

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN
First Session — Nineteenth Legislature

Monday, March 5, 1979

The Assembly met at 2 p.m.

On the Orders of the Day

CONDOLENCES

Passing of Speaker's Mother

MR. R.L. COLLVER (Leader of the Opposition): — Mr. Deputy Speaker, just before the Question Period I would like to pass along the condolences of our caucus to Mr. Speaker for the passing of his mother.

CONGRATULATIONS

Kinsmen Telemiracle

MR. R.L. COLLVER (Leader of the Opposition): — Mr. Deputy Speaker, I would also like to congratulate the Kinsmen of Saskatchewan for once again going over the top on Telemiracle. I think all members of this Assembly should express their deepest appreciation to the Kinsmen for that wonderful job they have just concluded.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

QUESTIONS

Supply of Gas to Medicine Hat

MR. R.L. COLLVER (Leader of the Opposition): — Mr. Deputy Speaker, I direct my question to the Minister responsible for Saskatchewan Power. On March 1, the Premier took notice of a question I had pertaining to the supply of gas to the city of Medicine Hat. I wonder if the minister has now got the answer for this Assembly.

HON. J.R. MESSER (Minister of Mineral Resources): — Mr. Deputy Speaker, I do. On Thursday last, the Leader of the Opposition directed a question to the Premier about a matter that has been discussed in this House on previous occasions, as well as in Crown corporations, as to the supply of gas from a field that is owned and operated by the Saskatchewan Power Corporation near the city of Medicine Hat.

We do supply natural gas to the city of Medicine Hat. We do not supply that gas in perpetuity; it is a 20-year contract which will be terminated in 1993. I believe the reasoning for the contract has been conveyed to this Legislative Assembly in the past and that is that it was a condition of removal of Alberta gas from that gas field to the province of Saskatchewan. I hope that refreshes the Leader of the Opposition's memory. The price that the member, I believe, related to in his question — and I stand to be corrected although I do have the debates and proceedings in front of me — he suggests that it is 16 cents per MCF and that is the price or about the price of the gas that is being delivered. However, I should point out to the members of the Legislative Assembly, as was pointed out to the members of the Crown Corporations Committee last year, that there is an export flow back from the sale of that gas from moneys derived from Alberta gas being sold which is accrued to the Saskatchewan Power Corporation

so the return for that gas to SPC is substantially higher than 16 cents per MCF.

MR. COLLVER: — A supplementary question, Mr. Deputy Speaker. The minister has stated that the gas being sold to the city of Medicine Hat is 16 cents per MCF. The gas being sold to the Saskatchewan consumer approximates \$2.50 per MCF. Why is the government of Saskatchewan subsidizing the residents of the province of Alberta and the city of Medicine Hat while at the same time not substantially increasing the gas that is a portion of the gas that is forming the mix that the residents of the province of Saskatchewan are using, why is the Government of Saskatchewan not substantially increasing that in light of the recent energy board's ruling?

MR. MESSER: — Mr. Deputy Speaker, firstly let me say that as far as the subsidizing is concerned, perhaps the Leader of the Opposition should address his question to the Government of Alberta. It is gas that the Saskatchewan Power Corporation has explored and developed in the province of Alberta. It has brought about, I believe, a 600 billion MCF reserve of gas available to the Saskatchewan Power Corporation. At the time that the Saskatchewan Power Corporation explored and developed that gas there was no indication that a term or condition of an export contract, which I suggest may not apply to other private companies who are exporting gas from the province of Alberta, was going to be made applicable to the Saskatchewan Power Corporation in the removal of that gas to the province of Saskatchewan. So that it is a term in condition that we have to recognize in exporting that gas into this province from the province of Alberta.

I remind the member, again, what the Premier conveyed to this Legislative Assembly last Thursday and that is, in the wisdom of the Government of Saskatchewan it is better to be able to somewhat control the escalating price of gas in this province by subsidizing it with our reserves rather than developing our reserves and finding ourselves, at some point in time, totally vulnerable to much higher prices for natural gas than we would appreciate the industry and the consumer in the province of Saskatchewan being able to pay being in a position of being able to do nothing and about it, because we then, at that time, have no natural gas reserves at all.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, in closing I would just like to remind this Legislative Assembly and the people of Saskatchewan that it is strange this kind of question comes from the Leader of the Opposition when both the provincial and federal Tories are on record in opposing any Crown corporation that is involved in trying to establish reserves of energy in order to enhance their ability to meet those demands.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. COLLVER: — Since the minister has now reiterated the same gobbledygook that was put forward to this legislature by the Premier on Thursday last . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . and that is, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that somehow the Saskatchewan government can have a reserve of gas in Alberta if it belongs to Sask. Power, but it can't have a reserve of gas in Alberta if it belongs to any other private organization, and my supplementary question to the minister is quite simply this. If your government is going to persist in using substantial quantities of Alberta gas, thereby overcharging the people of the province of Saskatchewan in their power bills, and your government obviously wants to have reserves of gas in Alberta, why won't your government take into account the tremendous reserves of gas held by the private sector in the province of Alberta and therefore increase the supply to the Saskatchewan consumer of Saskatchewan gas and reduce the price to them now, rather than wait for the future?

MR. MESSER: — Mr. Deputy Speaker, the member tries to make the point of overcharging in the province of Saskatchewan. May I remind him that excluding the province of Alberta, Saskatchewan enjoys the cheapest gas of any province in Canada.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MESSER: — It may be noteworthy, Mr. Deputy Speaker, to bring to the attention of the Leader of the Conservative Party in Saskatchewan that for communities served with natural gas under 750 in the province of Saskatchewan, almost, without exception, our natural gas rates are cheaper than they are in the province of Alberta.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MESSER: — Now, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that is not an indication of overcharging. It's an indication of a belief that we should try and control the price of our gas and rate the cost of that gas to those who consume in a way that shows the ability to pay, and that is what is being followed in the province of Saskatchewan.

He also tries to confuse and mislead this whole situation by saying, it is only, in our belief, a Crown corporation that can develop gas and/or oil in the province of Alberta and then pass that saving off to the people of Saskatchewan. He suggests that the private sector can do that. Mr. Deputy Speaker, the private sector may be able to explore and develop the gas . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . but I think they will not. The member for Swift Current is hollering for order. I don't know why, when I'm addressing myself with some precision to the question that emanated from the Leader of the Opposition, and if he's embarrassed with the answer, that's going to be his problem and the problem of the member for Swift Current.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MESSER: — But let me say, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that I appreciate the abilities of the private oil companies to explore and develop oil and gas and to generate a profit, but I do not expect them to pass that profit on to the province of Saskatchewan. They haven't done it historically and I don't expect that they're going to do it in the future. SPC (Saskatchewan Power Corporation) or the Crown agencies of this government that are exploring and developing and proving up gas are taking the profits thereto and returning them to the people of Saskatchewan, and that is the significant difference.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Director of Saskatoon Clinic

MR. E.A. BERNTSON (Souris-Cannington): — Mr. Deputy Speaker, question to the Minister of Health. I have here a copy of a report submitted to you by Dr. T.A. Watson, June, 1978. The third recommendation of that report.

It is recommended that steps be taken to immediately ensure that each clinic is directed by an experienced and qualified medical specialist. I also have here an order in council dated September 19. It indicates that Dr. Chris Franks was transferred from the position of director to that of senior research associate.

Could you indicate to this House who the director of the Saskatoon Clinic is as of today?

March 5, 1979

HON. E. TCHORZEWSKI (Minister of Health): — Mr. Deputy Speaker, let me reply to the question, and more particularly to the recommendation which the member (Mr. Berntson) referred to. There is Dr. Crosby, who was appointed on August 1 as the director of the Allan Blair Memorial Clinic in Regina, which the member is aware of. There is not a permanent director of the clinic in Saskatoon.

AN HON. MEMBER: — Ah, ha!

MR. TCHORZEWSKI: — The member for Nipawin (Mr. Collver) says 'Ah, ha!' The fact of the matter is, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that there is a recruiting committee that has been established by the cancer commission which is actively seeking throughout Canada for a director who will become the permanent director of the Saskatoon Clinic. And, I think it is fair to say, with some of the difficulties that we have experienced in our cancer clinics in Regina and in Saskatoon, it is only right that the recruitment committee does a very adequate job in assuring that we get the best possible individual whom we can find to become the new director of the clinic in Saskatoon.

MR. BERNTSON: — Supplementary, Mr. Deputy Speaker. I also have here a letter from a Dr. Peter Walden in which he indicates that because of the treatment he received from your commission, he will be doing what he thinks is right, and that is warn people about the situation in Saskatchewan. And would you not now admit that because your department in the past would not come to grips with this problem (in effect, you muffed it) we are having problems recruiting good qualified medical professionals for our clinics? By the way, before I sit down, I want to compliment you on your appointment of Dr. Crosby; it was an excellent choice.

MR. TCHORZEWSKI: — Mr. Deputy Speaker, I thank the member for the compliment. No, I would not admit that there are difficulties in recruitment. As a matter of fact, I do know that there is quite a long list of interested people who have indicated an interest in coming to Saskatchewan.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. TCHORZEWSKI: — I might add, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that a good number of those people are people who formerly were from the province of Saskatchewan, and because of the way in which we are progressing and the kinds of developments that are taking place here, are particularly interested in coming back and becoming a part of our excellent health care and our cancer program in this province.

MR. BERNTSON: — A final supplementary, Mr. Deputy Speaker. Aside from the minister patting himself on the back with what . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . is something less than accuracy, will you not admit that since June 1978, until today, (almost a year) that you have not been able to find a qualified medical professional to head up the Saskatoon clinic is something less than performance?

MR. TCHORZEWSKI: — Well, Mr. Deputy Speaker, if the member wants to be fair and objective in his analysis of what has happened to the recommendation in the Watson Report, he will find that essentially almost every recommendation that Dr. Watson provided to us has been or is in the process of being implemented, every recommendation, Mr. Deputy Speaker. Therefore I would not agree with the suggestion that the member opposite makes.

Damage to Condenser Shipped to Coronach

MR. R.A. LARTER (Estevan): — Mr. Deputy Speaker, a question to the minister in charge of SPC (Saskatchewan Power Corporation). Mr. Minister, when the huge condenser was shipped to the Coronach station, water was not drained from the cooling tubes in this unit, that is for number two unit and as a result, freezing occurred in the costly condenser cooling tube. Can you tell this House if this was the fault of the workers at the project or the manufacturer Hitachi and who is responsible for the repairs or the replacement of this condenser unit?

HON. J.R. MESSER (Minister of Mineral Resources): — I'll take notice, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

MR. LARTER: — A supplementary question. Would you kindly advise this House how bad the damage is, Mr. Minister, and if it is essential that we order another condenser, who's going to bear the cost of this, Hitachi or the Government of Saskatchewan?

MR. MESSER: — Well, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I've already given notice that to the substantive portion of the question I will provide information tomorrow if possible. However, I would like to comment that it is unlikely the damage is significantly severe as I have not been informed by the officials of the corporation of the problem. Usually, if the problems are significant or losses are significant, the corporation tries to advise the minister of such a situation. I have not been advised in this instance, but perhaps by Tuesday or the day after, I will be able to provide more fully what the member is after.

Aircraft Cost and Usage

MR. P. ROUSSEAU (Regina South): — Mr. Deputy Speaker, to the Minister of Revenue. According to my information, it costs in the neighborhood of a \$1.75 to \$2 per mile to operate a Cheyenne aircraft, depending of course on the amount of usage, etc. How does the minister justify CVA (Central Vehicle Agency) charging the user departments 30 cents per mile for these aircraft?

HON. W.A. ROBBINS (Minister of Revenue): — The fixed capital costs of the aircraft are carried in another vote, in terms of the Department of Revenue.

MR. ROUSSEAU: — I didn't hear the answer.

MR. ROBBINS: — Because the capital costs are carried in another vote in the Department of Revenue.

MR. ROUSSEAU: — Supplementary question. Does this system of charging also apply to the DNS (Department of Northern Saskatchewan) or do they charge themselves the actual cost per mile, or should I ask that of the Department of Northern Saskatchewan?

AN HON. MEMBER: — Ask somebody who knows or ask somebody who cares.

HON. N.E. BYERS (Minister of Northern Saskatchewan): — Mr. Deputy Speaker, with respect to the rates charged for the DNS Cheyenne, the DNS Air Force, if you want to call it that — his question I take it is specifically referring to the DNS Cheyenne. Will the hon. member then please state what question he is expecting me to answer.

MR. ROUSSEAU: — Mr. Deputy Speaker, the question I am asking is what system of

March 5, 1979

charging do you use on any aircraft? Do you use the same system of 30 cents or actual cost to the department?

MR. BYERS: — This system is approved by the Department of Revenue and Supply, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

MR. ROUSSEAU: — Final supplementary. Would the minister tell me what is approved by that department, what system is approved?

MR. BYERS: — Well, the system that is approved, Mr. Deputy Speaker, is the rate scheduled for the DNS Cheyenne.

MR. J.G. LANE (Qu'Appelle): — You seem to be very reluctant to answer the question. Now would you mind giving us specifically the per mile charge that you are assessing government aircraft, assessing the various departments?

HON. W.A. ROBBINS (Minister of Revenue, Supply and Services): — I don't have those figures with me.

Saskatchewan Land Bank Commission

MR. R. ANDREW (Kindersley): — Mr. Deputy Speaker, a question to the Minister of Agriculture. In the Friday edition of the Leader Post you are quoted as saying that the Saskatchewan Land Bank Commission is near to what it should own to be an effective force in keeping the family farm viable. Can the minister advise this Assembly if, in fact, the government has now reached the stage where it intends to sell off as much of its land bank land as it intends to purchase?

HON. E.E. KAEDING (Minister of Agriculture): — Mr. Deputy Speaker, the land bank intends to sell as much land as is eligible to be sold under the land bank program provided those people who are leasing wish to purchase. We are not going to be pushing purchases to the lessees. If they wish to make the decision to purchase that's fine. We are not pushing them to purchase nor are we asking them not to purchase.

As far as the volume of land which we have on hand I think that possibly I was misquoted on that. I think there is some need on the part of the land bank to acquire a little larger land base than we now have but that will be subject to future government policy.

MR. ANDREW: — A supplementary, Mr. Deputy Speaker. I think the article further indicated that the present ratio is one section in 65 sections of total cultivated land. Would the minister be able to advise the House if that isn't a proper ratio, if there is, in fact, a proper ratio or a ratio that you have in your mind?

MR. KAEDING: — Mr. Deputy Speaker, the volume of land which we purchase over a period of time will be decided by the government.

Change of Control over Saskatchewan Airforce

MR. ROUSSEAU: — Mr. Deputy Speaker, a question to the Minister of Revenue. Could the minister tell this House why the 'Saskatchewan Government Airforce' formerly under the exclusive control of the Central Vehicle Agency has now been split between CV and the Department of Northern Affairs?

MR. ROBBINS: — Its operation is in the North. It has its own planes. The Department of Revenue looks after the aircraft which are stationed in Regina, through the CVA (Central Vehicle Agency) account.

CIGOL Case

MR. W.C. THATCHER (Thunder Creek): — Mr. Speaker, a question to the Minister of Finance. Mr. Minister, I note that Saskatchewan has been required to make a repayment back in the CIGOL case. I understand it was in the neighborhood of about \$3.2 million, about \$500,000 in interest and that it was taken from the Heritage Fund. Since there were several other companies involved in the CIGOL decision, either directly or indirectly, obviously there must be some ramifications as far as these additional companies — I think Exxon is one of them but there are a variety of other ones. Would the minister tell this Assembly and give us an up-to-date report as to exactly where we stand, how much we owe? We paid back to CIGOL, obviously, the legal precedents are there. What is the current situation?

HON. W.E. SMISHEK (Minister of Finance): — Mr. Speaker, in the case of the CIGOL case, which comes as a result of the decision of the Supreme Court of Canada, we are required to pay the company something in the order of \$3.8 million. That money was collected under the provisions of Bill 42. As the hon. member is aware, Bill 47 of last year was passed, so while we will pay them the amounts owing, approximately \$3.8 million, including the legal fees, we will in turn collect an approximately same amount of money, less the legal fees which may be charged, under Bill 47. While it is true that the money will be paid under the Heritage Fund, when the money is received from CIGOL that money will be replenished into the Heritage Fund.

MR. THATCHER: — Supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Perhaps the Minister of Finance didn't understand me, I didn't ask him to merely repeat my question. I asked him what is the up-to-date situation? How much do we owe the other companies which are involved as of the CIGOL decision from the Supreme Court in terms of dollars and cents? We are aware that you have Bill 47 but you also must owe other people some money. You paid CIGOL, you have admitted you paid them \$3.7 million. What is our current situation? You are the Minister of Finance, surely you know, tell us!

MR. SMISHEK: — Mr. Speaker, there have been no demands by any other companies that I am aware of and in the light of that, there are no amounts which I can provide to this House because there are no amounts which have been claimed under the decision of the Supreme Court of Canada. There are agreements being worked out with the oil companies but there are no other claims which we are at this stage obliged to pay.

MR. THATCHER: — From the minister's comments, then is it fair for us to assume, Mr. Minister, that in negotiating the tax rates under Bill 47 you have, in effect, made a deal with the companies involved; that you have, in effect, said we'll waive the ramifications under the supreme court decision in return for certain tax rates, etc. In other words, you've been wheeling and dealing. And the last part of my supplementary question, Mr. Minister, is, you've made your payments so far, at least to CIGOL out of the heritage fund. Mr. Minister, would you tell us precisely where, in the setting up of the heritage fund authority is given for the payment of funds out of that heritage fund towards the settlement of law cases?

AN HON. MEMBER: Hear, hear!

March 5, 1979

MR. SMISHEK: — Mr. Deputy Speaker, my information is and this has been checked before the money was paid, that there is legislative authority under the provision of The Heritage Act to make that transaction, to be able to pay that amount since it's part of the royalties that were collected. Before payments were made we had counsel from the Attorney General's department and my department is satisfied that that is the case. In the case of the first question, Mr. Deputy Speaker, again I repeat that there have been no claims and I find that there have been negotiations, and that what we are insuring, as we said during the introduction of Bill 47 is that \$500 million that the Conservatives were prepared to give half of away to the oil companies . . .

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SMISHEK: — . . . we said we will keep it, we will insure that that money which belongs to the people of Saskatchewan will stay in Saskatchewan, and that the Saskatchewan people will be the beneficiaries of it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. COLLVER: — Mr. Deputy Speaker, I have a supplementary question on this line for the Attorney General . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . what section of the act establishing the heritage fund did you advise the Minister of Finance that they had legislative authority to issue cheques drawn on the heritage fund to pay claims made by legal decisions, under what section?

MR. ROMANOW: — Section 2,945 sub 4, Mr. Deputy Speaker. How can I answer that question? I'll have to take notice if this is thought to be a serious matter of urgent public importance; if it is to be that, I will give the answer and the section tomorrow.

MR. COLLVER: — Mr. Deputy Speaker, a supplementary question. The Attorney General telling this Assembly that he did not, in fact, as the Minister of Finance just stipulated, give him legal ramifications of issuing the cheque drawn on the heritage fund when The Heritage Fund Act is very specific as to its uses and no mention is made of any kind in the Act, whatsoever, that the fund is to be used to repay lost legal cases?

MR. ROMANOW: — Mr. Deputy Speaker, I think what the Minister of Finance said was that the Department of Finance people received the appropriate advice from the Department of the Attorney General people as to the method by which this payment should be made back to CIGOL. I have not seen an opinion from my department which may have been tendered to the Department of Finance on CIGOL.

I want to say to the Hon. Leader of the Opposition and to the PCs that their lack of knowledge about how government operates is absolutely appalling.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. ROMANOW: — Their assumption is that somehow Deputy Ministers of Finance are not entitled to talk to Deputy Ministers of Attorneys General or other department people to get the opinions and the advice necessary. The answer obviously is that it works on an ordinary basis. Now, if he wants to know what section it is I'll dig out the section and give him the answer.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, may I ask that we stand the other items and go the special order?

ADJOURNED DEBATES

ADDRESS IN REPLY

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Mr. White (Regina Wascana) for an address in reply and the proposed amendment thereto proposed by Mr. Collver (Leader of the Opposition).

MR. M.J. KOSKIE (Quill Lakes): — Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am pleased to be given the opportunity to participate in the debate on the Speech from the Throne, the throne speech which clearly enunciates our commitment to guide this province in its development in the interests of the people of Saskatchewan.

Before expressing my support for the throne speech I want first to reflect on the events which preceded the throne speech, the last provincial election.

May 1, Mr. Deputy Speaker, express my appreciation to the constituents of Quill Lakes for their support. I want to say that I was able to increase my plurality to over 1,400 votes, garnering approximately 54 per cent of all the votes cast. To my executive and my party workers and all the young people who supported me, I want to express my deep appreciation.

I wish to join with others in this House to welcome and congratulate the new members to the legislature and also to congratulate those who were re-elected. Talking about new members, I think all will agree, having listened to Dr. White, the member for Wascana, who moved the Speech from the Throne and Dwain Lingenfelter, the member for Shaunavon, who seconded the Speech from the Throne, that their presentations clearly demonstrate that the quality of our caucus has gained much by their election to the legislature.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. KOSKIE: — I would like to congratulate both of them on their excellent presentations. I wish also to congratulate a friend and colleague of mine, Don Cody on two points: for his re-election to the legislature as the member for Kinistino and also his appointment to cabinet (Minister of Telephones). I know Don will do an outstanding job.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. KOSKIE: — Mr. Deputy Speaker, as I look across at the opposition I can't help but notice that there are some significant changes. I note that the member for Thunder Creek (Mr. Thatcher) and the member for Rosthern (Mr. Katzman) have moved up to the front benches. I just want them to know that their rise in fortunes is a direct result of the efforts of the New Democratic Party in the last election. Accordingly, I would expect that they will, during the course of this legislature, demonstrate their appreciation. But to those who are still in the back benches over there, don't despair, because there is another election and we hope to put you all in the first row over there.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, our government is a government committed to maintaining, in

March 5, 1979

Saskatchewan, a rural way of life. But commitment is not enough. You have to have policies and programs to ensure that our small towns and villages not only survive but flourish, to continue to expand a way of life which has made Saskatchewan the leader in North America in economic and social legislation.

We are committed to continue the co-operative spirit which was so vividly displayed by our forefathers in the creation of the wheat pool, the credit union movement and our co-operative way of life. I think this was demonstrated by the words of the Leader of the Opposition this afternoon. We saw last weekend in 20 hours, the Kinsmen sponsoring Tele Miracle and \$1,400,000 was raised. I think the Kinsmen are to be congratulated, but also the people of Saskatchewan for their generosity.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. KOSKIE: — It seems to me, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that the greatness of Saskatchewan lies not merely in the abundance of the resources, but also in the hearts of the people of this province. But there are those opposite who do not believe that the people of Saskatchewan should control their own destiny. Where we have programs and policies the Leader of the Opposition substitutes rhetoric. Leadership for the Leader of the Opposition is never having to say I am sorry to the multinational corporations.

The Leader of the Opposition calls for leadership. What, Mr. Deputy Speaker, does he mean? The people of Saskatchewan knew what he meant last October. They weighed the kind of leadership he offered and they found it wanting. They did not think it would be very beneficial to elect a Tory government. They compared Tory promises with NDP performance and they opted for the tried, true and tested leadership of Premier Blakeney.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. KOSKIE: — Mr. Speaker, as I travel throughout my constituency, I am pleased to say that there is a growing desire to build and strengthen each and every community.

A week last Saturday, I was invited to Lanigan for an official opening of a completely renovated hockey rink, which included the installed artificial ice plant. The total cost of that renovation was approximately \$190,000. I am pleased to advise that the total grants provided by the government and the Crown corporations was approximately \$78,000.

Now I appreciate that the credit for this project must go to the Lanigan town council, to the Lanigan Recreational Board, the municipal councils who participated, all the volunteers because they were responsible for developing the project, raising the funds and getting the project completed.

What is more important is the fact, or equally important, is the fact that this government from its new resource revenues has made funds available to our communities for recreational purposes and these communities have had the opportunity to decide how they are going to be used.

Since I was elected in 1975, I have attended many official openings in my constituency. Why, I have attended five official openings in the town of Lanigan alone. I attended the official opening of a senior citizens lodge, a new curling rink, a renovated hockey rink, as I've mentioned, a new school gymnasium, a senior citizens drop-in centre — and what made all these possible? While I also attended the opening of the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan's (PCS) expansion at Lanigan.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. KOSKIE: — A \$40 million vote-of-confidence in the future of this province. These projects are there because this government, is prepared to work with our towns and villages and our R.M.'s (rural municipalities) to make funds available through community capital funds, revenue sharing and grants from the Department of Culture and Youth.

Much of the same type of activity is going on in other communities in the Quill Lakes constituency. Wynyard upgraded its artificial ice plant and its curling rink. Renovations were made in Drake and Lanigan and Leroy and Quill Lakes to their arenas. A new \$550,000 new arena is being built in Watson and a new curling rink in the town of Muenster.

I believe, Mr. Speaker, if our towns and villages are to survive and flourish that we must provide services which will encourage people to stay. We need good educational facilities, senior citizens homes, housing, health care, home care programs, transportation and good recreational facilities. I am proud to say that we have made good progress in Quill Lakes. The government has established two new regional parks, one in Wynyard and the other at Watson called the McNab Regional Park named after Max McNab, former National Hockey League player and a resident of Watson.

Mr. Speaker, I've outlined some of the growth and expansion that has occurred in the past seven years in so many parts of my constituency. What is even more remarkable is to compare and contrast what has happened in one community in my constituency under a Liberal government with what has occurred under the present government. Mr. Speaker, I think it is important to examine what happened because we had a government from 1964 to 1971 which had an identical philosophy to that of the members opposite. They believe like the Leader of the Opposition that governments elected by the people should not make decisions for the people of Saskatchewan. They and the members opposite believe that that right belonged to the board rooms of Houston and New York and Cleveland, big business communities, and multinational corporations; only they had the expertise and the knowledge necessary to operate this province. Big business had the prescription to cure it, 20 years of CCF government, but Mr. Deputy Speaker, their prescription was a bitter pill for the people of Saskatchewan.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, let us compare one small community under these two philosophies. The first thing that the free enterprisers did was to close the hospital; caring for sick was not and is not a priority of the members opposite. So the doors closed on the hospital and Leroy lost its doctor and shortly thereafter a druggist. The free enterprisers had set in motion the age old cycle guaranteed to cause the destruction of what was once a thriving rural community. But, Mr. Deputy Speaker, there was an election. The people of Saskatchewan had once more an opportunity to express their views as to what kind of philosophy, what kind of programs they wanted to see. Mr. Deputy Speaker, they spoke out loud and clear. They rejected the philosophy of the materialism supported by the members opposite; they showed their contempt for those who do not have the courage and the wisdom to entrust to the people of Saskatchewan the running of their own affairs. Mr. Deputy Speaker, they elected a New Democratic government.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

March 5, 1979

MR. KOSKIE: — You know, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that made all the difference.

Let us return now to the town of Leroy and see what has transpired since the magic day in 1971. Leroy now has a new social and health centre. Leroy has an attending doctor and health nurse. Leroy now has a small plant, manufacturing tarpaulins, employing local residents and using local business skills. Leroy now has twice-a-week bus service, soon to be made daily, to include St. Gregor and Muenster. Leroy has a completely renovated rink for its young people. Leroy has a 10 senior citizen unit. Mr. Deputy Speaker, you would think that this kind of progress, based upon people helping people, based upon the belief that people matter more, would cause the old line parties to reject their time worn cliches; cause them to abandon a philosophy built on myths and prejudices; cause them to at least question their underlying devotion to the altar of free enterprise. But have they, Mr. Deputy Speaker? No, they haven't. Even as the people of Saskatchewan attempt to continue to build on a rural way of life, the old line parties seek to destroy.

Recently the Minister of Transport has decided that the rail line serving Leroy must go; the line must be abandoned in the interest of his corporate ally the CPR and in the name of so-called efficiency. Mr. Deputy Speaker, a shameful and a callous act. A decision that will be the death-knell of rural Saskatchewan. And what, Mr. Deputy Speaker, about Her Majesty's Loyal Opposition? What is the position of Joe Clark, the prime minister in waiting, as he likes to be called? Do the federal Conservatives have a position on the destruction of Leroy's way of life? Yes, they have, Mr. Deputy Speaker. It was a hard decision to make — a tough decision for a prime minister in waiting — made reluctantly, but when you're a prime minister in waiting, you have to make some tough decisions. But they made it. They looked at their philosophy and there was only one choice — they chose to support, no, not the town of Leroy, not the town of Leroy. No, Mr. Speaker, they chose to support their corporate ally — the CPR. Mr. Deputy Speaker, with this kind of performance I can only say that I hope the prime minister in waiting is waiting a long time.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. KOSKIE: — Mr. Deputy Speaker, compare our commitment to those of the old line parties. They close the hospital — we establish a social and health centre. They abandon the rail lines — we increase transportation to Leroy. They promote larger and larger farms — we promote the family farm. They promote big corporations — we promote the growth of Saskatchewan companies. Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am indeed committed to the action and the direction of this government as it relates to strengthening rural Saskatchewan. Mr. Deputy Speaker, this government is committed to strengthening and building on rural Saskatchewan. In this throne speech, we see measures that will continue this thrust. In this and succeeding throne speeches, our commitment will be translated into actions. Performance, not rhetoric. Performance based on a belief that the people of Saskatchewan should enjoy the fruits of their labour. Performance sparked by the leader of our party, a man considered by many from all parties, and all provinces, as the best political leader in Canada.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. KOSKIE: — Mr. Deputy Speaker, the people of Saskatchewan have entrusted us with their confidence, with their belief that the New Democratic Party truly reflects their desires and aspirations for a better Saskatchewan. Mr. Deputy Speaker, this throne speech reflects a commitment to our rural way of life — a commitment to using

resources for the benefit of all of the people of Saskatchewan — a commitment to this and future generations — a commitment to those who matter most — the people of Saskatchewan.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I will not be supporting the amendment. I'll be supporting the original motion.

March 5, 1979

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. B. PONIATOWSKI (Saskatoon Eastview): — Mr. Deputy Speaker, it is a pleasure in rising to speak for the first time to this Assembly, to speak in support of the Speech from the Throne. Also, I would like to congratulate the Speaker on his election as the Speaker of this Assembly.

I would like to express the honor I feel in representing Saskatoon Eastview. I would also like to indicate my appreciation to the voters of Saskatoon Eastview for electing me to the provincial legislature.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. PONIATOWSKI: — My constituency consists of a very attractive area located in the south eastern part of the city. It is largely a residential area with people who are engaged in a large variety of occupations. Mr. Deputy Speaker, New Democrats have a tradition of receiving support from people from many walks of life who are committed to the ideal of creating a more equitable and just society.

A somewhat unique aspect of my constituency is that it contains a rather large number of special homes. These include a number of nursing homes, several residences for senior citizens, a veteran's home and a CNIB (Canadian National Institute for the Blind) complex.

It was particularly interesting and rewarding for me during the campaign to meet and to talk with people residing in these homes. Many of them were most anxious to tell me that they had met Tommy Douglas personally and it became clearly evident to me that a vast majority of these fine people had placed their confidence in the New Democratic Party and the policies of the Blakeney government.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. PONIATOWSKI: — Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am very proud of the record of the Blakeney government with regard to senior citizens. Programs like the Hospital Services Plan, Medicare, Aids to Independent Living and Prescription Drug Plan are evidence of our commitment to the social programs which are of very high importance to the people who are elderly.

As a government member, I intend to do what I can to ensure that additional programs and required support systems are established so that senior citizens are able to live in comfort and in dignity.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, the Speech from the Throne makes reference to numerous programs and areas of legislation which will be, no doubt, most beneficial and will be welcomed by the people of the province. I would like to make brief reference to some of these: the introduction of phase two of the revenue sharing program (this will provide greater financial support and a good deal of autonomy to urban and rural constituencies); legislation pertaining to the river edge authority (this will be of prime interest to the people of Saskatoon and region for the purpose of beautifying the river edge for years to come); establishment of a health research fund (this is greatly needed to improve our activities and benefits in the area of prevention in health care). Also, it will be of great professional interest to those working in the health care area.

A mines pollution control branch is to be established in the Department of the Environment. This is certainly of great importance, given the situation and projections pertaining to the extensive potential in the mining of uranium in our province.

Also, I would like to refer to the amendments proposed for the Workers Compensation system. The working people of Saskatchewan will be pleased and encouraged with the proposals to improve the treatment of injured workers.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. PONIATOWSKI: — Mr. Deputy Speaker, I would now like to make some comments on the topic of education. This happens to be an area that I have been very much involved with for a large number of years, both as a classroom teacher and, primarily, in administration as a principal, and also, on a provincial basis, working with the teacher's organization in this province.

I am convinced that our province will make a substantial contribution in joining with others in Canada, and others throughout the world, in celebrating the International Year of the Child. It is expected that this celebration will be useful in reviewing the needs of children and in promoting increased opportunities and protections for our youth. I suggest that it is imperative to consider our educational system when looking at the needs and opportunities of children. I am making this point quite deliberately in response to some specific comments in the debate thus far. It has been suggested directly, and by implication, by members opposite, that this government is not placing a high priority on education. Mr. Deputy Speaker, I take strong exception to these comments and observations. The record of this government in placing a high priority on education should be perfectly self-evident to any objective observer.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. PONIATOWSKI: — Further, it is my view that the educational system in this province is one of the best in North America.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. PONIATOWSKI: — Now, one could discuss at great lengths the progressive and effective programs and measures implemented by the Blakeney government since 1971. I would like to make reference to several areas.

Prior to the '71 election, relationships between the teachers, trustees and the government had reached peak proportions. Many of you, no doubt, will be fully aware of this situation. Upon election in 1971, the Blakeney government acted quickly to bring about a reasonable measure of . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . consultation, co-operation and harmony among the principal groups involved in the educational enterprise. Mr. Deputy Speaker, this was essentially accomplished by increased financial grants to local jurisdictions; removal of the rigid formulas regarding pupil-teacher ratios and budget review procedures.

Thirdly, abolition of area bargaining and the implementation of bi-level bargaining. The mechanism established for bargaining at the provincial level provided for representation from the provincial teachers' group, the provincial trustees and the provincial

March 5, 1979

government.

The creative and bold actions of the Blakeney government set the stage for a renewal in the quest for quality education for the boys and girls in our schools. Mr. Deputy Speaker, it should be noted that the position of the Progressive Conservative Party is to reduce or to remove government representation in bargaining at the provincial level. In fact that is on the record, or at least that is the information that I read; this is the position they had taken during the election campaign in 1978. It is my view that implementation of this policy would quickly result in problems similar to those existing prior to 1971.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, during the past few years much has been accomplished to improve the quality of education in this province. I would like to cite a number of examples simply to make the point, Mr. Deputy Speaker. as follows:

Continued updating and revision of curricula. Here again I would suggest that the kind of approach that we are using in Saskatchewan is in many ways the envy of all other provinces in this country.

An increase in the minimum number of years of training for teachers.

Provision of grants for kindergarten education.

Emphasis on sound physical education programs.

Increased support for French and minority language education.

Consolidation and updating of school law by way of the new Education Act in 1978.

Now I could go on for some time, as I indicated before. However, I have indicated a number of examples to illustrate my point. That is why I do not accept the comments made by the members opposite that not very much is happening in the way of educational priorities and so on.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I have been impressed by the kind of leadership that has been exhibited by the ministers of education in the Blakeney Government. Politicians in our neighboring provinces, and I include Ontario, Manitoba, Alberta and B.C. when I say neighboring provinces, criticized teachers and others and the quality of the educational programs for the sake of expediency and short term popularity. The Blakeney government has provided substantial support and resources to teachers and trustees and looks to the future in education with optimism. Mr. Deputy Speaker, we must continue to adjust and improve the educational system as deemed necessary. I would like to suggest the following areas of importance need some attention.

The decline of school enrolments in rural Saskatchewan and in some urban schools is one important issue. Since there is an abundance of teachers this might be a particularly good time to give closer attention to areas such as individualized instruction, improved library resources and the improvement of programs for the gifted. It should be noted, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that these issues were also identified by the member for Indian Head-Wolseley (Mr. Taylor).

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I think, also, that we have reached the stage where we should be considering raising the minimum number of years of teacher training to four years. The overall goal in education must be to provide the highest opportunities to the greatest extent possible.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I will now make some comments regarding the economy and related issues. The Speech from the Throne notes that the economy in this province grew strongly in 1978. In looking ahead there is reason to be optimistic. It is anticipated that the decade ahead will be one of even greater prosperity.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. PONIATOWSKI: — Mr. Deputy Speaker, the Blakeney government has taken steps to ensure the highest return to the people of Saskatchewan from the development of our natural resources. To achieve this goal the public sector role had to be advanced. Some members of the opposition continue to refer to this kind of an approach as 'Big government, inefficiency in the public sector.' In my mind, at least, this raises the question of philosophy of government.

I strongly believe that the mixed economy approach is the most appropriate and effective in today's setting. This is consistent with our policies in Saskatchewan. There is a role for the private and public sectors, for the co-operative enterprise and for joint ventures in the development of our economy.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I would suggest that the Progressive Conservatives are much too preoccupied with the private enterprise economy. It appears to me that they are recommending rather simple solutions to complex contemporary problems.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. PONIATOWSKI: — Firstly, Mr. Deputy Speaker, relying solely on the private sector would lead to numerous problems, such as creation of a branch plant economy or a foreign owned economy. Secondly, increased problems in terms of our balance of payments, loss of control of our resource development, a reduced financial return from our resource industry thus lessening our ability to provide high quality education, health and social programs and weakening of the small and medium-sized business economy in Saskatchewan and Canada and the extension of multinational presence and strength.

I raise these by way of example, to again illustrate a point. This is not the total kind of proposition that could be made. However, my point is that the kind of approach that has been adopted by the members opposite is a bit naive.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

March 5, 1979

MR. PONIATOWSKI: — Mr. Deputy Speaker, New Democrats adhere to a philosophy which permits an active approach to government. This approach calls for change — not radical change for change's sake — but change in an orderly, moderate, and progressive manner. New Democrats do not support regressive change, as it would appear our members opposite do — nor do they support the notion of standing still which also applies to the members opposite. Mr. Deputy Speaker, the goal of New Democratic governments is to bring about greater economic equality and social justice for the people. Mr. Deputy Speaker, I would like to close my remarks with a quotation from Franklin Roosevelt:

The test of our progress as a society is not in whether we add to the abundance of those who already have much, but in whether we provide more for those who have little.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I cannot support the amendment, thus I will be voting for the motion.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. J. GARNER (Wilkie): — Mr. Deputy Speaker, it is indeed a pleasure for me to address the Saskatchewan legislature with my first speech. First of all, I would like to congratulate the Speaker on being elected to position of Speaker for the nineteenth session of the Saskatchewan legislature. I know that when he accepted the position of Speaker, he will be fair and just to both sides. Mr. Deputy Speaker, when the House opened on February 22, it was one of the proudest moments of my life, when I sat in this chair on the Legislative floor to represent the people of the Wilkie constituency.

Most important of all, I would personally like to thank all the people who worked so hard in the election campaign of October to bring about my election victory. These were very wonderful people from all walks of life. They took very unselfishly of their own time and money to help bring about our election victory. It is a feather in their cap because it is the very first time that there has been a Progressive Conservative MLA in the Wilkie constituency since Saskatchewan became a province in 1905.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. GARNER: — To the other defeated candidates, it was a very hard fought election campaign, but I think they have learned their lesson — the people of the Wilkie constituency do not go for this type of smear political campaign. To the people who voted for me I say thank you and to the people who didn't, there may be, God willing, a next time. But I am here to represent all the people of the Wilkie constituency.

Now, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I would like to discuss some of the problems of the people from my constituency. It has been brought to my attention that there is going to be a proposed two-deer zone in zone 22 which includes part of the Wilkie constituency. After hearing about this I was in touch with all the Saskatchewan Wildlife Federation organizations in my constituency and their feelings were the same as mine. They are very strongly opposed to the idea of having a two-deer zone in their area. The farmer/hunter relationship

is good right now but if this proposal is brought forward it will deteriorate to a very low, low level. The land owners in the area have also told me that they will post all of their land. Right now there is little or no land posted in the Wilkie constituency.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, another of my concerns and the concerns of the people of the Wilkie constituency is the Law Reform Commission of Saskatchewan . . . tentative proposals for consent of minors to The Health Care Act. Hopefully if this proposal is sent to the Attorney General he will use common sense, throw it out and not ask them to do another study. I have conducted meetings throughout my constituency, finding out the people's views on this proposal and it is without a doubt the largest concern of the people of the Wilkie constituency right now. My office in Wilkie has received over 200 letters and phone calls from people opposing this proposal. Since 1979 has been designated as the Year of the Child let us start taking a more active role as parents and doing a better job of raising, understanding and loving our children. This proposal is taking the role of parents away and the parents I know want to remain the prime educators of their children . . .

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. GARNER: — . . . and also want to know when their teenagers go to the hospital what they are going to the hospital for. Right now the doctors have the authority to treat any minor for anything that pertains to be an emergency to save that minor's life. In my opinion, Mr. Deputy Speaker, this is a very good law.

Mr. Attorney General, I have a petition here with over 400 names on it from the Wilkie constituency alone . . . people that are concerned about this . . . and this is only from one constituency. What has been coming in from the other 60 constituencies?

Mr. Deputy Speaker, now I would like to talk about land bank. This is the phony name the government has for it. I will call it state farms, because that's just what I believe them to be. The state farms are of no real asset in the province of Saskatchewan. The only thing that they have accomplished is to acquire more land for the government to control.

The Saskatchewan government is putting a real hardship on the young farmers of today because in many instances the young farmer not only has to compete with his neighbors for buying land; now he has to compete against his own tax dollars and the provincial government in order to buy that land.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I believe we, the Progressive Conservative Party of Saskatchewan, had and still have a better policy to help the young farmers of Saskatchewan. Instead of the provincial government buying this land to add to the state farms they already own, we believe in, backing the note for the young farmer when he wants to buy land, whether from his father, his uncle, or the neighbor down the road.

Mr. Speaker, I know that in my own constituency many farmers, young and old, have said to me personally, Jim, this is a terrific policy; we like it and hope that you will win.

March 5, 1979

Win we did, Mr. Deputy Speaker, in the Wilkie constituency, but we did not win across the province. Maybe by the time the next election is called the rest of the people in Saskatchewan who did not vote for us, the Progressive Conservative Party of Saskatchewan, will be so fed up with socialism that they will give us that chance to form their government . . .

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. GARNER: — . . . a government by the people, for the people; a government that will listen to people whether it be farmers, businessmen, doctors, laborers, teachers, etc., or organizations from all across the province. Yes, we will even listen to the Saskatchewan Wildlife Federation that the present government seems to make promises to but never keeps them.

Now I direct my remarks to the Premier, whom I'm very sorry to see is not here in the House today. He'll get the message anyway. He so conveniently twisted my words the other day in the legislature saying that, and I quote from the *Hansard*, February 27, 1979, 'I ask anyone to try to square that with what the member for Wilkie was saying about bringing in a mandatory program of gun control.' Now, Mr. Deputy Speaker, this is nothing but bull. If the Premier thinks he can continue to twist, tangle or turn around my words, or those by other members on this side of the House, and thinks he is going to get away with it he is sadly mistaken because I for one (and I know my fellow colleagues are completely with me) will not stand for these little games that he and the government members try to play.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. GARNER: — Mr. Deputy Speaker, we will not let the Premier keep trying to fool the people of Saskatchewan as he so masterfully did in the October 18 election.

Now I would like to quote from *Hansard* remarks I actually did make in question period on February 27, 1979.

Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Tourism and Renewable Resources. In Saskatoon on February, 1977, he promised the Saskatchewan Wildlife Federation convention that his government would implement a mandatory firearm safety program for all hunters 18 years of age and younger. Now, two years later, the promised program has not been implemented. Why the delay in implementing this program? Mr. Deputy Speaker, a new question then. Would the minister please tell me why now, two years later, since they have been waiting for this federal report, the last Saskatchewan Wildlife Federation convention held last Saturday in Saskatoon, that convention unanimously supported this program being brought forward. Why are we still having delays? How much longer are we going to have to wait?

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I know that what I have just read to you from *Hansard* were the words that were spoken on Tuesday February 27, by myself. Now where in *Hansard* did

I mention anything about bringing in a mandatory program of gun control? Nowhere, Mr. Deputy Speaker. I hope, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that this has cleared the air, and also cleared up the minds of the Premier and members opposite, so that the word twisting games will stop and we can get on with the business of the legislature for the people of Saskatchewan.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. GARNER: — Mr. Deputy Speaker, I would just like to say that I am very concerned about the young people of Saskatchewan, their safety — whether it be hunting or whatever they are doing. Mr. Deputy Speaker, these are the only, the most wonderful, the major resource that we have left in Saskatchewan, that the NDP government has not tried to take over and nationalize yet.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I sure hope (it's quite a joke — the young people of Saskatchewan — I take it from the members laughing on the other side of the House) I sure hope, God willing, that they don't get them. Also, Mr. Premier, no matter how you try to twist my words, I do believe in a mandatory firearms training program for all our young people.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. GARNER: — Mr. Deputy Speaker, I would just like to quote from the Saskatoon Star-Phoenix, February 18, 1977:

Firearm training to be mandatory. First time young hunters in Saskatchewan will be required to take a firearms safety course beginning next year. Mandatory training, long touted by the Saskatchewan Wildlife Federation, was announced Thursday by Adolph Matsalla, Minister of Tourism and Renewable Resources. He told federation convention delegates in Saskatoon the program will begin in 1978, and gradually be expanded to eventually guarantee all hunters in the province took safety training. Matsalla said details of the scheme must still be worked out but cabinet has approved the principle. His announcement brought a standing ovation from wildlife delegates, many of whom have provided instruction through voluntary courses for the thousands of young people in the province. Yet, Matsalla said, those 18 and under, the ones mainly affected by the first stage of mandatory training programs accounted for 25 per cent of firearm accidents in most years. Mr. Deputy Speaker, let's get this program started now!

Mr. Deputy Speaker, the Premier stated that Mr. Garner condemns the Government of Saskatchewan. Yes, I will condemn the Government of Saskatchewan if I think they need condemning but I will give them credit if I believe they deserve it. The people of the Wilkie constituency and also all the people of Saskatchewan are my main concern. I am here to represent the peoples' views, not just my own personal views. Mr. Deputy Speaker, I commend the government on the rural electrification program introduced by the former CCF party . . .

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. GARNER: — . . . on behalf of a lot of Saskatchewan farmers it is indeed a pleasure to see that your government is still continuing this program today.

March 5, 1979

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I was shocked the other day when I heard the new member for Shaunavon (Mr. Lingenfelter) attack and try to discredit one of our former premiers, Mr. Ross Thatcher. Whether the people liked or disliked what the former premier did for our province, he still spent a lot of time and energy for the people and the province of Saskatchewan. There is no way that the NDP government should throw dirt on the name of any premier, or previous member who has passed away. I knew that the NDP would stoop low but I never dreamt they would go that low as to start crawling in and out of holes in the ground. Mr. Deputy Speaker, I direct this to the Premier of Saskatchewan personally with the utmost respect for his office. I ask you, Mr. Premier, do not let this kind of harassment to the dead continue.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, the other day when the Premier took credit for the price of beef rising in Saskatchewan — yes, beef prices rising — it sure surprised me because if his government had its way, we would have had a beef marketing board. With a beef marketing board we sure wouldn't have the good beef prices we have today, that the farmers and ranchers of Saskatchewan do so deserve. The very last thing that the farmers and ranchers in this province want is for the government to get mixed up in the cattle business. Beef prices are set on supply and demand and the serious minded beef producer stays with his cattle operation through good and bad. The only thing that scares me is when a government starts talking about putting a ceiling on beef prices . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Where were those same governments when they should have been talking about putting a floor price on beef prices?

Now, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I would like to turn to health care in this wonderful province of ours. I have two bills here, one from a young mother about to bear child; the other one from an 86 year old senior citizen.

I would like to deal with the young mother first. Here we have a bill for \$40, and there's going to be more bills to come. Shame is right, shame on the government, that same government that in the last election was saying, oh those bad Conservatives, they're going to do away with medicare. What is this?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. GARNER: — Mr. Deputy Speaker, here we have an 86 year old senior citizen — one of the real pioneers that opened this country up . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . \$375 bill. He's just barely living on the old age pension. Mr. Deputy Speaker, in summing it up, the NDP government of Saskatchewan is penalizing a young mother for bringing children into this world, and it is penalizing the senior citizens, the real pioneers of our country, when they should be taken care of. Mr. Deputy Speaker, if this is a government that helps the people of Saskatchewan, it just scares the heck right out of me if they ever were going to hurt me.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. GARNER: — Mr. Deputy Speaker, I have taken enough of your time. I have no choice but to oppose the motion, and I will be voting for the amendment. Thank you.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. A.W. ENGEL (Assiniboia-Gravelbourg): — Mr. Deputy Speaker, in rising to speak in support of the throne speech, I would first of all like to offer my condolences to the Hon. Speaker on the loss of his mother. I would also like to take this opportunity to express to

my constituency of Assiniboia-Gravelbourg how delighted I am to be back representing them.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. ENGEL: — I want to thank them for the support they gave me when I look around and see how excited the new members are, and I remember how great it was back in . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . 1971. It may surprise you, Mr. Deputy Speaker, but I feel even better this time.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. ENGEL: — I hope, Mr. Deputy Speaker, you will forgive me for my brief absence and I will promise you and this House, and especially the members opposite, I will do my best to make sure it doesn't happen again.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. ENGEL: — I referred to the new members and to the new MLA's, and I would like to congratulate all the members that were elected during this past election and particularly the hon. member for Wascana (Mr. White) and the member for Shaunavon (Mr. Lingenfelter), for their fine speeches in moving the Speech from the Throne. It is evident that they will serve their constituencies with intelligence and vigor and I would also like to congratulate the seasoned veterans on their re-election. Speaking about new members, when I look across the floor I only recognize one face and that is the member for Qu'Appelle (Mr. Lane); he just stepped out . . . oh, there he is. Some things appear new but when you look closer they are the same old things. The member for Qu'Appelle is still sitting in a Thatcher-led opposition, still shouting the same old harangues. I am sure that when the member for Qu'Appelle moved across the floor, he thought he was going to the top — I do not need to say more.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I would like now to respond to the fine throne speech and give my support to it, and its promises for Saskatchewan's future.

Particularly I would like to support the policies towards environment and resource development referred to in the speech. My constituency of Assiniboia-Gravelbourg has the Poplar River project which seems to be somewhat offensive to the member for Estevan (Mr. Larter). Mr. Deputy Speaker, I would like to explain what this project means to the people of Coronach. Before this project it was a community in decline, a community with a decreasing and aging population. The spirit of this fine community was ebbing away year by year. Mr. Deputy Speaker, the plight of the Coronachs was the plight of many small communities across North America. Big business and centralized government were not interested in the Coronachs of Saskatchewan; and if they were, it was in pulling resources, profits and taxes out of these towns to support massive power bases located in the financial centres of the world — just profits, no investments in the new way of life in these communities. The plight of Coronach and other communities before 1971 is well documented, Mr. Deputy Speaker, both economically and socially — poorer education, poorer health care, poorer opportunities for the basic amenities of life than their bigger neighbors had. We do not need to go through the whole list — it is known by us all as one basically without any hope, and any future.

But, Mr. Deputy Speaker, my party vowed to stop the decline of rural Saskatchewan; my party promised if elected they would join with the people of rural Saskatchewan. In

March 5, 1979

1971 we promised we'd work hard, we'd develop wise programs and invest Saskatchewan resources back in the interests of the people of Saskatchewan. We would work together to make rural Saskatchewan a great place to live. These promises made sense to the people of Saskatchewan, and they elected my party to power again and again. It is obvious that we delivered our promises and it is obvious that the people of Saskatchewan approve of them.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. ENGEL: — Mr. Deputy Speaker, these policies and promises are wonderfully demonstrated in my constituency of Assiniboia-Gravelbourg and particularly, in the new town of Coronach. I say new, because until this summer, Coronach was a village. In the 1976 census Coronach had a population of 382; in 1978 its population was 744 — a 93 per cent increase in one term. By 1980 the projected population is 1,200. The revitalization of Coronach is a demonstration of our party's resource, environmental and social planning, a reason indicated by the throne speech we could look forward to becoming even better.

First it was made possible to develop the Poplar River project by new income kept in Saskatchewan by the NDP resource development. This is demonstrated by comparing resource revenue for 1971, \$32.5 million — in 1978, \$461.9 million — Mr. Deputy Speaker, \$429.4 million more in one year for us to develop our province. The Poplar River project came into being also by our decision to use this revenue to continue to develop our energy resource to maintain our independence and to develop our own industries.

Now, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am not saying that growth is necessarily a good thing on its own. This is well demonstrated in many large metropolitan areas throughout Canada, but planned and constructive growth will definitely enrich any community economically and socially. Mr. Deputy Speaker, the Poplar River project is a well thought out project. The first unit of this power plant will be 300 megawatts. This addition to our provincial power system will give us one-eighth of full capacity for the province. This additional energy will increase our capacity for further industrial growth and in the whole make our province richer and stronger.

The effects of new personal incomes have already shown in the community with the addition of many new businesses, such as a new bank, new co-op shopping centre, a new Sears store, a new restaurant, new motels, new accountants, and law offices, a new auto parts store and many others.

I would like to show how the Blakeney government has helped Coronach provide new facilities: from the Department of Municipal Affairs under The Industrial Towns' Act we have administrated grants of \$10,000 a year for the last three fiscal years; a water supply grant of \$194,000 for the capital costs of installing a new water supply system; in addition the province will pay in the years 1979 to 1983 a grant annually to retire the debenture debt of this new water system; a capital grant for a new sewage disposal system of \$150,000 along with paying a grant annually to the town in respect of retiring the debenture debt for the sewer disposal facility; a capital grant of \$18,700 for a second water line has also been committed. Furthermore, the Saskatchewan Housing Corporation has built a 24 unit apartment block and 15 rental townhouses. The Department of Education also agreed in 1977 to help build a new school. A grant of \$335,000 was approved for this project.

Besides all this I would just like to list a few of the things the Saskatchewan Power Corporation helped do in Coronach: Fire equipment in the new fire hall \$51,538; donation to hospital board \$4,500; help to construct a new trailer court \$75,000; a sprinkler system for a golf course \$6,700; shelter for an ambulance; help to oil streets \$19,000; here is a good one, they are doing a new project there in sewage effluent irrigation and they invested \$20,000 there.

Large revenue sharing has made our Saskatchewan communities a fine place to live. Now we see in the throne speech revenue sharing is to increase again.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. ENGEL: — It's an honor to support this throne speech, Mr. Deputy Speaker. What is even a happier result for Coronach besides all this money is its new citizens. Close to 400 are living there already. The revitalization of rural Saskatchewan is the one aspect that demonstrates the success of our party. We have turned Saskatchewan around and made it into a great place to live. The new citizens of Coronach are happy to be working and living in Coronach. Their beautiful new homes demonstrate that they want to stay there. Many are working for their community, serving on the town council, serving on boards, coaching teams and working as volunteers in all aspects of the community.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, we realize a growing population places some stresses on a community. From day one the provincial agencies have worked closely with Coronach officials. Because of their concern to properly develop this program. Coronach has been able to take full advantage of the many provincial assistance programs.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I would now like to speak about the government's involvement in environmental planning and development of the Poplar River project. In Saskatchewan, we recognize that no large project should be built and operated until all effects on the environment and local community are fully assessed. The Poplar River plant will have the most effective equipment available to remove solid particles from the plant's stack emissions. The plant will meet all Canadian and Saskatchewan requirements regarding other substances emitted from the plant furnaces. One of the most dramatic effects of the project will be the mining area. Large quantities of overburden must be removed to mine the coal. Sask Power's mining plan has been prepared with the objective of restoring the disturbed land to its pre-mining product capability.

I have these two drawings, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that demonstrate how this will be done and what it will look like. A picture is worth a thousand words so I thought I'd hand these out here. It must be pointed out that reclamation will be expensive but it must be done. I am sure all Saskatchewan power consumers are prepared to pay the cost of restoring any disturbed land.

Now, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I would like to add that our province has worked very closely with the federal Departments of External Affairs and Environment. Both are satisfied that this project is being developed in a responsible way. The throne speech demonstrates clearly the importance the government places on environmental protection. Mr. Deputy Speaker, this is one more reason why I support the throne speech. The throne speech indicates that our province has a strong commitment to recreation. The Poplar River project will also supply recreation to the south central area. A large new reservoir has been built on the East Poplar River to supply cooling

March 5, 1979

water to the power plant. This reservoir is nearly full of water and can serve many other local uses such as boating and swimming. It's being stocked with game fish. It will provide a recreational resource area where it can meet local needs. We take great pride in this Poplar River project. I recognize that the Saskatchewan government and Sask Power must make a decision this year on the next unit of generating capacity for the provincial system. I strongly urge that we proceed with the second 300 megawatt unit at the Poplar River project.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. ENGEL: — I was delighted that the Speech from the Throne began with reference to our government's efforts to support the Year of the Child with its special \$100,000 grant but I would like to point out all our government efforts are directed to make every year the year of the child. This project will provide important new jobs for the future of our children in Saskatchewan. I am proud, Mr. Deputy Speaker, to be a part of a government that has done so much to get Saskatchewan on the tracks. It is too bad that there are other powers that are trying with all their might to throw us back off the tracks.

I am referring to PRAC (Prairie Rail Action Committee), a derailing device that both the Liberal and the Conservative Party of Canada and the Conservative members sitting opposite are using. I will not go into any detail in this area because it is being covered so well by my colleagues, and particularly the member for Morse (Mr. Gross) who will be speaking right after me. The PRAC recommendations are so insidious that it is threatening the very life of the family farm and the fibre of our rural communities. Beyond this, PRAC is threatening the strength of our whole provincial economy, an economy we have worked and struggled so hard to build to its present high level. For surely if the branch lines recommended for abandonment by PRAC die, it will drain our provincial Treasury to build and maintain roads to supplement the abandoned rail lines.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, who is running this country? The love affair between the old-line parties and the large corporations of this country seem to want to turn our farms into corporations.

I would like to echo just one thing the hon. member for Shaunavon (Mr. Lingenfelter) said — when agriculture is healthy, Saskatchewan is healthy.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I would like to promise my constituency that my party and I will fight to the end to save the Willow Bunch to Radville and Coronach to Big Beaver branch lines.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. ENGEL: — Our government has demonstrated confidence in these lines. We spent close to \$1 million to relocate a portion of the Big Beaver/Coronach line when the Poplar River reservoir was built.

In listening to the throne speech, Mr. Deputy Speaker, it is obvious my party continues to be ready to serve the vital agricultural industry of our province.

The Farm Fuel Cost Reduction Program will assist farmers greatly and in light of the federal government cutbacks in agriculture research, The Saskatchewan Agriculture Research Foundation Act will also be of great assistance to Saskatchewan farmers.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am pleased to support the motion and as you can well be aware I will reject the amendment.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. R.J. GROSS (Morse): — Mr. Deputy Speaker, it is a pleasure to take part in this debate and to express my support of Premier Allan Blakeney, this NDP government and this throne speech.

My first words must be to thank those people who worked for and supported our programs in Morse. I thank them for the confidence they have expressed in this government by sending me as their representative to the legislature. My commitment is that I will give to this responsibility what abilities I have and every hour it takes to serve all the people of Morse.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. GROSS: — To my predecessor, MLA Jack Wiebe, I want to extend my personal appreciation for the hard fought and clean campaign he waged in October. Mr. Deputy Speaker, I want to join with others who have congratulated you on your election to the Chair of this Assembly. I extend congratulations to the member for Wascana (Mr. White) who did such a fine job in leading off this debate. Also, I extend my congratulations to my neighbor, the member for Shaunavon (Mr. Lingenfelter) on his contribution to this debate when he so ably seconded the motion. I thought both members demonstrated that they had put a considerable amount of time and thought into preparing their remarks.

In my remarks, this afternoon, I want to focus on issues which are facing rural Saskatchewan. I want to demonstrate why I think it is fair to say that the Blakeney government is facing those issues head-on and providing leadership in proposing solutions. In passing, I may want to draw attention to the shortcomings of the proposals of our political opposition whether that opposition is in this Assembly or in the corporate board rooms of this country. This throne speech is one complimentary to seven years of the best administered government in all of Canada.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. GROSS: — In agriculture because of our land bank program, 2,300 new farmers have been either added to or maintained on the land. A new agricultural research fund that will be researching important new dynamics and techniques in agriculture has been announced — techniques like zero tillage, answers to soil salinity, better methods for insect and weed control, along with a whole host of other agricultural research oriented areas.

Municipal governments . . . through revenue sharing under phase 1, municipal governments have received an increase of some 45 per cent enabling them to hold the line on mill rates and even reduce rates in some areas.

Under phase 2, municipalities will receive significant increases. Regional parks will also receive a new capital and maintenance grant program to assist them. In the area of resources we will be continuing on with our activities in that sector. People of this province resoundingly showed their approval on October 18 for our policies in the

March 5, 1979

resource sector. People of this province believe that resources are the public preserve and if they are to be unearthed and merchandised the investments and profits will remain with the people of Saskatchewan.

I now turn to the area of transportation, Mr. Deputy Speaker. There are a number of black clouds hanging over our agricultural way of life. I suggest to members of this House that there is a deliberate plot by our federal government to import the American version of corporate agri-business into our Canadian agricultural system. It was blueprinted over 10 years ago by the federal agricultural taskforce on how that change was to take place.

The present federal Liberal government said in that task force that two-thirds of our present prairie farmers are inefficient and must leave the land by 1990. That, Mr. Deputy Speaker, is the overall plan of our present federal Liberal government. Needless to say it is a nightmare in the eyes of our producers.

But, Mr. Deputy Speaker, while the Tories of this province and this country agree with the basic motives of the taskforce, it would be fair to say that they don't agree with some of its figures. Where our provincial Tories part company with their federal free-enterprise Liberal friends is with the figures of how many farmers in this province are inefficient and how many should thus be forced to leave the land. Our provincial Tories in the last campaign enunciated very clearly as to where they stand on this issue. I ask farmers of this great province if they know what figure the Tories feel more adequately represents the number of inefficient farmers. Now, Mr. Farmer, if you were to say 25 per cent was the figure that the Tories used as farmers who are inefficient, you would be far too low. If you were to say 50 per cent, you'd still be too far low. If you were to say 75 per cent, you are still low. No, Mr. Farmer, it's not 25 per cent, it's not 50 per cent, it's not 75 per cent of you who are inefficient — the Tories feel 80 per cent of you are inefficient. Liberals say two-thirds are inefficient; Tories say 80 per cent are inefficient. Yes, Mr. Deputy Speaker, the Tories in Saskatchewan have religiously stuck to that figure and were prepared to die for it on election day. I suggest to you, Mr. Deputy Speaker, die they did. When it came to the October 18 election, the majority of the people of Saskatchewan saw through their little plot and defeated the Tory proposals.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. GROSS: — Now, Mr. Deputy Speaker, in order to affect this change, a number of things would have to happen. The key to this change is in three strategic areas. The first area is transportation; the second area is orderly marketing and grain handling. In dealing with transportation, it would mean that we would see the death to the crow rate and secondly, we'd see the death to our prairie branch lines and country elevator system. Mr. Deputy Speaker, this provincial government, the Saskatchewan Wheat Pool, the National Farmers Union are now locked into a head-on battle with our old time arch enemies. Our arch enemies are the federal government, Tory parties federally and provincially, and finally and not leastly, the Liberal-Tory farm movement, the Palliser Wheat Growers. It is history as to whose side Otto Lang is on in this great debate. It is also history as to where our Tory friends are on this issue. It is also history to the people who are politically aware as to where the Palliser Wheat Growers stand. I would like to take a little time to talk about this farm organization, the Palliser Wheat Growers, and elaborate a little as to what it is and what it does.

There is no farmer, Mr. Deputy Speaker, there is no farm organization in this province that has done more to divide, harm and provide a general disservice to our prairie

farmers than the Palliser Wheat Growers.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. GROSS: — I suggest to you, Mr. Deputy Speaker, the Palliser Wheat Growers is a collection of beat-up and burnt-out reactionary Liberal and Tory right-wingers who are serving only their own self-interests, their archaic political interests. Because of the laws of this House, it restricts the proper verbiage that should be applied to this organization. Mr. Deputy Speaker, it is one thing to lose our branch lines because of the PRAC report, but it will be a final and devastating blow when we lose the crow rate. Losing the crow rate will mean that the cost of moving grain to our producers will rocket from 12.5 cents a bushel crow rate to well over \$1 a bushel. Loss of the crow rate will mean farmers will be paying rates equal to that paid by our American counterparts.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, the loss of the crow rate will send two thirds easily off our farms (the Liberal figure), and I would suggest that the Tory figure of 80 per cent might even be a bit low.

It is indeed alarming that such a nightmare might be possible.

I have here a clipping from page two of the Leader Post, February 14, 1979 edition. It's titled 'Freight Rate Changes Drafted'.

The Tory party's agricultural committee, the Palliser Wheat Growers, is now co-ordinating and conducting secret meetings to dump the crow, with officials of the CNR, the CPR, and the other commodity groups. (. . . inaudible interjection . . .)

I would like to quote the press release, Mr. Deputy Speaker. Again . . . 'Freight Rate Changes Drafted'.

Saskatoon Star-Phoenix — The Star-Phoenix says a working group of railway officials and prairie farm leaders have drafted a formula for changing the controversial Crowsnest Pass freight rate agreement.

However, an official who requested to remain anonymous said the formula will be kept secret because of pending — and I underline — Alberta and federal general elections (. . . inaudible interjection . . .)

Now what do we have in Alberta? A Tory government.

AN HON. MEMBER: — Hate to lose votes.

MR. GROSS: — What do we have in Ottawa? A Liberal government. (. . . inaudible interjection . . .) We don't want to tell them what's going on because there are elections pending.

The official says there have been at least four, not one but four, closed meetings of farm leaders and railway officials since November 21 in Regina where ideas changing the preferential rate were discussed.

The newspaper goes on to say that meetings apparently included representatives of the Canadian National Railways, CPR as well as some co-operative firms other than the Saskatchewan Wheat Pool and also included

March 5, 1979

farm organizations other than the Saskatchewan Federation and a variety of commodity farm groups. Organizing and co-ordinating these talks — (the article concludes) — was the Palliser Wheat Growers.

Now, Mr. Speaker, it is no great secret that the Tories and the Palliser Wheat Growers, when in the political arena, are bed partners, but what I want to know, and what the farmers of this province want to know, is who has given the Palliser Wheat Growers the authority to take it upon themselves to conduct such unscrupulous meetings?

What I precisely want to know from members opposite is who is really co-ordinating and conducting these backdoor, after midnight, cigar smoking type meetings, (. . . inaudible interjection . . .) is it really Palliser or as I suggest, Mr. Deputy Speaker, the Tory caucus opposite?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. GROSS: — What I want to know and what this House deserves to know from the temporary leader of the opposition, the member for credibility gap in Nipawin is have you been conducting or helping to co-ordinate these meetings in conjunction with Palliser? Or has the member for Nipawin assigned this area to the agricultural critic? A well respected and knowledgeable farmer, the member for Rosthern (Dog 'n' Suds), I mean Mr. Katzman. Is he the mover and shaker of these dark room meetings which are deciding the fate of our producers? Or, Mr. Deputy Speaker, is it the now defunct, and I see he's not here, agricultural critic from the last time around, the hon. member for Moosomin, Mr. Birkbeck? He might well be, Mr. Deputy Speaker, after all during the October 18 election he was Mr. Devines' agricultural policy advisor and assistant, more commonly known to agricultural circles as the 80 per cent boys. Maybe, Mr. Deputy Speaker, it is their knowledgeable transportation critic, the member for Swift Current (Mr. Ham). Or maybe it's the member for Souris-Cannington (Mr. Berntson). After all he proudly displays the fact that he is a high-ranking official for the Palliser Wheat Growers. I would think Mr. Berntson would make a great co-ordinator and after all, Mr. Deputy Speaker, as you already know he is a great letter writer. Let us in this House make no mistake about it, the Palliser Wheat Growers, the provincial Tory and Liberal Parties are committed to the destruction of the crow rates. In fact, Mr. Deputy Speaker, Tories and Liberals are committed to kill the crow. There should be little doubt as to where their federal counterparts are.

In the case of the Liberals it should be unquestioned as to where they stand. Because of Otto Lang they automatically support the crow rate.

In the case of Conservatives, we understand that provincially and federally they are one common party. Just to reinforce that point the member for Nipawin (Mr. Collver) on November 27 reinforced it. He said, 'Federally and provincially the Conservatives are one.' Now, that's nice to know because we have a federal election coming up and we are going to want to know where the Tory Party provincially and where the Tory Party federally stand. Given that fact, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I decided to find out what the federal Tories had to say about the crow rate.

I went to my local MP, a Tory member, Mr. Frank Hamilton. Now, Mr. Hamilton, as all good Tories can appreciate, is a senior Tory member. He is a senior Tory member and has a great deal of stature in that caucus. I am sure you know he is a member of their agricultural caucus committee. I trust whatever Mr. Hamilton might have to say in agricultural related matters would be policy of that party. Now for the benefit of

members in this House I have found that Mr. Hamilton, like our provincial Tories, doesn't think too much of the crow rate either. In fact, Mr. Deputy Speaker, he figures the crow rate is a mess. He says it is part of our transportation mess. I would like to quote the wise words of wisdom from this member. I quote from the front page of the Swift Current Sun, January 11, 1979. The headline reads, 'New Government Needed to Solve Crow Rate Mess.'

Something has to be done about the crow rate for transportation in Canada and it will take a new government with a new mandate to do that. Frank Hamilton, MP, Swift Current-Maple Creek, Wednesday.

Hamilton said, 'Many changes are needed in the system for moving grain and shipping cattle West.' He wants to see the crow rate changed. Before Christmas the Progressive Conservative Party's agricultural caucus visited the West. Hamilton said, 'We visited the West and many farmers and agents were critical. They were critical of members because they made no promises.'

AN HON. MEMBER: — What paper is that?

MR. GROSS: — Swift Current Sun, January 11th. Glad to table it. He said they were critical because the Tory members made no promises about the crow rate, Mr. Deputy Speaker, and they would like to see the problem resolved. He said, we want to resolve those problems as well, but we want to win an election first, and we have to have the mandate to do it.

Now, Mr. Deputy Speaker, they want to solve the crow rate mess, but before they're going to guarantee they're going to solve the crow rate mess, they have to be the government. That's obvious. But they're not going to tell us before the federal election if they're going to solve the crow rate mess.

He said in the past the Conservatives had announced their intention for change before elections, and lost the vote and then had seen their Liberal opponents put into effect their ideas for change. Now, that's why he doesn't want to tell us what his ideas are, because the Liberals always steal them on us.

We are not going to be targets this time, he goes on. Hamilton said indications are Canada will have a new government this summer and he said, I want to be part of it. He goes on, I am tired of sitting in opposition and would like to be in the driver's seat for a change. If I can't get my way, I'm going to run and hide; it's my turn.

He goes on to talk about the Palliser Wheat Growers very proudly, and admits to being a high-ranking member of that organization. The member had just returned from a Palliser Wheat Growers Association meeting in Regina and said he found the meetings — the secret meetings that were going on — stimulating. Some new ideas were brought forward which he described as very interesting. He finds the meetings of the Palliser Wheat Growers in Regina very interesting and very stimulating because they're talking about devising a formula to abandon the crow rate. He doesn't want to talk about it when he's outside the House or he doesn't want to talk about it at pre-election time because he doesn't want the farmers to know what the Tories have up their sleeve, and that is the abandonment of the crow rate.

Now, