

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN
First Session — Eighteenth Legislature

Monday, February 26, 1979

The Assembly met at 2 p.m.
On the Orders of the Day.

QUESTIONS
PCB Spill

MR. G. MUIRHEAD (Arm River): — Mr. Speaker, as I rise for the first time in this House, I wish to direct my first question to the member for Shellbrook, the Hon. Minister of Environment. In regard to a PCB spill at Federal Pioneer Limited in Regina some two years ago that has just come to light in past months, when did the Department of the Environment in fact first become aware and how did they become aware of it?

HON. G.R. BOWERMAN (Minister of the Environment): — As to the specific dates, Mr. Speaker, I would have to take notice of the specific dates that they were notified. I couldn't give them to you here with any degree of accuracy. I'll take notice, Mr. Speaker.

MR. MUIRHEAD: — Mr. Speaker, we know that it definitely wasn't two years ago, so my question, Mr. Speaker, is this. Was or will any action be taken against the officials of the department for not notifying the minister?

MR. BOWERMAN: — No, Mr. Speaker, there will be no action taken against the officials for whatever part they have taken with regard to this matter. I will get the information for the member in regard to the particular date in which the information was relayed to the Department of the Environment officials.

MR. W.C. THATCHER (Thunder Creek): — A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. The former minister in charge of the Environment has indicated in press reports that he was not notified until November 26th, 1978, I believe, of this spill. Has the minister investigated this press report or are you, in fact, by your previous answers indicating that the press report of such is erroneous?

MR. BOWERMAN: — Mr. Speaker, I have not investigated the press report. I really felt that there was no need for me to investigate that press report; I will, however, as I have already indicated, bring to the House the specific dates that the Department of the Environment was informed about the spill and subsequently the minister.

MR. J.G. LANE (Qu'Appelle): — A supplementary to the minister, Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Minister of the Environment. Is it the government's opinion that the failure of the senior officials in the Department of the Environment to bring the PCB spill to the minister's attention is an acceptable practise and one that no attack or no discipline should be given to the senior officials?

MR. BOWERMAN: — Mr. Speaker, I don't think that any disciplinary action is necessary at this particular time. The reports of the PCB matter have been made public. I think there is nothing to be hidden. If there were errors in judgment related to the officials they are errors in judgment. I think it's unnecessary to discipline any of the staff members with regard to that matter.

Press Reports — PCB Spills

MR. R.L. COLLVER (Leader of the Opposition): — Question to the former Minister of the Environment. Are the press reports correct in stating that you did not know anything about the PCB Spills until sometime in November, 1978?

MR. BYERS: — The press reports are correct.

Procedure followed by Deputy Minister

MR. W.C. THATCHER (Thunder Creek): — A question to the Minister of the Environment, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Minister, the former minister has stood behind the press reports that he was not notified 'till very close to two years later. Is the minister by his answer to a question a few moments ago, suggesting that the practice or the procedure followed by the deputy minister in this particular instance of not notifying his immediate superior, that being the minister in charge, was in effect performing his duty adequately and correctly and that you would therefore approve of such procedure were it to happen again?

MR. BOWERMAN: — No, Mr. Speaker, that's not what I said. I did say there were errors in judgment, there may well have been errors in judgment, I think that might have been the case, but that doesn't require, I don't think, at this point in time, for this minister, or any subsequent minister, to take disciplinary action against any of the members of the department with respect to the non-reporting of the report to the minister until some date later, or the potential error in not reporting it to the city of Regina.

MR. THATCHER: — A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Minister, I am still not clear whether you are saying that you approve of the specific practice of a deputy minister who is not accountable to this Assembly, not accountable to the people of Saskatchewan, not reporting to his immediate superior, the minister, who in fact is accountable to this Assembly, is accountable to the people of Saskatchewan, and are you in effect, by saying it's a minor error in judgment, condoning the practice of deputy ministers who are not accountable in effect running their department and not informing the minister of what's going on? In your judgment, that is acceptable?

Additional Information Required

MR. COLLVER: — Question to the Minister of the Environment. Is the Minister of the Environment stating to this Assembly that the deputy minister that he inherited, who did not report this very dangerous spill to the previous Minister of the Environment until November, of 1978, is going to continue to be his deputy minister and that he condones that kind of information being given by his deputy ministers?

MR. LANE: — Well, I'd like to direct a question to the Minister of the Environment as well.

This is not the first time that this has happened in the Department of the Environment, and I call to the minister's attention the fact that it was the very Department of the Environment under the same deputy minister that completely missed the radioactivity that was in the earth-fill around the schools in northern Saskatchewan, completely missed it, and it was the federal government that had to bring it to the provincial government's attention. Are you endorsing this dereliction of duty by the particular deputy, and have you determined guidelines which have been given to that deputy so

that the department will keep informed or the minister will be informed in the future?

MR. BOWERMAN: — Mr. Speaker, I don't believe that there's been any dereliction of duty by the Deputy Minister of the Environment. I consider his actions both in reference to the matter of radon gas at Uranium City, and the subsequent matter of the PCB spill as being ones which were errors in judgment. I think there were errors in judgment there and I think the deputy minister has indicated that in his reports to the press. While I would consider myself in agreement with that position, I don't believe that the actions or the non-actions of the deputy minister at this time are derelictions of duty, nor do I believe that they are matters that need to be disciplined.

MR. LANE: — Supplementary to the minister. The government has announced its policy on nuclear development. Is it your government's intention to maintain in the same position, the present Deputy Minister of the Environment who has shown an inability to monitor environmental spills of various kinds, and an inability to protect the people of Saskatchewan and keep the government informed, given the government's policy for further nuclear development?

MR. BOWERMAN: — So far as I'm concerned, Mr. Speaker, I have not considered any change in the Deputy Minister of the Environment. Therefore, it would be my opinion that the Deputy Minister of the Environment that presently occupies that position will continue to occupy that position in the future.

MR. COLLVER: — Supplementary question to the Minister of the Environment or to the former Minister of the Environment. Since the former Minister of the Environment stated that the matter was not brought to his attention prior to November of 1978, was the matter ever brought to the attention of any other member of the cabinet prior to 1978?

MR. BOWERMAN: — Mr. Speaker, I couldn't answer that question with any degree of accuracy. I take it under advisement, but I couldn't give an answer today.

MR. LANE: — Were you aware of it yourself prior to that time?

MR. BOWERMAN: — No.

Year of the Child Celebration Funds

MRS. J. DUNCAN (Maple Creek): — Mr. Speaker, a question directed to the Minister of Social Services. In light of what has been stated about our children being our province's most precious commodity would the minister please explain to this Assembly why the pittance of only \$100,000 has been set aside for these very same children to celebrate the year of the child?

HON. H.H. ROLFES (Minister of Social Services): — Mr. Speaker, \$100,000 is about \$100,000 more than some PC governments have committed to the International Year of the Child. Mr. Speaker, it may be a pittance according to the members in the opposition, but let me say that at conferences that I have attended, I think there was not one PC government that favored any financial assistance from the provincial government. Not one!

Mr. Speaker, when I recently attended a conference, attended also by Harold Baker, who is now chairman of the International Year of the Child for Saskatchewan, we had a

speaker in from Ontario and she couldn't find words to praise Saskatchewan because she said we were the ones — not only did we lead — and she went on and I would like you to get the speech; she went on to tell us how Saskatchewan led in health care programs, how Saskatchewan led in social service programs and how now Saskatchewan was leading in being the first province to commit itself to \$100,000 for the International Year of the Child.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MRS. DUNCAN: — Supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. I enjoyed having you pat yourself on the back Mr. Minister, but this allocation amounts to 33 cents per child for the whole year and I say to you and I challenge you to answer me that you and your government are doing nothing more than paying lip service to the children of our province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. ROLFES: — Mr. Speaker, I simply want to reiterate \$100,000 is \$100,000 more than any other province in Canada had, at that time, given, I can tell you that had the PCs been in power in Ottawa, as they were in some of the other provinces, and had they, Mr. Speaker, been in power here, there would not have been one cent given to the International Year of the Child.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MRS. DUNCAN: — If you are so concerned about the children of our province why is it becoming the policy of your department to cut off welfare to single mothers?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. ROLFES: — Absolutely not, Mr. Speaker.

Lakeside Home at Wolseley

MR. G. TAYLOR (Indian Head-Wolseley): — Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Minister of Social Services (Mr. Rolfes) concerning the Lakeside Home in Wolseley. I appreciate your reply, Mr. Minister, but I checked as late as last night and the beds are still empty in the Lakeside Home while there is a considerable waiting list of male patients. I would like you to explain why action hasn't been taken to fill these beds.

MR. ROLFES: — Mr. Speaker, in regards to the Lakeside Home, I think it has to be understood that there are 70 beds to begin with, 40 male and 30 female beds. The long list which you are referring to refers to female beds and not male beds. We have a slight problem in that they can't be interchangeable. Mr. Speaker, I simply want to indicate to the Member for Indian Head-Wolseley had he made a simple phone call to my office or the department instead of simultaneously sending out a news release condemning the department, without first of all checking with my department, we could have rectified the situation very quickly. But no, he even sent out his news release before he questioned the department.

MR. TAYLOR: — I would like the minister to explain also why the government is replacing permanent positions with casual help at the Lakeside Home.

MR. ROLFES: — Mr. Speaker, I am not aware that we are doing that, but I will take that under advisement and check. I can tell the member that there was one reduction in staff but that's all I'm aware of, one permanent reduction in staff. That, I think occurs on an annual basis and can occur anytime during the year but that will have no effect, Mr. Speaker, no effect on the 70 beds that there presently are and just as soon as they can fill the beds, they will be filled. There is no impediment whatsoever in filling those beds.

MR. TAYLOR: — Supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Will the minister please explain to me with the reduction in beds and with filling the permanent positions with casual positions — will he give me a firm commitment and to the people of Wolseley in that there is no indication by the present government to cut back on the Lakeside Home?

MR. ROLFES: — Mr. Speaker, if the member for Indian Head-Wolseley would look at the resolutions put on the order paper by the member for Swift Current; on the one hand the member for Swift Current is insisting that this government cut back its spending, cut back its civil servants. It's in the resolution. On the other hand, when there is a reduction in staff, where we are trying to be more efficient, we get condemned from another angle.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. ROLFES: — Mr. Speaker, the people in the opposition can't have it both ways. You can't go to Swift Current and advocate that we reduce staff and on the other hand go to Indian Head-Wolseley and condemn us for not reducing staff. Mr. Speaker, I have assured the member for Indian Head-Wolseley that there is no reduction in beds and at this particular time there are 70 beds and 70 beds have been allocated to that home and that is the policy right now.

Capital Funding Grants for Municipalities

MR. H. SWAN (Rosetown-Elrose): — Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Minister of Municipal Affairs. The Premier at the SUMA (Saskatchewan Urban Municipality Association) Convention announced that there was not to be an extension of the Community Capital Fund beyond the end of March. He did not announce that there would be any funding available for capital funding by municipal organizations in 1979. Have you now a plan to bring in a capital fund that will assist the municipalities during the summer months of 1979?

HON. G. MacMURCHY (Minister of Municipal Affairs): — Mr. Speaker, in answer to the honourable member for Rosetown-Elrose, we did announce that the Community Capital Fund, which has been in place for the last five years, would end March 31. We also announced that while we have a commitment to a new capital program, as announced in the election, we're not at this point in time prepared to implement that program. We simply need some time to work out a program; as soon as it is worked out, we will announce it. The working out aspect, Mr. Speaker, will be done in co-operation with representatives of SUMA; in fact I've written to SUMA requesting representation from them on a committee to work out the details of a new capital program.

MR. SWAN: — Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. If you are not ready at this point in time to implement a new program, are we then to expect that all of the capital programs in the province are to be at a standstill for the summer months in 1979? You can't begin in May and still have programs in operation in May as well, so they need a program now.

