There are three alternatives that I have. I could, on the one hand rule, that if an amendment is out of order in any part that the whole amendment is out of order. On the other hand, I could allow the amendment to go as it is. When the vote is taken on this amendment then it would exclude No. 12 Resolution from being discussed. But I don't think that would meet with the wishes of the Members of this Assembly. Therefore, in order not to prevent the discussion of Resolution No. 12, which deals with the pollution in the Qu'Appelle Basin, and in order that we can continue with the debate as we have been doing, I would ask Members to refrain from discussing this part in the Resolution and I would rule clause (e) to be out of order.

QUESTIONS

British Columbia Costal Pilots' Dispute

Mr. Steuart (Leader of the Opposition): — Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, I am sure the Legislature is aware of the fact that the pilots under the Pacific Pilotage Authority have withdrawn their services on the West Coast. I am sure we can all appreciate the severe damage that this withdrawal of services can have on the shipment of grain from Vancouver and other coastal ports.

The Federal Minister of Transport, the Hon. Jean Marchand, has exercised a power contained in Federal legislation waiving the pilotage requirements for ships coming into those ports, some of those ports. This means that most of the ships will enter the ports without the navigational help of the pilots. However, there are indications that the pilots' withdrawal of services will be followed by the establishment of a picket line, which if observed by the unions, will bring the shipping of grains and potash to a full stop at the West Coast.

I think it should be made very clear that the pilots are

not in a union, they are not unionized. They are, in fact, not even striking, they have withdrawn their services. They have formed themselves, I am told, into a corporation. So this is a simple withdrawal of services.

Hon. Mr. Romanow: — Is it a question or . . .

Mr. Steuart: — Well, I am going to ask a question, but I have to set the tone first, please believe me. The fact that they are not a union makes this withdrawal of services more insidious than a strike. Because the Federal Government has no authority, I am told, to bring in compulsory arbitration if they desire to, no matter how costly this tie-up becomes. I should like to ask the Premier if he would join with me in sending a telegram to those union officials who are involved in grain-handling, the grain-handlers, longshoremen, etc. on the West Coast, asking them not to observe a picket line such as this if it is set up and urging them to continue to move our grain, our potash and other commodities on the West Coast. We all know these pilots are making about \$30,000 a year. They have asked for a 30 per cent increase, they have been offered a 15 per cent increase. I think it is a disgrace, this small number of people should be able to tie up the movement of grain, potash and other commodities. I wonder if the Premier would join with me in sending such a telegram?

Hon. Mr. Blakeney (Premier): — Mr. Speaker, I don't want to comment particularly on what the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Steuart) has said. I think much of it is in doubtful order. I think it amounted really to a statement not a question.

He asked two or three questions, one of which appeared to be whether or not we would join with him in sending a wire to someone — it wasn't too clear to whom — not to cross a picket line which might be set up by people who were not a union. I think that is a shade on the hypothetical side whether a picket line will be set up by this limited company called the British Columbia Coast Pilots Limited. If that corporation sets up a picket line, which would be something of a precedent in itself, and if on that occasion other people honor the picket line, then I think it would be time enough to concern ourselves. I wonder if that sort of thing is going to happen. We have been attempting, as best we can, to offer our good offices to see if negotiations will reopen. I, yesterday, published replies I had received from Mr. McKinnon, the president of the British Columbia Coast Pilots Limited and from the Hon. Otto Lang. I have today received — just arrived at 2:30 — a very lengthy wire from Mr. McKinnon, in which he sets out his case. Among other things he says that the pilots' demand is as follows: We (i.e. the pilots) are prepared to negotiate downward from a maximum increase of 13½ per cent which we are asking for. This in no way resembles the 30 per cent increase alluded to in statements made by other individuals or associations, etc. etc.

Members can see that the wire is argumentative in tone. I think it is clear from these facts that the issues are complex. We are not going to solve them in this House. But I do agree with the Leader of the Opposition. We, as a Government — and I hope the Opposition will join with us — are attempting to urge negotiations. We are urging them upon the pilotage authority, which is the Federal Government Agency and we are urging them

upon the British Columbia Pilots Association Limited, which is the company which the pilots have formed. Our representative has been in touch with both of these parties within the last 15 hours, I would say, perhaps a little less, and indeed this wire says, "This a.m. we were in a meeting attempting to have negotiations resumed when your representative phoned. Unfortunately the PPA refused to reopen negotiations," and so on. We are attempting through these methods to get negotiations reopened. I think we may have had some success. Certainly that is the best way to deal with the matter, to get negotiations reopened. I am hopeful this will happen and, if, in fact, picket lines do hold up work by grain-handlers or others, we will then be prepared to address ourselves to that problem.

Mr. Steuart: — Just a supplementary question. The Premier said this is hypothetical. The information we have is that it is not all that hypothetical and I would hope he would be as quick to act to try to bring this influence to bear with some of the union membership as he has been with the Federal Government. If he does we will certainly join with him.

Liquor Committee

Mr. McPherson (Regina Lakeview): — Mr. Speaker before the Orders of the Day I should like to ask a question of the Hon. Member for Arm River (Mr. Faris), chairman of the Liquor Committee. It is usual practice for a committee chairman when he calls a press conference to call in all the committee at the same time . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order, order! Questions cannot be asked of private Members. The questions can only be asked of Ministers pertaining to their departments. We do get astray at times but questions cannot be asked of another private Member.

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 not resolve itself into the Committee of Finance and the proposed amendment thereto, moved by Mr. Wiebe (Morse).

Hon. Mr. Bowerman (Minister of Northern Saskatchewan): — Mr. Speaker, I am advised that time is really something of an essence today and I see that the Member for Prince Albert West (Mr. Steuart) has already made his speech and I am sure that he will not be expecting to speak later this day.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Bowerman: — I will try to dispense with the usual congratulations that are in order and perhaps refer to them at another time in order that I may deal directly with the subjects which I want to deal with at this particular time.

Mr. Speaker, I noticed with interest last evening that the Member for Athabasca in his usual harangue didn't have anything to say about the programs and policies within the Department of Northern Saskatchewan. I must say that that was a wise political move on his part because I can assure him that his usual trickery and his continual distortion and his untruths are not being listened to by the people, particularly those people in the North, especially in light of the deplorable record which his Liberal friends have produced over the last seven years when they were the Government.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Bowerman: — The Liberal Opposition has been sticking very close to the creed which has been theirs and which they have lived by, in my experience in this House, and that creed is, never let the facts get in the way of a good political speech. However, it just takes a slight reminder, I suggest, from this side of the House, about their fantastic failures in the forest management areas, as well as in the Big River sawmill. And they are immediately retreating into their shell, the velocity of the winds subside and the vocal level decreases and a mysterious hush falls on their depleted ranks. We have all heard the record of the former Liberal Government when it came to the operation of the Big River sawmill and the operation of the Saskatchewan Forest Products Corporation. The mill itself has operated successfully over the years and has made a very significant contribution towards the economic climate in this part of the province and it continued until the political atmosphere began in 1971. The campaign in 1971, when the Liberals began to purchase their candidates way into this Legislature, was an attempt by them to frustrate the issues and an attempt by them to obscure the truths about the sawmill operation at Big River and to develop a program which they themselves were not even able to control.

The absolute mess which followed is really incredible. The economic and social implications to Saskatchewan and to the Big River mill has, or did reach, near tragic proportions. I am sure, Mr. Speaker, that our friends in the Opposition really don't need any reminder with respect to the developments at Big River. But for the benefit of reminding the people of Saskatchewan how this former government operated, when given the reins of government, I want to review some of the developments in that area.

I want to suggest that the estimated cost by the Government itself was a price fixed at somewhere close to \$250,000, a quarter of a million dollars and that the estimated production from that mill was to be 80,000 board feet per shift. Under the reconstruction of the former Government the cost skyrocketed to well over \$600,000. Production hardly reached 30,000 board feet when that mill passed to us when we took the reins of government. We have spent, in addition, \$120,000 to increase the production and that production has been increased this year, Mr. Speaker, to near maximum capacity. It took a change in the Government to restore this industry to a position where it now projects an image of success. This fiscal improvement at Big River underlines a very important fact. That Liberal Governments should never again be trusted to meddle and to interfere in fact, to destroy the publicly owned and managed industries which our Government has had the foresight in the years gone by to bring forth and again will indeed bring to fruition. We have

already heard what the leaders of the Liberal Party have decreed as their stand with respect to the Saskatchewan Forest Products Corporation. I want to recall to the memory of the House and to others, the classic comments which have been made by the Members of the Liberal Party. The Hon. Member for Milestone (Mr. MacDonald) said, and I quote:

If there ever was a Crown corporation in the history of Saskatchewan that was a miserable failure, it was the Saskatchewan Timber Board.

The Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Steuart) in all his wind and wisdom said that we should have got out of the Timber Board or Saskatchewan Forest Products, the day we were elected. Then he went on to say that no government belongs in the timber business. Mr. Speaker, at least no Liberal Government belongs in the timber business. In fact, the question is whether or not a Liberal Party really belongs in government.

The returns to the Saskatchewan Timber Board for the per cord of work used this year has been estimated at \$11 per cord or \$22 per M board feet. I want to say to you, Mr. Speaker, and to the Members of the House that this return is 15 times per cord higher than the returns that we are now getting from the Prince Albert pulp mill's use of wood in their limits. It is two times per cord higher than the return from the Meadow Lake stud mill and similarly more than two times per cord higher than the current return from the Simpson stud mill at Hudson Bay. From 1955 to 1964 the Timber Board returned profits and dues to the Treasury in excess of \$8 million. And the Hon. Member from Milestone calls that a miserable failure.

Over a ten year period the Timber Board generated an average of 1,600 man years employment per annum. At the Prince Albert pulp mill today the statistics show not 1,600 but 750 man years being generated by that mill. At Meadow Lake not 1,600 again, but 200. And at Simpson Timber not 1,600 but 400 man years per annum. Or a total, Mr. Speaker, of all of those forest industries which were set up under the Liberal Party when it was in government, amounting to an annual total of employment of 1,350 man years. The employment record was reached by the Timber Board using approximately 170,000 cords of forest resources annually, and today's employment records which are 250 less man years per annum utilizes approximately 700,000 cords from our forest resources. It is this record of forest utilization that brought the 1972 Liberal convention to its feet when 70 per cent of the voting delegates criticized the leaders of their party while they were in government for being so indiscreet in the timber agreements which they negotiated at that time.

Mr. Speaker, the demand for wood products throughout the world today has placed Saskatchewan forests as one of the key renewable resource potentials of North America. I want to say again that this Government, unlike our Liberal friends, recognizes this potential and will proceed with policies and with a program which will not only work towards the benefit of Saskatchewan people but will also result in an orderly and responsible approach to a total resources development program.

Mr. Speaker, to put it in simple terms for the benefit of the Opposition, we say that forests of Saskatchewan belong to the people of Saskatchewan. We are the custodians of this valuable resource. We have the responsibility of implementing

sound management policies to assure a continuing yield of forest wealth for present and for future generations of users. Mr. Speaker, we will respect that responsibility and strive to achieve those goals.

I want to change my remarks to deal with another aspect of the renewable resources such as fish and wildlife. In the latter half of the 1940s, after Saskatchewan had changed governments, conservation became a watch word on the lips of most Saskatchewan people. During the Liberals' years from 1964 to 1971 conservation, I suggest to you, Sir, was dropped as a watch word on the utilization and on the management techniques of our renewable resources. Conservation means wise use and it means sustained yields. Conversely the Liberal philosophy has, within its terms of reference, the kinds of actions which are designed to accommodate to the present, the concept of getting in, getting what one can and getting out with whatever one can. This philosophy and this kind of an approach was beginning to have its effects on our renewable resources as a result of the seven lean years which took place.

In the 1940s we were almost devoid of wildlife and fur resources after Liberal mismanagement. We had to close the big game seasons. We had to develop game preserves and game sanctuaries. In 1946 we were establishing fur conservation programs. The Saskatchewan Fur Marketing Service was established to assist in that development. We revived our natural resources only to have them deteriorate in the Liberal years from 1964 to 1971. And the grand finale of those Liberal years in 1971 was indicative of the final destination of their Government's uncommitted attitude to wise use and proper wildlife management practices when they brought in the great numbers of hunters that they did in 1971.

We are prepared to regulate, we are prepared to manage our resources and our environment in the interests of Saskatchewan even though those regulations may prove unpopular at the time of their implementation.

Mr. Speaker, I turn briefly to talk on the Human Resources Development Agency. In the New Deal for People our party very explicitly declared itself with respect to a complete overhaul or if desired by Indian people to phase out the Indian and Métis Department completely. A new agency has now been established and was designed, not only to relate to the disadvantaged among the Indian culture, but it was concerned with all disadvantaged people in all areas and all communities of the province.

Some of the objectives of the agency include the promotion of communication among disadvantaged people, the encouragement of disadvantaged people to become involved in solving their own life situations and the provisions for resource persons to help in coordinating many of the existing government programs and services. It is also designed to promote and to encourage new and innovative approaches to solving the problems and meeting the needs of disadvantaged peoples.

Another promise made in the New Deal for People which has been fulfilled by this agency is the commitment we made to the Treaty Indian and Métis of this province to provide financial and other resources for the further development of Treaty and aboriginal rights research. Another promise made and another promise fulfilled, Mr. Speaker.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Bowerman: — Indian people know about the tricks of the former Minister of the Indian and Métis Department. They were not fooled then as equally as they are not fooled today about his claim regarding the Ile-a-la-Crosse community development projects. This Government presents the facts as they are. We do not need a political fun house with mirrors as was used by the former Liberal Government to enhance their efforts in trying to impress people of Indian ancestry.

The development of our grants program with the Métis Society and the Federation of Saskatchewan Indians has provided the necessary flexibility whereby they establish the priorities for programs within their own terms of reference. And the substantial increase in these funds and the method by which they are handled is establishing a creditability not before known between the Saskatchewan Government and the Indian people of our province.

