

March 16, 1976

March 16, 1976

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

On the Orders of the Day

WELCOME TO STUDENTS

MR. C.P. MacDONALD (Indian Head-Wolseley): — Mr. Speaker, I would like to introduce to you and to Members of the House, a group of students from Indian Head and Fort Qu'Appelle and they have, as their guests today, some exchange students from the Province of Quebec. I am not sure but perhaps I could call on Art Thibault to perform that function for me. I know that all of us extend a very special welcome to the students from the Province of Quebec and welcome as well those students from Indian Head. I hope that they have a very educational and informative day.

HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. J.G. LANE (Qu'Appelle): — Mr. Speaker, I would like to join with my colleague, Mr. MacDonald, in welcoming these students from Indian Head and their special guests, the exchange students from the Province of Quebec. They are brought here by their chaperons, Mr. Claude Crozon of Fort Qu'Appelle, and Dick Boxall also of Fort Qu'Appelle. On behalf of myself, as the MLA for Qu'Appelle, I should like to join with my colleague in welcoming them to this Assembly and especially wishing the exchange students a very enjoyable stay in the Province of Saskatchewan and, I hope, a most educational afternoon.

HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. A. THIBAUT (Kinistino): — Pour les gens de la Province de Quebec je veux vous dire un bonjour, et un bon voyage.

HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. E.F.A. MERCHANT (Regina Wascana): — Mr. Speaker, I would like in your name to welcome a group of students from St. John School who are here with their teacher, Mr. Melnyk. St. John School is not far from the Legislative Chamber and I am sure they will enjoy their tour of the building and I will be seeing them later in the day.

HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. R.N. NELSON (Yorkton): — Monsieur le President, de la part de tous les députés ici, je veux aussi souhaiter un bien heureux bienvenue a tous les étudiants du Quebec dans notre Assemblée et dans notre province. Nous espérons que votre visite chez nous sera très intéressant et nous voulons aussi que vous retourniez ici bientôt.

HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

QUESTIONS

Construction of Government Building in Swift Current

MR. J. WIEBE (Morse): — Mr. Speaker, a question to the Minister of Public Works. I had expected the MLA for Swift Current (Mr. Ham) to ask this question yesterday but he didn't so I hope that the Leader of the Conservative Party (Mr. Collver) won't mind if I ask it today.

Last fall construction was started on the new government building in Swift Current. It was abruptly stopped on January 5, tests were run on the footings and those footings collapsed. I was wondering if the Minister could tell us, have they determined who is to blame and why this information has been kept silent up until this point?

HON. G.T. SNYDER (Minister of Government Services): — I think the assumption by the Hon. Member would seem to indicate that there is a deliberate effort to cover up some structural failures as far as the concrete emplacements were concerned. The piling, as the Member indicated, was tested, it failed under that particular test and I am given to understand that the responsibility rests with the contractor in question and he is under an obligation to restore and repair the structure and reach the specifications required by the contractor.

MR. WIEBE: — A supplementary, Mr. Speaker, can the Minister assure us that the cost of rebuilding the structure will not be borne by the taxpayers of this province but by the contractor?

MR. SNYDER: — I think that is a fair assumption. Any indication that I have indicates that the responsibility rests with the contractor, as I said initially.

Price and Wage Settlements - Anti-Inflation Program

MR. MacDONALD: — Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a question to the Minister of Finance. It is now something in the neighborhood of five months since the Federal Anti-inflation Program has been brought down for the people of Canada. Can the Minister tell me what prices and wage settlements, if any, have been referred to the Saskatchewan Price and Compensation Board for review?

HON. W.E. SMISHEK (Minister of Finance): — Mr. Speaker, the Saskatchewan Compensation and Prices Review Board is not under any obligation to report to myself as to what contracts or settlements they have been asked to make a ruling on.

MR. MacDONALD: — A supplementary, Mr. Speaker, could the Minister then indicate who has the responsibility of referring matters. That is the Minister of Finance who has spoken on the guidelines which will control these price and compensation boards, can he indicate to the Members of the House, who has the responsibility

to refer matters to that Price and Compensation Board?

MR. SMISHEK: — I am not sure what particular parties you are inquiring about. If it is in case of a collective bargaining agreement, Section 20 of the terms of reference of the board states and I quote:

Where a public sector body enters into a collective bargaining agreement which provides for an increase in compensation, the public sector body shall enter into the agreement subject to the conditions of the compensation increase as approved by the ruling of the board.

So it is the public sector body that has to refer the matter in case of compensation and similarly in cases of price increases, fees or charges.

MR. MacDONALD: — Can the Minister tell me if, from what I understand, is it a fact that according to his statement that the Price and Compensation Board of the Province of Saskatchewan has no responsibility nor authority to demand or to issue a rollback of any price or wage settlement. Is that a fact?

MR. SMISHEK: — Mr. Speaker, the board does not have authority to require repayment in the event that there has been a wage increase or it may be increases in fees and charges over the guidelines, but it has the power to make a ruling of whether an increase in prices, fees or charges or in the case of compensation should be less than the party or parties may have agreed upon.

Department of Highways

MR. R.L. COLLVER (Leader of the Progressive Conservatives): — Mr. Speaker, I would address a question to the Minister of Highways (Mr. Kramer). Is the Minister attempting to use the Department of Highways to punish areas in Saskatchewan that voted Progressive Conservative in the last provincial election?

HON. E. KRAMER (Minister of Highways): — Mr. Speaker, the answer is No.

MR. SPEAKER: — Order! I'll try and get order here. I question the validity of the question that the Member has put. I don't think it fits within the Interim Report that the Special Committee has delivered to the Legislature with regard to the Oral Question Period. Perhaps the Member would like an opportunity to rephrase his question.

MR. COLLVER: — Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I might ask you to explain just exactly how that does not fit into the rules as laid down in the guidelines for the Oral Question Period, since we consider it to be an urgent matter.

MR. SPEAKER: — The Interim Report contained a recommendation with

regard to Points of Order that might be raised during the Question Period. I would suggest and recommend the Interim Report to the Member if he wishes to read it and to see when Points of Order may be raised at the conclusion of the Oral Question Period, before the Orders of the Day.

MR. COLLVER: — I might just explain to you that I was not raising a Point of Order. I do have a supplementary to this question. Perhaps the supplementary would explain the question then.

MR. SPEAKER: — At this point I am suggesting to the Member that his question is out of order. If the Member has another question at a later time I may be prepared to accept it.

Wine From South Africa

MR. R.H. BAILEY (Rosetown-Elrose): — Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask the Minister in charge of the Liquor Board, in view of the fact that his Government has made an arbitrary decision in the purchase of the wine from South Africa, if his Government then is considering further restrictions from other countries of the world who have racists or differing philosophies than ours here?

HON. N.E. BYERS (Minister of Environment): — The Government, Mr. Speaker, has made no decision with respect to delisting products other than the one that was made within the last couple of weeks.

MR. BAILEY: — A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that the various nations around the world which this Government deals with, one could easily find policies equally as discriminatory and the very fact that you have selected South Africa would indicate to me . . .

MR. SPEAKER: — Order! I would ask the Member, rather than to give a debate and information that he start a question with an interrogative, such as who, what, why, where, when. Perhaps the Minister can briefly answer it then.

MR. BAILEY: — The question to the Minister in charge then, Mr. Speaker, how many letters were received from citizens of this province or groups of this province which forced the Government to make this arbitrary decision?

MR. BYERS: — Mr. Speaker, this Government is not forced into making any decisions on the basis of letters received from anybody. The Government makes decisions on the basis of their judgement on a particular problem. The Government has received in the last two or three months a good number of letters and I have received a good number of letters. I cannot give you the precise number but there are a large number from church leaders, organizations, individuals who strongly urged the Government to consider the delisting of South African products. And as our Government attempts to be sensitive and responsive to public wishes, we felt that this was one issue on which we could take the suggestions of a large number of the "body politic" in this

province. It is on that basis that we made the decision that when the existing stock of South African products in our Liquor Board system are depleted that no additional stocks would be ordered.

MR. MERCHANT: — Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Minister would indicate whether they would consider then, following that thinking, taking California wines off the market. In relation to the fact that they are being picketed over their grape growers' policy and also, Mr. Speaker, in relation to the attitude that the Government took in the Kraft Cheese industry that prohibited the use of Kraft Cheese. It seems to me and I . . .

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. BYERS: — Well, it is very difficult to ascertain, Mr. Speaker, what the position of the Opposition is with respect to the Government's decision. I read in the paper that the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Steuart) said that the decision was silly, but it so happens that a prominent person in the Council for World Development in this province said he was elated with the Government's decision and so were others. The Government has analyzed the particular problem, they have come down with a decision to deal with that problem and I feel that was a good and a wise decision.

MR. J.G. LANE (Qu'Appelle): — By way of supplementary, Mr. Speaker, Mr. Minister, would it not logically follow that the Government opposite would consider the prohibition of the sale of Russian tractors by a company here in the city of Regina, or is the Opposition to accept or read into your permission to sell such Russian tractors as an approval of the oppressive regime that exists in Soviet Russia.

MR. SPEAKER: — Order! I think I will disallow that question.

Poplar River Power Project

MR. R.E. NELSON (Assiniboia-Gravelbourg): — Mr. Speaker, a question to the Minister in charge of SPC. Has the Minister met this year with the Poplar River Surface Rights Association of Coronach to discuss the lack of progress in the land settlement negotiations with SPC regarding the Poplar River power project?

HON. J.R. MESSER (Minister of Industry and Commerce): — Mr. Speaker, I have met with the Surface Rights Association this year to expedite the progress in acquiring land for the Poplar River project.

MR. NELSON: — A supplementary, Mr. Speaker, has the Minister agreed to meet with the Surface Rights Association as requested in their letters to him of February 2nd and February 26th to discuss the terms of mediation?

MR. MESSER: — Mr. Speaker, the answer to that is, Yes.

Provincial Government Building in Swift Current

MR. D.M. HAM (Swift Current): — Is it true, Mr. Minister, of Public Works or Government Services, is it true, Mr. Minister, that the proposed Provincial Government building in Swift Current was originally investigated and preliminary studies extended indicated that this building was to be located at the other end of the lot?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SNYDER: — Mr. Speaker, I am not at all sure that I can answer the Member's question. If this is the case certainly it is a rather obscure point of view that has not been impressed upon me. The decision to build on its present site is done on the best advice that could be offered. If there is anything to the contrary then I would be pleased to take that as notice of question and refer it back to the Member at a later point in time when I have had a further opportunity to check.

MR. HAM: — A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Would you please take under advisement then, Mr. Minister, that the failings of the piling that were referred to earlier were as a result of the moving of the site from one end of the lot to the other and advise.

Poplar River Power Project

MR. NELSON (Assiniboia-Gravelbourg): — I should like to address a question to the Minister in charge of SPC. Did the Minister's letter when he refused to meet with the Poplar River Surface Rights Association, saying that they either accept a mediator or go to court and have settlement through expropriation, did he not tell the farmers the Minister is really forcing compulsory arbitration on them?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MESSER: — Mr. Speaker, the answer to that question is that I have not in any way undertaken to force compulsory arbitration upon the members who are referred to in the Surface Rights Association for the Poplar River project.

Department of Highways

MR. COLLVER: — Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Minister of Highways. Does the Minister recall a letter I wrote to him enclosing a copy of an MLA report dated April 11, 1974, from John Comer, former MLA for the Nipawin constituency, outlining and I quote:

In the coming year the Department of Highways will undertake the following work in the Nipawin constituency . . .

And then a list in which I requested an explanation of why some of the work was still incomplete in 1976.

MR. KRAMER: — I get an awful lot of letters from various people and,

Mr. Speaker, I will check on the letter and advise the Minister at tomorrow's question period.

Atlantic Richfield

MR. E.C. MALONE (Regina Lakeview): — Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a question to the Minister in charge of Saskoil. I see that he is not in his seat this afternoon and perhaps the Minister of Mineral Resources could respond.

It deals with the recent purchase by Saskoil of Atlantic Richfield, that is, their assets in Saskatchewan. I believe the total amount paid for these assets according to newspaper reports was \$23 million. My question to the Minister is, where did this money come from, was it the Energy Fund, general revenue or whatever? Was it borrowed and if so what is the interest rate?

