

**LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN**  
**Fourth Session — Seventeenth Legislature**  
**27th Day**

**Tuesday, March 12, 1974.**

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

**WELCOME TO STUDENTS**

**MR. J. A. PEPPER** (Weyburn): — Mr. Speaker, it is again my pleasure today to introduce to you and through you to the Members of this House, another group of Grade Eight students from the Weyburn Junior High. They are here today under the guidance of two of their teachers, Mr. Tony Tundridge, and again, Mr. Jim Nedelcove and I believe the same two bus drivers, Mr. Faris Lawrence and Mr. Calvin Young.

These students, as I mentioned, are from the Weyburn Junior High, a group which have been attending our Legislature here for some eight years now and I think it is a credit to the city of Weyburn and to the school of Junior High to see the interest that they are taking in politics which has a great bearing on the future success of their lives. I am sure that all Members will join with me in welcoming these students. And it is certainly our desire that their stay be educational, pleasant and as usual we wish them a well and safe trip home.

**HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**QUESTIONS**

**MEETING WITH SASKATCHEWAN BASED OIL COMPANIES**

**MR. D.G. STEUART** (Leader of the Opposition): — Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day I should like to direct a question to the Premier.

Sitting in Room 267 right now is a group of 12 or 14 people, representing about 130 Saskatchewan-based companies and most of them headquartered in Saskatchewan. Some of them are headquartered in other provinces but operate in Saskatchewan. These are small companies and they are almost totally Canadian and as I say about 80 per cent of them are Saskatchewan companies and they are based on the oil industry. They make their living servicing the oil industry. They inform us that there are about 200 employees less than there were before Bill No. 42. That many of these companies have now been forced to the wall, forced out of business or forced to move. They inform us that within another few weeks that if something isn't done very quickly, many more of them will be forced out of the province, or forced out of business; that the unemployment there will rise very sharply and that by July when school is out almost all of them will be gone and when they are gone it will be difficult, if not impossible, to get most of them ever to take the chance of coming back into Saskatchewan.

My question to the Premier is this: Is he prepared to meet them? They have evidently been trying to get a meeting. Is he prepared to meet with this group at 3:00 o'clock this afternoon

and is he prepared to enter into some honest practical negotiations to allow these Saskatchewan based companies to stay here and make a living? Because if he isn't, it isn't hurting Imperial Oil or Shell Oil, but the people it is hurting is the small Saskatchewan based companies and it will hurt the future of the oil industry, irreparable damage will have been done.

Is the Premier prepared to meet them and is he prepared to enter into some honest negotiations to help them?

**HON. A. E. BLAKENEY** (Premier): — Mr. Speaker, I am aware that the group is there in Room 267. I am advised that they had a press conference — and I don't know whether the advice is accurate or not — arranged on their behalf by the Canadian Petroleum Association, through the office of the Leader of the Opposition. They may, indeed, be representatives of small oil companies but I think there is no doubt in the world that the arrangements were made for them by the Canadian Petroleum Association and more particularly by Mr. Spicer.

Just one moment, may I make my answer. The Leader of the Opposition made a very long introductory statement and I propose to answer his question.

With respect to the implication that the Government declined to meet them, we have, indeed, been trying to arrange a meeting. There was some difficulty in getting a date. We suggested tomorrow and that was unsatisfactory to the group. We suggested today at 1:30 so as not to interfere with this House, and that was unsatisfactory to the group. The meeting has been set up for 3:00 o'clock and it is in Room 38. I propose to be there along with the Minister of Mineral Resources (Mr. Cowley) and at least one more of my colleagues. These arrangements were made long before the Leader of the Opposition made his comments in this House. We will indeed listen to them carefully as we try to do with all people and we will, indeed, try to see what the problems are. I don't know what the Leader of the Opposition would call meaningful negotiations. I doubt whether it is appropriate for the Government to negotiate changes in legislation with one group any more than with other groups of this province.

We will, indeed, discuss with them the problems which confront them and we will, indeed, attempt to alleviate those problems. We have no wish to cause problems for the oil supply industry any more than for any other group in this province. And we believe the course of appropriate action is to discuss with them their concerns and to do what seems under all the circumstances appropriate to meet those concerns.

**MR. STEUART:** — A supplementary question. I should like to ask the Premier if he means by consultation more than what he meant when I asked the same question some weeks ago, and the answer I got from the Premier then was, yes, we are inconstant negotiations and consultation with people in the oil industry.

I don't know whom he consults with or what part of the industry he consults with, but I talked to the Canadian Petroleum Association and they say, "We are not consulted with in any meaningful way. We are not consulted by the Premier or by the Ministers except to be handed some mixed up orders that are changed from day to day".

I asked this group today if they had ever had a meeting. They said, yes, they had a Minister down there who spoke to them. They said it wasn't a consultation, it was a confrontation and my question is: I hope that this smooth little answer that you gave us today, that you gave us two or three weeks ago, has been given sincerely, that you will really sit down and try to save these people's jobs, their investment and their future in Saskatchewan.

**MR. BLAKENEY:** — Mr. Speaker, that an analysis of the text will indicate that there was no word of query in the remarks of the Member for Prince Albert West (Mr. Steuart). He, in fact, asked no question but expressed a hope.

**MR. STEUART:** — The question is, are you telling the truth?

**MR. BLAKENEY:** — Mr. Speaker, perhaps the Member for Prince Albert West could contain himself when I am on my feet.

May I make this very clear. It is all very well for the Member for Prince Albert West to say that there is no consultation, but I tell him this, and I ask him whether he can deny it — which he cannot. I say that right now we are having consultations with the oil industry; right now we are talking about regulations; right now there are in the hands of the Canadian Petroleum Association, the Independent Petroleum Association and the drilling association, draft regulations which we have asked them to comment on. Right now they are considering what regulations are appropriate under the Oil Conservation Act Bill No. 42. If that is not consultation, I don't know what is. We have discussed these with them; we have given them a draft; we have asked them to give us their comments; they asked three weeks to make up their comments. The three weeks have not yet elapsed. We expect to get those comments. We think that is meaningful negotiations and a great deal more meaningful than much of the so-called consultation carried on by the Government of Saskatchewan when Members opposite were on the Treasury benches.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. STEUART:** — Mr. Speaker, it is all very well for the Premier to get up and give a smart . . .

**MR. SPEAKER:** — Order, order! Order please. I think on questions we don't need to have lengthy statements and arguments. The question was asked with a long preface first by the Leader of the Opposition and it was answered. But we are getting into a debate rather than a question period.

#### **PLANS FOR SASKOIL TO CONSERVE SASKATCHEWAN COMPANIES**

**MR. C. P. MacDONALD** (Milestone): — Mr. Speaker, one of the major concerns of the service and supply industry in Saskatchewan . . .

**MR. ROMANOW:** — Question, question.

**March 12, 1974**

**MR. MacDONALD:** — If the Attorney General will be quiet I will ask the question. Mr. Speaker, the fact is that with the road ban and the spring weather coming on in the Province of Saskatchewan it will be at least two months before anything can be done. In that same two month period there will not be 200 more jobless, not five or six or ten companies that will have left, but double that number. Has the Minister of Mineral Resources any plans for Saskoil which can be put into effect immediately to conserve Saskatchewan companies in the Province of Saskatchewan and retain Saskatchewan jobs?

**HON. E.L. COWLEY:** (Minister of Mineral Resources): — Mr. Speaker, Saskoil, as the Member is aware, is busy hiring people . . .

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. COWLEY:** — Well, Members may laugh but one of the requirements of any oil company is some people. Saskoil will be operational immediately after breakup and that is when we anticipate drilling, etc. to take place on behalf of Saskoil.

**MR. MacDONALD:** — Could I ask the Minister a supplementary question, Mr. Speaker?

The Minister indicates that drilling will commence when spring breakup occurs. From what I understand now there is just absolutely no drilling going on in Saskatchewan except previous commitments before Bill 42. Last year there were over 650 wells drilled in the Province of Saskatchewan. Could the Minister indicate to the House and to the service and supply industry in the Province of Saskatchewan and to all the people in Saskatchewan to what extent a drilling program is planned by Saskoil in 1974? Are we talking two wells, 10 wells, 30 wells, 50 wells or just exactly what kind of program is anticipated? •

**MR. COWLEY:** — Mr. Speaker, I can't tell the Member with precision how many oil wells will be drilled by Saskoil, but there will be a substantial effort made by Saskoil in terms of exploration. I think that to say that there is no exploration in the province at this time, is stretching the facts a little. There has been a decline in terms of the number of permits, etc. issued, but to say there is no activity at all is stretching the facts a little.

**MR. K. R. MacLEOD:** (Regina Albert Park): — Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question of the Hon. Minister. Is Saskoil hiring or taking office space in Calgary for purposes of Saskoil?

**MR. COWLEY:** — Saskoil probably in conjunction with the Saskatchewan Power Corporation will likely have a small office space in Calgary. The vast majority of office space will be in Saskatchewan.

**MR. MacLEOD:** — A supplementary question,

Mr. Speaker. I wonder if the Minister will tell us what space they have taken in Saskatchewan and how soon they expect to operate, to commence using that space. And if they are taking space in the new Toronto-Dominion Building which will be completed later this year or next year?

**MR. COWLEY:** — Mr. Speaker, I think Saskoil and I may be 100 or so square feet out, have temporary office space of about 1,300 or 1,400 square feet in Regina at this time and they are negotiating for a substantially larger amount of office space in Regina. I believe that one of the firms or agencies that they are negotiating with is with the new Toronto-Dominion Bank Building and whether or not that's where their final location will be will depend upon the price and other considerations.

## **ADJOURNED DEBATES**

### **BUDGET DEBATE**

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of the Hon. Mr. Robbins (Minister of Finance) that this Assembly do now resolve itself into the Committee of Finance; and the proposed amendment thereto by Mr. McIsaac (Wilkie).

**MR. A. R. OLIVER:** (Shaunavon): — Mr. Speaker, before I get into the Budget Debate I should like to take this opportunity to congratulate the three new Cabinet Ministers, the Member for Watrous (Mr. Cody) as Minister of Co-ops. I know that he will do a great job. The Member for Melville (Mr. Kowalchuk) Minister of Natural Resources and I know he has the qualities to take care of that department, and the Member for Nutana Centre (Mr. Robbins) as Minister of Finance.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. OLIVER:** — Mr. Speaker, I am proud to associate myself with these fellows and particularly with Mr. Robbins, who had the appointment just a few short weeks ago. I should like to give special congratulations to him for coming up with such a tremendous Budget in such a short time.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. OLIVER:** — Mr. Speaker, we have seen the past year as one that has set and, indeed, broken many records. Net farm income is up by 36 per cent, personal income is up by 25 per cent and is expected to increase a further 15 per cent in 1974, retail sales are up 13 per cent, manufacturing shipments up 23 per cent. This increase in the retail trade created 7,000 jobs which had the natural effect of aiding in the lowering of our unemployment rate to 3.6 per cent.

Mr. Speaker, while it is important to remember that our provincial economy is directly related to our agricultural industry, it is equally important to remember that all of our industries are dependent upon one another. One segment of our economy cannot fluctuate either up or down without having a direct effect on other segments. Our provincial economy may be compared to our rural communities where each person is

**March 12, 1974**

depending upon his neighbor to accept and fulfil his commitments in whatever role he has accepted in that community. Each community has one outstanding leader who generally sets the pace of activity within the community. So like the community leader, our Department of Agriculture and our agricultural industry takes the lead in Saskatchewan's economy.

Our agricultural industry has a long history of going from boom to bust with little stabilization in either production or income. Our Government is well aware of these facts and to that end we have pressed the Federal Government to provide greater stability to both the grain and livestock producer. We need a grain stabilization program which will have built into it an escalator clause that will compensate the farmer for the ever rising costs of production.

Mr. Speaker, the Federal Government did have a grain stabilization plan which, with the assistance of the Hon. Otto Lang, better known as "The man from LIFT" tried to ram down the throats of our farmers. We fought that proposal and were successful in having it withdrawn on the basis that it didn't take into consideration the costs of production and would have stabilized the farmer's income at the poverty level.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. OLIVER:** — Mr. Speaker, the Liberals opposite were in favor of that proposal to stabilize farmers at the poverty line. We have fought, and will continue to fight, for a new transportation policy that doesn't discriminate against the western farmer.

We have requested the Federal Government to contribute to the Hog Price Stabilization Plan but as yet they seem to be of the opinion that the Province of Saskatchewan should subsidize the Canadian pork consumer. Our Government saw the problem of the hog producer and tried to give them some price guarantee so they could plan their operations and stay in hogs. We introduced the Interim Hog Price Stabilization Plan where we are guaranteeing 57 cents per pound for index 100 or better hogs.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. OLIVER:** — This program is an interim step in stabilizing hog prices. We have set aside \$1.15 million in the Budget to make this possible with the hope that the Federal Government will assume their responsibility in this matter.

If we are truly concerned about the future of our young farmers it is imperative that we guarantee a reasonable return on this investment. A young farmer just starting out on this very important and worthwhile venture, is faced with soaring prices for machinery, land and repairs not to mention fuels, chemicals and fertilizers. A prime example of a terrific price jump is the price of antifreeze in Saskatchewan. It is an outrage that the price of this vital commodity should rise from \$1.49 a gallon last fall to now over \$10 a gallon, if you can get it. This can happen in our vital petroleum products if something isn't done to control such rip-offs. We are a small province when it comes to oil production and influencing either the Federal Government or the large petroleum corporations but we were not afraid to take on both the Federal Government

and the oil companies to provide some protection for our Saskatchewan consumers.

We have been criticized for not having a policy but the Opposition will never admit that we do have a policy and what's more, Mr. Speaker, they won't admit that it is working and that's the part that smarts.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. OLIVER:** — The Minister of Finance has summed up our policy in one phrase and that is 'development within the line fence'.

Our policy is to keep as many farmers on the land as is possible. We instituted the Land Bank Commission to purchase Saskatchewan land to preserve it for our young people and future generations to come. Mr. Speaker, I was surprised to read in the Shaunavon Standard of February 27th, that the Leader of the Opposition is reported to have said and I'll quote that little ditty for you:

A Liberal Government would abolish the Land Bank and sell the land back to the farmer.

I can well imagine to whom the land would be sold, and that would be to the highest bidder with no concern for the young fellow. To the person who would bid the highest that is to whom you would sell it, regardless of the little fellow who hasn't got the financial backing, like the well established, large farmer or the American buyer, the speculator, who can offer several thousand dollars more per quarter than actually what the land is worth. Their philosophy is to make a profit regardless from whom. If they had been concerned they would have done something to assist the farmer, yet the farm labor force dropped by more than 30,000 during those seven years of Liberal mismanagement.

Our FarmStart Program is very successful in its attempt to diversify the farming income. We will increase our FarmStart loans from 700 to 1,200, an increase of 42 per cent.

The reinstitution of the Prairie Agriculture Machinery Testing Institute, which was destroyed by the Liberals in 1965, will create 50 new jobs and provide vital information for farmers buying new equipment.

The Budget will provide assistance for our local governments also. The main farm access road program will enable the RMs to increase their rate of road construction from 1,300 miles to 1,850 miles per year. Equalization grants to RMs are up by 20 per cent. MRAA will launch a program to provide cost sharing for oiling market grid roads.

The Property Improvement Grants will be increased by \$30 to a maximum of \$300 for farmers; by \$20 to a maximum of \$200 for the businessman; and by \$16 to a maximum of \$160 for the householder. The Liberals thought they were doing great when they had \$70 per farmer.

Other local Government assistance is in terms of a better equalization grant formula. Unconditional grants of \$10 per capita should provide for a reduction in property tax. But the

**March 12, 1974**

most exciting of these programs is the Community Capital Fund. The New Democratic Government will assist Saskatchewan's cities, towns and villages in their planned capital works programs. In the towns of Shaunavon, Ponteix and Eastend which have populations over 500, we will provide them with 60 per cent of the project cost as outlined in a five year capital works program, prepared by the town councils themselves to a maximum of \$75 per capita. In all those smaller communities whose population is less than 500 these would be those communities from Consul in the west to Woodrow and Glentworth in the east, we will pick up 60 per cent of the costs to a maximum of \$15 per capita which will be on an annual capital works program planned by those individual village councils.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. OLIVER:** — This Community Capital Fund will provide \$45.75 million over the next five years and is the equivalent of nearly 40 per cent of all capital works undertaken by urban municipalities in this province over the past five years.

This Budget provides for an increase of more than 15 per cent in operating grants to the University of Saskatchewan. The Student Bursary Program is increased by \$500,000. An increase of \$17.8 million in operating grants to schools will hold the average mill rate for basic school purposes to 43 mills across the province. An increase in the Public Health budget of 20 per cent will allow our new program a healthy start. I would, however, like to impress upon the Minister the pressing need for health facilities in Val Marie, and a new facility at Climax. Mr. Speaker, Saskatchewan has always been the leader in health services to people. This was the dream of Tommy Douglas and, Mr. Speaker, I would like to take the liberty of reading to you and to this House an excerpt from a speech that Tommy made in this House on the 1st of April, 1954, almost 20 years ago. In part, he said:

I made a pledge with myself that someday if I ever had anything to do with it people would be able to get health services just as they are able to get educational services as an inalienable right of being a citizen of a Christian country.

And further on he goes on to say:

We have set ourselves a long-time goal towards which we are marching methodically and relentlessly. This is one in which free health services will eventually be made available to every citizen of the province irrespective of their ability to pay.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. OLIVER:** — Mr. Speaker, after the Minister of Health makes a few more announcements shortly about the newer health programs in this province, this dream of Tommy's will be virtually complete. Mr. Speaker, this is some 20 years after he made this speech but it was 20 years that were interrupted by seven years of Liberal sabotage in the health field.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!



**MR. OLIVER:** — I was very pleased to see that money had been set aside for the restoration of historic sites and better roads to these locations. This is a great opportunity for communities such as Eastend to mark such places as the North West Mounted Police Post and the historic Chimney Coulee. The Provincial Government's share of 60 per cent will allow improvements to such local museums as Robsart, Eastend, Shaunavon and McCord. It is an opportunity for Val Marie to mark the early headquarters of the Turkey Track and 76 ranches.

In summation, Mr. Speaker, this Budget is a program for development and this Budget is a blueprint for the coming year. We have once again demonstrated that we recognize how interdependent our industries are in this province. We are concerned about the welfare of all of our citizens and not just an influential few as the former Liberal Government clearly exhibited during their seven years in office.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. OLIVER:** — Mr. Speaker, their credibility under their present leadership is steadily deteriorating. When the Leader of the Opposition deliberately misleads his own people he must be reaching rock bottom.

Mr. Speaker, in that same issue of the Shaunavon Standard which I referred to earlier reporting on the February 25th Liberal nominations from which I again quote:

The Liberals had enjoyed very successful conventions to date with attendance exceeding 500 in all cases.

Now those weren't the facts because nine days earlier he attended the nomination of the Member for Athabasca (Mr. Guy) and I quote from the Saskatchewan Valley News which is a Rosthern paper, I believe:

The meeting, attended by about 125 people, concluded with a social hour.

**AN HON. MEMBER:** — Oh, oh!

**MR. OLIVER:** — Furthermore, Mr. Speaker, it didn't take the Leader of the Opposition very long to corrupt one of their candidates. I wish to quote from the Leader Post, March 9, talking about a policy conference:

Members of the Provincial Legislature, Jack Wiebe, Dr. Donald MacDonald, Gary Lane and Sonny Anderson will participate in a caucus report and discussion of provincial legislation presented in the current session.

Now it is difficult for me to believe that Mr. Anderson would deliberately mislead the public in believing that he was an MLA. He had to be influenced by someone. If Mr. Anderson is serious about winning that election in the Shaunavon constituency then he had better disassociate himself from the Leader of the Opposition and the Liberal Party.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**March 12, 1974**

**MR. OLIVER:** — Mr. Speaker, we have seen their credibility drop when they opposed the Denticare program but voted for the Bill. That is something like suffering through the marriage ceremony and not consummating the marriage. They destroyed the Agricultural Machinery Administration that we had set up here before but now they voted unanimously in favor of its reinstitution. They are nothing but political opportunists, they cannot and must not ever be trusted in running this province again, Mr. Speaker. I support the motion.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. M. KWASNICA** (Cut Knife): — Mr. Speaker, it is with a sense of pride and accomplishment that I rise to take part in this Budget Debate. This is the third Budget prepared by this newly elected New Democratic Government under the very able leadership of Premier Blakeney.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. KWASNICA:** — I am extremely proud, Mr. Speaker, particularly because this Budget virtually completes our New Deal for People, not in five years, nor in four years, but in three. Three years of hard work, active Government and an enthusiastic Civil Service that is eager to bring forth our programs for Saskatchewan people. And, Mr. Speaker, this province needs manpower to carry out all of its new programs. If it's extra people it needs, it's going to hire them. What good are programs that don't get off the ground because of lack of staff and the Opposition knows very that this is the case.

Now, Mr. Speaker, what have the Opposition been saying about this Budget? Well, two major complaints. One, you're spending too much and two, it's inflationary. I should like to point out that this Budget will not spend every penny brought into the Treasury. There is some \$12 million left in surplus and there is a cash carry forward of some \$45 million so we do have a cushion for the future. This Budget helps control inflationary costs by holding the line of taxes. There is not one tax increase.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. KWASNICA:** — Not one, Mr. Speaker. In fact, taxes have been reduced in many instances. Medicare premiums have been abolished, that is \$72 in the householder's pocket, \$15 million total. Denticare program for children at no cost to the parents. Property Improvement grants increased to a 20 mill level — \$300 maximum for farmers, a \$30 increase; \$200 maximum for businessmen, a \$20 increase; \$160 maximum for householders, a \$16 increase. There is the kindergarten program at no cost, no increased cost to the parent. An urban package of grants of \$25 per capita for the next five years which could be used as the councils see fit. Increased operating grants to school boards to take care of increased costs. There should be no increased property taxes for school purposes in the province.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. KWASNICA:** — Mr. Speaker, it is indeed an

honor to represent the people of Cut Knife constituency, a constituency with farming as its base along with some pretty major oil developments. I want to welcome at this time, probably a bit prematurely, all those new constituents north of the four mile road of Lloydminster up as far as the North Saskatchewan River, I want to welcome them back to my riding.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. KWASNICA:** — To them I want to extend personal greetings and I look forward to meeting you all and dealing with your problems. I also want to welcome those south of the city of Battleford as well to my somewhat enlarged constituency.