May I turn now to parks and recreation. I see that my time is fast decreasing and I won't deal with this in great length, but I want to say that 1972 has been a banner year for our parks and our recreation site users. All previous attendance records have been broken. I need only to say further that we have involved the public in a project at the Meadow Lake Park in that we have given the public an opportunity to have expressed some opinions with respect to the provisional master plan of that park.

I want to say in closing, Mr. Speaker, something with respect to the new Department of Northern Saskatchewan. I should like to return my remarks to this program and make some comments with respect to it. The functions of this new Department are to plan and to protect the great potential of northern Saskatchewan. It must be sufficiently flexible to meet the varying and different needs of residents we seek to serve. Again, Mr. Speaker, this is a promise that we made and it is a promise that we have kept. This Government has pledged to focus new attention on financial assistance toward helping these people come into their own. This Government has committed itself to assist northern people, to develop their latent occupational and social skills and to give them an opportunity to apply these skills through gainful employment. One of the major commitments of the Government to the people of northern Saskatchewan was to proceed on a basis of consultation and exchange dialogue on developments that take place. For example, the Department of Northern Saskatchewan has agreed to attempt to respond to a local committee at LaLoche regarding housing.

I want to make a comment with respect to the situations at Ile-a-la-Crosse. The Hon. Member from Athabasca (Mr. Guy) and his Liberal colleagues have been justifiably, and I suggest adequately, reproached by the voice of northern people who resent their political intervention and insincere comments from that Member with respect to the local affairs in that community.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Bowerman: — The kinds of actions demonstrated by the Member for Athabasca are the usual kinds of indiscretion and insincerity that has militated against the success of the disadvantaged

people throughout the world. This kind of derision and political gambling so frequently used by the Member from Athabasca has come to be recognized throughout Saskatchewan, and I say particularly in northern Saskatchewan, to be the common approach used by Liberals for political gain. Those kinds of activities among northern people may have won him a seat in this Legislature. So far as honor and respect among the electorate of northern Saskatchewan, I can assure you, Sir, this Member stands far below the bottom rung on the ladder.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Bowerman: — Mr. Speaker, I should like to list, if I may for the minute or two that is still left, the programs which we propose with respect to housing and some of the other programs which we propose for northern Saskatchewan. I want to say that we propose a program for the development of 625 new houses over the next five years in northern Saskatchewan. These will not be by invitational bid. I suggest they will be constructed and made by the people who live in northern Saskatchewan.

We have implemented a cross-cultural training program. We have had a seminar and a study group has been formed to consider the use of native languages in northern schools.

The prospectors' training program, 36 students attending, 26 of whom were Cree and Chippewan cultures, 10 of which were Métis or of non-Indian ancestry.

The personnel that we have hired in northern Saskatchewan since the inception of the department is 134. They have been hired to fill vacancies and new positions that have been established within the new department. Of that 134, 84 or 63 per cent have been recruited from within the northern administration district.

We have a northern sawmills program which I think will be very interesting and challenging to northern people. We have a proposed sewer and water facilities program. And, Mr. Speaker, I am sure these programs, had I the opportunity to develop and expand upon them as I should like to have done would have brought some information to this House which I think would be valuable to them. I am obviously not able to expand upon adequately all of those various comments even though I would liked to have done so. I nevertheless wish to commend the Minister of Finance (Mr. Cowley) on his very challenging Budget. I extend an invitation to the Members in the Opposition to join me and my colleagues in supporting this Budget unanimously.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Kowalchuk (Melville): — Mr. Speaker, I, too, will be very short in my opening remarks except to say to you, Sir, and to this House that last Friday we witnessed one of the best delivered people's Budgets this Legislature has ever witnessed.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Kowalchuk: — For a job exceedingly well done and for its contents, I congratulate him as well as the Executive Council and the

Premier, Allan Blakeney.

Today, Mr. Speaker, is the last day for debate on the Budget. We have heard New Democrats voice their positive appraisal and constructive criticism. We have also heard the Opposition Members attack the Budget offering cynical criticism and espousing the alternatives based on a different philosophy. But all of this, Mr. Speaker, is routine expected. However, we must remember, Sir, that this formal Legislative forum, where in reality, the faith of the province and its people is debated, when the Government Members loudly proclaim the virtues of their acts and the Opposition decries the limitations, is still the best method anyone has yet been able to devise democratically to guide government affairs of the people. That debating platform, Mr. Speaker, is this Legislature and although at times there is a great deal to be desired in its performance, at times the contents being more political than governmental, it nevertheless is the forum upon which the people of Saskatchewan sit in judgment. Mr. Speaker, as I have often said before in many and many other debates in this House, the people of Saskatchewan will not be fooled. The Opposition Members can draw all the red herrings they want, they can misinterpret and misrepresent the facts, Mr. Speaker, but if, and let me repeat the word, if, this 1973 Budget contains in it what the people of Saskatchewan want and I believe, Mr. Speaker, that this Budget contains a great deal of what the people of Saskatchewan want, then Finance Minister Cowley and his Government are to be congratulated and indeed this is a people's Budget.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Kowalchuk: — Mr. Speaker, the big question that all of us must ask ourselves is what does the Budget do and for whom does it do most? Does it have priorities in their order of importance? Of importance to whom? Does this Budget follow the Woodsworth tradition that it's the people who are important? Does it concern itself with people, all people, particularly the old, the young and the less fortunate than we are? Mr. Speaker, I think in every aspect this Budget does just that. It is expressing concern for the people of Saskatchewan including the people of Melville constituency.

Mr. Speaker, the people of my constituency are an integral part of this Saskatchewan scene. Let me tell you, Sir, I am quite partial to the Melville constituency. And I want to make a number of comments about this fairly small constituency, made yet smaller by the political boundary changes of the last Liberal Government but time will not permit me, Sir. However, I want to say one thing. It is a constituency whose outstanding trademark is its variety of differences and the greatest tribute that I can pay to these people that in spite of these differences of race and color and creed and religion and political differences to, Mr. Speaker, they have learned to work and build together fully recognizing the fact that mankind indeed has many more common factors that unites them in comparison to the few differences that divide them. The Melville constituency is not rich by any stretch of one's imagination. Budgets whether provincial or local affect them in every way. The many measures outlined in this Budget in assistance, municipal, school and all others will indeed be welcome. Its land is not highly assessed and its economy is mostly agricultural in base and is not that diversified except that it is a mixed cattle and grain growing country.

The city of Melville needs small industries and large ones if it can get them. The Mid-Canada Plastics, if it is given a chance, will, I maintain, become a really big industry. The potential is there. Every report by people knowledgeable in the plastics business, many from foreign countries, have visited this plant and have judged it to be a most potentially sound producer of plastic goods.

When I consider, Mr. Speaker, and I am now turning to another area, the last years of Liberal rule in Saskatchewan, their depreciating grants to schools coupled with the huge tax levies, I consider that the easing of the property tax burden for school purposes in the last two years by this Government is simply phenomenal.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Kowalchuk: — The commitment of the New Democratic Party to shift school taxes from property so that the mill rates average 25 mills on homes, small businesses and farms is a commitment that has been met. Other Members on this side of the House have already explained this benefit to property owners at great length and detail.

The increase of operating grants for schools coupled with the Property Improvement Grants made this an unbelievable achievement when compared to the Liberal record immediately after the 1967 election, Mr. Speaker. When the Liberals brought down the infamous "Black Friday Budget" of 1968 taxing everything they could lay their fingers on, Mr. Speaker, totalling hundreds of new taxes, and at the same time, let us not forget that they foisted their "legitimate Liberal area bargaining baby" almost entirely on the local school boards of the province I wonder how many of you remember what happened then? Who had to pay for that area bargaining baby's upkeep? Mr. Speaker, it was placed directly and squarely on the backs of the local taxpayers. The mill rates in the units went up anywhere from two mills to five mills to seven mills and more. That was the year, Mr. Speaker, if you remember, that the operating costs for the schools in Saskatchewan increased by \$14 million and, believe it or not, the Government, the Liberal Government, grants amounted to only \$5 million. Is it any wonder the school mill rates shot up? We haven't forgotten, Mr. Speaker. I remember very clearly how we pleaded with the Liberals, repeatedly stating in the debate on the budget and on the Area Bargaining Bill, "Who will pay for these increased costs of area bargaining?" But there were no answers. The Liberals made it plain and it was evident by their silence that the taxpayer would pay the shot and pay they did.

The Yorkton unit in 1968 and 1969 increased their mill rate by 15 mills, Mr. Speaker, Melville by five mills and scores of others had to greatly increase the property tax to meet the increased cost.

Yesterday, Mr. Speaker, the Member from Milestone (Mr. MacDonald) had the gall to rant and rave about the loss of autonomy by local school boards. The very people who perpetrated that loss with the area bargaining legislation, these same Liberals were instrumental in dealing that death blow to autonomy for local boards, now have the gall to pretend that they are the champions of the local people. When in 1967 and 1968 bill after

bill pertaining to education took away authority from the school boards by the fistful, Mr. Speaker. Who was it that stood up in this House and fought for the preservation of local autonomy? Was it the Liberals? Or was it the New Democrats? Who was it that said that area bargaining would deal a death blow to local autonomy? Not the Liberals, Mr. Speaker. It was the New Democrats with the late Woodrow Lloyd at the helm, pleading and begging, but you people over there wouldn't listen.

Mr. Speaker, when area bargaining was passed, that was when local autonomy was lost. Mr. Speaker, area bargaining provides little room for local board participation, in fact for many boards no participation at all in matters relating to finances, except to meet once or twice a year either to approve or disapprove the agreements reached by a very small, selective committee. Even then a board may oppose but they would just be whistling in the dark. Their small weighted vote didn't really matter. Some may say now, how come that you know all about that? Well for the last 13 years I have been a board member and a board chairman and many a time I have sat negotiating and bargaining in good faith with the teachers as a board member. I knew all about what was happening, Mr. Speaker.

Yes, Mr. Speaker, that was when the point of no return was reached for the local school board's autonomy, in the year 1968. The perpetrators of this crime were the Liberals, Mr. Speaker. These same Liberals who are sitting to your left, Sir. I sincerely hope that a solution to this impasse is going to be found in an amicable and a suitable basis before too long.

The Member for Milestone (Mr. MacDonald) spoke of the CCF attempting to destroy the SARM. Pure and simple hypocrisy, Mr. Speaker. In my opinion outright deceit. It was the Liberals who for political gain destroyed every effort at some municipal reorganization. They dealt that possibility a death blow. Reorganization was needed but it was the Liberals who destroyed that possibility – all for political expediency. It will take 50 years maybe to undo the harm that was done by these Liberals here. May I be so bold as to say, Mr. Speaker, that the late Premier, Ross Thatcher, tried to resurrect the idea of municipal boundary adjustment but even he failed, failed because he and his party had decided to play politics instead of searching for answers to serious municipal problems.

Let's turn to agriculture in Saskatchewan, Sir. Irrespective of how much importance is placed on the other sectors of our economy, agriculture is still the backbone and mainstay of our rural community and of our villages and towns and even cities like Melville. This Government considers that the wheels of all other sectors of the economy can only be kept rolling if agriculture is in a healthy state and if the viable family farm continues to exist. It makes sense then that we do all within our power to promote the things that will enhance the existence and operation of our family farms. All these programs of Land Bank and FarmStart have already been adequately dealt with and so I will proceed to some other areas.

Mr. Speaker, many of those agricultural policies and provisions, the people of my constituency I know will avail themselves of. The people in the Melville constituency are in a prime position to use these types of assistances that are being offered and provided through this Budget. There is a definite move by many young men to go back to the farm to take over their

parents' average size farms. This kind of start, coupled with the assistance available, plus the opportunity to rent land from the Land Bank will, I believe, serve to consolidate many small farm situations into viable family farm units.

The people of the city of Melville, as I am sure many other places in Saskatchewan, use the Qu'Appelle Valley as their recreational area. Many people own cottages at the lake shores. A need for implementing the Qu'Appelle Valley Environmental Report is, in my opinion, of top priority. Not just because of the psychological hysteria prevalent around us today, but for its pragmatic realization that tomorrow it will be worse and more costly and that tomorrow may be too late. Now is the time to attack this great problem.

Melville has a fairly good highway system, in fairly good condition. The program to continue widening the highway in certain areas is in the books but a number of additional projects will have to be implemented. The need for the reconstruction of Highway No. 247 along the valley rim between Crooked and Round Lakes is all too apparent. As I indicated many times before, the lakeshore traffic in summer has multiplied to such an extent that it becomes a top priority to build and oil that stretch of road.

Mr. Speaker, this Budget is a good Budget. The priorities are clearly evident by the amounts attributed to each one. These priorities have been governed by the amounts allocated to each one. These priorities have been governed by the wishes of the people expressing the philosophy that it is people who are important. I maintain, Mr. Speaker, that the citizens of Melville constituency and the Province of Saskatchewan have a lot to look forward to in the Budget of 1973.

I certainly will be supporting the Budget.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Matsalla (Canora): — Mr. Speaker, I want to begin by saying that it is with a great deal of satisfaction that I join with my colleagues in taking part in this Budget Debate. With the kind of Budget brought down on Friday last, Mr. Speaker, it ought to be a pleasant occasion, not only for the Government Members, but for Opposition Members as well.

It is only on occasion that legislators have an opportunity to give support to a budget document that is socially and financially sound, and one with a complete design to give the people of Saskatchewan a better deal all around.

Mr. Speaker, I want to warmly congratulate the Finance Minister (Mr. Cowley) for bringing in this fine social document, and for the able manner in which he delivered his address. The feedback I get from the country is very favorable toward the Budget. There is a general expression of hope that the Budget will help to stimulate the provincial economy, as well as provide the kind of services the people of Saskatchewan want.