HON. E.C. WHELAN (Minister of Mineral Resources): — Mr. Speaker, I will take it as notice. We will give you the answer.

1975 Operation Report of SEDCO

MR. S.J. CAMERON (Regina South): — Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Minister in charge of SEDCO. Has SEDCO submitted to the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council a report on its 1975 operations?

MR. MESSER: — No, but we will be shortly. I believe that the report is at the printers at this time.

MR. CAMERON: — A supplementary. Do I gather from the response that the report in any form has not been submitted to the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council?

Estimates of Department of Highways for Estevan Project

MR. R.A. LARTER (Estevan): — Mr. Speaker, to the Minister of Highways. Is the Minister prepared to table copies of the Estimates he said he received from private contractors, together with detailed estimates of the Department of Highways, pertaining to the Estevan project mentioned yesterday, to a totally independent observer to ensure the people of Saskatchewan that in fact the road work in question could not have been completed economically and quickly to the satisfaction of the local residents.

MR. KRAMER: — Mr. Speaker, the tenders that are offered by the various tenderers and accepted by the Department of Highways are public property. Everyone, the public, is entitled to be there and certainly this is available to any member of the public. I will be glad to supply the Member with the various tenders and any other information concerning those projects that he wishes.

MR. LARTER: — A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Could we have this along with copies of the tender from the Department of Highways?

MR. KRAMER: — The Department of Highways does not tender.

1975 Operation Report of SEDCO

MR. CAMERON: — I have a supplementary of the Minister in charge of SEDCO. My question, by way of clarification was, has SEDCO submitted a report on its 1975 operations to the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council? The response that I had was that the annual report was being printed. My question is, has the Corporation submitted a report to the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council on its 1975 operations.

MR. MESSER: — The answer to that, Mr. Speaker, is No. Not to my knowledge or with my authority.

Report of Provincial Auditors

MR. G. LANE (Qu'Appelle): — Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a question to the Minister of Finance.

I believe that the Minister received the Report of the Provincial Auditor on his desk last week. Would the Minister tell us the reason for the delay in tabling the Report and, secondly, when we can expect the Report tabled in the Legislature so we can get on with the business of the Public Accounts Committee?

MR. SMISHEK: — Mr. Speaker, I will check on that. I regret to advise the Hon. Member that the Report has not hit my desk for some reason, but I will check on it.

Western Canada Lottery Loss

MR. MERCHANT: — Mr. Speaker, a question to the Minister of Finance.

I wonder if the Minister would comment on recent press reports, particularly in the Manitoba paper, to the effect that the loss in the Western Canada Lottery is in the neighborhood of \$800,000. One member of the Board of Directors, you might inform us if this is correct, has estimated the loss of the last draw to be \$427,328. I wonder if the Minister would indicate whether these figures are correct or even in the ball park of the losses and indicate what effect that will have on Saskatchewan Sport and what effect that would have on the Saskatchewan Roughriders, who depend in part for Western Canada funds to survive?

MR. SMISHEK: — Mr. Speaker, I will be prepared to check on this. I think that the Western Lotteries and our participation is through the Department of Culture and Youth. Perhaps the Minister of Culture and Youth might have some information on that. I notice that he is not in his chair. I do not have such a report and the information is not available to me, but I would be glad to check with the Minister of Culture and Youth and provide the House with any information we may have at a later date.

Provincial Pension Plans

MR. G.H. PENNER (Saskatoon Eastview): — Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I may direct a question to the Minister of Finance.

Why is it that the provincial pension plans do not need to be funded and documented in the same way as plans that are operated by municipalities?

MR. SPEAKER: — I think that is a question which should properly be dealt with in another manner and not at this time.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Construction of Highway No. 47

MR. E.A. BERNTSON (Souris-Cannington): — Mr. Speaker, a question to the Minister for the Department of Highways. Who calls the shots for this Department, the Minister or the trainees on the construction to Highway No. 47?

MR. KRAMER: — I do.

MR. COLLVER: — A supplementary for the Minister of Highways. Is the Minister since he calls the shots prepared today to denounce the statement made in front of witnesses, by an official and aide to his colleague, the Provincial Secretary, to Estevan citizens in the order of, and I quote:

That is what you people get for voting PC in the last election.

MR. KRAMER: — I don't reply to hearsay, Mr. Speaker.

Total Cost of TV Programs

MR. E.C. MALONE (Regina Lakeview): — Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a question to the Premier.

I gave the Premier some notice yesterday of the question. He may not have had an opportunity to look into the matter and if that is the case I will ask it later.

The question deals with the recent TV programs the Premier has been on, one involving Douglas Fisher, the other one involving Patrick Watson. My question of the Premier is, are you able to tell me the total cost to the people of Saskatchewan of these programs?

HON. A.E. BLAKENEY (Premier): — Mr. Speaker, I am not sure with great precision of these, but I believe that the first program cost \$9,447.43 and the second one cost \$9,180, give or take a little bit.

MR. MALONE: — A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. I ask the Premier, are those the production costs that you are referring to?

MR. BLAKENEY: — These include the producer's fees, the cost of studio work, video taping, microwave work, etc., the performer's fees and the expenses - air fares, meals, hotel costs and the purchase of air time. And the performer's fees do not include anything for the Premier.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MALONE: — Mr. Speaker, I am sure he should get the greatest amount of all.

How much money was paid to Mr. Watson and how much money was paid to Mr. Fisher?

MR. BLAKENEY: — Mr. Fisher received \$150. And there might be some payment to him included in the item of air fares, meals, but the fee was \$150.

With respect to Mr. Watson, I do not have that information since the arrangement was with a company. I believe it is his company. And the total payment to that company including fees of research, air fare, hotels, etc., the total payment was \$2,058.88.

MR. MALONE: — What was the total amount, Mr. Premier, paid to the television stations that carried the broadcasts on the two evenings in question?

MR. BLAKENEY: — With respect to program number one, for the air time, I draw distinction now for air time as opposed to the payment to Armadale Publications for the production, which I am not including in your question, for the air time for the first one or for both of them, indeed, \$4,680 each.

MR. MALONE: — For each station that carried the broadcast?

MR. BLAKENEY: — No. That is the total payment for all the private television stations in Saskatchewan. I do not have with me a breakdown of the amount paid to each individual station.

MR. MALONE: — Is it your intention, Mr. Premier, then as Leader of the New Democratic Party to declare these items as election expenses when we go into the next election and have this amount credited against the amount of money that your party will be spending in that election?

MR. BLAKENEY: — I don't answer for the New Democratic Party here in this House, Mr. Speaker.

MR. MERCHANT: — I wonder if the Premier would indicate whether the CBC was paid to carry the program or whether the CBC carried it for nothing?

MR. BLAKENEY: — They carried it for nothing.

MR. CAMERON: — A supplementary. Was an advertising agency used in connection with the arrangements that were made or any of the time that was booked?

MR. BLAKENEY: — The answer is, Yes.

MR. CAMERON: — A supplementary. What advertising agency and how much money did they make?

MR. BLAKENEY: — With respect to the name of the agency, the agency is Dunsky and with respect to how much they made, I do not know since they received nothing from the Government of Saskatchewan. As you know the agencies get their payment from the media and I do not know the arrangement between the agency and the media.

MR. LANE: — A supplementary. You mentioned performer's fees, Mr. Premier. Were performer's contracts entered into between either yourself, the Government or whatever and the various interviewers?

MR. BLAKENEY: — I don't know whether the word 'contract' is appropriate but certainly arrangements in the legal sense of contracts were made. Frankly, I don't know with whom the contracts were made, whether it was made between the performer and Dunsky or the performer and the Government. But an arrangement was made to pay the performers.

Answer to Question on Highway Maintenance

HON. E. KRAMER (Minister of Highways): — Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, yesterday it will be remembered the MLA for Estevan (Mr. Larter) asked a question on a matter of privilege, which due to the time constraints of the new arrangements I was not able to answer. I wish to answer that today.

I believe, if I remember correctly, he asked me for proof that he had made derogatory statements about our crews and the work done by them. I have here, and it is old enough for him to have denied it, if he wished to - October 15th, Estevan Mercury:

Progressive Conservative MLA for Estevan, Mr. Larter, today voiced strong disapproval . . .

Now I am not going to read it all but I will table it. The heading itself says, "Road Work", not the Department, but "Road Work Criticized by MLA." Mr. Larter went on to say that had a private contractor been on this job it would have been completed in probably half the time. He went on to say that . . .

MR. SPEAKER: — Order, order! What is the Point of Order?

MR. MALONE: — On the Point of Order, Mr. Speaker, I am wondering if this is a ministerial statement as ministerial statements are known in this House. I believe it is a response to a question of the Member yesterday and if the Minister wants to answer it there is another appropriate time on the Order Paper, that is during the Question Period.

MR. SPEAKER: — I seem to recall that the matter was raised yesterday under the guise of a Point of Privilege by the Member for Estevan. I am at a bit of a loss as to when the Minister brings the information back to the House and responds to the Member for Estevan. It could be done during the Question Period, I suppose, and dealt with as the answer to a question. However, I haven't included it in the Question Period and the Minister is now answering the Point of Privilege raised by the Member for Estevan.

MR. MALONE: — I am not going to cut the Minister off, it is proper for him to make the statement. My Point of Order is as to where he makes the statement on the routine proceedings. Whether it is now or at another time, that is what I am asking.

MR. BERNTSON: — On the same Point of Order. Yesterday, when the Member for Estevan raised the Point of Privilege, I think I recall that you didn't accept it as a Point of Privilege at that time.

MR. SPEAKER: — In view of the comments that have been made here, I would ask the Minister if he would delay his response to the Member for Estevan until the Question Period tomorrow at which time if the Member wishes a supplementary he could place one.

QUESTION PERIOD - POINTS OF ORDER

MR. BERNTSON: — Mr. Speaker, on a further Point of Order, with regard to the Question Period.

I know that the Committee on Rules have generally agreed that we will pattern this Question Period after the Question Period at Ottawa as closely as possible or as it fits into this House. Specifically there was no mention made in this Committee that the official Opposition should have the first two questions or be recognized for the first two questions, followed by the third party.

I would point out the balance in Opposition in Ottawa is something different to what it is here and that there are 95 Members in the official Opposition and 16 in the third party, I think.

The tradition in the last session I thought worked quite fairly and that was that the Speaker would recognize Members from the Opposition at his own discretion and I think it balanced quite well. My point, Mr. Speaker, is that I wonder just because we bring in a new Question Period, I think it can

work very well. I wonder if the fairness of the Question Period should be jeopardized as it relates to the Opposition Parties.

MR. MALONE: — In response to the Member for Cannington, Mr. Speaker, I believe the agreement was, as he has indicated, that we would follow the Ottawa procedures as closely as possible and I believe in that procedure it is that the Speaker looks to the official Opposition for a question, supplementaries, another question, supplementaries and then looks to the third party and after that the fourth party. I believe that is what we observed in Ottawa and what the sense of the Interim Report is.

I may say, Mr. Speaker, this in no way cuts off the third party in this House from asking questions. It is only a matter of two questions going before they get in with their oars, so to speak. I noticed today that on many occasions they didn't rise at all to ask questions and we rose and asked the questions. So under the present situation of the last two days I would submit to you, Mr. Speaker, that the third party is not being hard done by, that they have every opportunity to rise to their feet and speak up during the 25 minutes provided.

MR. SPEAKER: — Any further comments on the Point of Order?

MR. K.W. BIRKBECK (Moosomin): — Just one point of clarification on that. If the official Opposition gets the first two questions can the third party ask a supplementary to the original question?

MR. SPEAKER: — Yes. If there are no further Points of Order on it I wish to make a brief statement.

I will advise the Member for Souris-Cannington and the Members of the House that I shall consider the matter that he has raised and bring a statement before the House tomorrow, which I hope will clarify the situation with regard to the Oral Question period.

The Member for Nipawin.

POINT OF ORDER

Department of Highways

MR. COLLVER: — Mr. Speaker, on a further Point of Order, I would ask for a formal ruling from you on the question which I asked today of the Minister of Highways in which you ruled out of order and what section of the new guidelines or Beauchesne or May's that you were using in ruling me out of order.

MR. SPEAKER: — Yes, I shall bring something on that for the Member as well.