MR. MacMURCHY: — Mr. Speaker, with respect to capital in urban municipalities in the coming summer there is about \$5 million outstanding in the Community Capital Fund to be allocated. There is about \$1 million of that which hasn't . . . I'm sorry, I'll put it another way. I'll start again. There is about \$5 million that is not spent in the Community Capital Fund, slightly over \$1 million has yet to be allocated. We are encouraging the municipalities who haven't allocated their Community Capital Funds totally to do that and do that before the end of March. So there is \$5 million to be spent in that. As well as the Community Capital Fund remaining there is about \$8 million out in Culture and Recreational Capital Fund to be spent in this coming year. Additionally, we have an agreement with the federal government for the Community Services Program. If the legislation passes in the House of Commons we will have available to us for capital in urban community from that particular fund 4.75, so that there is about \$13 million in community capital, in culture and recreation that is available from the province additionally. We are very hopeful that there will be an additional \$4.75 million from the federal government for capital, as well as the other on-going capital programs of the government.

MR. L.W. BIRKBECK (Moosomin): — Mr. Speaker, supplementary question to this minister. Do you not agree that this legislation which you are pending on in Ottawa will not come up due to a federal election and, therefore, you have drawn our communities into a financial debt which you are not prepared to assist them with any program immediately. You know very right well that there will be no agreement worked out with the federal government because that legislation is so far down the order paper.

MR. MacMURCHY: — Mr. Speaker, the community services funding can be made available to the province of Saskatchewan under existing legislation. It is the desire of the federal government to establish it under new legislation but it is available under existing legislation. Now it is true, Mr. Speaker, that Saskatchewan is the only province to have an agreement with the federal government. We are hopeful that the federal government will respond to the Saskatchewan/federal government agreement in a positive way, positive in the sense that if the legislation before the House of Commons isn't passed that it will provide the money under existing legislation which it can do.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

Tommy Douglas Building

MR. P. ROUSSEAU (Regina South): — Mr. Speaker, a question to the Minister of Government Services. Is the minister aware that the printing for the reproduction of Hansard has been moved from the T.C. Douglas Building to the Health Building and if you are, can you tell this Assembly why?

HON. G.T. SNYDER (Minister of Government Services): — Well, Mr. Speaker, I am not entirely aware of all of the services that were removed from the T.C. Douglas Building. I am sure the hon. member is making reference to the office supplies services. The employees of that service have been relocated in other locations, and I presume that that is the matter that the member for Regina South alludes to. A number of employees have been moved from their location in the T.C. Douglas Building and reported to other agencies. I think probably the Minister of Supply and Services should more properly have that question directed to him; I think

that is the agency that would be more properly answering that question.

MR. ROUSSEAU: — Mr. Speaker, if the other minister would answer, I'd appreciate it.

MR. W.A. ROBBINS (Minister of Revenue, Supply and Services): — Yes, Mr. Speaker, of course I am aware that the employees have been moved and relocated for at least one month until our environmental engineer can make an assessment of the situation in regard to the space they occupied in the T.C. Douglas Building. Once that has been completed then presumably any problems that have been found in that building will be corrected and they will be returned to that location.

MR. ROUSSEAU: — Obviously, the reason for the move, as I understand it, was for health reasons, environmental reasons. If that be the case then why haven't the other employees of that 'dungeon', for the lack of a better word of the T.C. Douglas Building, not been moved out as well? Is their health not equally as important?

MR. ROBBINS: — This is a particular part of the building which was set up particularly for office services. It has a particularly high ceiling, 14.5 feet. There are 15,000 square feet of space in that particular area. They did complain about ammonia fumes which are common in a printing shop, where printing is being carried out. And they also complained about carbon monoxide; the theory was that that carbon monoxide was getting into the system somehow or other from the department garage. They have done a lot of tests on this and they have found that the carbon monoxide readings are below the minimum required to maintain health; in that respect it is not that bad a situation. They have also, I think, corrected the ammonia problem, but because the employees did complain and use section 16 of The Occupation, Health and Safety Act, stayed away from work for a time — and they were not docked in terms of their pay — we decided to close that particular part of the building until we could effect the necessary corrections in it. And that is what has been done.

MR. ROUSSEAU: — Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. I'm not sure I understood the answer, but I think you said that the levels found were acceptable. The report received from your occupational hygienist does not agree with that statement. Abnormal increase up to 19 parts per million, up to 10 parts per million they do not agree. What is, in your opinion, the acceptable level of carbon monoxide in any area?

MR. ROBBINS: — The information I was given was that if it was below 25 parts to a million then it was acceptable.

MR. E.A. BERNTSON (Souris-Cannington): — A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. The poison centre at the Regina General Hospital indicates that an acceptable level is four parts per million. Could you indicate to me, then, why an employee in your department is expected to work in the mailroom in the Tommy Douglas Building at levels at excess of 100 parts per million?

MR. ROBBINS: — Mr. Speaker, I don't know where the member gets his information. That is not the information that was given to me.

Tommy Douglas Building

MR. J.G. LANE (Qu'Appelle): — Will you not now be prepared given the statistics given to you about carbon monoxide poisoning, to perhaps take away the amenity of an underground parking garage, close it down and convert it to office space and put it to

better use so that the carbon monoxide is kept outside the building?

MR. ROBBINS: — Mr. Speaker, the member for Qu'Appelle is working purely on assumption. The fact of the matter is that any problem that has occurred in that portion of the building will be corrected before the employees go back there to work.

Timber Leases

MR. G. McLEOD (Meadow Lake): — Mr. Speaker, a question to the Minister of Northern Saskatchewan, Mr. Byers.

Mr. Minister, in view of the recent transfer of several sawmills and planing mills formerly under the jurisdiction of Saskatchewan Forest Products to the Department of Northern Saskatchewan (DNS), I would ask you if any private sawmill operators who currently hold timber leases and supply contracts to the mills formerly under Saskatchewan Forest Products and now under DNS, have any cause for concern either in the short term or the long term for those leases and contracts?

HON. N.E. BYERS (Minister of Northern Saskatchewan): — Mr. Speaker, I believe the answer to that is no.

MR. McLEOD: — Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. You said you believe the answer is no? I ask you, since you have given the House the assurance that the private operators in question have no cause for concern, would you be willing to communicate that to them in view of the fact that many of them have been in these private operations for 20 years and in some cases more than that?

MR. BYERS: — Mr. Speaker, if any of the private sawmill operators have concerns and wish to relay their concerns to me, we will be willing to provide them with the answers.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

ADDRESS IN REPLY

MR. C. WHITE (Regina Wascana) moved, seconded by Mr. D. Lingenfelter (Shaunavon):

That a humble address is presented to His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor of the province as follows:

TO HIS HONOUR THE HONOURABLE CAMERON IRWIN McINTOSH

Lieutenant-Governor of the province of Saskatchewan.

MAY IT PLEASE YOUR HONOUR:

We, Her Majesty's dutiful and loyal subjects, the Legislative Assembly of the province of Saskatchewan in session assembled, humbly thank Your Honour for the gracious speech which Your Honour has been pleased to address to us at the opening of the present session.

He said: Mr. Speaker, to begin my address in reply to the Speech from the Throne, I would like to begin by congratulating you on your return to the Chair. You have presided over this Assembly for four years now and have commanded the confidence

and respect of the hon. members on both sides of the Chamber. I am certain you will continue to do so in the life of this legislature.

May I also express my personal thanks to Premier Allan Blakeney and the Government of Saskatchewan for the confidence they have seen fit to place in me today. I want as well to thank them for the honor they have bestowed on the many fine people who make up my constituency, Regina Wascana. This is the first time our constituency has been so honored.

Regina Wascana, Mr. Speaker, is no ordinary constituency. While it is similar to, it's also different from other constituencies in the province. It is unique in that it is the only constituency to at times have 61 MLAs working within it and might I add, all working in a constructive manner.

While I have yet to become acquainted with most of the members opposite, it is my inclination to judge them on the basis of what I know of their colleague, Mr. Al Wagar, who opposed me in the recent election. I found him, as well as my Liberal opponent, Mr. Dwayne Kock, to be a cordial, able individual dedicated to certain ideals.

Regina Wascana also differs from other urban constituencies containing as it does a university, more than one hospital, major cultural facilities and a substantial amount of land set aside for recreational purposes and for the conservation of wildlife. Yet in a way it is Saskatchewan in miniature. It contains elements of just about every ethnic group to be found in the province and people engaged in a multitude of occupations. Take a look at the occupations of the residents of Regina Wascana, Mr. Speaker, and you will obtain a pretty fair grasp as to how good government leads to the diversification of a province's economy.

Before moving on to the core of what I have to say, Mr. Speaker, I want to remind members of this House of two matters brought to their attention by the Speech from the Throne. First, there is the Celebrate Saskatchewan 1905 to 1980 programs which are now taking shape under the guidance of the Minister of Culture and Youth. I want to congratulate him on them because among other things they will focus on the heritage of our people and their vision of the future. Programs designed to rediscover and make known the past of the different people who make up our population cannot but promote understanding. I am firmly convinced that they will lead to increased co-operation among groups seeking to preserve their cultural heritage and they will doubtless increase people's awareness that no one group is seeking to perpetuate its language and culture at the expense of any other. They should demonstrate, for example, that our French Canadian citizens are not seeking benefits for themselves to the detriment say of our citizens of Ukrainian or German background. Programs, will, I believe, Mr. Speaker, help make Saskatchewan and Canada stronger and more tolerant — very desirable ends when the unity of our nation is being questioned.

Secondly, I want to remind the hon. members that 1979 has been designated the Year of the Child by the United Nations and by our province. One of the purposes is to encourage people to think of the plight of the world's children and their place in society as the future unfolds. That's a very worthwhile objective and one not very far removed from a goal of culture and youth's Celebrate Saskatchewan programs. Both the Year of the Child and Celebrate Saskatchewan call upon people to think of the future and the shape of society in the years to come. Saskatchewan people will, I am certain, rise to meet both challenges.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. WHITE: — Such challenges are not something new to them, they are merely calls on our people to do what they have done and let me say done well on numerous occasions in the past.

Some years ago a member of this House in a throne speech debate had this to say:

We believe the citizens of today have an obligation to the citizens of tomorrow.

The speaker was clearly thinking of the children of the day as well as those yet unborn. And that is not all, Mr. Speaker. He was thinking of all Saskatchewan citizens, for he concluded his speech with the statement:

For all these young people, the students, the unemployed, for business people, surely there is a need for a new approach, a new awakening, a new vision of Saskatchewan and its future. There is a need for a new deal for the people and the New Democratic Party of Saskatchewan will give the people of Saskatchewan a new deal.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. WHITE: — Mr. Speaker, the member then speaking was the Leader of the Opposition, but he did not remain in that capacity much longer. The people of Saskatchewan shared his vision of the future and made him Premier of this fair province of ours.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the unfolding of the vision (or to put it another way) the story of the provision of a new deal for Saskatchewan people is both long and complex. It is long because it did not end in 1975, nor in 1978, but rather is of the nature of a continuing program with this administration. It is complex because it affects people both directly and indirectly. Because it is long, complex and ongoing and because we appear to be entering a new phase where the development of our province is concerned, I think it is well for us to pause for a few minutes as we begin a new session and take stock of just where we stand and determine whether or not we are still progressing.

Since this is the Year of the Child, Mr. Speaker, I will begin by relating how the new deal has applied to children. I will not mention all ways, rather I will point out only certain programs which tend to single out children as a separate element in society. I will, by the way, adopt the same approach when I proceed to other groups within our population.

For children, the new deal has meant expansion of the medical care program to include such things as the Children's Dental Care Plan, one of the very few such plans in Canada. It has resulted in recognition of the need for day care facilities and the subsequent provision of start up grants, of aid to parents with children enrolled in such facilities and of special grants when handicapped children are involved.

Somewhat the same could be said of kindergartens. Schools operating kindergartens now receive annual assistance in the order of \$650 per child. Now it is true that the day care program cannot be described as a universal one. It must certainly be classed as a progressive innovation. Prior to the coming into power of the Blakeney administration

there was no provincial support for either day care centres or kindergartens. And what about the future, Mr. Speaker? It certainly looks as though we can expect to see the institution of additional programs affecting the child during the life of this legislature.

I noted with pleasure reference in the throne speech to the government's intent to examine its existing education, health and protection services for children with a view to their improvement. And among other things, this government will be expanding the Dental Care Plan. It committed itself to doing so in the last election and is known for keeping its promises.

At the opposite end of the population curve from the children are our senior citizens. What has the new deal meant for them? A great deal, indeed, Mr. Speaker. During this fiscal year alone, the government has allocated \$131 million to programs designed to aid our seniors lead dignified and independent lives. That compares with 5.5 million in 1971. The great increase in allocations has meant more funds injected into old programs such as construction grants to nursing homes.

But, more important, it has meant new programs. It has meant subsidization of the costs of residents of nursing homes. It has meant establishment of the Senior Citizens Home Repair. Program and construction of low cost housing for senior citizens. It has meant the provision of various in-home services, low cost drugs and hearing aids, and the Saskatchewan Income Plan. The total cost of such programs is about \$60 million in the current fiscal year.

Nor is that all, Mr. Speaker. The new deal will soon mean that our senior citizens no longer are required to pay school taxes. It is the opinion of the members on this side of the House that they have done so long enough.

While laying plans for the removal of such burdens as school taxes from the elderly, this government has not overlooked the beneficiaries of such taxation, the student element of our population. The New Democratic Party, like its predecessor, the CCF places great value on education and regards our young people as one of Saskatchewan's most valuable resources. Oh! That I might have been fortunate enough to complete school under a government with such beliefs. But, Mr. Speaker, I began school shortly after Liberals displaced Conservatives as the government of this province. Most of my years in public school were not spent in a school at all but rather in an old dance hall. Many were the days we did PT in the aisles to warm up.

The situation under a CCF government was very different. Within months of the election of Tommy Douglas, a new school was under construction. And the situation has continued to differ.

No sooner did the Blakeney administration take office in 1971, then it took steps to restore the autonomy of school boards and universities. Since 1971, it has also doubled, in fact almost tripled, operating grants and capital grants for Saskatchewan schools. In addition it has recognized the need for both gifted and handicapped children.

Capital and operating grants to Saskatchewan universities have also more than doubled during the same interval. During the fiscal year, they rose by a higher percentage than in any other province. Let me illustrate what has been happening since 1971. Operating grants have risen by approximately 175 per cent, the cost of living index by roughly 170 per cent and tuition fees by about 52 per cent. One of the

February 26, 1979

results of increased expenditures by the government has been an almost continuous decline in the percentage of university operating budgets coming from tuition fees. In addition, the government has made non-repayable bursaries available. In 1977-78 alone 4,390 such bursaries valued at over \$2,390,000 were awarded to university students in this province.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I personally would like to see the total elimination of tuition fees. As a member of a university community, I would certainly not object to even larger grants as well. But, when I compare the percentage increases in grants to Saskatchewan universities with those in, shall I say, Conservative Manitoba, the new deal appears to be working quite well for Saskatchewan students.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. WHITE: — Twice in passing, Mr. Speaker, have I mentioned another section of Saskatchewan citizenry — the handicapped. As I indicated, they have been beneficiaries of the New Deal for People as it affects both children and students but I didn't give any details. Let me do so now. One of the most notable actions this government has taken relates to the severely multiply handicapped. What began some years ago as Core Services has evolved into a progressive educational program. Rather than being institutionalized as frequently happened in the past, the severely handicapped now have a chance to master various levels of self care, perhaps go on to enter a regular school and generally to win a greater degree of acceptance by society. There is no bottom limit on the skills necessary for admission to one of the twenty developmental centres spread throughout the province. The New Democratic Party, Mr. Speaker, believes that every citizen in our province has a right to self-improvement.

Also of value where handicapped individuals are concerned is the Saskatchewan Aids to Independent Living Program instituted in 1975. It provides, without charge, artificial limbs, crutches, wheel chairs and so forth. The special needs of the handicapped have also been recognized in connection with living accommodations. Finally, unless I badly misread the throne speech, the Attorney General will be introducing legislation which not only handicapped but progressive minded people in general will approve.

Working people have also advanced under the new deal and continue to advance under the new deal. Mr. Speaker, I want to spend a few minutes talking about them and their relationship with the New Democratic government.

It is estimated that our provincial labor force totals 414,000. That's 414,000 men and women who hold regular jobs and earn a wage. They are the people who keep out power on in a blizzard, nurse our sick, mine potash, transport our products and do the thousands of other things without which our society would grind to a halt. The Saskatchewan NDP has always had a good relationship with the working people. As opposed to the old-line parties, we regard workers as important people.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. WHITE: — If you look at the results of the recent election you will find that the feeling is mutual. No sooner did the Blakeney government take office in 1971 that it acted to restore free collective bargaining. It repealed the restrictive anti-labor Bill 2 which had among other things, fostered industrial strife. Having done that, it proceeded to establish a 40-hour week with no reduction in pay throughout the

province. It increased the number of statutory holidays and the length of annual vacations. On more than one occasion, minimum wages were also raised until they are among the highest in the country. And, Mr. Speaker, the minimum wage is more meaningful in Saskatchewan than in certain other jurisdictions where it often does not apply to those who need it most.

Nor is that all Mr. Speaker. This government has taken steps to protect workers, in some cases, against losses of employment resulting from technological change. It has acted to ensure public servants of a very basic, democratic right — the right to participate in elections. That contrasts sharply with the situation in Tory Ontario or Tory Alberta.

The Blakeney government has also pioneered in occupational health and safety legislation to make our program about the most advanced anywhere. Other jurisdictions have copied what has been done here.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I was very pleased to hear announced in the throne speech plans to further improve workers' compensation legislation. That is an area where improvements were badly needed when this government took office in 1971. In the late '60s, any worker who had the misfortune to be hurt on the job often found that to be only the beginning of his troubles. Compensation rates were low. A worker suffering serious enough injury to be classed by a doctor under permanent total disability could not receive more than \$6,000 per year regardless of what his income had been prior to injury. Claims were also processed slowly and the outcome so often went against the employee that organizations such as the Injured Workman's Association were born.

How different the situation is today, Mr. Speaker. A worker who now has permanent total disability can look forward to up to \$12,000 per year. And that figure is adjusted on a regular basis as opposed to the situation in 1971 when the ceiling on payments had not been raised for four years.

Certain other compensation benefits have been increased even more dramatically and coverage has been broadened. But best of all, Mr. Speaker, injured workers are no longer met by a stone wall when dealing with a provincial government and its agencies and there is a determined effort to see that our workers' compensation legislation remains the best in Canada.

The desirability of improving the position of women in society has also been recognized by the Blakeney administration. In 1972 our province became the first in Canada to recognize by law, working women's need for maternity leave. Women who had worked for an employer for one year became entitled to 18 weeks off. It followed of course, that pregnancy ceased to be a ground for dismissal. Last year, in 1978 restrictions concerning when leaves are to be taken were substantially relaxed.

Within the last few years the government has also begun funding such programs as the Rape Crisis Line and sharing the costs of such desirable institutions as Transition House in Regina, Interval House in Saskatoon and the Native Women's Halfway House. In the immediate past it has established a Women's Division in the Department of Labour. The division concerns itself with expansion of opportunities for women in the labor force, fair employment in terms of such considerations as equal pay for equal work and is also involved in counselling. It has not already done so, it will soon be instituting affirmative action programs in government to eliminate discrimination based on sex.

While there is still room for improvement, it must be acknowledged, Mr. Speaker, that Saskatchewan women have progressed legally and otherwise since 1971 under the New Deal for People. There is not the slightest doubt but that they will continue to do so. As the throne speech points out this session should be marked by passage of matrimonial property legislation.

Northern residents too have progressed under the new deal. Creation of a separate Department of Northern Saskatchewan in 1972 took the provincial government to the doorstep of its northern citizens. The establishment of a single agency to deal with the North and its people made it possible to eliminate those problems arising from divided jurisdiction and the southern bias so often present in government programs. A greater measure of self government was also provided for and services taken for granted in the South were soon being rapidly expanded. Electricity is now in use in 81 per cent of northern homes, an amount almost double the percentage in 1971. Few, if any, northern families now lack a pure water supply, compared with 7 out of 10 in 1971. Mr. Speaker, 96 per cent of the population now has access to the telephone, that is four times the number of people in that position eight years ago. Other programs have led to improved roads, better housing, expanded educational facilities and generally upgraded communities. Just because a portion of this province has a very small population and only two representatives in this legislature, Mr. Speaker, it does not mean that it will be forgotten by this government.

One cannot refer to northern residents without in the same breath speaking of our native people. One-third of the citizens of the North are of Indian ancestry, hence, programs such as I have just mentioned of value to the North also benefit native people. But of equal and perhaps greater importance are other activities of this government. It has worked and is working closely with Indian bands to arrange transfer to them of land to which they are entitled. Transfer of such lands will enhance the economic base of their communities, foster independence and brighten the future of their children. That transfers are proving a tedious processes, can be laid at Ottawa's door. The federal government like most other governments in Canada has been slow to co-operate, a fact commented upon more than once by Indian leaders.

The Blakeney government also works closely with Indians in general in Saskatchewan on other matters to enable them to improve their lot in life; such co-operation has led to the Indian Special Constable Program and the Indian Justice of the Peace Program. It has also resulted in the establishment of the Indian Federated College at the University of Regina.

Mr. Speaker, it has been my pleasure to meet some of the young people registered there, as well as other Indian youths who have passed through the university and gone on to assume responsible positions, or to pursue studies elsewhere. Let us hope, Mr. Speaker, that neglect on the part of the federal government where funding the college is concerned does not prevent others from following in the footsteps of say a former student and friend of mine who is now finishing her doctor's degree.

Other areas where Indian government co-operation has occurred are housing, the funding of friendship centres, educational programs for children, and employment. However, Mr. Speaker, let me say this. In certain matters, above all employment, much remains to be done. My colleagues on this side of the House could expect to hear from me regularly and often on that matter, and I am quite sure, judging by their actions in the past, my words will not fall on deaf ears.

I could go on, Mr. Speaker, and point out how the new deal relates to other groups of people, for example Saskatchewan farmers, and mention a variety of programs included within it, but I will content myself with merely a couple more brief comments.

First let me say I do not propose to speak of the farming community. My colleague, the hon. member for Shaunavon (Mr. Lingenfelter), will certainly be speaking about agriculture, and representing a rural community, he is far better informed on rural matters than I am. You can trust me, Mr. Speaker, when I say he will have some thought-provoking statements for this House. I know him from some years ago when he was a student of mine at the University of Regina.

Secondly, I have purposely omitted a variety of programs included in the New Deal for Saskatchewan people on the grounds that they apply to the population as a whole. Some of them can be described as nothing less than milestones in the total program of this government. To illustrate this, let me say something about the health programs. Programs related to health have received, and will continue to receive, a great deal of attention from the Blakeney government. Among other things, it has brought in hearing aids and prescription drug plans, and it removed both premiums and deterrent fees from the medical care program, in order that the maintenance of health and recovery from illness bear no price tag.

Mr. Speaker, I was also pleased to note a number of references to future development in the area of health in the throne speech. Those references are indications of the determination of this government to keep Saskatchewan in the forefront of North America where health services are concerned. The government will be establishing a health research fund to promote and support research in the province. It will be fostering increased flexibility and autonomy in our cancer control program through a cancer foundation, and it will seek to improve delivery of health services by providing for the creation of health units. Mr. Speaker, a brief review of what has been done and what is about to be done in the area of health simply proves what I have been demonstrating. This government is not content to rest on its laurels it is constantly looking ahead.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. WHITE: — The phrases, Mr. Speaker, ‘a record of success’ and ‘a promise for the future’ which adorned the air waves during the recent election were not idle patter. This government, Mr. Speaker, carries on in the best traditions of Tommy Douglas and W.S. Lloyd.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. WHITE: — Now, Mr. Speaker, the programs I have been discussing provide only a partial picture of the new deal. As I said sometime ago, the new deal is complex. It also embodies a well thought out plan for the future development of Saskatchewan, a vision for the future shared by most Saskatchewan residents. An intrinsic part of the new deal is the belief that the people of Saskatchewan should have greater control of their own destiny, that they should be masters of their own house, or, as French Canadians put it *maitre chez nous*. The Blakeney government has taken steps to ensure that such a goal is achieved. It insists that the resources of this province be developed for the benefit of the people of this province, rather than syphoned off in the profits of multinationals foreign-owned corporations.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. WHITE: — To that end it has taken a number of steps and created such organizations as the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan, the Saskatchewan Mining Development Corporation and Saskatchewan Oil.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. WHITE: — The actions of the Blakeney government mean revenues for the people of Saskatchewan to finance the variety of benefits they enjoy. But, Mr. Speaker, simply acquiring money is not the sole purpose of this government in the design of its resource development policies. Those policies, and related actions, of the Blakeney government represent an expression of confidence in the present and future citizens of this province. In as strong a manner as possible the government has shown that it believes Saskatchewan citizens have now, and will continue to have in the future, the necessary abilities to meet and deal with the great promise that the future holds for our province. It is with great pride, Mr. Speaker, that I am a member of a government which holds such beliefs and which will meet head-on the challenges of the future.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. WHITE: — For a number of years, I have had the opportunity to be associated with young people in the study of our province's and our country's past. This association has made me aware of a number of things. First, the people of Saskatchewan can be justly proud of the remarkable accomplishments they have individually and collectively made over the years. Let me list just a few.

1. In 1945, Saskatchewan established a publicly owned insurance company. The company served Saskatchewan people well and is a model for other public insurance companies.
2. the telephone and electrical network set up here rival the best to be found in North America. These networks have been laid out over vast distances and have overcome some of the most difficult natural handicaps anywhere.
3. Saskatchewan has built a first-class natural gas utility and an excellent publicly-owned transportation company.
4. Saskatchewan people have also created successful industries for harvesting our forest products, and to mention only one other thing:
5. Some of the largest, most successful agricultural co-operatives in the world have been organized here in Saskatchewan.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. WHITE: — Secondly, Mr. Speaker, my association with young people has convinced me that they will not allow themselves to be outshone in accomplishments by their parents, or their grandparents. I have every confidence that the young people of today will seize the opportunities presented to them by this government and carry Saskatchewan forward to new and greater heights.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. WHITE: — Mr. Speaker, there is a close relationship between this government's resource policies and another subject — a matter of great importance to all citizens, both of today and of the future. Mr. Speaker, I refer to employment. A job for every citizen of Saskatchewan is an objective deserving our greatest efforts. Lack of employment is a problem which not only affects the individual directly, but touches every person in society, employed or not. There are many people in Canada today, Mr. Speaker, for whom employment, or rather lack of employment, is a very pressing problem.

Consider our native people — 75 per cent of or more of whom face unemployment or at best marginal or seasonal employment. Consider our young people — the 18 – to 25 – year-olds. For many, the prospects of finding meaningful, full-time employment are not good. And consider the women in our society — the unwed mother or the homemaker working to support her family. For these people, Mr. Speaker, finding employment is very, very important. When you consider what unemployment means in human terms, it is easy to see why people want jobs not handouts.

For the unemployed individual, each day begins with a sense of frustration and anxiety owing to the lack of an opportunity to engage oneself in useful work. It means pounding the streets and applying for jobs, often done more out of a sense of duty than hopefulness. It means a loss of self-respect and dignity. And if the individual concerned is the head of a family, it can mean much more. Unemployment can quickly reduce a family to the poverty level with serious results — children raised with less than adequate food, improperly clothed, poorly housed and with their health impaired. And that's only part of the story. Unemployment produces stress, conflict and breakdown of normal family relationships. It leads to alcoholism, crime, mental breakdown, suicide and even homicide.

My point, Mr. Speaker, is that no government can justly claim to be adequately marking the Year of the Child, much less doing its job, unless it is firmly committed and has addressed itself to the creation of jobs for its citizens.

And where does this government stand on that matter? The record is a good one and speaks for itself, Mr. Speaker. Since first taking office in 1971, 88,000 new jobs have been created in Saskatchewan.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. WHITE: — And that is not all. This government can claim with pride that during its last term in office, Saskatchewan had a lower level of unemployment in more months than any other province in Canada.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. WHITE: — An important reason for this situation is the resource policies of this government.

Mr. Speaker, not only did the Speech from the Throne mention resource development and public participation therein, it also made reference to federal-provincial relations. I

was pleased to learn of the government's intent to establish a new Department of Intergovernmental Affairs. We certainly don't want to be handicapped by lack of such a structure when negotiating with other governments to shape federalism of the future. We want to be as secure in the knowledge as we can that when decisions are made not only we in Saskatchewan but all Canadians will obtain as fair a deal as possible. We have received a variety of deals in the past which we do not want to see repeated, paralleled or continued. I want to take a few minutes to describe some of them.

The first example, Mr. Speaker, takes us back to 1905, to the birth of our province. As the hon. members know we did not at that time obtain control of our natural resources, rather, we received a cash subsidy from the federal government in their place. Another clause in the autonomy bill stated that the tax exemption enjoyed by the Canadian Pacific Railway on its large land holdings in the province would continue in effect. Under the arrangement, Saskatchewan, at its birth, received only somewhat more in the shape of the subsidy than it would have received through taxing CPR lands. You might say that was all right but the party benefiting most was the CPR. Criticism of the arrangement by local Tories is interesting, Mr. Speaker. They urged that all Canadians, rather than simply Saskatchewanians, bear the cost of the exemption. They were quite content to see the railway enjoy its privilege.

Some years later, in 1930, we received control of natural resources remaining in the hands of the federal government. At least we were given to understand we were receiving control. And here again, Saskatchewan came out on the short end of the stick. What happened was essentially this. As well as receiving the residue of resources, Saskatchewan, Alberta and Manitoba would continue to be paid federal subsidies under an already existing formula. The trouble with the formula from Saskatchewan's standpoint was that it did not take into consideration the amount or value of land the federal government had given away in each of the three provinces. Much more land had been alienated to railways in Saskatchewan than in either Alberta or Manitoba. Saskatchewan land had also been used to build railways in Manitoba. The Saskatchewan government was of the opinion that it had been short-changed to the tune of \$50 million to \$60 million, a great deal of money at the beginning of the depression.

It may interest this House to know, Mr. Speaker, that Saskatchewan was represented in negotiations by members of the last and only Tory government this province has ever had.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. WHITE: — Were the time at my disposal unlimited, Mr. Speaker, I could describe at length other instances where federal policies in the early years operated contrary to the best interests of our province. This is particularly true of railway and tariff policies. But I will confine myself to a few words concerning each.

Investigation shows that for a good many years in the early life of our province over 60 per cent of CPR net earnings were drawn from western Canada. That fact, coupled with higher freight rates and lower operating costs on the prairies than in the East, led the Saskatchewan government to charge that CPR dividends were paid largely by the West.

Where tariff protection is concerned, Mr. Speaker, let me just say this. At the beginning of the depression tariffs were costing the prairies something in the order of \$45 million per year. That amount exceeds significantly the sum of money the federal

government spent on relief in the three prairie provinces during 1937, the worst year of the depression. About the only difference where tariff protection is concerned after another 40 or 50 years of Tory or Grit rule is increased costs. A recent conservative estimate for western Canada was \$200 million annually.

In placing these four examples before the House, Mr. Speaker, my sole purpose is to illustrate the types of conditions we have no desire to operate under in the future. I do not do so from any desire to dredge up old grievances. Indeed, I am inclined to place them in a category of ancient history since the situation improved in later years.

The 1930s as we know, Mr. Speaker, witnessed devastation by drought and depression of our economy, based as it was almost entirely on agriculture. The dire straits of our province, among other things, led to appointment by the federal government in 1937 of the Royal Commission on Dominion-Provincial Relations. The recommendations of that commission pointed the way to a brighter future for have-not provinces like Saskatchewan. However, those recommendations were rejected by the richer provinces together with Alberta for reasons best known to themselves.

The federal government reacted by proceeding to implement the commission's proposal on a piece-meal basis and some of its actions are well known. In the 1940s it assumed responsibility for the unemployed, it cancelled certain provincial relief debts, it concluded tax-rental agreements with the provinces, it began making equalization payments to the poorer provinces and, among other things, it entered into a variety of cost sharing programs. In short, it assumed the role of equalizer within our federal system. I could go on from there and trace the history of federal-provincial relations over the subsequent 30 years but, Mr. Speaker, I won't. It is sufficient to sum up some of the major developments.

For a time Saskatchewan fared better. Confederation still had its disadvantages but there come to be more compensating advantages. However, after some years the situation took a turn for the worst. The federal government, for example, began withdrawing, often unilaterally, from an increasing number of cost sharing programs. That hurt our province financially. Ottawa also reduced the level of corporation taxes it collected so the provinces could expand in the field. Such actions helped richer provinces like Ontario but certainly not us. And even worse was to come. We, in Saskatchewan, had no sooner began to diversify our economy substantially through development of natural resources on a large scale and to reduce our heavy reliance on agriculture, than the federal government began to change what we could only consider very fundamental rules of confederation. On the one hand, it began to advocate a users-pay policy for Canadian railways. And on the other, it singled out certain natural resources for treatment as national resources.

In one instance, Mr. Speaker, the federal government proposed in effect to continue subsidizing all forms of transportation except railways, the form of transportation upon which the prairies and, above all, Saskatchewan are most dependent. In the other instance, it proceeded to place taxes on certain natural resources and essentially only prairie resources, in order to subsidize their costs in other parts of the country. In one case, we in Saskatchewan were told we would have to pay more and in another that we would have to settle for less. Such a restructuring of the economic rules of our country involves deals which neither the people of Saskatchewan nor its New Democratic government can accept.

Those in a nutshell, Mr. Speaker, are some of the major problems facing us in the area

February 26, 1979

of federal-provincial relations. What are we to do about them? Well, fortunately, Mr. Speaker, it's not simply a question of what shall we do about them, but what have we already done about them? The Blakeney government has, as everyone knows, advanced telling arguments against the federal proposals. And it has already formulated and put forward plans, excellent plans, for dealing with such things as the railway problem. Progress, Mr. Speaker, has already been made and more will be forthcoming. I won't go into the details. Others, perhaps the Premier himself, will do that. Just let me say this, Mr. Speaker. Advances have been made, and will continue to be made for a variety of reasons, not the least of which is the fact that Saskatchewan possesses leadership.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. WHITE: — If there is any province in this fair land of ours with a premier capable of making its position known and making himself heard, it is Saskatchewan.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. WHITE: — The qualifications of our Premier to lead Saskatchewan through difficult times and forward to a new and fair deal within confederation are outstanding.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. WHITE: — Let me simply list three of them, Mr. Speaker. Allen Blakeney understands confederation and all it involves.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. WHITE: — Federal experts in the field of intergovernmental affairs appointed to him as a Premier commanding the most respect at federal — provincial conferences, and as an individual who will have an extraordinary influence on Canada's future.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. WHITE: — Allan Blakeney is firm when it comes to standing up for the rights of our province. When the multinationals and the US State Department threatened reprisals for the takeover of the potash mine, did he run for cover as Canadian leaders habitually do? No! He held his ground and made his point.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. WHITE: — Allan Blakeney has stature across the land. And here, Mr. Speaker, rather than point out what people have said of him, or what he has done, let me simply say this. Nobody, and I repeat, nobody, ever refers to Allan Blakeney as Allan Who?

I want to end what I have to say on a very personal note, Mr. Speaker. To state that I'm a rookie MLA and politician is putting it mildly. As of September 1 last year I had never run for political office. I had never given serious thought to doing so. I subscribed to no party newspaper. I had taken no active part in an election campaign even to the extent of displaying a lawn sign. Not since the medicare crisis had I been sufficiently moved to buy an NDP membership card. I was very happy at Campion College on the university campus and felt I was making an adequate contribution to society. Then, out of the blue, came a call to run in the October election. What was my answer to be? As an

individual I had been growing increasingly concerned about development in our province and the country as a whole. It didn't take much thought to conclude that the direction in which I wanted the country, and the province, to move coincided very closely with the direction which Allan Blakeney advocated and was working toward. Being a Canadian historian also influenced my decision. When I considered the quality of leadership our province and our country has all too often been saddled with, there could be only one answer; get out of my comfortable chair and put my energies where my thoughts were, accept one of the variety of challenges the CCF and NDP have so often placed before the people of Saskatchewan. Mr. Speaker, in seeking both a new deal and a fair deal for Saskatchewan and all Canadians within confederation, Allan Blakeney is a leader you can follow with confidence and with your head held high.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. WHITE: — I, therefore, consider it a privilege to move, seconded by the hon. member for Shaunavon, (Mr. Lingenfelter) that a Humble Address be presented to his Honour the Lieutenant-Governor.

MR. D. LINGENFELTER (Shaunavon): — Mr. Speaker, it is a great honor for me and for the people of Shaunavon, the constituency which I represent, to second the address in reply to the Speech from the Throne. I would like to thank Premier Blakeney for giving me the opportunity.

Before I proceed with my remarks, Mr. Speaker, I wish to compliment the member for Regina Wascana (Mr. White) on the speech he just delivered moving the motion. His perceptive comments on the Speech from the Throne demonstrate his understanding of the provincial government's role in building a better society. Clint White has, today, given us evidence of his great ability and served notice that he will be a real credit to this Assembly.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. LINGENFELTER: — Mr. Speaker, I also would like to congratulate the member for Kinistino, the Hon. Don Cody, on his recent appointment to the cabinet. Mr. Cody has previously shown his talent for solving difficult problems in a very effective manner.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. LINGENFELTER: — Mr. Speaker, I want to take a moment to congratulate the members on the opposite side of the House on this, the first regular sitting day since they assumed the role of official opposition.

There were other events of note today, Mr. Speaker. As members know, our part of the country had an eclipse of the sun today. The moon passed in front of the sun and a cold darkness fell over the land. Mr. Speaker, it was as though the heavenly bodies themselves viewed any advance by the Conservative Party of Saskatchewan with such alarm that the sun disappeared from the sky.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. LINGENFELTER: — Mr. Speaker, the Speech from the Throne gives every indication that the Blakeney government is concerned and determined to assist all groups in our society and in all parts of the province. Since the reading of the Speech last Thursday, I

February 26, 1979

have spoken with a number of my constituents. They were pleased with announcements that were made and they expressed the opinion that our future looks bright in the southwestern part of the province as it does in all of Saskatchewan.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. LINGENFELTER: — Mr. Speaker, it has been my great privilege to represent the constituency of Shaunavon since the general election of last October. While the riding is not an old one in the sense that the name Shaunavon has applied to a provincial electorate district for only about 30 years, there have been some five members of the legislature represent the riding.

In 1949, Thomas John Bentley won the by-election victory and became the first MLA for Shaunavon when the new riding boundaries were created.

T.J. Bentley represented the constituency for 11 years, serving in the cabinet of Tommy Douglas, first as the Minister of Health and later as Minister of Social Welfare. From 1960 to 1964 the Shaunavon riding was retained for the CCF NDP by Arthur Kluzak. Art still lives in the constituency at Climax and is always ready with some words of encouragement or advice. He took an active part in the fight to establish medicare and is quite rightly proud of Saskatchewan's present position as a leader in the field of free universal health care.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. LINGENFELTER: — In 1964, Fern Larochelle won the riding for the Liberal Party and represented it for seven years. Mr. Larochelle's untimely death a little over a year ago saddened his many friends in the southwest.

In 1971, Allen Oliver was elected for the Shaunavon seat for the NDP. He served the Legislative Assembly for four years and in every department and agency of the provincial government, there are people who mention Allen Oliver's name to me. They remember the quiet, considerate manner in which he went about his work as an MLA and the compassion he had for fellow human beings.

Between 1975 and 1978, Sonny Anderson represented the people of Shaunavon. During those three years, Sonny was a popular and well thought of MLA.

The Shaunavon constituency is an area which has a rich and interesting history. The southwest corner of the province had been for hundreds of years the home and buffalo hunting area for several Indian bands. The Assiniboines lived in the Cyprus Hills, the Cree on the flat plains to the East and the Blackfeet toward the West in the foothills.

The first white settlers came into the area in the latter half of the 1800's to ranch. Generally, they came from the United States and settled along the Frenchman River, where an assured water supply existed. Later, British, Scandinavian, German, French, and other settlers in large numbers came to take up farming. The area and the climate produced a strong and hardy group of people. Mr. Speaker, people whose ancestors went through the severe drought of 1871, and the winter of 1905 and 1906 that wiped out many herds of cattle completely. Many of my constituents clung to their farms during the dust bowl years of the 1930s, and few areas in North America were hit harder by the drought than the southwest corner of Saskatchewan. In the past, it hasn't always been easy to wrestle a living from the land in the Shaunavon constituency, but,

Mr. Speaker, we who can look across the international boundary to our American neighbors and west over the border to oil rich Alberta have chosen to live as Canadians, in Canada, and in Saskatchewan, the best province in Canada.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. LINGENFELTER: — Mr. Speaker, I would like to centre my remarks today around three issues, issues which have important implications for rural Saskatchewan and, indeed, the entire province. Those issues are agriculture, transportation, and resources.

Mr. Speaker, I was very pleased to hear announced in the throne speech increased provincial funding for agricultural research. Agriculture is the single most important segment of the Saskatchewan economy. Eighty-four thousand people are employed directly in farming. It is estimated that each of these farm jobs generates three additional jobs in retail stores, service industries, construction, manufacturing, finance, utilities and other businesses. That means 252,000 people rely indirectly on agriculture for their living. Now, Mr. Speaker, if you add these numbers up, you get a total of 336,000 jobs. The result is that out of our provincial labour force of just over 400,000 workers, 80 per cent of these workers depend for their livelihood on agriculture. Beyond the jobs, Mr. Speaker, the value of agricultural products in Saskatchewan is immense, averaging well over \$2 billion a year. That is equal to the value of all the production from Saskatchewan's mining industry, our natural resources, manufacturing and construction industries combined. I think it is clear, Mr. Speaker, why the throne speech had so much to say on subjects related to agriculture and why the Blakeney government has always considered agriculture a priority.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. LINGENFELTER: — The new legislation providing increased research funds for such things as improved seed varieties, better fertilizers, safer weed and insect control, will be met with full approval by the farmers of Saskatchewan. Scientific research is very important to agriculture. In my own area, the dry years of the '30s had a devastating effect on farms and ranches. Had we been able, in the '30s, to apply some of the conservation practices that research in years since has developed, the dust bowl might not have been so extensive.

Mr. Speaker, in my constituency, there are over half a dozen delivery points that handle in excess of a million bushels of grain a year. In fact, Shaunavon averages over two million bushels per crop year. Livestock production in the Shaunavon area compares favourably with other parts of the province, but, Mr. Speaker, production figures can suffer badly if drought or disease strike. The best means of protection is scientific research and that requires money. It is important to note that the federal government has been cutting back on funding for agricultural research just as funding for other programs in secondary education, social services and health care have been cut back.

Mr. Speaker, grain growers and livestock producers across the province will applaud the move by the Blakeney government to assume financial responsibilities for yet another program left hanging high and dry by the federal government.

Mr. Speaker, the throne speech mentioned the Farm Cost Reduction Program which has now been operating for some months. Gasoline, diesel fuel and other farm fuels have become a major component in the cost-price squeeze farm families find

themselves in. The price reduction for farm fuel is in keeping with previous action taken by the government to help farmers fight the high cost of living. The farm electrical rates in Saskatchewan are considerably lower than rates in our neighboring provinces. Manitoba Hydro and Alberta Power charge rural customers, in some cases 50 per cent more than SPC (Saskatchewan Power Corporation) charges customers in similar categories.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. LINGENFELTER: — Our telephone service is equally inexpensive. Our phone rates for farm families and small centres are second lowest in Canada and much less expensive than rates in Alberta. Mr. Speaker, farm families must register and pay insurance on a number of vehicles. Now, that is the same across Canada. But one thing that is very different, Mr. Speaker, is the price that people have to pay for automobile insurance. A twenty-year-old Saskatchewan farmer driving a recent model full-size car and arranging to pay his automobile insurance premiums can expect to pay less than one-half what he would pay if he lived in Alberta or Ontario. Our public automobile insurance plan operates as a service to the public unlike the highly profit-oriented private corporations in some other provinces.

Another area where rural residents of Saskatchewan are better off than their counterparts in other parts of Canada is in the financial assistance that this provincial government makes available to local authorities. Municipal governments really have access only to property tax in collecting amounts of money they need to operate. Programs like the Community Capital Fund; grants to build and maintain super grid roads; grants for recreational facilities and more recently revenue sharing have all been very effective in helping municipalities keep their property taxes down.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. LINGENFELTER: — Mr. Speaker, I was pleased to hear announced in the throne speech, that the land bank program would be further improved. Even with the larger farms in the southwest, there is a definite place for the land transfer system of the land bank. There are at present, 75 new farmers in the Shaunavon constituency thanks to the land bank and there will be many more.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. LINGENFELTER: — Mr. Speaker, this New Democratic Party government has a great deal to be proud of in the area of agriculture. Long-term programs like FarmStart have helped thousands of farm families diversify their operations, making their production unit more viable. There have been over 120 FarmStart loans and grants for a total output of over \$2 million in the Shaunavon constituency alone. Short term programs have also worked well, programs that made financial assistance available to move harvesting and grain-drying equipment from one farm to another when the wet weather struck last fall. When the beef producers were in difficulty with low prices, the Beef Industry Assistance Plan was drawn up and put to work.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. LINGENFELTER: — The additional money kept a number of cattle operations going.

Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that when farmers have needed help from this provincial government in recent years the help was forthcoming.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. LINGENFELTER: — Best of all, Mr. Speaker, the policies and programs of this New Democratic government have always been designed to fit the needs of the family farm. Now not everyone thinks that is such a good idea. In the June 19, 1978 edition of the Western Producer a Conservative member of this legislature had some interesting things to say about his party's stand on the issue of maintaining the family farm. He said and I quote, 'The economics in agriculture that dictate bigger is better should be given priority over the outmoded concept of the family farm.' That was the agricultural spokesman of the Conservative Party of Saskatchewan speaking just last year. While it is fair to say in his defense, Mr. Speaker, that he was sometimes forced to share his assigned duties as party spokesman with numerous other members of another opposition political party, presumably he was stating his party's stand.

There are other interesting comments on the subject of family farms by opposition members of the Conservative Party. Grant Devine, Conservative party candidate in the Saskatoon Nutana riding in the last election wrote an article for the publication, Business Review. In the article Mr. Devine says 80 per cent of our farmers are non-productive. He says that those 80 per cent should find something else to do and let the 20 per cent who are good businessmen carry on the farming.

Now, Mr. Speaker, those statements were not from some part-time supporter of the Conservative Party or just an ordinary party member; the statements came from two of the most prominent Conservatives in the province. In the first case, the sitting MLA for Moosomin, Mr. Birkbeck, and in the second, a professor of agricultural economics and agricultural policy maker for the Tory Party. The Conservative Party of Saskatchewan has some strange policies, policies that if ever implemented would stunt the development of our province for years to come. But their policy as it applies to the farming family is in a category all by itself; it strikes at our very way of life. If there was ever a body blow aimed at rural Saskatchewan it was that portion of the Conservative Party's platform which deals with family farms.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. LINGENFELTER: — Mr. Speaker, I believe and my party believes that the family farm is the foundation of our social fabric.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. LINGENFELTER: — Mr. Speaker, I would like to turn now to the subject of transportation and specifically rail transport of prairie grain. The Speech from the Throne outlined the concern of the Blakeney government over recommendations of the Prairie Rail Action Committee (PRAC). And, Mr. Speaker, there is cause for concern, beginning with the committee itself and its chairman, Fred Anderson. Mr. Anderson served on the MacPherson Royal Commission in 1961 and came up with the user-pay concept of shipping grain to export. The MacPherson Commission also recommended that railways be allowed to export. The MacPherson Commission also recommended that railways be allowed to abandon uneconomic lines on the prairies during the next 15 years following 1961. At that time, about 8,000 miles of track were considered unprofitable. Fortunately, political pressure and strong reaction from farm organizations prevented Liberal and Conservative governments in Ottawa from

abandoning many of these lines. In 1967 with the passing of the National Transportation Act, the federal government began for the first time to set up a basic rail service that would be thought of as permanent. By December 1974 the federal government considered 12,413 miles of rail lines to be in the basic network, and announced that they would be permanent until the year 2000. Another 6,284 miles were protected until the Hall Commission had a chance to study them.

The Hall Commission was set up in April of 1975 and issued its report on May 16, 1977. Judge Emmett Hal and the other commissioners spent two years examining in detail Western Canada's transportation and grain handling system. The commission conducted some 120 hearings attended by more than 15,000 people. They received over 1,600 briefs from concerned individuals and organizations. Mr. Speaker, if ever there was an honest effort made by a group of people to hear and understand all aspects of the problem, it was made by the Hall Commission.

The Hall Commission recommendations were just as impressive as the in-depth nature of the study itself. The most important recommendations call for the railways to maintain branch lines to the extent that the country elevator system can remain in place. The Hall recommendations completely rejected the concept of inland terminals as a substitute for local country elevators.

Perhaps best of all, Mr. Speaker, the Hall report took the same position as the Blakeney government that consideration of economic and social effects on prairie towns and villages of wholesale rail line abandonment must be of a higher priority than feeding money into the bulging bank accounts of Cargill Grain or the CPR. But, Mr. Speaker, the federal Minister of Transport, Otto Lang, had no intention of concerning himself with the viability of rural communities. He chose to ignore major portions of the excellent research and well thought out recommendations of the Hall Commission. Instead, Mr. Lang set up the Prairie Rail Action Committee and staffed it with his cronies. Together, the federal minister and PRAC set about insuring that any expenditures by the federal government for upgrading rail lines would be kept to a minimum, and that as much of the cost as possible would be shifted to the farmers, the municipalities and the provincial government.

Mr. Speaker, the PRAC recommendations are a disaster for the western grain farmer. Of more than 2,500 miles of branch lines reviewed by PRAC, PRAC recommended only a little over 1,000 miles be added to the basic network. Fully 1,416 miles of prairie rail line is recommended for abandonment. That means some delivery points that handle over a million bushels of grain a year could be left without rail service. It means hauling distances for some farmers will increase by more than 20 miles. The PRAC recommendations mean rural communities will lose a large chunk of their tax base when the branch lines and elevators go. It means that provincial taxpayers will be faced with massive bills to rebuild our highway systems once the grain movement is shifted from the branch lines on to roads. It means that farm families will shift their shopping habits from towns that are losing their railways and elevators; the towns will lose their businesses and services; they will decline in population and they will die.

Mr. Speaker, the Saskatchewan government has pledged itself to stand with the people of Simmie, Bengough, Hazlet, Holdfast, LeRoy, St. Louis, Willow Bunch and the other communities affected.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. LINGENFELTER: — The federal New Democratic Party has joined the fight as well with members of parliament like Les Benjamin and Lorne Nystrom already campaigning to have the Canadian Transport Commission reject the PRAC proposals outright. What about the Conservative party? What have they been saying?

Don Mazankowski, the member of parliament for Vegreville, Alberta and Conservative spokesman on transportation said in an interview which appeared in the January 4th edition of the Western Producer that if the Conservative government were federally elected, and I quote:

I said it might also be possible that a PC government would order some lines back into the 'uncertain' category or into the permanent network.

Now, Mr. Speaker, that will just warm the hearts of some of our local rail retention committees fighting to keep their rail lines. The Tory spokesman on transportation saying his party 'might' put some lines back in the uncertain category, not that he would do it and not that if he did it would be permanent but a few lines might be put back into the uncertain category. That is the Tories standing shoulder to shoulder with the grain producers and taking part in their struggle.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. LINGENFELTER: — Mr. Speaker, on the subject of economic and social problems caused for farmers and municipal governments by rail line abandonment and loss of their elevators, Mr. Mazankowski had this to day and I quote:

Rationalization of the grain elevator system should be allowed to evolve naturally as grain companies decide what is practical.

Now, Mr. Speaker, that is exactly the kind of resolute, hard-driving, dedication we have come to expect from the Tory party on the issue of maintaining delivery points. If the branch line is going to be torn up and the grain company decides to move its elevator, that is no business of the government. The farm families who are affected can go and fight Cargill Grain and the CPR on their own. That's the kind of odds the Tory party likes to see when its corporate friends are involved in a fight.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. LINGENFELTER: — Well, Mr. Speaker, I want to tell the members opposite that the New Democratic Party is committed to join the fight to save the prairie branch lines.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. LINGENFELTER: — We regard rail service to the country elevator system as absolutely necessary in maintaining the social fabric of rural Saskatchewan, and I, for one, will not rest so long as the two old-line parties continue their efforts to destroy the structures that best serve the family farm.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. LINGENFELTER: — Mr. Speaker, I want to turn now to an area of public policy that has attracted a lot of attention and debate over the last 10 years, and which the throne speech identifies as a major priority of this government. No one would deny that in

Saskatchewan public policy regarding the management, taxation and development of our natural resources has attracted considerable attention over the past 10 years. Fair-minded analysts would probably say that the use of our resources attracted considerable attention in the 1967 provincial election campaign and heated up between then and 1971. In the last provincial election, the use of our natural resources was one of the major issues, if not the number one issue. It has remained at the forefront of public attention since then, figuring largely in 1975 and in the recent election of last October. Given the fact that this issue has received such attention, I find it inexcusable that the members opposite could be so ignorant as they have demonstrated themselves to be about this party government's policies. These may be strong words, Mr. Speaker, but throughout the course of the last legislature and the recent election campaign, members opposite have consistently twisted the facts. They have twisted the facts about what commitments and promises we in the NDP made to the people of Saskatchewan. They have twisted the facts about the results of those commitments being kept.

I want to come back to this later in my remarks, but let me just say, it appears to me that Saskatchewan voters were a fair bit more perceptive than they are given credit to by some politicians. October 18th proved that, and it proved the opposition dead wrong.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. LINGENFELTER: — Most members, probably all members, would subscribe to the belief that the natural resources of the province belong to the people of the province. The BNA (British North America) Act, an agreement signed between Canadian and Saskatchewan government in 1930, give the province the resource management, taxation, development, and responsibility authority. Members opposite, Mr. Speaker, give lip service to the belief that we have those powers, even if their counterparts, the Conservatives and Liberals in Ottawa, sound and act less convinced.

Where the serious debate arises, Mr. Speaker, is about the exercise of that power. Conservative members, like their predecessors, in the now extinct Thatcher Liberal party, preach the doctrinaire private enterprise dogma. The range of their solutions is familiar — lower royalties, lower taxes, more incentives, more foreign control — anything but tougher government regulations and taxation levels assuring the best possible return for the people of Saskatchewan, and anything but government participation in ownership on behalf of the people of Saskatchewan.

We on this side, for our part, have made our position abundantly clear. I said earlier that members opposite have tried to misrepresent or twist the facts about the commitments we made. The Leader of the Opposition, in this House and outside on the hustings, implied that somehow we hoodwinked the voters because we didn't promise tougher royalties, we didn't promise tougher regulations and specifically we didn't promise government ownership — ownership on behalf of all the people no matter what their economic station in life.

What are the facts, Mr. Speaker, about those commitments we made? I will try to be brief. In 1971, in our program New Deal for People we made the following points:

1. Development of our resources must be aimed at maximizing benefits for people, not maximizing profits for big business and its promoters;
2. With respect to new development, the NDP will give first priority to public ownership

through Crown corporations. Partnership managements between government and co-operatives or private developers will be undertaken. Limits will be established with respect to foreign equity capital;

3. An NDP government will review existing royalty and other arrangements;
4. Where feasible, we will reclaim ownership and control of foreign owned resources.

I invite the member for Nipawin (Mr. Collver) to pay attention to those points which are abridged but in no way taken out of context of our 1971 program. In particular, he should note the fourth point and he should check the public record to see if it was understood before he makes the indiscriminant charge, as he has in the past, that this plank didn't give the people the clear view of our intention. I invite him to check first with the member for Thunder Creek (Mr. Thatcher). That member can probably advise him to choose his words more carefully than in the past.

The member for Thunder Creek probably can probably diarize every memorable speech ever delivered in this house by a more famous Thatcher. He would be able to refer the member for Nipawin to a statement made on February 18, 1971, when the then Premier Thatcher referred to our program, and I quote:

In another plank it was referred to by the Leader of the Opposition, this afternoon, nationalization of the potash industry was promised. That election promise has to be the silliest ever made in the history of this province . . . apart from being silly, Mr. Speaker, that promise is dangerous. Saskatchewan could lose her potash markets overnight.

Obviously, Mr. Speaker, overnight is a long time for a Thatcher whether a Liberal or a Tory. Because no matter how many times the sun rises and sets they are still in the dark as evidenced . . .

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. LINGENFELTER: — . . . by their blind allegiance to the worn-out dogma and scare tactics spread by them and their political friends. But there are more to this revealing harangue, and I quote again:

If any government tried to expropriate the industry several thousand workers could lose their jobs. And I say that even if the NDP by some miracle did form the government they wouldn't dare to proceed with that plan, they wouldn't dare.

In case members think that statement by the more famous Thatcher was a heat-of-the-moment thing I want to advise you that he repeated it after as much reflection as he could muster — overnight.

Mr. Speaker, Allan Blakeney and the members he led at that time performed the miracle, they formed the government four months later.

In the period between 1971 and 1975 many steps were carried out towards achieving

the objectives set out. Our 1975 campaign pledges reaffirmed our intentions to act to see that the people of Saskatchewan get the greatest possible benefit from our resources.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. LINGENFELTER: — We said again and I'll quote for the benefit of the members opposite. This may well involve new approaches to public ownership, to joint ventures between government and private enterprise and to resource royalties and taxation.

I have tried to outline what I think are the central issues in the debate about management, taxation, development of our resources. The debate is about the exercise of power, the people exercising the power through their government or the people being powerless — just as eastern Canadians now find themselves powerless as Exxon dances among their freezing puppets in Ottawa.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. LINGENFELTER: — I've tried to dispel the myth spread by members opposite that we, for our part, weren't forthright in setting our commitments so they were understood by those opposing the policy and by the public. The record regarding the debate of our commitments speaks for itself and no part of that record speaks more clearly, Mr. Speaker, than the results of the October election.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. LINGENFELTER: — Few things, Mr. Speaker, give members on this side more reason to be proud of Premier Blakeney and his colleagues from the last Assembly than the decision they took in 1975. They dared to proceed with 'that plan' — as the former Premier Thatcher called it when the industry demonstrated its complete unwillingness to co-operate with the government.

I said earlier, Mr. Speaker, that the members opposite also twisted the fact about the results of this government keeping its commitment to resource policy. The litany of the pestilence that was supposed to flow, according to them, from the oppressive socialism was as old as the Conservative Party if not as old as their economic theories. The record of the results are clear enough for anyone who wants to examine the record.

Revenues are yardsticks that people opposite ought to understand well enough, Mr. Speaker. Projected revenues for this year of \$462 million will be more than 14 times what they were in 1971. Oil revenues make up a fair chunk of that but they would nearly be cut in half if we followed the Alberta taxation formula recommended by the member for Nipawin and that has been documented. Potash will make up another large chunk of that revenue. In fact, potash revenues alone would yield more than three times more this year than all the resources yielded in 1971 — not a bad performance for those used holes in the ground. Had this government continued to get revenue yields from potash that had been obtained by the last Thatcher-inspired-thinking, we would have collected in the order of \$38.5 million between 1971 and 1978 instead of approximately \$364 million we will collect. Continuation of the giveaway in potash alone would have meant \$325 million that would have been drained from the province. The result in better revenues for the people of Saskatchewan are impressive, Mr. Speaker.

What about investments and jobs in the resource industry, Mr. Speaker? What are the

results? In potash, \$50 million worth of expansion and plant refurbishing adding to the productive capacity of 1.6 million tons of potassium chloride per year and adding jobs in construction and jobs in mining.

In oil, in 1978, nearly a 40 per cent increase in new investment over 1977, double the number of wells drilled and close to 1,500 new jobs in the oil industry alone in 1978. In uranium, investment this year in the order of 70 million to 75 million dollars, up from 20 million dollars a year earlier.

Mr. Speaker, new investment, new jobs and new resource development with the people of Saskatchewan in mind. Twist the facts about the results as the members opposite might try, the results of the NDP policy are impressive and on October 18th, the people of Saskatchewan said they were impressed.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. LINGENFELTER: — There is not doubt that this term of office will see even greater financial returns from our resources. I am confident that a fair share of these returns will be reinvested for the benefit of future generations. All of us have to be concerned about future energy supplies. It's sound to invest some of these returns in developing better conservation and in studying and developing alternate energy sources. It's just as sound to invest some of these returns in exploring for and developing other natural resources which our province has which don't attract the public attention that potash, oil and uranium have over the past several years. With all these resources we are extracting, we need constantly to ensure the maximum amount of finishing for the final product, and thus jobs, remain in Saskatchewan. For my part, reinvestment of some of these returns for those purposes would be welcome.

Mr. Speaker, in his remarks, the member for Wascana put it very well when he said:

. . . carrying to fruition of our resource policies is important for us in being masters of our own house.

I am pleased that the throne speech pledges continuation of these policies that worked, and are working for the people of Saskatchewan. I am pleased to second the motion.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. R.L. COLVER (Leader of the Opposition): — Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure for me once again to rise in this Assembly and see such friendly faces across and so many faces across. It is also a pleasure, Mr. Speaker, to see you in that Chair again. One sincerely hopes with the new make-up of the Legislative Chamber and perhaps less pressure on Mr. Speaker to decide between opposition parties as was the case in the previous legislature that we might even learn to become friends in this current session, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I was very interested to note the mover and seconder's comments today and to note that primarily the speeches they gave were identical to those given by members in this Assembly for the last two years . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . and as a matter of fact, I wondered, and I wish to congratulate them, Mr. Speaker, for the excellent delivery that both of them made of someone else's material. Don't you think, Mr. Speaker, that it would be . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . reasonable to assume that two new members to the Legislature would have different phraseology than 'oil-rich

February 26, 1979

Alberta', which both members used at least two or three times, 'Tory Ontario' and 'Tory Manitoba' — these are the great phrases of the last session of the . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . legislature. I pass along this advice to these two new members and, although their delivery was excellent and although I am sure they are going to make a contribution to this Legislative Chamber . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . I would sincerely hope that the next time they speak in the legislature, they use their own material and not some material that was presented to them.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. COLLVER: — . . . for their use by someone else. One thing, however, Mr. Speaker, I was most discouraged to hear, one thing that I was most disgusted to hear, and I am not going to criticize the new member; I am going to criticize the speech writer who wrote this material. Quite frankly, Mr. Speaker, when it falls on a government that admittedly won 48 per cent of the vote in the last provincial election, admittedly has 44 members across and we have but 17, when it falls on them to open a session of the legislature by attacking and poking fun at the dead — by attacking and poking fun at a respected Premier of this province who made a valid and vast contribution to the people of this province, when it comes to poking fun at him, and poking fun at his remarks, then I say, Mr. Speaker . . .

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. COLLVER: — . . . the other side has stepped too low — too low for the people of the province of Saskatchewan. They start again, Mr. Speaker, with the kind of personal attacks, but not on someone in this legislature, but on someone who is not here — on someone whom the people of Saskatchewan do respect and admire for the contributions . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . that he made, Mr. Speaker, to this province. It is obviously true as well, Mr. Speaker . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . that the speechwriters who wrote those two masterpieces didn't like the slogan the NDP ran on last October 18th — now here's a winning slogan, New Decades for Progress. That was the slogan and I'm going to remind the two members, and the speechwriters who wrote those speeches, that the slogan was New Decades for Progress. Now unfortunately, as they are no doubt aware, the Speech from the Throne as it was presented by His Honour, Lieutenant-Governor McIntosh, just a few days ago, was particularly devoid of progress, and certainly didn't offer anything new to the people of the province of Saskatchewan, so what they had to go with, on at least a half dozen occasions was their old slogan, New Deal for People. Now, Mr. Speaker, I have noticed for some considerable time that the members opposite and their party seem to reflect on the past a great deal. They reflect on the past when they bring forward as a member did again today, the dust bowl of the '30s. They reflect on the past in that they want to repeat all of their programs which they presented in the last provincial election. As a matter of fact most of the speech of the seconder of the throne speech today merely repeated word for word the speeches given by the Premier during the October 18 election. Now, there is nothing wrong with that; admittedly it was a winning team last October.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. COLLVER: — . . . Mind you I might just let you know that the best losing teams are those who learn from the winning team and we intend to learn well from you in the last provincial election. I intend to relate to that in just a moment, Mr. Speaker. I intend to relate to how you got elected to this legislature in just a moment.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to clarify just one item here today that was mentioned by the seconder to the Speech from the Throne. I am sure it is going to become an issue; it certainly is an issue in terms of the Progressive Conservative Party of Saskatchewan and the Progressive Conservative Party of Canada and that is Mr. Lang's PRAC (Prairie Rail Action Committee) decisions. PRAC as we all know, as the members have mentioned earlier and as the NDP have been able to express through their positions as cabinet members and so on around the province, is nothing more than an arm of Otto Lang. We agree with that, Mr. Speaker, we agree that PRAC is doing a great deal of damage to western Canada . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . If you had only quoted the entire article, if you had quoted his entire remarks, if you had quoted him on more than one occasion, you would find that Mr. Mazankowski feels precisely the same way. Mr. Mazankowski feels that way except concerning rail lines such as the one which I viewed the other day, the so-called rail line through Regina Beach. As the Premier will know, it has no tracks because the tracks have been ripped out for scrap. I noticed the Premier nodded when I said that. No one, least of all the NDP I would hope, and least of all the Premier of Saskatchewan is arguing that that rail line which has no tracks and no rail ties should not be abandoned. I don't think he is arguing that. I don't think the member who spoke seconding the speech would argue that either. The fact is that that kind of rail line which is serving no useful purpose, on which trains cannot travel, of course should be abandoned, but those that are affecting communities at this stage of the game, those that are materially affecting not just areas in your constituency, Mr. Member for Shaunavon (Mr. Lingenfelter), but those in mine as well . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . those communities we say should not be disserved by Otto Lang, should not be disserved by the federal government and PRAC (Prairie Rail Action Committee), which was nothing more than the appointment by a minister of some people who . . . well I'm not going to call them liberal hacks . . . the fact is, Mr. Speaker . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . oh, ex-conservatives. You know, Mr. Speaker, there are so many ex-conservatives around. I'm surprised that the Conservative Party in Saskatchewan didn't get a hundred per cent of the vote in 1971 instead of two per cent of the vote in 1971. I hear about all these ex-conservatives supporting Tony Merchant, and ex-conservatives supporting this one. My goodness, there are so many Conservatives, it's surprising we got as much percentage of the vote as we did in 1978, isn't it, Mr. Members opposite?

AN HON. MEMBER: — Yes, it is.

MR. COLLVER: — Were you surprised? I suggest the members were not surprised . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Don't you think that's a good way to do it, Mr. Member for . . . (inaudible interjection) . . .

Mr. Speaker, I'd just like to make a few comments today . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . for the purpose of those new members who are attending this legislature for the first time, and I would like to draw this specifically to the attention of those, like the member for Regina Wascana, the member for Saskatoon Sutherland, and others who seem to have within the NDP sufficient courage of their convictions to stand up for what they believe in. And I'd like to just read you a very brief passage . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . from an item . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . No, it certainly doesn't concern the member for Saskatoon Centre. He's one of those automatic types, Mr. Speaker, he automatically repeats everything. He's like a sponge; he soaks up everything and soaks out everything, which is the reason, of course, . . . (inaudible interjection) . . .

Now, Mr. Speaker, I'd just like to read this for these members . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . for those members opposite who might be perhaps inclined from time to time to think for themselves — not repeating speeches written by someone else — but speak

and think for themselves.

Now to another great fault . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . I found in the last parliament committed by some of this House also for which I would desire of them all might be left . . .

Now this is history, so the member for Regina Wascana might perhaps be able to understand it. I hope the rest of you will listen carefully and I go on to quote:

I have seen right good men in other causes, although I did dislike them in that doing, sit in an evil matter against which they had most earnestly spoken. I mused at it and asked what it meant, for I do think it a shameful thing to serve God, their Prince, or Country, with the tongue only, and not with the heart and body. I was answered that it was a common policy in this House to mark the best sort of same and either to sit or arise with them. That same common policy I would gladly have banished this House and have grafted in its stead thereof either to rise or sit as the matter giveth cause.

Mr. Speaker, that was spoken by Peter Wentworth 400 years ago in the House of Commons in England — 400 years ago. And I recommend to the member for Saskatoon Sutherland and to others opposite who may think for themselves, if you hear of situations that arise in this Assembly which obviously you cannot sit on or stand on just because the NDP happen to have pushed it forward, surely you will have the courage of your own convictions. And if you speak outside this Chamber and to members of your own little cause in one way, surely you then will speak the same way in this Chamber and you will in turn stand or sit with the motion as it exists . . .