The financial critic, the Hon. Member from Albert Park (Mr. MacLeod) in his address, called the Budget a 'Las Vegas Budget.' I want to reply to the Hon. Member and tell the Members opposite that our Budget is a spending budget, and the

spending is meant for the benefit of Saskatchewan people and not to provide a Las Vegas for the corporate interests of New York and company.

To sum up my analysis of the Budget, Mr. Speaker, I should like to say that it is a Budget fulfilling election promises. Many of these promises have been entirely fulfilled. A tremendous Budget and a fine record, Mr. Speaker. This Budget covers some 60 election promises. In our election program, New Deal for People, some 165 points are outlined. If you would check and make an analysis of the promises made with this Budget and the budget of last year, you would find that some 120 promises were either fully fulfilled or on the way to complete fulfilment. This leaves some 45 more points for this Government to consider and tackle. I am confident, Mr. Speaker, that with the record of this Government of fulfilling some 120 of the promises in less than two years that there is every reason for optimism that the rest of the promises will be attended to.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Matsalla: — Mr. Speaker, I am happy to note that the Budget gives our farming industry high priority. This NDP Government recognizes agriculture to be the most important resource base in the province — 75 to 80 per cent of the income in the province is directly and indirectly derived from agriculture.

Farmers in Saskatchewan and Western Canada, Mr. Speaker, have been overlooked for too long, and as a matter of fact still are by the Federal Liberals. You will recall the LIFT Program of a couple of years ago. This program was one of the worst misguided, coercive and go-broke programs the farmers of western Canada were ever forced into.

You will recall, Mr. Speaker, the episode of the Farm Income Stabilization Bill, under which the Liberals had a plan to stabilize the income of farmers at the poverty level. The Members of the House will recall the fight New Democratic MPs put up against this Stabilization Bill. It was through this fight for justice and fair deal that the New Democrats saved the farmers some \$70 million, and from binding poverty.

I am certain, Mr. Speaker, the people of Saskatchewan recall the report of the Task Force on Agriculture, supported by the Liberals, provincially and federally. The main thrust of the report was to develop large farming units and eliminate two out of every three farmers. New Democrats, Mr. Speaker, rejected the Task Force Report immediately. Its recommendations were not in line with what we believe in. We believe that we should preserve our rural way of life and that every effort should be made to maintain the family farms.

It is with this belief, Mr. Speaker, that the New Democratic Government introduced the Land Bank Program. With only six months in operation, the program is well accepted and is being looked forward to with great optimism. As a matter of fact, the program is being so well received, Mr. Speaker, that it was necessary for the Finance Minister to double this item in the Budget for the purpose of the Land Bank to \$20 million.

The Opposition continue to say it is easy to purchase land, but what about getting people to lease it? I want to tell the

Leader of the Opposition and the Members opposite, that my experience in and out of municipal office is that there is literally a scramble and a line up for land to be leased. The inspiring thing about it, Sir, is that mainly the younger farmers that are showing keen interest in leasing land, either for expanding their present small operation or in getting started in farming.

Mr. Speaker, we in the New Democratic Government have the confidence of the people in the Land Bank Program. The Land Bank Program will do what it is meant to do – and that is to maintain our rural life style of family farm. I want to tell this House and the people of Saskatchewan that the Leader of the Opposition, and his Liberals are doing everything in their power to discredit and destroy the Land Bank Program. They are resorting to tactics of misinforming the public through twisting of the facts and uttering falsehoods, and in the same breath they are attempting to sell the Federal Small Farms Development Program, which in reality, is a selling and buying agency designed to buy out the small farmer, eliminate the farm and expand the already large farm unit. The Small Farms Development Program as it is proposed is just another Liberal scheme to carry out the Task Force on Agriculture and to eliminate two out of every three farmers.

Mr. Speaker, I am justifiably happy that this NDP Government is taking forward steps in developing the rich resources of our province for the benefit of Saskatchewan people. The New Democratic Party believes that Saskatchewan people could develop their own resources. Certain resource developments require outside capital, but in no case ought there to be a sell out of resources, as there was under the Liberals. The Budget of last Friday, I want to say, will proceed in a number of ways to develop the resources of our province but I want to, this afternoon, make particular reference to an industry on its way to development located in the constituency of Canora.

This development, again, demonstrates a budget fulfilling election promises. The industry I am referring to, Mr. Speaker, is the experimental poplar lumbering project set up in Sturgis. It is hopeful that this project could be the beginning of an expanded lumber industry, providing component material in the manufacture of various poplar products. It is hopeful too, that the success of this project will strengthen the Timber Board operations to make it possible for the Board to continue further development of the rich Saskatchewan forest resources.

On behalf of the people of the Canora constituency, particularly those of Sturgis and the outlying communities, I want to commend this Government and the Timber Board, for having the courage and the foresight to set up the experimental project which will likely lead to a potentially successful lumbering industry.

The operation in its present form, although small, has done much to stimulate the economy of the area. Some 62 men have direct employment with the industry. It is estimated that in the first year of operation, nearly \$500,000 will be directly injected into the economy of Sturgis and surrounding communities. Should the manufacture of poplar products prove feasible, the favorable impact on the area will be that much greater. But, Mr. Speaker, I must take this occasion to rebuke the Leader of the Opposition for his interference and the tactics he used in

order to scuttle the project development plans. Did you know, Mr. Speaker, that before the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Steuart) had the facts on the project site and what was involved in the negotiation for it, he quickly belittled the Premier and the Government and the Timber Board in its efforts. He called it blackmail.

Rather than discussing with the Sturgis town council to determine accurately what was being negotiated between the council and the Timber Board, he obviously discussed it with some local die-hard Liberals and the former defeated Liberal mayor of the town. The facts of the negotiation were either not known or the Leader of the Opposition distorted the facts to suit his own type of cheap political manoeuvring. I suggest that this was deliberate.

When the Leader of the Opposition and the Members opposite speak of developing industry in the province, and then do everything possible to destroy its development, then I suggest that the Opposition's tactics are irresponsible and destructive, and certainly cannot be supported by the people of Saskatchewan. The people of Sturgis settled the issue instigated by the Liberals and the Leader of the Opposition. In the last fall civic election, they returned the present mayor and the council with an overwhelming majority.

Mr. Speaker, one of the main concerns of the New Democratic Government is to find ways and means of improving life in the small community. I believe this Budget is taking a great step forward in this direction. This Government will spend \$2.1 million on Operation Open Roads and Operation Main Street programs. In addition an amount of \$1.2 million will be available as assistance towards the cost of improving streets. Mr. Speaker, this is a Budget fulfilling election promises.

Now, with the ease of driving on high speed paved highways, many small communities are being by-passed. People no longer want to tolerate dusty and rough road conditions. This NDP Government, being sensitive to the needs of the people, set out to solve the problem. I want to commend the Minister of Highways (Mr. Kramer) for his leadership in this area. The rural municipalities, I am certain, will be most pleased to participate in the Open Roads Program providing for dust free oil treated roads connecting a highway to the built up limits of the town. And I am confident the towns, villages and hamlets will happily accept the Operation Main Street Program which will provide 70 per cent assistance in the cost of oil treating the main business street and connections to the built up town limits. These programs will prove very beneficial to small town communities in my constituency. Some have already shown positive interest. I am particularly thinking of Hazel Dell, Endeavour, Stenen, Tadmore, Amsterdam, Buchanan, Mikado and Verigin.

Mr. Speaker, I want to tell the Members of this House that these programs are being well accepted by municipal councils. I understand that applications requesting oil treatment projects are coming in fast and heavy.

Furthermore, Mr. Speaker, this New Democratic Government is fulfilling another election promise to the people of Saskatchewan.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Matsalla: — Mr. Speaker, one of the major promises made by this New Democratic Government was to reduce property school taxes to 25 mills. Many critics questioned this promise and the Liberals said it was impossible, but, we in this Government proved it possible and, Mr. Speaker, we did it in less than two years of office.

In actual school tax calculation for practical purposes, let me illustrate what this tax reduction means to a property owner in my constituency.

Mr. Speaker, let us take an assessment of \$8,000. This would be quite common in my area, particularly with farm land and businesses. In the Canora School Unit No. 37, in 1971 — a Liberal year — the mill rate was 42, school taxes \$336, less Homeowner Grant \$70, net taxes \$266; in 1972 — an NDP year — 37 mills, a reduction of 5 mills, the school taxes amount to \$296, less Property Improvement Grant \$104, net taxes \$192, a reduction of \$74; in 1973 — an NDP year — assuming the mill rate to remain at 37, taxes amounting to \$296, less Property Improvement Grant of \$144, the net taxes would amount to \$152. A further reduction of \$40, or a total reduction of \$114, in school taxes since the long last Liberal year of 1971.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Matsalla: — Mr. Speaker, this is a record of all records in property tax reduction in an outstanding Budget fulfilling election promises.

Mr. Speaker, time does not permit me to discuss more fully what this Budget and the first budget of this NDP Government under the capable and strong leadership of Premier Allan Blakeney aim to do for Saskatchewan. But I want to sum up by saying, the Budgets of this NDP Government mean social and economic security for the people of this province.

Mr. Speaker, I will not support the amendment, but I will give my full support to the main Budget Motion.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Taylor (Minister of Social Services): — Mr. Speaker, I am very happy to be able to have this opportunity of taking part in this debate. I would start by joining those who have already congratulated the Minister of Finance (Mr. Cowley) on the Budget he presented to this House. The Member for Biggar has once again demonstrated his outstanding ability and his concern for the needs of people. As with the Throne Speech, the Budget presented by the Minister, continues this Government on the new course and direction charted by the New Democratic Party and approved by the people of Saskatchewan in June of 1971.

Now the comments made by the Members opposite, are to me, an indication and clear proof of how good this Budget really is. Very few remarks from the Opposition have been directed towards the programs set out in the Budget. Instead, they have spent their time beating around the bush in a vain attempt to find fault. The antics of the Opposition can best be described as

the man – I think it was Mr. Kramer – spoke of, who jumped onto his horse and dashed off madly in all directions.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Taylor: — If I were to dare to use a biblical phrase, and the Opposition had some reaction to this when someone else did last year, I would describe the Members opposite as men so occupied with trying to get the sliver out of their neighbor's eyes that they failed to recognize the log in their own. And maybe the log is sort of symbolic when one thinks of the rape of our forests.

Mr. Speaker, the Budget recognizes the great importance that we place on the agricultural industry. Because of the great popularity of the Land Bank we have provided \$20 million for this program in the coming year. We further recognized the need for a better system of credit, particularly relating to livestock. A new program called FarmStart will be provided with \$15 million for the extension of credit. Along with this, we are providing \$2 million in grants to assist in the development of agriculture in this province.

The Budget, also for the coming year, provides funds to extend the range of assistance available to the small businessman. It is the intention of this Government to provide a service of consultation to small businessmen on a regional basis. Surely all Members of this House must support this endeavor. We all recognize that the small independent retailer, in particular faces difficulty in competing with the large, multi-national corporations. Field representatives will provide him with additional assistance.

I should like to take a moment to comment upon some of the things that have been said by Members opposite.

The question has been raised concerning the number of employees in the Public Service. It has been suggested that there is an increase in the number and there certainly is. I hope there will be a few more added in the future. If we are going to continue to provide new programs to meet the needs of this province we are going to have to staff these programs to do the kind of job the Liberals failed to do for seven years.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Taylor: — We intend to help the small businessman and we'll do it by sending men to assist them. We intend to help the farmers and we'll do that partly by sending field staff who can work with them and help the farmer in his own business of agriculture. We also need men to meet the needs of the present programs we already have, programs as I have said before, that were starved in the past. We need additional probation officers, additional social workers, in order to carry out the tasks that are assigned to them. But when the Members opposite talk about the increase in the permanent establishment, it might be interesting to know that some games were played with this in the past. Temporaries, are not listed in the establishment figures of employees. It might interest the Members of this House to know that under the previous administration we had temporary employees who were temporary for four or five years. This is the way

in which they managed to avoid listing increases in the figures of permanents.

So you will find a change here too. We will be increasing the establishment. Now the previous administration also started, and I believe with good intent, a supernumerary training program and I take nothing away from the intent in that program. It was a program designed to assist native people in training for positions of employment, both in government and in the private sector. I have had some reservations about the way this program was operating and going, and we are looking at ways of improving it for the future. But one of the problems that seemed to develop was that after the supernumeraries were taken on in that position, they tended to be left there and the establishment that came to need additional employees used the supernumerary instead of increasing its own size, and so the size of the establishment was held down. Now this was a way, Mr. Speaker, of managing to engage cheaper labor, but I think more it was a method of hiding the real need for employees to do the job.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I was very pleased with the announced intention of our Government to establish a Crown corporation for the exploration of petroleum and natural gas. The Liberal Members have pointed out, and rightly so, that this could be costly, with little immediate return. We all know this. You drill a well and it may, or may not, provide oil or gas. It could be costly, and it could take some years before any money returns to the province; but this, Sir, I suggest, symbolizes the difference between Liberals and New Democrats. Liberals are looking only for the quick buck while New Democrats are planning for the future.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Taylor: — The real benefits of this program will accrue not only to our generation but also to the generations that follow.

Now we were also, all I am sure, very happy to see the vast increase in the Property Improvement Grant. I am sure that the property owners of Saskatchewan will be pleased with this. Mr. Speaker, I think it was the Leader of the Opposition, it was certainly one Member over there, who claimed that we were shifting the tax burden to non-profit organizations. He claimed that some cities were considering taxing these groups. But how does this comment compare with his record when he was the Provincial Treasurer? Our Property Improvement Grant will be available to every property owner in the Province of Saskatchewan. Under the Liberals the Homeowner Grant was paid to a hotel owner living in his hotel, but it was refused to a church supplying a rectory and paying taxes on it. This, Mr. Speaker, was one way in which the costs were transferred.