ANNOUNCEMENT**Strasbourg Intermediate C Hockey Champions**

MR. MacMURCHY: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I want to bring to the attention of the Member for Cutknife and particularly to all Members of the Legislature, that last night in Strasbourg, Strasbourg defeated Cutknife to win the Saskatchewan Amateur Hockey Association Intermediate C championship with a total score of 8-2. I think we all want to extend our congratulations to Lowell Lanigan who is not only the coach of the hockey team but is the Phys Ed instructor at Strasbourg High School, and his team. Congratulations for a job well done.

I must say, Mr. Speaker, that out in Last Mountain - Touchwood we play hockey for keeps. There has been 21 years of Intermediate C competition in the province and out there in that constituency we have won the championship 13 times. Five times in Semans; five times in Raymore; Nokomis once, Punnichy once and now Strasbourg joins this illustrious group.

HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. M. KWASNICA (Cutknife-Lloydminster): — Mr. Speaker, I wish to take this opportunity . . .

MR. SPEAKER: — I assume the previous Member's statement has the status of a ministerial statement so the Member for Cutknife Lloydminster may respond.

MR. KWASNICA: — Mr. Speaker, I want to take this opportunity to congratulate the Strasbourg team and I know that our coach, Paul Pelehern, they threw everything they could at him, but all I can say is watch out for next year.

WELCOME TO MR. GORDON GRANT

MR. D.G. STEUART (Leader of the Opposition): — I should just like to - this is not in the form of a ministerial statement . . .

MR. PENNER: — Too bad, you are the only one capable of making one.

MR. STEUART: — I would just like to take this opportunity to welcome to the House, Mr. Gordon Grant, who sat in here on both sides of the House for many years, and I am sure had the respect of Members on both sides of the House. We welcome him back from the sunny South or whatever sunny part of the world he has been. I am sure all Members will join with me in saying how pleased we are to have him here.

HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

ADJOURNED DEBATES**Address-In-Reply**

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion by Mr. D.G. Banda (Redberry) for an Address-in-Reply.

MR. P.P. MOSTOWAY (Saskatoon Centre): — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Yesterday I referred to the agreement broken by the Tory Party. I also referred to the fact I felt of revolt of Members in that party is imminent because I feel they are honorable men who I am sure want no part of broken agreements. I also mentioned the fact that in and out of this House Members are obliged to work for respect; the same respect that I presume all citizens of this province strive for. I mentioned that it is difficult to convey respect for one who would try to deceive the citizens in this House and the citizens of this province. Now I say this because to admit one is wrong is one thing, but to try and whitewash it over is another thing, and that is the very thing that the citizens of this province will certainly remember at the next election and they certainly will not stand for it.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, with this little recapping I leave this topic for other things that I am sure are of great concern to the people of Saskatoon Centre constituency and in varying degrees to the other citizens of Saskatchewan.

Right now I should like to interject and talk for a minute or two on the Premier's talks and interviews that he has had recently on TV and radio. He is out of the House right now, but I certainly have conveyed to him that it was a good move, a wise move. I have had numerous replies from people who saw the proceedings on TV and radio, and many of them have said after being fed the kind of gibberish that was thrown at them, the wrong version, they were glad and very pleased to hear the proper version as put forth by the Premier. And I say to the Premier, that dozens and dozens of calls have come to me, numerous letters, scores of letters have come in praising the Premier for his good work and his ability to explain the situation properly.

MR. WHELAN: — How did he get his picture on the National Magazine?

MR. MOSTOWAY: — How did he get on the cover of the Canadian magazine! Well, there's no doubt about it, I believe numerous reporters have said they put him on there because he is undoubtedly the best Premier of any province in Canada.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MOSTOWAY: — We should put on Mr. Nixon there? I'm afraid there wouldn't be too much to report on Mr. Nixon, so maybe he could share his space with the Leader of the official Opposition.

Now, Mr. Speaker, it strikes me as being absolutely ridiculous the fact that housing is out of reach for most of the citizens in Canada. It strikes me as ridiculous the fact

that the interest rates for mortgages are much higher in Canada than they are in most other western nations, a lot higher than in that great capitalistic country, the United States of America. Now I ask you, Mr. Speaker, when will the Federal Government bring mortgage rates under control? Obviously they are not going to, or does it really want to bring mortgage rates under control? When will the Federal Government realize that high mortgage rates set by them and then subsidized by either themselves or provincial governments may put a few people in houses, but in the process large contractors, financial institutions, land speculators and real estate firms are laughing, as the Hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Steuart) has said on numerous occasions, all the way to the bank.

Mr. Speaker, as I see it, senior governments must get into the house building industry throughout all of Canada, because in this area the private sector has not served the people of Canada well. When a young married couple have to pay \$160,000 over a period of 20 to 25 years for a \$40,000 or \$50,000 house, surely something is rotten to the core, and something is rotten to the core insofar as mortgage rates and the Federal Government are concerned.

Mr. Speaker, I have another concern, and that is in the area of credit cards. In this regard I should like to bring to your attention two cases. In the first a high school aged boy had a bank account in a well-known bank in Saskatoon. Well, imagine his surprise, and his mother's surprise, when this very same bank sent him a credit card without any prior communication on the subject with him. Now I ask you, Mr. Speaker, is it proper for a bank to dare presume that it knows a particular individual's needs or even wants a credit card? I say this is a flagrant breach of trust, and I say that this violation of our human rights should be pursued with vigor with the view of stopping this despicable practise.

The other case involved a department store telephoning a lady constituent of mine and asking her if she would like a credit card. Now that, to me, is certainly real gall that only a large department store could come up with. Now, Mr. Speaker, it is my hope that this practice can be stopped before more damage is done. As far as I'm concerned it should be made illegal.

Mr. Speaker, I have other numerous concerns of particular interest to the citizens of Saskatoon Centre constituency, but I'll only mention a few and fleetingly.

One of them is in regard to a river bank development in Saskatoon. I have attended public meetings on the proposal and I wish to encourage this Government, with co-operation from Saskatoon city council and the Federal Government, to involve itself to the extent that this proposal will become a reality in the very near future. I think everyone admires the development in the Wascana area of Regina, and I think it is something that should not be denied the citizens of Saskatoon.

One more short point, Mr. Speaker, and that is that I believe it is time benefit revisions were made in regard to workers' compensation. In that regard I may sound like a long-playing record, but I have numerous cases where there has been much hardship on the part of those receiving benefits.

In this field the Government has certainly done much, but much more must be done if we are to provide a decent standard of living for injured workers and their dependents. It seems to me, they, along with others, such as senior citizens, have been the real victims of Trudeauian inflation.

Mr. Speaker, I certainly shall be supporting the Motion.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. R.A. LARTER (Estevan): — Mr. Speaker, in replying to the Speech from the Throne I feel I should make some remarks with regard to the closing of the House. I feel I should make it abundantly clear to all Members in this House that should our caucus make decisions at any time and feel at another time that our decision in caucus has been wrong and not in the public interest, then certainly under our democratic process we will always reserve the right to make a change on that decision. This we have done publicly on occasion and God help us if we have to rely on keeping the Government Members and Members to our right happy in regard to making those decisions. All of our major decisions are made by the entire caucus and certainly the one in question, it was especially important because the decision on this affected us even into the coming Session, and if you realize that the report on third party indemnity would not even be in until April 10, then it does affect us into the future.

All Members of this House knew that Mr. Collver was out of town on the two dates, including prorogation date. There is no doubt about the fact that the Member for Rosetown-Elrose (Mr. Bailey) and myself were both euchred and double-crossed on these dealings.

No one in this House had more against prorogation, Mr. Speaker, and that method of getting an increase in salary for MLAs, then Mr. Collver and the people of Saskatchewan should know this. And he was away at the time and we reviewed our position and the entire caucus reversed their position.

Mr. Collver was not specifically speaking, of my understanding, with the Attorney General on third party grants but on negotiations and talks he had been working on for the past nine months, and mostly through the Attorney General.

My understanding of the situation is that the general needs that we were after and the commitment or non-commitment the Attorney General made, he admitted that we did need more money, and he did not say outright he would get it, but he said he would work and see what he could do. But, this of course, was only a further planned delay on this matter which had been going on for nine months.

Certainly, Mr. Speaker, the Attorney General's remarks on the news media of having broken no promise between parties in nine years was not completely truthful. I should like to comment briefly on this statement made by the Attorney General regarding his nine years in the Legislature, and this was the first time an agreement had been broken between the parties. I should like to inform the Attorney General that we don't believe this to be the case at all, and it's only a few short weeks ago the Minister of Consumer Affairs (Mr. Shillington) in front of the press and others regarding an agreement on

certain amendments to The Rent Control Act, after a handshake on these amendments, and later reneged on this handshake and said, oh, this handshake may be all right in business, but in government if you make a handshake about the only thing you can be sure of after it is over you are fortunate to have all your fingers.

In seconding the Speech from the Throne the Hon. Member for Redberry (Mr. Banda) mentioned that this province had indeed reached a crossroads in resource industry, and I must agree with him in this regard, but in our opinion a very dimly lit crossroad, dimmer than he would envisage.

I should like to mention again that we in the Progressive Conservative Party believe that truly the Government has taken us down a path of no return in the resource field. It will prove disastrous and one that will discourage future money being invested in the province and possibly all of Canada.

The people of Estevan constituency are quite concerned, Mr. Speaker, over the fact that many of the Government head offices of these various departments have been moved to Weyburn. We fail to see the logic in that Estevan is the hub and the centre of this southeast part of the province. Weyburn is 70 miles out of Regina and a good part of this area could be worked out of the Regina offices. The Government offices, in many cases, are 140 miles from the people along the Manitoba border. Estevan is the natural hub for the entire area. It would seem to me, Mr. Speaker, that the Hon. Member for Weyburn (Mr. Pepper) over the past number of years has done a better job of selling the Weyburn community to his cohorts than the former Member for Estevan. As a result of this condition there has been a deterioration in service and liaison between people of this area and government. I know that the people of this constituency would appreciate if you would take a closer look at what is happening and I am sure that you will realize that surely Estevan is the centre of giving good service for the whole southeast corner of Saskatchewan.

Mr. Speaker, in the Canadian Magazine one of the Premier's cohorts is quoted as saying, even if we are defeated in three years, at least it will be worthwhile, speaking of course of the takeover of the potash industry.

Certainly most of the people of this province do not share his beliefs. But again the sad part is the Government of Saskatchewan has taken us to a point of no return on many of these journeys into dream land. I would have to agree with the Leader of the Progressive Conservative Party that this Speech from the Throne should be noted for what it does not include, rather than what it does include. But then I don't believe I am disappointed in the Throne Speech, as this is exactly what the Attorney General promised us.

Certainly there could be some positive steps taken and suggestions made for the inflationary period we are going through. We could have at least expected to see some positive steps on the reduction of government spending, a real program of controlling the amounts of civil service growth and a possible cutback on capital works, such as new buildings for government offices. Certainly the Government of the province is the biggest contributor to inflation at this time. Never has there been more unrest in labor in this province and never have we seen so many lost man hours over the past four years, to date,

and all of this from a so-called labor government. Not only can't this Government negotiate with federal governments, corporations, etc., but they can't even satisfy the labor people for whom they say they are the champions.

Mr. Speaker, I should like to mention briefly a few things about the Estevan constituency, they may be old hash, Bill 42, again what the lack of drilling has done to the Estevan area and what the future in the oil industry and the future of the people working this industry have to look forward to.

Certainly it is a fact among oil people that this Government has curtailed the exploration of oil in this province. Regardless of what the Hon. Mr. Whelan has stated on how drilling was going to increase, I think he now realizes that he was very badly informed or was attempting to misinform the public on this matter. Indeed the drilling is not increasing in this province. In order to counteract this they recently purchased Atlantic Richfield Oil Company for \$23 million. Mr. Speaker, I hope their format for purchasing these holdings is not based on the same formula as was based on the purchase of Canadian Northwest Land Holdings. It recognized in the oil industry that the going price on wells which are purchased in our area works out to about \$1,000 a barrel, in other words, a 15 barrel a day well would be approximately \$15,000. In the case of the Saskatchewan Government purchasing the Canadian Northwest Land it works out to about \$9,000 a barrel, in other words, \$135,000. Instead of a two and a half year to three year payout which private industry recognizes, it will take seven years for the same payout on the purchase they made. If the same formula is used in this purchase and the purchase of Atlantic Richfield, you can imagine how much extra money the Saskatchewan taxpayer has paid for these holdings.