In turning to constituency matters, Mr. Speaker, I want to thank all of the Government departments for the excellent co-operation they have given my riding. First of all I must thank our Minister of Education (Mr. MacMurchy) for the gymnasium-auditoriums in Maidstone, Neilburg and Hillmond. Three, Mr. Speaker. Thanks also for the Lakeland Regional Library Program which has brought public libraries for the first time to smaller centres of Lashburn, Maidstone, Paynton, Cut Knife, Marsden and Neilburg.

We owe thanks to the Department of Social Services for assisting the Saskatchewan senior citizens who reside in the Dr. Cooke home on the Alberta side of Lloydminster. I got nowhere, Mr. Speaker, with this particular problem during the four years of Liberal regime and I am pleased to have been able to work out that particular problem with an NDP Government.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. KWASNICA:** — To the Hon. Eiling Kramer, Minister of Highways, my constituents and I wish to thank you for your program, Operation Mainstreet and Open Roads which has seen the towns of Neilburg and Paynton get oiled streets and access to the highway. I gather the town of Cut Knife will go ahead with the same development this year.

We appreciate also Mr. Minister your one-third support financially for a meridian bridge north of Lloydminster and we await a decision from Ottawa for their one-third share. The extension and improvements on Highway No. 21, better known as the 'Wild Goose Route', are greatly appreciated by all. I hope the Minister will soon be able to announce a bridge at Maidstone.

Since the constituency has acquired a large area to the north of Lloydminster, some new needs must be met there. Highway No. 3 to Deer Creek which has been oiled lately has now become a major traffic route for tourists and truckers as well. This highway is too narrow and the cold mix oil surface is being pounded out by overweight vehicles of all sorts — by trucks, trailers and campers. I hope this stretch of road from the junction of No. 17 to Deer Creek will be rebuilt at the earliest possible date. Also the section of No. 17 north to the meridian bridge will have to be hard surfaced in preparation for the meridian bridge.

I must also thank the Minister of Highways for building an all-weather road to Table Mountain so that the skiers

**March 12, 1974**

participating in the Saskatchewan Winter Games, just completed, could reach the ski area safely. Table Mountain was designated as the first winter regional park in Saskatchewan, in keeping with this Government's policy of extending winter recreation so that people will be happier all year round in Saskatchewan.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. KWASNICA:** — The Highway Department has also done an excellent job in placing highway signs notifying motorists of approaching towns as well as stressing the use of seat belts. I must also thank the Minister for the oiling of No. 21 from Unity north to Wilbert and from Silver Lake Regional Park to the North Saskatchewan River.

Mr. Speaker, I want to turn now for a few minutes to the area of farming. We are all aware that farm income is good these days and is at an all time high because of good prices for flax and wheat and rape, and because of the stabilized hog prices subsidized by our Department of Agriculture. This has helped to keep our hog producers in business. However, with feed prices maintaining a fairly high price, cattle and hog producers are both experiencing difficulties especially the specialized feed lots which do not grow their own feed. Under these circumstances it is obviously advantageous for the ordinary farmer to go into cattle and hog production using his own feed grains and I would urge that farmers do just that.

I want to commend the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Messer) for implementing the \$1.5 million hog stabilization program, which is helping to keep our farmers in the hog business.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. KWASNICA:** — The drop in returns on cattle at this time, Mr. Speaker, points out once again the need for a price stabilization program in this sector of farming. Indeed, it proves the need for a total farm stabilization program for all agricultural products based on the cost of production. Such a program will, Mr. Speaker, cost millions, millions of dollars that a provincial government cannot afford on its own, millions of dollars that must come from Ottawa and the federal treasury. And is such a program forthcoming, Mr. Speaker? No, nothing so far, just talk. But perhaps with New Democrats in Ottawa pushing the federal Liberals, we may see some form of stabilization, especially if a federal election is pending.

Mr. Speaker, I want to take a moment to congratulate our Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Messer) on one other account, for the leadership and initiative he has given and shown Saskatchewan farmers. This leadership is reminiscent of a previous capable and fiery Minister of Agriculture, whom many Members will remember, the Hon. Toby Nollet, whose constituency, I now have the honor to represent.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. KWASNICA:** — Mr. Nollet, an innovator of sound programs, in 1957 brought in the Agricultural Machinery Administration, Saskatchewan's first farm machinery testing program. This program gave

farmers professional and unbiased evaluation of machine performance in typical Saskatchewan conditions. It gave information on adjustments and operator hints, on modifications that the companies had made or were proposing to make. This program did an honest job for Saskatchewan farmers, but, Mr. Speaker, I fear it was too honest a job and it bothered some machinery companies, those same companies which support the Liberal Party to this very day. And, as could be expected, the agricultural machinery testing program was scuttled in 1965, one year after the Liberals were elected to office. And so progress was thwarted for approximately nine years because of seven years of Liberalism in Saskatchewan.

I am indeed delighted, delighted to see that our present Minister has been able to re-establish a Prairie Machinery Institute in co-operation with our two sister provinces, Alberta and Manitoba.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. KWASNICA:** — I am proud to see some \$320,000 allocated in this Budget to start up the program.

The main testing site, will be situated in rural Saskatchewan near the town of Humboldt, right in the middle of a certain\_ Federal Liberal MP's riding, whose name I will not mention. This same Liberal MP did not see fit to give one red cent to this most needed and valuable program to Saskatchewan farmers. This is the same Liberal MP who has taken the Saskatchewan Government to court because our Government is trying to bring some order into the chaotic potash industry in our province.

Yes, Mr. Speaker, these are Liberal, these are Conservative tactics; they will not succeed in hoodwinking the Saskatchewan public or farmer.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. KWASNICA:** — Mr. Speaker, one farm program that has really become popular throughout my riding, and indeed throughout all of Saskatchewan is FarmStart. This program, geared to help the smaller farmer by way of loans and grants, has assisted hundreds to go into cattle production and expand livestock herds.

What is the record of FarmStart in my own constituency, Mr. Speaker? Up to February 22, just three weeks ago, 12 applications had already been approved. Loans ranged from \$7,750 to \$38,200. The total amount in loans and grants in my constituency alone to date is \$273,540. These loans are at 6 per cent interest with up to 15 years to pay. There are 11 more applications awaiting return, and 25 applications in. This is a program, Mr. Speaker, that I submit is meaningful, a program geared to help save rural Saskatchewan.

Mr. Speaker, as you can see, there is a great deal to be enthusiastic about in this Budget, and I must comment on what is called the urban package. Some \$57 million are provided as equalization grants, unconditional grants, capital works and urban transit grants. For the first time in the history of our province, cities, towns and villages will get a grant of \$10 per person without any strings attached. There is a \$45.75

**March 12, 1974**

million capital works program which will pay up to 60 per cent of the cost of projects at \$15 per capita per year. Facilities such as urban parks, surfacing of streets and new recreational facilities can be built.

It is the hope of this Government that the \$10 per person unconditional grant will be used to reduce the property taxes even further.

Mr. Speaker, as one who is concerned about the problem of alcohol in our province, I am pleased to see our Government making some advances in this crucial area. Alcoholism is increasing in Saskatchewan. It's the number one problem involving some 32,000 people directly. Direct costs of alcoholism in Saskatchewan are estimated at a staggering \$17.5 million per year. The estimates for this coming year, Mr. Speaker, show some \$638,000 for a new public alcohol education campaign for the next year. I wish this program every success. However, Mr. Speaker, I want to urge the Minister in charge to allocate much more to the Alcoholism Commission of Saskatchewan than the \$1.6 million. When the new alcohol education program is instituted, the requests for help, advice and rehabilitation will be stepped up to such an extent that the Alcoholism Commission will find itself starved of funds, facilities and staff to cope with the demands that will be made on it. I urge this Government to move quickly to allocate at least 10 per cent of the yearly profits derived from alcohol taxation to the work of the Alcoholism Commission.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. KWASNICA:** — Otherwise, Mr. Speaker, the \$638,000 allocated for the new public education program will be a total waste.

Mr. Speaker, these are only a few of the benefits in the 1974-75 Budget. There are many more, such as the stepped up main farm access road program, a program to provide cost-sharing on the hard surfacing of market grid roads, and we're all looking forward to that program. In talking to one of the members of staff in the Department of Municipal Affairs the other day, he said he thinks that they will have enough money in the budget in Municipal Affairs that the municipalities will not be able to match dollar for dollar. There is more in a student bursary program/there is a new legal aid program, four new community colleges are planned in this Budget and the ones in Lloydminster, Vermilion and Maidstone area hopefully will get underway this fall. A day care program, a new family farm income program and many, many more.

These are the benefits of electing a New Democratic Government. A party that fulfils its promises. A party of democratic socialism, where the needs of ordinary people are placed before the needs of huge oil, machinery and food monopolies that have been gouging Canadian citizens ever since confederation — the same monopolies and banking institutions that have treated western Canadians like serfs of the 15th century.

Mr. Speaker, as you can readily surmise from my remarks, I will be supporting this Budget.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. E. F. FLASCH** (Maple Creek): — Mr. Speaker, this is the first time that I have availed myself of the opportunity to participate in the Budget Debate. I have always been of the opinion that it was a debate reserved for experts in the field of finance, but after listening to some of the Liberals, I decided that there was a decided lack of expertise across the way and I felt that that gave me a considerable amount of leeway and that I may have licence to get into this debate.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. FLASCH:** — Mr. Speaker, I want to congratulate the Minister of Finance (Mr. Robbins) for introducing the Budget. I have always had great respect for his ability with figures, and I know that he has much to contribute to this Government and through the Government to the Province of Saskatchewan.

Before I get to the specifics of the Budget itself, I want to make a few comments in connection with inflation. According to the Liberals this is one of the greatest problems facing the province. I agree that it is a problem, but it is a problem which has its causes outside the boundaries of this province for the most part.

The provincial Liberals have always harped on the topic of inflation; it's been that way for years now. It was while they were still in office before 1971 that they imposed the infamous 6 per cent guideline within which all wage settlements were to fall for one particular year at least. One of the major problems with that guideline was that nobody was able to define it, not even the Minister of Education of the day, was able to say what 6 per cent really was.

One common theme that ran through the approach of both the provincial and federal Liberals in their attempts to solve the problem of inflation was that they singled out the wage earners of this country and of this province and attempted to use them as guinea pigs in their solution. The provincial Liberals as I said imposed a guideline and harassed labor and the federal Liberals deliberately created unemployment in order to curb consumer spending and so lower prices. That's certainly one instance in which the Liberals provincially and federally could find some common ground.

It's not surprising in view of their statements in the past, that the Opposition would label this Budget, inflationary. They have raised the same cry any time any group has received a wage increase over the years. We heard the same cry when we had an increase in the MLAs indemnity a few years ago.

We heard the same criticism again, Mr. Speaker, when the Premier some months back announced the abolition of hospitalization and medicare premiums. They didn't want those premiums abolished, Mr. Speaker, because what's good for the people of Saskatchewan is bad for the Liberal Party.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. FLASCH:** — Any time a dollar finds its way into the pockets of the ordinary people of Saskatchewan, the Liberals cry "inflation".

**March 12, 1974**

I have a clipping from the Regina Leader-Post, date-lined February 12, 1974, under the topic "Inflation Top Issue" and I quote:

Inflation and not the energy crisis is the main issue in Saskatchewan, provincial Liberals decided at a weekend meeting.

In a statement Issued Monday, party president Garry Wilson said delegates to a meeting of the party's provincial council mostly believed inflation to be the No. 1 issue and the NDP Government should be condemned for not taking any concrete steps to keep down the cost of living in the province.

The statement also said the party is getting ready for an election campaign as early as June — about a year Before the NDP Government is expected to call the election.

Now, I ask you, was not the abolition of the premiums I mentioned — hospitalization and medicare premiums — was that not an attempt to reduce the cost of living? In effect, Mr. Speaker, it did just that.

**SOME HON. MEMBER:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. FLASCH:** — How unfounded can criticism be? The Liberals have criticized this Budget because they say taxes should have been reduced. I ask you, Mr. Speaker, what is the basic difference between, say, the removal of hospitalization and medicare premiums or the increase in property improvement grants, which were substantial in this Budget, on a farm, up from a previous total of \$270, now up to \$300, what is the difference between that type of reduction and a direct tax reduction? In the final analysis, both leave more money in the pockets of consumers.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. FLASCH:** — And according to Liberal logic that money will be spent and that spending will add to the inflationary spiral, and Liberals can't have it both ways, Mr. Speaker. I think it s a sin, Mr. Speaker, and certainly if it isn't a sin it's a shame, for any Liberal, especially a Liberal who sat in this Legislature when the Black Friday Budget was introduced in 1968, to even dare criticize any government for not reducing taxes.

Mr. Speaker, economic conditions in this province have seldom been better. And I can see only one purpose in Liberal criticism of present conditions arid of this Budget. Their purpose is to try to justify the poor economic conditions that existed during their years in office. If consumer spending in Saskatchewan is a cause of inflation in this country, then there certainly should have been no inflation in their years in office. In those years, people didn't overspend, they couldn't, they had no money, Mr. Speaker.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. FLASCH:** — And we still had inflation. The root cause of inflation



is very difficult to determine. The old classic example of too much money chasing too few goods doesn't really apply because we know we have experienced inflation when there was no shortage of goods. There should be no shortages of goods in times of peace if a bit of economic planning took place. If production facilities are taxed to the limit, then excessive demands for goods, will naturally drive up prices. However, in our free enterprise system, shortages can easily be created artificially by those in a position to control production, and prices will then be increased for the purpose of making larger profits. I'm not sure that this isn't happening in some instances. My colleague from Shaunavon (Mr. Oliver) a few minutes ago, mentioned the case of anti-freeze.

Anyway, Mr. Speaker, it is difficult to understand how a province with less than 5 per cent of the population of this country, in fact, I think it's around 4 per cent and I'm sure that when you look at the percentage of the national income generated by the Province of Saskatchewan, and you view it in context of the total picture, it's a rather insignificant amount, it's difficult to understand how this province can make a major contribution to controlling inflation. Inflation is a matter for which the federal government must bear the brunt of responsibility.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. FLASCH:** — And even they can't control it totally, Mr. Speaker, because our own economy is certainly influenced by decisions in other countries, particularly those of the United States, our largest trading partner. The problem of inflation is world wide.

I admit, Mr. Speaker, that I don't know the solution to the problem and neither do the Liberals opposite. I recall a definition, I picked up — a definition of a baby. I don't remember where I got it. Anyway a baby was defined as an alimentary canal with a loud voice at one end and no responsibility at the other. I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that that's a very good definition of a Liberal.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. FLASCH:** — On top of that I don't think they know which end is up.

I was pleased, Mr. Speaker, that this Government intends over the next five years to make available \$100 million in assistance to urban municipalities. They have for too long had to provide services at too great an expense to the local tax- payer. This Budget provides them with some much-needed assistance.

While the agricultural sector of this economy is for the most part experiencing good times, this Government realizes the necessity of maintaining it in that position. And accordingly we have a 50 per cent increase in FarmStart grants; \$20 million set aside for land under the Land Bank Commission. I am pleased that a new department that of Tourism and Renewable Resources, will be set up. Northern Saskatchewan has almost unlimited potential as far as the development of holiday and recreational facilities is concerned. Tourism is rapidly growing in importance in this province.

The announcement of assistance to construct an access road

**March 12, 1974**

to Fort Walsh will be of particular interest to the people of Maple Creek. I might add that at the present time in the town of Leader we are constructing a nursing home, a 35 bed nursing home. This is being done at a tremendous cost; inflation has taken its bite. I understand that in the last two years the price of that home has gone up something like 60 per cent. I would like to thank the Minister of Social Services (Mr. Taylor) at this time for seeing that the home materialized.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. FLASCH:** — I want to say, Mr. Speaker, that I am pleased that the Department of Natural Resources has its own full time Minister, and I congratulate, Mr. John Kowalchuk on his appointment to that position. I know that John is very capable and that he will do a good job.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. FLASCH:** — I was a bit disappointed in connection with the spending priorities at the Cypress Hills Park last year, Mr. Speaker, and I would be remiss if I didn't mention it. This park as you know, is now in transition between the constituencies of Shaunavon and Maple Creek and consequently the Member for Shaunavon and I have both got a real interest in the area. Last year, the sum of approximately \$120,000 was spent on a new golf club house at the park. I would be rather foolish if I stood here and said that I am displeased with the spending of that sum, but I am unhappy that it was spent on a golf clubhouse which we really didn't need. For years, at least as long as I have been in this Legislature, I have been working for and attempting to develop better facilities on the ski slope there. I have consistently as has the Member for Shaunavon asked that some money be "set aside for a tow bar. That never materialized, Mr. Speaker, because funds were never available. We could easily have cut thousands of dollars off the price of that clubhouse which we really didn't need and directed it to the improvement of facilities on that slope. I am very disappointed, Mr. Speaker, that it hasn't happened.

I could also go into the hiring policies at the park, but I will forego the temptation at this time.

Mr. Speaker, I could continue indefinitely discussing the very good aspects of this Budget. I will however, limit the remainder of my remarks to some of the criticisms Opposition Members have levelled.

The financial critic says nothing has been done for the livestock industry. I would ask him whether he has ever heard, or whether any of the Liberals have ever heard of the subsidy being paid to hog producers. Perhaps they can contact the Member for Morse, I am sure he has heard about it.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. FLASCH:** — The Liberals credit Ottawa with the selling of wheat and the record wheat sales of the past few years. I wonder, Mr. Speaker, whom they wish to credit for the sales in 1968, '69 and '70. What is sauce for the goose, is sauce for the gander.

The financial critic the other day admitted that no one knows exactly how much this province will receive by way of oil royalties and yet he says that this Government should have mapped out its spending programs so that we can see how these funds are going to be appropriated. It doesn't add up.

We are constantly reminded of the amount of money we received from the Liberal Government in Ottawa. Yet virtually all of that money comes from Ontario, British Columbia and Alberta, all of which have another than Liberal Provincial Government.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. FLASCH:** — Members of the Opposition criticize constantly but they offer no alternative programs or ideas. Mr. Speaker, I recall a bit of doggerel that expresses my feelings perhaps more ably than I have in the past few minutes. It goes something like this:

I hate the guys who criticize  
And minimize the other guys  
Whose enterprise has made them rise  
Above the guys who criticize.

Mr. Speaker, I will be supporting the motion.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. D. W. MICHAYLUK** (Redberry): — Mr. Speaker, the Budget for the 1974-75 fiscal year brought in last Friday by the newly appointed Provincial Treasurer, the Hon. Wes Robbins, indicates the priorities which the New Democratic Government considers for the benefit and interest to Saskatchewan people promised in 1971, the New Deal for People. Undoubtedly, Mr. Speaker, anyone who heard the unfolding of the Budget could only be impressed as I was, both with the Budget content and the choice Premier Blakeney made when the Hon. Member for Saskatoon Nutana Centre assumed the post of Provincial Treasurer.

Might I, Mr. Speaker, commend the Premier on his choice and congratulate the Hon. Wes Robbins on his appointment to a post for which he is so eminently qualified.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. MICHAYLUK:** — I too, Sir, wish to congratulate the Hon. Members for the constituencies of Melville and Watrous, the Hon. John Kowalchuk and the Hon. Don Cody on their appointments to the Departments of Natural Resources and Co-operatives respectively.

Mr. Speaker, might I on behalf of the Redberry constituents thank the various departments and Ministers for the various projects and programs my constituents are enjoying and benefiting from in my area. Such are operation Open Roads, extension of natural gas to the community of Krydor and the village of Hafford; the re-opening of the hospital at Rabbit Lake; a golf course in The Battlefords Provincial Park and many other projects and programs not enjoyed by my constituents during the seven lean Liberal years.

**March 12, 1974**

Hon. Members will recall the phrase 'not one red cent for Redberry'. I do want, Sir, at this time to extend a hand of welcome to the people of those parts of The Battlefords constituency and the Shellbrook constituency who will in the next election fall into the constituency of Redberry. Since my election to this Legislature I have had, Mr. Speaker, the privilege to watch the performance of the Liberal Party on your left both in the Opposition and in the government. I must admit that they perform at peak capacity in the promising and the criticizing department when they are in the Opposition where they so rightfully and justifiably adapt best.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. MICHAYLUK:** — Unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, I can only see five Members in their seats. They must be dedicated to the task of being watchdogs for Her Majesty's loyal Opposition.

I recall, Sir, the 1960-64 era. Speaking from the same location which they now occupy, they were the crusaders that would rid Saskatchewan of industrial stagnation, retarded development, oppressive taxation and major depopulation.

Hon. Members will recall, Mr. Speaker, as do the people of this province, the Liberal free enterprise 1964-71 era when some of the Hon» Members of the now Opposition sat in the Treasury benches. That period, Mr. Speaker, will be remembered for some of the most retrograde legislation, and an insensitive economic attack upon the sick, the aged and those less fortunate. Is it any wonder then, Mr. Speaker, that Saskatchewan lost over 103,000 of its people of which over 35,000 were in the labor force? Mr. Speaker, given the opportunity in 1971, the electors gave the New Democratic Party the largest percentage of the popular vote given to any political party since the formation of the province in 1905.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. MICHAYLUK:** — During the seven Liberal years our province experienced a social and economic depression, with massive unemployment, population loss, business closures and outright bankruptcies. Our farming communities suffered from severe cash shortage, rising operating costs coupled with declining farm prices.

Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Leader of the Opposition and my friend the Hon. Member for Rosthern remember as do the hog producers, hogs selling for 18 and 20 cents per pound dressed. The burden of municipal taxes soared, our less fortunate — the sick — were saddled with medical and hospital deterrent fees; oppressive labor legislation appeared with Bill 2 for labor and the denial of human rights to wage earners.

All this could not be justified by lack of provincial funds, Mr. Speaker, as the provincial budgetary finances increased from \$215 million in 1964 to \$451 million in 1971. A \$200 million increase, double the 1964 budgetary revenues. However, Saskatchewan residents were being deterred from needed important services, and the government did not introduce any new meaningful or major programs during this period. To worsen the situation, they set up financial impediments to prevent people from utilizing the programs made available to them by the New Democratic Government prior to 1964.

Mr. Speaker, during this debate, the attitude of the Liberal Party has been disappointing but predictable. One would think that following their humiliating defeat at the polls just three short years ago, they would have learned a lesson.

I would have thought, Mr. Speaker, that the voter reaction to their policies would have forced them to do some soul-searching; however, as shown during this debate, they are the same bunchy they haven't changed one iota.

Mr. Speaker, I remember vividly when speakers opposite stood in this House and made fun of the New Deal for People which our Party presented during the 1971 election. We all remember how Liberal Members opposite would stand in this Assembly and accuse us of playing politics with the people by promising things that would never be fulfilled. Yes, Mr. Speaker, Liberals thought it could not be done. The voting public knew it could; this Government knew it could be done, and it has been done.

In three short years this New Democratic Government has fulfilled its mandate. However, Members opposite are forewarned that we will not stop there but forge on with new programs. It would be very easy for this Government to rest on its laurels and await the next election knowing full well that we have fulfilled the promises to the people.

However, once again this points up the difference between this Government, this Party and my friends opposite. Members on this side of the House know full well that much remains to be done. We recognize the social and the economic problems that still exist and must be attended to. We have consistently shown the public we are willing and able to cope with any eventuality and we will continue to pursue that policy as long as we have the support of the Saskatchewan electorate.

Mr. Speaker, based on this 1974-75 Budget alone, I am confident the people will reward this Government by giving us another overwhelming mandate come next election.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. MICHAYLUK:** — Last Friday, it was interesting to watch the Opposition as the Budget was brought down. With each passing minute they became more and more despondent. They knew that their task as critics would be difficult. However, not even the most ardent pessimists on this side of the House felt their position would be as pitiful as it was. Yes, Mr. Speaker, their reaction and position with respect to the Budget most certainly was disappointing.

Just when the Liberals had a chance to regain some of their lost creditability by giving credit where credit is due, they choose to bring out their big guns and heap nothing but criticism. All the financial critic could say was that the Budget was inflationary. All he could do was harp at the increase in jobs that this Budget creates, all he could do was preach doom and gloom and attempt to convince anyone who would listen that there was little in the Budget which would benefit the people of this province.

Mr. Speaker, what did the Member for Wilkie say in his

**March 12, 1974**

address? Well, he claimed the Budget was inflationary and instead we should have used our buoyant position by reducing taxes. And he claims the Budget will not generate new economic development.

I challenge him and urge him to get in touch with the President of the Saskatchewan Chamber of Commerce who stated publicly the Budget was not inflationary. As for his taxation arguments, Mr. Speaker, Liberals are the last people on earth who should talk and show concern about taxes after the 1,477 new taxes they imposed when they sat in office.

No, Mr. Speaker, I do not intend to take seriously the hon. friends opposite. I want to remind the people of Saskatchewan however, that their criticisms are politically motivated and nothing else.

Mr. Speaker, this is, as far as I am concerned, a very responsible Budget. The direction taken will further add to the positive development of this province and its resources.

The Leader of the Opposition unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, is not in his chair, likes to dismiss lightly the province's Present favorable economic position. He warns that a recession could hit us at the same speed at which the current boom arrived. Yes, that could happen, Mr. Speaker, and no doubt would happen if the Government was not prepared and did not move in with the types of programs and policies to counter any downward trend in the economy.

**MR. MacDONALD:** (Milestone): — Where's the Premier?

**MR. SPEAKER:** — Order, order!

**MR. MacDONALD:** — Mr. Speaker, on a Point of Privilege. You know, we just wanted to point out that there isn't a single Cabinet Minister in the whole House or only one Cabinet Minister and he turns around and points to one Member on this side of the House who happens to be absent. I think we should tell everybody in Saskatchewan there are few Ministers over there.

**MR. SPEAKER:** — Order, order!

**MR. MICHAYLUK:** — Mr. Snyder is here, Mr. Bowerman is here and Mr. Brockelbank is here. Mr. Speaker, I can see Cabinet Ministers all around me . . .

**MR. SPEAKER:** — Order, order!

**MR. MICHAYLUK:** — The Premier is unavoidably absent because he is meeting with a delegation and he mentioned that in the question period this afternoon.

**MR. SPEAKER:** — Order, order!

**MR. MICHAYLUK:** — The Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Steuart) warned that recession could hit us at the same speed at which the current boom arrived.

Yes, that could happen, Mr. Speaker, as I stated before I was interrupted by the Hon. Member opposite. No doubt this could happen if the Government was not prepared and did not move in with the types of programs and policies to counter any downward trend in the economy.

Agriculture has always been our basic industry. When things were good for the farmer things were generally good for other segments of the economy and this philosophy would work conversely as well. This Government has always stressed the need for diversification within the agricultural industry and stressed the need to diversify other segments of the economy to relieve dependency which has been built up in the past. Mr. Speaker, this Budget is designed to assist in achieving this principle. The proposed 46 per cent increase for agriculture reflects the continuing commitment and concern we have for our basic industry.

The Federal Government's continuing insensitivity towards prairie agriculture is reflected by their policy such as the LIFT program. This insensitivity is only one reason why this Government has chosen to spend increased amounts to protect and stabilize the family farm unit. Until such time that the Federal Government comes up with a more rational national development policy, this New Democratic Party Government will continue to give the type of support necessary to counteract and offset the adverse affects of not having such a policy.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. MICHAYLUK:** — Mr. Speaker, more money for the Land Bank, the re-institution of machinery testing, expanded crop insurance, continued support for FarmStart and financial assistance to promote a viable hog industry shows conclusively where Members on this side of the House and this New Democratic Government stands when it comes to the welfare of the family farm.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. MICHAYLUK:** — Mr. Speaker, I sincerely question the credibility of Hon. Members opposite if they honestly oppose these measures.

The Member for Wilkie (Mr. McIsaac) claims this Budget is inflationary; he claims it will do little or nothing to assist today's family in offsetting the problems created by this national ill. I can only ask him to quit playing politics. Yes, there is inflation in Canada. Mr. Speaker, yes, I agree, it is imposing extreme hardships on thousands of people. But what is the Federal Government doing about it? What are the Liberals doing about it? What is their policy to flight inflation? Nothing.

Not only do they not have a policy, they do not believe the situation is serious; in fact, the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) has stated publicly that there is little that can be done. . The Leader of the Opposition when he was Provincial Treasurer forwarded the same argument claiming the problem was international and beyond the power of any federal or provincial government to deal with it.

Well, Mr. Speaker, this New Democratic Government does not share that view.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**March 12, 1974**

**MR. MICHAYLUK:** — Yes, we will continue to press Ottawa to deal positively with the inflation problem. However, we will also do whatever we can to program improvements for the people of Saskatchewan.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. MICHAYLUK:** — Yes, Mr. Speaker, we will take advantage of our current economic boom to put into place the types of programs and policies which will favorably offset the rising costs of goods and services.

Yet, Mr. Speaker, the Liberals oppose this. Well I can tell this House and the Members opposite, that my constituents, Mr. Speaker, do not oppose the types of programs we have proposed which will put more money in their pockets and improve the services which are becoming costlier each year.

But what my constituents, Mr. Speaker, do oppose is the negative politically motivated short-sighted position of my hon. friends opposite, Mr. Speaker.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. MICHAYLUK:** — On what grounds do you oppose our urban assistance package? Don't you gentlemen think municipalities should have more financial assistance? Do you think that they don't need it? On what grounds, Mr. Hon. Leader of the Opposition and your group, do you oppose increased property improvement grants? And why is your financial critic opposed to stepped up operating grants for schools or our first ever family income program?

Mr. Speaker, I really do not believe that Members opposite are in opposition to these programs. However, they know they have to defend their political interests by some obscure campaign aimed at discrediting the New Democratic Government.

The record of this Government is in sharp contrast to the seven lean Liberal years when this province experienced an economic and social recession unparalleled short history since the depression.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. MICHAYLUK:** — Was it not Hon. Members opposite, Mr. Speaker, who claimed this Government was conducting a war on business? Why then is it that retail trade is up over 13 per cent? Manufacturing is up by 23 per cent and 7,000 new jobs have been created in the retail sector alone.

Mr. Speaker, at the rate this New Democratic Government is going, perhaps we might fulfil the Liberal promise to create 80,000 new Saskatchewan jobs.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. MICHAYLUK:** — Mr. Speaker, earlier I said this Budget was a very responsible one. It recognizes our current economic buoyancy,



and takes advantage of that position to bring in the types of people oriented programs which are consistent with the philosophy of this Government, and the New Democratic Party.

The innovative legal aid program, Mr. Speaker, driver training, a kindergarten program, increased emphasis on housing, denticare, day care assistance and many other unique and positive programs will undoubtedly win the support of the people of this province.

Yet, the Liberal Party did not want to see these types of programs brought in. They say we have gone on a spending spree. I guess, their arguments are, and were predictable, because this Budget illustrates the sharp philosophical differences between the two political parties.

Mr. Speaker, we will not sit by and allow our people to be subjected to conditions which work to the detriment of their social and economic advancement. This Government will not allow itself to be thwarted by the insensitive ramblings and criticisms of my hon. friends opposite. We had a job to do when we were elected to form a government. Mr. Speaker, we got on with that job and in three short years completed the pledges made in 1971. As we continue to look ahead we will work towards bettering the conditions of all people in this province.

Mr. Speaker, the traditional responsibility of the Opposition, and I have mentioned this on several occasions in my previous speeches, the responsibility of the Opposition is to criticize the Government. However, with that responsibility also comes the responsibility to be objective and to offer alternatives. Has the Liberal Party of Saskatchewan, Mr. Speaker, as represented by the depleted numbers to your left, fulfilled that responsibility? Well, they certainly have been critical. But what about offering alternatives?

Mr. Speaker, do they have programs worked out which would contrast the approach this Government has taken? Oh yes! They are planning political meetings throughout the province to formulate a program to fight inflation. What are Prime Minister Trudeau, or the Federal Liberals doing — precious nothing, as are the Saskatchewan Liberals.

Mr. Speaker, the Leader of the Opposition was quoted in the Press on Friday. He said he was disappointed the Budget did not offer assistance to those hit hardest by the cost of living increases, our elderly. If there is one person who should not bring this issue up, Mr. Speaker, it is certainly the Hon. Member for Prince Albert West (Mr. Steuart).

What did he and his Government ever do to assist the elderly of this province? Did his Government abolish medicare premiums for the elderly? Did his Government launch a home repair program for the elderly? No! Did his Government bring in a hearing aid program for the elderly? No! Did he work towards a denticare program which may some day include the elderly? No! Or did he ever study the high cost of drugs which face the elderly people of this province? No! Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Leader of the Opposition and the Liberals in this Legislature did precious nothing, and voted against Budgets that provided revenues to implement the programs I have just mentioned.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**March 12, 1974**

**MR. MICHAYLUK:** — No, Mr. Speaker, the Member for Prince Albert West will be long remembered for many things, but he will certainly not be remembered for anything he ever did for the elderly of this province. In fact, Mr. Speaker, his complete hypocrisy is brought into the open when one considers that it was his Government which gave the elderly people of this province deterrent fees. A tax on the sick. The Leader of the Opposition also said the Budget did little to encourage economic development.

Well, it might not create the type of economic development that his Party wants. However, the effects of our economic development program are, and will be, much more favorable than anything his group is capable, or was capable of achieving. No, Mr. Speaker, Members on this side of the House do not think of multimillion dollar pulp mills when we talk of economic development. We believe there is a much better way to go and we have again, as reflected in this Budget, attempted to encourage the type of economic development as we feel will have a much more favorable, long-lasting effect on the Saskatchewan economy.

Hon. Members will recall that just three short years ago the Liberals attempted to peddle the acceptability of building a \$70 million pulp mill in the North, a pulp mill which if built would have been controlled by a multinational corporation and a corporation which, Mr. Speaker, succeeded in persuading the then Government to put up most of the money for a 30 per cent government share.

Well, the New Democratic Party said the pulp mill scheme was a bad one. The people of Saskatchewan agreed as was indicated at the poll results on the night of June 23rd, 1971.

Mr. Speaker, the Liberals at the time, and even now, claim this mill would have generated unprecedented employment activity in the North. Yet, take a look at what has happened as the result of a different approach to the people of northern Saskatchewan concerned.

Just last year the Department of Northern Saskatchewan through our able Minister the Hon. Mr. Bowerman, through a relatively stringent economic development program costing about 100 times less than the pulp mill, created more employment than the mill would have for the people of the North.

Yes, Liberals do not like talking about things like that. They never mention success stories like at Beauval where close to 100 people are working full time in an enterprise encouraged, promoted and assisted by this New Democratic Party Government, and controlled by the people in the area. No, Mr. Speaker, our approach to economic development is not going to grab the types of headlines the Liberals generated when they announced the pulp mills, heavy water plants, or whatever, but what our economic development program reflects is a concern and dedication to pursue the types of projects which are socially and economically beneficial to the people in the area concerned.

I would be remiss if I did not say that I, too, feel that we still have a long way to go. However, increased budgeting for the Department of Industry and Commerce and the new emphasis being placed on tourism and transportation will go a long way in eliminating many of the economic disparities this province has experienced in past years.

Mr. Speaker, Members opposite continually criticize us for not recognizing the role Ottawa is playing in relationship to our province. Well, I can only refer to what Ottawa is doing to, not for Saskatchewan, with respect to the transportation policies. We all know that the present transportation policies of the Federal Government work to the detriment of the prairies. We all know that central Canada has a distinct advantage in encouraging economic relocation and it is known that it was this Government, with the Attorney General (Mr. Romanow) as its head, which has been waging a very earnest battle with the federal Liberals to get them to change the discriminatory transportation policy.

Yes, it was because of Ottawa, Mr. Speaker, that the three western provinces banded together to set up the Machinery Testing Institute in this province. We know where we stand with Ottawa on these matters and will in spite of Ottawa continue to press for the development needed to capture our full potential.

Mr. Speaker, I maintain the Opposition is attempting to smoke screen the public by launching initiatives which are to me insincere and as I have said before politically motivated. They are attempting . . .

**AN HON. MEMBER:** — You lost a page!

**MR. MICHAYLUK:** — You're right I lost a page somewhere.

They are attempting to make us and the Saskatchewan people forget their deplorable seven year record. Yet they have not shown to me, my colleagues or to the people of the province any alternatives or proposals contained in this Budget. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pride that I support the Budget and as you may have been aware in the remarks that I have offered to you and to the Members of this Legislature, that I will be voting against the amendment.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

## **INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS**

### **BOY SCOUTS FROM MORSE CONSTITUENCY**

**MR. J. WIEBE** (Morse): — Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I could interrupt the proceedings for a moment to introduce 10 young people to the Legislature this afternoon.

Through you, Mr. Speaker, and to the Members of this House I should like to introduce 10 young boy scouts from my constituency of Morse. They represent the Boy Scout group in the town of Morse. They are here this afternoon along with Mr. Stu Heiser. I am very pleased that they have taken the time to come in and see how government works. I hope that their afternoon will be enjoyable, now that radio time is completed I think we will be getting back to normal debate in the Legislature. I wish them well this afternoon and I look forward to meeting with them at 4:30.

**HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

The Assembly resumed the interrupted debate.

**MR. D. BOLDT** (Rosthern): — Mr. Speaker, in rising to take part in this Budget Debate I want to make a few comments first before I go into my prepared statement, on some of the remarks that were made by the Members who spoke today and particularly the Member for Redberry (Mr. Michayluk). At no time do I think that he discussed, nor the other Members, the Budget. All they did was criticize the Liberals. We are not the government, and there are many, many things that were outlined in the Budget Speech and read by the Finance Minister that need explaining, but nobody yet has explained it any further than what the Minister of Finance did last Friday. Just always criticize the Liberals as if we were the government. All they did was repeat and repeat practically read it word for word. We got a very lavish copy of it, I read it at home and I suppose many other Members did. We don't have to have that repeated. There are many items in the Budget that need explaining but I don't think that the Government has explained it to the back benchers. They don't know what is in the Budget, they don't know what the program is. Nobody knows, except the Finance Minister. I doubt very much whether the Premier knows what is all in the program.

The Member for Redberry mentioned that during the seven years or the latter part of the seven years that we were in power the farmers' income was low. This is true. But tell me what has the NDP Government done to increase the price of wheat since two years ago. Just absolutely nothing! Absolutely nothing! He tells us that the New Deal program is completed in three years rather than four. Well the New Deal program — the completion of it was announced months before the Lakeview by-election, and the New Deal was turned down by the people.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. BOLDT:** — On four different occasions we had by-elections in the province, three of the Members that were running in the by-elections are sitting on this side of the House, Mr. Speaker, and one on that side. I think that is a very strong indication that you cannot buy votes. You are not going to buy votes with this Budget.

**MR. CODY:** — . . . Meadow Lake . . . buy votes.

**MR. BOLDT:** — You'll get your time, Mr. Cody, just let me say a few words.

The Member for Shaunavon (Mr. Oliver) made a comment that the Liberal caucus had a meeting yesterday in Swift Current, he mentioned Jack Wiebe, Don MacDonald, Gary Lane and a Sonny Anderson. Well Sonny Anderson is not in the caucus, but he is a Liberal candidate, he will be in the caucus and I want to tell the Member for Shaunavon that these four back benchers, they are all in the back row, they drew a bigger crowd in Swift Current than the Premier and all his troops a couple of weeks ago when they were in Swift Current.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. BOLDT:** — Why didn't you draw a crowd

there? There is nobody going to come and listen to the propaganda that you have to tell them. We know a good deal about the Andersons, they are good farmers, they are in the ranching business. I am sure that the ranchers — we the Liberal Party have the support of the ranchers — and it won't be too long when you call the election that Mr. Anderson will be on that side of the House.

I believe, Mr. Speaker, when I read the Budget and heard it on Friday last that I had to come to the conclusion that never has so much been taken away from the people in return for so little. This Budget is asking the people of Saskatchewan to contribute to the Government of Saskatchewan \$1,000 for every man, woman and child. A couple with two children, the Blakeney Government is asking \$4,000 to operate this little Kremlin here in Regina. Then the Minister of Finance says the people have never been taxed less. The last year when we were in office we took \$450 million from the people of Saskatchewan, you have doubled that in three years. And yet the Minister of Finance says in his Budget Speech the farmers and businessmen and homeowners will pay less. That certainly is the understatement of the year. They will pay less? They will pay a lot more, but the Minister of Finance doesn't know that if I bought a \$6,000 car in 1971 I paid \$300 education and hospital tax, this winter when I bought a similar car I had to pay \$8,000 for that car and I paid you, the Government \$400, that's \$100 more tax. But the socialists can't add that up.

Coupled together with the federal spending spree of \$22 billion that adds \$4,000 to our taxes — in other words between Ottawa and Regina the average tax to run our two senior governments costs the individual \$2,000 or \$8,000 for a family of four. Never in the history of our country have the people been taxed heavier than they are today.

As the Hon. Member for Wilkie stated in this debate that the Budget had gone up 25 per cent. Really when you look at the Budget it hasn't gone up 25 per cent — \$92 million will be voted for in the Supplemental Estimates which would bring last year's budget to over \$800 million. If we have a 9 or 10 per cent inflation cost and the 15 and 20 per cent increases in wages that you are awarding, industry has to follow suit, that extra 10 or 12 per cent that you have added just takes care of the cost of living. You are adding absolutely nothing new to this program. The Blakeney Government talks about inflation at the federal level, criticizes Ottawa and that's all he does, he just talks about it and then adds fuel to the fire. I am not surprised at all the Government had to bring in a 25 per cent increase in this Budget. It just had to be that way.

When one looks at the program it all is absorbed by more civil servants and higher wages. More planners to plan new programs that won't work because they are not planned right. A good example is the Department of Northern Saskatchewan, and of course your latest indication of what you are going to do with the oil industry

The Minister of Finance (Mr. Robbins) emphasized the increase in grants and programs to urban governments. I want to compliment him on these increases, but the Government was forced, absolutely forced to increase them or else the urban municipalities would be forced to increase the mill rate by 8 or 10 maybe as high as 12 mills. Even with this increase — and I listened

**March 12, 1974**

to Alderman Wright, the deputy mayor of Saskatoon over the weekend — even with this increase he said that they would have to raise the mill rate approximately 3 mills, just to carry on the existing services. No increase in services! Grants that are being offered on a cost-share basis will mean further outlays for the cities, in other words, the additional grants to the large urban municipal governments will only cover up the expected increase in costs of existing services.

The unconditional grants are of course welcomed, but it appears to me somewhat of a joke when the Blakeney Government states that the urban governments will have more say and are not tied down to conditional grants as was the case of last year or years past. Well that certainly wasn't the case a few months ago when you imposed the ward system on the two large cities.

**MR. ROLFES:** — That was last year.

**MR. BOLDT:** — A few months ago.

As I said before the increase in the Budget will not provide 25 per cent more services. The greater part perhaps 80 per cent of the increase will go for the increase in additional costs for existing programs, mostly because of high wages, high wage demands and increases in the cost of materials and services.

The Property Improvement Grant increase is also welcome, but also necessary. The Minister misrepresents the facts when he said that taxes to householders and farmers will be further reduced. They will not. Municipal mill rates will no doubt increase substantially, some municipal mill rates will go up from 5 to 10 mills, particularly because of the high cost of snow removal on municipal roads.

**MR. ROBBINS:** — Go down by 82 mills.

**MR. BOLDT:** — No they will not.

The Minister would be more correct if he had stated that farmers will pay less in taxes under the new formula, than under the old. But the net result will be more taxes for farmers and urban dwellers than in the year before. However, taxes are not the only cost that face the people of Saskatchewan and of Canada. Costs of goods have gone up way out of line. Here is where the Government has utterly failed. I mentioned on a previous occasion that the cost of oil, gas and propane have gone up 30 per cent since the NDP took office. Personal income tax was increased twice since they took office. Farm machinery has gone up in some instances 40 to 50 per cent in the last two and one-half years under NDP Government. You just read the New Deal, the New Deal says very emphatically, that farm machinery prices will be kept down. Have you read it? This they have failed to do. As a matter of fact this Government has failed miserably in keeping prices under control. The only attempt that was offered to keep prices under control was offered several months ago to hold the price of beer at the current level. That's the only time that you intervened. Here too, the Premier had to pass on the increase to the consumer.

A few days ago the bakeries increased the price of bread by two cents, the announcement was made on Saturday. Another increase in the cost of living. What is the Provincial Government doing about it, absolutely nothing. Wages and farm products

must and will go up if the governments fail to keep prices under control. The best way to keep prices under control is to spend less and stop printing more currency when revenues fail to meet expenditures.

Of all the increases announced by the Government, industry and manufacturers, the comment always is the same, it goes something like this: the cost of bread will be increased by two cents a loaf because of wage demands, and increased costs in distribution. That's the reason. . . .

**MR. CODY:** — They didn't say that!

**MR. BOLDT:** — They sure did! You never listen to the news or you would know. You better listen or read the paper.

Let me turn to the Minister's remarks on highway spending. I am sorry that the Minister of Highways is not in, there are very few Ministers in the House, as usual. I should like to make a few comments regarding highways. I welcome, I really do, the \$12 million increase for the highway capital program. The Government has finally realized that good roads will make rural and northern Saskatchewan more pleasant to live in. But I can remember how you criticized the \$45 million capital highway budget when we were in office. Why, you made resolutions and committed to reduce that \$45 million, you told the people that you would cut the highway capital budget down to \$20 million.

**MR. ROLFES:** — You gave it all to the contractors.

**MR. BOLDT:** — You haven't found any under-the-table deals yet, and if you had found some, you would have blown it all over the country. I can remember how you criticized the re-construction of No. 2 Highway to La Ronge. You then called it foolish spending and under-the-table deals. The Minister of Highways (Mr. Kramer) hasn't found any under-the-table deals, and he won't. Now you finally realize and agree with what we had in mind back in 1964 to 1971. I welcome the paving of No. 2 Highway at a cost of \$6 million. But I want to tell this House that when we were the Government, and would have said that we were going to spend \$6 million for less than 5,000 people, you would have called us insane. But now you are doing it, I welcome that you have seen the light. Department of Northern Saskatchewan personnel in La Ronge now have multiplied and there is so much travelling of civil servants back and forth from La Ronge to Regina, that it now apparently warrants paving. But in 1971, you suggested that the natives in the North did not need those kinds of roads.

But I want to remind the Government, the Minister of Finance that a \$60 million capital highway program provides no more road work, no more construction in 1974 than a \$45 million budget did in 1971.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. BOLDT:** — That's a fact. Costs have gone way up. You're getting no more today for \$60 million, then we did in 1971 for \$45 million.

**March 12, 1974**

**AN HON. MEMBER:** — . . . no kick backs.

**MR. BOLDT:** — You're no more efficient. You name us the kick backs. You don't know of any kick backs.

The Minister of Highways is a real poor fighter for his Department in Cabinet. He cannot match his colleagues. He can make a lot of noise and nonsense in this House, but Mr. Romanow was able to slap off \$10 million and grab it for the Automobile Accident Insurance Fund. All credit has to go to Roy and none to Kramer.

However, I feel that his is a grave error. But this is the kind of fighter, Mr. Kramer is when it comes to Cabinet and I wouldn't be a bit surprised if Roy would grab another \$10 million next year for the Automobile Accident Insurance Fund. An extra \$10 million dollars spent on highways a year, would most likely result in savings to the insurance fund and save lives and injuries to thousands of people.

I believe the Government is wrong in subsidizing the Act from gas revenue.

The AAIA has been accepted by all people of Saskatchewan as a good program. The cost of insurance premiums is related to the behavior of drivers, and the full cost of claims and the administration should be borne by those who drive, and not from general revenue. The Attorney General's argument is that those who drive most should pay more, and \_ so 3 cents for every gallon of gas goes toward the cost of claims.

The fact is that many drivers, private and truckers, drive more miles outside of Saskatchewan, than they do in Saskatchewan. They are still fully covered. I drive more miles out of Saskatchewan with my car than I do in Saskatchewan and yet when I go to the States I'm fully covered under the AAIA and the gas I buy contributes nothing to the fund. So I believe transferring the 3 cents tax on gas to the AAIA is not fair to the automobile user.

I want to say a few words about the agricultural expenditures.

It is very interesting to observe the Minister of Finance when in his speech he emphasized the importance of the agricultural industry to our province, and yet only a miserable 3.3 per cent of the total Budget will be spent on agriculture. It is merely lip-service.

It is even more obvious that the Government is not sincere with the farmer, when we compare the \$30 million agriculture budget to that of an almost new department, namely, the Department of Northern Saskatchewan, which inside of two years has been allocated \$29 million. Almost the same amount as agriculture.

And if I understand the Estimates correctly, and the Minister of Finance can check me if I'm not right, as indicated on page 9 of the Estimates, the farm people themselves, will contribute through various fees and charges of programs and projects, almost \$13 million to the Budget.



So, in reality, the Government is only spending \$17 million on agriculture, or a percentage of about 2 per cent of the revenue received. And I say this is not satisfactory to the industry.

I want to say a few words about the Land Bank, I really should call it the Grab Land Bank policy of the NDP. They will receive another \$20 million. The land prices, with good grain prices, have doubled in the last two years. If the Government wants to pay the price now offered by the private sector, the \$20 million now allocated to the Land Bank will only buy 50 per cent of the acres of a year ago.

I want to say this to the farmers. I hope that farmers will be careful when they deal with this Government. I would encourage farmers who want to sell to look at the private sector. They will get a far better deal from then than from the Land Bank.

I want to say this to the Government. Let the Government provide the finances to our young farmers so that they can be landowners and not land renters.

**SOME HON.MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. BOLDT:** — I urge farmers, particularly those who are considering retirement, not to sell to the Land Bank. There are many farmers today who can afford and who will buy land for their sons. I want to throw out this warning to our farmers or rural people. Do not let the Government grab the land, because you might never see the day when it will again be privately owned.

Now, I should like to say a few words about the Department of Northern Affairs or the DNS as it is called. Mr. Speaker, over \$22 million will be spent by the planners and \$6 million on capital, for a total of almost \$29 million.

And let's look at this item. I would like particularly the Liberal Members on this side of the House to take note that they have a Department there called the Northern Service Branch, which will spend, I think it's in the Northern News Service Branch, which will spend \$654,000. I hope that the NDP will calculate this item as an election .expense. Because all it is, is an NDP political propaganda department.

**MR. ROLFES:** — Dave, you don't mean that.

**MR. BOLDT:** — I sure do, I'm sincere about it, Herman you must agree with me, you know it's true.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. BOLDT:** — Well, they had \$15 million last year and they blew it. This year they need twice that amount and I doubt very much that if this department of government will satisfy the natives in the North. It certainly hasn't done so up to this time. The \$15 million didn't satisfy them, another dollar certainly won't.

It is interesting to note last year's Estimates of the Department of Northern Saskatchewan for the Saskatchewan

**March 12, 1974**

Assistance Plan. Now this is very interesting when you look through the Budget items, the social services, welfare, they have an item in the DNS which should really go to the Welfare Department of \$3.5 million. Last year it was \$3 million, this year the Minister of DNS (Mr. Bowerman) expects that there are going to be more people on welfare in the North after spending \$30 million, than there were last year, because the Estimates indicate there is \$3.5 million allocated for the Department from the Saskatchewan Assistance Plan. Yes, sir, and yet you say that you are going to provide jobs.

It is therefore recognized by the Government and the Department that all the money that will be spent in the North adds up to more people on welfare than ever before.

Yes, when I was in La Ronge this is the statement made and I want to repeat it. Yes, the South is being raped by the North, and the white man in the North just loves it. Apparently, there is no benefit from all this expenditure going to the people that really need it. You're going to keep the native people on welfare. And I want to point out what is the real problem of the native people in the North. Are they not getting enough welfare to take care of food, lodging and clothing? And I think the answer must be, I think they do. I'm sure they do.

What is the solution? Or what is the problem?

And I want to tell the Members of this House, that my next statement is not a 'catch phrase' to get a lot of votes. I want to tell you what the facts are. I know that almost all of the Members of this House, including the NDP will agree with what I will say but very few want to be quoted.

The leaders of the native people, many chiefs, are alarmed and have expressed that idleness has made them turn to alcohol. One of the leaders from Sandy Bay, when interviewed by the CBC, said that 70 per cent of his community in the settlement were alcoholics. And I think it is safe to say that 70 per cent of the funds used for alcohol come from the hard work of Canadians who resent paying taxes for this purpose, and I am one of them. These people, I believe, want jobs — not welfare.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. BOLDT:** — I also believe the Canadian taxpayer is willing to support industries such as the Choiceland iron ore mine, which you confiscated, or another pulp mill, which you paid \$6 million to get out of that area, or uranium mines, so that we can say to every able-bodied white or native, 'there is a job for you, if you want to eat and feed and clothe your family, there is a job for you, no way will we give you welfare unless you are disabled or unless there is another very good reason.

But what do the federal and provincial governments want to do about this situation? Well, the other day, the federal Minister in charge of housing, recently suggested another \$100 million for home building programs for the native people. You know really, I wish that when I was 21 years of age, I wish the government would have said to Dave Boldt, I will build you a \$5, \$10, \$20,000 home. I never got that offer. If that had been given to any Member in this House we would be millionaires.

So, we are going to construct homes, and the Federal Government wants you to put up 25 per cent of that amount. So, we are going to construct \$5,000 to \$20,000 homes, so that the alcoholics and not only the natives, the whites and the reds, can drink in a large living room, furnish it with French provincial furniture, have running water and flush toilets. We will make it as convenient for you as possible, we might even consider delivering groceries and alcohol to your doorstep. That's your program.

Do you really think, Herman, that that will make the natives happy? No, I don't think so and I don't think you do and I don't think anybody in Saskatchewan does. A \$20,000 home with running water will not make them any happier, than they are today.

Those people who are happy and healthy and thankful, are those that work. Idleness corrupts the individual; it destroys the body and soul. The individual and family and many of the offspring, become permanent liabilities to the state. And yet that's all this \$28 million is going to do for the Department of Northern Affairs.

We must get all able-bodied people, white or black, red or yellow, off the welfare rolls. That must be our prime concern as legislators.

I do not think there is any hardship in the North for lack of money. I believe there is just gross mismanagement of funds, by individual families. That's all it is.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. BOLDT:** — If it was spent in the right places we would see very few hardships.

So I heard, and I want to digress a little bit from my notes. About the month of December, when there was a riot or demonstration on one of the Indian Reservations south of Montreal and I think it would be good for the news media if they heard this, because I don't always agree with the news media. They showed this riot where three policemen were injured and I think eight cars upset, damaged and then before the film was off the air, the commentator said something like this. That's not the only Indian problem that we have in Canada, there are three reserves in British Columbia where poverty is rampant, where the poor are perhaps the poorest in the world. And they turned the camera on a little Indian hut, there were six people, wife, and husband and four children. And the camera showed that there was no food, there was no furniture, there was no bedding and they turned the camera onto the native and they asked him what is your problem here. And he said we are as poor as any poor individual in this world. Right here in Canada there is poverty such as you wouldn't see any other place in the world.

And of course, when you look at it they want the people to believe that these people are really poor. Before he signed off he said their way of life is alcohol and prostitution. Well, I said to my wife when the TV news was over, what does this commentator really want us to do? I'm sure that Barrett gives this family just as much welfare as Premier Blakeney's Government does. Maybe even more. I am opposed to the Barrett Government building this family a \$20,000 home and furnish it with

**March 12, 1974**

French provincial and big bedroom suites so that the man can sit in a French provincial and drink his beer, watch a color TV and the woman practise prostitution in a queen sized or king sized bed.

But that's all we seem to have for these native people is welfare. That's all that this Government is concerned about. I'm not concerned about how much welfare that this family in British Columbia is getting. I would like the Press to point out to the people that this family might be receiving \$400 a month welfare payments and maybe \$600 a month from prostitution. And I would tell the people of Canada, this here is a \$1,000 income going into this home and it's not going for education. That's the problem. That's our social problem with the natives and that's the problem with the whites.

**MR. SNYDER:** — What's your solution?

**MR. BOLDT:** — Take the liquor from them. White or black, red or yellow if you can't handle liquor, the law should be such that he should not touch it, he wouldn't be able to touch it.

But no, \$41 million comes from liquor profits and then you're going to spend a measly \$1.6 million to rehabilitate these people.

**MR. SMISHEK:** — Why don't you read the Budget first of all?

**MR. BOLDT:** — Well I read it, \$1.6 . . . one of your fellows there... the Member for Cut Knife (Mr. Kwasnica) said \$1.6 million went to alcoholism. I believe that much more emphasis should be given to educate our young people regarding the harmful effects of tobacco and drugs before they become addicted to them. But the mistake that we make, all the emphasis that you are making is after they become alcoholics; after they become tobacco users then we want to lift them up. I'm not so much concerned about the alcoholic, I am far more concerned that we teach them to stay away from those drugs.

**AN HON. MEMBER:** — And what did your Government do?

**MR. BOLDT:** — They were wrong too, but you know my stand.

Mr. Speaker, I would now like to say a few words about the Social Services Department. I can't let him go off scot-free: better known as the Welfare Department. The health of the nation, its people and its Government should be gauged by the number that need social assistance and the amount needed.

In 1971, the total social welfare budget was \$42 million, and that includes the federal contribution. Three years later under NDP guidance, this budget has climbed to \$105 million.

**AN HON. MEMBER:** — Is that all?

**MR. BOLDT:** — No' that's not all. Sure there might be a few others, but you transferred \$3.5 million into DNS as well.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. BOLDT:** — If you add the welfare dollars hidden in the Department of Northern Saskatchewan's budget, the welfare costs have risen by 200 per cent in the last three years.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. BOLDT:** — That is what has happened under a Government that promised jobs for our people under the New Deal program. Welfare! You know we spend more than one dollar out of every nine that the Minister of Finance collects from Ottawa and the people of Saskatchewan for welfare. How can we prosper under such circumstances? Of course, there is no end in sight with all these planners that you are going to have in the DNS and in the Welfare Department, things are bound to go up.

Now I want to say this in all fairness to the Government, that the Government must be blamed to a degree for this tremendous increase for a welfare state and for implementing some of the foolish programs. But I also want to say this to the public, to the citizens of Saskatchewan, that they must also share some of the blame. If we want the Government to totally look after our needs, then of course, this department is going to be by far the highest spender in government. The child care program is a typical example. If mothers with children feel they must work and demand Government financed child care centres, then inside of a few years this program alone will cost \$100 million.

If we, as younger people, and we are all comparatively young in this House, if we do not want to share some of the responsibility of caring for our parents, but expect that the government is going to take over and finance all of the welfare homes, the senior citizen homes, the nursing homes, then these costs — and there's a great demand for it — then these costs will also sky-rocket and this Department will be spending more money than we will be spending on education and health and all the rest put together.

There are many costly programs that this Government has gone into that need not have been. Just to mention a few. Intercontinental Packers was a very foolish move; buying shares in Interprovincial Steel and Pipe was absolutely not warranted and has not created one additional job; the cancellation of the Meadow Lake Pulp Mill cost Saskatchewan taxpayers \$6 million and nothing to take its place is in sight as long as this Government wages war on industry; the confiscation of mineral rights from oil companies has thrown many Saskatchewan people out of work and I'm sure that your Premier heard the delegation that came, and the result is that we have absolutely no exploration in this province.

I want to direct a few words to the Attorney General. He's not that good that he would get out of my claws too. I want to criticize the office of the Ombudsman. This is another waste of public funds, absolutely useless. Why? The Cabinet has a Cabinet room and it's interesting to note that in Crown Corporations the other day, they even have a Cabinet Secretary in Saskatoon, a fellow who is on the Board of Directors of SPC. I wonder what wages he is getting? Half the time you have one

**March 12, 1974**

or two Cabinet Ministers advertising in the Star-Phoenix — "We will be sitting in the Cabinet room in Saskatoon".

That set-up is in addition to that of Ombudsman. I would certainly urge all Members to read the report from that office. I am sure that you will agree with me that most of the complaints are frivolous and could easily be looked after by the MLAs. I want to read a few of them, just a few short accounts as reported from the office, by Mr. Boychuk, and I am referring to Complaint No. 73-420-01, as an example. And we need a high-priced lawyer, a former judge, maybe getting \$30,000 or \$40,000 a year, with five staff members there to look after these complaints and he writes like this and I quote:

Every new endeavor has a milestone (that one sure has). This matter was the first to be rectified. It came from a legally blind parent whose daughter had started at trade school and was entitled to a \$10 a month rehabilitation grant. He received the grant the first month, but then followed three months without a payment. He then received payment in the fourth.

So he went to the Ombudsman.

**Upon notification to the Department (that's to the Ombudsman) and concurrent to my visit to the local office, the cheque for the arrears went out the same day. The problem was simply an administrative oversight.**

Well, I bet that cost us maybe \$1,000 to rectify that. I am sure that if this case had happened in Saskatoon, any one of the MLAs could have picked up the phone and within a few minutes this error or omission would have been corrected without the high paid office of the Ombudsman.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. BOLDT:** — But you have got a Cabinet meeting there every week, you have six NDP MLAs that don't do their homework, they are out politicking somewhere so that the people in Saskatoon can't get to you.

I want to read just one more case and is Complaint No. 73-420-16 and I quote from that report:

The applicant, an inmate of the correctional centre, applied on more than one occasion for a temporary leave of absence pass, to spend a weekend outside of the centre. He complained his request, which had been turned down, had not received the proper attention and should be reviewed.

And of course, Mr. Boychuk reviewed this.

Investigation disclosed that all the proper steps had been carried out by the centre and there was every justification in refusing to grant the leave.

Surely we don't need a high-priced Ombudsman with a staff of five to look after complaints that MLAs should be looking after and could solve; after all, I want to tell the Cabinet Ministers and the MLAs that we are getting paid pretty good pay for the time that we put in here.

However, I must point out that the Ombudsman heard 304 complaints of which 182 came from the six cities. Saskatoon is a bad example. The Members there should take note.

Saskatoon has a Cabinet office and six NDP Members. It is apparent that the Saskatoon MLAs are not doing their homework, as 62 people had complaints to bring to the Ombudsman, from the city of Saskatoon.

To further point out that this office is not needed, I received a complaint from a farmer living in the Biggar constituency, in the former Finance Minister's constituency (Mr. Cowley), but he hasn't got time to look after the complaints, so they write the Liberals. It had to do with some land taken from him for highway construction. It amounted to about 40 acres and he was paying taxes on 160 acres and he thought he should have a reassessment. So he phoned me and I told him I would contact the Minister, Mr. Wood. I wrote the Minister of Municipal Affairs and inside of a week I and the farmer were notified by the Minister that the quarter section would be reassessed in 1974. That's all that was needed — no Ombudsman. This farmer doesn't even know there is one existing in Saskatchewan.

Another complaint was registered recently to me by a hog producer from my constituency. I wrote to the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Messer). The farmer and I received a letter from him indicating to me that the farmer's concern was taken care of immediately. He was notified and I was notified — no Ombudsman was necessary.

We should have — and I want to emphasize this — we should have 60 Ombudsmen in this House — we don't need 61.

In closing, I want to repeat that this Budget is inflationary and only meets the needs of increased costs in wages and services. It will create the greatest bureaucracy that this province has ever seen. The Departments will get hung up with red tape so that we will see very few decisions made. There will be more chiefs than we have Indians in this province.

The Minister of Finance, in his opening remarks, belabored the fact that he had bought himself a new tie, and he got a good buy. But I want to say that his Budget is not a buy for the people, it is a sell-out.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. BOLDT:** — I shall support the amendment and not the Motion.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. L. LARSON (Pelly):** — Mr. Speaker, I find it rather interesting, and a great pleasure to rise and take part in this debate.

I am rather sorry that the Member for Rosthern is leaving. I enjoyed very much his lecture on morals, his lecture on economics and his lecture on the ills and sins of this Government.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**March 12, 1974**

**MR. LARSON:** — I say again, that it is with a great deal of pride and satisfaction that I take part in this debate.

I do not believe, Mr. Speaker, that in my entire career as a Member of this political Party, I have ever been as proud, or as satisfied as I was last Friday when the Minister of Finance (Mr. Robbins) presented this Budget.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. LARSON:** — Not only was the presentation superb, but the contents were beyond, in my opinion, all expectations.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. LARSON:** — I believe it is the first time in the history of this Legislature that we had a presentation with contents of this magnitude and this far reaching consequence for the people of the Province of Saskatchewan. It was no surprise to me that the presentation was of the calibre and quality that it was. The Minister of Finance was a former seatmate of mine and I was quite aware of his abilities, quite aware of his aptitudes and quite aware of his very human outlook towards people and towards Saskatchewan.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. LARSON:** — What came as a bit of a surprise was that only after a few months in charge of this very vital and important department he had such a knowledgeable grasp of the intimate details of his department and of the programs.

I find it difficult to expand to any great extent on the elaboration and the total explanation that he gave in this Budget. I am certainly, Mr. Speaker, going to make sure that as many people as I can reach will get a copy of this document so that they can see first hand the kind of direction we are going.

My second source of satisfaction is being a Member of a Government that has the foresight, that has the wisdom and the courage to place before the people of Saskatchewan a Budget of this magnitude.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. LARSON:** — I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that it is going to take a considerable amount of time before the people of the province realize the full impact of the benefits that are available to them through this document. It is not going to be done very quickly, it is going to have to take time and they are going to have to learn by doing, by participating in the programs and the new horizons that have been opened to them.

Not only is the Budget a fulfilment of a very —ambitious election program, it is a Budget of challenge and a Budget of pattern for the rest of Canadian provinces and of Canada as a whole to follow.



This Budget is a pace setter, one of fulfilment, as I have said, as well as a pattern of the needs of the future. A pattern of the aspirations of people, and a pattern of the role that governments must play in the year 1974 and in the future. This Budget, and this Government recognizes that there is a new role and a new direction that must be played by governments if we are to keep abreast and in tune with the demands of today and the demand of tomorrow.

No longer is it satisfactory to do anything less. No longer are people, particularly the people of Saskatchewan, content with a mediocre and out-dated approach to today's fast paced and ever changing social conditions.

The clear indications of the rejection of mediocrity and insensitive governments is evident in many places in the democratic world. The results of elections that have elected minority governments in many countries, including our own Canadian Parliament, stands as grim evidence of this fact. No longer can governments continue to be complacent, no longer can they continue to be out of touch, no longer can they afford to be afraid to lead and be afraid to set pace for this self-evident pattern. This will only lead to weakening of the democratic process as well as the stagnation of progress and the stagnation of ambitions.

I offer hearty congratulations to the Minister and to the Government for meeting this challenge and acting decisively on it. What, Mr. Speaker, has been the general reaction to this Budget?

It can only be described in one or two simple words — fantastic and unbelievable.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. LARSON:** — Towns have welcomed the new horizons that have been opened for them. Cities can hardly believe the challenge that is now available to them. Hamlets and rural councils all agree it is the kind of opportunity that they have been waiting for. If there is any question in their minds, the question is: Are we going to be able to take advantage of the programs, and acquire the people necessary to do the work, acquire the people necessary to complete the programs? They have been waiting with open arms and at last they have received something that they really appreciate.

Even the conservative Chamber of Commerce ( and I say conservative with a small c) have to admit that it is a good Budget and that it is going in the right direction-. Only the Liberal Party attempts to find fault with it.

Of course, it is very obvious, even to the novice and the very naive, that their attempts are futile and ill-conceived.

The Member for Wilkie (Mr. McIsaac) yesterday had the audacity to refer to it as a rip-off and as inflationary. I am very sorry that he is not in his seat because I certainly wanted him to hear what I have to say. I should like to ask him, Mr. Speaker, as well as all Members opposite, just what you mean by rip-off and inflationary? I would ask you if you call the cancellation of deterrent fees, the cancellation of the

utilization fees, as rip-offs and rip-offs for whom? I ask you to stand up in your place to say whether or not you consider this a rip-off and inflationary? I would like to ask you if the hearing aid program is a rip-off, and if you call it inflationary — where people today can acquire hearing aids for less than 50 per cent of what they could under the former government? Yet, Mr. Speaker, the Member for Wilkie had the audacity to call these kinds of programs rip-offs.

I would like to call on all Members on that side of the House, Mr. Speaker, to stand up in your places and state your particular stand, whether you concur, whether you disagree with this kind of tactic and this kind of approach. Will you stand up as the Hon. Member for Wilkie did and tell the people of the province that senior citizens housing programs are a rip-off; would you tell them that the FarmStart program is a rip-off; will you tell them that the hog stabilization program is a rip-off; will you tell the people that? Will you call — the Property Improvement Grants now up to \$300 a rip-off and inflationary? Will you call the drop in car insurance for most cars a rip-off? If what the Member for Wilkie said, Mr. Speaker, is true, then denticare, urban assistance, municipal assistance, family income program, Open Roads program, paved streets, these must also be classed as rip-offs and inflationary. I invite the Member for Wilkie, or any other Member from that side of the House to come to my constituency and publicly call these programs rip-offs.

If the Member for Wilkie wants to talk about rip-off's let's just have a little look and see what we will find.

Of course, when it comes to the corporate friends of the Liberal Party, the word rip-off means something completely different.

**MR. FEDUNIAK:** — Like the streakers, Leonard!

**MR. LARSON:** — Yes, right — that's a very good interpretation. Streakers would come very close to fitting the definition.

If we look, Mr. Speaker, at the entire economic structure of not only citizens of Saskatchewan, but citizens of Canada, we find that over half of the people in this country are in a position where they are being ripped-off rather than in a position to rip-off. For example, in half of this country we face a potential petroleum shortage and higher prices, despite the fact that we have Canadian reserves sufficient to meet all our needs from coast to coast for the foreseeable future. Yet, according to the Liberals, this is okay, this is fine, to allow the oil companies to manipulate, to allow them to hold up consumers, to allow them to create shortages and to allow them to continue their program of scare tactics in order to get higher and unrealistic prices.

]

If you look at the food industry and food prices, we are told that food prices must rise because of shortages. Food shortages in a country like Canada where we have one of the most productive and the most comprehensive agricultural industries in the whole world — an industry that survived, flourished and provided not only Canadians, but people outside with high quality, cheap food, for a very, very long time.

A host of problems and aberrations plague the home building industry despite timber and raw materials and reserves that are the envy of the whole world. No place on earth, Mr. Speaker, do you find any country that has the tremendous reserves that Canada holds, yet, in spite of this, we have problems and suffer shortages and high costs that the average person finds impossible to bear. In short, Mr. Speaker, the incomprehensible contradictions that spell economic hardships for far too many people and constant juggling of family budgets for most people has raised the spectre of a system that is totally and completely out of control.

While salaries and wages have failed to keep pace with the cost of living during 1973, the working Canadian family have had to watch, have had to watch in awe in some cases, the parade of profits that have strutted shamelessly across the financial pages of this country. Yet, friends opposite say the Provincial Government is to blame. They say that the Provincial Government is doing nothing to control these facts. We have our Prime Minister, speaking in the House of Commons, in the Throne Speech Debate, saying that even Canada as a nation is hardly able to do very much about the inflationary trends. Yet my friends opposite don't want to class this as rip-offs.

In the resource industry, let's look at some of the profits. We find for 1973 Falconbridge Nickel Mines, 770 per cent profit; Abitibi Paper Company, 260 per cent increase in profits. This is to mention only two.

In the food processing industry and retailing, the area that hits the most families and most Canadians directly in the pocketbook, we find almost a parallel story. George Weston shows an 86 per cent increase in profits; the Loblaw Company for a four week period, profits of 73 per cent. Again, only to mention a couple.

We get right back to the oil industry and we hear Members opposite crying and moaning and groaning that they must have incentives, they must have profits, that their exploration costs and the risks are too high and that they have everything stacked against them. In spite of all the risks, in spite of all the pleas and in spite of all the costs that friends opposite talk so much about, we look at the financial statements and find the following: Texaco Company profits for 1973 — up 30 per cent; Imperial Oil — up 45 per cent; Home Oil — up 115 per cent; Shell Oil — for the third quarter of 1973 — up 43 per cent.

**MR. MOSTOWAY:** — Poor little companies!

**MR. LARSON:** — Yes, poor little companies. Yet our friends opposite are concerned, yes very concerned about their production costs, concerned about incentives, concerned about high capital risks, concerned about exploratory risks. These kinds of rip-offs have been running rampant for a long period of time.

If Members opposite wanted to be objective in their analysis of what is and has happened, they would note that the multi-national corporations in Canada hold some \$4.7 billion in deferred taxes that will probably never be paid.

I would suggest that even at a modest interest rate charged on this \$4.7 billion, it is quite possible that the taxpayers of

**March 12, 1974**

Canada could look for tax relief of some \$70 or \$80 per capita. Yet, this kind of rip-off and this kind of practice is not mentioned.

Again, if Members opposite would take note they would discover that more than half of the Canadian families and individuals have no savings deposits, but 13 per cent hold more than 55 per cent of the total deposits in Canada. Eighty per cent of Canadians do not even own Canada Savings Bonds, but 4 per cent of Canadians own 65 per cent of the total bond value. Eighty-six per cent of Canadian families and individuals do not own stocks, while 2 per cent of Canadians own 64 per cent of total stock values. The top 10 per cent of Canadian families and individuals receive more in wages and salaries than the bottom 50 per cent.

When it comes to rip-offs and inflation, it is easy, Mr. Speaker, to see where the sympathies and concerns of the Liberal Party and our friends opposite lie.

**MR. WEATHERALD:** — You are in that top group.

**MR. LARSON:** — My friend from Cannington says that I am in that group. For his information, I would not be standing in this House, drawing to the attention of the Canadian people, these facts if I were part of it.

One of the problems that we face is there aren't enough people that know precisely where the economic powers lie. They are hoodwinked, they are fooled and they are not really aware at all.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I was sorry to hear the other day when the new Member for Lakeview (Mr. Malone) and I am sorry he is not in his seat, made his comments during the address. I do not find it particularly palatable to attack him as a new Member. I was of the opinion that he was a fair-minded and a rather reasonable sort of person.

**AN HON. MEMBER:** — You're right about that.

**MR. LARSON:** — However, when I heard him yesterday refer to the Budget and refer to this Government as being hypocritical, I find it rather difficult to refrain from naming some hypocritical comparisons and allowing others to judge where the real hypocrisy rests, Mr. Speaker. May I remind him that those who live in glass houses can ill afford to toss rocks and stones.

During the 1964 election campaign when the Liberal Party was campaigning on the issues of high taxes, stagnation, 80,000 new jobs, prosperity for all of Saskatchewan, what was the record and what did they do after they won that election?

Well, Mr. Speaker, I wonder how many people remember the increase in Medicare premiums of \$20 per family, \$10 per individual. Not much hypocrisy here.

In the year 1965, somehow or other I recall an increase in the grazing lease to farmers and I seem to recall an increase in the tobacco tax from five to six per cent. I recall an increase in the fuel tax from 14 to 15 cents a gallon on gasoline

and 17 to 18 cents a gallon on diesel fuel. I seem to recall some restructuring of income tax rates — an increase to 27 per cent from 25 per cent, and in 1965 again, another increase.

In 1966 I seem to recall an increase in car licence fees. I recall a \$2 surcharge on drivers' licences of 25 years and under. Private vehicles fees were increased to a maximum of \$7. The E and H tax was placed on cleaning materials. Not even the housewife could escape the tax. Municipal and hospitalization taxes — 2 mill levy — even where no hospital existed.

In 1967 — another election year — there was a \$25 surcharge imposed on all operators if a driver was found to be more than 50 per cent at fault in an accident. An automobile premium tax increase of one per cent; a night hunting penalty of \$25. Again I remind Members opposite that this was an election year and all sorts of excuses were offered.

I invite now my friend from Lakeview to compare the hypocrisy in 1968 — after the 1967 election. In March, after the election the E and H tax was extended to cover lodgings, meals over \$2 and communications. \$1.50 was imposed on patients visiting doctor's offices; \$2 imposed on emergency visits; \$2.50 per day for patients in hospitals up to 30 days; the tobacco tax was increased to .8 per cent; the gasoline tax was increased, this time up to 17 cents a gallon for gas and an increase up to 20 cents for diesel fuel and extended to cover all internal combustion fuels. Pari-mutual tax was increased by 10 per cent. Tax imposed on the AAIA premiums of 2 per cent. Cancer patients were taxed on the basis of hospital utilization structure.

In 1970 we find the following, the E and H tax again extended to cover all meals over 15 cents. Again an increase in fuel tax as well as an income revision upward of 1 per cent. This, Mr. Speaker, is the run down of the actions of the Opposition when they were in the Government.

The central theme of the Liberal Party when in government truly was to tax where it hurts the most. If there is hypocrisy in government, Mr. Speaker, as the Member for Lakeview charged yesterday, it must be in a government that taxes the hungry, taxes the sick, the bedridden, the under 25 drivers whether they are guilty or not.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. LARSON:** — It surely cannot be with justification charged to a Budget of this magnitude that offers extended services without any increase in taxes. But that Members of the Opposition have an impossible task to criticize this Budget is very easy to understand. What is not so easy to understand is the complete and incredible lengths they will go to in their attempts to confuse and mislead the people. To criticize and gain any credibility on a program such as this is indeed a very difficult and impossible task. To criticize an extra \$9 million into the FarmStart program that will do more to put young farmers back on the land certainly ought not to be tried by any political party. • An extra \$20 million for the Land Bank Commission — you certainly ought not to try to criticize that one because it will blow up in your faces. The development of a sheep marketing commission, again, should not be criticized but should be welcomed. An increase of 46 per cent in the Department of

**March 12, 1974**

Agriculture spending, again, if you have any compassion for food and the possible need of food in the future you ought to say it is not enough.

There is budgeted \$28.8 million for the Department of Northern Saskatchewan. For too long a time our citizens of the North have been neglected. For too long a time the bucks have not been there. This goes some distance in trying to provide this.

An unconditional grant of \$10 per capita to urban municipalities again I say our municipal councillors welcome it. Go to the conventions and listen to what they have to say about it.

A \$46 million five-year community capital fund. Towns in my constituency are already planning, are already excited as to how they are going to take best advantage of the kind of program now possible; that they have sought and longed for, for a long time. These programs are so necessary if we are to make our urban centres in Saskatchewan attractive and hold our people in them. A \$46 million five-year community capital fund is excellent. A \$211.5 million program for education, again, school trustees and school boards will welcome it as will teachers, and pupils and those involved in education. Universal driver education courses in schools certainly are long overdue and due for expansion.

A \$10 million family income program and my friend from Rosthern very bitterly criticized welfare. I have some sympathy for his stand but certainly a \$10 million low-income program will assist and help to put the province on a new direction in alleviating family poverty and income.

The increase in the Property Improvement Grants again certainly will be welcome.

Mr. Speaker, before I conclude I want to say again that this is a good Budget. I think if I had a word of advice to offer the Premier, I would suggest that this ought to be the kind of Budget that you should use for an election. Certainly, I would welcome it, certainly the people in my constituency would welcome it. I see some rather frightened looks across the way.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. LARSON:** — I see some very, very scared looks as a matter of fact. I invite Members opposite to come out and fight an election on the issue of this Budget. I invite you to come into my constituency and I invite you to use the kind of emphasis, the kind of analysis that you use in this House. I want you to come out and talk about the use of resources. I want you to come and have the people of my constituency hear you cry about the oil companies. See how much sympathy you will receive. I want you to come and talk about economic development. I want you to come and talk about the Denticare Program. Talk about the community colleges, talk about the Property Improvement Grant, the senior citizens' grants. Tell the people what you are going to do about them. Tell the people how you are going to handle them. Talk about FarmStart, the Land Bank, Open Roads, I could go on, Mr. Speaker. Very obviously, Mr. Speaker, I will not be supporting the amendment but I will be supporting and commend to this Government the main motion.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. H. E. COUPLAND:** (Meadow Lake): — Mr. Speaker, I had to laugh at all the scared faces we saw over there when the Member for Pelly threatened to call an election on this Budget. We sure challenge him to go ahead, when he talks about scared faces he just had to look across his side and see his colleagues shivering.

Mr. Speaker, as I have quite a bit more to say, I wonder if we could call it 5:30?

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

**MR. COUPLAND:** — Mr. Speaker, when you called it 5:30, I was mentioning some of the comments made by the Member for Pelly. It seemed amazing in listening to him speak, you would almost think that he believed what he was talking about; that this was such a wonderful Budget that they should go to the people. I would invite him to talk to his leader and give him that suggestion. We kind of thought on this side of the House that they were making some predictions as to whether they would go to the people this year but after listening to the Budget that was brought down here Friday, they don't dare go to the people of the province on this Budget.

Mr. Speaker, this Budget which was presented last Friday was one which fails to meet the number one problem of today — the problem of inflation. In fact, this Budget creates its own significant pressure on prices, and in turn pressure on wages and profits which encourage an inflationary spiral which the Members opposite have tried to ignore. The spending spree of this Government is beyond the needs and desires of the people of Saskatchewan.

The Budget merely calls for more spending on the same New Deal projects that failed to create employment, except for NDP supporters in the bureaucracy. Mr. Speaker, this Budget provides more money for the Ministers opposite to buy more shares in businesses like they did in the Intercontinental Packers almost one year ago. The \$10.2 million paid to Intercontinental was extravagant, wasteful spending and the biggest rip-off we have ever seen in this province.

If this is the way in which the Blakeney NDP are going to continue to spend our tax dollars this year, then the prosperity which is proclaimed by the Minister of Finance will be shortlived indeed. If the huge revenues of this Government are to be used for more globe-trotting by the Ministers, to Stockholm, Geneva, Peking and Finland, then we do not need more spending. If we are going to increase Cabinet salaries to even more than the present half-million dollars this year"/we should in fact start spending less.

This Government which tells us that expenditures will rise nearly 25 per cent should be prepared to assure this Assembly that these funds will not be wasted under their present policies in which there is too much spending and too little performance. People throughout this province might be happy to see this huge increase in government spending, if they were not equally sure that this money was not simply going to support the NDP political machine or to create jobs for NDP supporters.

But this New Deal Government has been so blatant in its

**March 12, 1974**

political patronage — so extravagant in its unproductive hirings and so devastating in its tax increases since taking office — that people have no confidence in their ability to spend this money wisely.

The Minister claims that there is no tax increase. But where is that new \$177 million in revenue coming from? Perhaps there is no actual change in the rates or structure of provincial taxes, yet the huge new revenues are still coming out of the pockets of the people of Saskatchewan.

The Minister calls this a development Budget — but that is one of the most misleading themes we have heard for many years. If, as the Minister claims, we are getting so much new revenue from the wise new policies of resource use, then why does he rely on the income tax for the bulk of his new revenue? If we are basing our prosperity on improved resource development, why do we have a rise of \$18 million in resource revenue, but a rise of \$58 million — about 50 per cent more than last year from the income tax?

It is clear, Mr. Speaker, that this is not a development Budget but a rip-off Budget which is being paid for by Saskatchewan taxpayers with little if any benefits left for anyone but the NDP.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to point in particular to the failure of this Budget in facing the mess created by the Department of Northern Saskatchewan. What this Budget says is that we will see more of the same inefficient, power-grabbing, disruptive policies that we had over the past year. This Budget says that the Members opposite feel that they can spend their way out of the mess in the North — by expanding their patronage, threatening community leaders, and ignoring the desire of northern people to decide their own futures.

The DNS has moved hundreds of trailers into the different communities in the North to put up a big show. I say this is a tremendous waste of money. Why couldn't they have given some of this money to the local community authorities and let them do some of the things that they need for the people in the North. Such things as a fish hatchery up on the west side that could put fish back into that chain of lakes up there on which those people have depended for their livelihood for years. But no, nothing creative out of the money that is being spent in the North except sending a bunch more bureaucrats up there and trying to tell the people that they know what is best for them.

I stand with the Member for Wilkie in opposing any further spending by the Department of Northern Saskatchewan until a full and open inquiry has been made into the activities of the Department. Not until the people of Saskatchewan can be assured that their money is not being misused or misspent in the North can we expect them to go along with the increased expenditures outlined by the Minister. Only when we can see, through a full inquiry into the Department, that tax money is not being squandered, can those of us in the Liberal Opposition consider supporting these expenditures.

This Budget follows the same pattern as the budget introduced last year. I called it a Las Vegas Budget last year — one where you can spend a lot of money and get nothing in return.



Well, Mr. Speaker, this year it is the same high spending, poor performance Budget which taxes both the rich and the poor, and fails to recognize the menace of inflation.

Many of us who took part in the Special Committee on Welfare were keenly disappointed with the position taken on welfare in this Budget.

We do not agree with the Minister's statement that there will be no net increase in total income for any families on social assistance. If this program will not increase incomes for these families then where will these multimillions of dollars he announced be going? Instead of this family income program which is merely a new wrapping on the same old programs, the Minister could have introduced a modified form of guaranteed annual income perhaps for a test period for people over 60 years of age. There is a group in there that when one of the spouses reaches 65 and the wife or the husband is 60 or even less, they find it hard to make a living. The one gets a real good income from the Federal Government but that is deducted off the provincial share so they end up worse off than they were before.

In my area of the province, Mr. Speaker, we would have hoped for greater job opportunities to have been encouraged by this Budget. What has this NDP Government done to replace the jobs that were lost by the cancellation of the pulp mill? Nothing, Mr. Speaker. There would have been a paved highway to Beauval. There would have been TV up there for those people. They wouldn't have to travel on the same old winding gravel roads that they are today.

**AN HON. MEMBER:** — What did you do for them?

**MR. COUPLAND:** — We were providing some opportunity for them and they were happy for it. You go up there and ask today whether they wanted that pulp mill cancelled. They will sure tell you.

But the only place where new jobs appear to be encouraged is in the public service — more bureaucrats to run our lives, make our decisions and spend our money — more bureaucrats at a time when our population continues to decline. Mr. Speaker, the hiring of all these new bureaucrats is causing a lot of unrest among the civil servants who have worked for the government for many years. You hear it on numerous occasions where this Government has brought in political heelers and put them in departments and corporations at higher wages with less knowledge than a lot of the people who have worked for those departments for years.

This Budget fails most obviously in its failure to use these times of prosperity in agriculture to encourage secondary industry to develop in this province.

The Blakeney Government refuses to consider foreign capital, except maybe Roumanian money, and it even rejects the possibility of letting large Canadian firms establish in Saskatchewan. And even discourages a lot of them as we found out today with the group that came in to meet with the Government.

But most of all it discourages businessmen living here in this province to develop their own business.

The NDP, through their policies of high income tax and sales tax and estate tax are telling businessmen in this

**March 12, 1974**

province that it is all right to make a few dollars but if the NDP Cabinet decides that you are making windfall profits then you had better watch out. What they are saying is, do not be successful in business or we will have to take you over or tax you until you stop trying to make any profit. They have created a program for business where consultants from the Industry Department advise businessmen on how to run their business. Well, if there is anything that a businessman needs it is not free advice from the bureaucrats, especially with this Government, on how to make money or operate efficiently. These so-called consultants would be better used trying to encourage^ some efficiency in Government departments.

Before taking my seat, Mr. Speaker, I would like to just comment on the Minister's statement that this Budget is not inflationary. I say that this Budget will create higher prices for four reasons. The first is the size of this Budget, which is far larger than those of any provincial government's in the past. The sheer amount of spending of this Government will have a substantial economic impact that was not felt by the lower spending of former years.

The second is the constitutional power over prices, or rents, or milk and of other food products which this Provincial Government is failing to use to cure inflation. Just two weeks ago the Premier called on Ottawa to use selective price controls. And even though he has the power to impose such controls himself he does not use them. This is strange logic for the Premier who claims to have the answer to inflation. His answer is simply to blame Ottawa.

The third aspect of higher prices created by this Budget is the lack of incentives to encourage new production to meet the rising demands for goods and services. Instead of encouraging industry to develop, this Budget is a spending spree of throwing money after outmoded programs and the buying up of business shares at extravagant prices.

The fourth, and most obvious inflationary factor, is the spending of public funds on unnecessary, irrational items and services. We do not need or want a raise in salaries in the Premier's office from \$47,000 in 1971 to \$468,000 in 1974. We did not need or want a doubling of the cost of Information Services. We did not need or want to hand over contracts to Dunskey Advertising, or Service Printing or Delta Systems merely because of their loyalty to the NDP. It is this sort of squandering of our tax dollars that shows this Budget to be a rip-off of Saskatchewan people.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. COUPLAND:** — For these reasons that I have just outlined, for wasteful spending, ineffective programs and the creation of more inflation, I will not support the Motion but will vote for the amendment.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. J. K. COMER:** (Nipawin): — Mr. Speaker, before I get into the main part of my address I wish to make some comment on the speech that was made by the Member for Meadow Lake (Mr. Coupland).

He talked about the fact that this Budget is inflationary. You know the Member for Touchwood when he was speaking the other day related what the President of the Regina Chamber of Commerce had to say about this Budget and he said:

The Chamber of Commerce is not known to be friendly to the New Democratic Party.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. COMER:** — When he asked him whether he thought the Budget was inflationary, he said, "No, not really".

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. SPEAKER:** — Order, please!

**MR. COMER:** — The Member also talked about the fact that in this province we should be using selective price control. He mentioned that possibly we could control rent. And you know I agree with him that we could control rent but mark my word if this Government made one move to control rent the fifteen Members across the way would sit there and bray and bray and bray about how we were driving business out of the province.

A number of them have talked about the size of the Civil Service. You know it is about time you came out from under the weeds and told us which civil servants you are going to get rid of - which programs you are going to get rid off. Is it going to be the Dental Care Program?

**SOME HON. MEMBERS::** — Hear, hear!

**MR. SPEAKER:** — Order! The Hon. Member will have a chance to speak in this debate.

**MR. COMER:** — Mr. Speaker, I think it is fair to say that the main comments made by the Member for Lumsden (Mr. Lane) are probably the most sensible ones that he has made in this House.

You know someday they are going to have to come out, they are going to have to tell us which programs it is going to be — Dental Care, which of the health programs, which of the agricultural programs. You can't go on forever telling us that we have too many civil servants, that we have got to get rid of them. Sooner or later you are going to have to come down to solid facts — which ones, which jobs are you going to do away with, which people are you going to axe. We know that you know how to axe people, you did a good job in '64, you axed all kinds of them. You got axed in 1971.

**MR. LANE:** — They missed some.

**MR. COMER:** — They missed some. George Trapp is still here, they missed some.

He talked about the rip-off. Remember Wilf Gardiner when he got on the radio and told about the rip-off and the highway contractors. The Hon. Member from Prince Albert West was a

**March 12, 1974**

part of that, he knows. And then the Member for Meadow Lake (Mr. Coupland), he had another one. I don't know where he got it but Cabinet salaries are up \$500,000. I don't know which Cabinet Ministers got \$500,000 increase but he knows about it somewhere.

He talks about the fact, he bemoans almost that there was no tax increase. Remember in 1968 prosperity, prosperity in this province, the Liberals were in power, the non-inflationary Liberals — \$33 million increase in taxes, thanks to the Hon. Member for Prince Albert West. He talked about the fact that he wants us to give money to the Local Community Authority for a turkey hatchery. He talked about graft in the North. He didn't talk about Simpson Construction though about the graft that went on there when they were the government. He complained about the fact that welfare spending hadn't increased. You know that this is sort of an on-again, off-again romance with the Liberals. One day they want more welfare, the next day we are spending too much on welfare.

You know, Mr. Speaker, I could go on and speak about a number of the comments that have been made by the Liberal Opposition about this Budget. I think we could all go on for days, having fun with their attempted criticisms, but I have some other things I should like to turn to tonight.

First of all I should like to congratulate the Minister of Finance, the Member for Saskatoon Nutana Centre (Mr. Robbins) on his appointment to the Cabinet. He certainly has demonstrated his ability in bringing down a Budget as progressive and far-reaching as the Budget that was brought down in this House on Friday last.

I should like to congratulate the Hon. Member for Melville (Mr. Kowalchuk) on his appointment as Minister of Natural Resources. I am sure that John will bring a very practical and a hard-working approach to a very important department, the Department of Natural Resources.

I should like to also congratulate the Member for Watrous (Mr. Cody) on his appointment as Minister of Co-operatives. This is a department that the Liberals attempted to completely do away with, to sabotage, to destroy. A man with a firm foundation in the co-operative movement such as Don Cody I am sure will do a very creditable and a very capable job in re-building this Department.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. COMER:** — Mr. Speaker . . .

**MR. LANE:** — I hope that means more jobs.

**MR. COMER:** — Are you looking for a job? Mr. Speaker, I should like today to begin my prepared address by speaking about an event of what I consider to be of historical significance to this province and that is the 200th anniversary of the community of Cumberland House, the 200th anniversary of the founding of the Hudson's Bay Post at Cumberland House.

On June 23rd, this is going back into history a bit, in 1774 the explorer Samuel Hearne left York Factory with nine men

in five canoes to establish the first inland post of the Hudson's Bay Company. On September 3rd they established their post on the north side of Pine Island along Cumberland Lake between the Tearing River and the Big Stone River. The Hudson's Bay Company was forced to establish an inland post due to the competition they were facing with the Montreal traders who had been intercepting a great deal of furs which had formerly been traded at the Bay. The site of Cumberland House was chosen as it offered ready access to much of western Canada by way of the Saskatchewan River. The Hudson's Bay Company had access to the fur resources of the prairies by way of Cumberland Lake, Nemew Lake and the Sturgeon-Wier River. The post at Cumberland House was able to tap the fur resources of the Upper Churchill, the Peace and the McKenzie River systems.

During the late 1700s and early 1800s Cumberland House was the most important of the inland posts of the Bay. With furs from all over the West being traded through it and with supplies being dispatched from it to all the posts of the West and of the North. Nearly every important explorer of the area west and north of Cumberland House spent at least some time at this post. Cumberland House has seen canoes, the York boats, the river boat, dog teams, automobiles and bush planes. Today the community is a town of about 1,200 people. It boasts a number of facilities and I am sure that all Members of the House will want to wish this community well on its 200th anniversary and I hope that many of you will make an attempt this summer to visit this community on its 200th anniversary.

Mr. Speaker, I should like to turn and make some remarks on the Department of Highways. As has been mentioned in the past Operation Open Roads and Operation Mainstreet are welcome additions to our highway program. It has been stated time and time again by Opposition spokesmen that this is a bad road program. I ask those who make the statements that Operation Open Road and Operation Mainstreet is a bad road program to go to the communities that have been served, anywhere in the province, and ask them what they think about this bad road program. They'll get their answer and it won't be that it is a bad road program.

It has also been suggested here in this debate that the Department of Highways should be moving more quickly in the building of four-lane highways. You know we all like driving on four-lane highways but for too many people in this province there is still a need for good two-lane highways. Too many people in this province have to travel on gravel and rough oiled highways day after day and these poor highways should be looked after first before we go into further four-lanes. You know, it is sort of like you've got to fix the roof if it's leaking before you bother putting wall paper on. I think that is what we have got to do in highways as the Minister of Highways (Mr. Kramer) has said, let's not build the champagne highways. You know I can think of a lot of highways in this province and I'm going to mention a few that should be upgraded, some in my constituency and some outside of my constituency.

I think of Highway No. 3 from Crooked River to Hudson's Bay No. 23 from Crooked River to Carrot River. No. 49 from Pelly to the Manitoba Border. No. 3 in Shell Lake Area. No. 44 from No. 4 to Dinsmore. No. 35 from White Fox to Tobin Lake. The Hanson Lake Road. All of these roads were completely ignored for seven years and need work done on them before further four-laning. I was amused the other day when the Hon. Member

**March 12, 1974**

for Albert Park (Mr. MacLeod) rose and stated that we were ignoring Highway 35 from Wadena to Tisdale. Tisdale apparently is an area he loves, he used to live there. He obviously hasn't been over Highway 35 for a long time if he is claiming that we are ignoring it. If there was any highway that was ignored when your Party was the Government of this province it was Highway No. 35, north of Tisdale. If you'd have made that a corduroy highway it would have been an improvement, from the way it was. It was deliberately ignored and I believe it was ignored for political reasons because they didn't manage or they were smart enough not to elect a Liberal Member.

The other day in this House the Hon. Member for Rosthern (Mr. Boldt) got up and admitted to us why he got rid of SGIO agents and the same philosophy applies in their approach to highways. If there was a Liberal MLA you got a highway. If there was a New Democratic Party MLA you might as well get a Red River cart because they would ignore you.

Going on, there are a number of grid roads in this province that are heavily travelled that I think merit special attention. There are grids that have become major connections between highways and they are grid roads that extend beyond existing highways. These grids often create routes through more than one rural municipality and they often carry very heavy traffic loads. The maintenance of these grids becomes a problem too big for any one RM, too big because the grid carries so much traffic it acts as a highway. I would urge the Minister of Highways to make a serious evaluation of these roads and take as many as possible into the highway system. I don't mean the type of grid road takeover that the former government practised. Again it was the same sort of thing with the SGIO and highway improvements. You know if you got the ear of the Minister, especially just before an election, you got your road fixed up. But if you didn't, you got nothing. I think we should look at these roads, look at the grid roads that are connectors between highways, extension of an existing highway and we should move to take them over providing the traffic count warrants it. There are many of these in the province.

I think of one especially in my constituency and going over into the constituency of the Hon. Member for Melfort-Kinistino. This is a grid road that runs from Arborfield to the Muskoday Bridge south of Prince Albert. The road carries very heavy traffic. It goes through a number of RMs, the RM of Arborfield, Connaught, Willow Creek, Kinistino and Birch Hills. The RMs have been trying to keep this road up to standards but no RM can put all of its maintenance money into one road. And, then, because they must spend some of their money on other roads, which is only proper, within the RM, these very heavily traveled grids deteriorate with traffic counts of 100 to 200 vehicles per day. Grids like this grid road must come into the highway system. Whether we call them secondary highways or whatever we call them it is impossible to expect municipalities to handle the cost of maintaining these grids.

Mr. Speaker, I, along with other speakers and along with urban municipal people across this province, welcome the announcement of the \$10 per capita unconditional grant.....

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. COMER:** — . . . to cities, towns and villages

across this province this will mean a great deal. It will mean that the municipalities will be able, the urban municipalities, will be able to improve their services to their citizens without raising their mill rate; provide services that are needed. It has been said that this is overdue and in a lot of ways it is overdue.

The urban areas in many respects, have been ignored. They have not received the assistance. Not that I am saying that the rural municipalities get too much. I think it is only fair and reasonable that rural municipalities should receive more per capita because of areas involved.

I think you will see this program welcomed. I think you will see it in the years ahead expanded. Oh, I know that the Liberals will say that it is too little, but it is an awful lot more than they gave. I think the Community Capital fund will also be welcomed. Allowing funds for communities to build necessary facilities of their choice with provincial assistance; allowing some form of rational planning of the building of these facilities, whether it be curling, whether it be a skating rink, swimming pool, all of these things will become much more possible now that this Community Capital Fund has been established.

These programs, the Community Capital Fund and the Unconditional Grant will be of benefit to the urban areas. There is one group of municipalities which I feel somewhat concerned about and these are the very small towns and villages. Almost everyone of these communities faces a real problem with housing. It is almost impossible to get a man to come and take any job and stay because, quite often, the wages are not as high as they might be in the larger centres, so he won't build a house there and there is no housing available.

All of the CMHC plans which allow low rental housing do not apply to these small communities. CMHC claims that it takes roughly 50 years to pay for the house, they mortgage it over 50 years, and they are not sure those communities are going to be there in 50 years.

I think that if we looked at it over 20 years those communities will be there. I should like to urge the Provincial Government to give consideration to either making some money available to communities to build low rental housing, to bring down the amount that must be borrowed through CMHC, so that they can put the mortgage over 20 years without increasing the payments that the occupant makes or else use Winter Works and allow the small communities to use Winter Works grants to build homes even if it is just one in a community, to reduce the capital cost that must be borne by CMHC and, therefore, to reduce the amount or the length of the mortgage and make it possible for small communities that have a need for housing, to get low rental housing. I could go on and probably name 150 communities that I know of and there are probably another 250 I don't know of in this province that could take advantage of such a program.

Mr. Speaker, I should like to deal now with an area that interests me a great deal. This is the area that we talked about at times of natural areas set aside. We have in this province a number of provincial parks. Provincial parks, basically, are tourist or recreational and they are important. We have the regional parks, centered within a few municipal organizations,

**March 12, 1974**

and they are important. But one of the things that disturbs me about Canada and especially about Saskatchewan, is that we have been very slow to set aside areas that we could call wilderness or refuges, whether it be for wildlife or for plant life.

You know about one month ago in the National Geographic there was a story on the American areas which the United States has set aside as wilderness areas, as nature preserves. They had literally hundreds of them set aside. Some of them were very small, only a few acres, but they have done this. They have set this little bit of an area aside. We, in Saskatchewan, all we have set aside is the wilderness area in the Pasquia Hills, the Wildcat Hills, Wildcat Hill wilderness area, and this is important. It is in my constituency. It is a wilderness area and a real wilderness area. It is almost impossible to get \_ into it. But I think that we should be looking at setting aside more areas, not necessarily enormous areas, township after township of land, but rather find certain distinct phenomena that in the future will be valuable to have preserved and set them aside. Set aside areas all across this province that are still in their natural state.

There are some moves in this province now to set up some form of grasslands park. I hope that before too many years are up we can see some form of grasslands park established in this province to preserve an area of prairie.

The International Biological program has made a study of sites all over the world and have recommended a number of sites in Saskatchewan. We should be seriously looking at setting aside some of these areas. I think of the area known as the Narrow Hills in the south end of the Nipawin Provincial Park. It is a very beautiful area, it's an esker, a very narrow, long range of hills, which should be set aside certainly with no logging on it. I think of the Anderson Island in the Saskatchewan River, which has a number of distinct fauna on it, distinct to the Cumberland Delta Area of Saskatchewan. All across the province there are areas like this that should be set aside. We can almost think that it is unimportant because we have so much in this province, so much area where nobody lives. But I am not convinced that within 20 or 30 years that it will all be gone, it will all be ruined. We must be moving now to set these areas aside.

It is the sort of thing where no one who sets it aside is going to reap enormous political benefit of it. I think that for every area we set aside, generation after generation later will thank us for it, even though they don't know who we were, because it will be there. It will be preserved, when so much is being destroyed.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. COMER:** — Mr. Speaker, I should like to turn to one more area, an area that I have talked about on a number of occasions in this House. This is the area of the timber policy.

Last year, speaking in reply to the Speech from the Throne, I spoke about the planned legislation which came down as amendments to The Forest Act. I supported that legislation and I continue to support that legislation.



Last year in speaking, I made a statement and I said, I think at this juncture the Government has an opportunity to spread the benefits of the timber industry over many communities along the forest fringe and communities in the North". I still think this is probably the most important aspect of the timber industry. We must all remember that we cannot be satisfied with the timber industry that is concentrated in two, three or four communities. We must attempt to spread that timber industry across as many communities of the North as we can — and by the North I mean not just the DNS area but the forest fringe as well. Whether it be sawmills, or whether it be a plywood mill — I hope we never have another pulp mill — whether it be a furniture component factory, all of these, we must make every attempt to spread these into as many communities as possible. I think there has been one area where I think the Government has been remiss. I think the Government has been mistaken and I should like to deal with that situation as it doesn't only affect my constituency but it probably affects mine more than anyone.

I am referring to the matter that is known across the North as the 21B permits. These permits were allowed to small operators, to cut timber on a limited scale, for sale or for barter. There were roughly 45 or 50 operators in the province. As near as I can determine they were cutting about five million board feet of lumber. The largest concentration of these operators was around the community of White Fox. There were about five operators there cutting, roughly, about one million board feet of lumber.

Last year the Department of Natural Resources, last May, under Mr. Bowerman, withdrew the rights of these men to cut the white spruce saw timber. I would not oppose changes in the harvesting of timber. There will have to be changes, there will always have to be changes. I realize at times there will be dislocations, but I cannot accept this cutoff of a certain group of operators.

This change has completely put an end, at least at this time, to any forest activity in the White Fox area. These four or five operators employed 25 to 35 people in the winter. These jobs are no longer present in that area. They will probably show up somewhere else, Hudson Bay, Prince Albert, but that doesn't help a community like White Fox.

As I said there may have to be changes in forestry, but I would urge the Ministers responsible to reconsider the decision to force these small operators out of the bush.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. COMER:** — Surely some method can be found to continue this economic activity. Surely some method can be found to spread the benefits of forestry to as many communities as possible. As I said, Mr. Speaker, I supported The Forest Act and I continue to support it. I think that it was important that the Province of Saskatchewan get and maintain control of the forests. I certainly support the indication in the Budget that we will be expanding our tree nurseries and building another one. Reforestation is important. On the whole I support the forest policies of the Government, but there is one area that I am not satisfied with.

**March 12, 1974**

Mr. Speaker, with that qualification I will be supporting the Budget and will oppose the amendment.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. H. OWENS:** (Elrose): — Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to say a few words in support of the Budget presented to this Assembly on Friday last, March 8th, by the recently appointed Minister of Finance (Mr. Robbins). His first Budget has so dumfounded the Members of the Opposition that the best they can do in making criticism is shout inflation and expound on the actions of the Government in Ottawa. However, they have not proposed any effective or realistic ways or means to improve the Budget, nor have they pinpointed any revenue from the federal authority that was not and is not rightfully due the Province of Saskatchewan.

The Minister suggested the Budget could be called a development Budget: development of our economy and our resources, development of our people through progressive social programs, and development of local autonomy through an imaginative new plan of assistance to local governments.

Mr. Speaker, the Opposition say inflation. It is a sorry state for the people of Saskatchewan when their Members in opposition fail to comprehend the difference between development and inflation. I cannot conscientiously suggest that the Members opposite are in such a lowly state of mind, so I can only conclude they are still following the same line of thought, namely, "What is good for the people of Saskatchewan we must oppose".

Mr. Speaker, Saskatchewan stepped out of the sphere of gloom and doldrums and into an area of light and progress in 1971. Programs and progress of unprecedented proportions have been their reward and now they have been presented with a blueprint for the future that exceeds their hopes in almost every facet of our society.

The reactions I hear from Saskatchewan citizens is their sheer joy in programs that definitely and positively put people first. I mean people before profits of the large corporate interests. Reasonable profits are acceptable if service is provided, but the increasing profits that we read and hear about, especially during the past few months, are not acceptable to the ordinary worker trying to make a decent standard of living for his family and still facing ever-increasing costs for almost everything he has to buy.

Herein lies the basis for programs that will assist the most, the people in the greatest need. This fact was acted upon by this Government when the hospital and medical care fees were removed from health care last year.

The Budget proposes other assistance plans such as the Family Income Program that will provide most assistance in the lower income groups, a social policy that will be recognized as a fair and just policy by fair-minded citizens. I hope this will be a start in the system of tax credits instead of the present federal policy of raising tax exemptions and tax brackets. A tax credit system would give maximum benefit to those in the low and middle income brackets.

The dental care plan is starting for children six years of age and extending over the next five years to include ages three to twelve. A \$2 million day care program for children should aid in expanding this program to 4,500 spaces for the coming fiscal year with continuing growth during the next five years, to become fully operational at an estimated cost of \$6 million and provide 13,500 spaces in day care centres.

The Saskatchewan Housing Corporation's shared housing program, the senior citizen's home repair program, the house building assistance grants and the home renovation grants are all expanded along with the \$1 million neighborhood improvement plan, all designed to help people, especially in the lower income group to live in more pleasant and dignified surroundings.

I am surprised to hear insinuations that such programs to assist people to enjoy better living conditions are inflationary.

Let me turn for a moment to assistance to local governments where people are directly involved as well. This Budget offers much more for all taxpayers with possibly a bit more emphasis on the urban areas, realizing that urban centres are facing problems in many cases beyond their capability to cope with, chiefly because of their limited tax base. Urban communities will be offered an urban assistance package including equalization grants on the basis of ability to raise revenue and the costs of police services. Unconditional grants-\$10 per capita will hold or lower the property tax burden as also will capital works programs of up to \$75 per capita over a five year period to capital projects which the community feels is needed in their particular town. This figure would represent 60 per cent of the cost of the project with the community assuming the remaining 40 per cent. A budgetary figure of \$1 million is provided for assistance in urban transportation in the larger centres. Rural municipalities will be assisted with a program of stepped up assistance by the Municipal Road Assistance Authority including a start on hard-surfacing of market grid roads and by a 20 per cent increase in equalization grants to \$3 million.

Another aspect of top priority with local government is that of education, not only because it is of prime importance as it affects their children, but also because of the effects of mill rates on their living costs. Education programs in Saskatchewan are continually being expanded and I refer specifically to the continuing education program and the newly announced kindergarten program, pilot areas this year, a full program next year. The injection of a further \$500,000 to a total of \$1.8 million to the student bursary program and an extra \$6 million grant to universities to a total of \$44.75 million shows the concern this Government has for the education of Saskatchewan people. In the secondary school system sufficient grants have been allocated to allow the average mill rate for Saskatchewan to remain at 43 mills for the basic school program. Details of grants to individual administrative districts will be announced in due course. Hopefully quite soon.

At this point, Mr. Speaker, I want to remind the Members of this Legislature and the people of our province of the increase announced in the Property Improvement Grants to 2 mills to a total of 20 mills. The Property Improvement Grant program is designed to lower the cost of education and if used for this purpose will reduce the tax for education to the average ratepayer across Saskatchewan to an average of 23 mills.

**March 12, 1974**

Property Improvement Grants, Mr. Speaker, have been mentioned by several previous speakers, but I believe they are worthy of repeating again. Farmers will receive an increase of \$30 to \$300, businessmen increases by \$20 to \$200 and the householder an increase of \$16 to \$160. Mr. Speaker, I suggest that this is a most worthy and welcome contribution to the taxpayer and could hardly be called inflationary.

Our Government has not forgotten the agricultural sector. As in past years considerably more funds have been allocated to this Department to further extend present programs and introduce new ones. Farmers will be pleased to know the Agricultural Implement Board will be provided with moneys to expand its services and they will be anxiously waiting the establishment of the Prairie Agriculture Institute in co-operation with the provinces of Manitoba and Alberta, the program formerly called AMA that was so hastily dropped by the previous administration.

Crop insurance will be further extended by adding utility wheat and mustard for coverage and to provide better service for the large increase in the numbers of farmers who will be insuring their crops under this program by opening an additional 15 crop insurance offices throughout the province.

Transportation in Saskatchewan is a long — that is in miles — and costly program. Therefore the Budget provides for \$46.5 million to the building and repairing of our highway system for the travelling and motoring public. We have reached the stage in our highways program where most people living in Saskatchewan are within a few miles of a dust-free road. But too often it is a rough and dusty road that leads into the smaller urban centre. The Open Roads and Mainstreet programs started last year will be extended into more of these centres and to the tune of approximately \$1.5 million.

Mr. Speaker, I would be remiss not to mention northern Saskatchewan. Personally I am not acquainted with this very important area of our province, but I am pleased to see the Minister has allocated several millions of dollars for the improvements and needed facilities of these so long forgotten people. I am not surprised to hear that the Department of Northern Saskatchewan has had some problems. I do disagree with the Member for Rosthern when he spoke this afternoon when he intimated that food, lodging and shelter was all the natives of the North really needed.

Mr. Speaker, until we are prepared to accept these people as our equals we will continually have problems. It is a sad state of affairs when the Members opposite use our northern residents as political footballs for Liberal Party gain, completely disregarding the feelings and the future of our northern natives.

Mr. Speaker, I must compliment the Government and more particularly the Minister of the Department of Northern Saskatchewan (Mr. Bowerman) for the program he has started in the North, a program that will be a model for other unfortunate areas and that when implemented will provide a lifestyle and a livelihood compatible and acceptable to residents who chose to call that area of Saskatchewan their home.

showing a proposed surplus and all this with no increase in the taxes for Saskatchewan people.

Words fail me to adequately communicate to you my respect and admiration for the Minister of Finance. I consider it a significant honor to have had the privilege to share a seat in this Legislature with him. His knowledge of finance is unequalled in this Legislature. He has proven this fact in this Budget and more specifically in his presentation of the Budget. His appearance on a call-in radio program and the answers he provided for his questioners proved to the people of Saskatchewan that he has full and complete knowledge of the Department he heads. Mr. Speaker, I congratulate him on his appointment to such an important position in this Government. I congratulate him on his first Budget, as I said earlier, a blueprint for Saskatchewan's future — for Saskatchewan people.

Mr. Speaker, you will surely realize that I will be supporting the motion.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

### **INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS**

#### **52ND CUB PACK — REGINA**

**MR. K. R. MacLEOD:** (Regina Albert Park): — Mr. Speaker, by leave of the House I wonder if I might have the honor of introducing to you and to the other Members of the Legislative Assembly about 20 members of the 52nd Cub Pack from All Saints Anglican Church, in the west gallery, along with their cub master Mr. Geoff Pawson. We welcome them to the Legislative Assembly.

**HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. E. L. TCHORZEWSKI:** (Humboldt) Mr. Speaker, I should like to join the Member on behalf of the Members of the Government side of the House in extending a welcome to the cub pack, on this very fine evening. We hope they enjoy what they see going on in this House and learn a great deal from it. Welcome to the House.

**HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

The Assembly resumed the interrupted debate.

**MR. G. B. GRANT:** (Regina Whitmore Park): — Mr. Speaker, the Members opposite have been very intent for the last two days on criticizing the Opposition for being critical of the Budget. I am sure they must have forgotten the role of the Opposition, because that is actually what we are here for. You fellows don't seem to realize that. You think that you are over there to criticize us. You are the Government, you are the ones who are running the affairs of the province and believe it or not we are the official critics and you shouldn't criticize us for being critical.

Mr. Speaker, I can't miss the opportunity to make mention

**March 12, 1974**

of the remarks of the Hon. Member from Redberry (Mr. Michayluk). This afternoon he was, I think, a little unwise to make the mention that he did of absenteeism. It seems to have boomeranged a little on him. In watching television tonight, I would say it came out about even-steven, because I think the Government Members who are absent were given as much prominence as the Members of the Opposition. I noticed particularly tonight that the Hon. Member for Redberry didn't turn up until 7:13 himself. At 7:00 there were 32 Members missing from the Government side, there were only 12 over there and I believe that we could have pulled a dirty trick on you if we had wanted to, but we are pretty good fellows on this side so we didn't do it.

I can tell you that your Whip and myself are convinced that there is not just one streaker in this House there are 57 streakers, he has most of them on his side of the House, I have a few on my side of the House. It is pretty difficult to keep all you fellows in the House. I don't think it behooves either side of this House to point the finger at anybody being absent, because the chickens come home to roost. I don't know of any way of overcoming it, except by the installation of television for all our sessions. I have been opposed to televising the sessions, but I can see a lot of merit in it. I have a feeling that if television cameras were scanning these seats that Mr. Pepper and I wouldn't have any difficulty at all in keeping the Members in the room.

Mr. Speaker, first of all may I extend my congratulations to the three new appointees to Cabinet. I don't suppose there is ever a unanimity of opinion when new appointments are made to Cabinet. I know from experience that at least the recipients are agreeable that the appointments are wise. At least we have three on that side who feel that the selections were proper. The Hon. Member for Saskatoon Nutana Centre, Mr. Robbins fills a very important post and one loaded with responsibilities. I am sure he has already found that out. In this day and age governments of all colors seem to recognize no limitations of either the raising of funds or the expenditure of funds. The new Minister of Finance has demonstrated responsibility in other fields, but I fear he hasn't carried this same trait into his new position, except possibly for his purchase of ties. Now when he went to great lengths to explain what a good bargain he got in that tie last Friday — we all had great hopes of a sensible budget, a wise budget, one that wouldn't be extravagant as compared to the old C. M. Fines budgets where I believe he wore a tie that bore the Horn of Plenty. I can tell you that the new Finance Minister should write Mr. Fines and see if he can get that tie because Mr. Fines' budgets were a far cry from the plenteous situation that we find ourselves in today.

These three new appointments to Cabinet boosted that august body to 18 members, an all time high. Many of our citizens, rightly so I think, are beginning to ask why so many Ministers are required. Well it is certainly too large, it must be unwieldy, I don't know how all 18 of you gather around that table in the Cabinet room. It is certainly expensive and especially so when one considers that we have only 900,000 people in this province, just a good sized city really, and it takes 18 Ministers to administer the affairs of those 900,000 people.

Mr. Speaker, one thing about the Blakeney Government is that they are known as the big spenders, big spenders on the Cabinet, on Executive Assistants, on advisers and almost anything

you wish to touch on they are big spenders.

I would hope that the Premier or possibly the Minister of Finance would explain to this House just why we need a \$27,500 full time Minister of Co-ops, a Minister I believe whose salary is the biggest single item in the department budget. I really can't recall too many occasions when this portfolio was not lumped in with others. I am sure the Minister of Agriculture who is able to pick up Municipal Affairs so readily could have taken this on without any difficulty. There are several Members on the other side I am sure who could have handled it without any hesitation at all.

Mr. Speaker, budgets as we all recognize them cannot be perfect. There are three areas of possible failure: they can be too small, they can be too large or they can have wrong priorities. Well the Robbing Budget certainly cannot be termed too small however I think it is guilty in the other two respects, namely, too large and wrong priorities. I think you will all recall that Maxwell Henderson, the former Federal Auditor General said that, "Canada has become one of the most grossly over-governed countries in the world. Canadian taxpayers are rapidly losing control over public purse strings." Well Mr. Henderson was referring to our Federal Government, and I agree with him 100 per cent. I think he was absolutely right. It is even worse now since he made these remarks, it hasn't changed.

Nothing could be more applicable to our own province. We are over-governed, we have lost control of our public purse strings. Even our own Provincial Auditor has questioned the expenditure of millions of dollars of provincial funds spent without proper authority. As Mr. Henderson said there has been a serious erosion of Parliament's control of the public purse. Heaven knows what's going to happen now with the \$900 million Budget. Just how many millions of dollars will be spent without proper authority.

I think we all know where the democratic form of government has its beginning, but I'm beginning to wonder if we have the same degree of understanding as to just where it is going.

Mr. Speaker, the Government opposite has adopted the slogan 'damn the cost, full steam ahead, go for broke'. One sure thing as I said before the Socialists are big spenders.

First, they are big spenders on themselves. Look at the Cabinet costs, 18 bodies at \$27,500, plus the additional that the Premier gets, just about an even half million dollars. As compared to our Cabinet costs, \$342,000. Inflation started right at the top. You can't blame it on the little fellow, it started right with the Cabinet. They inflated their own salaries far beyond requirements.

Secondly, NDP in the Blakeney Government are big spenders on assistants, consultants, planners, specialists, they have so many of these around that it's little wonder the Ministers are bogged down by the paper which these so-called experts generate. I know the Minister of Health (Mr. Smishek), his biggest complaint is the paper work that is going through his office. And he must have generated it because it didn't exist with the previous Ministers, not even the Premier when he was Minister of Health, didn't require the clerical staff that the present

**March 12, 1974**

Minister needs. But he has too many experts around him, they are generating paper and he has had to boost his own staff in order to handle it.

Now, thirdly, they are big spenders of other people's money, and I think this is a sad part, because it's not their own money they are spending. I have yet to see a Socialist who was a big spender of his own money.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. GRANT:** — But I've seen many who were big spenders of other people's money.

Yes sir, we have a New Deal for People, the Cabinet, the Caucus, their friends, their relatives from Calgary, the Party faithful, but it's a poor deal for all the other people.

The current Robin Hood from Saskatoon in his Budget remarks said the Budget and the NDP philosophy will result in a narrowing of the gap between the rich and the poor. This statement is somewhat confusing. I certainly agree that as far as the Socialist hierarchy is concerned, they never had it so good, so it's certainly narrowing the gap for them. But there is nothing in the Budget for the old age pensioners, little for those on welfare, there's a non-detailed promise of something for the working poor, but on the other hand what do we have. \$15 million for Saskoil, \$20 million for the Land Bank and heaven knows how much to start up the famous Saskatchewan Development Fund. When the former Minister of Finance introduced this piece of legislation, he said he wasn't sure just where the money was going to come from, whether it would come from government sources or whether it would come from the investors. I don't see anything in the Budget for it, but you don't start a fund up like that out of thin air and I presume there will be a sizeable amount spent in establishing that fund.

There was little indication of anything useful to narrow the gap between the rich and the poor. Only a discouragement of business and initiative.

We hear talk these days of alienation of the West and I think this is a sad and unwarranted expression. The continual harangue of the Members opposite, blaming Ottawa for their own short comings is not very helpful to the development of a workable arrangement for a united Canada. As I said last December, and I won \$10 on it, your own David Lewis can pull the plug any time he wishes. Why don't you convince him to put a stop to Ottawa's misdeeds?

Actually, the NDP are responsible for all these bad things that come out of Ottawa, because they are keeping the Liberals in power down there. If they don't like them, pull the plug, get them out of there. You can do it any time you want. Actually you don't want to, and I don't blame you. If I was in Mr. Lewis's shoes I certainly wouldn't call an election. He never had it so good. He'll never form the Government, not in my life time, and after the next election he won't be the King Maker Lewis, that he is at the present time. He couldn't be in a better position. He doesn't have to take any of the responsibility, he can call the shots, so why should he pull the plug on the Liberal Government.



Mr. Speaker, we have seen an invasion by the NDP Government into business through such activities as Intercontinental and IPSCO and the plywood business and the latest, Saskoil, but only after the spring breakup. It was suggested that there have been meetings or there are meetings going on at the present time with the oil industry. I believe the Minister mentioned this this afternoon. But these discussions should have been going on last November and December. These discussions right today are going to be of little or no help to those gentlemen who were in the buildings today.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. GRANT:** — It's too late. Why didn't you take them into your confidence in November and discuss questions and problems with them rather than leave it to the situation as reached today, where they are faced with losing staff and possibly going into bankruptcy.

I would point out that none of the windfall revenues from oil are to go into the consolidated revenue account, but at the same time \$15 million of general funds are budgeted for Saskoil. If this Government co-operated with and encouraged the oil industry, Saskoil wouldn't be necessary. In any case, even if they persist in discouraging private initiative this \$15 million should have come from new oil revenues, not from general funds. Certainly a wrong priority.

Back in 1933, the good old CCF, made no bones about it, they believed in public ownership, right down the line, including land. Of late, there seems to be a lessening of this determination, at least there is a lessening of the direct approach. The Government to your right interprets government ownership and a control of our resources and productive capacity as meaning government regulations, control through public elected or appointed representatives on boards of directors of private businesses and last but not least, through tax changes.

We have some shining examples of this philosophy and practice in Saskatchewan. First of all, government ownership. Well, the newest one is Saskoil. A recent one is farm land and another new one this year, Saskatchewan Investment Fund. All kinds of them.

Secondly, government control. This is another means, rather than by outright government ownership. Hearing aid dealers — put the private individual out of business, let the government run it. Hog marketing, control over the marketing of our farm produce, without a vote of the people; oil production, they are into it up to their ears, not by public ownership, but by control, they can even close down small businesses if necessary, for a period of, I believe, five days.

Well, the other way is through appointment of directors to boards of private or public corporations. Well, we've got two good examples of that in Intercontinental, they are gradually getting control of that business, not only through partial ownership, but by representation on the Board. IPSCO is another shining example.

Mr. Speaker, Canadians pay loud lip-service to the necessity of retaining our freedoms and I think we all do that, right in this House. However, in practice we sit quietly back and let governments, in particular, our Saskatchewan Government and a

**March 12, 1974**

government on the west coast, take over our responsibilities and erode our freedom of choice. Many have even lost their right to work by not joining a union and the right to work certainly should be a basic right, a basic freedom. I don't think everybody is entitled to a living, but I think they are entitled to an opportunity to make a living. Many have lost their right of appeal against decisions of boards and agencies of the government. I think it's a sad trend when an agency or a board of any government can have the final word and the courts are not brought into the picture at all.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. GRANT:** — Farmers have lost their freedom to make many decisions pertaining to the disposal of their own production. Here in Saskatchewan you can even have a choice of hearing aids, providing you buy it from the Government. To me it is sickening and frightening to witness the quiet acceptance of businessmen and people in general of this cancerous growth of government control.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. GRANT:** — Now, just who is this government monster we seem so ready to accept as our saviour? It's people. Not this building, it's people. You and I — who delegate our rights, our freedoms and our responsibilities. To whom do we delegate these precious possessions? To politicians, in many cases not too successful in private life. To civil servants who don't necessarily possess divine wisdom. I think this is an area that regardless of your political philosophy we should all be concerned about, because it's happening every day and the general public, I don't believe, are conscious of it or just don't give a darn.

The present Government of Saskatchewan has an insatiable appetite to take over from the private sector. The 1974 Budget leaves no doubt, if we let George do it, Allan Blakeney is certainly willing to help.

\$20 million to buy farm land, making a total of \$50 million in three years and no indication of any desire to sell it. The Minister of Finance (Mr. Robbins) said well, it's only \$50 million out of \$5 billion. You know it's really small potatoes, what's \$50 million. Well, it's about one per cent I believe. One per cent in dollars and I presume about one per cent in land. There are some 65 million acres, I believe, of farm land in Saskatchewan and even if they only take one per cent, I made a quick calculation here and of course the result is 500,000 acres roughly at \$100 per acre. That to me is the equivalent of all the land ten miles on each side of the Moose Jaw highway, all the way from Regina to Moose Jaw. Eight hundred square miles, a block of land 40 miles long and 20 miles wide. That's a big chunk of land and even though the Minister of Finance thinks it's a pretty small percentage, I still say that's a big chunk of land for any government to acquire in three short years.

The Government, Mr. Deputy Speaker . . .

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. GRANT:** — . . . Mr. Deputy Speaker, the

Government has consistently refused to disclose full details of the land purchased. I just wonder why. They claim it's in the public interest to acquire this land, it's in line with their political philosophy, it's in line with the New Deal for People. If it is in the public interest as the Agriculture Minister says, should not the public, the people supplying the money not have an accounting? Mr. Henderson thinks so and I'm sure Mr. Lutz, our own Provincial Auditor thinks so. I'm just wondering how long it will be before the Provincial Auditor will question this silence on behalf of the Government.

The Budget provides for sizeable assistance to municipalities which I'm sure is most welcome. However, we must not overlook the fact that it was the same Government, the Government to your right, the Blakeney Government that forced the ward system on 300,000 people with no choice, no vote, no word, as far as their opinion was concerned. As if this uncalled for action wasn't bad enough in itself, let's take a look at what the legislation makes by way of provision to get out of it. Well, it's almost going to be a way of life before a change could take place. Four years before it can be voted on. \_Now pay attention. Four years is an off year for civic elections, so a special vote would be required in order to have a vote on the ward system. Taxpayers as a rule are reluctant to have special votes and hopefully we can get by with votes every three years and not have to have a special vote. But if voted on at a regular civic election it can't occur until 1979 and if a change should be desired by the voters it would be effective in 1982. The shortest effective date would be 1979, after a vote in 1977 at the end of the four year period. On top of this the council of the day would decide if a vote would be taken.

Mr. Speaker, when the Mayor of Calgary was here a short time ago, he was absolutely flabbergasted to think that any government in Canada would force such a ward system on any municipality without a vote and with so little recourse to changing the trend, if the voters so desire.

Mr. Speaker, you and the Members to your right can rest assured a Liberal Government would correct this high-handed and undemocratic action.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. GRANT:** — We would provide for a vote just as quickly as possible, hopefully by the next civic election.

Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Finance has indicated sizeable assistance to the working poor. This is a\_group, I think we all have sympathy with, equally and maybe even" more so in some instances with the pensioner or even the welfare recipient. The working poor seem to have been caught between two millstones. I wonder though just how much of this \$10 million help will reach the people that it is intended for. Are we going to create another bureaucracy of say 100 civil servants down in the Toronto-Dominion Bank Building at \$7 a square foot, in order to dispense this \$10 million? I want, Mr. Speaker, to mention what I consider a serious omission of help for the working poor. I refer to the housing problem. A real gap in government programs. As far as I am able to learn, I think I'm correct in this, both federal and provincial programs to assist low and moderate income families to purchase homes are geared entirely to new home

**March 12, 1974**

construction and the limited serviced land available the grants for new home construction are unrealistic. There is a limit to the amount of money available for construction and this results in people going into very small homes which usually are not suitable for a young and growing family.

Excluding existing homes from any direct grant to provide the down payment for purchase of a home, the Provincial Government is contributing towards creation of the slum areas and doing nothing to alleviate the housing shortage.

In the city of Regina, there are hundreds of homes in the north, the cathedral area, the northwest and the north central and all older areas of the city which would be suitable for many people with families, if provision was made to provide a grant for the down payment. This policy of discrimination contributes towards urban sprawl and does nothing to maintain older areas of the city, which already have services, schools, sidewalks, streets, etc. The homes in these areas are much more reasonable and if assistance were given to purchase homes of this type a real contribution would be made to solve the housing shortage and prevent the waste in land and buildings which results when neighborhoods become less desirable. And that is mainly because of this discriminatory government fiscal policy.

The Provincial Government has endeavored to place welfare families in homes throughout the city and in these instances the homes are purchased directly by the Government. Working people of moderate means, often with families and no funds for down payments are discriminated against by the Provincial Government. Only if they throw themselves completely at the mercy of the Government will assistance be given. The suggestion has been made that if they were on welfare, then their situation could be looked after.

My suggestion would be;

- (1) that the Government should provide the same type of assistance to people contemplating purchase of an existing home as that provided for new homes,
- (2) that the qualifying income level should be raised;
- (3) that the maximum purchase price of homes under the government assistance program should be raised to realistically reflect the increase in the price of homes and construction costs.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased, and I am sure the people of Saskatchewan will agree with the priority given to the restoration of two historical properties in Regina. I refer to Saskatchewan House and the Territorial Building. This, to me, is closer to the proper role for government than the meat packing business.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. GRANT:** — Members of this House will recall that back in 1971 I had the honor of announcing that our Government had designated Saskatchewan House as an historical site worthy of preservation and restoration. At that time I expressed hope that a portion

of this building might be used to house a good part of the Plains Historical Museum collection of some 15,000 items, now in storage in Regina.

In discussing it with departmental officials there seems to be some question as to whether this valuable collection of Saskatchewan relics will find a home in Saskatchewan House. It would be a real loss, Mr. Speaker, in my opinion, to tourism in Regina and to the preservation of historical items if these items are not retained in Regina.

The Premier, and several Ministers are well aware of the collection I refer to, and I would urge the Minister of Natural Resources (Mr. Kowalchuk) to assess this matter personally because I fear the city of Regina stands to lose a valuable collection unless the Government sees its way clear to be a little more helpful.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, the Budget before us is not\_ that of a government conscious of its responsibilities. It is strictly an election budget for 1975. Anybody who had ideas that we are going to have an election this year had better forget about it, because it is going to take all of 1974 to get this Budget in gear. The full effect of it will not be felt until late in the year. The dental program and the help for the working poor will not be in low gear until late summer. The Budget produces no tax reductions in a year of unprecedented buoyancy. Reductions could normally be expected in this type of year. We can hardly expect tax reductions in a poor revenue year. So the Government has utterly failed in its responsibility to ease the tax burden of our people.

Mr. Speaker, the Members to your left have voiced objections to budget priorities. Political consideration has predominated in establishing many priorities to the detriment of the legitimate needs, such as help for the working poor to purchase older homes.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. GRANT:** — Mr. Speaker, because of these factors, I cannot support the motion, I will support the amendment.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. J. A. PEPPER:** (Weyburn): — Mr. Speaker, it seems that it is the custom in this House to criticize the Member who has just spoken before you. I have considerable respect for the Member who just took his seat, but . . .

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. PEPPER:** — I can assure you, Mr. Speaker, that I am going to place before you the facts and the contents of this Budget as I see them, and I am quite willing and prepared at any time to let the citizens of Saskatchewan then be the judge.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. PEPPER:** — Mr. Speaker, it is indeed a

**March 12, 1974**

pleasure, a privilege for me to rise tonight, in this Legislature, and forward to you and Members of this Assembly, my full support for this Budget.

At the outset, I should like to congratulate my colleague, for Saskatoon Nutana Centre (Mr. Robbins) for the very able delivery. And in congratulating him, I wish to include the Member for Watrous (Mr. Cody) and for Melville (Mr. Kowalchuk) for their elevation to the Cabinet. I am confident, Mr. Speaker, that these men will have a favorable impact on the deliberations which our Cabinet finds itself involved with on behalf of the people of Saskatchewan.

I should like, as well, too, on behalf of my constituents, to thank this Government for the many positive items it has included in this latest record Budget. From a political point of view, naturally, I am pleased with the Budget, in that it fulfils the commitments made to the people of the province when the New Deal for People was made public prior to the latest general election.

But even more important than that, Mr. Speaker, this Budget will go a long way in improving the quality of life for Saskatchewan people, many of whom are faced with added hardships due to today's inflationary pressures.

I might also add that it concerns me considerably that the Opposition in this Legislature has adopted such a negative stand in response to this document. I had hoped that they too would have recognized the futility of criticizing for criticism's sake. However, Mr. Speaker, that is their choice and I am sure the people of Saskatchewan will keep that in mind when this Government's record goes to the people for an extended mandate.

A number of Members on this side of the House, have very concisely analysed the very positive thrust of this Budget. Whether one looks on agriculture, health, education, economic development or social considerations contained in the Address, most objective individuals will readily see, Mr. Speaker, the favorable impact that this Budget will have on the economy of the province. Yes, we are going through a period of relative economic prosperity. However, we have no guarantee that this wave will continue. That is, unless we recognize that fact and are prepared to do something about it. Equally important is the recognition, Mr. Speaker, that it has been the agricultural industry which in years past has dictated the general economic climate of this province.

As well, I think it is important to remember that when the farming sector of the economy suffers, the pressures are equally adverse in other sectors. That is why, Mr. Speaker, it is so important to recognize the inadvisability of depending solely on our family farmer. Now, that is not to suggest for one moment that agriculture will play a declining role in the future, but quite the contrary, Mr. Speaker.

However, due to the structure of the provincial economy, governments face the responsibility to do whatever possible to lessen, if not eliminate, the risks of 'boom and bust' which have been felt many times (as many of us know) across the prairies.\

This Government, Mr. Speaker, believes that diversification must be encouraged. Soon after assuming office, many

fundamentally important steps were taken. We still believe that further steps must be taken to ensure that the maximum number of family farmers are given the chance, Mr. Speaker, to pursue their chosen profession on the farm lands of this great province.

Yes, this Budget further endorses that principle and I feel very confident that the budgetary proposals for agriculture will be met with enthusiastic response from the farming sector.

I am certain, Mr. Speaker, that all Members of this Assembly will vividly recall the position taken by Members opposite when this New Democratic Government brought in the Land Bank program. I hope that their hostility towards this program has subsided and that they now realize, Mr. Speaker, that they were in error when they earlier assessed the impact it would have on the agriculture industry. Yes, the Land Bank program is working. It is realizing the goals which were set for it when it brought in the necessary legislation and it is assisting our farmers in realizing their individual goals. And it is for that reason, Mr. Speaker, I was very pleased with the \$20 million increase in the Land Bank budget. Without a doubt, this additional capital will go a long way towards stabilizing and hopefully increasing the number of family farm units in Saskatchewan in the months that lie ahead.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. PEPPER:** — Our commitment in agriculture, Mr. Speaker, goes further than that. Continued support for the FarmStart program is further proof that our commitment to agriculture remains a priority item. It is a well known fact that farming costs are escalating at a very significant rate and this program will go a long way in eliminating the disparities which farmers on the, lower end of the income scale face as they strive to achieve economic viability.

Our concern for agriculture extends beyond these two programs, however, Mr. Speaker, as reflected by the commitment to reinstitute our farm machinery testing program.

It was regrettable, to say the least, when the former Liberal Government of this province abandoned this program, which was brought in by the former CCF Government. So I congratulate the Government and the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Messer) for this and for his foresight and the dedication in fulfilling the election pledge as well.

Further proof of this Government's commitment to agriculture can be shown with the provision of extended crop insurance coverage and financial assistance to promote a healthy hog industry.

Members on this side of the House, Mr. Speaker, are often accused of not publicly recognizing the Federal Government when we speak of agriculture in Saskatchewan. I do not intend to justify that criticism, but will only say that had the Federal Government shown the same leadership, Mr. Speaker, that was displayed by our own Agriculture Minister, I am confident that the industry would be in a more healthy situation even than it is today.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**March 12, 1974**

**MR. PEPPER:** — Oftentimes, this Government has had to work overtime to offset the adverse effects of some of the federal policies and their programs. As a result, Mr. Speaker, many of our family farmers have not been able to realize their full potential. Until such a time as Ottawa recognizes fully Saskatchewan's role and its potential within confederation, it will be necessary for this New Democratic Government to extend, Mr. Speaker, increased financial assistance to offset unacceptable federal policies.

The financial critic, Mr. Speaker, who is not in his seat this evening, his main concern about this Budget was that it was inflationary. Yes, inflation is certainly having an adverse affect on today's average family, I will admit. However, I must admit that I cannot agree with the Hon. Member's concerns because even the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) recognized the problems inflation is causing in Canada today, despite the fact he is not prepared to tackle the problem head on.

This provincial New Democratic Government does not share such a narrow view, Mr. Speaker, I can assure you. While we recognize the fact that financial constraints do not permit us to completely lick inflation, we are of the belief that something can be done, and due to our present economic buoyancy, we are prepared to do our share on behalf of the people of Saskatchewan. Yes, increased assistance to municipalities, increased school grants, increases in the property improvement program and the elimination of hospitalization premiums, are all designed, Mr. Speaker, to put more money in the consumer's pocket to help him fight inflation on a day to day basis.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. PEPPER:** — Now I would just like to spend a moment or two reviewing our Government's urban assistance program. Costs of goods and services are escalating annually. We recognize that fact. We also recognize the necessity of escalating municipal funding to ensure that these services are not jeopardized. However, the unique feature of this program is not only the increased amounts of provincial money, Mr. Speaker, which is being passed on, but also the commitment to give municipalities greater say in determining their own spending priorities.

The \$4.3 million equalization grant program, coupled with the unconditional \$10 per capita grant, will not only enable municipalities to maintain their level of service, but will also enable municipalities to hold the tax line.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. PEPPER:** — These two thrusts, coupled with the community capital fund to further encourage community development, I am sure will be welcomed by both rural and urban municipalities, as they continue to carry out their elected responsibilities.

In total, Mr. Speaker, this Government is prepared to allocate \$100 million to municipalities over the next five years.

I now want to spend a moment or two commenting on our



Government's continued commitments towards health and education. Perhaps it is not surprising that it should be a Saskatchewan NDP Government which launches an innovative Denticare program.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. PEPPER:** — Certainly, in light of its past records in the health field. This program, Mr. Speaker, further reflects the social consciousness of this Government. I know that this program will win the widespread approval of even Members opposite. I am hopeful that this Legislature will award this program its unanimous support and its backing.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. PEPPER:** — Increased assistance to our chronically ill and our elderly is reflected in the expansion of Level IV units in Moose Jaw and Saskatoon.

Mr. Speaker, this Government's health care record is unparalleled. Abolition of medicare premiums, a comprehensive hearing aid program and the commitment with respect to the high cost of prescription drugs are all part of the total health package. A package, Mr. Speaker, for which I offer my unqualified support.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. PEPPER:** — Now, in the field of education. This Budget stands out equally as well. Education carries with it a significantly high price tag. A price tag that we feel is worth spending. For the third year, Mr. Speaker, this New Democratic Government through increased operating school grants has made it possible for school boards to hold the tax line. A tripling of student bursaries, stepped up assistance for our universities and the addition of four new community colleges over the next fiscal year will assist this Government, Mr. Speaker, in ensuring that Saskatchewan remains in the forefront with respect to education in Canada today.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. PEPPER:** — For a moment, Mr. Speaker, if you will permit me, I should like to say a word about our number one resource, people. Our New Democratic Party has always pursued a people-before-profits approach in government.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, -hear!

**MR. PEPPER:** — This philosophy has been consistently followed as new policies and programs are brought forward. It is not surprising, Mr. Speaker, that it should be this New Democratic Government which launches support programs such as the first ever provincial family income program, a stepped up day care program, an expanded public housing program or a comprehensive consumer rights and protection program. Other speakers as you know, have in the past and I am sure they will during the course of this debate expand on these programs. However, it certainly

**March 12, 1974**

bears repeating that this Budget, Mr. Speaker, recognizes the uniqueness of Saskatchewan, its diversity and its special needs.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. PEPPER:** — Because, Mr. Speaker, for too long that have-not image has hung over the province. I am confident that this Budget will offer the necessary support and the assistance to remove the dark clouds and move Saskatchewan farther down the road to economic and social equality.

Time will not permit me, Mr. Speaker, to articulate the many positive provisions contained in the Budget. The Hon. Minister of Finance said that this was a development Budget. I agree with him in that observation, Mr. Speaker, as this Budget will not only encourage diversification and development of our economy but it will also assist the people of this province in their quest of personal fulfilment and it will help the family structure in Saskatchewan as it strives to improve its individual goals.

This Government differs greatly from that of the former Liberal Government when it comes to economic development. That, Mr. Speaker, is quite obvious. Pulp mills and heavy water plants are not consistent with our economic philosophies. Granted there are areas which need further assistance, I admit this. There are areas which need further assistance and will no doubt receive that attention in future budgets. However, Mr. Speaker, this Budget does make a very significant advancement towards that.

One has only to look to the Department of Northern Saskatchewan where our new emphasis on the Department of Renewable Resources which shows clearly the direction which this Government has plotted for the future economic growth of this province.

In terms of social development that commitment, Mr. Speaker, is clear as well. We know that disparities exist in today's society. We recognize the hardships facing people. Hardships, Mr. Speaker, which we as a Government are prepared to deal with. As life goes on and society continually takes on a more demanding appearance government has a responsibility to recognize these pressures and obstacles and has not only a social but a moral responsibility to ensure, Mr. Speaker, that no one is forced into accepting a standard of life or quality of life substandard to that of his neighbor.

Again, Mr. Speaker, as so ably stated by the Minister of Finance, this Budget is historic. In its new directions are seeds from which we will grow a stronger and more diversified economy. A greater measure of control by Saskatchewan people over their future. A narrowing of the gap between the rich and the poor. A better and a more satisfying life for all Saskatchewan. Yes, this Budget is consistent with these objectives and policies. I am certain that there were many Members opposite who doubted this Government when it said it was committed to fulfilling its New Deal for People. I am sure there are many people in Saskatchewan who were of the same opinion. However, Mr. Speaker, I am equally confident that there are many men, women and children who had faith, who knew this New Democratic Government could be entrusted with the reins of government and who would work towards the economic and the social goals set for it by the people of this province.

Mr. Speaker, because this Budget not only reflects but it fulfils the promise made by the people of Saskatchewan and because it will improve the quality of life for the people within our province, I wholeheartedly offer to you, Sir, my full support for the Budget.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. E. F. GARDNER:** (Moosomin): — Mr. Speaker, a number of the Members opposite have been asking what programs we would do away with or what we would leave out of the Budget. Some of our Members have mentioned one or two. I certainly can't speak for many of the departments but I would like to mention certainly one program and that is the Land Bank. I would like to tell you that as far as I am concerned after the next election when the Liberals form the government . . .

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. GARDNER:** — . . . my suggestions would be that we very carefully examine every transaction — we would first abolish the Land Bank. Secondly we should examine every transaction that was made by the Land Bank and take a very close look at them. And in the cases where the renter was granted a legitimate lease, we would sell the land to him at a reasonable price and on reasonable terms.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. GARDNER:** — I just wanted to make this comment for the record because there seems to be some doubt as to what our feeling would be in this regard. I can tell you also that I only wish the Government opposite would call an election immediately with the issue of the Land Bank. Because this is one that we could well win on.

Mr. Speaker, we listened to the Budget Speech the other day and it was quite lengthy, of course, and I think Members on both sides were wondering when the goodies were coming. And we really couldn't believe it when the speech was over. The people of this province were expecting some tax reductions. They were justified in expecting some tax reductions. And of course they were disappointed. Taxes should have been reduced at this time when revenues were buoyant. Instead the Minister of Finance, if you take a look at the Estimates, is taking more money from the taxpayer from almost every tax source that you can imagine in this province. And he gets up with a straight face and says I would like to inform the House that we are not raising any taxes. Of course, this was a big joke throughout the province because most people were expecting a reduction in taxes.

Mr. Speaker, I should like to mention one place where the Minister of Finance apparently made some strange calculations. He made some strange ones in the Press and I talked to several people who got about half-way through and gave up. He was trying to explain how people were not paying any more taxes. Most of them shook their headland quit about half-way through. But we do know that at this particular time the people in Saskatchewan, most people, indeed people all over Canada face a common problem and that is making out our income tax returns.

**March 12, 1974**

Most find it a rather distasteful job, most are a little unhappy about this job but they realize it has to be done. Basically though, I believe most people feel that income tax is a fair tax.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. GARDNER:** — Let's look at the provincial portion of this tax and see if it is. Most people know that this NDP Government has raised our income tax rate twice in the short time they have been in. They have brought it up to 40 per cent in Canada. That is bad enough. But this socialist Government apparently believes in soaking the low-income person and letting the rich off easier.

I refer you to the 1973 income tax guide. I believe almost every taxpayer in the Province of Saskatchewan has this little booklet and has probably been looking at it in the last few days. If he hasn't he certainly is going to have to in the very few weeks ahead. I'd like you to take a look at the portion which tells you how much tax you have to pay. It starts on page 3C and there are several pages of this. It indicates the taxable income that you would have, then it shows the federal tax you would pay and the provincial tax you would pay.

These figures are available to everyone and they can certainly look these up and verify what I am going to say. A person with a taxable income of \$500 would pay no federal tax, but he would pay \$30.40 provincial tax. I don't know how you would figure this percentage. Maybe the Minister of Finance who is somewhat of a mathematician can tell us what percentage of federal tax the provincial tax is when the federal is zero and the province is collecting \$30.40. Let's go up a bit and look at what happens when he has a taxable income of \$1,000. We find then that the federal tax is then \$66.00, the provincial tax is \$66.40, in other words the provincial tax is 100 per cent of the federal tax. Let's take a look at what happens now when the taxable income increases to \$2,000. We find there that the federal Government gets \$256, the province \$142.40 or the province is then collecting 55 per cent of the federal tax. Now take a look at \$3,000. People who are earning a bit more money, \$3,000 taxable income, the federal people at \$3,000 take \$456, the province \$222 or the percent of federal tax taken by the province is 44.9. Let's jump to \$5,000 taxable income, the federal people take \$876, the province takes \$390, the percentage is reduced to about 44.7 per cent. Supposing \$10,000. This is a person with a \$10,000 taxable income after deductions. This is a pretty substantial income; he would pay a federal tax of \$2,096 and a provincial tax of \$882. So the percentage of federal tax that is collected by the NDP Minister of Finance has dropped to 42 per cent. As the taxable income goes up, the percentage that the province charges goes down. Now isn't this a rather strange way in which to collect taxes from people? The more money they make the higher their taxable income the percentage taken by the NDP goes down. I sit here and listen to the New Deal for People and they talk about how they are helping the low income people. I don't know how the Minister calculated this, he is pretty good at calculations but he is certainly making it tough for people in the low income group. He is charging then a much higher percentage than he is the richer people.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. GARDNER:** — It seems rather strange action from a Government that professes to care about the poor people or the low income people to end up charging them a much higher percentage than he is charging the people with \$10,000 or so taxable income.

Mr. Speaker, I should like to touch on one other subject tonight. I am sorry that the Minister of Agriculture isn't here. I don't like to mention these things as some of the Members do, but I wouldn't do it on the air certainly tomorrow if I am on the air, but I will mention it tonight.

The Hog Marketing Commission, in this province as we know, has created a marketing mess. We have a very, very queer bidding system; it caused a great deal of problems with the buyers in this province. We have a system whereby no producer has any vote on the board, no control. We know there are many people quitting the hog industry and we are wondering why. And, incidentally, the Minister of Agriculture, I am sure, has a large staff of research people and he could tell us how many hogs are in this province at the moment, compared to one, two or three years ago or even several months ago. You notice that he very carefully is not doing it because he knows the hog population is going down every day. And the fact is the people are just quitting the hog business.

I had a chap come to me over the weekend. He was in the hog business before the days most of them went in and built the big hog barns. He was one of the original large producers. He quit! He sold his hogs and I asked him why. He told me, "That when I have to go to some Government bureaucrat with my hat in my hand and say, please, Sir, can I sell my hogs, that is the time to quit." He said if the NDP Government . . .

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. GARDNER:** — . . . want hogs they can raise them themselves. I am not going to have somebody coming and telling me how to run my hog business. And that is exactly the reason why he quit.

Mr. Speaker, we know that we are supposedly associated with the Manitoba Hog Commission through Expork and we haven't heard too much about it lately. Fortunately, I believe, we haven't heard too much about it and I hope we don't hear any more. We know that we have a mess in the hog marketing business in Saskatchewan but really you should see what is happening in Manitoba, because they are really in trouble down there.

The Manitoba Commission, as you know, made some contracts to sell hogs to Japan and the Japanese being rather shrewd traders and the NDP Commission being rather new at the job got really badly taken in by the Japanese. They got taken in to such an extent that the farmers in Manitoba are paying between \$7,000 to \$8,000 per day to subsidize the pork consumer in Japan. This is orderly marketing through the Manitoba Hog Commission. They are very frightened that this information will get out and will be available to the general public. You may have noticed in one of the farm papers of January 12, 1974, and I will quote from this:

The Manitoba Marketing Board has recommended that members of the provincial Hog Marketing Board swear

**March 12, 1974**

an oath of secrecy on the details of a contract for pork sales to Japan.

In other words they don't even want the people on that Commission to say anything about it publicly. They are so afraid that this information will get out and this is what is going on. I might quote also from this same article:

A Member of the Legislature in Manitoba, Warner Jorgeson labelled the Board report as a whitewash. He said he considers it absolutely incredible that the Manitoba Marketing Board should suggest that members of the Hog Board swear an oath of secrecy. That is not democracy, he said, it is a bloody totalitarian regime.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** — Hear, hear!

**MR. GARDNER:** — This is one of the problems they are having in Manitoba. We are associated with them; the Minister announced this in the House, through Expork. I hope that we stay as far away from them as possible because we have enough problems.

Mr. Speaker, I have a few additional remarks to make on the Budget and at this time I would beg leave to adjourn the debate.

Debate adjourned.

The Assembly adjourned at 9:10 o'clock p.m.