Now as I said earlier, Mr. Speaker, the Opposition has found it difficult to really criticize the Budget. I was most disappointed I suppose in the remarks of the financial critic the Member for Albert Park (Mr. MacLeod). I really looked forward to hearing from him a serious criticism based on fact and not on fantasy. Instead our ears were assailed with rhetorical nonsense. His speech sort of reminded me of a Walt Disney Production that could have been entitled, "Kenny in Wonderland," or "MacLeoding the Issue."

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Taylor: — The financial critic's credibility was stretched beyond the breaking point when he spoke about his concern for our senior citizens. Now certainly, Mr. Speaker, I don't want to use language that shouldn't be used, but certainly I would suggest that the Hon. Member, maybe through ignorance, did an admirable job of avoiding even an accidental collision with the truth. Let me give you some examples.

He said in this House that in British Columbia they are providing an income supplement for senior citizens which will cost that Government \$65 million and provide a pension for all their citizens of \$200 a month. That part was true. He was correct. It's going to cost them about \$65 million, it will provide pensions of \$200 a month and I join him in commending the New Democratic Government of the Province of British Columbia.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Taylor: — He went on to say that the Federal Government will pay \$25 million of that, and that is not true. The Federal Government has told British Columbia on at least three occasions that they will not pay one red cent towards the increase in pension for senior citizens. He suggested that it would cost, in Saskatchewan, \$22 million for us to provide the same. I think his estimate is low, but that doesn't matter. He said that the Federal Government would provide us with a \$9 million return if we did this and this, too, is not true. The Federal Government has told us that they will not cost-share a supplement above the \$150 to the senior citizens of this, or of any other province. I can only suggest that the Leader of the Opposition is not the only one who has difficulty in working with the facts.

Now let us look at the Liberal concern for senior citizens. Under the Saskatchewan Assistance Plan, which incidentally the Member from Meadow Lake (Mr. Coupland) criticized us for providing increases, but under that plan the Liberals gave to the senior citizens of this province, or supplied, \$4 million in their last year in office. We are budgeting for this year \$7.6 million. In grants to special care homes the Liberal Government, in their last year in office, gave \$56,000. We shall give \$3 million this coming year. For community services to the aged, in the last year of office the Liberals budgeted no figure. We have budgeted for the coming year \$284,000. The Liberals charged senior citizens about \$2 million in deterrent fees — we abolished deterrent fees. The Liberals collected \$3 million a year in premiums on Medicare from senior citizens — we have paid the premiums on their behalf. Mr. Speaker, if you deduct the amount collected in premiums and deterrent fees the Liberal administration of 1970-71 spent \$1.3 million on senior citizens. This coming year, not including the abolition of deterrent fees, we will spend \$20 million on these same senior citizens. This does not include Property Improvement Grants, low rental housing and programs under other departments. The record, I suggest, indicates where the real concern for our senior citizens really lies.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Taylor: — Now the member for Albert Park (Mr. MacLeod) also

emphasized the involvement of the Federal Liberal Government in the construction of special care homes. Well, the Provincial Government gives a 20 per cent grant to every non-profit or municipal senior citizen home built in the Province of Saskatchewan. Twenty per cent, as a grant. The Federal Liberals supply a loan for which they charge 8¾ per cent interest. That is really generous. This, I believe, indicates something of our concern for senior citizens.

This coming year, Mr. Speaker, we intend to expand the operation and work of the Department of Social Services. We shall be looking at the possibilities of work creation. One aspect will definitely be a housing survey for we have already noted with interest that rents to welfare clients have increased by 37 per cent. It may not be that our clients are abusing welfare, but maybe some landlords are. This, we intend to investigate.

I intend also to continue the public meetings which I have carried out in this province as a means of meeting the people of the province and hearing their views.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Taylor: — Now I cannot believe that the Opposition would vote against this Budget. Would they vote against a \$15 million credit program for farmers; a \$2 million grant program for farmers? Would they vote against a \$22 million program for disabled persons in the province? Against an \$11 million increase to education; a \$3 million grant to patients in special care homes? Would they vote against increased Property Improvement Grants? Would they vote against a \$3 million program for senior citizens' home repairs? I can't believe that anyone would vote against these things and certainly, Mr. Speaker, I intend to vote against the amendment and strongly support the motion.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Steuart (Leader of the Opposition): — Mr. Speaker, I should just like to deal for a moment with some of the things that have been said by the speaker who just preceded me in the debate. I won't try to answer all their points, the ones they raised and all the untruths that they put out over the radio and in this House this afternoon, or in the last few days, but the gentleman who just sat down, the Hon. Mr. Taylor, Minister of Welfare, talked about us playing with the truth. Well, maybe from time to time we have played with the truth, but when it comes to playing with the truth the Hon. Member is a master. He talks about all the increases they have given to the old people, and they have given some increases to the old people, but he took the money that we paid, and we paid 70 per cent of the cost of all the old people in Level III care homes and we paid it to the homes. They took it away from the homes and they are paying it now in a grant directly to the old people. Now he takes the money out of the Saskatchewan Assistance Plan, puts it over in another column and says, look at the amount of money we are giving to the old folks as compared to what the Liberals did.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Steuart: — The Member from Melville (Mr. Kowalchuk) who claimed that he was a member of a school board, talks about the reputation that the NDP Government or the Liberal Government had with the trustees. I just suggest that the Member for Melville should have gone to the Regina Inn yesterday where 1,200 school trustees were gathered from all over this province to protest bitterly this NDP Government's proposed plan to destroy local school boards to find out what they really think of the NDP as against the Liberals.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Steuart: — I must say the Member from Canora (Mr. Matsalla) did say I was in the town of Sturgis and he said I went and talked to the former mayor who is a Liberal. I did talk to the former mayor and he is a Liberal. I also went and talked to the present mayor who had been re-elected. He is a school teacher and I understand that he is an NDP. I asked him about the location of the mill in Sturgis And he did tell me that they were being blackmailed. He said that the Timber Board of the Government said you put it there in that location or you don't get it. Well that is what he told me.

As a matter of fact I suggest that if the Premier takes the Government airplane and goes to Sturgis that he should be very careful and not try to land at the airport that cost the people of this province about \$3,000 and the local community about \$2,000, because that is exactly where they put that little saw mill, plunk in the middle of the airstrip. That is why many of the people up there complain about the location of the mill. Hundreds of square miles all around that town, they could have put it anywhere, but for some reason they decided to put it right in the middle of the airport.

All I will say about Mr. Bowerman, Minister of Northern Saskatchewan, that he really didn't talk about the Department of Northern Saskatchewan. He did make some criticism of Mr. Allan Guy. He said something about him in regard to respect in the North that Mr. Allan Guy must be on the lowest rung of the ladder. Well, that is not true, but if it was true I would tell you where that ladder would be sitting. It would be sitting on the overstuffed carcass of the Member from Shellbrook, I will tell you that.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Steuart: — I think the people of the North answered what they thought of Mr. Bowerman and answered what they thought of the NDP in the by-election which Allan Guy won for the fifth time.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Steuart: — Mr. Speaker, someone once said that the world won't end with a huge bang but rather with a sad whimper. And last Monday the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Messer) sounded the death knell to a great Saskatchewan dream with just such a whimper.

Mr. Messer announced the end of the South Saskatchewan

River Irrigation project, with a timid whine of fear about rising costs. What is this project? Why is it important to anybody outside of the Outlook-Conquest area?

The South Saskatchewan River Dam and Irrigation Project began as a dream long before this province was even formed. To dam that great river, create a vast inland lake, make possible hydro power, have water to irrigate a half million acres of dry prairie land and develop parks and playgrounds for our people, this was the dream that started almost a century ago.

The irrigated land would produce a wealth of crops, forage, sugar beets, corn, peas, potatoes and many other field crops. Industry would follow to process these huge crops and the dam would produce the power to operate the factories. Local farms would prosper, the towns would grow and summer resorts on the lake provide recreation for the southern half of Saskatchewan.

An impossible dream? Not by any means! It has already happened in the Province of Alberta. That province now employs our people. They supply us with sugar, they supply us with canned food and they have the greatest forage and cattle industry in Canada. In Alberta they built and they finished their dam and irrigation projects in spite of the cost and in the face of a group of negative people who were afraid of the high cost of finishing the job.

Go to Lethbridge, go to the town of Taber and see the prosperity those people are enjoying, thanks to irrigation. Alberta has a booming canning industry, a successful sugar beet factory and the largest cattle population in Canada, thanks to irrigation.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Steuart: — Lethbridge alone had three new livestock feed production industries started last year, proving that the boom is still on in Alberta.

They went through a period when the canals were said to be too large and expensive, the cost per acre looked too high, and the secondary industry had not developed fast enough. The easy thing would have been to stop, to drop the whole plan, to take the small negative view of the future. But the Alberta people believed in themselves, believed in their future and they paid the price and are now reaping the reward.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Steuart: — Their faith paid off and that province grows while the NDP Government of Saskatchewan stands idly by and watches our farms dwindle in number and our people move to Alberta by the thousands. The irony of this situation is that it was the old CCF Government, under Tommy Douglas, who signed the agreement and actually started this great program.

In 1958, speaking on second reading of Bill No. 99, an Act respecting the South Saskatchewan River Project, Premier Douglas called it a multiple dam project, power, irrigation and recreation. He also said it was the single most important project ever undertaken in Saskatchewan.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Steuart: — Mr. Douglas stated at that time that it would only be a viable project if all three programs were developed to their full potential. He called it a turning point in our economic history and he painted a great picture of power, farms, industries and recreation that would change this province's history.

T. C. Douglas was not the only man of vision who fought and worked for the South Saskatchewan River Project, former Premier James Gardiner and John Diefenbaker kept this dream alive and helped make it a reality.

Three men of different political faiths, but with a common belief in this province, its people and its future.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Steuart: — The late Ross Thatcher was also a believer in this great plan and under his guidance it took shape and it grew.

I phoned John Diefenbaker this morning in Ottawa about the decision to stop work on this project. Mr. Diefenbaker was a man who brought the Federal Government into this plan and put up 75 per cent of the cost. He told me this, and I quote, and he said I could quote him. He said:

I am appalled by this damnable decision of the NDP Government.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Steuart: — Mr. Diefenbaker further stated that a lifetime of work by many people was being thrown away just when success was in sight. He said the people of Saskatchewan would be revolted by this failure.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Steuart: — Mr. Speaker, thanks to these outstanding men and many others who also contributed we now have the Gardiner Dam, Lake Diefenbaker and the beginning of an irrigation system. We have invested hundreds of millions of dollars, millions of man hours of planning and work and we are on the verge of success.

The most difficult part is past, the big money is already invested and the payoff is within our grasp. More farms, prosperous farms, family farms, a sugar industry, a canning industry, hundreds of good jobs, wonderful summer playgrounds are all ours for the taking. But Premier Blakeney has lost his nerve. Premier Blakeney is a negative man with small plans and even smaller courage.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Steuart: — Premier Blakeney is not cut in the mould Tommy Douglas or Jimmie Gardiner, John Diefenbaker or Ross Thatcher. These men knew Saskatchewan was a hard, tough place that would only

yield its riches and give success to men with vision and the courage to plan big and take big risks when necessary.

Mr. Speaker, this Premier and this Government talk of bold new plans but they have failed every test that has faced them.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Steuart: — By quitting now on the South Saskatchewan River Project, they are dooming it to a second-rate venture that will never repay the money or the faith that has already been invested in it.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Steuart: — I challenge the Premier to finish the job, and it will take a few more millions of dollars. A small amount compared to the hundreds of millions we have already invested. Then, I say, go after a sugar industry and I think you will get one. The sugar industry won't dare stay out of Saskatchewan.

They are in Alberta and British Columbia and they will come here if for no other reason than to protect their position in the prairie market.

Don't tell me we can't get a canning industry. They have one in every province west of Nova Scotia.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Steuart: — We were treated last year in this House to some canned vegetables from a new cannery in Manitoba. But we will never have these job-producing industries if we don't have the produce, the sugar beets, the peas and the corn. To grow these crops takes irrigated land, about a third or a half more than we now have.

In other words, we must finish irrigating the west side of the South Saskatchewan River Project.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Steuart: — Mr. Speaker, the original contract called on the Saskatchewan Government to make possible the irrigation of 500,000 acres of land. It was a CCF Government that signed this agreement in 1959, and I have a copy of it in my hand and I will table it.

Hon. Mr. Messer: — 50,000!

Mr. Steuart: — 500,000 acres! 50,000 in the first year, Mr. Messer. You had better read the contract. And then it says in the contract, we will go in all possible haste until they have put in the works and make it possible the irrigation of 500,000 acres. Maybe if Mr. Messer would read the contract, or maybe if Mr. Blakeney would refresh his memory, because he was a Member of that Government, they might have the nerve to get on with the job.

I say this to him, he has a moral obligation to the people

of Saskatchewan to finish the job and allow our people to realize the tremendous benefits that will result.

Unemployment is at a ten year high, our people continue to leave Saskatchewan to find work and new opportunities. Here is a golden opportunity to create jobs, diversify the agricultural industry, develop new family farms and attract industry. This is not risking dollars for oil in deep costly wells that will probably come up dry. This is not gambling on mineral finds in the vast expanses of our North at odds as high as 500 to one. This is using our land to produce food, land that we know about, land that is fertile but only needs water.

There is a market for the food that we can produce. Surely there is. This question answers itself. In a world already short of food and with the population growing by leaps and bounds, we have an assured market. In a world where millions go to bed hungry every night surely we don't have to argue about the need to produce more food or the lack of markets.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Steuart: — Mr. Blakeney, you have been the Premier of our province for only 19 months and already you have cancelled the Meadow Lake pulp mill and you and your followers have heaped scorn on it ever since. You said there were no markets, this is a lie. The Prince Albert pulp mill is setting production records right now and selling every ton they produce.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Steuart: — You claimed the mill would pollute the Churchill River system — another falsehood — the plans called for \$10 million worth of pollution control, more than enough and you knew it.