Mr. Speaker, the Saskatchewan people must remember that there has not been one more barrel of oil created by this purchase than we are already receiving now and that we are also receiving through taxes maximum benefit from these wells. The \$23 million could possibly have been better spent using some imagination in drilling for more oil, rather than by purchase and accomplishing nothing more than disillusioning the people of Saskatchewan.

Mr. Speaker, promises have been made on the improvements of Highway No. 18 and 47 for at least the last 16 years that I have lived in Estevan, by both the Liberal and NDP governments. These roads are deplorable, especially when you consider the amount of revenue that has been generated by this district of the province. The people of this area have suffered the same potholes year after year and no matter how hard the merchant, the cattle mart, the total community tried to attract business to Estevan, the red flags on these roads, year after year certainly does drive them the other way.

I am especially concerned, Mr. Speaker, that a Member of this Legislature cannot offer criticism about these roads or about the method used by the Government, without the Minister of Highways blaming the Chamber of Commerce over statements which I made to him in letter form and to the newspaper some months ago and just now commented on by the Minister of Highways. The Minister of Highways has since apologized to the Chamber of Commerce as they said absolutely nothing publicly regarding the highway program.

The Hon. Minister used my remarks as an excuse and said so in writing to the Estevan city council as an excuse to withdraw all the equipment which was supposed to build Highway No. 47 North in 1976. He said that I was undermining the morale of the Department of Highways and therefore would not build the road this year. I feel very sorry for this Minister, who is very thin skinned. I also feel sorry for the people of Saskatchewan if this is the type of blackmail that we must put up with. I think after seeing his actions I know more than ever why I left my comfortable pew in order to attempt to gain a seat in this Legislature. These kinds of actions just scare me to death.

Mr. Speaker, any time a government attempts to stifle me and condemn my remarks or use them as blackmail in order to cover up inadequacies, it simply serves to prove that my stand in the first place was correct. It would be interesting for the people of Saskatchewan to see four or five contractors whom I have discussed this matter with, discussing publicly the training program that went on in this area of Saskatchewan this year. I am sure you will have a different viewpoint on the highway building by the Department of Highways and his department.

Mr. Speaker, the residents of the most part of the Souris Valley which runs not only into the Estevan constituency but also into Weyburn and Souris-Cannington are very concerned with the amount of snowfall this winter and fear for a larger flood than they have ever previously experienced. The dumping of more water each year on the Yellowgrass area and now from the Creelman area, and from areas all along the Souris River, is indeed a cause for great concern for this year. I realize there is a three-year study under way, which involves co-operation of both the Federal and Provincial Governments. But, Mr. Speaker, you must realize that the people of these areas have lost their livelihood and face further and greater disaster this year. They certainly have not been compensated properly for floods in past years. I don't believe that in the rural areas or in some cases in Estevan that they were properly compensated to the right extent. The reason that I bring this to your attention is that there are some temporary measures which so far the Government of Saskatchewan has refused to take which could alleviate some of these hardships.

The oldtimers of this area feel that if a few steps were taken as temporary measures, and they have been pointed out to the environmental group, that they might save the Government and the taxpayers of this province dollars in flood settlements. We know this is not the entire answer but they firmly believe that these temporary measures could help them through the years until the flood study has been completed and further action taken.

Mr. Speaker, these people do have a real problem and I am sure the only reason there has not been more government action is that they are in the minority. If you really are a government for the people then you will fully recognize these serious problems.

Mr. Speaker, I feel that more attention should be placed and more research and action should be taken on the possibility of dams on the Souris River area which would give a fantastic water supply not only for potential industries such as

petro-chemical plants but for the future water supply of our vast power industry which we are so blest with in this area. This would also give the people of southeast Saskatchewan and in fact southern Saskatchewan a very large accessible summer resort.

Mr. Speaker, I should also like to comment on the fact that Estevan is in dire need of air service into this community. We are fortunate in not only having black top runways but we have the most hours, and the record of the most sunshine days of any city in Canada. I believe this makes for very good flying conditions, this would be a natural tie-in for any flights going from Regina to Minot to Minneapolis. We would appreciate any future considerations on moves towards air service.

I should like to thank, Mr. Speaker, the Government of Saskatchewan for not only the grants towards rinks and towards senior citizens drop-in centres, but also for participation in the building of the Lampman Union Hospital. This is indeed a growing community and we are very pleased that the Government is taking part in this growth.

Mr. Speaker, the people in the Estevan constituency and as I know in all the province are extremely worried at the increasingly high costs of growing old. I speak particularly for the residents of nursing homes and senior citizens' lodges throughout the province and to the many instances where people have worked hard all their lives and who, for example, may be retiring say on only a half section of land and find that depending on the level of care they require in the nursing homes, they are punished for having accumulated and worked hard for a very meagre amount of money and then they cannot receive full assistance until these meagre savings are gone. It is urgent that governments come up with better formulas to make it possible for all people to grow old with dignity.

I should like to commend the Government of Saskatchewan for participating in the Winter Games just completed in the town of Bienfait. I do not believe there could have been anything done to unite a community more than what has happened in this area. I sincerely congratulate the Government for participating and promoting this type of activity in these small communities.

Mr. Speaker, in conclusion, I must again condemn the Government for not bringing in the Budget at the early date. The Conservative Party was accused of delaying this Budget. If we did err in judgment we admitted it publicly. The Government, in ignoring our apology, and by not bringing in the Budget at an earlier date, are punishing the people of Saskatchewan and in particular those responsible for bringing in budgets at all levels of government such as school boards. Two wrongs do not make a right, Mr. Speaker, and we regret the Government's petty and stubborn refusal to change their minds on so important a matter. We suggested this Budget was not ready for March 12 and that the Conservatives have been made the convenient whipping boys while at the same time providing the Government with the extra preparatory time that they actually required.

This is a nothing Throne Speech and was basically designed to introduce the opening of the House with little or no thought

given to content. I cannot support it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. E.C. WHELAN (Minister of Mineral Resources): — Mr. Speaker, there are times when we are unsuccessful in our attempts to negotiate with the Federal Government and perhaps some day we will solve that problem. But the facts as presented by the Hon. Member who has just taken his seat indicate clearly that we will never be successful in negotiating with the euchre-playing deputy leader of the Tories.

Mr. Speaker, in the Speech from the Throne this House has been told that the Saskatchewan economy in contrast to the economy of the country has been spurred by record farm incomes and high resource revenues to a new level of performance.

Mr. Speaker, I will endeavor to tell this House of the role the Department of Mineral Resources has played and will play in the continued growth of Saskatchewan. First, however, Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct my congratulations to the very able mover and seconder of the Speech from the Throne. The Hon. Member for Redberry (Mr. Banda) and the Hon. Member for Athabasca (Mr. Thompson). We on this side of the House are proud to have them with us. I am sure that their constituents are proud of them. Mr. Speaker, they were articulate, accurate and effective. The constituencies they represent are indeed fortunate to have two such able representatives in this Legislature.

Now, Mr. Speaker, may I turn to reporting of my Department's activity, to speak of our action and our recommended actions, that will secure for the people of Saskatchewan a fair and equitable return from some resources that belong to them.

Mr. Speaker, I will begin by explaining to Members of this House the position this Government took at the recent Energy Ministers' Conference held in Ottawa on March 5. I will endeavor to discuss oil and gas pricing, giving particular consideration to a summary of Saskatchewan's position on oil and gas pricing and to the recommendations that we put forward at the conference. I will discuss the treatment of crude oil inventory and product pricing that follow increased crude costs. I will explain the position this Government has taken on the Mackenzie Valley Pipeline, and discuss a matter of seriousness to all citizens of Canada and Saskatchewan and energy conservation programs revealing what action we have taken to date and the areas under review.

The international market, we are told, is overflowing with oil, scores of sea-going tankers have been laid up for want of business. Some fairly critical concessions have been made. Recently Iran announced a 9.5 per cent cut in the price of a barrel of heavy crude to improve sales. In all likelihood, there will be further reductions. Why? In Saskatchewan two-thirds of the oil wells in the Fosterton-Dollard crude producing pools in the southwest part of the province are standing idle. Is it all because industrial countries have been more successful than expected in restraining their thirst for oil? Is there recently a shortage of petroleum in the world? What exactly is the consumer of petroleum products supposed to believe, particularly when he sees the prices of these items rising steadily and finds that every time he drives up to the gas

pumps, he expects to see the prices going up?

Other voices say that Canada will face a domestic oil shortage probably within the next ten years and that gasoline rationing will be a fact of life. Still others say that Canada will be self-sufficient in petroleum within 15 years. Clearly, Mr. Speaker, there are questions that have to be answered. Clearly there must be some sort of consensus particularly in this country. To this end there have been a series of Energy Ministers' meetings to find solutions to problems that beset us domestically. At these meetings one thing has been painfully evident. Our woes, the problems that we face with our oil industry in Saskatchewan, are not as much created by international oil situations as they are created by federal policies. Or rather I should say a lack of federal policies, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, we in Saskatchewan are optimistic about the future of oil even though we have been forced into making price concessions in oil that we sell domestically. While oil on the domestic market brings \$12.50 a barrel we in Saskatchewan are trapped into a position of selling to eastern consumers in Canada at a price below that. They pay Venezuela \$12.50, they pay the Middle East countries \$12.50, but they pay the Province of Saskatchewan \$8 a barrel. This means that we are in effect subsidizing Canada. Our contribution to Canadian consumers of petroleum is in the millions of dollars annually.

However, the Federal Government is not optimistic, the Federal Government has taken a pessimistic outlook on oil production and has been moving in the direction of totally eliminating exports of Canadian oil by the year 1981. Two years earlier than was first forecast by the National Energy Board. On January 1 of this year, exports were cut by one-third and a further gradual cut is slated for the end of November. Not only is the Canadian oil industry worried about this direction, but so are the oil producing provinces, including this province.

Saskatchewan has been particularly adversely affected by the Federal Government's curtailment of oil exports because 70 per cent of all crude oil produced in Saskatchewan is in the heavy and medium grade categories - the grades of oil that contain the most impurities and require special refining processes.

However, there are no such refining facilities in western Canada. Prior to the cutback in oil exports, Saskatchewan crude found a ready market in refineries in the northern tier refineries of the US. Saskatchewan was admittedly 'over the oil-barrel' when Ottawa announced a further cutback of oil exports in January. So when we went to the Energy Ministers' conference in March, we had some legitimate complaints to make, and many concrete proposals that would have restored Saskatchewan's oil industry to a state of health.

One of the questions we asked at the Energy Ministers' conference was, as a producing province and owner of the natural resource in question, why are we not allowed to sell our resource at the international price, in the same manner as producers of other commodities in other provinces? Why are we treated as colonials who have to furnish eastern Canada with cheap energy? It doesn't make sense, Mr. Speaker. We pay the

full international price for commodities which we import from other parts of Canada and the world.

This Government considers any price below international price to be a direct subsidy of eastern Canadians, and seriously questions why these particular resources should be singled out to protect Canadian consumers when all other goods and services which we purchase here in Saskatchewan, are sold at international price levels. Considering the subsidy, which is over four dollars per barrel, Saskatchewan's contribution to Canadian consumers is many millions of dollars per year.

You will have noted by now, Mr. Speaker, that as a group, the Ministers of the conference were unable to arrive at any consensus as to why price increases should take place in the price of crude for the coming year. The consuming provinces, primarily led by Ontario, rejected any price increase. The only thing that was resolved was that a decision would be deferred to a later date when the first Ministers are next scheduled to meet. And in the meantime a task force has been set up to check into pricing matters, particularly pricing in the United States.

We, of course, asked the Ministers at the conference, why, at a time when crude is a valuable commodity, and a strong demand exists, is our production restricted? This too, does not make sense. We have been told that cutting back production will supposedly provide greater security of supply for Canadians. And yet, this ends up costing both the province and the producer tremendous sums when you consider that the cash flow is also cut back for the producer, and that because of the costly procedures involved in recovering our heavier crudes, cutting back production means that the per unit cost of production is forced upward.

