

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN
Second Session — Eighteenth Legislature
13th Day

Tuesday, March 30, 1976

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

On the Orders of the Day.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

MR. M.J. KOSKIE (Quill Lakes) moved, seconded by Mr. S.J. Cameron (Regina South) that *The First Report of the Select Standing Committee on Crown Corporations* be now concurred in.

He said: Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the Crown Corporations I will be moving a motion of concurrence and I would just like to make a brief comment.

At the present time the Crown Corporations Committee has been operating under a substitution of transferral of membership solely on a daily basis. Discussion took place in Crown Corporations and it was felt by the Committee that because more than one Crown corporation may be dealt with on a particular day and because particular MLAs have a particular interest in a given corporation that it would be meaningful that the extension of transferability be made in accordance with the resolution.

In summary, if this resolution is adopted the membership in the Crown Corporations Committee will be allowed on a daily basis as before or on a Crown corporation basis, but either substitution terminates on a daily basis and forms for the substitution on either basis will be made available.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I move that this First Report on the Select Standing Committee on Crown Corporations be now concurred in.

MR. S.J. CAMERON: (Regina South) — Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I might before we have the questions, address a remark or two in connection with this matter.

We, the official Opposition Party, brought to the Crown Corporations Committee on the first day a number of matters of reform of that Crown Corporations Committee. We think fairly extensive reform indeed is in order in connection with it. This is one small modest advance which, incidentally I was moved to observe when we first introduced the idea, it was found by the Committee when I introduced it to be unacceptable logic and after Mr. Messer's motion of the same idea it became a sound and sensible idea. But we are pleased to support it. As I say it is a modest advance. We think a good deal more reform in that Committee is required but we ask Members to support this one.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Motion agreed to.

QUESTIONS

PICOCURIE LEVELS IN URANIUM CITY

MR. E.F.A. MERCHANT: (Regina Wascana) — Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I might direct a question to the Minister of the Environment. Would the Minister indicate what the picocurie levels were in the buildings that have been closed recently in Uranium City? Just the numbers.

HON. N.E. BYERS: (Minister of the Environment) — Mr. Speaker, I do not have the precise figures for all the buildings and homes sampled. May I say that there have been preliminary radiation tests on 94 buildings and 20 other locations used by the public in Uranium City and that the results of these tests have been turned over to the community's municipal council. May I say that in over three-quarters of the dwellings tested the radiation levels were less than the desirable objective of .03. Higher than desirable levels were found in 21 houses, with levels in eight houses exceeding the .05 level. There were three publicly used buildings that showed higher than desirable levels and in a high school it was found much lower than the high level originally discovered, but it is still not satisfactory. I could give the Member more information. I simply want to say that there has been an ad hoc technical committee of officials set up. They are meeting today. The tests will be continuing and the survey crews will be in there for about another month before they really complete their work.

MR. MERCHANT: — Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Minister would now admit that when the high school was reopened the picocurie level had been lowered to 30 picocuries per litre which is ten times the rate which is ordinarily considered safe, the level that you mentioned as .03 picocuries per litre?

MR. BYERS: — As I thought I made very clear to the Hon. Member and all Hon. Members of the House that when the initial tests were taken, the tests were taken with equipment that could not really produce precise levels and that the levels in the high school have been lowered, mainly because of improvements made to the ventilation system. We are continuing the survey. The measuring equipment used first took a good deal of time. It took five or six hours I am told to do one building. Since that time testing equipment has been brought in that will test a building now in about 20 minutes which formerly took five or six hours. The original levels were very high and have been brought down because of the improvements to the ventilation system in the school. I am not saying that they are satisfactory. The tests at this time do not indicate that they are at a satisfactory level. However, the best advice we have is that the schools are safe to operate and it will be another month, as I have indicated, before the survey tests have been completed.

MR. MERCHANT: — Mr. Speaker, would the Minister indicate whether these figures are correct? That the level was lowered from 170 picocuries in the school to 30 picocuries per litre and it was at that time that the school was reopened though the usual

safe level is considered .03 picocuries per litre. Port Hope was closed at 23.

MR. BYERS: — Mr. Speaker, I do not have at hand the figures for all the buildings in picocuries per litre, or whatever they are called. We are going on the best judgement of a team during the survey. It is a team that is comprised of both federal and provincial people, the best people in the business that we can get and with much better equipment than we had initially. The Saskatchewan Government provided the initial equipment, it wasn't another agency. We can argue about what the numbers were. I make the point again, in case the Hon. Member did not get it the first time, that the measurements obtained on the first survey are not necessarily precise and valid; they are only approximate.

MR. MERCHANT: — I wonder if the Minister would indicate to the House whether this Government has requested equipment from the Federal Government to maintain a continual monitoring of Uranium City and presumably Rabbit Lake as the Ontario Government has requested equipment to work in the streets and work in the homes for the city of Port Hope?

MR. BYERS: — Well, I could give you a long speech about this.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. BYERS: — I want to say that if the Hon. Member is concerned about equipment that I am advised from very good sources that the employees at Uranium City asked the Federal Government to provide equipment to undertake these tests in January. The Federal Government did not respond until after Hon. Alastair Gillespie made this magnificent announcement on the evening before the Conservative leadership convention.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

RESERVATIONS ABOUT DRUG PLAN

MR. CAMERON: — Mr. Speaker, a question to the Minister of Public Health. I am wondering in view of the leave given him yesterday by the Premier to go on expressing his private reservations about the drug plan, whether he would indicate to us more precisely what his objections are, what he is doing about them because he is not the only one who has reservations about it?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

HON. W.A. ROBBINS: (Minister of Health) — Mr. Speaker, I said that I would have preferred increased monies available for home care, for health promotion and preventive type medicine. I would have preferred that ahead of the drug plan. I did not say that I did not support the drug plan. I said the drug plan was a good plan, but I would have preference for those other approaches.

MR. SPEAKER: — Order! Just so we don't get off the track on this, the Member may ask what is the policy or what is the intention of the Government. But I think we should not at this time be dealing with the individual feelings of the Minister of any particular department.

MR. CAMERON: — Mr. Speaker, I suggest then that the Minister ought not to be expressing his personal views unless we can question him about them. My question then of the Minister is whether he is prepared, in view of his private opinions to effect some changes to the drug plan and channel more monies into the programs he would rather see rather than this particular program, which as I said, many people are questioning? Perhaps while I am at it I should ask him whether he is with Kramer or Whelan on the speed limit question?

MR. ROBBINS: — I might present the argument in Cabinet but it depends on the majority of Cabinet coming to a decision with respect to it.

MR. CAMERON: — Further supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Seriously, is the Minister of Public Health, is it his opinion that we cannot in terms of priority afford the program the drug prescription program, without cutting back in the other two programs that he has mentioned? He said he would rather see the money directed to the other programs rather than the drug prescription program.

MR. SPEAKER: — Order, order! I just said to the House that the Member can ask what is the policy or what is the intention of the Government, but cannot ask Members to express their opinions on policy. So I think in effect what the Member is doing is asking the Minister of Health to express his opinion on the policy. The Member for Estevan.

COAL AT POPLAR RIVER PROJECT

MR. R.A. LARTER: (Estevan) — Mr. Speaker, to the Minister in charge of Sask Power. Has your department determined whether the coal at the Poplar River project meets the BTU content in comparison with the Boundary Dam power project?

HON. J.R. MESSER (Minister of Industry and Commerce): — I can't with precision say whether or not it meets the BTU content of the coal at the Boundary Dam installations. But it certainly meets a satisfactory level at least to the extent that we believe that the project will be a viable one by utilizing the coal on site at the Coronach location.

WATER SKI AT CORONACH AREA

MR. R.E. NELSON: (Assiniboia-Gravelbourg) — Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Minister in charge of the Sask Power Corporation. Would the Minister accept an invitation by the people of the Coronach area to come down

and be the first water skier so that he can find out the hazards of leaving barbed wire fences in a bottom of a lake by a careless department?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: — Since water skiing won't occur for some time yet I don't look upon the question as being urgent.

MR. NELSON: — Mr. Speaker, as far as being urgent I think when a water level is rising as fast as it is rising in that lake and when the fences are in the bottom of the lake, each day . . .

MR. SPEAKER: — Order, order! The Member for Regina Lakeview.

DOWDELL'S RESIGNATION

MR. E.C. MALONE: (Regina Lakeview) — Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a question to the Minister of Finance again, dealing with the Dowdell matter that I asked about yesterday. You recall that the Minister advised me that the reason for Mr. Dowdell's leaving the service of the Government of Saskatchewan was to take another job in Ottawa. My question to the Minister today is, have negotiations taken place or taking place at this time which would result in a substantial payment to Mr. Dowdell other than pay that he could normally receive when he severs his relationships such as holiday pay and so on? Have negotiations taken place in this regard? Is the Government in the process of paying to Mr. Dowdell a substantial sum of money as a result of his leaving their service?

HON. W.E. SMISHEK: (Minister of Finance) — Mr. Speaker, I have not been involved in any negotiations.

MR. MALONE: — A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Are you aware of any negotiations taking place that you may not have been involved in personally?

MR. SMISHEK: — Mr. Speaker, there have been some discussions with officials, but not with myself and I am not aware at precisely where that may be at the moment.

MR. MALONE: — Would the Minister undertake to find out the answer to my question and advise this House whether or not there has been any agreement made or about to be made resulting in Mr. Dowdell's receiving approximately \$10,000 as a result of his terminating his service with the Government?

MR. SMISHEK: — Mr. Speaker, I will check and advise the House in due time.

MR. MALONE: — A final supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Is it the policy of the Government, when civil servants leave their employ to go to other jobs, to pay them any money other than what is

owing to them for holiday pay, pension benefits and so on?

MR. SMISHEK: — Mr. Speaker, there are situations that there are payments made.

MR. MALONE: — What are the situations?

MR. SMISHEK: — Mr. Speaker, I do not have the details of those situations.

SCHOOL BOARD GRANTS FINAL

MR. R.H. BAILEY: (Rosetown-Elrose) — Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a question to the minister of Education. Is the Minister aware that officials in his department informed all school boards that when they were notified as to what the grant would be, that figure or that grant is final? That no further salary costs would be forthcoming regardless of the outcome of teachers' salary negotiations?

HON. E.L. TCHORZEWSKI: (Minister of Education) — Mr. Speaker, the answer is yes, I am aware of it. And to the latter part about that the grant is final the answer is yes and no. In yes, it is final from the point of view that there will be no major adjustments because of what salary negotiations might be. But it is clearly indicated in the memorandum that has been sent to the boards that the final amounts may change depending on errors or other adjustments that may be made after school boards have had a chance to consider information that was sent out to them.

MR. BAILEY: — A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Would the Minister not agree that in most cases where over 60 per cent of the budget remains in the unknown, that boards across this province could be running at high deficits?

MR. TCHORZEWSKI: — I don't think that that will likely be the case. We have no indications that boards will be running at large deficits at this time.

MR. BAILEY: — A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. In the event that boards are running at large deficits due to the final negotiations, would your department be prepared to state at this time that you would recognize those deficits in the forthcoming year?

MR. TCHORZEWSKI: — Mr. Speaker, I am not prepared to state that yet, it is a hypothetical question.

CUTBACK IN HEALTH SPENDING

MR. J.G. LANE: (Qu'Appelle) — A question to the Minister of Public Health. He has alluded to his choice of priorities and not having attained his goal I see that he is quoted as stating that an increasing emphasis will be placed on teaching people on how to take care

of themselves through preventative medicine because the Government clearly cannot absorb the increasing costs of health care. A review of budgetary expenditures for the Department of Health indicates that health research projects have no increase in monies and are maintained at the same level. Research and planning at the same number of personnel. That, in fact, there has been a reduction in the allotted budget, proposed budget. I am sure, Mr. Speaker, you can tell the fired Minister of Agriculture that if he would put the word please after a question, he could double his vocabulary. That in fact that the Minister of Public Health has said that there has been a cutback . . .

MR. SPEAKER: — Order, order! The Member has been out of order so much that I doubt if I could call all of the instances at this point that he has been out of order on. If the Member wishes to rephrase the question without bringing forward the Budget Debate and leaving out any other extraneous material, I would be glad to hear the question.

MR. LANE: — Mr. Speaker, the question to the Minister of Public Health. It is obvious that there has been a dramatic cutback in the matter of preventative medicine and would the Minister not admit that he has in fact failed to attain his policy directives and that there is a dramatic cutback in preventative medicine in this Budget?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. ROBBINS: — Mr. Speaker, no I wouldn't admit there has been a dramatic cutback because if you really analyze those figures you will find that that is not the case.

MR. LANE: — By way of supplementary, Mr. Speaker. You indicated that the Government could no longer absorb the increase in cost of health care. There is a restraint I think the Minister admitted on preventative medicine. How long a time lag do you foresee between an effective program of preventative medicine replacing the cutback on the health costs that you have indicated?

MR. ROBBINS: — That's a hypothetical question, Mr. Speaker.

MR. LANE: — Mr. Speaker, by way of further supplementary. I don't think that is your decision to make whether it is hypothetical. I asked a policy question, how long a time lag there would be and he refused to answer. Would the Minister not be prepared to admit that in fact the health program really consists of a cutback in nursing staff, a cutback in hospital beds and the closure of hospital beds, would the Minister . . .

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: — Order! The Member for Moosomin.

MR. L.W. BIRKBECK: — Mr. Speaker, a question to the Minister of Agriculture. Are the industrial milk shippers in the Province of Saskatchewan required to make application to the Department of Agriculture subject to your approval for licence to operate?

LICENCE FOR MILK SHIPPERS

HON. E. KAEDING: (Minister of Agriculture) — Yes, that's true.

MR. BIRKBECK: — Have any of them got their licences yet?

MR. KAEDING: — I think they all have licences if they have applied.

MR. BIRKBECK: — I am sorry I didn't hear your answer.

MR. KAEDING: — I think they have all got their licences if they have applied.

MR. BIRKBECK: — A supplementary again, Mr. Speaker, in the answer to a written question you indicated to me that there were a number of industrial milk shippers, I believe eight, who have made application and had been turned down. It also indicated to me that only good milk shippers were getting a licence or were having to make application for a licence.

MR. KAEDING: — No. I should check into that and get you the exact figure but I believe that all milk shippers have to have a licence to ship milk.

MR. BIRKBECK: — A supplementary again, Mr. Speaker. I should just like to know really if all those who are eligible for licences have in fact got their licences from the Department of Agriculture?

MR. KAEDING: — No, I wouldn't say that. When you apply for licence you have to meet certain criteria. With regard to milk there are some pretty rigid standards on milk. I think both you and I would want those rigid standards. At the present time there are some who may have applied and did not reach those standards and did not get a licence.

MR. BIRKBECK: — What is the time limit that you and the Department of Agriculture feel is required to get that licence out after they have made application?

MR. KAEDING: — I couldn't give you a time period on that and I think that's a departmental problem.

MR. BIRKBECK: — Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. I wonder then, would you

mind bringing that information to the House at some time in the future?

MR. KAEDING: — I'll give it to the Member privately if he wishes it.

NUMBER OF SANDBAGS IN ESTEVAN

MR. LARTER: — Mr. Speaker, a question, I just about got to the Minister of Municipal Affairs yesterday. In view of reports I have on sandbags available in Estevan for the predicted flood peak, I wonder could you tell us if there is a great number of sandbags available to the people in this area?

MR. MacMURCHY: — Mr. Speaker, I checked with the Director of EMO this morning and he indicated to me that they had established an office in Estevan in the fire hall and that while I can't give the Member the number of sandbags available, he indicated to me that he felt that his people would be able to handle the situation there. That's the report that I have from EMO headquarters.

MR. LARTER: — Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. There is quite a peak predicted there very shortly and my information is there are only about 9,000 sandbags available in Estevan at the present time and they estimate it will take, in some of the areas, close to 100,000 sandbags. I would appreciate if you would check with the EMO and see if this amount could be made available or ready at least.

MR. MacMURCHY: — I will keep in touch with EMO and I shall inform the Member of information that I receive.

YOUNG VOYAGEUR PROGRAM

HON. E.L. TCHORZEWSKI: (Minister of Education) — Mr. Speaker, the other day the Member for Kindersley (Mr. McMillan) asked a question and I indicated that I would check the information and provide it to him. He asked what the Federal Government's contribution had been in 1975-76 to the Young Voyageur Program. The figure is \$15,275. I want to add that that does not take in the full cost because there is a considerable amount of cost that is borne by the host community wherever it may be throughout Canada because it was an exchange program. The latest information that I have indicates that none of the provinces in Canada are taking over the federal program as it was at the present time. So, therefore, that would be lost as well.

MR. A.N. McMILLAN: (Kindersley) — Mr. Speaker, in way of clarification. Are you saying that the total federal contribution to Saskatchewan's Young Voyageur Program in the way of grant and contributions totalled \$15,275?

MR. TCHORZEWSKI: — That's the information that I have, yes.

SECTION 15 RESIDENTIAL TENANCIES ACT

MR. MERCHANT: — Mr. Speaker, I wonder if in the absence of the Minister in charge of The Residential Tenancies Act if I might direct a question to the other lawyer the Government has. On March 16, as I understand it, the Government exempted Section 15, limited dividend projects and I imagine that's the sort of thing that came up in Cabinet and perhaps the Attorney General can help me with it. Does the Government now admit that they were wrong to include Section 15 projects, in the original legislation for rent control or has there been a change in policy?

HON. R. ROMANOW: (Attorney General) — No and no.

MR. MERCHANT: — The answers with all due respect are contradictory. I wonder if the Attorney General would indicate whether it is correct that Section 15, limited dividend projects, are now completely exempt from The Residential Tenancies Act, including all of the other provisions of The Residential Tenancies Act?

MR. ROMANOW: — I'll take notice.

WELFARE CHEQUES NOT PICKED UP

HON. H.H. ROLFES: (Saskatoon Buena Vista) — On Friday last, Mr. Speaker, I took notice of a question from the Member for Qu'Appelle (Mr. Lane) in respect to cheques not picked up during the last mail strike. I have this information for him. I'll go through them by regions. Qu'Appelle, there were none; Melfort, one, the client had left the province; Weyburn, none; Swift Current, none; Moose Jaw, none; North Battleford, nine, three were cancelled, six adjusted and reissued; Prince Albert, there were none; Yorkton, 114, but 97 were re-mailed, 17 cancelled due to people who were deceased or left the region; Saskatoon there were 20, six cancelled and 14 re-mailed; Regina, 105, 54 were picked up subsequently and 51 in the Regina Region were further investigated. Regina had 17 cases that were identified for further action, five have been successfully prosecuted and 12 we are still investigating and there is a follow-up.

Mr. Speaker, there were 234 cases in all out of thousands of cases. I think it speaks well of the Department of Social Services.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

ADJOURNED DEBATES

BUDGET DEBATE

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of the Hon. Mr. Smishek (Minister of Finance) that this Assembly do now resolve itself into a Committee of Finance, and the proposed amendment thereto by Mr. MacDonald (Indian Head-Wolseley).

HON. W.A. ROBBINS: (Minister of Health) — **Mr. Speaker in rising to take part in the Budget Debate I wish to offer my congratulations to the Minister of Finance for his presentation of the Budget Address.**

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. ROBBINS: — It was concisely presented. The address was marked with clarity and preciseness and provided a reasonable resume of the Canadian and Saskatchewan economies in 1975. It was a job well done.

The second thought which emerges in this debate is the general ineptitude of the Opposition benches, particularly when it comes to economic and budgetary matters.

Mr. Speaker, one is perpetually amazed at their capability of being wrong. Surely they do not plan it that way. After all they don't believe in planning. They and 'the silent seven' who sit to their left believe that planning is socialism and they are opposed to that.

It should be obvious to every one that planning does not mean that one will be exactly right. It only provides reasonable assurance that one may be approximately right rather than being exactly wrong.

A budget, Mr. Speaker, should be one's servant, not one's master. It should be designed as a guide and a guard. It is a measurement of the probabilities in financial accounting of government for a fiscal period.

Mr. Speaker, as long as I have been a Member of this House, revenue inflows and expenditure outflows have always exceeded the Estimates. Nevertheless it is the overall relativity between the two which counts. And this has been a consistent pattern for the last four years. The results are there for all who would like to observe them. Over \$90 million in cash carry forward in the last four budgets. In fact, Mr. Speaker, responsible fiscal management has been a consistent pattern on the Saskatchewan scene, irrespective of who occupied the Treasury Benches, for the past three decades or more.

Mr. Speaker, critics from the Opposition parties condemn public enterprise as exemplified in our Crown corporations. Public enterprise and for that matter private enterprise is not virtuous or villainous in itself. Either one, in terms of basic intrinsic value, is dependent to some considerable degree upon people who have a keen sensitivity and a well developed social view point for the good and welfare of other people.

Mr. Speaker, Opposition spokesmen repetitiously condemn public enterprise. In their eyes it represents dismal socialistic failure. Facts and history bother them not one bit. They have no intention of paying any attention to either facts or to history. Like the college graduate, they are three letter men — three Bs — Braggadocio, Bluff and Bluster.

For example, Mr. Speaker, I heard the Hon. Member for Nipawin, the Leader of the Progressive Conservative Party, the other day being quite critical of Crown corporations in

Saskatchewan. He used examples in relation to potash and the probabilities in potash. He mentioned the Saskatchewan Power Corporation. He mentioned Sask Tel. He mentioned SGIO. He used the argument that potash for example would be in the commercial field and that the others were provincial monopolies and therefore were not comparable examples.

Why doesn't he compare them with Saskatchewan minerals? The Crown Corporations Committee this morning had a look at Saskatchewan minerals. It has \$8,249,059 invested in assets. Its net earnings this year totalled \$5,319,000.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. ROBBINS: — There is a return to the public Treasury of this province of \$17,560,000 since this Crown corporation was established. The Crown sodium sulphate plants at Chaplin and Bishopric and Ingebright have to compete with privately owned sodium sulphate plants in this province. They also compete with sodium sulphate plants in other countries. They compete in the commercial markets of the world in terms of selling that product. They do an extremely good job of it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. ROBBINS: — Sask Minerals is a publicly owned corporation that hired individuals who had the capability of doing a good job and they are doing it.

Saskatchewan Minerals isn't the only example. Look at the field of lumber where Saskatchewan Forest Products operates. Obviously it has up and down years. But it has returned \$10,250,000 to the Provincial Treasury of this province. And it competes with people like Simpson Lumber and Macmillan-Bloedel. It sells commercially in the market place.

Mr. Speaker, Opposition members criticize us for the stance we have taken in relation to the anti-inflation program. The Federal Government represented by the national authority is engaged in an attempt to slow the inflationary tendencies in our economy. As a Government we have felt the national program has many inequities in it. Nevertheless, we have long advocated some controls on the economy, particularly, selective price controls on key commodities. We already have a form of price control on two of the major exports from this province, oil and wheat, through a two-price system.

Mr. Speaker, if we are to subsidize eastern Canadian consumers on our domestic crude oil production, and we do, it logically follows that some reciprocal arrangement should bring compensating economic benefits to our province. Steel and lumber, fertilizer and cement come readily to mind. We may well ask why not a two-price system in those key commodities? Why not a price for the domestic market and a different price for the world market? We have it with two of our basic commodities, I previously mentioned, oil and wheat.

Opposition Members, Mr. Speaker, zero in on what they are pleased to refer as the 'restraint con game'. The Leader of the Progressive Conservative Party, the Hon. Member for Nipawin is quoted in the March 27, 1976 edition of the Star-Phoenix:

Collver describes restraint in spending the greatest con game since the sale of the Brooklyn Bridge.

I wonder why he went so far away for his comparison? One would assume that he could find an example closer to home. He might even find one in his home city that would qualify for that interpretation. That particular sale, Mr. Speaker, even starts with the same letter as the bridge he mentioned. The Progressive Conservatives decry decentralization as a camouflage to cover up what they term as a transfer of civil servants. On the other hand they condemn big government. You can't have it both ways. We have actually achieved some decentralization in government and that is not an easy task. Many factors are involved.

The Hon. Member for Nipawin claims the Budget over-estimates revenues and under-estimates expenditures. The Budget calls for revenue inflows of \$1,330,000,000. It anticipates expenditures of \$1,328,000,000. He compared the Budget figures with four years ago. But he is comparing apples with oranges. Four years ago we had a net budget, today we have a gross budget, like all the other provinces across this country. If you took the actual payments we received from the federal authority, some \$364 million estimated in terms of equalization payments and cost shared programs in the fiscal year '76-77 and deducted them from the estimates you would come up with a budget of \$966 million. It is unfair to compare a budget of four years ago with a budget today because one was on a net basis, the other on a gross basis.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. ROBBINS: — He made comments with respect to \$3,000 per family in government expenditures in this province. Why doesn't he look at Alberta? It appears to be some sort of Utopia for people who occupy the benches to the left of the official Opposition. It has a population which is less than twice the population of this province, yet their budget is more than two and one-half times greater than the budget in this province. Why be too critical in terms of this Government? Generally the consumer goods that consumers buy have roughly doubled in price over the last three or four years. Cars, combines, tractors, some of them much more than doubled in price. The private sector prices have more than doubled in the same period. I hear no criticisms of that.

Let's look at another province with a Progressive Conservative Government — Newfoundland. They just brought in a second budget in the last five months calling for expenditures of \$1,250 million. Newfoundland has a population of less than two-thirds of ours. Yet their budget is only marginally smaller.

Members of the Opposition should note when they talk about high taxes and revenue flows to the Government of Saskatchewan that Newfoundland is a good example for comparison. They have a higher income tax rate than we have — 42 per cent of federal income tax as against 40 per cent less a \$100 tax reduction last year, plus a surtax applicable to the next year, which is only applicable after an income of about \$16,000 if the individual is a single person. They have a gasoline tax of 27 cents a gallon, ours is 15 cents. They have even got a corporate income tax of 14 per cent, ours is 12 per cent. In fact there is

only one province in Canada with a lower corporate income tax than Saskatchewan, at the present time. Other than Alberta which has no sales tax, we have the lowest sales tax in Canada along with Manitoba.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. ROBBINS: — British Columbia has a seven per cent tax; Ontario seven; Quebec eight; New Brunswick eight; Prince Edward Island eight; Nova Scotia eight and Newfoundland ten. Gasoline taxes fall in the same category. You can analyse them across the country, only one province is lower than Saskatchewan, that being Alberta.

Mr. Speaker, the financial critic for the official Opposition in a burst of egalitarian eloquence comes to the defence of local governments. He claims the Government should do more for them.

I have an example I should like to cite. I have a home in the city of Saskatoon. My tax notice for the year 1970 showed the taxes at \$463.76. I was eligible for a \$70 homeowner grant and that would leave a net figure of \$393.76. In 1975 the taxes on that same home were \$614.36. I prepaid the taxes reducing that figure to \$592.44. I got a \$200 property improvement grant, my net figure is \$392.44 or \$1.32 less than it was five years ago.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. ROBBINS: — Mr. Speaker, I think you can put up a very logical argument to say that property owners should bear a larger part of the cost in terms of taxes at the present time than five years previously.

Grants to local governments in the last four years have risen by more than 1,600 per cent. In the words of a modern TV ad, they have had their turn. Priorities demand other allocations and their day will come again.

The Hon. Member for Indian Head-Wolseley wants it both ways. He criticized the Minister of Finance. He claimed 'deceit' in comparing estimated spending next year with actual spending in '75-76 the year which will end tomorrow. The comparison he claims should be between this year's estimated spending and next year's estimates. Well, he has a point, let's concede that. Yet when he looked at the budgetary figures on health spending, to suit his own purposes, he claimed deceit again: But he compared estimates for next year and estimates for '75-76.

MR. STEUART: — What did Walter do? Exactly the opposite.

MR. ROBBINS: — That's exactly what Walter did do. He compared the Estimates for '75-76 with Estimates for '76-77.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. ROBBINS: — Typical Liberal logic. Totally illogical. Perhaps both the official Opposition and the others who sit across the way should be praising the ‘Sociable Creditors’ in British Columbia. After all it was Liberals and Conservatives deliberately deserting their own parties and principles, if they have any, which resulted in the election of Premier William Bennett. Their budget has just raised their income tax — incidentally that is not bad for us, I don’t know whether Members opposite fully understand the implications of that but that is a good thing for us when British Columbia raises its income tax — it improves our situation in relation to equalization payments. They moved their corporate tax too. They raised it from ten to 12 per cent on businesses that have profits of less than \$100,000 a year; and from 12 to 15 per cent on other businesses. They raised their sales tax by two per cent.

MR. NELSON: (Assiniboia-Gravelbourg) — Cleaned up the mess.

MR. ROBBINS: — So-called. No one denies that governments must exercise discretion in the proper use of resources. And all of them should practise fiscal responsibility. Yet when the Saskatchewan Government does just that, not a word of praise. Not even a word of ‘faint praise’, not even an acknowledgment of the established facts of the case.

Mr. Speaker, the world wide economic situation is somewhat ominous and threatening. The free market has proved itself incapable of meeting human needs. Premier Alex Campbell, of Prince Edward Island, has publicly admitted that to be the case and said that the free market economy has not functioned well in the maritime economy. The free market system has been tried and found wanting.

Mr. Speaker, man should be alert enough, he should be disciplined enough, he should be thoughtful enough to democratically enact adjustments and variations when and where required.

This Government has been alert enough to realize the need for responsible fiscal restraint. We must desist from spending capital as if it were income. Opposition Members talk about government spending is often far removed from the reality of the actual situation that exists. It is often, Mr. Speaker, just cheap talk and talk is cheap. It is in numerous instances not in accord with the facts. And often, Mr. Speaker, totally irrelevant.

Admittedly, there can be wasteful expenditures in government. Over lavish life style expenses should be eliminated. I am all for that. We should be constantly diligent to retain economy in government. As we should as individuals. We live in a finite world. It is wrong for us to assume that the resources available are infinite. They simply are not.

In terms of pure logic, Mr. Speaker, if we operated on terms of pure logic, we wouldn’t have 16,000 snowmobiles running around this province this winter. We would have people cross country skiing instead. They would save a lot of energy and millions of gallons of fuel. They would be healthier people. There would be a lot less injured people ending up in hospitals. I am all for the preventive health approach.

Those expenditures which are essential in health, education, social services and highways should not be decried. I don't object to constructive criticism with respect to them. But when we slow the escalation of rising costs we should not be castigated for it. We are told we should spend more, yet when the total budgetary expenditures rise they say we should restrain them and spend less. If one Opposition party took that stance and the other the opposite, one might understand them. They both take both sides of the argument and defend them vehemently and courageously. Confusion reigns supreme on the Opposition benches.

Liberal Members opposite contend, Mr. speaker, there are cuts in service and health care. Yet the overall Health budget estimate has risen from actual expenditures for 1975-76 as closely as we can estimate, and the year doesn't end until tomorrow, of some \$293 million, to proposed expenditures next year of \$337,920,470. Funds available to our hospitals from Saskatchewan Hospital Services Plan, in fiscal 1975-76, including the supplementaries, will approach the \$167 million mark. Estimates for 1976-77 are in excess of \$193 million. An increase of over \$26 million.

They call for restraint, Mr. Speaker. They say we are not providing sufficient funding even though the increases are substantial ones. Saskatchewan Liberals should be reminded of the statements of a fellow Liberal at the federal level. The Hon. Minister of National Health and Welfare, the Hon. Marc Lalonde, speaking in Saskatoon on December the 5th last, to a Liberal gathering, said, and I quote him:

Canadians can no longer afford to support indefinitely spiralling health costs.

He singled out the use of hospital beds in Saskatchewan as an example of what he said might be overuse of expensive health facilities.

Saskatchewan has 8.5 acute care hospital beds for each 1,000 of population. The national average is 6.8 beds per thousand and the Federal Government's national target is five beds per thousand.

The latest available statistics indicate 220 separations for each thousand of our population in the year 1974 in terms of our hospitals. The national average in 1974 was 156 separations per thousand.

We are attempting to slow escalating health costs, we are condemned for it. The Budget grows, we are condemned for that. You cannot have it both ways. The Hon. Member for Indian Head-Wolseley contended governments are the major contributors to inflation. If they operate with large deficits particularly at the federal level where the money supply is controlled, I would agree. They do not do so when they produce surpluses and do not make a 'net' demand on the economy. The Hon. Member for Saskatoon Eastview, condemned Saskatchewan's oil purchase of Atlantic Richfield for \$23 million. He ignores repatriation from foreign to Canadian ownership of Canadian resource industries. The Committee for Independent Canada will find him a poor prospect for membership.

Mr. Speaker, confusion reigns supreme among the Opposition Members. Both Liberal and Conservative criticism of the Budget,

are in the main, contradictory and unrealistic.

Mr. Speaker, I shall support the main motion and vote against the amendment.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. H.H.P. BAKER: (Regina Victoria) — Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to be able to take part in this Budget Debate and have the opportunity to speak on the air, to those listening and to say that I am pleased to be the representative of the Regina Victoria constituency in one of the fine parts of our city.

My talk today will be one of warning and one that will portray the future needs of our province and particularly the cities, towns and villages.

Mr. Speaker, it is not the spending that causes inflation, it is the gouging by inconsiderate enterprisers plus the devastating interest rates that raised our cost of living all out of reason these past two years and again for the future.

This talk of restraint and cutbacks in government spending is not the answer — it is only a way of copping out of meeting our real responsibilities. I don't buy the idea of cutbacks, restraints on public spending. We need planned spending in our public sector to keep a balanced economy and fill the gaps for employment. The private sector cannot and will not be able to carry the amount of investment to meet all employment needs.

Let's not fall prey to the advocates in political parties calling for massive cutbacks if we are to stop recessions, depressions and uncontrolled unemployment. Those who preach austerity will meet the same fate the Government did in 1971 in Saskatchewan. We need spending in the right places. We must have a measure of anti-inflation controls on the cost of living to assist us.

The Budget brought down says it is one of restraint and not austerity. I say it is one that could cause creeping unemployment and creeping paralysis of the economy. I am sorry to say it has overlooked to some degree the property taxpayer and the pensioner.

The 11 per cent that we say the Budget has been increased by, is also reflected in costs for cities, towns, villages and municipalities. I say municipal costs because of the rapid growth in all of our cities and towns has caused rising costs of more like 13 per cent. If it is 11 per cent, where are urban centres forced to get it from? In the main it must come from property taxes. A \$44 million budget for Regina in 1976 means at 11 per cent, we must find close to \$4.5 million. We can probably find \$3 million, but the rest will have to come from the property tax and this doesn't include what the schools may do.

Where do a large part of these costs come from? Well, cities accepted the challenge to build facilities for our people to give a better quality of life in the field of sport, recreation, in culture, the arts and different types of housing. This is right and good. The \$75 per capita received from the province to build our communities is an excellent move. The

municipalities accepted that task not only to provide up-to-date facilities, but it created work for our citizens to the point where we have virtually no unemployment. We want to help to continue full employment, but if all operational costs are left to the cities, towns and villages, it is bound to increase the property taxes more than can be anticipated.

That is why SUMA on behalf of the urban municipalities, has asked for at least \$15 unconditional grants over and above the \$20 given now. They need it if services are to be kept up and let us not forget if costs go too high on the ratepayer, urban centres will shy away from all projects, even winter works projects and the result will be unemployment.

The construction industry is our community's biggest employer, so let's not let them down. It's our urban centres that have to initiate most public projects, housing for families, housing for senior citizens, special care and nursing homes, NIP and Land Assembly programs. Sure, the costs are shared, but if we don't initiate them, they'll never get off the ground.

That's what I mean when I say it is the cities, towns and villages that are creating a good share of our employment. I don't want to see the day again when there are ten people waiting for the other fellow's job. It is this generous Government that has given us generous grants to do these things. We can't let them down now. That's why I say an unconditional grant of between \$10 to \$15 per person should still be added to this Budget to help keep a buoyant economy in our fine province and keep full employment at all times in our urban centres.

I am not saying this in a critical fashion, but I am trying to impress my colleagues on this side of the House how necessary it is that we as a Social Democratic Government must always think of people first.

From 1964 to 1971, all we got as a grant in Regina amounted in total to about \$3.40 per person. There were no per capita construction grants. That is why the province lost 103,000 people. We don't want those days back again. Because of this Government and in co-operation with urban centres, our population has increased over last year by 16,000 people.

We want our people to come back, we want others to come and live here, too. Together we have the answer. Let's not make wrong moves now that will jeopardize our position, not only as a government and if we want to look at it as a party in a political way, it is necessary to follow what I advocate.

I emphasize this because we are a good government. We have done great things for Saskatchewan, yes, for all of Canada. The people speak highly of us for what we are doing. The soundness of our policies these past five years will continue to bring back the people we lost.

Yes, we must continue to build a solid economy and one that will give all of our Saskatchewan people continued security so that we are free from want, free from deterrent fees, free from poor wages, free from paying hospital and doctor bills, free from paying chiropractic fees, free from the high cost of drugs, and hopefully we will have a plan to make us free from dental bills in the future, and free from high costs of car insurance and liability and personal costs.

The farmers have good security under this Government. To the farmers within reach of my voice; let's not go back to the days when your farms and homes were taken from you mercilessly. The New Democratic Government in Saskatchewan has been one of compassion, a Government that has given us security, with a 'cradle to the grave' plan in the field of health — socially and other built-in guarantees so that we are not cast aside and forgotten. We believe in sharing the fruits of our labor, in other words, equalizing and sharing the wealth.

I know the people of Regina and Saskatchewan will want to keep this Government in power because it would mean disaster again, if they didn't.

I said earlier that we must look after our senior citizens, our pensioners. Because of inflation the increased cost of living has put many of our pensioners in need and in dire straits. More should be done on sharing this from Ottawa, but we too should be in there to see that at least \$20 to \$25 more be given to our pensioners. The 11 per cent cost increase affects them in the same way as it affects every facet of the economy.

Canada is rich, Mr. Speaker, Saskatchewan is rich. Why deny our pioneers who built this country the right to live well, live with dignity, and enjoy this great free land of ours? In the main, those who missed out on the full benefits of the Canada Pension Plan are having cost of living problems. Let's review our position on this and provide proper compensation.

I again turn briefly to costs of education. We know that education is under the province's jurisdiction. This Government has given large and generous education grants to our schools for operation and capital expenditures. But this country has reached the stage where there must be some federal input for education costs through unconditional grants to the provinces. This would in no way touch the autonomy of provincial rights.

Turning again to agriculture, we all know that agriculture is our primary industry. Not only for the West but creates more real wealth than any industry for the whole of Canada, we must keep it strong. How can we do it?

1. There must be orderly marketing by marketing boards with teeth in them.
2. We must stop wholesale rail line abandonment.
3. We must stop them from taking away our Crow's Nest rates.
4. We need stabilization programs for our grain and livestock industry. This can only be achieved if there is full federal participation.
5. We must continue to give adequate moneys for research.

Some of the things I should like to enumerate in a general way for future progress would include:

1. We should work toward a full dental care plan.
2. All levels of nursing care be put under the medicare plan, and build more special-care nursing homes.
3. Education costs from here on in be borne by the province, with unconditional grants coming from Ottawa to help defray the costs. Property cannot carry the costs of education if increases are needed annually.
4. Homeowner grants should also be made available for renters.

5. The Canada Pension Plan should be revised to reduce the pension age to 60 for men and 55 for women. We as provinces should continually press Ottawa for this.
6. Inaugurate a universal provincial pension plan. Also an income continuance pay plan for those who become ill, with a compulsory insurance program in case of death.
7. I look forward to a regional park agreement with our city this year.
8. Construction of a super highway south to the American border and to the extreme North using Highway No. 6. We also need all-weather roads through the North to meet the needs of those communities.
9. I suggest we build a refinery to refine some of our crude oil, either alone or in conjunction with our Co-op Refinery.
10. I am very pleased, Mr. Speaker, with the Home Repair Plan.
11. The \$200 Homeowner Grant will again be well received. The plan I first recommended to this House in 1965.
12. The \$75 per capita for municipalities should be increased a bit each year because this does create projects for continual employment in each municipality.
13. Continue construction of low-cost housing and senior citizen housing as well as more nursing homes.
14. I call for University plans for expanded and new courses coupled with the construction of necessary buildings at the University of Regina — it looks as though we have been short-changed a bit this year.
15. We need to construct apartments for our university students at the Regina University.
16. We must press to enlarge on our guaranteed income plan for all Canadians — as one of the wealthiest nations in the world we can afford this.
17. We must do what we can to see that interest rates are rolled back and held.
18. We need more housing for our native people, either through ownership or through rent, the Budget will provide much of this.
19. Assistance from senior governments for comprehensive urban renewal programs for commercial areas and for renovating older homes.

Our industrial growth has been beyond our highest expectations. The Provincial and Federal Governments have co-operated with our local governments. We can expect our economy to continue to flourish and grow and expand. However, the rapid growth has strained our funds to provide services to these areas. I would hope sufficient loans will be made available for all communities to help provide needed services.

Yes, we believe in people. We want to share our provincial prosperity with them through public ownership, through private ownership, co-operative ownership and through a social and humane way of life. Yes, Mr. Speaker, I believe as my colleagues do, in people. People who live in Regina, in Saskatchewan and in Canada. And we also think of people throughout the world, particularly those in underdeveloped countries and people who are undernourished.

Social democracy as we practise it in Saskatchewan will have to become the world's by-word if nations are to work together and keep it in existence. People are hungry out there, Mr. Speaker, and Saskatchewan stands out as a beacon of salvation

to those in the need of food. Let's keep producing abundantly to keep up our good life and make it better for others.

Some say over there on the other side that this Government is taking away local control —

- does giving a \$20 unconditional grant take away control?
- does the \$75 per capita grant for capital construction take away local control?
- does giving lucrative police grants take away our control?
- do winter works take away control?
- do capital bus grants and bus operational grants take away control?
- do grants for sewage treatment take away control?

All this does not take away control, it gives back control where it belongs, so we can operate democratically and carry out the services requested and needed by our people in each municipality.

Yes, we now have complete control of local government because of the millions given to us these past few years. The funds I mentioned we need for 1976 will add to that freedom of local government and control.

I could go on and on, Mr. Speaker. In this Budget we are continuing in the main with the great social programs we started and we are building on them within the framework of long laid plans. These are given not for political aggrandizement but as a right. Oh, how fortunate we are to have a people's government in Saskatchewan. I am sure Regina and the rest of Saskatchewan will keep it so. I support the Budget.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. W.H. STODALKA: (Maple Creek) — Mr. Speaker, I rise on the Budget Debate with mixed emotions. My sympathies go to those people responsible for local government. Because of the limited funds available to them in this Budget, the decisions they will be forced to make will be difficult and unpopular.

On the other hand I am pleased that those responsible for printing the Budget chose as the cover a picturesque scene of the rolling ranch land south of Maple Creek. We in the Maple Creek ranch land area are proud of our heritage and pleased to live in an area that offers a wide range of activities that contribute to the well-being of Saskatchewan.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. STODALKA: — Within our boundaries are productive grain farms and ranches, oil fields and gas fields, and sodium sulphate mines. Our climate and wide range of recreational opportunities make it a great place to live.

One segment of our community is presently under strain. As all Members are aware, the cattle business has been in a depressed condition for an extended period of time. Those involved in the industry are hoping that the predictions of an upturn in the market are not only accurate, but will occur in the immediate future. It is our sincere hope that the Budget's predicted upswing in market conditions arrives at an early date.

Yesterday, as I sat listening to the Leader of the Conservative Party reading his speech word for word, it occurred to me that now was an appropriate time to evaluate the Conservatives' performance. This evaluation is based on the goals and the objectives set by the Conservative Party and which were so eloquently delivered to this Assembly by their Leader in his maiden address. Being an educator I decided to prepare a report card, based on the very goals and objectives outlined by the Leader of the Conservative Party in his highly publicized speech on decorum. I do not suggest my ratings are infallible but I do feel they accurately represent the situation as it is. All Members can sit in judgement of my assessment.

The format of the report card identifies the stated objectives of the Tories as taken from Hansard. The objectives are then in turn commented on in relation to their degree of achievement. The following is an assessment of those practices the Tories classify as being of a type that should be ended forthwith.

Objective No. 1. It is a rule that a Member must address orally and not read from a previously written speech.

Comment: As reading speeches by Tory Members is now occurring on a regular basis, I am afraid the only valid remarks that can be made is complete failure to achieve that established goal.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. STODALKA: — A special category, Mr. Speaker. While reading of speeches by leaders of opposition parties was not stated as an objective of that party, the Leader of the Conservative Party is to be congratulated for the expertise he showed in reading his Budget address.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. STODALKA: — His performance was both fluent and expressive and certainly deserving of an 'A'.

Objective No. 2. To address the Speaker before leaving the seat of the Assembly.

Comment. Average, Mr. Speaker. No better or no worse than other Members.

Objective No. 3. No chewing of gum.

Comment: Outstanding when considering their own conduct but completely ineffective in changing the habits of gum-chewing Cabinet Ministers.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. STODALKA: — Objective No. 4. Showing disrespect for Opposition speakers by leaving the Chamber en masse.

Comment: Showed a complete disregard for their stated objective when they staged a walkout earlier in this Session.

Objective No. 5. Showing disrespect by reading newspapers and other trivia in an obvious way.

Comment: I have been unable to decide whether writing, reading and circulating notes in the Assembly could be classified as trivia.

Objective No. 6. Eliminating disrespectful conduct such as catcalls, disrespectful comments, slouching in chairs, etc.

Comment: Commendable in certain areas, but just like the rest of us in others.

Finally, as to the overall goal of the party and stated by the Member for Nipawin and which I quote:

It will be said, after four years, Mr. Speaker, that seven Progressive Conservatives in this Assembly will not behave in this fashion and will not participate in that kind of behavior.

Comment: Assessment of previous comments on objectives indicate a disheartening lack of success in achieving the pre-conceived goal.

Mr. Speaker, the assessment speaks for itself and no further comments are necessary.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. STODALKA: — Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Finance speaks of restraints in his Budget. While I recognize he was referring to financial restraints, I also found myself being subject to certain restraints as I listened to his presentation. The effect was even greater when I read the Budget. As a person who has had some experience in statistical analysis, it is my assessment that the Minister is guilty of trying to pull off a real con job. It is indeed a shame that such a wanton disregard for acceptable statistical procedures was adopted by the Minister of Finance in order to try and score political points.

Mr. Speaker, I should like to offer an illustration to prove my point. It is the Minister's obvious effort to try and convince the people of Saskatchewan that the Budget projected an 11 per cent increase in expenditures. Valid statistical comparisons require extreme care that items to be compared are influenced by as few variables as possible. To make a valid comparison the Minister had two options available to him. In the first instance he could have compared 1975 projected expenditures to 1976 expenditures. A second and less accurate comparison would have been to compare the projected and supplemental expenditures of last year with the projected and an estimate of supplemental expenditures, based on previous experience, for this year.

In the aforementioned instances, the Minister would have at least been comparing apples to apples. But what did he do, Mr. Speaker, to try and convince us he was presenting a Budget of restraint he found it necessary to compare apples to oranges. Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Finance had the audacity to compare the 1975 projected budget plus supplemental expenditures to only the projected expenditures for 1976. A comparison that past experience shows is irrelevant. In fact, the projected expenditures of the last two budgets indicates that the increase is not 11 per cent as previously stated but 16 per cent. Mr. Speaker, such a deliberate attempt to distort can only affect the credibility of the Government.

Mr. Speaker, it is obvious that the key determinant in providing operating grants of \$27.8 million to school boards

was a decision by the Government to continue paying approximately 58 per cent of costs. Anyone familiar with school finance recognizes there are many areas in which school boards have little or no control over many of the items in their budget. In fact, the Provincial Government through its dominating position in negotiating teachers' salaries and working conditions, complemented with its power to control the price of power, telephone, gas, insurance, licence fees, and gasoline tax, has a greater impact on the Budget than the board itself.

The only major source of revenue available to school boards is the property tax. Because it is the Government's stated intention in the Budget to pick up only 70 per cent of the annual increase in school costs, you have told school boards they have to either raise their mill rate or cut programs. There is no other alternative available to them.

Last year for school units the Department of Education Foundation Program used a computational mill rate of 41 mills in determining the amount of local support expected of a school jurisdiction offering a basic program. Many boards which wished to offer a program above the basic program in fact exceeded the 41 mills. In this year's grant formula you set the computational mill rate at 47.5 mills. This represents an increase of 6.5 mills over last year. In percentage terms this is an increase of 15.9 per cent.

Mr. Speaker, in a time when the Minister of Finance is fallaciously gloating about a provincial increase of 11 per cent in budgetary expenditures, he is in effect telling school boards that they are expected to increase their budgets by 15.9 per cent. He is suggesting that school boards should raise their budget 4.9 per cent more than the province has, according to his own statistics.

In terms of the indicated provincial 11 per cent increase, a 4.9 per cent increase in a school board's budget is in reality asking boards to increase their share of contribution by 44.5 per cent more than the province increased its budgetary expenditures. From initial reports there are many school jurisdictions who will be forced to exceed the 6.5 mill rate change in the computational mill rate, just to try and maintain their existing programs.

Mr. Speaker, Saskatchewan property owners are going to be paying higher school taxes on their property during 1976. The decision they must do so was in reality made by the Provincial Government.

Mr. Speaker, the Budget treats municipal governments even more harshly. While expenses have risen sharply, help from the Provincial Government has not kept pace. This Budget indicates that local municipal governments, who are saddled with the property tax as their source of revenue, will be paying a greater percentage of their costs. Those who own their own home, their own farm and their own business will undoubtedly be feeling the impact of greater property taxes because of this Budget.

Mr. Speaker, considering the evident increase in both municipal and school mill rates, Saskatchewan property owners will be faced with record-breaking increases in mill rates.

Today again, another Minister, the Minister of Health, said

that property owners should be paying more. Mr. Speaker, all the statements of the ministers opposite are not going to make those increases any more acceptable.

Mr. Speaker, much has been said over the past few months from the Members opposite about the Federal Government's failure to deal effectively with professional incomes. The Minister of Finance suggests that a provincial surtax of ten per cent on provincial income tax in excess of \$1,500 is a mechanism designed to include a group who were not contributing towards the fight against inflation. This group he identifies as professionals.

Mr. Speaker, the Members opposite always have a great capacity in creating issues which they hope will appear popular with voters. The format they use is usually the same. The strategy used is to divide society by playing one group against the other. The present game includes playing the low and middle income workers against the professionals.

Members in the Government eager to promote their cause use the all-inclusive term 'professional' to identify an apparently large group who are apparently escaping the fight against inflation. Mr. Speaker, this is a deceptive strategy designed only to confuse and divide. For, Mr. Speaker, in fact the great majority of professionals are covered by the guidelines. Both the Provincial and Federal Governments are adhering to the maximum increases in salaries permitted by the anti-inflation guidelines. Thus many professionals of all kinds, including doctors, lawyers, nurses, accountants, teachers, as well as others, are all included in the anti-inflation program.

What does the ten per cent surtax mean to those who work in the private sector? Well, Mr. Speaker, I note that both the increase in the gasoline tax and the six cents increase in the price of cigarettes are estimated to bring more to the provincial treasury than the surtax on income. Furthermore, Mr. Speaker, the ten per cent surtax is not a tax for professionals only. With the high price for grain in the past two years, many farmers have had high incomes. Finally, farmers who have had years of very low incomes have had a decent income. This tax is going to hit them, Mr. Speaker. The tax is going to hit many of those who are in business. It is obvious that any declaration that this is a tax designed to include a group of professionals who are not contributing towards the fight against inflation, simply is not true.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. STODALKA: — Mr. Speaker, the real reason for introducing this tax was to try and gain political points for the Government. It is another instance of trying to divide society for political advantage. A mechanism designed to make the Government appear to be on the side of the low and the middle income workers against the professionals. In actuality, the ten per cent surtax is a tax against farmers, businessmen, professionals, as well as many others.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. STODALKA: — A tax which will raise less money than the six cents on a package of cigarettes.

Mr. Speaker, two years ago the Government launched a denticare program to treat all children six years of age. Last year the program outlined in the budget was expanded to include children born in 1967 and 1969. I notice that this year's Budget makes no mention of extending the plan further. If it is the Government's intention to do so it is not stated in the Budget as it was in previous years.

While I have no quarrel with the aims of the program, it would appear to me that administratively there have been numerous problems. In the southwest portion numerous clinics have been constructed but there is a lack of personnel to work in them. I personally have received many complaints from parents who require service for their children and are unable to locate the dental staff or do not know how to get in touch with them. If the denticare program is to succeed, sufficient staff must be made available. This is the second year in a row that this deficiency has existed. Parents are disturbed at the lack of services. It seems that in the Government's haste to extend the dental care plan there was a deficiency in securing the qualified personnel necessary to operate the program effectively.

The Budget also increases subsidies for Level II and Level III residents of special-care homes. But, Mr. Speaker, the Budget does nothing to resolve the situation where Level IV guests pay nothing while guests at other levels who have financial means are expected to pay. The extremely high cost of care for Level III soon exhausts the financial resources of those who are able to pay. The present policy suggests to our senior citizens that they should either spend or distribute the financial resources to their beneficiaries before they require the services of a special-care home. The message is clear, if you keep your money, it will soon be depleted. On the other hand if you do not have any financial resources, your needs will be taken care of.

Such a policy promotes spending your earnings when you are young rather than preparing to help yourself in your senior years. It is my contention that those with resources should be prepared to pay a portion of the cost, but certainly not the extensive rates now being levied.

On November 20, the Minister of Mineral Resources outlined Saskatchewan's new oil policy. A policy including credits for exploration and development.

In a news release from his Department, the Minister declared and I quote:

We are sure that industry will respond by stepping up activity in the province.

Mr. Speaker, I have an article here from the March 20, edition of the Financial Post which I should like to read into the record.

Prices bid at petroleum and natural gas rights sales in British Columbia and Alberta have climbed back to respectable levels, following the low years during the federal-provincial oil and resource taxation confrontation. Since land sales are a barometer for the mood of the petroleum industry, the future for exploration in

both provinces looks convincingly good. Saskatchewan on the other hand might still have to travel a far distance to not only create similarly attractive conditions but to also make up for the considerably lesser geological potential remaining within its boundaries.

Further evidence of the fact that the policy changes have not attracted investment capital were evident in the latest land sales.

Mr. Speaker, again I should like to quote from an article in last Saturday's Financial Post, the March 27, edition. The headline of the article is, 'Private Sector Cautious in Saskatchewan Oil Rights Sale'.

Saskatchewan's first land sale after a 13 month pause in provincial oil and gas rights offerings versus a two to three month interval in the past, was not what the Government might have hoped for following its recent increase in return to the oil producers to about 94 cents a barrel from an average of 37 cents a barrel. In all, the sales brought in \$2 million. But industry's portion of accepted bids amounted to only \$627,000, a mere 31 per cent of the total.

I go down a little further:

But the real story lies in the type of acreage bought by industry. Permits, traditionally the most exploration directed parcels were bought entirely by Saskoil, which has also posted all of the nine permits it bought on March 9. One lone permit was acquired by Calgary based Anderson Exploration Limited. A mere \$46,335 out of the total \$889,112 paid for all permits. Which places industry spending for this type of exploration property at a mere 5.2 per cent per acre price for the permit came to an average of 1.16. The situation is even more worse than the next lower rank on the exploration scale for drilling reservations. Industry bought none, while Saskoil took two for a total of \$150,000. In another Crown corporation, the Saskatchewan Power Corporation accounted for four, for \$124,696, resulting in a total for this group of \$275,929 or 14.31 per cent of leasable lands.

Mr. Speaker, the evidence is overwhelming. The policies of this Government are not providing required exploration. There is a need for the Minister to go back to the drawing board in order to attract — to develop a program that will attract the necessary capital.

Mr. Speaker, I am sure that you can conclude from my remarks that I have made that I will not be supporting the motion to accept the Budget but will be supporting the amendment.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. P. P. MOSTOWAY: (Saskatoon Centre) — Mr. Speaker, I rise with pleasure to speak in support of this Budget speech. A Budget that has been very well received by citizens throughout all of Saskatchewan.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MOSTOWAY: — It has been hailed as being fair and just to all and when it meets the test of the Board of Trade, as it has, I know it has to be good.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MOSTOWAY: — At this time, Mr. Speaker, I should once again like to thank the people of Saskatoon Centre for having expressed confidence in me on election day on June 11, of last year.

Before I go on, Mr. Speaker, I want to say that the increased grants to school boards, increased police grants, increased library grants, and the unconditional grants of \$20 per person for cities like Saskatoon are greatly appreciated. The increase in these grants certainly relieves the tax burden at the local level and were Provincial Government grants not increased, as they have been, local taxes would be much higher than they are or will be.

Mr. Speaker, during my talk this afternoon, I shall be mentioning specific concerns of the citizens of Saskatchewan and in particular, the citizens of Saskatoon Centre constituency. I shall be mentioning the plight of many of our senior citizens, my disappointment that grants to renters will not be forthcoming this year and my inability to understand why a group of large landlords would want to oppose our rent control legislation. Further to this, I wish to touch on what I think is our failure to capitalize on the potential of the research council and also my hope that all forces in Saskatoon will pull together to ensure that the headquarters of the Saskatchewan Potash Corporation is located in Saskatoon. I will also be asking the Government to take a good hard look in regard to the possibility of a flu epidemic in the future. I will certainly be mentioning . . . it sounds like the flu epidemic has hit certain Members opposite. I will also be mentioning the drug program and a possible inclusion of other drugs in it. I will also touch on credit cards because I believe they are a curse on society.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MOSTOWAY: — I see the members opposite must have some stake in the credit card business because they seem to think it is a big joke. I also believe large enterprises are abusing the credit card system. I will be making a few remarks in this area. I also believe there must be further involvement of the Department of Consumer Affairs in the protection of consumers in Saskatchewan.

The failure of the Family Court system to have materialized in Saskatchewan will also be mentioned. And because I believe traffic safety should be stressed in our schools, I shall be mentioning this point also.

The possibility of life insurance paid for by the Workers' Compensation Board for breadwinners of families, when the breadwinners pass on, will be mentioned. That's, if time permits.

The need for improvements for transportation for the elderly and the handicapped in our cities will be touched on also.

Last but not least is a concern in regard to the preservation of our historic sites in Saskatchewan on which I shall be passing a few comments.

But at this time, Mr. Speaker, I want to make a few comments in regard to the Leader of the Tory or the Conservative Party and his remarks relative to this Budget. Yesterday, the old Tory, or the Conservative Leader, screamed, ranted and raved on deficits and sound business practices, straight out of the book of Social Credit. He claims that this will be a deficit budget. He is wrong and I say to the Hon. Member for Nipawin that if he is proven wrong one year from now, the only honorable thing for him to do will be to resign.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MOSTOWAY: — As for statements on sound business practices, I challenge him to show Members of this House where sound business practices have not been used, as they have been in the past, whether the Government was, in quotation marks, “Liberal”, CCF, NDP or what have you. These rantings and ravings of his relative to deficits in some business practices may bamboozle some people but certainly not those who are experienced in this field. To those civil servants who had a hand in the making up of this Budget, I simply say, I am sure the majority of Members in this House and the majority of the citizens of Saskatchewan have confidence in your ability.

Now, Mr. Speaker, in going back to this year’s Budget, I don’t think anyone would expect Liberal MLAs to do anything other than to condemn it. You see, Mr. Speaker, Liberal MLAs are so negative, so persistently negative, that the citizens of this province expect this of them, and that is why they were rejected at the polls in the last election.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MOSTOWAY: — Mr. Speaker, the last Assembly tolerated 15 Liberals and this new Assembly barely tolerates 15 Liberals. This 15-15 deal is absolute proof that the Liberal Party is absolutely static — that it neither moves forward nor backward. It is a true reflection of the thinking of that Liberal crew opposite — rudderless, truly in shambles but with just enough energy to take up the battle cry for a Pandora’s box of corporations on whom they rely for hefty contributions as, I might add, the Conservatives do.

Mr. Speaker, the Liberal MLAs speak for corporations and that is their right. They have fought and still fight progressive moves and programs and that, too, is their right. The Liberal Party looks to Prime Minister Trudeau for guidance, and that is their right. With all these rights, the Liberal Party has, the citizens of Saskatchewan know that Liberal MLAs are wrong but then again that is the right of Liberal MLAs.

Now, I should like to direct my attention to the seven Tory or Conservative Members of this House. The seven who held up

this Budget for two weeks because they wanted more money. The seven who said, “We don’t care if grants will be held up to school boards and citizens in general. We don’t care.”

I will be the last Member in this House to deny those seven wonders of the world the privilege of breaking an agreement to have the Budget brought down earlier. I would be the last person in the world to deny the Tory or Conservative Leader the privilege of trying to deny that he was the cause of the delay in the Budget, for this is his right in a province that is democratic like Saskatchewan.

And I would be the last person in the world to suggest that a revolt in the Conservative Party is imminent because of dissent and embarrassment over the immature actions of its Leader who is not in the House at this time. When he does come in, I wish you would introduce me to him because I really don’t know what he looks like. No, Mr. Speaker, I would not be a party to this because I believe the Tory or Conservative MLAs have a democratic right to represent only a small clique of financially powerful and influential people lurking in the shadows.

Mr. Speaker, Conservative Members opposite have a right to condemn Liberal and New Democratic Members for being human in this House and then doing the same things for which they condemn us. They have a right to read their speeches like the Hon. Leader did, they have a right to walk out of this House en masse because of the pressure. This seven-up-and-out-of-the-House gang has the right to not participate meaningfully in this House. They have a right to pick up the pieces and carry on where the old Conservative Party left off with close ties with the Ku Klux Klan, with close ties with those who would deny parents a say in the kind of school instruction offered their children. With close ties with those who tried to destroy the rich cultures that were brought over to this province.

Mr. Speaker, Conservative Members opposite, emotionless and a host of other adjectives, have a right to degrade this House. They have a right to make the citizens of this province think they represent Alberta rather than this wonderful province. Conservative MLAs even have the right to move to Alberta if they wish to. There they can have the right to wonder why Alberta with its abundant money hasn’t done more for its people — why only a small Conservative clique there own and control pretty well everything. There in Alberta Conservative Members from this House can help pay the huge interest on Alberta’s recent deficit which ran into the hundreds of millions of dollars.

And if that isn’t enough then these same seven-uppers in this House, when they do move to Alberta, can have the right to pay medicare premiums per family of over \$150 per year or they can remain here and pay nothing. In Alberta, they can take their children to a dentist at from \$20 to \$100 a crack, or they can remain in Saskatchewan and have the same service at no cost.

When in Alberta, these same Conservative or Tory MLAs can pay higher insurance rates, higher power rates and other higher rates, too numerous to mention. And in Alberta, they can travel on a very good road system provided it’s only between Calgary and Edmonton, or they can remain in Saskatchewan and travel on good roads anywhere in the province.

Mr. Speaker, those seven who up and left — this uncola gang

that sits to your left is certainly free to go to Alberta where they won't have to stomach Crown corporations which provide services and benefits to all of our citizens.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MOSTOWAY: — You may be wondering why the reference to uncola or seven-up, Mr. Speaker. Seven-up has no color, too.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MOSTOWAY: — Well, Mr. Speaker, I am sure Members on this side of the House do not downgrade Saskatchewan as Conservative MLAs do. I know I speak for all New Democrats when I say, the people of this province find very disagreeable those who do not put Saskatchewan first. New Democrats put Saskatchewan first and I am sure even Liberals try to, but, then again, they come under the influence of Prime Minister Trudeau, their leader.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MOSTOWAY: — Mr. Speaker, to downgrade Saskatchewan and point to Alberta as the land of milk and honey must make Saskatchewan people wonder. Our citizens must wonder why Conservative MLAs do not like Saskatchewan. Is it because they speak for an established clique of influential people? Do Conservative MLAs in this House dislike Saskatchewan because they hate to see an NDP success story instead of an old Tory success story?

Mr. Speaker, they appear to dislike Saskatchewan. Is it because one of them has misled them into believing Saskatchewan citizens want their natural resources plundered by sinister cliques in New York, Chicago and other places, or is it because he is beholden to the Alberta Conservatives for its great financial support during the last election? I hear the money came over in truck loads.

Mr. Speaker, I love Saskatchewan. I was born and raised here. I have had the opportunity of working in six provinces and of those, I found Saskatchewan to be the best in any field of endeavor, and the reason for this is simple, it is because Saskatchewan people are the best, and I condemn those seven Conservatives opposite who do not agree with me.

Mr. Speaker, let me now turn to this Budget and its implications for the citizens of Saskatchewan and in particular the citizens of Saskatoon Centre.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MOSTOWAY: — Mr. Speaker, many of our senior citizens need a better deal, particularly in regard to pensions and supplements paid to them. In Saskatoon Centre, what with an acute housing shortage and all-too-high food prices, many senior citizens suffer in silence while the world passes them by. And while I'm at it, I hope the Federal Government includes all people between ages 60 and 64 relative to the allowance now called the Spouse's Allowance. Surely being single or widowed should not be a valid reason for not receiving this allowance.

Now, I have to express my disappointment over renters not being given some sort of relief through renters' grants. The first step of this Government, control of rents, has been taken and is welcomed by most all. All that remains now is to provide renters with grants and I will be eagerly awaiting an announcement to this effect in the near future.

And while I'm on this topic, Mr. Speaker, I must say I find it difficult to comprehend the actions of a group of large landlords in Saskatoon who claim they will oppose rent controls. Now, I ask those same citizens if such a move is wise. To propose changes is one thing but to oppose legislation passed by all Members of this House, is another thing and, I urge this group to reconsider its stand.

MR. MALONE: — . . . changed their mind.

MR. MOSTOWAY: — You've changed your mind? You're now on the side of large landlords? A little flip there and a little flop there, and mostly flops. I'm telling you, you put a Liberal tag on it every time.

MR. PENNER: — Paul, where are your glasses? Why don't you wear your glasses?

MR. MOSTOWAY: — It looks better this way, Glen. After all I am entitled to some rights.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to note that various business organizations in Saskatoon have now put down their cudgels and are now supporting the move to have the headquarters of the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan located in Saskatoon. This is a noble gesture on their part, and I welcome the change in attitude because headquarters located in Saskatoon will add much to that centre in the form of jobs and economic activity.

And further to this, locating the headquarters in Saskatoon makes sense because it is here that the Saskatchewan Research Council is located. Perhaps we have not used the services of this Council enough in the past. Perhaps we can do so in the future, particularly in regard to potash and all aspects of it.

MR. PENNER: — It's about time the Government did a little research and maybe showed . . .

MR. MOSTOWAY: — I tell you what, in the past they have done a lot of research into things pre-historic, etc. I think their latest topic was the Liberal Party.

Mr. Speaker, I know all citizens of Saskatchewan approve of this Government's drug program. I, too, believe it is an excellent program.

AN HON. MEMBER: — . . . except for when . . .

MR. MOSTOWAY: — I know that Members opposite . . . At times I think Wes would be in favor of providing free drugs, possibly sedatives, to certain Members.

I, too, believe that it is an excellent program, but I should like to suggest that serious consideration should be given to including all prescription drugs in this program, and this includes prescription vitamins — the same vitamins which can very well lead to fewer general prescriptions in the long run.

Mr. Speaker, I should like to mention that I have formally asked the Minister of Consumer Affairs to look into the despicable practice of hounding our citizens, young and old, into accepting credit cards. To me, these big companies are getting bolder and bolder. They must be stopped cold, even though such a move, to prevent these large companies from hounding our citizens into accepting credit cards will be opposed by Members opposite, and we all know why.

Now, this, in turn, leads me to another area which probably comes under the jurisdiction of that same department which, incidentally, has done and is still doing excellent work on behalf of the citizens of Saskatchewan. I am referring — yes Consumer Affairs — I am referring to what I feel should be more Department of Consumer Affairs involvement in further protecting consumers. To me . . .

AN HON. MEMBER: — . . . department . . .

MR. MOSTOWAY: — Absolutely, Mr. Minister, an excellent department, taken over by an excellent man and given to him by an excellent man.

But, to me, too many people get raw deals. Particularly in dealing with larger and/or outside the province companies. Too many of our citizens are no match for some of the shysters who operate in this province, and I should like to see more government involvement in informing our citizens as to their rights of consumer protection.

Mr. Speaker, I know all citizens in Saskatchewan are concerned with traffic safety. In this regard, I believe, no one can be over taught. We need constant reminders as to the proper rules for pedestrians and car riders.

Now I will be the first to admit that many schools are directly involved with traffic safety, and this is good. However, I think that, as a general rule, we can assume that many of our children are not aware of the rules of traffic — pedestrian or vehicle. Therefore, and keeping in mind that young minds are very impressionable, I should like to see more direction and input from the Department of Education in promoting more awareness in traffic safety with our children.

MR. TCHORZEWSKI: — Hear, hear!

MR. MOSTOWAY: — The Hon. Member says hear, hear! That to me is an indication that he will do something about it, and I know he will, because his record is excellent. But, this is not to say that many good and dedicated teachers have not been teaching this in the past because I know they have. It's just that I believe that traffic safety is too important to leave to chance.

Mr. Speaker, I certainly hope this Government has seriously

considered a very thorough and quick study relative to the possibility of a flu epidemic in the future. I believe many citizens want to know more on the subject, and I, for one, along with certain other citizens, urge the Government to be prepared should this epidemic spread.

Mr. Speaker, I am not now going to point fingers at the Federal or Provincial Government over the decision to delay the implementation of a Family Court in Saskatoon. I would not stoop so low. However, I wish to say that many are disappointed and hope that differences can be worked out. I say this because these courts are a must if we are to try and prevent and heal family break-ups. God only knows the misery that these break-ups cause, particularly to the young. Therefore, I say on behalf of many, we are anxiously awaiting a Family Court system to be set up. There is precious little time left if we are to try and alleviate suffering and misery.

Mr. Speaker, I have one more concern I should like to say a few words on and that is public urban transportation. I know much has been done by the provincial and municipal governments involved but, I believe, much more will have to be done in light of probable drastic increases in gasoline and oil prices. I believe all governments should be doing all they can to induce people to leave their cars at home, if possible, and walk or utilize public transportation.

MR. PENNER: — Would you walk home on Friday night?

MR. MOSTOWAY: — Would I walk home? Well, I probably would if I relied on Liberals to pick me up.

But this will probably mean more buses, better service, and consequently, more money to be spent. But I believe that more money that might be spent in this area, will be a good move in the right direction for it will really save all citizens money in the long run.

One last point, Mr. Speaker, and that is that quite a number of citizens in Saskatoon have expressed deep concern over the possibility of a nuclear plant being set up in the Saskatoon area. From what I can gather, most want nothing to do with such a venture unless there are iron-clad guarantees that nothing can go wrong, and, this, I believe, cannot be done. Mr. Speaker, we in Saskatoon don't want a nuclear plant and all its implications.

AN HON. MEMBER: — . . . another Romanian tractor plant?

MR. MOSTOWAY: — Yes, I think we'll settle for another Romanian tractor plant again. That's two, Mr. Minister, I believe.

Mr. Speaker, I have spoken a few words in reply to this fair and just Budget. If I were foolhardy, I would vote against it.

Mr. Speaker, I will be voting in favour of this Budget.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. R.A. LARTER: (Estevan) — Mr. Speaker, you know when I was in the caucus room I rehearsed my speech exactly the way the Hon. Member gave it. But when I get out here I know that both the Government Members and the official Opposition have been going at us here now for 47 out of 59 days and we are getting kind of a complex. And I knew my speech off by heart; but I am going to read it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. LARTER: — The Minister of Finance has just presented his first Budget and there is no doubt that he feels this is a Budget that meets the test of responsible leadership. We do not agree.

In the first part of his Budget he mentions and I quote:

The first is immediate and urgent needs to join the national effort, however hollow it might be in the fight against inflation.

And the second he quotes is a longer term but equally urgent need:

to develop a stable, secure and rewarding economic future for the people of Saskatchewan. This Budget meets these needs for responsible leadership.

And again we do not agree. The Progressive Conservative Party does not believe that this Government has given any more than lip service and a very little effort towards curbing inflation. As a matter of fact, it is as feeble an effort of curbing galloping inflation as the socialist Liberals have shown in Ottawa. I speak, of course, of the complete lack of positive action on the part of this Government and the federal Liberals in starting their housekeeping at home, right in government. There should be a positive move in cutting government spending and a planned control over an ever increasing bureaucratic society. This Government is not fighting inflation but rather aiding and abetting it. The Minister mentions a secure and rewarding economy for the people of Saskatchewan. This Government's idea of rewards is nationalizing this province, taking over all resource industries, oil, potash, uranium, coal, etc. and have everyone responsible to the state. This we say is morally wrong.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. LARTER: — Soon almost everyone in this province will owe their hearts and souls to a socialist government. Some reward! Some responsible leadership! We appreciate the fact that you do have some basis in blaming the federal Liberals for much of the shortcomings of our economy. We do not, however, believe that they are the entire cause of all of our ills. And this Government must accept responsibility in contributing to an ever growing civil service, huge government spending, ill-advised decisions on entering into the potash industry and a general lack of leadership in contributing to a festering inflation. No, Mr. Speaker, we do not agree that this is a balanced budget either.

After close examination of this Budget and after examination of past budgets and the overspending habits of this

Government, it soon becomes apparent that, indeed, this could very well become a deficit Budget. In fact, a possibility of being the largest deficit Budget in Saskatchewan history.

This, of course, is the first Budget Debate that the provincial Progressive Conservative Party has participated in in this province for many years. And any illusions that we have had concerning facts we would receive and illusions of receiving the whole story of the financial situation and financial plans for the province are fast disappearing. I can say personally that I am totally amazed at the way the Minister of Finance can lay a document in front of the people of Saskatchewan and proceed to tell them that this is the way it is. Mr. Speaker, I say that this isn't the way it is. I say that when you are playing with facts and figures that belong to the people of Saskatchewan, when you are laying these facts and figures in front of the people of Saskatchewan you should start true to begin with.

How can he estimate, or any financial budget come close to representing what is going on when these figures start out wrong? I personally have never seen a document which covered up so many things and hides so many facts as this little blue book of Estimates. How could a Minister stand there and tell the people of this province that they are reducing the number of civil servants and in fact they are transferring them on paper only in almost every department? Transferring them, Mr. Speaker, from administration and personal services to other personal services or other expenses. And I refer you to a number of pages where this is the most glaring, in the book on Estimates, and that's on page 12, 25, 37, 40, 44, 48, 49, 50, 70 and 90, for the most glaring examples of this.

A complete cover-up on the part of the Government in an attempt to convince the people that they are, indeed, trying to cut government spending. No, Mr. Speaker, not only am I convinced that this is, as the Hon. Member for Nipawin said, the biggest con job ever performed by a Minister of Finance, not only in not telling the people the way it is to the people of the province, but, in my opinion, not even setting his own backbenchers straight on the true facts.

The Minister of Finance may have been able to do a temporary selling job in the newspapers and other media and a temporary selling job on some of the people of the province, but, Mr. Speaker, the hospital boards, the school boards and all levels of municipal government know the facts and this Government has just done a job of transferring huge financial obligations to working people of Saskatchewan in the way of projected huge increased mill rates and at the same time not making any attempt to curb government capital expenditures such as on new buildings, to house the ever growing number of civil servants.

The size of government, Mr. Speaker, has grown so much that it now takes around 20 per cent of our entire budget to pay the civil servants and all expenses related to it, including places to house them.

Also the lack of planning which is showing up in huge increases in power and gas and telephones, increases in every type of service which is offered to the public through a growing monopoly. No, Mr. Speaker, the people of Saskatchewan do know or will know that your entries into the oil business and into

the potash business has indeed cost them and cost them dearly. Never has a government in Canada ventured, and I have said this before, on such an irresponsible trip into dreamland with the taxpayers' money.

You know, Mr. Speaker, I think when all new MLAs are elected or when they are running for office they probably made the same promises I did when urging people to support me and that is that I would, if elected, support good legislation, oppose legislation which would interfere with the individual's freedom and rights in our province.

Mr. Speaker, I must report to the people of this province that having sat in the legislature since last November 12th, I have not seen good legislation and I, therefore, must tell the people of Saskatchewan, that I cannot support the actions of this Government. In fact, its record is so bad in interfering with the rights of individuals and perpetrating acts which will mortgage the future of everyone in this province, that there is no way that I can support a government which has so completely discarded the welfare of its people.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to touch on the resource industries. We have mentioned on numerous occasions that the resources of this province belong to the people. This seems to be one point we can agree on. It is in the development of these resources where we part company.

The Government insists that the multinationals have been ripping us off for years and have taken the profits from our resources and in comparison the people of Saskatchewan have received very little. Mr. Speaker, I agree wholeheartedly that this is the case, but then who, Mr. Speaker who is at fault? Is it the PCs? No, it couldn't be the PCs, they haven't been around long enough to give away a free lunch. Was it the Libs and the NDPs? You bet your bottom dollar it was.

There are only two parties that have given anything away in this province. We have said the NDP were the party that were poor negotiators. I was wrong. Both the Liberals and the NDP are guilty of lousy negotiations with the bad multinationals and it is these two parties that have performed all of the giveaways. Rather than learn from their inability to negotiate and negotiate hard for their clients and that's the people of Saskatchewan, they are saying, no, we are not going to play anymore. No negotiations, game over. We are going to develop our own resources. Oh, we might be slow, we might slow it down to 50 years or more, but we'll do it.

Mr. Speaker, this narrow minded, tunnel vision, tone deaf attitude to what really should be done in the resource industry in this province has done to this province exactly what NDP stands for, No Darn Production.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!!

MR. LARTER: — Saskatchewan has as many resources or more than most provinces, but this multinational complex that they have, means that there is no chance for investment dollars and no way will this province ever be entrusted again to handle this investment. Indeed these chosen few have undoubtedly hurt investment speculation in all of Canada.

Negotiation, this Government doesn't know what the word means. Confrontation, now that's our bag.

The oil industry is in a similar category. However, the Government has changed its direction slightly and the price of new oil is just not that bad as it was. However, the climate remains the same and who knows later if what you give to the companies on Monday, you'll be taking away on Friday. This is what is keeping exploration to a minimum.

This province could be the most vibrant, exciting and forward moving of any province in Canada, if we could just change the management, or I should say the mismanagement.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. LARTER: — I mentioned the resources as they, with agriculture are the key in bringing about the finest tax base for Saskatchewan and to give us a good surplus in future budgets. Dollars to do the things we dream about and talk about for our senior citizens. Dollars to build the types of communities, the type of educational systems, hospitals, nursing homes, at prices the taxpayer can afford to pay.

Mr. Speaker, these are not dreams. If we could just change the management and the board of directors, all of these dreams could become a reality.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to touch for a minute on highways. Some time ago I was in a controversy on the highways in our area. This controversy, and I have to bring this out because it does affect the people of our area and I certainly would not want to be personally responsible for anything that happened in the future to our roads in that area.

I should like to bring a light on what really happened in that area and that is on Highway 18. The equipment was moved in just before the election, about \$1 million to \$2 million worth of equipment and they worked on that 4.6 miles of road for five months. That 4.6 miles of highway is not finished yet. At no time did I criticize the foreman or any of the experienced men on that project. They are good men, lots of them were stolen from private contractors and they are real good road building people. But what I did object to was the fact that you take \$1 million or \$2 million worth of iron and run ten to 12 trainees all summer long at half loads, half speed, in a province where the building of roads, we do have such short seasons and it was this that got the ire of the taxpayer up in that area where these going through the motions of building a highway on a training program. Certainly the program, the Saskatchewan Government has put on for the past few years, where they train the operators in the winter on the basics of road building is to be commended. But to take ten people out or ten or 12 trainees and end up the summer, five months, with only four or five people on the job. Every contractor in Saskatchewan will tell you that there is only one way to do that, you train them in the winter and give one operator to each contractor in the summer and he'll either be a road builder inside of a month or a month and a half or he won't be around. But this isn't the case with government building roads. These fellows or gals are around all summer long and they might never become operators. This is why the criticism was levelled against the

Department of Highways. It was used as a training program, not as a road building construction crew.

Mr. Speaker, I should like to mention a little about the surtax. I too believe that this is a slap in the face to the people of Saskatchewan. It's a condemnation of anyone who has tried to work themselves into a little better state of their life. I believe you are attacking everyone. You are attacking everyone. You are attacking the farmers, the teachers and it is not accomplishing all that much.

Mr. Speaker, I will support the amendment, but I will not support the Motion.

MR. G.H. PENNER: (Saskatoon Eastview) — Mr. Deputy Speaker, I'm pleased to have the opportunity to resume the comments that I began yesterday. I must say that I was so impressed by the remarks from the Member for Saskatoon Centre (Mr. Mostoway) that I want to ask him what it is he intends to do next year?

MR. MOSTOWAY: — Teach.

MR. PENNER: — My response to that would be, where?

The remarks that he made lead me to think, Mr. Deputy, that if he is unable to find a job teaching that he will at least have a good opportunity to get a job writing some kind of a nursery rhyme or something. He did a good job this afternoon relieving some drivel about motherhood, nothing very much in the way of substance. I was interested in the remarks, Mr. Speaker, of the Member for Regina Victoria (Mr. Baker). He did it ever so gently, but he slapped the Government in the face for what they were unable to do for municipal governments in the province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. PENNER: — Mr. Speaker, before I get into a continuation of where I was yesterday in dealing with the matter of education and how it is proceeded with, in this Budget Speech, I'd like to digress for a moment and make some remarks about the bills that were introduced recently by the Member for Weyburn (Mr. Pepper) with regard to the drinking age. I want to say that I intend fully to support those bills and I urge all Members to do so. I hope that the fact that the Member for Weyburn and the Government in general have stolen the idea after we ran the flag up a little bit, is not simply political gamesmanship, but that in fact, those bills will get through second reading. That in fact, those bills will not be put in the name, eventually, of a Member of the Cabinet and then stood off the Order Paper. I hope that's not what they are going to do, Mr. Speaker, because I think that those bills represent a true social issue and a true social concern and I look forward to the day, Mr. Speaker, when each Member of this House will have to stand and be counted in his vote on the issue.

Mr. Speaker, I was saying yesterday that in my opinion this Budget represents very little more than an explanation by the Minister of Finance that the problems that we have that are

related to inflation can be blamed on the Federal Government and that he has taken the problem and dumped it and any solution to it on to local governments. I suggested that the Budget represents a cop-out and I was explaining, using education as an example, why I felt that way. Just to review where we were, we're looking at grant increases to schools in the Kindergarten to 12 program of something under 20 per cent. It's about 19.3 or 19.6 per cent. And when one looks at that on first blush as I'm sure the Member for Saskatoon Buena Vista (Mr. Rolfes) has done, on first blush, that looks pretty good. Because Members of the Government can go out to the people of Saskatchewan and say, well, we increased the grant 20 per cent. But in order for them to tell a true story they are going to have to tell the people of Saskatchewan that that money is going to do nothing more than cover the increased costs of the teachers' salaries in this coming year.

Now, my colleague from Regina Lakeview says, "If that," and that's true, because we don't know what the teacher salary settlement is going to be yet.

It's going to be a situation this year, Mr. Speaker, where for the first time that's all that the grant is going to cover. And all of the other cost increases that school boards have to face related to paper supplies and text books and audio visual hardware, maintenance, repair, transportation, increased costs in power and electricity and telephone, that the Government opposite has arbitrarily placed on everybody in Saskatchewan. That those kinds of things are really not going to be a part of the increased grant that is being made available to school boards.

As my colleague for Maple Creek indicated earlier this afternoon, the increased grant that is going to be made available to schools is calculated on a mill rate that has gone from 41 last year to 46.5 this year. A tremendous increase in the computational mill rate. School boards are very likely to have to exceed that, Mr. Speaker, and so what has happened with regard to the matter of educational funding or educational grants in this Budget clearly indicates that the majority of the load is going to have to be picked up at the local level.

Mr. Speaker, in his Budget Address the Minister of Finance patted himself and the Government on the back for having increased school grants since 1971 by a total of 11 per cent of the amount expended in education. He makes that sound like a great step forward. But he fails to mention that since 1971 the Government has taken over complete control of the negotiating of teachers' salaries. That alone takes up between 60 and 70 per cent of a school board's budget. Professional salaries are by far the greatest expenditure the school boards incur and so, Mr. Speaker, on the one hand we have a government boasting about the fact that it provides 58 per cent of expenditures in education and yet on the other hand the Government directly controls an expenditure far in excess of that because we have provincial bargaining of teachers' salaries.

Mr. Speaker, we have in the Budget for spending in education an amount of money that will do nothing more than pay the increased salary costs the boards must accept and which they have little say in determining. And as I said before, in order for the level of educational services and the quality of education provided in this province to remain the same as it was in

1975, there will be extensive mill rate increases borne by the local taxpayer.

In effect, Mr. Speaker, what has happened is this. Because the Government took over teacher salaries, because the Government forced the mandatory agreement on teachers two years ago, because the Government was unprepared to re-open negotiations with teachers, despite the fact that every possible indicator said that teachers' salaries were not in line with other employee groups, because of all these factors, Mr. Speaker, what this Budget does is ask school boards in Saskatchewan to pick up a greater share of the cost of funding education in all areas other than teachers' salaries. There will be some school units, because of the way the mill rate is set and the way the assessment is set, Mr. Speaker, where the grant increases won't even come close to covering the increased cost of teachers' salaries.

Mr. Speaker, I want to say a word about spending at the university level as well. The Minister of Finance talked of a 14 per cent increase in funding to the university campuses in Saskatoon and in Regina. While I understand the need for restraint and accept the fact that restraint is required, I know as I'm sure Members opposite know, that 14 per cent is not going to cover the increased costs of that operation. What this Budget means is that if universities are going to continue to operate at the level in which they operated in 1975, then student fees are going to have to be increased and it is going to cost more for each client to obtain whatever it is that a university provides.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that the Government, particularly the Minister of Education (Mr. Tchorzewski) is taking a pretty hard look at what is happening with the two universities in Saskatchewan. If we assume that there is only a certain amount of money available for spending at the post-secondary level and then look at the population of the province and examine priorities with regard to how that money ought to be spent, it's my view that duplicating facilities is questionable. I recognize that there are some colleges where duplication can take place without any real difficulty, in the general arts field and possibly in education and there may be some others. However, I am convinced, Mr. Speaker, that to duplicate expensive colleges like Engineering, Law, and Medicine and some of the other disciplines even within the field of arts, is not necessary, that it is a waste of money and that it will in the final analysis dilute the quality that Saskatchewan is able to offer through its post-secondary educational systems.

I know that that is an unpopular kind of move politically. But I am convinced that Saskatchewan hasn't got room for two full universities and that if there is room for another post-secondary school that it ought to be of a liberal arts college and stay at that level.

Mr. Speaker, let me turn for a few moments to the field of health. I feel I have some understanding of the health field since I have sat as a hospital board member for three years and I want to point out that I concur with the remarks of my colleague from Indian Head-Wolseley (Mr. MacDonald) who pointed out that this Budget suggests an increase in health expenditure of 15 per cent, not 25 per cent as was suggested by the Minister of Finance in his Budget Speech. Mr. Speaker., it clearly suggests a reduction in the services provided to the people of Saskatchewan in the health care field. An increase of 15 per cent in

the amount of money spent, but a reduction in the services that will be available. Mr. Speaker, I was astounded at the response given last week in the House to a question from the Member for Saskatoon-Sutherland (Mrs. Edwards) by the Minister of Health when he suggested in effect that hospital boards make the decisions about the quality of services they are going to provide,

I am surprised at the statement, Mr. Speaker, because it is misleading. Anyone involved in the health care field in this province is aware that the money that is available to hospital boards is money provided by SHSP. Anyone involved in the health care field is aware of the fact that this is a year of line by line budget assessment for hospitals in Saskatchewan. Anyone involved in health in Saskatchewan, Mr. Speaker, is aware of the fact that it is that line by line scrutiny that is creating the situation where hospitals in Saskatchewan are being forced to cut back seriously the staff component in their institutions. The March 27th issue of the Saskatoon Star-Phoenix has a story in which the chairman of the University Hospital Board points this out very clearly.

The article says and I quote, Mr. Speaker:

Hospital Board Chairman Cliff Wright said in a prepared statement released Friday afternoon that SHSP officials visited the hospital on three separate occasions in February to outline the extent of their requests for staff reductions. Hospital officials repeatedly stressed concern about the effects of cutbacks on hospital operations and teaching programs.

In the same edition of the Star-Phoenix there was an article describing a speech made by the Minister of Health to the Saskatchewan Union of Nurses and in it a nurse from Saskatoon City Hospital is quoted as asking the Minister of Health if he was aware of what this is really going to do to the heavy workload that nurses are already under. The article says:

She said the workloads are so heavy that they are starting to jeopardize the nurses' health and the patients are already beginning to suffer from the nurses' heavy workload.

If you add those kinds of things, Mr. Speaker, to a statement that was made to me by a doctor in a grocery store in Saskatoon on the weekend, when he said, "When in the world are they going to get to the point of realizing that we have tightened up as far as we can tighten up. It is going to take an accident before people wake up."

Mr. Speaker, hospitals in Saskatchewan, by and large, in the last few years have done everything possible to make their operations more efficient and more effective. It has been my experience that hospitals have not only accepted the fact that there is no bottomless pit from which money from health can be obtained, but have come to grips with making their institutions among the most efficient and the most effective that there are.

The average hospital stay has been cut down appreciably over the last few years, and rightly so. There is no point in having an acute bed used by someone when there are others who need it worse. There is no reason why long recuperation periods should be taken up in the hospital when they can be taken up just as well at home.

Mr. Speaker, I am concerned about where the breaking point is because hospitals have done well in cutting down their average patient stay, because they have become more efficient in the way they employ their staff, because they have cut back on their staff. This Budget, in effect, is going to ask them to do it even more.

Mr. Speaker, I was disappointed when I wrote this speech thinking that I was going to be able to deliver it all yesterday and what I said was that I invite the Minister of Health to get up and tell us on what basis he feels that further cuts can be made. Where is the breaking point? And I was disappointed when he spoke this afternoon that he didn't address himself to that at all.

While I am on the matter of health care, Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Finance boasts in his Budget about the fact that there will be no hospital doors that will be closed. And that may be very true, but he didn't say, as he should have said, that there will be hospital beds closed, that there will be more hospital beds closed this summer because of slowdowns, than has been the case in the past, because hospital boards throughout the province don't have any other choice.

MR. ROLFES: — Oh, come on.

MR. PENNER: — The Minister of Social Services says, oh, come on. He ought to go down and take a look, Mr. Speaker, at what in fact is going on in hospitals. Hospital boards across this province are not cutting the staff because they like to; they are not cutting their staffs because they think they have been overstaffed all these years. They are cutting their staffs because the money isn't there to pay them.

Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Health and other Members of the Government have a right to ask: do we have a solution? We have been critical about the amount of money that you are allotting for health and we are saying that it is not enough and yet you are saying that there isn't any more money in the pot. Mr. Speaker . . .

MR. ROLFES: . . . deterrent fees.

MR. PENNER: — Well, I am going to tell you one thing, Mr. Minister. When we see a statement in the Budget that says that we have cut out all those premiums and we are saving the taxpayers \$11.8 million, that is bunk. It doesn't make any difference whether I pay it out of the front pocket or whether I pay it out of the back one. But there is no such thing as free anything in this province. That is a myth that you have perpetrated on the people of this province and I think that the people of Saskatchewan may soon begin to wake up to the fact that that is true.

Now, Mr. Speaker, if I could conclude my remarks about health. I was surprised this afternoon that the Minister did not get up and talk about one of the solutions to the increasing costs in health. And if there is a solution it is not in closing beds; it is not in ignoring the fact that there are people who need the care; it is not in turning our back on the health care system; it is not in letting the health care system slide

and deteriorate like it is in this province, but it is to face up to it squarely and to begin to take a look at what rationalization will do. Now there has been a start that has been made but it has been very slow. And if we are going to do anything, at all with regard to health care in this province, Mr. Speaker it seems to me that it has to be in the area of rationalization

The Minister of Health got up this afternoon and defended the Budget and talked about participation and preventive health implementation and I agree with him, but I wish at the same that he would have addressed himself to the matter of rationalization and what that can do to the effective spending of dollars in the field of health.

Mr. Speaker, I want to spend a few moments dealing with what this Budget does for municipal governments in Saskatchewan I expect that most Members opposite would be hoping that I have very little to say and I must confess in terms of what this Budget does for municipal governments in Saskatchewan that is pretty close to being right because what it does can be summed up in one word and that word is, nothing.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. PENNER: — I have overstated the case, Mr. Speaker. There are a couple of things that were done. The grants to libraries were increased. A small portion of the Budget and you can increase a small amount by a big amount, but in terms of the overall spending it doesn't have very much effect.

We have heard about police grants and I have heard two or three Members opposite talk about the additional \$1 million in the police grant.

I don't know whether the Member for Victoria is, I think he is a member of the Regina Police Commission, I don't know whether he has figured out the funding under the new formula this year, but I know that in Saskatoon the Police Commission has figured out the funding under the formula provided by the Government. And the whole \$1 million will go to Saskatoon.

Now it seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that there are likely some other police forces in the province that expect that they are going to get a little bit of an increase, but you use the Government formula, you plug in the figures that the Government says you are supposed to plug in and the increase that the Budget provides is all going to go to Saskatoon because that is what the formula says we have to have.

Mr. Speaker, municipal governments are receiving no relief at all from the Provincial Government insofar as the property taxes are concerned.

The Budget rationalizes or recognizes no additional costs to municipal governments in their 1975 operation aside from the two that I mentioned.

Mr. Speaker, the Government continues to put pressure on the most regressive tax that we have in this province, the property tax. And I expect that if local governments use the maximum amount of restraints, I say the maximum amount of restraint, in determining their programs and the services that

they are going to provide to people in 1976, that there will be a 15 to 20 per cent increase in budgets at the local level to retain last year's level of services.

If local governments decide that they want to improve the calibre of services and the calibre of programs provided at the local level, then the increase in the expenditure and the increase in the tax rates will be higher than that.

Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Municipal Affairs has not yet spoken and I expect that he will, I hope that he will. I hope that his defence of his portion of the Budget will be a good deal better than his defence of the changes of load limits on trucks on municipal roads, a defence, Mr. Speaker, that was based on a lack of understanding of what had been asked and what the real concern was; a defence that was based on punishing the trucking industry; punishing new concepts in grain transportation similar, Mr. Speaker, to what I think he may have to say with regard to municipal financing.

What this Budget has done is punish local government, punish cities, punish towns, but more important he has punished the people who live in them.

When it comes to services at the local level and programs at the local level, I don't think that the people of Saskatchewan want, in 1976 any more than they had in 1975. I am convinced that the people of Saskatchewan are interested in restraints. I don't think that they want to have the expenditures go up any more; I don't think they want the level of service any better than it was last year. We have to face that if we are going to have the same level of services that we had last year it is going to cost 18 to 20 per cent more. Because of what has happened to the cost of materials to build roads, the cost of materials to lay sewers, the cost of materials to build sidewalks, the costs to pay people who work at the municipal level.

Those of you who read the newspaper have read quotes from people who are involved in local government. You have read a quotation from the mayor of Saskatoon and you know what the situation is in Regina; you have heard what the situation is in Moose Jaw and in other communities.

Mr. Speaker, I have two hopes. The first is that despite the fact that this Government gives every appearance of buckling under the pressure of big labor with regard to anti-inflation, since in effect it has invited people to strike if they are unhappy with the way wage settlements are going. The Government having taken what appears to be that course of action, I hope, Mr. Speaker, it will not, for if it does it will be ignoring that attitude of the common person and will make my prediction with regard to tax increases at the local level being in the range of 15 to 20 per cent look very small.

My second hope, Mr. Speaker, is that before we are finished with Estimates the Government will have seen the light with regard to the problems faced by municipal governments in Saskatchewan and like it did last year, place more money into that which is available to be passed down to municipal governments. It may not, because the Minister of Municipal Affairs, yesterday, in question period said that he didn't think that would happen. And it is understandable because last year, of course,

was an election year and when the Budget came down the Government had completely misread what had happened to the costs at the local level. They had heard what had happened to tax rates with communities that set them early and so because it was an election year they came through with a little bit more. I really don't think they will do that this year, Mr. Speaker, but I hope that they will take a pretty hard look and take a pretty good reading about what is happening to the tax rates at the local level.

Mr. Speaker, I want to take a few moments on the matter of housing. I want to say at the outset, Mr. Speaker, that when I heard the Minister of Finance make his speech last week, when he got to the matter of housing I didn't know whether I should laugh or whether I ought to be sick. Mr. Speaker, he talks about the increase in housing starts between now and 1971 and he ends off his little statement by saying, we are proud of our record. In effect what he is saying is that the credit for the growth that has taken place in communities in Saskatchewan is credit that belongs to the Government of Saskatchewan.

I say, Mr. Speaker, that that simply doesn't represent what happened. If he had even gone so far as to say, we accept our portion of the credit, it might have been a little bit more realistic. To say that the change that came about in the economy of this province between 1969, 1970, 1971 and now, is a result of the economic planning of this Government, is unadulterated nonsense. For the most part the growth, the economic buoyancy that this province has come to know has been in spite of, not because of, the policies of the Government opposite. A long list could be developed, Mr. Speaker, of things that this Government has done which, in fact, would suggest that they are not interested in the development of this province and they have forced out investment and because of their policies they have forced people in small businesses to change head office locations to take them out of Saskatchewan and put them elsewhere.

No, Mr. Speaker, if there is any credit due to the fact that there has been an increase in housing in Saskatchewan and that credit is due to people at the local level. For the Provincial Government to take the credit in this matter, Mr. Speaker, doesn't really represent in my view the facts and it is not far removed from an attitude that takes credit when it rains and takes credit when the sun shines.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, I want to say that in my opinion this Budget does not represent the priorities of the people of Saskatchewan. The people of Saskatchewan are finding it very difficult, on the one hand to know that we have money for potash and money for oil and money for office buildings, and on the other hand they have to have cutbacks in services and cutbacks in money available to relieve the local property tax burden. And for those reasons, Mr. Speaker, I will not support the Motion, but will support the amendment.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

HON. E.L. TCHORZEWSKI (Minister of Education) — Mr. Speaker, we now have heard a typical example of contradiction that we have seen displayed by Members opposite in this debate. We hear the Member for Saskatoon Eastview talk about the fact that people are interested in restraints and I

agree with him. And that is why this Government has introduced at this time a very responsible Budget. At the same time talking about the need for government to spend more money as he talks about the need to reduce expenditures, clearly indicate the kind of contradiction and the kind of lack of reasonable points to criticize that the Members find themselves in, in this particular debate.

Mr. Speaker, during this past month as the news of budgets brought in by provinces across Canada was reported, some very grim legacies of Liberal and Conservative governments were being established throughout Canada. We have heard of major tax increases in British Columbia and in Newfoundland. Medicare premiums in Alberta are being increased to \$179 for a family of four — one of the richest provinces in Canada. In Saskatchewan there are no medicare premiums. Hospitals were being shut down wholesale all over Ontario. Alberta was forecasting a \$31 million deficit. School grants in Alberta were increased by 11.7 per cent compared to Saskatchewan's 20 per cent increase.

So, Mr. Speaker, in the midst of these results of years of poor planning by Tories and Liberals, the Budget introduced by our Minister of Finance, Mr. Smishek, stands out like a star to be followed.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. TCHORZEWSKI: — It represents good planning, it represents foresight in the past and now, a plan of action put together by a careful analysis of priorities that assures the optimum services to Saskatchewan people.

Our Minister of Finance must be commended for the outstanding job that he has done in putting together and presenting this Budget during these difficult times and I congratulate him for it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. TCHORZEWSKI: — Mr. Speaker, the spokesmen for the Opposition parties have tried in vain to find some reasonable criticisms to make in this debate. Their desperate attempts have once again, as I indicated earlier, resulted in proving to Saskatchewan people that their approach is one of inconsistency, contradiction and hypocrisy.

In one breath they demand more money for all areas one at a time. In the next breath they shout, cut expenditures and reduce taxes. As stated in the Budget Speech, the cumulative effect of their demands since last November would have imposed on the taxpayers of Saskatchewan an additional burden of \$300 to \$400 million.

Now Saskatchewan people have known for a long time that what Liberals say cannot be believed. They cannot be trusted, and their promises are meaningless. The range of proven examples is a pretty broad one and a pretty long one, from constituency gerrymanders to prescription drug plan promises that were never delivered.

But there now has appeared a new shadow over the political

scene of Saskatchewan. After a long period of absence from the Liberal-Conservative team, the Conservatives have joined again in the two old line party coalition. I say a shadow, Mr. Speaker, all because for awhile some people thought the Tory presence was a new light beginning to shine. Unfortunately that flicker has been tramped out by the Leader of the Conservative Party in his actions which led up to the delay in the presentation of this Budget.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. TCHORZEWSKI: — His over-ruling the Conservative caucus agreement to have the Budget on March 12 — an agreement — a promise made in good faith, has shown that Conservatives also cannot be trusted.

The people of Saskatchewan now know that any promise made by the Conservative Leader cannot be depended on. When the opportunity presents itself to make some personal political gain the Conservative Party would break any promise at any time.

So now the Liberal shadow of contradiction and untrustworthiness has been joined and broadened by the Conservative presence.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. TCHORZEWSKI: — Mr. Speaker, this Budget stands in sharp contrast to the deep recession of Liberal years and the economy elsewhere in Canada today. I say to the Members opposite that this is so because of good management — management by an NDP Government. Management that has guaranteed that the people receive the benefits of our prosperity. Liberals and Conservatives are satisfied with prosperity alone — the NDP assures that the prosperity is shared by all of the people. We are interested in assuring that economic prosperity brings about social prosperity. That is why in this Budget increase of 11 per cent it has been possible to provide larger increases in some areas of major priority.

That is why school grants are being increased by 20 per cent; Health budget increased by 25 per cent, compared to the increases in Alberta of 11 per cent. That is why universities' operating grants increased by 14 per cent; capital grants to schools up by 41 per cent; and highways up by 20 per cent.

Opposition Members have asked for increased expenditures, for reduced government spending and for reduced taxes. That's a pretty broad field — almost too difficult for the Members opposite to grasp as a whole, so I challenge just one of them who hasn't spoken yet, any one of them, to indicate where in these areas that I have mentioned they would cut those expenditures that I talk about.

Mr. Speaker, the Budget reflects again the high priority this Government gives to education. This is a high priority because we view education as an investment — and a good investment. Total operating grants will be increased from \$140,231,000 in 1975 to \$167,966,250 in 1976. This is an increase of \$27.8 million, or nearly 20 per cent. In 1976, Mr. Speaker, these operating grants and the property improvement grant will provide

71.6 per cent of all anticipated school costs. Most of the grants will be distributed to school boards through the foundation grant formula. This formula was devised and implemented for the first time in 1972. Each year it is updated, but its basic principles and objectives remain the same. They are:

1. To make it possible for each school system to provide a desirable and realistic level and range of programs and services without an unduly high local tax rate. To do this, the variation in expenditure requirements and local ability to pay are taken into account so as to equalize the total financial resources available to each school system.
2. To enable a retention of full local autonomy is another objective of the foundation grant formula. Grants are paid unconditionally. It is possible for school boards to set their own priorities and establish levels of expenditure they feel are appropriate without being either rewarded or penalized for their particular choice or choices. Gone are the times not so long ago when a Liberal formula existed based on a pupil-teacher ratio.
3. Mr. Speaker, to avoid undue hardships for school systems affected by circumstances beyond their control, such as large increases or decreases in enrolments, requirements for major capital projects, major changes in cost patterns and so on, these situations are dealt with by various features of the formula such as sparsity factors, enrolment drop factors, recognition of capital debt retirement, special recognition for handicapped students and other matters as well.

The major features of the 1976 formula and there have been some major changes that will be of great benefit to school boards and students throughout Saskatchewan. Some of those features are:

The recognized per pupil expenditures have been increased by 20 per cent for Division III and by 24 per cent for all other types of students as requested by the Saskatchewan School Trustees Association.

Recognized expenditures for pupil transportation has been increased by over 14 per cent.

Recognized expenditures for board and room and/or transportation for handicapped students has been increased by 20 per cent.

The formula includes provision for the recognition of certain payments made by school boards for the rental of community facilities. So that facilities that exist in communities can be used for the purposes of education and utilized therefore throughout the day.

The computational mill rates in the formula have been increased by six mills.

The combination of increases in recognized expenditures along with increases in computational mill rates will increase school grants to school boards by almost \$28 million, thereby maintaining the province's share of school costs at the 1975 level of approximately 57 per cent. I think that this is a real accomplishment in a year of restraint.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. TCHORZEWSKI: — Mr. Speaker, in the area of capital grants:

The total capital grants will be increased from \$8.3 million in 1975 to \$11,915,000 in 1976. This is an increase of \$3.5 million or 42.7 per cent in capital grants to our school boards. Mr. Speaker, we have not stopped at these major inputs to school boards of funds during this period of restraint.

MR. SPEAKER: — Order! If the Member would allow me to interrupt him so that I can carry out some routine procedures before 5:30.

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

EVENING

MR. TCHORZEWSKI: — Mr. Speaker, when it was called 5:30 I was speaking about the Budget in the Department of Education and outlining some of the specific areas in the foundation grant formula that have been modified and changed in order to be able to meet some of the increased costs that school boards are going to be incurring in the '76-77 fiscal year. As I started to say just before 5:30, we have not stopped at these major inputs to school boards of funds during this period of restraint. Other initiatives are proposed to ensure that various needs in education are being adequately met.

The 1976-77 Budget provides for sufficient funds to establish two additional regional offices, these to be situated in Regina and Prince Albert respectively. These offices will make it possible for the department to meet its obligations more adequately through the provision of service at the immediate level and indeed in the case of the Prince Albert office, to be able to offer consultative service as may be required by the Department of Northern Saskatchewan and to provide for the investigation and integration of the local improvement districts which lie between the boundaries of northern Saskatchewan and the organized school districts south of those.

The Budget makes provision for the establishment of additional consultative personnel at the regional offices which will have a direct impact on the quality of education that may be offered to students throughout the province. The amount provided for seconding under these arrangements is double the amount that was provided for the same arrangements in the 1975-76 budget.

The Budget makes provision for the establishment of a consultative services branch which will be responsible for the co-ordination and implementation of support services to district superintendents, principals, teachers and school systems.

Some new auditory training equipment at the School for the Deaf and the provision of video-tape recording and playback equipment to support the total communication instructional approach.

Funds to support the first phase in the development of a Department of Education Resource Centre — print and non-print materials — to support the work of the professional staff.

Substantial increases in financial support for special education.

Provision of consultative service to assist schools in metric conversion curriculum changes.

The home economics program will be examined, along with related subjects to determine whether any changes are needed in response to emerging public expectations that the school should provide students with experiences that enable them to develop 'life skills'. The Family Life Education Developmental projects will be continued with the aim of examining ways in which a school and its community can work together in developing programs that reflect local concerns. Schools will continue to be supported in their attempts to integrate into their existing programs an emphasis in such areas as consumer education, environmental education and outdoor education.

Work will continue on the development of a new physical education program for Divisions III and IV. The emphasis will be on working with school jurisdictions and communities to show how students can be given more opportunity to participate in physical education and recreational activities.

The Department will be collaborating with SaskMedia to increase the amount of appropriate resource materials for Saskatchewan schools.

SaskMedia will provide educational communication needs for rural and urban Saskatchewan by making high quality audio-visual materials available at the lowest possible cost to the citizens of Saskatchewan.

Mr. Speaker, since the last time that the Department of Continuing Education Estimates were presented to Members of this House, some very substantial and exciting changes have occurred in the field of post-secondary education in this province. At this time I should like to address myself to four of the main areas: university support; community colleges; institutes and adult education support; student assistance; and also department administration.

I want to outline briefly some of the considerations that have gone into our planning in these four areas. However, before doing so, I should like to draw to the attention of the Members the changing environment in which we find ourselves operating.

In the sixties it was a popular notion that higher education was the key to future prosperity and the universal panacea for our social ills. I welcome the fact that this myth has been dispelled, but I am concerned that the pendulum may now be swinging too far the other way.

We are experiencing an increasing demand for post-secondary courses to be directly related to the job market. Although it is an important function of the post-secondary system to provide qualified graduates for jobs in business and government, we have to ensure that we do not concentrate solely on this function and lose sight of the importance of other traditional functions of institutions of higher learning such as community service, the transmission of knowledge and the pursuit of new knowledge through research.

In a nutshell, government funding policies must reflect the real need for economic restraint and yet maintain a level of support that will not endanger the well-being of our post-secondary institutions nor diminish their ability to meet the educational needs of the people of Saskatchewan. This has been the guiding philosophy behind our funding proposals.

With the province-wide community college system now in place we are in a position to undertake some consolidation and retrenchment measures in the delivery of post-secondary programs in the province. These measures I believe will more realistically serve the needs of the people of Saskatchewan. We have in the community college network a tremendous potential for the provision of post-school educational opportunities. The colleges provide a decentralized and highly flexible mechanism to deliver a wide range of courses, including technical courses and university classes. I am not suggesting that the colleges replace existing institutions, for that is surely not the case. But, I am suggesting that we are now ready to assess and realign the delivery of some aspects of post-secondary programs.

I think we can be very proud of our institutes and vocational centres. They do an outstanding job of providing vocationally oriented programs and have co-operated very well with us in our industrial training programs. Parts of our apprenticeship programs, retraining programs and upgrading programs have had to rely on the institutes for their teaching facilities.

While this arrangement has served us well to this point in time, and I assure you we don't anticipate an immediate and dramatic change, I would suggest that the people of the province could, over time, be well served, if some aspects of manpower development, skill training and particularly upgrading programs were offered on a more accessible basis through the community colleges. I shall discuss the number of people and communities reached by the network in just the last year, a little later on. But I should like to make this point first, the cost of delivery of programs to the colleges has proven to be most economical and I predict that we will be experiencing an even greater demand for skill training and upgrading through the network. Accessibility, cost of delivery, efficiency, these all are the issues that we must address ourselves to over the next few years and I envision the emphasis will be on the provision of skill training by contract between the community colleges and the institutes.

In the case of programs already offered at an institute this will be accomplished through a college-institute contract whereby the course would be offered in the college region with the supervision and the assistance provided by the institute. This contract concept is important to ensure the standards of training are the same throughout the province. I am pleased and assured that the institutes and colleges and the universities are prepared to co-ordinate these services with efficiency, harmony and flexibility.

And I make a further point that in view of present fiscal constraints and the projected leveling off of enrolments (partly compounded by the buoyant Saskatchewan labor market) the institutes and the universities have reached a point where careful planning for further growth is a very important issue. Mr. Speaker, in order to provide the leadership and to pilot the institutions through this period of consolidation the Department itself has been undergoing some internal reorganization and consolidation.

I point out that this adjustment has been accomplished with a negligible increase in the numbers of staff and level of Department administration costs. It is our belief that we should impose on our own operation the same stringency and requirement for efficiency that we expect from the institutions or anyone else.

Permit me to digress for a moment at this time, Mr. Speaker, to acknowledge on behalf of this Legislature the distinguished public service contribution of Dr. Ray Harvey who retired as Deputy Minister in October last year.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. TCHORZEWSKI: — Mr. Speaker, Dr. Harvey has a long and admirable record of achievement in the fields of education and the public administration of this province. Largely due to his experienced leadership the transfer of responsibility for secondary education from the Department of Education to the Department of Continuing Education was orchestrated with great skill and efficiency.

A few words, Mr. Speaker, I want to make on university support. One of the important aspects of my department's responsibility and I might add, the most expensive component, is responsibility for university support. From an historical perspective, the massively increased demand for post-secondary education in the 1960s and early '70s necessitated continued growth in the levels of expenditure in this area. At the present time enrolment continues to increase but at a much more moderate pace than in the '60s. Simultaneously we are experiencing a levelling period in the economy. And in view of the current need for financial restraint in all areas of government spending, our policy of encouraging economy and consolidation in the university sector is most germane.

While it is necessary that the universities maintain an independence from government, they must, nevertheless, be accountable for their expenditures because more than 80 per cent of their operating revenue comes from the taxpayer. Rationalization, including the funding of new programs, is, of course, the concern of the Saskatchewan Universities Commission.

The Commission has now completed one full year of operation. Basically the Commission acts as a buffer between the universities and the Government. This buffer not only ensures university independence, but provides as well the insurance of maximum benefits from every tax dollar spent in the university sector.

Our specific proposals for the current year call for a 14.3 per cent increase to \$64 million in operating support to the universities. This will permit maintenance of current operations and some new program growth as well. The capital grant allotment this year will be 15.85 million dollars.

Mr. Speaker, these proposals, I believe, are indicative of our determination to maintain the standards of excellence that we have achieved at our two universities here in Saskatchewan.

The funding levels that we are proposing for the technical institutes and vocational centres will continue to ensure the

provision of highly skilled technical manpower for the Saskatchewan labor market. We are proposing a 5.5 per cent increase in funding to the technical institutes and vocational centres. We propose to spend \$18 million in this area as opposed to \$17.1 million last year.

In this period of budgetary restraint, the Government has been forced to make careful priorities in its expenditures, concomitantly ensuring training opportunities for Saskatchewan residents consistent with the need for technically skilled manpower.

Many programs are still faced with high student demand to increase their enrolment. Enrolments in others however have fallen off sharply. To a degree that is inconsistent with their original mandate. Consequently, continued support for programs with marginal demand by industry and students can no longer be justified given the other priority expenditures of government. Governments all across Canada are closely examining the priorities and benefits of programs in the post-secondary field. I think we in Saskatchewan have achieved an optimum balance. We have managed a judicious distribution of our scarce resources which ensure the continuation of high quality education to meet the demands of industry and students.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I said earlier that I wanted to make a few comments on community colleges. The Department of Continuing Education was established to develop an integrated and a comprehensive system of post-secondary education opportunities and to make them readily accessible to the people of Saskatchewan. I think our most demonstrable progress is evident in the expansion of the community college network. I am pleased to report a tremendous response by the general public during the organizational phase of the college regions. With this kind of grassroots organization the continued success of community colleges in our province is assured.

Initially in 1973-74, there were four pilot projects in operation with 12,000 adults participating. In 1974-75, six more colleges came on stream. This past year, the final three colleges began operations. Enrolment figures from last year show that 25,000 adults participated in 2,000 courses in over 300 communities and it is likely that by June 30, the end of the 1975-76 college year, enrolment will have doubled. Total registrations in 1975-76 are expected to reach 50,000. And in just the first half of this college year, 1,898 classes have been offered in 436 locations throughout Saskatchewan.

During the initial stages of community college development, student demand centered on general interest programming. But, as was predicted earlier, the trend toward greater demand for skill training and upgrading is now on the increase in the college regions. Enrolments in the first half of the 1975-76 college year indicate an increase in the proportion of adult basic education courses.

This Budget allots \$3.7 million to Saskatchewan community colleges. This is a modest increase over the previous year and is I feel continued indication of our commitment to provide educational opportunities through all areas of the province.

Last month I was pleased to announce the establishment of the Saskatchewan Indian Community College. This event, I

believe marks a milestone in the history of the educational development for native people in this province. It will provide the vehicle for self-determination in the development of adult learning opportunities for native people on reserves. We have reached an agreement with the Federal Department of Indian Affairs and Northern Development and the Federation of Saskatchewan Indians, to recognize all reserves and Crown lands as a community college region under The Community Colleges Act, effective March 1 this year.

The college will be based upon the same model as the other 13 colleges. It will be administered by a board, in this case appointed to represent the geographic distribution of reserves throughout the province. Only a small core of staff positions will be created to carry out program and administrative functions. Emphasis will be placed on utilizing local resources and talents to provide programs under short-term contract.

The mandate, Mr. Speaker, of the newly created college is to assess native needs and to develop and provide decentralized programs to meet the special needs of native adults on reserves for occupational training, skills development and upgrading.

And finally, Mr. Speaker, in the area of continuing education I just want to mention a few words on student assistance. The Government is pleased to continue its program of assistance to Saskatchewan students through the Saskatchewan Student Loan Plan and the Saskatchewan Student Bursary Plan. In addition continued support is being given to the existing scholarships, special bursaries and awards to youth of the province to encourage post-secondary education.

The need for career counselling, particularly in the adult sector has become more apparent in recent years. In recognition of the necessity to expand career counselling to the adult community in general, we have taken steps to initiate the development of a program to provide service in this area.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, I just want to turn finally to the Department of Culture and Youth and say a few words about the budget in that Department.

I am pleased to report that the programs of the department in the fields of sport and recreation and the arts and cultural activities have been well received throughout the province as they have been in previous years. Participation in such activities, especially in rural Saskatchewan, is becoming part of our way of life rather than just the special pursuit of the few. This means that the demand for recreational and leisure time services will continue to accelerate.

However, Mr. Speaker, I am confident that the programs included in the budget of the Department of Culture and Youth for this year will satisfy these demands and give most citizens, whether urban or rural dwellers, access to programs and facilities which enable them to participate in the sport, recreational, artistic or cultural activity of their choice.

This year's budget is estimated at some 5.76 million dollars, up from 5.66 million dollars last year. This modest increase is in keeping with the Government's policy to hold the line on expenditures and thus provide an example of fiscal restraint to other groups in society. However, Mr. Speaker, I

wish to assure you that the services and support which the Department of Culture and Youth provides to the people of Saskatchewan will not suffer. The Department can and will live within its budget while at the same time improving and expanding its programs.

I want to just comment on a number of program developments which I know are of interest to the people of Saskatchewan. The first of these is a restructuring of the Youth Employment Services Program. In past years, Mr. Speaker, any employer engaged in non-profit activity was eligible to receive subsidization for the employment of students during the summer months. This meant that only about one-half of the students employed under the program were given work in the provision of recreation programs of a physical, social, cultural or cultural conservation nature.

As a result, the program has been restructured this year to focus upon recreational activity mainly. This new thrust will allow youth employment services to be more closely co-ordinated with other departmental activities and thus improve the quality of recreational programs available to the people of Saskatchewan.

The second program development, Mr. Speaker, is a streamlining of grants to recreation boards. During the last fiscal year, Mr. Speaker, 54 new Community Recreation Boards were established. In total more than 600 communities, rural municipalities, and Indian Bands are now eligible for grants which they themselves, not the Provincial Government, will allocate.

Last year, the system whereby communities applied for specific grants for specific programs was phased out and the present system of global grants was introduced. The acceptance of these programs by communities has been excellent. The growth of recreation boards is one indication of this. A better sign, however, is the co-operative effort of volunteers throughout the province. This co-operation is seen not only in the constructive feedback to the department, which allows us to restructure and improve our programs to better meet the needs of communities; it is also most evident in the co-operation among rural municipalities and the communities within their boundaries and among communities in the province's recreation regions.

As an example of this co-operation and community participation, Mr. Speaker, I must mention that regional games and festivals are gaining in popularity. A typical effort was the Moose Mountain Regional Games held in Bienfait on February 6th and 7th of this year. That host community of 800 people was descended upon by 3,000 spectators and participants representing every centre in the region. Similar situations existed elsewhere throughout the province.

Mr. Speaker, while the Department of Culture and Youth may provide some grant financing and advice, it is the volunteers of the community whose hard work and effort are responsible for the great popularity and success of such activities. The department will continue to support such efforts in every way possible.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. TCHORZEWSKI: — Mr. Speaker, I am happy to report that the Saskatchewan

Multicultural Advisory Council has been of great assistance to me and to the department over the past year. Their input into the design and administration of the Multicultural Grants Program and the selection of the multicultural component of the Olympics and the Arts Program is truly appreciated. I want to place this on the record at this time.

As you are aware, Mr. Speaker, the Government through the Saskatchewan Economic Development Corporation will participate in the production of a feature length film based upon W. O. Mitchell's "Who Has Seen The Wind".

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. TCHORZEWSKI: — The members opposite laugh and they make all kinds of strange statements from time to time but in spite of what they say or what they think is some meagre political gain, I should like to take this opportunity to thank my colleague, the Hon. Member for Tisdale-Kelsey (Mr. Messer) for his support to this program.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. TCHORZEWSKI: — Mr. Speaker, as Minister responsible for the development of the Arts and Culture, I fully support SEDCO's investment both for sowing the seeds for a potential indigenous film industry in Saskatchewan and for capturing on film a story which will . . .

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. TCHORZEWSKI: . . . show the rest of the world what is best about our way of life in rural Saskatchewan.

Mr. Speaker, before I turn to support for the professional arts, I should like to comment on one final highlight of the department's cultural activities, and that is the "Towards a New Past" program. This . . .

AN HON. MEMBER: . . . ambition to live in a piano box.

MR. TCHORZEWSKI: — This development of oral histories will be expanded this year. Further, I am pleased to announce that these oral histories will be provided as teaching aids to the schools of the province through the Department of Education. Mr. Speaker, what better way can there be for children to learn and understand the history of Saskatchewan than to read and study the transcripts of words spoken by people who participated in the making of that history.

Mr. Speaker, grants to the Saskatchewan Arts Board, the Saskatchewan Centre of the Arts, and the Saskatoon Centennial Auditorium will total \$1.07 million this year, up from \$.97 million last year. I am sure the Member for Saskatoon will appreciate hearing that. The Saskatchewan Arts Board, I think, should be commended for its work. As an autonomous board it has fostered the growth of the Summer School of the Arts, and professional groups such as Persephone Theatre, Globe Theatre,

and the Regina Modern Dance Workshop.

Further, these groups and others such as the Norman Mackenzie Art Gallery and the Mendel Art Gallery should be commended for their outreach programs whereby the people in smaller centres in Saskatchewan are given the same access to professional art that people in Regina and Saskatoon have.

I should like now to highlight certain parts of the department's sport and recreation budget. One of the most popular programs in the sport and recreation field has been the Coaches' Certification Program, offered throughout Saskatchewan through the community colleges and the University of Saskatchewan. Some 900 volunteer coaches have completed the theory portion to date and it is expected that another 750 will complete level one theory in the coming year. The department will be providing the level two theory portion of the coaching development program this year and I look forward to the same enthusiastic response.

I am pleased to inform the House that the department has established a grant program to assist sports governing bodies in employing full-time provincial coaches. During the coming year 12 provincial sport associations will be offered the opportunity to employ a provincial coach. This assistance will benefit both grass roots program development and the training and competitive performance of provincial teams.

Because of the success of the coaching development program it is also the intention of the department to implement a pilot project in officials development this year. After what we have seen at some of our hockey games recently, I want to indicate that there probably is a great need for something in this field.

This program will provide officials with easy access to formal training, an opportunity to improve leadership skills, and a means to obtain recognition through accredited certification. This will provide more and better qualified officials in the long run and provide an administrative and developmental structure for officiating for sport governing bodies.

A special needs consultant also, Mr. Speaker, will be employed this year to provide administrative, consultative and creative assistance in the area of programs for the handicapped. This employee will be involved in such programs as the Games for the Physically Disabled and the Special Olympics. The Government gives a high priority to ensuring that opportunities for sport and recreation are available to those with special needs.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, I feel I must just make a few comments about the development of Sask Sport and its role in the province.

Sask Sport has been in existence for only five years, but much has been accomplished in that time. As the Saskatchewan division of the Western Canada Lottery Foundation, sport and cultural groups are able to obtain funds both through the sale of tickets and for specific programs through the Lottery Trust Fund.

The involvement of volunteer organizations in the selling of tickets is an excellent way for sports, recreation and cultural groups to demonstrate their willingness to help raise the

dollars vital to their operation. These efforts plus the program support moneys available in the trust fund are an important factor in the future funding of sport, recreation and cultural activities in Saskatchewan because they lessen the burden of government in providing tax dollars for such programs.

Mr. Speaker, there is a great deal more I could say about the budget of the Department of Education, Continuing Education and Culture and Youth and about the provincial Budget as a whole. It is a responsible Budget, but as I said when I began, it is a Budget that has been developed during times when there is a need for restraint. But in spite of this period of time when there is a need for those restraints, this Government because it believes in planning and because it believes in identifying priorities which are people priorities, this Budget is able to provide to such organizations as school boards, universities, hospitals and other sectors of our economy, the needed funds under some degree of restraint, which will enable them to deliver and to provide the services that the people of this province have for so long learned to know and expect and to have.

I will not support the amendment, I will support the main Motion.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. J. WIEBE: (Morse) — Mr. Speaker, in rising to address the Assembly in regards to the Budget Speech, my remarks are going to be much briefer tonight than I had intended, not because I want it that way . . .

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. WIEBE: — but because mother nature has decided to give me a cold and I will go as long as my voice holds out.

Last Wednesday, March 24th, when the Minister of Finance brought down what he termed a happy budget, I think many of us sat in this House with anticipation as to exactly what kind of responsibility and direction he and his Government would show the people of Saskatchewan and also take this province. He also mentioned that budget days for the NDP Government were happy days.

I might comment too that he could be right because from this Budget it seems quite apparent that the NDP enjoy heaping scorn on Ottawa and placing all the province's woes on the shoulders of the Federal Government. The majority of that speech certainly seemed to have that tone.

The NDP as well appeared to be happy about the fact that Ottawa provides 28 per cent of this province's income. That then goes on to mean that they are happy that Saskatchewan is a welfare province and not capable of looking after itself. They are happy about the fact that without Ottawa's help we could not educate our children. Without Ottawa's help this province could not provide enough money to look after our sick and our many medical and hospital programs. They are happy as well that without Ottawa's help this province could not afford its social service program. They appeared to be happy as well that without Ottawa's help and initiation and the 50 per cent contribution of

crop insurance premiums that Saskatchewan farmers could not afford nor have the outstanding crop insurance program we now have.

Mr. Speaker, the former Minister of Agriculture says, don't you think we pay any income tax? I think when you look back at the amount of money that this province sends to Ottawa and the amount of money that this province gets from Ottawa, that we're getting a pretty darn good shake here in this province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. WIEBE: — Let's as well, Mr. Speaker, go to the Province of Ontario, the Province of British Columbia, the Province of Alberta and have a look at how much income tax money those individuals pay and how much of that income tax money comes back into this province instead of back into their own provinces. Mr. Speaker, I would be very pleased if I could stand up in this Assembly and say that this is not a welfare province, that we are a province that does generate enough funds without the help of Ottawa to look after the citizens in this province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. WIEBE: — There are many other aspects of this Budget, Mr. Speaker, I'm certainly pleased, Mr. Speaker, that the Members opposite are giving me the opportunity to rest my voice, this then will allow me to hopefully complete my remarks tonight.

I would like to direct my main remarks tonight to the agricultural section of this Budget.

Mr. Speaker, it's extremely disappointing and discouraging when one hears a government in its Throne Speech and now in its Budget presentation, hardly even mention our greatest industry, our greatest resource, and that is agriculture and the people involved in agriculture.

Since June of 1975 this Government has completely ignored agriculture and this Budget is stark proof of the contempt and the low priority which this Government holds for agriculture and again the people involved in this great industry. Contempt, Mr. Speaker, for an industry that provides for the bulk of the welfare, gross provincial product and budgetary revenue that this province receives. Without a healthy agricultural industry this province could not continue to grow or to function. I say to the Minister of Finance and I say to the Government opposite, that you are taking this province down a dangerous path by cutting agricultural budgetary estimates as severely as what you have.

Let's just look for a minute at how the NDP react to an industry that provides the bulk of the revenue which this Government spends. Let's go for a minute and look at how the Minister of Finance should have presented this Budget in terms of agriculture and let's read, for a moment, between the lines. First of all he should have said, look fellows, we have to tighten our belts. Inflation is causing a bit of a problem, we're going to do our part as a responsible government. We are going to increase the allocations of budgetary moneys to all other government departments and agencies, not by just a little bit,

no, we'll have to keep our huge bureaucracy functioning well, so we'll increase other departments by as much as 40 per cent. But I want you to remember that we are a responsible government. We are going to show that responsibility by cutting agriculture, not by just a little bit, we're going to slash it to the bone. But I say to the farmers of Saskatchewan, don't be too upset. You'll be happy to know that we are going to ensure that funds will be there to maintain our huge bureaucracy within the agricultural department. You'll be pleased to know that we are going to maintain our permanent staff of 560 employees at a cost of \$7.4 million. We are even going to hire other people at an additional cost of \$1.8 million. You know, that doesn't even include over 400 in the crop insurance program and hundreds more in our boards and commissions.

The people of Saskatchewan will be happy to know I'm sure that we are not even going to cut our other expenses and administration costs, which we need to keep that bureaucracy going. In fact, we are going to spend over \$13 million on that alone.

The NDP Government says that we are happy that 52 per cent of the agricultural budget for 1976 will go towards salaries and administration. Now aren't we nice guys? We are not going to cut this part out of the Budget, in fact, we're going to increase this section of it over 1975.

They continue to say, Mr. Speaker, that we are a responsible government. Agriculture, you'll be happy to know, that in this Budget we will drastically cut such meaningless programs that will help your industry and this province to grow. You'll be happy to know that your NDP Government will drastically cut, instead of increase, badly needed funds for research and development. And I think this is one of the worst aspects of any budget that's ever been introduced into this province, is the fact that funds for research and development have in turn been slashed to the point in time where it will take a long time in years for this branch to recover.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. WIEBE: — The Government also says this in regard to Farmstart, a very popular program and an amalgamation of many of the programs initiated by the former Liberal Government.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. WIEBE: — I knew, Mr. Speaker, that that would get a rise and give my voice an opportunity to have a bit of a rest.

AN HON. MEMBER: . . . name one program . . .

MR. WIEBE: — Well, Mr. Speaker, to remind the Premier, under Farmstart if I understand correctly and the Minister of Agriculture can correct me, that there isn't one dollar spent by Farmstart on one acre of land in the province. Farmstart is not allowed to advance moneys to purchase land.

Now, as I was saying, Mr. Speaker, before I was so rudely interrupted, when Members opposite hear the truth, Farmstart a

March 30, 1976

very popular program, an amalgamation of many of the programs initiated by the former Liberal Government, but the NDP say look, they say look, under this program we are getting too many young men and women back on to our farms and staying on our farms. We are getting too many farmers, diversifying their farm operations, we better cut this program. So being a responsible government, we will cut grants and interest subsidies by close to 40 per cent.

Being a responsible government as well, the NDP then say, look we don't want farm living to be too attractive, so we had better cut our grants for sewer and water by 45 per cent. If we make living in our rural areas too attractive, our farmers may decide to stay out there. Look, we don't want the air to smell too good out in rural Saskatchewan, so we had better cut our grants for pollution control of livestock operations. We'll just implement the regulations and the restrictions and let the feedlot operator either sink or swim.

You know the dairy producers are having a bit of a rough time. As a government let's show our responsibility to them and make them happy by cutting our grants for improvements of facilities for the production of manufactured milk by 33 per cent. That should really help them out, that will give them a boost.

Then there is the health of animals, the veterinarian services branch and the grants to veterinarian service districts for operating and capital expenses. You know we've got a shortage of veterinarian services in Saskatchewan, farmers are having to drive longer distances, in many cases disease protection and prevention can be serious. As a government let's really show our responsibility in this department. Instead of increasing the Budget for this subvote to cover the cost of inflation, we'll cut this department by eight per cent. Maybe if we have a serious outbreak in Saskatchewan we can cry to Ottawa. Their responsibility is to protect the entire country, they'll come and they'll bail us out.

Marketing and economics. Grants to the marketing development fund. The NDP say that's not very important. Ottawa sells our grain production, we don't have to worry about livestock marketing. Who in the world would be interested in buying what our farmers produce in this province? Let's really show agriculture that we care, let's cut this branch by 20 per cent.

If someone wants something that we may happen to produce bad enough, maybe they'll find out where Saskatchewan exists and they'll come down and pay us a visit.

The list goes on. The Government is determined to show its responsibility to agriculture, in the Finance Minister's happy Budget, the NDP were extremely happy I imagine with subvote No. 46. The Farm Fuel Cost Reduction Program.

Predictions are that farmers' net income across Canada could be down as much as 30 per cent in 1976. Their gross income is not expected to drop. However, farm operating costs are blamed for the major reduction that will occur in net farm income in 1976.

On this I doubt whether the NDP can hardly control their over-exuberance to help reduce the farmers operating cost.

They say that we helped them a bit last year when profits were good. Now that they are expected to drop, let's really show our concern, we'll help the farmers reduce their operating costs by slashing the grants under this program by 57 per cent.

The Government then says, we won't tell the farmers either that under the federal-provincial agreement back in 1974, we took 11 cents a gallon from them when we forced the price of oil up. We won't tell the farmers that we have this 11 cents tucked away in an energy development fund and that we might not use it to find more forms of energy, we might just use it instead to purchase a potash mine or maybe an oil company or maybe we'll expand our operations and go into uranium.

Here again, Mr. Speaker, the increase of farm fuel costs in Saskatchewan is directly related to the greed of both federal and provincial governments. That's the only reason why the price of farm fuel in Saskatchewan has gone up. In Saskatchewan it's gone into what they call an energy development fund and they are refusing to tell the people how much. What has Ottawa done? Ottawa has forced the price of fuel up last July by ten cents a gallon. So they said to farmers, look, we'll refund you that money, we'll give you back ten cents. What does Saskatchewan do? They take 11 cents and then they say we're going to give you back seven cents. Then they say, we're going to limit what you can get back, only on 2,900 gallons. If you buy more than 2,900 tough luck. You pay the whole shot.

Now what do they say? You're going to have a rough year in 1976. The price of gasoline is going to go up again in July. Your operating costs are going to go up. We're going to help you out by cutting that grant from seven cents a gallon to four cents a gallon. So in effect every gallon of fuel that any farmer buys in this province, he gets four cents a gallon back from Saskatchewan, he gets ten cents a gallon back from Ottawa, but there is seven cents a gallon that winds up in the coffers of the Provincial Government. Those coffers I understand, now are over the \$400 million mark. That's helping agriculture. That is helping agriculture to reduce their operating costs in 1976.

Here is another dandy, Mr. Speaker. Flood control and drainage. The Minister of Finance in his happy Budget told Saskatchewan farmers that our government doesn't care. So what if thousands of acres of good productive farm land lie under water and are not being made available to produce crops to feed a hungry world. Who cares if millions of gallons or cubic feet of water that could be stored to be used to irrigate grass and crops in our drier areas runs into our river systems and eventually out into our oceans. We, as an NDP Government certainly don't care, we will cut this subvote by 43 per cent.

Mr. Speaker, the list goes on and it is a sad list. It is a list of neglect, it is a list of I don't care and it is a very unhappy list. I think the headlines after that Budget was brought down should have read, 'Saskatchewan Farmers Have Been Shafted'. Walter Smishek, or pardon me, the Minister of Finance, has hit farmers, with one of the worst budgets that this province has ever seen. He has really applied the shaft to agriculture. Another way that you could say it, is that Smishek hits agriculture, farmers tanned. The Government lets agriculture down. If there is any department that should have had an 11 per cent increase, or even held its own, it should have been the Department of Agriculture.

One has to ask, why, Mr. Speaker? Is it because we have a government that doesn't care? Could it be because we have a new Minister, who is not prepared to fight for his department and the farmers whom he represents? Could it be because we have stronger Ministers in other departments who don't put much value on agriculture? Could it be because there are not many active farmers elected to the NDP benches, that are not capable of standing up and fighting for our industry? Or, Mr. Speaker, could it be that our rural base is diminishing and that there is not that same political advantage to be gained by paying attention to agriculture?

These are questions, Mr. Speaker, that everyone since the introduction of this Budget, are asking. The results of this Budget will not only have its effect on the future development and growth of our agricultural industry, but it will be a Budget that will be remembered and I believe, felt, for many years to come. There is no way that I, as a rural Member, could ever conceivably support a Budget that places our greatest industry in a position which this Government has.

Instead, what kind of a Budget should have been introduced? Because of inflation the Government should have shown leadership and responsibility to inflation and also to its programs. The Minister of Finance in his closing remarks stated that the Opposition's criticism would be on three grounds; taxes are too high, level of services provided too low and restraint of spending is insufficient. I say, Mr. Minister, right on! It is not going to be difficult for me or any Member on this side of the House to criticize this Budget on all three counts and still be extremely consistent in our criticism.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. WIEBE: — Governments, the greatest cause of inflation should show restraint in their spending especially when governments spend money that does not create, produce nor develop new wealth. In the Department of Agriculture you have drastically increased spending on the Government's desire to create an uncontrollable bureaucracy. Over 52 per cent of this Budget will be spent on that bureaucracy. Cutbacks can and should have been made in this regard. Spending money on an army of civil servants does not ease inflation. Raising taxes, pasture fees, Land Bank fees, you name it, to feed that bureaucracy is just not sound business. Building new offices, renting more space to house that bureaucracy as well is not sound business. Feeding, nurturing, expanding and giving in to the bureaucracy is non-productive and will not ease inflation.

Just as an example, as what is happening in Swift Current. I will leave that for a moment and hopefully get to that at the conclusion of my remarks. What the Government should have done, Mr. Speaker, is provide the tools to enable the agricultural industry in this province to grow and to prosper. Instead of cutting programs that increase potential and production, the Government should have cut its spending on its bureaucracy and used those savings to be put into programs that will create and generate more productivity.

Let me look at three vital areas which I feel the Government has erred in this Budget. There might be come justification to holding the line or cutting back on Farmstart programs

and some of the grant programs. I have already mentioned my feelings in regard to the Farm Fuel Rebate Program and the undesirability of having that program cut. But let me just briefly mention two programs that were cut and cut drastically by 42 per cent. Programs the Government should not have cut, but should have cut instead part of its bureaucracy and increased these two departments by 50 per cent. These are research and also flood control and drainage.

The Minister of Agriculture, or the former Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Messer) asked if I cashed my cheque. What cheque?

MR. MESSER: — The Hog Stabilization cheque.

MR. WIEBE: — No, I cashed each and every one of them. I might point out to that the subsidy cheque that I cashed, and would the Minister of Agriculture or the former Minister of Agriculture like to tell the people of Saskatchewan that it was because we had a Saskatchewan Hog Marketing Commission that each and every farmer was receiving that cheque. That cheque would have gone out had there been a Hog Marketing Commission or not. That cheque and the money for that came from the Provincial Treasury. It came from each and every taxpayer in the province, not from the Saskatchewan Hog Marketing Commission. And I can dare say, Mr. Speaker, that had we not had the Saskatchewan Hog Marketing Commission forced upon the hog producers of this province, without a vote, then we certainly would not have had that subsidy program because the Minister of Agriculture used that subsidy only to justify his actions. The worst thing that could ever have happened to the Minister of Agriculture and the Hog Marketing Commission . . .

MR. MESSER: — . . . the cheque . . .

MR. WIEBE: — I don't mind cashing any cheque that comes from the Minister of Agriculture. If you are trying to bribe me into supporting the compulsory aspect of the Hog Marketing Commission it won't work, but keep the cheques coming, I appreciate them.

As I was saying when we look at Hog Marketing Commissions, as such, when we were the Government in 1964 to 1971 there were three marketing boards implemented in the Province of Saskatchewan. Up to that point in time from 1944 to 1964 the CCF Government had implemented only one marketing board in the province. From 1964 to 1971 three marketing boards were implemented in this province and from 1971 until now, I believe, there has only been two marketing boards implemented. Let's just look at the difference though. Let us look at how Liberals approach marketing boards and how the NDP approach marketing boards.

We say, and we did, during those seven years allow any group of agricultural members that wished to form a marketing board to do so, but only after a vote was held by all producers involved. Once the majority of those producers agreed to have a marketing board, that that marketing board be run, conducted and controlled by producers themselves and not by government. That, Mr. Speaker, is the difference between our method of implementing marketing boards and the Government Members' opposite methods of implementing marketing boards. No vote, no

representation by the producers. I believe that is a great difference and I will put our method of marketing boards up to yours any time and I will get the support of the people of this province too.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. WIEBE: — I wonder when we are going to have the vote that the Minister of Agriculture promised us on the Hog Marketing Commission? The present Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Kaeding) and the former Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Messer) seem to be surprised that this promise was ever made. Maybe what we show: be doing is instead of talking about more research assistance for the Conservative Party, we should be providing more research assistance for the Government Members, to look back at some of the speeches that were made in this House by the former Minister of Agriculture when he promised the people of Saskatchewan, the hog producers, an opportunity after a couple of years to have a vote on the future of the Hog Marketing Commission.

MR. MESSER: — . . . quote . . .

MR. WIEBE: — Now the Minister of Agriculture wants me to quote him and if he will allow me an opportunity on Thursday or Friday to once again enter this debate . . .

MR. MESSER: — I can't do that . . .

MR. WIEBE: — . . . I will be very pleased — oh, yes you can Jack. And what you would have to do and it would have to be by agreement of the entire Legislature, you can convince those 38 Members on that side of the House that the Member for Morse should speak twice. I am sure that Mr. Speaker will allow that to happen. I will give you three days to get that going. Members to my left say that they will agree Jack, so you have your work cut out for you.

As I was saying before I was sidetracked from the Budget remarks, let me just conclude briefly by saying that the two vital programs that I think the Government should have increased by 50 per cent, instead of decreasing by 42 per cent, were the two areas of research and flood control and drainage.

When one looks over the Province of Saskatchewan and sees not the thousands of acres, but the millions of acres, that each and every year are left idle because we do not have proper drainage on the farm and productive land in this province one has to wonder why in heaven's name this Government is not directing more energies towards that aspect of this Budget.

Research, as well, is very vital. Why in the world should we keep the farmers in this province back in the horse and buggy days? We should be spending money.

MR. MOSTOWAY: Ask Otto.

MR. WIEBE: — Sure, ask Otto, and that is very easy, if you have a problem let's blame Ottawa. We are not prepared to do anything on our own. We are not prepared to do anything on our own and

that is exactly the philosophy that you people are using. You are using it everywhere you go. Let's not do anything on our own as a government, let's not allow the people of Saskatchewan to do anything on their own, let's give them welfare, let's cry to Ottawa and let's get someone else to help them solve the problems that we have.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. WIEBE: — And up until that time that that kind of a philosophy stops in this province, agriculture, I am afraid, is going to be subject to the same kind of treatment that it has in this particular Budget.

Turning briefly from the main aspects of the Budget, I said that I wanted to make a few comments in regard to Swift Current.

You go into the government offices in Swift Current and if you are lucky you might find someone working. There is a good line-up at the coffee pot; there are a number of people sitting at the edge of their desks visiting with the secretaries, but they are not out in the field doing the work that they should be doing. Just let me give you an example.

Eighteen months ago I dug a well on my farm, something like 650 feet.

MR. STEUART: — Drop in some time.

MR. WIEBE: — I am really pleased with all the help tonight, fellows. I thought I would only go for about ten minutes, but you are giving my throat enough intermissions along the way that I think I can continue for a little while longer.

Going back to the problem which I encountered with this well. I went in to Swift Current as I was having a problem with the color of the water and the taste of the water; beautifully soft water and lots of it, but the problem was that we had something in the water and it wasn't iron. It happened to be a bit of an oil base in that water. So I went to Swift Current and approached the so-called water expert and asked him if he wouldn't mind coming out and having a look at the well. He was happy to do so. He came out the next day and had a look at it and couldn't figure out what was wrong and said, "Look I will take in a gallon of water and I will be back in one week's time."

That was 18 months ago! You know I phoned that expert on three separate occasions and my farm manager has been into that office on four separate occasions to have a talk with him. We have yet to see him back on that farm and we have yet to have an answer whether anything can be done or whether anything can't be done. I have met him occasionally on the street and he says, golly I am still thinking about it, I am still working on it; I can't come out this week I have to go into Regina and attend a seminar for civil servants to teach us how to look after our areas. When I went back three weeks later he said, golly I have to go out and talk to a ladies group out in such and such a place about grasshoppers or some darn thing.

So here again, Mr. Speaker, why have we got this army of civil servants in Swift Current if they are not doing the job that they are hired to do? And I am not the only one who has had this kind of experience with that water expert or with anyone else from within that department. A lot of the complaints which I have had as an MLA representing the areas surrounding Swift Current have been similar ones. They, too, are wondering why we have that army of civil servants there.

We are happy to know as well that a brand new building is going up in the city of at least we think it is. You know it is going up to house those civil servants, which only leads one to believe that there might be more of them coming into the city of Swift Current. People are beginning to wonder what is happening with that government building in the city of Swift Current.

Last week I asked the Minister of Government Services, and I am sorry he is not here tonight, about what is happening to that building. Construction stopped on January 5th and from that time until now it has been impossible to obtain any information from him, from his department or from any member from within that department.

I asked him if he would investigate what is going on. I told him that there were a lot of rumors in the city of Swift Current. The former minister of Agriculture at that time intimated that these rumors were being started by the MLA for Swift Current and the MLA for Morse. I disagree and I must question that indication. I asked him to report back to this House on what the problem was, whether the rumors were in fact true or whether they weren't. He disregarded my request. He in effect said no, you are not going to get any answer as to what is happening in Swift Current.

Let me just read an editorial which appeared in the Swift Current Sun last week with regard to the rumors and the Swift Current building. The editorial is headed, "Rumors are Plentiful".

There have been numerous rumors about the provincial government building in Swift Current. It is about time the Provincial Government cleared the air. Construction on the \$5 million structure stopped in January and it is difficult to believe that the Government doesn't know the reason.

Gordon Snyder, Minister of Government Services has refused to make any comment in the Legislature and hedges questions with talk of further investigations. The Provincial Government has had long enough to study the matter, particularly when there may be tax dollars involved.

Ed Knutson, President of the Swift Current Construction Association, said in Tuesday's Sun, that the cement pilings were not at fault for the work stoppage. He said the building was a failure in design. Mr. Knutson said the Government would have to redesign the foundation if they hoped to build on the Cheadle Street site. He estimated the cost would be about half a million dollars. (This is additional money). The question is, who is going to pay the additional cost?

Mr. Snyder said in the Legislature last week, the public would not be held responsible for any additional costs. But added at a later sitting an adequate level of controlled funds will be spent and will continue to be spent, which still leaves the question open.

Jack Wiebe, MLA, Morse questioned the Minister last week about the blueprints for the building. Mr. Wiebe asked whether the proper plans had been allocated for the building and further questioned the Minister as to whether or not Poole Construction, the general contractor had initiated any legal action against the Government. Mr. Snyder dispelled both questions as rumors.

Someone quite obviously has made a mistake and the Government should put an end to speculation and rumors and bring it out in the open. The Provincial Government has promised some answers in the Legislature but has failed to produce anything up to this time. Taxpayers have a right to know if their money is to be used or if it is not to be used.

I ask again, tonight, Mr. Speaker, I ask the Minister of Industry and Commerce (Mr. Messer) to use his influence and talk to his seatmate and ask his seatmate to report to this Legislature as early as possible what the situation is, what the problem is in Swift Current. And hopefully when he does that the rumors which are now plentiful will be answered.

Mr. Speaker, I have much more that I would like to say on this Budget, I don't want to adjourn debate, my voice cannot continue on, I will support the amendment, I will not support the main Motion.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

HON. N.E. BYERS: (Minister of the Environment) — Mr. Speaker, in rising to take part in this Budget debate I want to congratulate the Minister of Finance for the Budget Address, not only in regard to the substance of the Address, but also for the capable and confident manner in which he presented the Budget Address to this Assembly and the people of the province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. BYERS: — As I daily observe him carrying out the onerous duties of this office, I am confident that he will rank high in the list of his predecessors.

It is not my intention tonight, Mr. Speaker, to devote a large portion of my remarks rebutting the many distorted and confusing and incorrect claims advanced by the Liberal financial critic last Friday. We on this side of the House are prepared to acknowledge the difficult task that his colleagues hoisted on his shoulders. Perhaps he deserves the award of distinction for 1976 financial critics.

The financial critic in the British Columbia Legislature can tackle his job with ease as the Social Credit Government in that province doubled and tripled automobile insurance premiums,

increased the sales tax to seven per cent and imposed deterrent fees of up to \$7 per day.

Financial critics in Conservative Alberta and Conservative Ontario can cry 'mismanagement', or other appropriate terms, while Conservative governments approve budgets with astronomically large deficits and thereby mortgage tomorrow's taxpayers to pay for today's services.

Our financial critic is less fortunate. His task was more difficult. He was forced to wander with his political grab-bag from department to department, from subvote to subvote, from Crown corporation to Crown corporation, vainly searching for an example or two of some administrative kink in highly accepted government programs.

Mr. Speaker, the political and financial fodder that the financial critic provided to this Legislature last Friday may be a satisfactory diet for the people who occasionally attend Liberal meetings, but, it's time the Liberal financial critic and his colleagues realized that six Members were elected to this Assembly with 40 per cent or less of the popular vote. These six Liberal Members sit in this Legislature with pluralities of 500 or less and that we will be out after these seats and more the next time around.

In this Budget we are carrying out the mandate we received from the people of Saskatchewan last June to continue and expand the programs launched in our first term of office, and to initiate several new programs contained in the New Deal '75.

Mr. Speaker, while I will not dwell long on the financial critic's remarks, I want to comment on one or two criticisms advanced by the Liberal financial critic. I want to reply in particular to his claim that local governments are one of the casualties of this Budget.

No one will deny that local governments are faced with increased demands for services, recreation, transportation, environmental improvement and so on. It's an open secret that in recent years associations of municipal representatives across Canada have appealed to senior governments for more funds to finance local services. They have proposed a variety of ways for senior governments to meet their requests. Their proposals to redirect provincial revenues to local government coffers are I expect well-known to all Hon. Members. But they include suggestions such as unconditional grants, and methods to share provincial revenues with local governments.

As a Member of this Legislature who represents a rural constituency that contains about 20 urban centres, 12 rural municipalities, two Indian Reserves, I was perplexed and amazed that in true Liberal style he fails to understand or appreciate the initiatives of this NDP Government to transfer vast sums of provincial revenues to local governments.

Let me state as briefly as possible some of this Government's initiatives to assist and strengthen urban governments, in particular.

To enable local governments to cope with the large backlog of projects accumulated during the Liberal years, a provincial-municipal winter works program was started four or five months

after Premier Blakeney got his feet under the Premier's desk. The federal-provincial-municipal winter works program that operated in the 1950s and up to the mid 1960s provided local governments with finances to construct community facilities, clear road allowances for the grid road program, and to provide jobs for thousands of people who were seasonally unemployed.

Even a Conservative government in Ottawa did not regard this program as an action to take over peoples' lives nor an intrusion into the affairs of local government. A provincial CCF government co-operated with Canada and the municipalities to ensure that funds were distributed equitably and without favor. This program was shelved by a federal Liberal government in the mid 1960s.

Despite pleadings as we hear from time to time from the Hon. Member for Kindersley (Mr. McMillan) that the province continue the Young Voyageur Program, about to be scrapped by the Federal Government, a provincial Liberal government refused to put a five cent piece into a provincial-municipal winter works program throughout their entire seven year term.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. BYERS: — I remember, Mr. Speaker, that in 1970 the Federal Government attempted to 'bail-out' a decrepit provincial Liberal government heading into a provincial election with no programs and no creditable 'record of performance' by offering to loan this province \$5 million at a low rate of interest to launch a winter works program because even the Federal Government was alarmed at the devastating effects of the Liberal policies in driving thousands of tradesmen and others into other provinces.

And the present Leader of the Opposition supported by this year's financial critic rose in this Chamber and said we are not accepting the Liberal government's offer because we don't believe in winter works programs.

Unlike the Homecoming '71 program, that imposed a firm limit on one project per community, some communities in Saskatchewan have undertaken five or six projects each winter, with winter works funds. I've said on previous occasions that the Liberals' idea of a winter works or public works program is to hire grown men to chase tumbleweeds on windy days. It certainly isn't necessary, Mr. Speaker, to search the files of the now defunct information Canada for a list of rinks, halls, swimming pools and water systems that have been built with NDP provincial-municipal winter works funds. The results are clearly visible in every community of this province and the Liberal financial critic knows it.

We are meeting the requests of urban municipal governments for unconditional grants by providing a \$20 bill for every man, woman and child in every city, town, village and organized hamlet with no strings attached to enable councils to finance services and operating costs that the property tax base cannot provide.

For those urban communities with a tax base lower than the average, we'll insert a stuffer in the envelope — an additional \$2.3 million in equalization grants and \$5.4 million in equalization grants for the rural municipalities.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. BYERS: — If the community belongs to a nearby regional park, the province will again this year provide an operating grant — a program initiated by this Government.

Under the Community Capital Fund Program, we are virtually dumping \$75 per capita over a five year period on each main street in the province for the councils and organizations and citizens to divide up for their favorite capital projects.

One program that we have entered into with the Federal Government in the last couple of years is the Neighborhood Improvement Program otherwise known as NIP. It is a program that is going to benefit some of the cities. There is an agreement as to the dollar amounts that the province and the Federal Government and the municipalities will put in. It is a good program. I think we have had a couple of disappointments with regard to the Federal Government's performance in this program. We would have preferred to have had 25 or 27 communities approved last year. We had our list ready in the spring, the Federal Government only approved 17. I draw to the attention of Hon. Members that the Province of Saskatchewan, I think, is willing to proceed with this program as rapidly as possible and to pay our fair share subject to the agreement. This, however, is one of the programs that the Federal Government has decided, for good or ill to slow-walk and consequently the funds allocated for Municipal Affairs are reduced accordingly in this Budget.

Housing for smaller communities. I think we remember well the only program the former government had was to provide a grant of \$500 and it was limited to new construction. Since we have become the Government and set up the Housing Corporation, we've seen a variety of housing programs come on stream.

I want to draw to the attention of Hon. Members with respect to low cost rental housing projects either approved for construction or under way or completed in communities that in their term of office the Federal Government would not even approve a site for low cost rental housing projects. Those communities today have houses built or under construction or finished because of our negotiations with the CMHC and the federal agencies to make these housing programs available.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. BYERS: — The Municipal Water Assistance Board. Two years ago the budget for this subvote was about \$250,000. Last year we raised it to \$850,000 and it remains at that level this year. This program recognizes that some communities have particular needs but cannot be financed from the standard unconditional and community capital fund program with respect to developing and financing water supplies for urban centres. In 1975 after the election we revised the regulations to increase the provincial grant formula. A number of communities have taken advantage of that and a number will in the coming year.

Mr. Speaker, the strength of any society is not measured by the size of the bricks nor the strength of the mortar in the new civic centres and senior citizens homes even though these facilities enhance the beauty of our environs and improve our quality of life.

This massive redistribution of provincial wealth to our local governments has in a significant way developed other desirable values that cannot be measured in dollar terms.

As a wise poet once said:

Why build ye castles glorious
If man unbuilt goes
Ye build in vain, unless
The builder also grows.

Let me state some of my impressions of the values and benefits that are evident as a result of our government's initiatives to strengthen local governments.

Programs such as the Neighborhood Improvement Program and the Community Capital Fund enable councils and citizens to consult and co-operate in determining the long term needs of the community. The annual town meeting or ratepayers meeting that virtually died out in many communities during the Liberal era is being revived. In communities like Kelvington, Wadena, Foam Lake, the councils have held three or four public meetings in the past year to co-operatively plan the community's future. Chatter of the type we frequently hear from the Member for Rosetown-Elrose (Mr. Bailey) that this Government is thwarting the aspirations and desires of local governments may appeal to a few voters in his riding but he will be laughed out of town if he makes that statement in many centres in Saskatchewan.

Secondly, there is a renewed interest in seeking election to local government councils. Communities where councils were re-elected by acclamation year after year or where municipal election day often failed to fill all the seats on local councils now witness hotly contested municipal elections — with recounts and controversial issues to add to the interest. Our people possess a new pride and a new faith in the future of our province — developed mainly by our government's new initiatives for local governments — that they want to be on the team — and not on the bench.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. BYERS: — Thirdly, Mr. Speaker, these initiatives have removed the 'doomed to die' cloud from many small centres. The attitude of a place with no future and the soon to become a ghost town psychology hindered many small centres from preserving their place in the sun.

The introduction of the Community Capital Fund, the unconditional grants and winter works programs as well as a revised Municipal Water Assistance Grant Program have provided a new lease on life for countless hamlets and villages. The installation of water and sewage systems, the renovations of community halls have rekindled a dwindling social and community spirit. Last June the folks in the small centres said they liked these programs and they wanted more and this Budget honors their wishes. The Liberal financial critic called the Budget a casualty for local governments. It may cause casualties but they will be political casualties for Liberal candidates of the future.

I now want to turn, Mr. Speaker, to some of the programs that this Budget will provide for the Department of the

Environment. The Department of the Environment has now reached the point where emphasis on establishing a new department can be safely replaced by emphasis on consolidation of activities and programs. We see our main job in the next year as filling in the information gaps as well as completing and continuing many of the new programs that got under way in our formative years.

Five new positions will be added. The Budget allocated for the next fiscal year will provide about the same level of service to the people of Saskatchewan.

I now want to discuss some of the specific programs and activities of the Department of the Environment.

Mr. Speaker, opportunities for re-cycling continue to create a great deal of interest, despite the fact that we have a relatively small and scattered population and that lengthy transportation requirements reduce the chance of economic success for re-cycling ventures. This year we are allocating funds to our Policy Planning and Research Branch for studies of re-cycling opportunities, urban fringe problems, development of an environmental quality index and the preparation of transportation guidelines. One type of re-cycling in Saskatchewan which is seldom referred to as re-cycling are the auction marts and the newspaper ads. These are very common methods of re-cycling whole products. We practise this form of re-cycling almost daily.

Now the Department of the Environment as a co-ordinating agency, not an operating agency, has researched and investigated re-cycling possibilities in Saskatchewan. The Government of Saskatchewan has established an interdepartmental committee chaired by the Department of the Environment, with membership from the Department of Industry and Commerce and the Department of Health. This interdepartmental committee is presently reviewing the extent of re-cycling in the province. This committee will make specific recommendations as to a research re-cycling program. It is also working on a four to five year program of co-ordinating re-cycling activities in the province.

Now there are a number of Saskatchewan businesses already involved in different types of re-cycling programs. Some businesses re-use their own wastes, others are re-using their own wastes and other's wastes. Others are involved in supplying manufacturers with waste material to be re-cycled. Mr. Speaker, there are a number of re-cycling projects now under way or being actively investigated in Saskatchewan. Let me give you a few examples. In Saskatoon, Truroc Gypsum Products now re-cycles newsprint to be used as a filler in wall board. The newsprint is supplied by charitable groups who gather it from various sources in the province.

Another Saskatoon firm, Cosmopolitan Industries is involved in producing rubber mats, dock bumpers and traction mats from discarded tires. Test strips of rubberized asphalt have been made using asphalt and rubber crumb. The results of this test conducted by the Department of Highways, will shortly indicate if wide use of such rubberized asphalt is practical in Saskatchewan.

The city of Saskatoon has initiated an experimental project involving the collection of newspapers from a designated square mile area within Saskatoon. Residents are asked to separate newspapers from the rest of their garbage for a period of three

months. The paper will go to Cosmopolitan Industries Limited for sorting, packaging and shipment to Fibreform Industries of Tisdale. The degree of participation in this experiment will give the city some idea of what to expect cost wise if residents are asked to separate garbage from other sources. The results of this experiment will be of interest in as much as some cost-benefit figures will be available for similar projects in other areas of the province.

The city of Saskatoon used methane gas to fuel the boilers in the sewage treatment plant. This methane gas is given off from biological reactions in the digestors — where the sewage is cooked in order to obtain a disposal sludge. Once this was wasted but now it is being used to fuel the boilers in order that the digestors can operate.

At the University of Saskatchewan, another unusual type of paper re-cycling program has been established. At the University, colleges and departments are asked to deposit used paper that is blank on one side into a box that is provided. Approximately every two weeks, a group of students gather this paper and place it on a book shelf in the library lobby and here it is available for essay writing. The University newspaper, 'The Sheaf' is also collected and shipped to re-cycling plant in Tisdale.

In Regina, Roofmart Western Limited, collects waste newsprint, cardboard, paper and computer cards and ships them to their parent company. This waste is then re-cycled into shingles, cardboard, paper and cards.

Another Regina firm buys scrap metal, steel, copper, brass, iron and batteries. They cut it to certain specifications and sell it to IPSCO and to foundries in Regina and Saskatoon and outside the province.

You are all familiar with Interprovincial Steel and the Operation Re-cycle program.

Several plastic companies are either re-cycling the scraps they produce within their own factories or are able to re-cycle other plastics. Re-cycling of various types of plastics is in progress in Melville, Weyburn, Saskatoon and Swift Current. One firm regrinds plastic hangers and manufactures the waste into flower pots. A test project to regrind telephone housing to be re-cycled into flower pots is to be carried out in the future.

Two Saskatchewan towns, Eatonia and Davidson are presently experimenting with effluent irrigation — treated sewage irrigation. The experiments are being conducted for both irrigation and disposable reasons.

In Tisdale, Fibreform Industries Limited is manufacturing egg trays from re-cycled newsprint and cardboard. In the near future this firm may manufacture peat pots from this previously wasted material.

There are some departments within the Government that are making use of outdated forms by cutting and binding them to make note pads. I, therefore, think we want to watch these experiments in re-cycling with interest.

I want to say a word about the Environmental Assessment Branch. To ensure that new development proposals are planned

in a manner to limit any detrimental impact, and to provide the government with sufficient information on which to make decisions, we added a new service last year by establishing an Environmental Assessment Branch. This branch will have two major jobs. (1) It will set guidelines for environment impact studies which must be included in approval for applications for any new public or private project which could have environmental effects. (2) It will review and make judgements upon such assessment studies. We have encountered considerable difficulty in hiring staff for the Impact Assessment Branch. A Resource Management Consultant has already been hired for this branch, Mr. Harold Wine. We are still in the process of selecting a Director for this new branch, but I expect that the Director will be in place early in the new fiscal year.

This Branch will have a budget of \$279,330 for the 1976-77 fiscal year, including \$200,000 for follow-up activities on the Churchill River Study. This amount will include the costs of the public hearings for the Churchill River Study and the funding of local people for the purpose of evaluating the Churchill River Study Report.

I would also like to mention the role that the Saskatchewan Research Council will be assuming in connection with environmental assessments. The Saskatchewan Research Council has also established an Environmental Assessment Unit that will carry out assessments for companies proposing projects in Saskatchewan that may have environmental implications. We see this new unit as a viable alternative to consultants located outside the province who have been the only choice for project proponents up until now.

Mr. Speaker, I believe this new service reflects the confidence we have acquired as a result of environment assessments that have been conducted to date by a number of project proponents. As a result of the experience gained, we now know what information is needed and how and when it must be provided.

I would like to pay tribute at this time for the co-operation we have received from project proponents. Many of my department's activities, related to environmental protection or restoration projects, involve joint action by different provincial departments and, in some cases, joint action by more than one province, the Federal Government and municipal governments. This joint action re-emphasizes the fact that environmental protection is not the isolated concern of one department alone, but it is an overriding policy of the entire Provincial Government. Such joint activities emphasizes a new and fundamental shift in emphasis at all levels of government — a shift from development without environmental protection to development plus environmental protection.

Mr. Speaker, in 1975 the Government approved new regulations connected with the Air Pollution Control Act. One change was to bring Saskatchewan's air quality standards in line with those national objectives for ambient air quality worked out to date by federal and provincial pollution control experts. Ambient air is defined as the air that everyone breathes outside of their home or place of work.

The second change introduced is an additional enforcement tool which should help us prevent air pollution in advance. Before any new development likely to affect air quality can

commence operation in the province, a permit approving the effectiveness of air pollution controls must be sought and granted. Existing operations will not need such permits immediately. However, as potential pollution estimates are worked out for each industry, existing operations can be brought under the permit system.

Mr. Speaker, after a number of discussions with IPSCO and the Department of the Environment, last year, Interprovincial Steel and Pipe promised to spend approximately \$1.5 million on the installation of smoke controls on its two largest furnaces. These discussions followed a year long monitoring program by our staff in the Air Pollution Control Branch. IPSCO has agreed to have the new equipment in operation by September 1, 1976, and are presently very optimistic of this completion date. The public was also assured that in any future expansion of steel-making facilities, pollution control devices would be incorporated in advance.

Mr. Speaker, I want to say a word about our Hydrology Branch and the South Saskatchewan River Project agreement. In the 1976-77 fiscal year we will continue a number of our hydrology studies at a level similar to those conducted last year. These studies are centered on such things as the design of works, flood control, irrigation works and so on. They play a vital role in the development of Saskatchewan.

Now under the ten year agreement with the Federal Government, Saskatchewan is assuming more and more financial responsibility for the South Saskatchewan River Project. When this agreement was implemented, the cost to Saskatchewan was about \$60,000 per year. Now it costs us approximately \$200,000 per year. The South Saskatchewan River Project was officially transferred to the province on April 1, 1969. Since April 1, 1969, Saskatchewan has paid 100 per cent of the costs of operating this project. The ten year agreement provides that the Federal Government will pay 100 per cent of the maintenance costs for the first six years but will pay only 50 per cent of the cost of maintenance in the last four years. As of April 1, 1979, Saskatchewan will assume 100 per cent of all costs and have full responsibility.

A little tidbit in the Budget, Mr. Speaker, not so little in a sense.

In passing I should like to bring to the attention of all Hon. Members that in the next fiscal year metric conversion will cost the Department of the Environment between \$20,000 and \$30,000. We estimate that the cost to the Department of the Environment for implementing the metric conversion program over the next seven years will total around \$100,000. A big factor in these conversion costs will be the redrawing of charts and tables and costs associated with reprinting.

I want to say just a word about the Environment Advisory Council, a group of 12 Saskatchewan citizens from all parts of the province of all walks of life. As members of the Advisory Council their jobs are: (1) to review policies and programs of the Government relating to environment and to report findings and recommendations to the Minister. The report has been tabled. And also, to bring to the attention of the Minister any environmental problem areas. And, (3), to serve as a focal point for public reaction to government programs affecting or having potential effects on the environment.

March 30, 1976

In 1975 Dr. Evelyn Jonescu from the Great Plains Research Centre became the chairman of the council, replacing Dr. Stan Rowe of the University of Saskatchewan.

Two members of the council resigned last year due to the pressures of business: Dr. Alex Kelly and Mr. Peter Jack. I want to acknowledge their good work on the council. These vacancies have been filled by Dr. Isabelle Anderson and Mr. William Watkins.

During the last year the Advisory Council raised a number of concerns about land use in the province, re-cycling, the Churchill River Study, environmental education and the Poplar River Project.

The final issue that I want to turn to, Mr. Speaker, is the Qu'Appelle implementation package.

The official opening of the Qu'Appelle Implementation Office in Fort Qu'Appelle last October and the signing of the \$33.7 million Qu'Appelle agreement marked a significant step in the program to protect and improve the Qu'Appelle environment and to develop tourist and recreation industry in the valley.

The agreement signed by Ministers of both the Governments of Canada and Saskatchewan gave the official go-ahead to the ten year federal-provincial cost-sharing program. The agreement is based primarily on the 64 recommendations of the Qu'Appelle Basin Study Report which dealt with the need to meet the increasing demand on the water supply and the need for land use control. These improvements will also provide the basis for development of the recreation and tourism potential.

Mr. Speaker, I should like to bring all Hon. Members up-to-date on some of the projects undertaken even before the Qu'Appelle agreement was signed.

At Lumsden — channel improvements through the town of Lumsden started in the fall of 1974. Lumsden's flood protection system, along with the new pre-cast concrete bridge across the channel, was completed last fall except for some minor work which will be completed this spring. Lumsden is now protected from flood even if they are considerably greater than the 1974 record flood level

At the other end of the valley favorable weather conditions permitted completion of flood protection works at Tantallon. Drainage structures and embankment construction on the CPR right-of-way remain to be completed. This system will confine flows far greater than those of the record Tantallon flood of 1955.

Since the agreement was signed, preparation of an overall flood management plan for Moose Jaw has continued. Plans for dike protection of the residential areas along the Moose Jaw River have been completed. They are now being evaluated in comparison with the suggested alternative of re-locating residences to a serviced subdivision on higher lands to the south. Proposals for Spring Creek and Thunder Creek flood protection works are also being reviewed and evaluated.

In the city of Regina work on the Albert Street weir has been completed. These structural improvements will ensure

travel by way of Broad Street and Albert Street during an extreme flood and will reduce the level of Wascana Lake under flood conditions. Downstream from the Albert Street dike, construction in the Riverside area along Wascana Creek has been deferred until this year because of citizen objections to the plan. Further talks have been held with citizens and the city regarding flood plain regulations and amendments to the city building bylaw. Progress has also been made in other areas of the agreement.

All applications to sell lands under the Flood Prone Land Purchase Program have been appraised and offers have been made for the land. Approximately 4,500 acres have been purchased so far, at a cost of \$600,000. There are offers still outstanding for an additional 4,500 acres. Negotiators are contacting landowners to explain the program, review appraisals and encourage owners to sell or to determine the reason for not selling. Upon completion of this personal contact, further review of the program will be made.

Mr. Speaker, we are still in the midst of preparing an overall plan to guide future recreation and tourism development in the Qu'Appelle Valley. The initial planning phase is to be completed in September. It will provide guidelines which will allow interim recreation and tourism development to proceed while the long-term planning continues.

Mr. Speaker, various structural measures have been used to combat future flood situations — protective dikes, upstream storage, diversion works and channel improvements. Although these measures have been beneficial, they have shortcomings in that they are costly and tend to encourage further development. Therefore, in an attempt to reduce the long-term toll of flood damages, the federal-provincial and municipal governments are developing a long range approach to the problem. Rather than concentrating on structural measures which may not be adequate to protect property, other programs aimed at reducing the damage potential are being developed.

The policy of the Government of Saskatchewan is that further development should be prohibited on flood plains and expensive protective works should only be used for existing developments.

The federal policy in this area is illustrated in proposals by the Government of Canada in 1975 for federal-provincial flood damage reduction accords. The federal policy would ensure that flood risk areas are clearly defined and mapped and further investment would be discouraged in those areas. Federal assistance for development in areas identified as being subject to flooding will therefore not be available through CMHC, DREE or other federal programs.

In addition to government, organizations and individual citizens will have the opportunity to contribute in a positive way to the Qu'Appelle Implementation Program. The Qu'Appelle Implementation Agreement calls for the establishment of a Public Advisory Council to provide advice to the Qu'Appelle Management Board, to review the progress on all implementation programs and to provide public comment.

The council will meet as required to carryout its functions and will meet at least once a year with the Management Board. Public meetings may be held to encourage involvement of other

interest groups. These meetings with the public will offer an opportunity for the public to ask questions, get information and present suggestions to the council.

The new Public Advisory Council will initially number about 18 members and it will be made up of representatives from local governments, urban centres, Indian Bands and major organizations having an interest in the valley. The Qu'Appelle Valley Development Association, as one of the major interest groups in the Basin, has been requested to nominate one representative to serve on the council.

I want to just outline, Mr. Speaker, a summary of the spending plan for the Qu'Appelle. And for the benefit of the new Members I want to point out that the Department of the Environment has overall responsibility for the spending package, however, a considerable amount of the money allocated for the Qu'Appelle Implementation Program is to be found in the subvote of other government departments.

Once again, the Department of the Environment is responsible for co-ordinating provincial department and agency activity in the Qu'Appelle Basin Implementation Program. Our total provincial expenditure for the year is budgeted at \$4,001,770. That is over \$1 million less than the amount approved a year ago. I want to draw to the attention of the Hon. Members that the reason for the lower figure is, of course, that approximately \$1 million of last year's budget was designed to assist Regina in developing its advanced sewage treatment. So that was a one shot expenditure.

To summarize the Qu'Appelle expenditures, Environment will be spending another \$20,000 for algae barriers around bathing areas and \$205,000 for additional flood protection work in the Wascana Creek. We will also be responsible for \$192,970 for the implementation agency itself and for \$71,000 in additional research.

At Moose Jaw we are going to spend \$200,000 and Agriculture will be spending around \$600,000 for additional Moose Jaw flood protection works. Agriculture is also going to spend \$10,000 for further work at Lumsden and \$10,000 for further work at Tantallon and \$200,000 on improvements in water conveyance systems. And I should like to bring that to the attention of the Hon. Member for Morse, because this is not clearly identified in the Budget.

The cost of controlling development in the Basin will come to \$378,000 with Municipal Affairs responsible for \$349,600 and Environment responsible for \$28,400.

One of the biggest items in the Qu'Appelle budget is for \$1 million for continued purchase of flood prone lands by Agriculture.

Tourism and Renewable Resources are proceeding with their wildlife protection and recreation developments in the Basin. They will spend \$44,000 on continuing wildlife management investigation; \$47,000 on continued fish management investigations; \$400,000 for recreation and tourist planning; \$180,800 for the development of historic resources and nature interpretation projects and \$250,000 for alternate land use purchases.

Mr. Speaker, there are other programs one could discuss with equal vigor and enthusiasm . . .

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. BYERS: I will assure you that I will not be supporting the amendment and that I will be supporting the Motion.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. E.C. MALONE: (Regina Lakeview) — Mr. Speaker, I can't help commenting on the Member's last remarks about how he proposed these programs with such vigor and enthusiasm and if that is proposing with vigor and enthusiasm I am not quite sure what the opposite would be. I do want to say, Mr. Speaker, in following the Minister of Environment, I want to say to the leader of my party and to my colleagues that I am prepared to make practically any sacrifice whatsoever for the Liberal Party, to go across the province, to speak, to try and raise money, any sacrifice whatsoever except one, and that is to make the sacrifice of agreeing to follow the Minister of Environment in debate, because one of the reasons I don't want to do that, Mr. Speaker, is that I have to sit here all the time and listen to the speech. I can't leave because he may sit down quickly. But really I am very fond of the Minister and I am sure that he does his job very well.

Mr. Speaker, I have been sitting here in the last couple of days listening to the Government spokesmen talk about the Budget and talk about other things and I find it, again, very curious that certain people have not entered this debate. I find it very curious that the Minister in charge of the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan (Mr. Cowley) has remained mute as he has ever since this Session was called late last fall. One would think that by now that Minister might have some advice to give to this Legislature as to the Potash Corporation and the dealings to date, but we have heard nothing from him and I suspect that we will continue to hear nothing from him in the days ahead. In fact I would invite the Minister to come to the question period more than one or two days a week as we have certain things that we should like to ask of him if he is not prepared to get up and speak in these debates.

I notice as well, Mr. Speaker, that the Attorney General (Mr. Romanow) has remained very silent. He did a lot of speaking last fall about potash and related matters. It is curious to me that he has not chosen to enter this debate. There have been some very serious allegations cast on him about certain agreements that were made. We invited him, on numerous occasions to get up and explain his position on those things and we haven't heard from him either.

I should also like to know why the Attorney General has not yet in a speech explained to us why he chose not to proceed with the Family Court project in Saskatoon. I can recall when that project was first mentioned to this House, that it met with all those unanimous approvals, but there he sits and I suspect that we will not hear from him the next couple of days.

It seems rather strange, too, that the Minister of Industry and Commerce (Mr. Messer) has not entered the debate. Many things have been said about SEDCO. The only defence the Minister

has made about these remarks from my colleagues about SEDCO is to attack the press for daring to report these comments. I would be very interested to hear from him as to why these things are happening and to get an explanation from him, but I suspect he is too busy making movies and perhaps he is taking acting lessons so that he can try out for the lead role.

We have yet to hear, Mr. Speaker, from the Minister in charge of the Department of Northern Saskatchewan. I would like to hear him explain about the community college fiasco of recent months up there, and his involvement in replacing that board. I'd like to hear him explain why local governments voted non-confidence in the Department of Northern Saskatchewan. But I suspect we won't hear from him either.

And there's the Premier, I wonder where the Premier is? I wonder if we'll hear from him? I'd like to hear the Premier talk about why the Government has been spending thousands of dollars of the taxpayers' money to have NDP propaganda broadcast and put in newspapers. I'd like to hear his explanation as to why that's happening.

We haven't heard from the Minister of Mineral Resources either. Remember a few months back the Minister got up in this House and told us of the new oil royalty policy of this Government. And how the companies are going to come flooding back into this province and there was just going to be massive development to the oil patch. I haven't seen any companies come back, Mr. Speaker. I don't think anybody has seen any companies come back. I'd like to hear from him, I'd like to have some explanations from that Minister as to what has happened to the oil industry in this province.

I'd like to hear from the Minister of Agriculture. I'd like to get some explanation from him as to why Land Bank rates have been increased so drastically. I'd like him to explain to us now, that farm land would have been cheaper to have been sold rather than to have been rented under the Land Bank project.

AN HON. MEMBER: — . . . tomorrow . . .

MR. MALONE: — I see he is getting his instructions to go tomorrow. I hope we'll have something from the Minister about that.

You could go on and on, Mr. Speaker, as to the participation or the lack of it from the senior Members of the Cabinet opposite.

Mr. Speaker, the Smishek Budget of Wednesday last has once again clearly demonstrated to Members on this side of the House, if not to the public at large, the complete failure of the socialist government to put forth any solutions whatsoever to the economic problems facing the people of Saskatchewan. The Budget taken with the last few Speeches from the Throne, shows that the Government does not have any new or innovative policies or, indeed, any policy at all to fight inflation. The zeal which the Government displays in developing and implementing policies that further their own political ends, have taken more and more power unto itself, of obtaining complete control of the means of production and of interfering further in the everyday lives of all of us who are under their domain, is completely lacking when it comes to facing the harsh realities of the day.

One may well question the priorities of a government that can expend \$23 million to acquire an oil company, an acquisition that will not add one barrel of oil to the reserves of this province, will not create one new job, it will not put any more money in the treasury of the province for years ahead, if at all. However, it cannot afford to proceed with the Family Court project in Saskatoon. How could a government justify spending up to \$1 billion to buy potash mines, but fail to further supplement the income of thousands of senior citizens in the province, who are losing their own personal day to day battle with inflation? The increase in payments to senior citizens homes is, of course, welcome. But it is no more then what is required to keep the standard of care at the same level as it has been over the past few years.

This Government, Mr. Speaker, cannot seem to understand that our senior citizens do not want to be institutionalized if it can be possibly avoided. But they want to live the remainder of their lives in dignity in their own homes, or with their families and to be able to pay their own way. This most of them cannot do without government assistance. Government assistance that they're entitled to because more than anything else it has been the policies of governments at all levels that has caused inflationary times. How can a government justify spending millions to acquire farm lands and at the same time cut back on adult education programs such as the Government Correspondence School that benefits people who are desperate to improve themselves? This list goes on and on, but one thing is clear, the NDP have the option in taking more power unto themselves over actually helping people who in most instances cannot help themselves, their choice will always be power, not the people.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MALONE: — The Minister of Finance has called his Budget one of restraint. But one must ask, who is being restrained? Is it the Government of Saskatchewan? Has the Government cut back on any of its programs? Has the Government slowed down its policy of takeover in the resource industries? Has the Government diverted any of its spending to bring assistance to those hardest hit by inflation? Has the Government cut back or eliminated any of its programs of expansion in the civil service? The number of buildings it's going to construct? The answer to all of these questions is, no. Indeed, the Government has not accepted the responsibility that is theirs, it has only passed the responsibility on to others who are not equipped or as well equipped as the Government to take it, such as local governments, local school boards, hospital boards, the elderly.

The Government in its wisdom has decided not to enter the battle against inflation, but to abdicate the role that it was elected to take and pass the burden on to others.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MALONE: — The policy of the NDP socialist Government and the Minister of Finance over the past few years and which is implicit in the Smishek Budget, can be summarized briefly from a quote by Leo Tolstoi as follows:

I sit on a man's back, choking him and making him carry

me. And yet assure myself and others that I am very sorry for him, and wish to ease his lot by all possible means, except by getting off his back.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. MALONE: — Mr. Speaker, the time has come for the NDP to get off the backs of the people of Saskatchewan. To allow private development to flourish once again in this province in the resource industries and elsewhere. To eliminate needless government expenditures where they are not required, to the potash industry, to the oil industry, the timber industry, and the civil service.

Until the Government removes itself from the backs of these developers, these industries will not return to the people of Saskatchewan, the fair share of the profits that they are entitled to as of right and we will continue to see the province lag behind our neighbors and continue to be regarded by the rest of Confederation as a 'have not' province.

Mr. Speaker, the Government, I am sure, is well aware that many steps could have been taken by it to fight the battle of inflation. But to do so would have been politically unpopular. The Government knows that it can only do so by many unpopular things in any term of office before the public will react against them and defeat them in the next election. Policies of this Government since 1971 have been rejected by the majority of the people in Saskatchewan in 1975. And the recent potash legislation has not been well received, to put it mildly. It's apparent that the Government is afraid to take any more unpopular moves because it fears it could be disastrous for them in the next election, although that will not be until 1979. I want to say, however, Mr. Speaker, to this Government, that you already lost that election, that already the majority of the people of this province are fed up with you. They have realized that you are not the successors to the old CCF movement of the 1940s, the 1950s, but you're a band of dedicated socialists who are determined to impose your policies on the people whether they want them or not.

Your only chance for survival in 1979 is if you regain your integrity, and start governing by the wishes of the people and not to spite them. I do not want, Mr. Speaker, the Government to think that they are the only government that needs to regain integrity, there are others.

Some weeks ago the Prime Minister gave his now famous speech where he said that the free enterprise system is not working. That it is out of joint. In my view the Prime Minister did not go far enough. He should have said the governments are not working, the governments are out of joint, not just the Federal Government or this Provincial Government, but most governments at all levels, federal, provincial and municipal. I say, Mr. Speaker, that the reason that governments are not working is that the political process is not working as well. Because political parties in their all-consuming desire to either obtain power or retain it, have ignored the fundamental political philosophies that have caused their creation in the first place and by so doing they have lost their integrity. That is in order to curry favor with the voters they have failed to be candid about the problems that confront our society and rather

than attempt to solve those problems using their basic political philosophies as a starting point, they ignore them, and they promise the voters programs that they feel are appealing and will result in their election. The voters of Canada and the voters of Saskatchewan in particular in my view are becoming disillusioned with all political parties because of their failure to live up to the tenets of their philosophies and indeed in many cases seem to be acting in a manner diametrically opposed to them.

For example, let us look at the federal and provincial parties and how they are functioning at the present time. The federal Liberal Party is perceived by the average voter as having tilted so far to the left in philosophy that it is difficult to distinguish it from the NDP in many of its positions. This tilt to the left has caused the party to lose much of its traditional support. It is apparent that the party is now trying desperately to move back to the middle of the road position that has assured its success in most federal elections since Confederation. The provincial Liberal Party until recently was perceived by the voters to be a party that tilted to the other extreme. It was sounding more and more like a Conservative Party and ignoring its traditional supporters within the province. That process has stopped as I will explain in a moment.

It is not only the Liberal Party that has temporarily disregarded its traditional political philosophy. The other parties are equally as guilty if not more so.

Let's look at the federal New Democratic Party. This is a party that seemingly does not know what it stands for. It is a party that is rudderless and under weak leadership and is dominated by men whose political glories are all in the past in the old CCF movement. One does not know whether the federal NDP is a socialist party, a reform party or simply a spokesman for organized labor. The greatest mistake that the old CCF at the federal level made was to become the New Democratic Party and allow itself to be the spokesman for and be dominated by only one group in society.

The federal NDP will never form the Government of Canada until such time as it creates policies that are meaningful and attractive to portions of all segments of the Canadian mosaic, not just the labor movement and a few university professors.

The provincial New Democratic Party of Allan Blakeney perhaps comes the closest to a party that abides by its political philosophy. However, the Premier and other spokesmen constantly disclaim the fact that the provincial NDP are made up of and dominated by advocates of the socialist philosophy. The Premier and other party spokesmen do not have the integrity to publicly admit that their policies are socialistic. Indeed the Members opposite bend over backwards to say that this is not the case. They say that they are taking over the potash industry because the companies made them do so, not because they are socialists. They say they are taking over the oil industry because we have to ensure a fair return to the people of Saskatchewan of oil profits, not because they are socialists. They implement a Land Bank policy that is supposed to facilitate the transfer of titled farm lands from one generation to the next, but which does not and which the Government will not admit, because if it does so it would admit that they are in favor of state control of farm land, the most socialistic policy of all.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. MALONE: — They refuse to allow private development of our northern mineral resources by private enterprise, not because their socialistic policy demands this, but according to their spokesmen, because this will ensure a fair return to the people of Saskatchewan of the profits to be derived therefrom.

But we must ask ourselves what returns have been made to the people of Saskatchewan from the oil industry and the exploitation of our northern minerals since 1971 when the New Democratic Party took power. It is apparent that the oil industry is in a state of chaos in the province and that the return to the people of Saskatchewan from the development of our northern resources has been minimal if anything at all. Accordingly this policy since 1971 of the NDP of ensuring a fair return to the people of Saskatchewan from these two sources has been a failure and the only reason for its implementation is that the philosophy of the New Democratic Party demands it and not because there has been any additional benefit to the people of Saskatchewan.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. ROMANOW: — Now tell us about the provincial Liberal Party.

MR. MALONE: — Wait. Let us for a moment consider the Conservative Party — no personality, it's just a party — in Ottawa the party still does not know whether it should follow the policy of prairie populism that brought it to power under John Diefenbaker or the traditional Tory policy of maintenance of the status quo and the protection of vested interest. The policy of John Diefenbaker got it elected and while the populist movement was successful in this regard it had so little substance it could not be used as a basis for governing a country as diverse and complicated as Canada and the inevitable happened — defeat of the Conservatives. The federal Conservatives know that the alternative of traditional Conservative philosophy is not acceptable to most Canadians and thus their dilemma which until resolved will relegate them to the role of Opposition as long as the Liberal Party remains true to its philosophy.

While the federal Tories are wrestling with their philosophical dilemma their provincial counterparts have as yet not been able to define any role for themselves in the political spectrum of this province. They campaigned in 1975 without any policy and so far have not taken any positions of significance on the issues of the day. The only impact that the provincial Tories have had on the provincial scene since their election has been to take a strong position on such weighty matters as not chewing gum in the Assembly, not reading speeches which we all now do and demanding in true Tory fashion more money for themselves from the public purse. The provincial Tories, Mr. Speaker, are a political aberration that occurred because the electorate did not approve of the policies of the New Democratic Party between 1971 and 1975 and because the Liberal Party failed to convince the electorate that the party had returned to a party of traditional liberalism. The Liberals will not make that mistake again.

An examination of the traditional Liberal philosophy will

show that it stands for something other than being against the NDP. Our philosophy is based on a fundamental belief in the worth and goodness of the individual. We believe in individual initiative, individual enterprise and individual responsibility. We believe that the individual will always strive to improve himself and by so doing improve all of mankind. We believe that the system that best promotes the worth of the individual is the free enterprise system and we will always strive to maintain and improve it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MALONE: — We believe that economic powers should not be held by a few but should be dispersed as widely as possible for this ensures the proper function of the free enterprise system and equal opportunity for all. We believe in a compassionate a government that will act to ensure equal opportunity for all and acknowledges to the general welfare of all that governments must assist those who are unable to assist themselves — not unwilling to assist themselves — but unable to assist themselves because of age, sickness, temporary unemployment or lack of work skills. We believe in the welfare of the individual, not welfarism.

Some will say that the Tories believe in the free enterprise system as well. But do they really or do they believe in a form of privileged enterprise system where the emphasis is preserving the status quo and protecting vested interests and not ensuring equal opportunity for all?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MALONE: — The result of their system is to entrench economic power in the hands of the few, to the disadvantage of the many, to ensure the maintenance and growth of the already powerful to the detriment of those who would seek a legitimate share of that power.

Some will say that the NDP believe in the welfare of the individual. But do they really, or do they really believe in a form of welfarism that no matter how well intentioned or motivated results in a reliance on government to solve all problems; that forces people to seek government assistance and provides them little or no initiative to get off the government welfare rolls of whatever description. The NDP policy of welfarism puts little or no faith in individual initiative, little or no emphasis on the work ethic and the rewards that accrue therefrom. It condemns the individual to a future that will be decided for him by government bureaucrats and planners.

The logical result, Mr. Speaker, of the NDP philosophy is the same as that of the Tories, power in the hands of a few. For the Tories, the vested interests; for the NDP, the government bureaucracy.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MALONE: — This perhaps explains the strange affinity between the NDP and the Tories which many find so hard to understand. That is how people in one election can vote for a right wing party and then in the next election vote for a left wing party.

March 30, 1976

This can be explained if we understand that there are those who do not want to accept individual responsibility and who prefer to have the decision made for them by someone else.

The Liberal Party is the only political party that truly believes in the worth of the individual and of the free enterprise system.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MALONE: — A belief that is shared, in my opinion, by the majority of Canadians. But unless the Liberal Party is prepared to reassert this belief and in doing so recover the integrity that comes from being honest with the electorate as to what we stand for, we will not retain power in Ottawa or regain it in Regina. But I can assure you, Mr. Speaker, that at least at the provincial level in the days ahead, the Liberal Party will by defining and advocating policies based on the philosophy of traditional Liberalism and by acting so, will form the Government of Saskatchewan in 1979.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MALONE: — Mr. Speaker, as I indicated earlier I believe that the Budget does not meet the problems facing the people of Saskatchewan, that it places an unnecessary burden on the shoulders of those who do not have the strength to bear it, that it is an abdication of the responsibility that this Government was elected to take upon itself and accordingly I'll be supporting the amendment and voting against the main resolution.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

HON. J.R. MESSER: (Minister of Industry and Commerce) — Well, Mr. Speaker, I had not intended on entering this debate at this particular time. I note that there are some Members across the floor who sit to your left, Mr. Speaker, who seem to be spending a good deal of time this afternoon looking at a document that was tabled earlier this afternoon in regard to the Saskatchewan Economic Development Corporation and I would like to address a few words in regard to the Industry and Commerce policies in the Province of Saskatchewan, the success of those policies and programs, Mr. Speaker, the objectives of those programs and I think that the rapid movement towards attaining those goals that were laid down in those objectives. Not only for the Department of Industry and Commerce, but also for the Saskatchewan Economic Development Corporation. I know that there will be a number of Members in the Opposition who will, no doubt, want to spend some time on the Saskatchewan Economic Development Corporation during Crown Corporations and I very much look forward to that.

Mr. Speaker, I have a significant amount of remarks that I wish to make in regard to this Budget Debate and I now beg leave to adjourn debate.

Debate adjourned.

The Assembly adjourned at 9:22 o'clock p.m.