You said the mill would ruin the forest — another lie. These same forests would have been replanted and regenerated as they have been in British Columbia for over 100 years. There will be more trees rot and burn in the next 10 years than that mill would have used.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Steuart: — The Choiceland iron min, you said it was a gamble and you cancelled it, but, of course, it wasn't a good gamble. We knew the iron was there, we know the market is available and we had Canadian people with the knowhow to mine the iron and refine it.

In fact, after your too hasty decision to cancel the Choiceland iron mine, you sent your people East to try and revive it. Your people contacted Stephen Roman, the head of Roman Industries, who was ready to go ahead with the project before you cancelled it, but turned it down because he didn't trust you. Your narrow, negative outlook has cost Saskatchewan thousands of jobs, millions of dollars of industrial investment and relegated us to the status of a second-rate province.

However, Mr. Speaker, in the cancellation of the pulp mill and the iron mine there was a certain twisted logic, the NDP

don't like big business or small business, nor foreign investment, unless it's from Roumania and they had campaigned against these projects.

I have always believed that Premier Blakeney had to throw out these developments, even though they cost us thousands of jobs and over \$6 million, to keep his supporters happy.

However, the South Saskatchewan Dam is a totally different situation. First of all it is Canadian, Saskatchewan. Then it's agriculture and its success means more family farms, more diversification.

The sugar and the canning industries would also be Canadian. They would produce many jobs at good wages. Our economy would be broadened and it would be strengthened. These we are told are all prime goals of the NDP Government. Why then have they turned their back on this wonderful opportunity?

Mr. Speaker, I believe it is because they are afraid. Listen to their speeches, they are always against something, the NDP have a chip on their shoulders. Somebody is always taking advantage of them. The NDP answer to the problems of society are to regulate, control, forbid and regiment.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Steuart: — Their Ministers freely predict our population will continue to fall and they see Saskatchewan as a minor province of 600,000 to 700,000 people.

We say this is a great province with unbelievable resources of coal, oil, gas, minerals and water. Saskatchewan has about 40 per cent of the best land in Canada and a cattle industry second only to Alberta. Our people are hard working, resourceful and optimistic. Unfortunately our NDP Government is proving to be negative and pessimistic.

I again challenge the Premier to throw off this pessimism about our future and show some courage by reversing this shut down of the South Saskatchewan River Project.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Steuart: — Mr. Premier, these western provinces are big country and they call for big decisions. History will forgive you if you miss the target aiming high but not if you don't have the courage to even risk the shot.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Steuart: — Mr. Speaker, I am sorry that the Member for North Battleford (Mr. Kramer) is not in his place. I don't know whether he is holding an auction or not. But I want to talk about the Saskatchewan Hospital in North Battleford.

Some time ago I talked about a situation in North Battleford about the care and the treatment accorded to the patients in that hospital and I said that it had seriously declined in the last few months. I also pointed out, in the Press release, that

February 16, 1973

I felt that the political interference of the NDP MLA from The Battlefords, Mr. Kramer, had not helped the situation.

Mr. Kramer subsequently challenged me to make known names of people where he had interfered with people in a political way getting jobs or getting promotions. I intend to answer that challenge today.

Let me first talk about Mr. Kramer and what he had to say. Besides challenging me he talked about the locked doors. He talked about and denied what he had said that the situation in the North Battleford Hospital was declining and that the care of the patients, the morale in that hospital was going down, that the care of patients was slipping.

I have, Mr. Speaker, a letter that was sent to the North Battleford News Optimist, Friday, February 9

, by a psychiatric nurse, who has worked in the hospital for a long time. She has some very unpleasant things to say about the Government and she had some very unpleasant things to say about the Liberal Government when we were in power.

She goes on to say:

I would first like to say that I am a psychiatric nurse and have worked in the Saskatchewan Hospital for over 20 years. I have seen all the great changes and the politicians, the doctors and administrators and other classifications of management who like to take credit when all that was needed was to give us a ward staff and the right to think and function as psychiatric nurses and the situation would have improved.

She says:

The situation at the Saskatchewan Hospital is a mess. The morale of the staff is at an all time low. Staff resignations are too high.

She goes on later, to call for the need for an investigation.

Let's have an impartial one, not one loaded with employer representation like the one we had one or two years ago.

And she is referring to an investigation which was carried on after the NDP became the Government and they sent up Dr. Colin Smith and Dr. Skoll, and I understood they asked the people who work in that institution to come to them if they had any complaints.

Evidently, they didn't feel they could come to the management, I don't blame them, and criticize what was going on and I think that investigation was not successful. The information that we have is that it didn't do any good and the morale up there continues to drop and the situation continues to grow even more serious.

I want to make it very clear that my purpose in bringing this up was not to become involved in a political controversy with the Member from North Battleford. If he wants me to name names I will name names. But I want to make it very clear that even if Mr. Kramer disappeared tomorrow, even if Mr. Kramer took

his hands off and didn't attempt to use his political influence in that hospital, the situation is still serious and it would still call for an investigation and some changes.

Mr. Kramer wants me to name names and I will name some. I will name Jack Degenstein, hired in 1972. As a farmer his greatest qualification is that he is an NDP supporter. Andre Douville, hired in the fall of 1972, another NDP supporter. Evelyn Rousseau, hired in the fall of 1972. These people I am told as their greatest qualification is the party membership rather than any ability for skill to help to work in a hospital that looks after the mentally ill. I am told that within a day or two there will be a promotion for a Warren Sprecker, and again, I am told this individual has far more excellent qualifications with the NDP than he has with doing the job that he is hired to do in North Battleford to qualify for this particular promotion.

I can name other people that Mr. Kramer has put into good positions since he became the Member, nothing to do with the hospital in North Battleford. David Miner, Crop Insurance Board and the Land Bank. Ted Strain one of his NDP workers to the Land Bank Appeal Board. Leonard Lenograph, Alex Covar, the list is as long as your arm, Mr. Speaker. I won't name any more, but I have more

I have one more thing to say about Mr. Kramer. When someone complained about some of the dismissals brought on when the NDP Government came into power, after they had said they would not indulge in this sort of thing, Mr. Kramer came out with the headline, "Kramer Claims Many More Government Dismissals Are Needed." He complained there hadn't been enough people fired for political purposes since the NDP were elected.

Mr. Speaker, let me make it very clear, the situation in North Battleford is far more serious than a bit of political hanky-panky and hiring people or getting people promoted or forcing people to leave indulged in by the local Member. I think what is of vital importance is the care and well-being of the patients in that institution and the public confidence in that institution.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Steuart: — Let me say, I have been a Minister of Health, Mr. Grant has been a Minister of Health, and I have great sympathy for the present Minister of Health (Mr. Smishek). These are not easy problems. We have brought about great changes in the care and treatment of the mentally ill in this province, and they have been brought about in the face of great odds. I have sympathy for him, all I say to him, we ran into the same problems, and the same criticism when you people were on this side of the House. We then hired a man called Dr. Frazier, we commissioned him to carry out a report and he did it. We brought into effect more of his recommendations, that report was not a favorable report, it did cast some aspersions on what we were doing. I had trouble in Weyburn when I was the Minister. I set up an Ad Hoc Committee, that Ad Hoc Committee went out and made studies and we carried out the recommendations, we carried out 90 per cent of the recommendations. I am also told that even Mr. Kramer has pleaded with you to make some changes, that your own NDP people are pleading with you to make some changes,

the staff has pleaded. You so far have turned a deaf ear. You will hear more about this from Mr. Grant who spent two days up there. The situation I tell you, Mr. Minister of Health, if you want to be stubborn and play politics, that's your responsibility and your problem. I say to take the blinders off and look at North Battleford and have the courage, have the courage on behalf of the people that are in that institution. Have the courage on behalf of the relatives of those people and the people of North Battleford to have an independent investigation.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Steuart: — If there is nothing wrong, fine. If there is something wrong then correct it.

Mr. Speaker, the Member for Milestone (Mr. MacDonald) had in this House a Bill, a proposed Bill by the NDP to change the relationship between teachers and trustees in regard to bargaining. I have a copy of that here. It is a bad Bill. It is a bad move for both teachers and trustees. I hope that not just the trustees stand up and fight against this Bill, I hope the teachers take a long look at it. I say they are in great trouble if they ever become employees of this Government or any other government.

Another point I want to make about this, Mr. Speaker. This Bill wasn't hard to come by. An Act respecting Collective Bargaining Agreements for Teachers. They are all over the province, all over the province except in this Legislative Assembly. All over the province except handed to people in this Assembly. This is part of a pattern, the Carillon, the University paper, Regina, released contents of changes to be brought in The University Act, that the University is going to be split. There will be two and a great many other changes. It was carried in the Carillon and nobody has denied it yet. I have had people phone me. I had four phone calls saying what about this Act, that Act, Acts I had never heard of. I did some phoning around and I find out that what the Carillon had in about the University has been proposed. The Carillon released the information about the budget cuts affecting the University before we ever heard the Budget itself. The Liquor Report falls into the hands of the Press by some strange situation, then the Member complains about it. I say he better take a look, if he says somebody should resign over this, then I think the whole Government should resign because this whole situation grows and grows.

I have in my hand another Act, An Act respecting Dental Nurses, it is marked confidential. It is about as confidential as last week's *Leader-Post*. I'll table it if you want. It is a bad Bill, it is another bad Bill. It sets up an Act, it sets up a board, a board according to this Act, that we haven't seen yet. Everybody else in the province evidently has seen it. I don't know whether your back benchers have seen it, Mr. Premier. If they have we haven't seen it. The Press hasn't seen it. Everybody but the people elected by the people of Saskatchewan to control their affairs in this Assembly have seen this Act evidently.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Steuart: — What does it do? It sets up a board, the board will be set up by the Government under the control of the Government. Then it goes on after it sets up a board that is absolutely under their control, in Section 16, it says:

Upon the Minister having consulted the Board, the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council or the Cabinet may make regulations prescribing certain services being Dental Nursing Services.

It goes on then to give the total control of nursing services, training and the licensing to Cabinet itself. I will table this, some of the Members there might want to see it. I don't know whether they have seen it or not.

Mr. Rolfes: — Don't worry about it, Dave!

Mr. Steuart: — I am not going to worry about it, all I say is that it shows a contempt for the Members of this Legislative Assembly by this Government. If the back benchers on that side haven't got the nerve to stand up and complain, I'll complain for them.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Steuart: — I recognize, Mr. Premier, Mr. Speaker, the Government must carry out negotiations, but I suggest they start to use some system different than so-called proposed Acts. It may not be anything different, it may be just a sheet of paper saying these are changes we are thinking of making. When you put something down and say, this is an Act, this is a Bill, it has in many people's mind a totally different status. Again people are shocked and amazed that elected representatives don't know anything about what is in a Bill when others have already seen the Bill. I recognize you have problems, I suggest that you take a look at this whole situation and approach the matter in some totally different way than this particular procedure.

I know it is easy to stand up and say, "You people did it." We had a Bill that was sent to the teachers one time, went all over the province. We didn't do it again. Why? Because it was a bad way to proceed. It is a bad way in which you are proceeding.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Steuart: — Mr. Speaker, we have other Members on this side of the House who want to speak. I just want to say one or two things about the Budget. I want to congratulate our Member from Regina, Mr. Ken MacLeod, who criticized the Budget. He must have got under your skin, because you have all been very sensitive in the last four or five days. He called it a Las Vegas Budget. I suppose that's where they throw the money away like drunken sailors and certainly it is an indication that over \$700 million will be spent by this Government, by far a new record in the Province of Saskatchewan.

They talked about a tax shift. Somebody mentioned that it is a tax shaft, and that the people are getting shafted, the working people and the old age pensioners. I say what might be

a good name for it, would be a "Thank you Otto Lang Budget," because if it wasn't for Otto Lang and the Federal Government, it would have been the saddest Budget that has ever been brought into the Legislature of the Province of Saskatchewan.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Steuart: — You look at the taxes, you look at the money coming in from sales tax, gas tax, all the consumption taxes are way up. Why are they way up? Because we had great grain sales and record prices. The Federal Government gave us a two-price system and put over \$30 million in our farmers' pockets. Cattle prices, hog prices are at an all time high. The Federal Government contribution of over 40 per cent, I say, Mr. Finance Minister, you should turn East and thank Otto Lang, Pierre Trudeau and the Federal Government, because without them you would have had a pretty sad Budget.

They talk about the greatest thrust in this Budget being the tax shift. Well let's look at it. They talk about increasing school grants by \$2 million, as if it was some kind of a record. In 1970-71 we increased tax grants for school purposes, operating purposes, by \$11.2 million. They talk about reducing taxes to 25 mills for schools. Well, in the beginning, that is not true. In the second place, even though they did reduce it, they can't take all the credit for it. The Homeowners Grants which they have now renamed the Property Improvement Grants stands at about \$30 million, a little over \$30 million. When they became the Government the Homeowners Grant stood at \$12.8. The increase they have given to the people of this province to keep their campaign promise isn't anywhere near 18 mills. That's only part of the story.

Take a look at your tax bill, anybody's tax bill, whether they are a homeowner, a pensioner, wealthy person or a poor person. Look at their total tax bill. They just say what is the mill rate? They don't really divide it into that much for education, this much for municipal purposes. All they know is that they have to pay \$500 or \$600 or \$1,000 or \$2,000 if they are farmers, for property taxes or farm taxes.