This has created a serious problem for Saskatchewan. Cutting back production has had a distinct impact on the pace of development of oil resources, and the resulting loss of revenues has meant that general economic development has been slowed down. Why should we in Saskatchewan have to be struck down by the mismanagement of the Federal Government? It is almost as if they have to pull us down with them, Mr. Speaker, so that they won't have the example of Saskatchewan, a New Democratic province, in such contrast to the halting performance of the rest of the Canadian economy.

Mr. Speaker, we will not allow that to happen.

Mr. Speaker, those that argue that a price increase in oil would be detrimental to their economy must realize some straightforward facts. For the past three years, Canadian industry has enjoyed relatively cheap oil, and has had a competitive advantage over most industries in nations with whom they must compete. And if they're having difficulties now, as they say they are, then it certainly isn't because they're paying too much for oil. I would suggest that there is something much more seriously wrong.

As far as the average Canadian consumer is concerned, and the impact that an oil price increase would have on the cost of living, perhaps it should be known exactly who receives how much for a gallon of gasoline at the pumps.

Suppose that a gallon of gas at the pumps costs 81 cents, Mr. Speaker. While the Government of Saskatchewan would earn nine cents from the sale of a non-renewable resource, the Government of Canada would take a share of 17.3 cents; and the average province would collect something like 19 cents in taxes from that gallon. Taxes, Mr. Speaker, imposed by the Federal Government, and other provincial governments on a resource that belongs to the people of Saskatchewan, and for which the people of Saskatchewan are only receiving nine cents from that gallon. Just whose oil was it in the first place, anyway? Whatever is left of that amount goes to the producers, the refiners, and the marketers of that gasoline.

Perhaps, Mr. Speaker, what should be done, is some action taken on behalf of the consumer, by the Federal Government. Perhaps the Federal Government should lower its tax levies to protect the consumers, instead of expecting producing provinces to get shafted.

Saskatchewan recommended at the conference, Mr. Speaker, that the price of crude oil rise gradually to international levels, suggesting \$10 per barrel by July 1. We also suggested that the ten cents Federal excise tax on gasoline be phased down as the price rises to international levels. The Federal Government gets ten cents per gallon at the pumps and you get approximately 34 gallons from an average barrel of crude oil. They get \$3.40 out of a barrel of crude at the pumps while the people of Saskatchewan who own the crude get less; they get about nine cents per gallon. We strongly urged that the Federal Government withdraw immediately from the gasoline tax field, and return the taxing privileges to the producing provinces. Mr. Speaker, we presented our recommendations at the conference, and our arguments for these recommendations.

Mr. Speaker, at the time of the last crude oil price increase, where the price of crude oil was established at a level of eight dollars a barrel, the Federal Government established a 45 day price freeze, but it was up to the individual province whether or not provinces imposed a freeze on petroleum products that exceeded the 45 days. The differing length of price freezes from province to province created a great deal of difficulty.

Mr. Speaker, a refinery has a certain amount of crude on hand in storage tanks, along with products that have already been processed, and are stored in readiness for sale. Now when there is a price increase in a barrel of crude, some sort of across-the-board price freeze is necessary in order to prevent windfall gains that could result from large inventories. The idea is that the processed petroleum products, and crude in storage should be used, and the products sold at the old price until inventories are depleted.

If there is not a freeze for a period of time following the raise in the price of crude, some interest could stand to make an unreasonable gain. The Federal Government had recommended a 45 day freeze following the establishment of the \$8 a barrel price. However, Ontario along with other provinces, exceeded this amount of time, with fairly serious consequences for Saskatchewan.

Saskatchewan refineries are in a position where a relatively low inventory is required in their operations. Refiners operate

on a smaller scale than the larger oil interests that operate in the East, and have kept a relatively low inventory of crude on hand. The Regina refinery keeps an inventory of perhaps twenty three to twenty four days. What's more, the proximity to Alberta means there is no real need to build large inventories; there is no likelihood of delays in the movement of crude oil from Alberta to Saskatchewan. As a result, the 45 day freeze was not extended in Saskatchewan.

In fact, concerns were such that refiners could easily have depleted their inventory; and that they came close to a situation where they would have had to take a loss by paying the new crude price and still selling at the old. Because of the nature of the refineries in Saskatchewan - they are small, and one-refinery operations, the refiners would not have been able to spread their losses.

There is only one co-op refinery. They could not spread their losses over another refinery, or in another province in the way a big refinery could. The Kamsack refinery expressed similar concern, since it is entirely dependent on trucked crude supplies.

Other provinces, however, for various political reasons, extended their price freezes. Integrated companies or refineries which operated in Ontario, for instance, found they were depleting their inventories after the prolonged freeze, and were losing money in Ontario. Although they were paying new crude prices, they were restricted from selling their products above the old price.

What a large integrated company or refinery could do in a situation like this, is recover its losses in a province where the price freeze was no longer in effect; and instead of increasing prices in Saskatchewan proportionate to the increase in per unit cost of finished product, they could have increased them still further, so that they could recover the losses they incurred in a province such as Ontario that prolonged its price freeze. And they would have done this, Mr. Speaker, they would have soaked the Saskatchewan consumers good and proper to make up for the dollar they were losing in Ontario. But we approached them and assured them that we were not above taking action should this situation have occurred to any extent.

However, Mr. Speaker, this is not good enough. Rather than having to work as antagonists against the refiners, we feel strongly that there should be consensus among all the provinces. They should all agree and stick to the agreement. There is need for general agreement, Mr. Speaker, because extensive freezes throughout Canada, will work against any national policy for crude oil and crude oil pricing. If we have agreed to sell our oil for a lower, domestic price, then surely we should have the right to co-operation from all provinces. Mr. Speaker, I think that's only fair.

Now, as to Saskatchewan's position on the Mackenzie Valley Gas Pipeline. A report from the National Energy Board of April, 1975, indicated that Canadians will require Mackenzie Delta gas by 1984. We think that this is a fair and reasonable estimate. However, we feel strongly that a national decision on a project as important as this should be based on an adequate resolution of the issues it raises, such as native land claims, and environmental impact, and not be rushed along in the desire to meet American requirements for gas. We have

indicated our feelings to the representatives at the Energy Ministers' conference.

We've also made our views known concerning which pipeline company should be selected to handle the project. We stated that our preferences were for Foothills Pipeline Company to undertake the project, since it is more likely to remain under Canadian financial control, and would therefore act in Canada's long-term interest. Of course there are other reasons: it would be less difficult to construct and finance, and it would not depend on regulation by, or a pipeline treaty with the United States.

Now, Mr. Speaker, may I turn to Saskatchewan's Energy Conservation Program. Although we are an oil producing province, we feel the responsibility for conservation, and recognize the need for increased efforts to make the best use of energy. To this end, we have established an interdepartmental committee to oversee energy conservation programs for both government and the public. The task of this committee is to co-ordinate the work of technical committees on agriculture, buildings, industry, information, education and transportation.

A great deal of emphasis has been placed on reducing energy use in public and private buildings. To this end, we have taken this action to date. We have set new insulation standards for all new government-owned or financed structures. We formulated a model by-law regarding insulation standards for distribution by the Department of Municipal Affairs, to all municipal governments, with a request that each municipality amend their building code to conform with the model by-law.

We have acquired access to an energy analysis computer program that will be used in the design of all new government buildings. We have set a target of an 11 per cent reduction in the amount of energy consumed in the '76-'77 fiscal year. Saskatchewan Power Corporation has widely distributed pamphlets on home insulation, and the Department of Education is currently redrafting building standards for schools to increase the energy efficiency of these structures.

The Department of Health is conducting an investigation into how savings in energy can be realized in hospitals without harming the level of patient care.

All housing designed or financed by the Saskatchewan Housing Corporation now meets the new insulation standards. Energy conservation guidelines are being drafted for the libraries across the province, and other areas are under review.

In the area of transportation, the Legislative Review Committee on Highway Traffic Safety has recommended a 55 M.P.H. speed limit. Some discussions have been held with some of the larger cities to establish a computer-based synchronized traffic control system to set up the energy efficiency of vehicles in urban driving. Public transit use is being encouraged, and other areas are under review.

In the agriculture sector, which is a large energy consumer, and especially vulnerable to increased costs, both the SPC and the Department of Agriculture are advising and informing farmers on methods of obtaining optimum use of energy resources. There

is also a research program to investigate the use of waste heat and solar energy that can be applied to grain drying and greenhouse purposes.

In the industry sector, Mr. Speaker, government plays an important role. However, industry will have to assume a great deal of responsibility for energy conservation. SPC has held plant seminars, and has provided advice to industry.

The information/education sector of the program, extensive amounts of information have been made available to the public through literature sent out by various departments, through the media, and before long, hopefully through the schools. The Department of Education is currently examining ways in which the issue of energy conservation can be introduced into the school curriculum.

This area is one that will continue to grow so that total public awareness of conservation will result. We are confident that the people of Saskatchewan already have an energy-use consciousness.

Mr. Speaker, the intention of this Government is to keep Saskatchewan's economy in good health. The Department of Mineral Resources is directing its efforts to that goal and intention, so that next year we shall again see Saskatchewan achieving a new level of performance. My Department is, of course, cognizant that there are measures that have to be taken to fight back the problem faced elsewhere in Canada, and again have acted accordingly with an energy conservation program. Mr. Speaker, I, on behalf of the Department of Mineral Resources, am confident that all challenges can be met to the benefit of all the people of Saskatchewan.

I have discussed our position at the Energy Ministers' Conference, and why we have taken the positions we have. I have indicated the areas where we are acting, and where we will act, and have informed this House as to the efforts my Department will be making in the coming year.

Again, Mr. Speaker, there is a feeling of confidence, a feeling of purpose, and a dedication to the common good of the Province of Saskatchewan. Mr. Speaker, I will support the Motion.

MR. R.H. BAILEY (Rosetown-Elrose): — Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise at this time in the Reply to the Speech from the Throne. I note when I look at the Speech from the Throne that there is at the bottom of page two that March has been proclaimed "Salute the Olympics Month." It would appear to me, Mr. Speaker, that in the last two days it's been "Let's get the Conservatives Month."

MR. MALONE: — All year round.

MR. BAILEY: — Well, it would appear so. While I wasn't here yesterday, Mr. Speaker, I understand that it was a continuation of what occurred on Friday. Mr. Speaker, some time ago in this House it was obvious that Members opposite decided that perhaps it was a good time to "Let's Get Roy Bailey Month." And we had the same incident of the Member for Moose Jaw going off in a tirade about my criticisms that I had made prior to June 11, and if I remember correctly the Minister was so angered that

he referred to me as being a fascist. I should like to inform that Member, Mr. Speaker, that if I were to stand in this House and refer to the Member for Moose Jaw North (Mr. Skoberg) as a communist it is quite likely that my executive back in the Rosetown-Elrose constituency would have called me in and either severely reprimanded me or ask me to step out altogether. And yet Members opposite, Mr. Speaker, can take it upon themselves because of the document that was written long before June 11, of which I might add, Mr. Speaker, most of the Members opposite threw in the wastepaper basket - most of the Members opposite didn't bother, but I took it upon myself to criticize an agency of the Government. But this Government says, we are beyond reproach. This Government says that if you criticize us, we will get even with you. That is what the Member for Moose Jaw North tried. That is what he tried in this House, Mr. Speaker.

I want to tell the Member for Moose Jaw North when he put my name on the line at that time, and he wanted to check out my credentials, he wanted to check out how worthy I was and so on, I'll invite you to come to any area in which I have worked and ask the people. I am sure that my record will stand up well. Not only in this House but out in the country as well.

You know, Mr. Speaker, the reason why the Member over there was selected to come after me, they thought they would get hold of the boy who has previously been to Ottawa. He would be able to handle me. Well, I think his record in the House has now been established and perhaps he should go some place else for some more grooming.

Mr. Speaker, when I examined the Speech from the Throne I was convinced that it was the same group of people who wrote the TV commercials that we have been seeing. It sounds to me like an NDP TV commercial. It is to me somewhat amazing that in a province where the majority of the wealth comes from agriculture, it got about 22 words or something in the Speech from the Throne. Nothing was really said whatsoever.

Talking about criticizing the Government opposite, Mr. Speaker. I have watched the affairs of government in this province since I was 14 years of age. I have listened and I have read and I have been very interested. But the response of the Hon. Member in charge of Highways, Mr. Speaker, has to be the most childish response in the history of this province. He simply said you people have criticized a crew of mine, therefore, like a little boy in school, I am pulling my crew out and you are not going to get a highway. That is what he told the people of this province. That's the Government opposite. If you criticize us we will get even with you.

The Hon. Member for Saskatoon Centre (Mr. Mostoway) who acts as the Party Whip, when the Saskatoon Chamber of Commerce decided that they were going to take exception to Government interference in private business, and surely they have that right, surely they have the right to do so. He goes to the press and says if you keep on with your criticism I will be suggesting to my colleagues that they don't get any money from the Government.

One of my RMs moved a resolution condemning the potash takeover. I would hope that the Government wouldn't see fit to re-arrange the grants of the RM so that it does not get any because they criticized the Government.

Mr. Speaker, driving into Regina yesterday, I listened on the radio to the report by the Minister in charge of the Liquor Board. In an arbitrary decision the Government has made, once the stocks from the South African wines are used up this Government would no longer be purchasing the wines from that country. I am not criticizing that policy in itself, Mr. Speaker. But I am wondering, what about all the other countries of the world with which this Government either directly or indirectly has business. When I think of the discrimination that has gone on behind the iron curtain, particularly with the Jewish people, the rankest of all discriminations equal to that of Nazi Germany, I wonder why this Government wouldn't make a statement about products from behind the Iron Curtain at the same time. It doesn't make sense to me, Mr. Speaker. I am not criticizing them for going after the South African Government but the very fact that they selected South Africa seems to be a discriminatory act in itself. They have forgotten a good many other countries with which they do business. I am wondering, too, in this particular action, Mr. Speaker, what groups, if the Minister could inform this House, what groups, what were the pressure groups? I want to tell you this Government wasn't very responsive to the people's actions when they overwhelmingly condemned the potash takeover. They didn't want to listen then. All of a sudden they want to listen to a very small pressure group.

Now, Mr. Speaker, one can't criticize the Speech from the Throne too much, one would have to say you will criticize what isn't in the Speech from the Throne.

Mr. Speaker, I want to tell you that in the constituency that I represent, the most common complaint that I have, the most common request, the topic which is most discussed on the telephone with me, was never even mentioned in the Speech from the Throne. The constituency of Rosetown-Elrose covers 12 rural municipalities. It is a large constituency. In that constituency, Mr. Speaker, we have two, only two senior citizen or nursing homes, that is all. I want to say from the border in the south of Kyle over to Beechy, to Lucky Lake to Dinsmore to Macrorie, we have people being forced to take old people 200 miles away to find accommodations and not one single word in the Speech from the Throne. The Premier stands and tells about a big advertising campaign while we see this Government building a bureaucracy of civil servants unparalleled in this province. They don't have any money to support these communities. And the former Minister of Social Services comes out and says, you are going to have to have more names than that. Well, Mr. Speaker, I want to tell you that the people of Saskatchewan are not going to be too happy I am quite sure even though they have found an excuse for delaying the Budget.

I will venture to say this that for the past six weeks we have heard, oh, we are going to catch up, we are going to recognize local government boards. I am glad the Minister of Education (Mr. Tchorzewski) is in his seat because I am going to have something to say about that as well. And it wasn't mentioned in the Speech from the Throne.

Mr. Speaker, I just completed a budget in its most part, I have a couple more days or nights to touch it up. Over the years, Mr. Speaker, and I want to say that I have been in this business a lot longer than those mouthy people over there who try to interrupt when I am speaking, more and more control is

being removed from the local level. Mr. Speaker, I should like the Members opposite to listen to this; 62 per cent of the budget which I prepared is not determined by the Board which I work for at all. It is being determined by a farce which is being conducted in Regina right now, and which has been going on for seven months, an absolute farce. About 27 to 30 per cent of my budget, Mr. Speaker, is determined by provincial grants.

Mr. Speaker, I want to talk just for a moment about the re-organization of the Department of Education. No public statement has been made by the Minister of Education. I see the former Minister of Education taking his seat so perhaps he would like to listen to this. When the former Minister of Education decided he was once and for all going to strip the trustees in this province of all their powers, he did a pretty good job. He turned around and set up a provincial negotiation outfit in which the trustees were going to be there as mere puppets on a string. He didn't even have the courage to put them there in the same number at the negotiating table as the Government officials. And the senior Government officials as they sit opposite the members negotiating on the part of the teachers, they can't make a decision. Every time a decision is to be reached they must run out to the Minister. And the trustees sit there and have absolutely no say. If it comes to a vote it is all determined upon the Minister and nobody else. Seven months have gone by and, Mr. Speaker, trustee-teacher negotiations are no closer, as I understand it, to an agreement than they were last September.

This is one thing, Mr. Speaker, despite what the Government Members want to say or Opposition Members want to say, the greatest thing which is holding up that part of budgets which belong to school units, is not as much the grants as it is the slowness in teacher negotiations.

Now the former Minister of Education has moved into Municipal Affairs and he is going to start another empire building. We have the empire building structure being set up in the Department of Education where the Minister and his cohorts in Regina will always be clean. Nobody will ever be able to come to them with any criticism, you keep it all out in your field, that is your responsibility.

Mr. Speaker, in talking to boards around the country, including RMs we hear anything from a 25 mill increase and the lowest I have heard is five. That is the lowest I have heard.

You know, Mr. Speaker, it is a pretty tough cookie in my business to go out and watch this Government exercise its discriminatory policies. They may not like what I have to say at this particular time, but that is too bad. That is why Members of the Opposition are elected, to criticize the Government. I watch in my community . . .

MR. STODALKA: — Watch your grants go down, Roy.

MR. BAILEY: — I don't get enough grant at the present time to make that much difference. I want to say this now that you have mentioned grants, I know in retaliation the Minister of Education is going to get up and he is going to say, but we have

upped it by \$100,000. I inform the Member for Maple Creek that I went back to 1963 and the percentage of grants in the total cost operation has not fluctuated by more than two per cent in 12 years.

Mr. Speaker, we talked about discriminatory things. I go out and I say to my people, I am sorry, we have to make some reductions here. I think the Member for Yorkton got up and said, we don't have a pupil-teacher ratio any more. That made me chuckle. We haven't? We have got teacher-pupil ratios. We always had. But he obviously has been living in that utopian dream world opposite and he doesn't recognize it.

Mr. Speaker, school boards across this country are going to have to go out this year and they are going to say, I am sorry but we are going to have to reduce the size of our teaching staff. Simply because there is a decline in enrollment and we work it out and work together. Teachers are saying this. If there are eight people in the community who want to do the cha cha, the Government picks up 80 per cent of the cost of that, but if we want to hire another teacher, in a particular group, the Government may say, in my particular case, we'll pick up about 25 per cent of the cost.

Getting back to the Government's operations in the field. When I asked a question in the last session about community colleges what a terrible fascist I was. Another agency of the Government which was beyond reproach. I wasn't supposed to criticize that. Well, I have had a lot of conversation and I think the former Minister of Education should be congratulated because it is working and it is working relatively well, and certainly he can't say that I would hinder it in any way. I notice that some of these towns are a beehive of activity.

But why was it when the Minister established a committee that he didn't listen to the recommendations of the committee. Why was it when the committee came back in and recommended that the board of the community college be elected that he ignored their request? I have since found out and it is very apparent to all the people of Saskatchewan that every time this Government wants to do a little empire building, we have got to pad it with our own boards, we must keep our empire up. So that this little core which is in the Government can grow and grow and pretty soon you have people all over Saskatchewan who are afraid to even say a word in case they will get the retaliation like the Member for Moose Jaw North tried to level against me.

Mr. Speaker, I want to say something about the criticism that has come of the Conservative Party and towards our Leader of this party. I am telling you right now that it takes a lot more guts, pardon the expression, Mr. Speaker, to stand up and admit that a mistake was made. But I want to say this that the Government opposite and the people to my right don't realize really what is going on. The House Leader of the Government and for whom I have a great deal of respect, would far sooner see the Liberals sitting here because he knows he can whip them anytime at the polls. They are no opposition to them, and you people know that from experience.

MR. MALONE: — What have you been doing?

MR. BAILEY: — I should like to say to the

Member for Regina Lakeview that I will take my share of discussion in this House along with the rest of you.

Mr. Speaker, what is very apparent here, I don't know what happened between the sessions, obviously you people must have got together, and you decided let's crucify the Conservatives. Why can't you leave that til Good Friday? You decided that this is going to be and I think, Mr. Speaker, that the Members opposite do well to take the Throne Speech debate, move an amendment and let's call it, "Let's get the Conservatives Month," the month of March. Well, Mr. Speaker, I will be quite prepared to answer the challenges from any of the Members opposite.

Mr. Speaker, I want to get back for just a moment to that of the highways. He is a veteran they tell me, the Minister of Highways is a veteran in this House. I find, Mr. Speaker, in a visit that I made in the province over the weekend, the highways in that particular area, had gone into nothing but a deteriorated cow path. Mr. Speaker, a Government that was elected in 1971, which has had more revenue given to them than any government in this province has ever got their hands on, and the highways in Saskatchewan are going down, and Members opposite know it. The Minister knows it, he can't even stand to listen to it.

Mr. Speaker, I should like to comment on one other topic at this particular time, and that is a topic which again was deleted completely from the Throne Speech. Mr. Speaker, in the Province of Saskatchewan for the first time after many, many years the SARM, the urban municipalities and the Saskatchewan School Trustees have got together as local government boards because they have common problems and because of their common problems that they have, that they could share some of these problems and perhaps come with some solutions to present to the senior Government here.

Mr. Speaker, this Government's attitude, this Government's attitude to local government is deplorable.

AN HON. MEMBER: — You said that once.

MR. BAILEY: — This Government's attitude not only, and I may be saying it as good many more times too, it may take that long to get it through some of your heads over there.

Mr. Speaker, I want to say this. The first thing that this Government attempted to do was to destroy local control. That's the first thing that they have attempted to do. I sit on a board day in and day out and I watch this control being eroded. They won't admit it. They won't admit it, Mr. Speaker, but give them another four years, give them another four years and they will exercise upon the towns and the cities and the RMs and all local government boards the famous socialist philosophy, we know what's best for people, we know what's best, let us run your affairs because we can do it better than you can.

Mr. Speaker, the record of this Government doesn't say so and when I stand to speak and I hear Ministers opposite suggesting that I sit down, I will sit down when I'm good and ready to sit down and when I'm finished speaking.

Mr. Speaker, it is very obvious, it is very obvious that this document here, this famous document and my sympathy with

the boys who moved and seconded, Mr. Speaker, my sympathies are with them. You know, I don't know who wrote your speeches out in the back room for you, I know that you have got lots of help around, but you did an admirable job, I can appreciate it, you didn't have much to work with, but you moved and seconded and I congratulate you for it.

Mr. Speaker, no way, it's impossible for me to support this document, it's impossible for me as a representative of people to support the Speech from the Throne.

HON. E. KRAMER (Minister of Highways): — Mr. Speaker, I would first of all like to congratulate the mover and the seconder and I would like also to point out that this tremendous document is only an addendum to the real Speech from the Throne which we brought in last fall. The long delay, of course, that we had when a lot of idle chatter was listened to for weeks and months on end, nearly months, we are faced with this particular short Throne Speech, however, when we get both of those Throne Speeches together and the legislation that this is going to be brought in, I am sure that the public, not the Opposition, but the public will be satisfied, as they have been over the years with CCF and New Democratic Government Speeches from the Throne programs and when the Budget is belatedly brought in, I'm sure that the public will once again be quite happy with the Budget.

Before I go into some of the things, I don't want to make a speech, I just want to chat a bit, but before I go into it, I had a horrible dream, a rather bad dream last night, in fact I had two of them. I dreamt that somehow or other I was in Ottawa and I was watching the Premier from Saskatchewan, his name was Collver. He walked in with a retinue and he had a bundle under his arm of papers and so on and he said, Prime Minister Caouette I've got something to say to you. First of all your Members aren't sitting up straight, they are chewing gum and one thing and another and you're not treating the West perfectly. Then he started shuffling his papers and he mentioned a couple of things about how shot and bull shot and Mr. Caouette said, you don't speak very good, as plain as the people in western Canada say those words. Then he went on and mumbled a bit more and said, well, I'm sorry, Mr. Prime Minister, I don't think I can speak for the West, I have trouble keeping my thoughts together and went to the bathroom.

That wasn't the worst of it. I barely got through with that and turned over and I even had a worse dream. Here was Premier hotlips Lane and Deputy Premier running iron Anderson, down there and they had Senator Steuart with them, putting the case for western Canada, putting the case for Saskatchewan. The Prime Minister was saying, now (imitation) hotlips, you know, I think I'll let you pull up all this railroad providing, and I'll give you those 10,000 Red River carts that you want, but providing that you use all the structural steel and put it through the mill down there that you have in Saskatchewan, in order to make new penitentiaries so that we can have room for all those people that are going to be imprisoned under the new gun laws. Well about that time my wife nudged me and said, stop groaning, wake up. And it was darn near time to get up anyway so everything turned out for the best.

Mr. Speaker, I suppose now is as good a time as any. We've been mentioned several times and I want to be as patient as I

can with the people opposite, but especially I want to be patient with the press. I want to read a short news release and he has given me the opportunity, the Member for Estevan (Mr. Larter) who complains bitterly because I took his advice, I don't know what he wants me to do.

Progressive Conservative MLA for Estevan, Bob Larter, (and this is October 15) today voiced strong disapproval at the methods and lack of efficiency in the rebuilding of five miles of highway No. 18 near Estevan. Many people in the area, particularly those affected by this stretch of road are appalled at the length of time it has taken with 35 to 40 people and \$2 million worth of equipment on the side to get this job done.

The statement said, remember this:

It has taken the Department of Highways over five months to rebuild this stretch of road with the taxpayers' money and equipment, he said.

I don't know who else's money it would be built with, but anyway maybe there's a better way.

Mr. Larter went on to say that had a private contractor been on this job it would have been completed in half the time. He went on to say, that this, of course, also affected 15 miles of the rebuilding of highway 47 in 1975 since this same crew were to build this stretch as well.

The MLA concluded his statement by saying it would be very interesting to see the final cost per yard on this job in comparison with other highway contracts let to other contractors this year.

Well, Mr. Speaker, it seems to me it's passing strange, that the House opened last fall, he wants the information he says, he had the opportunity all through that fall session to put a question on the Order Paper as to the costs which would have been provided to him, but he chose to communicate only through a press statement, only through a press statement. Mr. Speaker, he still communicates through the press. March 10, 1976, Meadow Lake Progress, and I will only read an excerpt from this:

He went on to say, that Mr. Kramer had not written him explaining the delays but simply acted out of vengeance.

Mr. Speaker, let me go back. The Member visited the site, snooped around, quite welcome to do that, got all the information that he wanted, quite welcome to do that, that's a good idea for Members to see. I don't know what questions were answered, but not once did he contact me, as the Minister of Highways. He complains because I did not write to him. I ask the Member, when did he correspond with me? When did he attempt to find out the answers before going to the press and giving this advice?

AN HON. MEMBER: — He did not.

MR. KRAMER: — Of course he did not. He chose that cheap, cowardly

method that is used by both groups in the Opposition, continually attacking civil servants who are not able to reply. Kicking people when their hands are tied, who cannot fight back. That's their method. They talk about dictatorship and this type of thing. That's their method, always been their method and I'll have a few words more to say about this later on.

I want to say, Mr. Speaker, to the members of the press . . .

AN HON. MEMBER: — He made a mistake.

MR. KRAMER: — I'd be quite happy to have him admit he made a mistake. I want to say to the press, Mr. Speaker, that it is not true, though you keep on with your lead in the statement made by the Member and they are saying it over there, because of those statements made. It is not because of statements made that we discontinued the work. The Member and others said private contractors could do it better and cheaper. I took their advice. In late October we called for tenders and December 10th gave the private contractors a chance. December 10th we opened the tenders. The tenders were much higher than we anticipated. I certainly don't blame the contractors one bit, not one bit, because they had to gamble on more, possibly more rain next year and they had to have a margin, a cushion. I wouldn't have bid any lower myself. Because of that, we decided not to accept the tenders. Certainly I wasn't going to change my mind at that time and tell that same crew to continue the work. The plans are already in place for them to go elsewhere. When they talk about that particular stretch of road, that particular stretch of road has no more priority really than 6,000 miles of other similar road in Saskatchewan.

The Member for Estevan says we have some low grade roads in Saskatchewan and that's true. But I'm saying this, that they are much better on an average than many other parts of Canada that you choose to travel in and anybody who has ever travelled knows it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. KRAMER: — I want to say something else, Mr. Speaker. I'm pleased to repeat that the decision not to accept the contract bids was one of economy, not one of vengeance. It was simply a business decision. But certainly I am not going to ask that foreman to go back and continually take not only from the Member in the press, but from others, the sidewalk superintendents, and the instant experts who don't take the trouble to try to get some information before they shoot from the lip.

Don't blame me, Mr. Speaker, and I say to the Member for Estevan, don't blame me because I took your advice, it's on your head and not mine. It's on your head.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. KRAMER: — Mr. Speaker, I want to say this simply, not telling the people of Estevan that that road is not going to be built, there is no point. Mr. Busch, the foreman, I was talking to him just two or three days ago and he said there is just no way that we can even think of building that road with the water

table where it is until next fall unless there is a dry summer. It's unusual in that country, we have to check the precipitation. If the Member had taken the time to check the precipitation in that area he might know better.

AN HON. MEMBER: — He doesn't know to come in out of the rain.

MR. KRAMER: — That's true and let alone check the precipitation. Nicely put.

Mr. Speaker, I'm saying then that the priorities of choosing where you go, especially when we're in this period of restraint, is going to simply be we're going to try to work in areas where the dirt is drier and where it is certainly more economical. We must get more economical dirt wherever possible. You don't mow hay in the sloughs when there is hay to be cut on the highland.

Mr. Speaker, going back to that familiar accusation that we hear from the Liberal Opposition and they may as well be all together in one coalition and I suggest that's where you ought to be, that's where you are going to be eventually, that's where you are going to be, just like they did in British Columbia, just like they did in Manitoba and just like they are going to do in Ontario. That's where you belong. You think the same, you look the same, you act the same.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. KRAMER: — Get together, get together, because that's where you belong.

MR. THATCHER: — Sure be the end of you, if it happens.

MR. KRAMER: — Well, it would be fun watching it. I challenge you, get together, get together by 1979, you belong together. You deserve each other, you deserve each other.

Let me take a look at these people who attack, continually attack and deride the civil service. Just a few moments ago they talked of this horde of people who are hired by this Government. The Member for Estevan referred to them not just in reply to this Throne Speech. Even the Leader of the Opposition was talking about the mob of civil servants, that mob. Every time they open their mouths they are using derogatory terms.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I have here a statement of provincial employment, provincial and federal employment figures. The source, Statistics Canada. Provincial Government employment and Statistics Canada, Federal Government Employment. I will lay this on the table. Maybe they can read and maybe just maybe they can understand. Let me for a moment give you some of the highlights. We hear from the fearless Leader of the Opposition, the second Opposition, I can't lump them all together. He says, this horde of civil servants, was it needed, the horde of civil servants who have been hired, and it has been said by many of them.

Let's take a look at that stellar Province of Alberta. Let's take a look at their performance. These are the figures for 1970 to 1974 Canadian Statistics. How many civil servants does Alberta have? 28,926, nearly 29,000 and they don't have near the Government services. Health is all run by private insurance, several other services they don't even have. I wonder what they do?

Let's take a look at Saskatchewan. Saskatchewan - 13,481. And if you look at Manitoba - 13,164, Mr. Speaker, and combine them with Manitoba's you would have a grand total of 26,445 or 2,281 less than Alberta.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. KRAMER: — How is that for efficiency? What kind of services do they get from that horde of civil servants in Alberta? I could quote another and I think this one has to be a misprint. There is another Conservative province, New Brunswick, what happened to them from 1970 to 1974?

In 1970 - 9,649 to 21,975. That is the Tory efficiency and the great lame duck, Mr. Davis, in Ontario, an increase over that period from 75,000 to 83,000, an extra 8,000 again in four years and they have gone up since.

And out of all this where does the Federal Government stand? How are they making out? Let's take a look at how the Feds are doing. They have gone, would you believe, in those four years by 71,000 civil servants, from 243,000 to 314,000. This is the great efficient group of people that we have both federally and provincially in Alberta. Which one do you choose?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. KRAMER: — I am just a little tired, Mr. Speaker, of this constant maligning of civil servants, the people whom we depend on to do the work that is necessary, to provide the kind of services that all of these people demand. They say, and we heard it just a few minutes ago, they say, you have to cut back on this and you have to cut back on that. Let them tell us and I challenge them to tell us what programs they don't want.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. KRAMER: — And when you tell us which programs you don't want please go see Peter and Red over in Edmonton and give him a little advice.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. KRAMER: — Now, Mr. Speaker, there is something else that I should like to talk about. I should like very much to talk about some more slurring remarks that I have heard though I know that all Members of the Opposition do not follow this particular line.

First of all, last spring we witnessed, what I would call

almost a rip-off in Ottawa when the MPs and the Prime Minister and the senators all got their pay raises. And that was a pretty fantastic jump. They did attempt to oppose and have them whittled down. Broadbent got it. I will tell you something else, John Diefenbaker got his, too, and he has continued to pocket it even though he opposed it and he opposed the one before. Just check the record of that. There are only two people in Ottawa who are refusing to take the increases and have consistently refused to take them and not accepted them. You can check that.

I want to say this about Saskatchewan. When I first entered this Legislature, Mr. Speaker, in 1952, the Members of the Legislature received \$3,000 - \$2,000 and \$1,000 each time.

MR. MacDONALD: — You were overpaid.

MR. KRAMER: — I will get to you a little later. Mr. Speaker, the Member for Qu'Appelle or Indian Head, wherever he parachuted to - at least I have been able to continue to be elected for 24 years in my own constituency.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. KRAMER: — In spite of the concentrated efforts of all those people opposite.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. KRAMER: — Mr. Speaker, we will just take a look at these indemnities. We are hearing from some people that they won't accept, that the pay is enough, that they won't accept a raise. I say to the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Steuart), he is right, he isn't worth that much, judging by his performance thus far in the House. I would say to the Member for Elrose (Mr. Bailey) judging by the stature he had in this House today that he does deserve more.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. KRAMER: — He is the only Member thus far who has been able to stand up there and speak his piece and do it well. I say fortunately or unfortunately, democracy does not choose between one Member and another. Democracy says that we must pay them all alike regardless of performance and that the people, their constituencies, are the judges. I say that is in the hands of a judge and it will be remembered, however, that the last time we had a judge, Judge Merv Woods, check the indemnities out he recommended that the total indemnities ought to be \$15,000 approximately. And in our wisdom, or otherwise, and I say otherwise, we choose to take \$12,500. That was back in 1972. Since that time the cost of everything has nearly doubled and if you took that as a criterion, certainly anyone today who has half of a brain would realize that no Member of the Legislature, Mr. Speaker, can possibly survive unless he has other sources of income. I say that it would be a sorry day for Saskatchewan and for Canada if only those who could afford to sit in the House, federally or provincially, could afford to sit, to be elected.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. KRAMER: — I say the people of Saskatchewan and the people of Canada want Members, want their Members to be well paid. They want them to feel independent and that they ought to be paid a fair remuneration as well as everyone else.

We, in the New Democratic Party believe that people should be well paid for their services, whether it is a scrub person or whether it is a doctor or whoever. We don't think that they should be paid too much, nor do we think that they should be paid too little. That the great leveller, income tax and a few other things, it takes care of some of these things. It doesn't matter much to me, but I say that there are people on both sides of this House who should not be asked to subsidize this position, in this House. It is totally unfair and there ought to be some sliding arrangement similar to what is in Ottawa. I say that it would be much better to do this. I think that the federal people made a mistake, they took too large a jump. I think that is one of the problems today, Mr. Speaker, when we hear the labor groups and other people complaining about price controls. It does not sit too well with them that just a few months before the same Prime Minister and his Government gave themselves a very, very generous increase in pay and now they choose to freeze all those people in the lower group.

Further to that, the week before Thanksgiving, all the senior deputies and the assistant deputies got a raise from \$54,000 to \$65,000, just before the Thanksgiving dinner.

Civil servants, trade union people take a dim view of that. And it is small wonder that trade unions are not too happy with being the sacrificial lamb. Salaried people, those workers who are easily controlled thus far are the sacrificial lambs in this game. I don't blame them for dragging their feet and saying, 'we aren't too anxious to make all the sacrifices while the bankers continue to take up to 200 per cent and private businesses of other kinds take the great increases and the great profits, and the ordinary people of Canada are asked to lead the parade and make the sacrifice. It is small wonder.

Mr. Speaker, I want to say a word or two generally about the province's highway system as I see it today and some of the problems that we face.

There is a new problem raising its head, raising its ugly head in the scene of transportation in the Province of Saskatchewan. That is the move, again, by the only western Cabinet Minister who is now the Minister of Transportation acting in collusion with Cargill and Company and CPR, to remove thousands of miles of rail lines in western Canada. If they get away with this, the provincial governments, provincial departments of highways, municipal governments are going to have to reassess the total plan, their total plans, for highway development throughout this province. Because if this happens, if the loads that are now carried on those steel rails are forced onto our highways and our municipal roads the taxpayers of Saskatchewan are going to pay double and triple the price in order to, once more, pay for yet another transportation system after we have paid for CNR and CPR in the past.

I say that is a word of warning that must be left to the people of Saskatchewan, Mr. Speaker, and that is something that this House will heed at their peril.

Mr. Speaker, we have here in Saskatchewan, 25 per cent of Canada's highway system. We have less than five per cent of the population to pay the bills. We get very little. There has been some halting improvement, very little however, in assistance from the Federal Government. If you move south of the line you will get inter-state highways paid 90 per cent by the Federal Government, just south of the line. The western provinces and certainly Saskatchewan more than any, are faced with the problem of going it alone, with the large area of service. On top of that, once again, the pirate from Ottawa moved into our tax field and took another ten cents a gallon on the gas tax. After we reduced it seven cents they raised it by ten cents. I say that that intrusion does not sit well with us and is a pretty hard pill to swallow for us here in western Canada.

Certainly the people of Saskatchewan always bear the brunt, more, the cost is greater in Saskatchewan in roads, the cost is greater in the delivery of power, the cost is greater in the delivery of telephones. All of this because we have this vast prairie basin to service and it is overlooked quite often by those people who criticize the level of service that we are economically able to provide.

Mr. Speaker, I should like to say a great deal more and I will during the Budget Debate. I hope that what I have said will be heeded. I hope that once and for all that the Member for Estevan will stop crying and complaining because I took his advice. It was not because of the fact he complained, but because of the fact of what he said, we had the opportunity to take a look at it; we asked the private contractors what they thought of it and they told us. Now don't complain about us taking your advice any more. It is your advice.

Mr. Speaker, I think that this very straightforward document is certainly, and combined with the great Speech from the Throne at the main session opened last fall, I think that I am proud to support it and I will support the Motion.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. R.A. LARTER (Estevan): — Mr. Speaker, on a Point of Privilege. I demand that the Minister of Highways withdraw the word 'cowardly' as being very unparliamentary.

MR. SPEAKER: — Order! I think it is apparent from what has happened here that the Member who has allegedly made the statement is not prepared to withdraw the statement. I am not able to say by recollection in what context the word was used and consequently I can't make a decision, if called upon at this time, whether it was used in an unparliamentary fashion.

MR. KRAMER: — Mr. Speaker, to save you a little time and I respect the rules of this House, whether the rules say this or not, I will respect the House and withdraw.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

HON. H.H. ROLFES (Minister of Social Services): — Mr. Speaker, I should like to address the House for a short time today. Before I get into the contents of my speech I should like to take this opportunity to congratulate the mover, the Member for Redberry (Mr. Banda) and the seconder, the Member for Athabasca (Mr. Thompson).

Certain Members opposite have indicated that they don't want to participate in the Throne Speech for reasons that they have not made known to us. But I think the Throne Speech avails every Member an opportunity to speak about areas or topics that he or she is concerned about and to let their constituents know that they are prepared to raise these issues in the House when the opportunity arises.

I suppose someone should have warned the Leader of the Conservatives (Mr. Collver) that it was the Ides of March yesterday. Listening to him perform one could say that that was the final death blow. When I listened to the Member for Elrose (Mr. Bailey) today, who was at his best, one can well see that the Member for Nipawin may be in a little bit of trouble not only from Members on this side of the House but from Members to his right and from other Members as well.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. ROLFES: — Mr. Speaker, before today I had a lot of respect for the Member for Estevan (Mr. Larter). I must admit that some of my relatives who live in Estevan have spoken fairly highly of him and I wait with some anticipation to the tabling of the agreement, which I have not personally seen. In speaking to Members from both parties opposite during the last session, we all realized that it had gone much longer than most of us had anticipated: that many of us were in some financial straits; and that we also recognized that we should make certain that Members get well compensated for their duties in this House. I thought there was an agreement by all of us. I did not do any of the negotiations but as I say I look with some anticipation to the tabling of those agreements and will then make my own judgment as to the words of the Member for Estevan. I think some day, or very shortly, he will regret having said those words although I know he was under some stress from the words of his Leader yesterday that he would be getting up.

Mr. Speaker, leaving some things aside I have been listening and waiting with some anticipation to see what Members opposite had to say at this time in the House. But it seems to me that very little is said about the problems that are facing Saskatchewan. On the one hand . . .

MR. MALONE: — Especially in the Budget . . .

MR. ROLFES: — Well, it is very difficult to discuss the Budget when you don't have the Budget before you at this time. But on the one hand, Mr. Speaker, we witness the Leader of the Opposition who is able to do nothing more than pass along the same old tired phrases. There has been no change whatsoever in his attitude toward the various programs which help people. There is a good reason for this, Mr. Speaker, that there is no change in his attitude and that is because he is and has been

bankrupt of any new and progressive ideas for a number of years.

AN HON. MEMBER: — That's your speech from last year.

MR. ROLFES: — No, it is not my speech from last year, it might sound the same and it is still the truth. In the last election campaign, Mr. Speaker, all of the people of Saskatchewan were witness to the Liberal's attempt to be all things to all people.

AN HON. MEMBER: — . . . Saskatoon.

MR. ROLFES: — Today it is - I don't know but if we have to follow the example of city council in Saskatoon I think they'll go up quite a bit in Saskatoon and I can't answer for your incompetence, Mr. Member. It is not my fault, I don't sit in city council and I am not responsible for the \$12 million debt that you have incurred in the name of the people in Saskatoon.

Today it is obvious, Mr. Speaker, that the provincial Liberals have lost all purpose. Their only remaining identity is their defence of the multinational corporations and big business enterprise. In the absence of any ideas, we find them opposing policies simply for the sake of opposition and I suppose that is why they are in Opposition, Mr. Speaker.

What about the Conservatives? They can take little comfort in their lot so far. It appears that their Leader, the Member for Nipawin, prefers to make predictions instead of informing the people of Saskatchewan about what he stands for. For example, last year he said that the 1975 provincial budget would bring about the downfall of the New Democratic Party. He indicated that it would be the demise of the New Democratic Party, that we would disappear from the scene. What a demise, Mr. Speaker, what a prediction.

Mr. Speaker, if we have to judge the Members of the Conservative Party so far from their actions in the House, we would have only one word to describe their actions and that is it has been a complete failure. They have not put before the people their stand and possibly they are waiting for the Budget.

Mr. Speaker, I want to turn for a few minutes to natural resources. The prominent issue across this nation is the manner in which Canadians have utilized their resources. There is a growing public contention that resources must benefit the people who own them, namely the residents of Canada. We see this belief generalized not only in Saskatchewan but in all of the other provinces. We also see this in the Federal commitment. The recent news about the Federal Government's pending purchase of Atlantic Richfield, which is a major oil company, in a case in point. What are the two Saskatchewan Opposition parties doing about the issue. Unfortunately, it is a total opposition to public involvement. The people of Saskatchewan are witnessing an old movie, different players but the same set and the same plot at least for the multinational corporations and the Liberals and the Conservatives. The approach of the Opposition parties in the development of Saskatchewan's resources is an insult to every person in this province. Their statements today follow the exact same crooked logic as the statements of their predecessors. For example, in 1961, the

former Liberal Leader of Saskatchewan said that this province's taxation on industry and our royalties on production should be lower than those in any other province. The people of Saskatchewan realize that he meant that Saskatchewan people should be satisfied with a second class existence. Today we hear the same refrain from across the floor.

Mr. Speaker, the Liberals and Conservatives opposite wonder why our NDP Government is committed to a resource policy which would ensure control for the people of this province. Let me take a page from their own history book, perhaps it will open their eyes as to what is really at stake. Over the past several months we have heard the Liberals and Conservatives whining that the big corporations need more tax incentives, freer access to land and lower royalties. This is the same thing we heard from the former Liberal Leader in 1961. At that time he used the example of Puerto Rico. The former Liberal Leader noted that a governor (and it is interesting to note that he didn't refer to what the people of Puerto Rico wanted, but a governor) in Puerto Rico had given immense tax exemptions to industries and corporations. Free use of land, negligible royalties and so on. He added that this was good and was a pattern which Saskatchewan should follow. Mr. Speaker, I ask the Members across the floor to look at Puerto Rico today. What has happened? Today the Puerto Rican people face a constant uphill fight for even a small degree of control over their resources and their economic future. Today Puerto Rican people are subject to the whims and plots of those same multinational corporations.

Mr. Speaker, this is what the New Democratic Party and this Government stand steadfastly against. This is what the people of Saskatchewan stand against. Recently we have heard the story of potash companies being directed not to sell potash to other countries, namely Japan. The scenario is no different, not at all. I join with our Government in pledging to the people of Saskatchewan that this will never occur as long as we are the Government.

The people of Saskatchewan are still waiting for specific concrete proposals from the provincial Opposition parties. You know when given close scrutiny the game they play is based upon a very tricky strategy. Quite simply, they never take a specific stand on anything. Let me give you a few examples. In 1974 the current Liberal Leader, the Member for Prince Albert-Duck Lake, stated that and I quote:

We are being bypassed by the potash industry.

Our Government has been saying that for years but perhaps it was an unaccustomed period of clarity for the Member. Here is another one of his statements:

Freedom of enterprise does not mean that it is the right of business to take advantage of people to defraud their customers. If our present laws aren't tough enough a Liberal Government will make them tougher.

Obviously the Liberal Leader was giving only lip service to this statement because he was steadfastly opposed to this Government and the people of Saskatchewan is bringing in tougher measures. Mr. Speaker, it is fortunate for the people of Saskatchewan that the Opposition are not in power at this critical time in Saskatchewan and in Canadian history.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. ROLFES: — You will notice that I said, Opposition, because as Tommy Douglas so eloquently put it, "they are two wings of the same evil bird of prey." This Government has a sensible, no-nonsense resource policy. It is one which presents a clear, economic and social alternative, one which the people of Saskatchewan have endorsed in the past and will continue to endorse.

Mr. Speaker, I should like to further elaborate on other points in the Speech from the Throne and therefore I should like to ask leave to adjourn the debate.

MR. SPEAKER: — The Member has asked leave to adjourn the debate, is leave granted.

MR. KATZMAN: — No.

Debate adjourned on the following recorded division.

YEAS — 34

Blakeney	Pepper	Thibault
Bowerman	Smishek	Romanow
Messer	Snyder	Byers
Kramer	Baker	Lange
Kowalchuk	Robbins	MacMurchy
Mostoway	Whelan	Kaeding
Kwasnica	Dyck	McNeill
Feschuk	Rolfes	Cowley
Tchorzewski	Matsalla	Skoberg
Vickar	Nelson (Yorkton)	Allen
Koskie	Johnson	Thompson
Banda		

NAYS — 7

Collver	Larter	Bailey
Berntson	Ham	Katzman
Birkbeck		

The Assembly adjourned at 5:20 o'clock p.m.