Now, Mr. Speaker, I have a few comments to make today about the way the NDP government was elected last October. I think Mr. Speaker, they did a masterful job. I think they did a terrific job of fooling the public. I think they did an outstanding job of telling the people incorrect facts, inappropriate phraseology and untenable positions. Mr. Speaker, I think that they did a masterful job because what they tried to do was written for them in the bible of the socialist movement. What they tried to do in the last provincial election was told to them by Mr. Lenin in his works . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Oh yes, oh yes! Mr. Lenin in his works spelled out clearly and distinctly how you go about winning elections when there is some alternative. Because Mr. Speaker, if we persist in the present government's attitudes . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . You want a quote? How about this one Jack? How about this one Mr. Speaker? Lenin said we'll hang every capitalist in Russia. And when, Mr. Speaker, his aide asked him where he's going to get the rope, he said the capitalists will sell it to me. And Mr. Speaker, I know that's true in Saskatchewan. We see it all over Saskatchewan. What else did Lenin say about winning elections? What he said was, tell a big enough lie, repeat it often enough and it will be believed. As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, although it was given — in this continent at any rate — the credit was given to the original starters if you want against North America, the Germans in the '30s and '20s it was given to them and handed to them — it was in effect Lenin who first suggested that. As a matter of fact it went before then; Machiavellian said it in certain ways. Other people said it. The fact is tell a big enough lie and it will eventually be believed. Tell it often enough and well enough and it will eventually be believed. Mr. Speaker, the fact is the NDP . . .

AN HON. MEMBER: — It's a wonder you were able to convince your constituents you were sane.

MR. COLLVER: — . . . the NDP served that cause in the last provincial election to the letter. Let me give you some examples just so you will know we are not just pulling this out of the air. Here is an ad produced by the NDP in the last provincial election. It says no. 2, local autonomy:

Forty-five per cent of last year's provincial budget was handed over directly to local government to be spent by them as they saw fit.

There's the ad, 45 per cent. Now I notice the members thumping because they weren't in this legislature when the last budget was presented. They have probably never seen a budget document the ones who are thumping, because they are the automatic kind; they believe automatically what their leadership tell them. They believe automatically that they should read those speeches that somebody else writes in this legislature and put it forward as though it were their own. Let me give you an example just for the information of those members who aren't aware. Forty-five per cent, says the ad. Gross expenditures by major classifications for the fiscal years ended March 31st 1968 to 1977, so this is up to 1977. I would be happy to read it to you for the budget figures as well. They are approximately the same percentages; agriculture, 1977, \$76 million, nothing spent by local autonomy, local boards, that's out of a total of \$1,364,000,000. I just want to mention one other thing, the definition — and the Premier says, oh — the definition in his mind of a local board is a group of people who live in a particular town that he or his cabinet appoint. We are talking about locally elected boards. Let's talk about them. Local autonomy to everyone means local elections and locally elected people, not people appointed by you or your ministers or your treasury board. Where is all the desk thumping for education, \$316 million out of a \$1,364,000,000?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. COLLVER: — . . . (interjection) . . . I admit that. Part of the education budget goes to locally elected boards.

MR. COWLEY: — Almost all of it.

MR. COLLVER: — Almost all of it, says the member for Biggar. The fact is that not almost all of it goes at all. A very large percentage of that \$364 million goes right here in Regina and is spent by the Department of Education — a very large share of it. A large share of that goes to the university's commission which is run by a board appointed by the Premier and his cabinet. Run by the board appointed by the Premier and his cabinet! Elected board of governors. And if they have anything whatsoever to say about the allocation of funds then what was all the guffuffle (?) about the separate university's commission three or four years ago? What was all the gufuffle (?) there? You say that the university commission has no power whatsoever. I say, absolute nonsense. Forty-nine million dollars for government services, not a penny to locally elected boards; Mr. Speaker, \$336 million to highways, not a penny to locally elected boards, millions under the highways' budget. O.K., Mr. Speaker, I'll allude to the minister there and allow him a few millions of dollars, but not 45 per cent, Mr. Speaker. Now, \$155 million to social services, not a penny to local elected boards; \$55 million to Northern Saskatchewan, not a penny to local elected boards.

As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, out of those figures of \$1,364 million we estimate that less than \$300 million, less than 300. It is only an estimate because it is almost impossible to determine. I suppose you could out of the estimate book.

MR. BLAKENEY: — . . . hospital boards?

MR. COLLVER: — Hospital boards! I am glad the Premier mentioned hospital boards. How many of them are locally elected, Mr. Premier? All of them, my foot! Nipawin is locally elected. That one I will give him, but not very many of them, Mr. Speaker. The vast majority of hospitals in Saskatchewan . . . well the Premier knows full well. Mr. Speaker, the fact is that the Government of Saskatchewan puts nowhere near 45 per cent in the hands of locally elected officials. Nowhere near it! But that was one of the messages they had for the people of Saskatchewan in the last provincial general election.

Let's talk about some of the other things that they told the people in the province of Saskatchewan in the last provincial election.

In Margo, Saskatchewan, one of the members here will recognize the name Margo, Saskatchewan. Senior citizens in a senior citizens' home were told by local members of the party that unless they donated \$50 to the NDP, the said \$50 being collected, that the people would lose their medicare, would lose their medicare. We will substantiate that one if you like.

Let me talk about another one. You want names, I'd be happy to give you names, Mr. Speaker. The fact is Mr. Speaker in the last provincial general election, a very prominent Saskatchewan citizen in the city of Regina who happens to work for a provincial government agency, was told because he happened to be the vice-chairman of a particular block group, that if he didn't remove the Conservative signs from that particular block, that he would lose his job. And he was called in on two separate occasions, by the head of his department of that particular government agency and told to get the signs and when he told them he didn't have that power, when he told them that they were condominium units, he was still called in; they didn't care one way or another, but get the signs down. That's how the NDP win elections in the city of Regina.

AN HON. MEMBER: — You make the federal liberals look honest.

MR. COLLVER: — I don't know. I should find out, shouldn't I? I should find out whether he's employed now?

MR. THATCHER: — Do you have the name on the tip of your tongue Jack?

MR. COLLVER: — Do you have his name Jack? Is it your department, Jack? I guess it is, for goodness sake. The member for Melfort automatically knew about this situation. I wonder how it got to his attention?

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to touch briefly on one other comment that was mentioned during the last provincial election. Mr. Speaker, in the last provincial election, the election campaign opened up with a statement by the Premier of Saskatchewan.

This is going to be a tough campaign; a dirty campaign.

Then he proceeded to prove with his own people that it was true. He proceeded to prove to the rest of the people of Saskatchewan that that was the way to win an election campaign and Mr. Speaker, unfortunately, the people of Saskatchewan rewarded the Premier for the dirty campaign.

MR. THATCHER: — We may hire your guys next time.

MR. COLLVER: — The fact is Mr. Speaker, they were successful in their attempt to create an atmosphere of dirt, an atmosphere of beleaguered poor little NDP being attacked by these horrible dirty vicious people. They were able to portray that to the people of Saskatchewan. They were able to portray to the people of Saskatchewan for example — and I'm holding up this wonderful ad which we all saw in the last provincial election — only the NDP have the right answer for Medicare.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. COLLVER: — It says there by the NDP, should you pay to visit your doctor? Collver Conservatives yes, says the ad; Blakeney New Democrats no, says the ad. What are the facts? The fact is that at no time have the Progressive Conservatives ever suggested you should pay to visit the doctor. Within four months of the last provincial election, patients now have to pay to see their doctors, with the NDP as government. Where is the truth? Where is the truth?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. COLLVER: — The truth — where's the truth? The truth, Mr. Speaker, is that unfortunately the NDP in deciding to win the last provincial election, in deciding that only they had solutions to problems, decided in their own wisdom, to set up the dirtiest, the most vicious campaign, and to do it from the top. What was the opening statement? The opening statement of the whole election campaign, Mr. Speaker, was 'Dick Collver is the Richard Nixon of the West.' And it persists — and it persists. You see an attempt to plant in people's minds, the most awful vicious stuff while at the same time coming to appear as great heroes.

For example, you know Mr. Speaker, it was an interesting revelation to me. The other day I happened to be in Saskatoon, and you know . . .

AN HON. MEMBER: — You still go back there?

MR. COLLVER: — Sure, all the time — in fact, you'd be amazed at how welcome we are since the election, which is unfortunate. It is unfortunate that the people in Saskatoon didn't find out the truth in Saskatoon before the election rather than after! Interesting, Mr. Speaker, that I should be there and that I was talking to the wife of our party's director, who happens to be a teacher in the Saskatoon school system, and she said she was really amused by the conversation that occurred in the coffee room, in the particular school that she taught. A couple of the NDP teachers were commenting on a recent \$100,000 court case in Saskatoon. And they were saying, it's just not true, it can't be true. The person who is involved in this court case in Saskatoon can't possibly be guilty. Our supporter said, you must be mistaken because a statement of claim has been issued; that means he must be guilty. The other two, who happen to be supporters of the NDP said, a statement of claim does not necessarily prove guilt. My goodness, all over the province of Saskatchewan the NDP are now having to argue on the other side of the coin that a statement of claim does not prove guilt.

The member for Moose Jaw will remember. The fact is, Mr. Speaker, I was amused to find out that that kind of vicious attack is now working in reverse, only it is not even being done by us — it is being done by the NDP themselves. They get so used to that kind of attack. They get so used to talking about that kind of dirt, that it backfired, and it is back firing all over the province.

February 26, 1979

Well, it is the other things they are talking about, publicly talking about in Saskatoon. I notice that Mr. Curry had some remarks to make in Saskatoon that I think interested a great many people in Saskatoon . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . The member for Regina Centre (Mr. Shillington) should be very cautious about what he says about the people of Saskatoon; they are not as stupid as he thinks.

MR. MOSTOWAY: — How come they ran you out?

MR. COLLVER: — Oh, they didn't run me out. It might interest the people of Saskatchewan to know another way that the NDP got elected. Having passed out, Mr. Speaker, these wonderful little documents, having passed an election act that attempted to answer the people of Saskatchewan when they asked about fair play and electioneering and having passed certain rules and regulations with regard to elections such as, you must not wear buttons into the election booth and then every NDP scrutineer and every NDP poll worker throughout the province of Saskatchewan had buttons printed up . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Not false, not rubbish. Maybe it didn't happen in Kelvington only because of the urgent urgings of the minister. But I can assure you it happened in a great many other constituencies.

Mr. Speaker, here is an instruction sheet handed out to one NDP candidate. It says, 'Call on the voter, introduce yourself as follows, . . . ' etc. Hand the voter your card. Mr. So and So will be pleased to discuss your concerns or answer any questions you have at that time. '2. If you have determined that no one is home or only a babysitter . . . leave one of the candidate's cards. Make sure either you or the driver will pass this information on to the candidate, so he doesn't waste any time calling on the voter.'

Here is number three; this is the one we really thought was wonderful. This is passed out to the workers in Saskatchewan. It is in keeping with the Premier's call to recognize enemies in Saskatchewan! It is in keeping with an enemies list and a great enemies of the province of Saskatchewan list. 'If you or the candidate have positively identified a positive or hostile voter, pass this on to the driver. The driver will keep a list by name or by house number. If positive, candidate will ask voter to . . . sign and driver will deliver sign.' They don't say what will happen if they are hostile. But I can tell you the employee at the Department of Agriculture would tell you what would happen if they are hostile. The young lady Sandra Legge, whose case came up just recently — perhaps the minister was away — would tell you what would happen if they are hostile. The caretakers in Pelly would tell you what would happen if they are hostile. The people around the province that you are making certain is purged of anyone who happened to go against you during the election, would certainly tell you what would happen if they were identified as hostile. The fact is, Mr. Speaker, that in the last provincial election, and I don't intend to say anything more about this . . . Mr. Speaker, I don't intend to play on this but I do intend to tell the people of the province of Saskatchewan that when it comes to dirt the NDP wrote the book. When it comes to smear the NDP wrote the book.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. COLLVER: — Interestingly enough in answer to all of the smear and all of the dirt, the people of Nipawin re-elected me to this legislature with an increased majority, so not all of them are prone to your kind of tactics and your kind of campaigning. I have a great deal more to say on the subject of the throne speech and I beg leave to adjourn debate.

Debate adjourned.

The Assembly adjourned at 4:30 p.m.