What has this Government done? They call it a tax shift. Why do we call it a tax shaft? When you look in the Budget, while they have given more, not a record by any means, while they have given more to school boards and while they have raised the Homeowner Grant, mostly to those who need it the least. They talk about the incidence of taxation falling on the poor and the needy and the people on fixed incomes. Who gets the biggest chunk of the Property Improvement Grant? The big farmer, the bigger farmer you are the more money you get. The bigger businessman, the more money you get. What about the little pensioner, the people on fixed incomes? They get the small end of the stick, from that particular grant. Look what else happens to them.

Every city in this province, every town in this province, because they got little or no help from this Government, will have to raise their mill rates. It is going to be a pretty hollow comfort to read the wonderful NDP program has been kept, and find out they have to dish out another \$30, \$40, \$50 or \$100 on local taxation because you take it out of one pocket to give it to the schools and give it to some of the wealthy people

in the Property Improvement Grant. You didn't take it out of the other pocket to give it to the municipalities. Let's look at your record. You have got the second worst record in any province in Canada in grants to municipalities, cities and town. Let me give you some figures. Little Prince Edward Island gives in per capital grants to towns . . .

An Hon. Member: — . . . 50 per cent.

Mr. Steuart: — Well, you keep running this place and you'll be up to 50 per cent!

I'll give some other provinces. They give \$12 per capita. Nova Scotia, a little less than Saskatchewan, \$3.20, that's the only one that is worse. Quebec gives \$12 per capita. Ontario \$12 per capita. Manitoba \$8 per capita. Alberta \$25 per capita. British Columbia, even the NDP haven't loused things up yet enough, they can still afford to pay \$32 per capita.

What about Saskatchewan? \$3.65 per capita. Some tax shift, tax shaft is a better word for it. When you add this, the income tax, the increased tax on business, the increase in tax in tobacco and inheritance tax, on gift tax, car licences, I say to you, Mr. Speaker, this NDP tax shift is a hoax. I say also that the New Deal, when you look at this Budget and the Throne Speech, is a bad deal except for the NDP supporters. Six hundred new jobs, but they cut some, the net is a little over 400 increase. Where did they cut them? They cut most of the jobs at the mental hospital in North Battleford and Weyburn. Welfare up to 12.27 per cent of the Budget, in the last year of the Liberal budget it was 6.6 per cent. Granted they have added some new services in Welfare, but not that many. The emphasis by this Government is on welfare and handouts, as I pointed out earlier. It is not on real sound development.

Mr. Speaker, this is a negative, small inward-looking Government with little or no faith in the future of our people or our province. The Throne Speech reflected that view. This Budget is a clever, almost too clever by half Budget. But again if you look at it closely, there is little or no substance in it. It is as negative as the approach of the Premier and his Cabinet and for that reason I will support the amendment, I cannot support the motion.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Loken (Rosetown): — Mr. Speaker, with the presenting of the Budget this Government has proved without a doubt that they are masters of the political con.

How can a government introduce a record Budget of over \$720 million and cripple urban and municipal governments at the same time is almost beyond comprehension. Never has a government passed the buck or rather, failed to pass the buck, so cleverly.

Mr. Speaker, the Premier of this province should immediately join the magician's union, his magic mirror trick, that the school tax is being reduced to 25 mills is a wonderful illusion. But it is nothing more than an illusion. The Premier's sly hand has simply shifted responsibility to urban and

February 16, 1973

municipal governments. But naturally when those government's are forced substantially to raise the mill rate because of irresponsible provincial government planning, the NDP can remain pious, aloof, absolved of all blame.

Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege to represent the constituency of Rosetown, a community rich in natural resources and people, a community that is recognized as the heart of the wheat belt, a community that contributes greatly to the economic well-being of this province. What is the NDP Government doing to encourage the people of Rosetown constituency to rise to even greater heights in their contribution to this province? Nothing, Mr. Speaker. Worse than nothing. The policies of this Government are not designed to raise the standard of living and way of life in rural communities. The policies of this Government are hateful, jealous and vindictive. They are designed to tear down the successful farmer and humble the progressive community until we can all live in an equal state of poverty. This Government penalizes success and rewards failure.

Once Saskatchewan is destitute we can live off federal equalization grants forever. This Government introduced the estate tax, saying it was time to tax the rich to ease the average taxpayers' burden. In 1973-74 the Minister of Finance expects estate taxes to yield the large sum of \$2.8 million. This is approximately one-third of 1 per cent of the NDP record Budget. Obviously the estate tax's contribution to balance the Government's spending is minute. But the harm, Mr. Speaker, the harm the estate tax is causing to this province is devastating. In my constituency family farms could be forced to liquidate holdings to pay the estate tax and out in the wings the Land Bank waits to gobble up the heritage of another hard-working farmer.

Mr. Speaker, farmers in my constituency are selling their holdings and moving to Alberta, not because they dislike Saskatchewan, but because they want to protect the investment of a life's work.

Mr. Speaker, I urge this Government to get out of the estate tax field, the funds raised by this tax simply doesn't compare with the loss of our hard-working farmers to another province.

What has this Government done for the Rosetown constituency, Mr. Speaker? The Government has reduced health care grants to the Rosetown Union Hospital. Rosetown now has a choice, suffer the discomfort of poorer quality health care or raise the municipal mill rate to cover the NDP cutbacks in health spending. The Blakeney magic mirror strikes again.

Mr. Speaker, education grants are still out to recess but the outlook is ominous. It appears that education grant increases will barely cover teacher salary increases, any additional education expenses must be paid by raising the local property tax. The Blakeney magic mirror clearly reflects two-faced politics.

Mr. Speaker, what has this Government done for the Rosetown constituency? The Government is going to half further irrigation development.

When the Minister of Agriculture and the Premier of this

province are urging diversification in every speech, how can they justify killing a project that is the very essence of diversification?

When the NDP screams for the preservation of our rural communities how can they deal such a lethal blow to the towns of Outlook and Conquest?

The 1972-73 fiscal year budgeted \$2.3 million for capital construction of irrigation works, fulfilling contracts which had been let before the NDP Government was elected in 1971. Those works, including a pumping station, canals and reservoir near Conquest will be left unfinished.

Conquest has been waiting five years for the reservoir. It was to be used as the source of their water supply. Some sewerage construction has already been completed. Mr. Speaker, the NDP cancelled the project so it's back to the wells for the people of Conquest. And yet, Mr. Speaker, this Government says it is concerned about the preservation and improvement of our rural way of life. What will happen to Outlook?

Since construction began on the Gardiner Dam the population of Outlook has doubled. Now they are faced with the prospect of many families being forced to move from the town with the cancellation of the irrigation project. A total of 33 Department of Agriculture positions in the project will not be renewed.

Very basically the continued prosperity and growth of Outlook is married to the future of the irrigation industry. The cancellation of the irrigation project will effectively destroy any hopes of attracting vegetable processing industries to the area. But then, Mr. Speaker, this Government has demonstrated time and again it is not interested in attracting industry.

Mr. Speaker, I realize that the irrigation project is not developing as quickly as was anticipated but that is no reason to desert it. I realize the cost for development is high. But if this Government is willing to spend \$30 million acquiring land, why is it afraid to spend \$2.3 million finishing what has already been started?

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Loken: — If this Government is serious about diversification, what better method of promoting it than developing our irrigation fields.

Mr. Speaker, for years before irrigation, wheat was the main crop that could be grown in this area. Today, it is yielding alfalfa seed, barley, faba beans, corn, potatoes, Russian ryegrass seed and a few other grass crops, and in addition to all of that, the land is conducive to grazing large herds of cattle.

Mr. Speaker, this is one time when I urge the government not to pull in its horns but to provide leadership, develop our irrigation fields, promote diversification and provide incentives to vegetable processing industries.

February 16, 1973

For a change, do something constructive about increasing our employment and economy instead of budgeting \$22 million more for welfare.

Mr. Speaker, the people of the Rosetown constituency are vigorously opposed to the Land Bank and its Government ownership principles. Most farmers of the Rosetown constituency are vigorously opposed to the Hog Marketing Commission and its objectives of state control of the industry. Mr. Speaker, the people of the Rosetown constituency want to work for themselves, not the Government.

Mr. Speaker, I will not support the motion.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Lane (Lumsden): — Mr. Speaker, it is with a great deal of pleasure that I enter the Budget Debate.

I should like to thank the Hon. Member for Albert Park (Mr. MacLeod) for his incisive criticisms of the Budget and I should like to thank the Federal Member for Saskatoon-Humboldt for supporting the Province of Saskatchewan for another year.

Mr. Speaker, there is an unbelievable and unprecedented reliance on Ottawa for sources of revenue for the Province of Saskatchewan. I realize, Mr. Speaker, that much of the money that we are to receive from Ottawa, is money that the province is entitled to as of right — and I am referring in particular to the equalization payments. But, Mr. Speaker, the first two budgets of the NDP make it abundantly clear that equalization payments have become a deterrent to economic improvement by our province.

Mr. Speaker, the direction given in these two budgets is a direction for more programs, more service projects, without any thought or a concern to a positive economic diversification by Saskatchewan.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Lane: — I realize that strengthening the existing economic base is an admirable goal, Mr. Speaker, but it is the very party opposite that argues that strengthening the agricultural segment is a job and duty of the Government in Ottawa and not of the Province of Saskatchewan.

Mr. Speaker, this approach of saying we do not have to do anything constructive in the area of economic diversification will mean a perpetuation of the agrarian economy in Saskatchewan. It will mean, Mr. Speaker, that we will continue to lose political clout in Ottawa as our population continues to decline.

Mr. Speaker, we are already facing a serious population decline and loss of another federal constituency. And the Government is making it quite clear in this Budget that that direction is to continue. That this Government does not intend to take a positive approach to diversify our economy and is quite content to out-program everyone else, with Ottawa's money. It has been evidenced by statements made by Members of the Government that it will continue its yearlong practice of begging Ottawa for

more and more money. Mr. Speaker, the practice of begging started shortly after the Government opposite took office.

Hon. Mr. Messer: — What statements?

Mr. Lane: — The Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Messer) asks me, what statements? Well, the first one that I am going to quote from is a statement by the Hon. Minister of Agriculture. "Messer to Urge More Federal Aid." *Leader-Post*, August 11, 1971, page six.

The Minister of Agriculture of Saskatchewan will recommend that the Saskatchewan Government consider asking Ottawa for financial aid to help farmers.

Again, for Bertha Army worms, this was the first request. I table this one, Mr. Speaker, merely to indicate that is when the practice of begging and asking more and more money had just started.

We then move on, Mr. Speaker, and I have limited myself to just 13 headlines of requests that the Government has made. I am going to list some of these for the edification of the Hon. Members of the Treasury Benches, Mr. Speaker, because obviously they make a request and try and forget about it if things don't work out the way they want it or they go around the province crying, "Ottawa won't help us. We can't do it ourselves and Ottawa won't help us."

Mr. Speaker, I am going to refer to another one. "Saskatchewan to Request Work Subsidization." This is the Natural Resources Minister, at that time, Mr. Kramer.

The Provincial Government will ask Ottawa to subsidize work programs for northern Indian and Métis and indirectly cut back on welfare costs.

In other words, "We can't do it ourselves," Mr. Speaker.

"Winter Works Details Sought." Now the Premier couldn't take this too long, sitting back and seeing everyone else asking for money, so by July 5

of 1972 he was on the bandwagon begging Ottawa for money. "Winter Works Details Sought," the headline in the *Leader-Post* of July 5

Mr. Blakeney said another subject to be brought up by Provincial representatives would be the burden placed on provincial and municipal governments in the operation of last year's Winter Works Program. The Federal Government paid only 18 per cent or \$5 million of the total cost. We feel that that is simply not good enough.

Now we get into the very infamous or famous — depending on how you look at it — the Roumanian tractor plant, Mr. Speaker.

There have been a few things said in this House. Some people say that the Roumanian are coming to Saskatchewan.

Mr. Guy: — Where are they?

Mr. Lane: — That's a good question. The best question ever asked by

February 16, 1973

a Member of this House, of where are the Roumanians and where are the tractors. But anyway, again the Premier gets into this.

The Premier decides that this Roumanian tractor plant is such a good deal that by turning out quality products at a lower price, that the proposed assembly plant could start to serve as a start toward the trend to lower prices.

That is why we are going to have an Roumanian tractor plant, according to Premier Blakeney.

But the Premier says:

That this project will not proceed without a DREE grant from the Government at Ottawa. And that this project will not proceed without money from the Government at Ottawa.

If it is a good deal, I thought it was the policy of the Government to implement such a good deal. And those were the promises that were made.

Now we go on a little further, again, the Premier: "Works Program Accelerated," is the headline in the *Leader-Post* October 12, 1972. Now the Premier released the contents of a telegram to Prime Minister Trudeau, urging the Federal Government to at least double the present \$85 million committed for local improvement projects.

Mr. Blakeney attacked the Federal Government for providing less than half the \$200 million allocated for job creation projects last winter, while it appeared that unemployment this winter would be worse. And the news release compiled by the Premier's staff – now I am sure that we could never find out who compiled this Press release – but they described his attack – and I am going to refer to statements later where we are called a poor province by Ministers of the Treasury Benches. His attack on Federal plans, "Scorching Criticisms."

The Provincial Government now plans to allocate \$9.9 million to job creating including \$5 million set aside in a provincial municipal cost-sharing program.

Again, we have the classic, we have the former Minister of Natural Resources who asked for job aid so that the province wouldn't have to pay so much welfare. He got a transfer, Mr. Speaker. Now he is asking for more aid for highways.

Not begrudging the Eastern and Maritime provinces, Mr. Kramer said, simply:

We want a little money in Saskatchewan too.

That is the attitude that started shortly after the election of June 23

and I submit, Mr. Speaker, that that attitude of begging and crying to Ottawa is demeaning of the people of Saskatchewan.

Well, they seem to do all right. They seem to have been given \$295 million in the Budget.

Mr. Wiebe: — How much?

Mr. Lane: — \$295 million came from payments from Ottawa and other provinces. Now, again, another quote by the Minister of Highways, "More Money Wanted."

Saskatchewan urges go ahead on tractor plant again, complaining that Ottawa didn't give any money to the great white hope of industrial development policy of the party opposite.

Well, things got a little out of hand that they went begging and asking and carping and prying to Ottawa all the time, Mr. Speaker. They got a little sneaky! So what did they do, under the headline, "Air Policy Changes Sought," *Leader-Post* of September 6, 1972.

Mr. Thorson, the Minister of Industry and Commerce puts under a conference on air policy:

Mr. Thorson also said he wanted to discuss federal programs promising more help for tourism in the poorer provinces. More Federal assistance toward historic sites and a need for a national policy on pollution as it affects tourism.

And it was on his begging list as he went to Ottawa, Mr. Speaker. Again, Mr. Thorson can't quit the practice of begging. January 8, 1973:

A grant of \$218,000 has been applied for a DREE project in Saskatchewan. A \$1 million loan by the Saskatchewan Economic Development Corporation would have been smaller if DREE grant had been larger.

Again, why can't we do it on our own? Now we are getting into the crunch of the matter and it is unfortunate that the Hon. Minister of Agriculture is not in his seat at the present time. He asked the original question, I believe, this afternoon of what programs were asked.

Saskatchewan plans a new farm program in announcement by the Minister of Agriculture of Saskatchewan January 17, 1973.

The Provincial Government is attempting to get federal help for what Saskatchewan officials will claim to be a major new farm development program.

Again, help from Ottawa.

Then, here we are a poor province just like the spoiled child, Mr. Speaker, and we get \$295 million. Headline January 24, 1973: "Saskatchewan Still Not Happy With Health Cost Plans."

A revised formula by which Ottawa would contribute to provincial health costs is an improvement . . .

And he had to make this great admission that Ottawa has done a good job. And he said:

. . . over the original proposal but still unsatisfactory to Saskatchewan.

February 16, 1973

Mr. Smishek said there has been dissatisfaction in recent years with the cost-sharing arrangement whereby Ottawa has restricted its financial contributions to costs incurred for acute care hospitals and payment to physicians.

Mr. Smishek said he was disappointed there was no provision in the new formula for cost-sharing of new provincial programs.

Mr. Speaker, here he was taking things up already so we can start begging, asking and grabbing Ottawa again.

I find it difficult to see why Ottawa would not indicate it for parity to take its share of financial responsibility.

The new Finance Minister (Mr. Cowley) is on this particular conference and he said:

Saskatchewan's position on cost-sharing was generally that a straight transfer of individual income tax points would not put Saskatchewan further ahead, unless it is on an equalization basis with the richer provinces. Saskatchewan has also pushed for inclusion of property taxes for school purposes in the calculation of equalization payment we get from Ottawa.

New programs to aid Western development should come from Ottawa and a significant transfer of additional taxing powers to be given up by Ottawa.

But the ultimate, Mr. Speaker, the goody, has been saved to the end. The great program that has been talked about and propagated by the party opposite, promised and touted around this province, which has been made for the basis of the new political machine in western Canada, Mr. Speaker, ultimate begging by the Government: "Land Bank Aid Sought."

Lorne Nystrom, NDP Member for Yorkton-Melville, Thursday urged the Federal Government to help out Saskatchewan's Land Bank, for small farmers.

Even when you come up with a program you can't do it on your own and you have to get help from Ottawa.

Mr. Speaker, that is the attitude of the Government opposite, they come with an idea of a program, and they don't get help from Ottawa, they blame Ottawa for not implementing that program. Mr. Speaker, in the words of the recent President of the United States, "The buck stops here." And this Budget makes it quite clear that we have to quit lapping out of the trough of public money from Ottawa and that we are a poorer province only because the party opposite has made us a poorer province. And we are a 'have not' province only because the party opposite has made us a 'have not' province, Mr. Speaker.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Lane: — Mr. Speaker, the party opposite does not have the courage to say that we want industry and we want the development and we want to become an economically viable province. You are degrading and demeaning the people of the Province of

Saskatchewan and the begging practices and programs that you have started should be stopped immediately.

Mr. Speaker, four out of every 10 dollars in this massive Budget comes from the Government in Ottawa. Mr. Speaker, \$295 million! But is the Government opposite prepared to say thank you? No, they certainly are not. They keep harping and complaining and issuing press releases. The research officers find out another way to beg for money from Ottawa, Mr. Speaker.

For 19 long gaunt begging months we have heard nothing but harping and griping by the Government opposite because Ottawa doesn't give enough money, Mr. Speaker.

But, Mr. Speaker, when we get \$295 million, just about 40 per cent of this Budget, it takes one and a half lines in a 38 page Budget Speech by the new Minister of Finance (Mr. Cowley) and the announcement that Provincial Government enterprises will contribute \$55 million, one-sixteenth as much, takes up considerably more space.

Mr. Speaker, the Government opposite is guilty of fiscal mismanagement and political dishonesty in its dealings and approach to the Federal Government.

Mr. Speaker, not one effort in the last 19 months of NDP Government to diversify our economy. Not one ounce of credit to the Federal Government for financing this so-called "New Era in Government Programming in Saskatchewan."

Mr. Speaker, there is going to be a reaction and it is already starting to set in in Alberta, Ontario and British Columbia. They are fed up with the equalization programs and they are going to cut back on their contributions to the Federal Treasury that are going to be distributed throughout this province. When that happens, Mr. Speaker, the people of Saskatchewan are going to pay for the fiscal mismanagement of the party opposite.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Lane: — They are going to pay for the extravagances that have been set out by Premier Blakeney and the new Minister of Finance. Mr. Speaker, we have got an extravagant Budget. It has been called the Las Vegas Budget for the high rollers of the party opposite and that is precisely what it is. Spending money like drunken sailors is all this Budget indicates. But, Mr. Speaker, this supposed party with a New Deal for People, the party that cares, and there are individual hypocrites who could be named, it would take me a minute to name the 45 of them who have got up in this House and said how they care for the people and we are the party that cares for the people and is concerned about the people. Even the Press has gone so far as to carry this a little. I don't know why the Premier and the Hon. Attorney General (Mr. Romanow) are complaining about the Press when this false representation is existent throughout the Province of Saskatchewan. But, Mr. Speaker the Government's record on unemployment in Saskatchewan is a sorry blot on the record of the history of this province.

To quote the Minister of Finance, Mr. Speaker, "It is one thing to recognize the existence of a program, it's another thing

to take forceful action to solve that problem." And on both counts the Government opposite has failed, Mr. Speaker.

In the section of the Budget Speech dealing with an overview of the Saskatchewan economy there is not one mention of the unemployment problem in Saskatchewan. Unemployment is mentioned in the section on the national economy, but there is no mention in that discussion by the political speech of the Minister of Finance. The Saskatchewan unemployment record rate is higher than the national average. The unemployment problem is not the fault of the Government of Ottawa. It is not the fault of the lack of sincere effort on the part of the Federal Government to tackle the unemployment-inflation problem. The lack of sincere effort is the lack of any effort on the part of the Government opposite, Mr. Speaker, to make anything more than a token effort to deal with the unemployment tragedy in Saskatchewan.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Lane: — The only action taken this winter was to allot \$5 million for 4,200 man months of work. In other words there has only been provided out of the total Budget of over \$700 million, work for ten people for their lifetimes, by the Government opposite. Ten people employed for their lifetimes is all this Government could come up with, Mr. Speaker.

The NDP Government of Saskatchewan and the NDP of Canada stand condemned of rank hypocrisy when it comes to the question of unemployment in Saskatchewan.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is time to look at the sincere efforts that are talked about by the Minister of Finance. Let's take a look at the NDP leader, David Lewis and the NDP nationally. All we have to do is go to the index of the debates of the House of Commons, Mr. Speaker. I have them for two years, 1970-72.

Now, Mr. David Lewis, leader of the NDP with his sincere effort and his constructive programs to deal with unemployment has made several comments about unemployment, Mr. Speaker. But in 1970-72 he never made one speech with one proposal to deal with unemployment in the House of Commons in Ottawa. As an aside, Mr. Speaker, in the debate on the income tax amendment in Saskatchewan, he suggested a reduction in the personal income tax rate. The Minister of Finance may be interested in this. A reduction in the income tax rate for the lower income people would increase their spending power and thus create jobs. That's the NDP program on unemployment in Canada and your record this afternoon and in this Budget Speech is what we are debating.

Mr. Speaker, the reason we have an unemployment problem in Saskatchewan is a lack of sincere effort on the part of the Provincial Government to tackle the unemployment-inflation problem. And as I say the buck stops here, Mr. Speaker. That party can no longer blame anyone for the unemployment situation in Saskatchewan. It is you that cancelled the industries, no one else. It is you that don't have, when you talk about constructive opposition, don't have one proposal in the House of Commons in Ottawa to deal with unemployment. Every comment made by the leader of the NDP in Ottawa is in the form of a question. Questions before the Orders of the Day. The only proposal is to lower the income tax rate, which wasn't listened to by the new

Minister of Finance, Allan Blakeney and his NDP Government as they have raised the provincial tax rate three per cent again in this Budget, Mr. Speaker. They don't even listen to their Members in Ottawa, their national leader. They are insincere when they deal with unemployment because they don't have the guts, Mr. Speaker, to admit that they don't have an answer. They are afraid to admit that their decision to cancel Choiceland and the Athabasca pulp mill put thousands of people out of work in this province, and that they don't have a better policy. They mask their insincere and callous efforts in unemployment by a screen of silence and they leave it out of that discussion of the Saskatchewan economy in the Budget.

Mr. Speaker, farm cash receipts are up in Saskatchewan, factory shipments are up. The value of mineral production is up. Urban housing starts are up. New construction is up. Retail sales are up, gross personal income is up. But so is unemployment in Saskatchewan, merely through the actions of the Government opposite.

Mr. Speaker, the Government opposite may want to come up with the excuse that they didn't have time to act on the unemployment. Well, David Lewis has been on record since 1969, talking about unemployment. I could trace the sorry record of the Government opposite when it comes to dealing with the problem. But I know that the embarrassment – we notice that the bouncing booze building builder from Bruno is very quiet this afternoon, obviously he is embarrassed by his own party's stand on the question of unemployment.

Mr. Speaker, in 1972, 12,000 people in Saskatchewan were out of work. In October the same figures apply. In November, 14,000 were out of work. Mr. Speaker, we have got quotes: "Construction Trade Facing Job Crisis" November 3, 1972.

An anticipated lack of building throughout Saskatchewan this winter may produce the worst unemployment record in the construction industry in more than a decade.

Union and industry officials agree employment opportunities for the 4,000 unionized construction workers in the province are likely to be scarce.

In Saskatoon, union officials are expecting the present 25 per cent unemployment rate to double.

Mr. Speaker, Jim Chase, general manager of the Saskatchewan Construction Association said:

The lack of new industries and businesses locating in the province has slowed construction.

Mr. Chase also says you would have to go back to the early 1960s, lo and behold there happened to be a CCF Government at that time, to find a comparison with the unemployment that can be expected this year in the construction field.

Mr. Speaker, more joblessness is expected. A quote from the Globe and Mail, November 4, 1972:

Job opportunities for the 4,000 unionized construction tradesmen in the province will be scarce.

Here is the reaction of the Provincial Government to prove to the people of Saskatchewan, once and for all, that they don't care about the unemployed and this is the word that fits that party and its actions, they simply don't care. After being told by union officials, construction officials, businessmen that unemployment was going to be high, here is what the Premier of Saskatchewan, in his callous approach to unemployment says:

Job forecasts said inaccurate. Comments from the construction trade that Saskatchewan is heading into a winter of low construction activity is inaccurate.

But he has got an answer, he has got a program. We are launching what we consider a massive Winter Works Program. That's the answer that the Premier of Saskatchewan and the NDP have \$5 million, ten people, jobs for their lifetime. That is their massive program.

Mr. Speaker, we on this side of the House, are debating this program and this Budget on the callous and cruel attitude of the party opposite when it comes to unemployment in Saskatchewan.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Lane: — Mr. Speaker, we urge the Government of Saskatchewan to do something, do anything about unemployment and quit trying to hide your failures nationally and provincially under a screen of silence as you have tried to do in this Budget.

Mr. Speaker, to top it all off as I have mentioned, when the Government in Ottawa is proposing tax cuts to stimulate the economy, our Provincial Government proposes major tax increases against the producer sector of our economy. Another example proof that the Government opposite simply doesn't care. Mr. Speaker, we have an unemployment rate in Saskatchewan higher than the national average which means and puts to rest once and for all the falsehood that Ottawa is not at fault for unemployment in Saskatchewan. The Government opposite has had ample warning from various sectors in the economy. The Government has failed to act and this Budget is a smokescreen for the unemployment scandal caused by the uncaring Government opposite.

Mr. Speaker, there is another aspect of this Budget that I should like to speak about in closing. This high rolling Vegas Budget has established the concept that the Government intends to keep adding programs on programs without caring whether or not these programs are serving their purpose. The supposed tax shift does not help those without property, it does not help those who are on an economic level that they can only rent property. Not only does it not help the people who rent by choice, but it does not help those who have to rent out of necessity, Mr. Speaker. We can see quite clearly why the Minister of Finance didn't want to table his tax tables.

Mr. Speaker, a person in Saskatchewan who earns \$4,000 in one year and is married with two children — this Government is crass enough and uncaring enough to take the last 30 cents from him. And they talk about the hog dog tax, Mr. Speaker. The 30 cent income tax that they are going to propose. For a person earning \$6,000 they want to get his last \$11. \$25 in taxes from every man, woman and child is going to be taken by

this Government opposite. As the Hon. Member from Albert Park (Mr. MacLeod) says, this isn't a tax shift, it's a tax shaft. And that is precisely what it is.

Mr. Speaker, everyone who fills out a 1973 income tax form should know full well that the definition of ability to pay in the Province of Saskatchewan means each and every one who is working. And that's what the term thrown around by the Government opposite means. This plan, this tax plan is just as unfair and inequitable as the Succession Duty legislation.

Mr. Speaker, there are nearly 45 new programs under the Budget and yet the Government opposite has made it quite clear, on its failure to act on the proposals for the reorganization and amalgamation of the Department of Co-operation and Corporate Development, that it does not intend to insure the effectiveness of these programs. That it does not intend to weed out the obsolete and the ineffective programs. Mr. Speaker, I realize that it may be politically unpopular to criticize, but the actions of the Government opposite regarding the Department of Co-operation and Co-operative Development is indicative of this Government's intention to be extravagant and not responsible.

Mr. Speaker, the Government now has a study before it which makes it clear that the Department has failed the movement and that the movement has far surpassed the department's in its sophistication and the size of its programs. Even within the movement, Mr. Speaker, the Department does not have a good reputation.

In order to eliminate duplication, the report by a Co-op member indicates that the Department of Co-operative Affairs should be amalgamated with the Department of Consumer and Co-operative and Corporate Affairs, to eliminate the overlapping.

We have the biggest Co-op in Saskatchewan advocating rationalization and yet the Government opposite does not have the will to reorganize the Department.

Mr. Speaker: — Order, order!

Mr. Lane: — Mr. Speaker, I will oppose the motion and vote for the amendment.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Cowley (Minister of Finance): — Mr. Speaker, it has been a long afternoon since a quarter to four when the Members opposite rose in their seats to put forward their last breaths of opposition that they could mount to the Budget.

Unfortunately they couldn't have found much to criticize because they spent most of their time on something else. Mr. Speaker, I said when I introduced this Budget one week ago, that I was proud of it. I was proud of the programs it contained. As one Liberal after another rose and spoke, my confidence in this Budget grew.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Cowley: — As my colleagues rose, and one by one took apart the few and the weak arguments mounted by the Opposition, my confidence became unshakeable. Mr. Speaker, having listened to their arguments and their contradictory amendment, I was saddened that this Government will not enjoy the benefit of a constructive informed opposition. Mr. Speaker, I want to deal for a minute with a couple of little points I picked up along the way, little errors that were made by those sitting opposite. I was interested this afternoon when the Leader of the Opposition talked about "using our land to produce food. And you don't need to argue the need to produce food." And the Member opposite is a member of the Liberal Party which introduced LIFT.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Cowley: — Mr. Speaker, that is a strange statement from that Member. The Member for Albert Park (Mr. MacLeod) talked about the Premier's staff. He said that Ross Thatcher employed seven people and that we added 21 last year. Let's look at the facts. In 1970-71 and 1971-72 there were 11 people in the Executive Council Administration. In 1972-73 the number was increased to 17. The increase was six, not 21, he was only 250 per cent out.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Cowley: — He went on to say that Information Services was greatly expanded. Mr. Speaker, in 1971-72 there were seven people employed but in 1972-73, if you exclude the new Inquiry Centre, there were eight people, greatly expanded.

Mr. Speaker, when he talked about Federal Government contributions to the Saskatchewan Assistance Plan he used a figure of \$34 million, the current figure is \$28.5 million.

Mr. Speaker, one could understand this Liberal error. After all C.D. Howe said, "What's a million?" Now the Member for Albert Park says, "What's \$5 million?" Last year the Member criticized the Government's contribution to the Teachers' Superannuation Fund. He said \$1.3 million was unfair. This year he said nothing has been done to rectify it. Well, nothing is just a 277 per cent increase to \$4.9 million.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Cowley: — But then, "What is \$5 million?"

The Member for Whitmore Park (Mr. Grant) said that the Budget had grown \$272 million in the last two years. This was obviously arrived at as a result of close study and careful attention, including careful attention to the fact that we changed to gross budgeting. He was only \$100 million out.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Cowley: — Mr. Speaker, they even had trouble with the amendment that they brought forward to criticize the Budget. They were 20 per cent out of order.

Mr. Speaker, most of the Members opposite avoided the Budget. The Member for Milestone (Mr. MacDonald) never even mentioned it. The Member for Athabasca (Mr. Guy) was more concerned with where I sat than anything else. I want to tell the Member for Athabasca, that in terms of seating there is only one thing that is important to me, and that is to sit on this side of the House.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Cowley: — In fact, I get a chance to look down on him from here. Mr. Speaker, if one word could best sum up the Opposition's performance in this debate, it would have to be confusion. And were they confused! It is analogous to the kind of confusion produced when you ask someone "What's a Liberal?" The Member for Albert Park (Mr. MacLeod) doesn't know. It took him a long time to find out.

The opposition critic, the Member for Albert Park, led off. Perhaps I should say 'misled' off . . .

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Cowley: — . . . and his colleagues followed one by one, like lemmings into a sea of confusion and misrepresentation.

First he confounded one and all by an announcement that income taxes had been increased \$25 million. Now that is not true. The increase in rates from 37 to 40 per cent of federal tax payable will yield about \$7 million. The rest is due to a more buoyant economy and increased income.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Cowley: — Now if one used his logic with respect to provincial income tax, and applied it to federal income tax, you get some interesting results.

The Member for Albert Park said we increased our provincial income tax in 1973, while the Federal Government were reducing theirs. Well let's use his statistical methods and examine the facts behind his statements. In 1972 provincial income tax went up \$10 million, entirely due to an improved economy. Federal taxes on personal income, notwithstanding the reduction boasted about by the Member for Albert Park what happened to them? Well, Mr. Speaker, in Saskatchewan they only went up \$30 million in 1972. Let me give you some estimates for 1973. We indicated in December that our rates would increase, coupled with a much more buoyant economy, we estimate an increase of revenue of \$25 million.

The Members opposite will be interested to know that even if, on next Monday, when John Turner delivers his Budget, even if the Federal Government announces a five per cent reduction in Federal income tax, the revenue from income tax in Saskatchewan to the Federal Government will go up an estimated \$35 million in 1973 over 1972.

Mr. Speaker, the opposition critic has come a long way from a 'funny money man' committed to creating inflation through a

brief conservative metamorphosis to wander into Liberalism.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Cowley: — Mr. Speaker, Mr. Stanfield would take inflation out of income tax, the Member for Albert Park would take growth out of it as well.

If the Members opposite don't know any better, they should be silent. If they do know better, they should stop misrepresenting the facts and misleading the public.

Mr. Speaker, we said we would shift education costs from property taxes to more equitable taxes. We have increased direct payments to homeowners, small businessmen and farmers by \$18 million in less than two years.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Cowley: — I should like the Leader of the Opposition, who is absent, to note that we took out his \$12 million from that figure. We put over \$20 million in additional money into school grants to hold the line on school mill rates and unlike the previous government, it is not a cosmetic figure, we are going to pay it out. \$38 million versus a \$7 million tax increase for individuals, that's the record, Mr. Speaker.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Cowley: — The Member for Albert Park, the Opposition financial critic, went on to say that the Property Improvement Grant helps the rich and not the poor. Well, who gets the assistance? The senior citizen with his home in Moose Jaw, paying \$300 a year in property taxes . . .

An Hon. Member: — Is that the rich fella?

Hon. Mr. Cowley: — Yes, that's a Liberal rich fella. He is receiving the old age security and the guaranteed income supplement. He is getting \$150 a month. He doesn't pay any income tax. He is getting \$66 a year more under the New Property Improvement Grant.

Besides that, Mr. Speaker, he no longer pays hospitalization and medicare premiums and he will soon be getting a hearing aid at a reduced cost.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Cowley: — The farmer in the Perdue area with six quarters of land, hardly a land baron, is getting \$200 more than he did under the previous government to reduce his school taxes. Now he may pay more income tax, but he only would pay more income tax as his income rises. He won't lose anything until his net income is over \$27,000 and I think even he would agree he can afford to pay then. And he no longer pays deterrent fees and his visits to the chiropractor are covered.

The small business man in Biggar, he receives up to \$180 on his business and if he owns a home he could receive a total of \$270. Besides, Mr. Speaker, when he goes across to the local café he doesn't have to pay the hot dog tax any more.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Cowley: — These are the people the Liberals call rich. Now who are the poor, the poor people that the Members opposite feel sorry for because they don't benefit? Well there is the CPR, Safeways, The Hudson's Bay Company, Imperial Oil, the Royal Bank. Mr. Speaker, they label the ordinary people of Saskatchewan as rich and identify the poor as being the large corporations. That is where their priorities were when they were the Government, that is where their priorities are now that they are in opposition.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Cowley: — Defending the corporations at the expense of the people of Saskatchewan.

Mr. Speaker, the Opposition criticized the Budget for failing to take action to combat unemployment. That is sheer nonsense. This year more people were employed in Saskatchewan than have ever been employed in January in this province's history.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Cowley: — That's the month's figure you are using.

In the non-agricultural sector there were 19,000 more than in January of last year.

You know, Mr. Speaker, with that record, four times 19,000 is 76,000 people, we could almost meet the commitment they made in 1964.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Cowley: — Mr. Speaker, that's a fact. The Members opposite suggest that our Government has done nothing to stimulate employment and develop opportunities. Let me point out what our Government has done and what we propose to do.

For the second consecutive year we have sponsored a provincial Winter Works Program, something the party opposite never introduced to ease unemployment. Indeed, two winters ago they didn't even take advantage of a federal loans program to provide low interest moneys to the province and municipalities. Five million dollars has been provided in this Budget for a provincial Winter Works Program. As I mentioned in my Budget address, this past fall we accelerated our own provincial Capital Works Program and the Crown corporations have accelerated their capital spending.

The Members opposite do not recognize the stimulus which our housing program will give the construction industry. Public housing will be doubled. The enriched House Building Assistance

Program will encourage more families to have homes built for them. The Home Rehabilitation Program will stimulate activity and make possible much needed repairs to older homes. The Pensioners' Home Repair Program will not only provide better accommodation for the aged, but also create employment. In addition to this, programs such as Operation Main Street and street improvement in smaller centres, will not only make our small towns and villages a better place to live and do business in, but it will create jobs as the work is being undertaken.

Our agricultural program, FarmStart, encourages diversification and as farmers take advantage of it by starting and expanding their operation, employment will be created right on the farms.

Mr. Speaker, we have taken effective action. The fruits of that action are indicated by the fact that 19,000 more people have jobs in Saskatchewan than had jobs one year ago.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Cowley: — This is a significant increase in job creation. This January's year-to-year increase in employment in the non-agricultural sector is the largest increase on record. This, Mr. Speaker, is NDP action, not the idle talk of Liberals.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Cowley: — Mr. Speaker, what are the other criticisms which the Opposition tried to mount when they weren't dealing with things which didn't have anything to do with the Budget? Whether we haven't done enough for senior citizens. I shouldn't want to suggest that we wouldn't like to do more. I should like to suggest that when they were the Government they did some things — they introduced deterrent fees; they increased Hospitalization and Medicare premiums, they would like to forget about that one. What have we done? Well, we removed deterrent fees; we abolished the premiums for those over 65; we introduced a \$3 million pensioners' home repair program; we are providing more public housing for senior citizens; we have doubled the home care program; we provided \$3 million for grants to some residents of special care homes; we are introducing a hearing aid program; chiropractic care is under Medicare; we have reduced property taxes for those senior citizens who are home owners; we have established a senior citizens' commission and we have increased the number of level IV beds, to name but a few.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Cowley: — Mr. Speaker, that's New Democrat action. Contrast that with Liberal talk. In 1965 the now Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Steuart), said he hoped to launch a drug plan in the not too distant future. The next day he said in the paper he was meeting with the chiropractors. The Leader of the Opposition talked and talked and talked and ended up in the Opposition.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Cowley: — He may last as leader until

1975, if he can keep the wolves away over there, and if he does, Mr. Speaker, if he lasts as leader until 1975, and if he can find a pocket borough to run into to get re-elected like Albert Park, he will last after 1975 as Leader of the Opposition as well.

Mr. Speaker, the crowning example of the Opposition's ineptitude came with their criticism of cyclical accounting. Mr. Speaker, we said we would try and budget over an economic cycle. Their criticism is that we don't set the length of this cycle in advance. If the Hon. Members opposite can inform us of the length and pattern of the next couple of economic cycles in Canada, and of what the crop conditions are going to be in Saskatchewan, and of what the world markets are going to be, we will gladly designate the length of the cycle. And may I suggest to the Hon. Members opposite that when they have the information they might just send a copy to John Turner in Ottawa, because I am sure he would be interested in seeing it.

Mr. Speaker, I have attempted to deal with some of the criticisms mounted by the Members opposite and deal with their rather weak amendment which they proposed, which as I said was only 80 per cent in order, which was considerably closer than most of the other statistics they used. I invite the Members opposite, having been given the facts, to reconsider the position many of them have taken during the week's debate and to vote with the Government for this Budget.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

The amendment was negatived on the following recorded division:

Yeas – 12

Messieurs

Coupland	McIsaac	McPherson
Guy	Gardner	Lane
Grant	Weatherald	MacDonald (M.J. No.)
MacDonald (Milestone)	MacLeod	Wiebe

Nays – 37

Messieurs

Blakeney	Baker	Cowley
Dyck	Brockelbank	Taylor
Meakes	MacMurchy	Matsalla
Wood	Pepper	Faris
Smishek	Michayluk	Cody
Romanow	Byers	Gross
Messer	Thorson	Mostoway
Snyder	Whelan	Comer
Bowerman	Kwasnica	Rolfes
Thibault	Carlson	Oliver
Larson	Robbins	Lange
Kowalchuk	Tchorzewski	Feschuk
		Kaeding

Motion agreed to on Division.

The Assembly adjourned at 5:27 o'clock p.m.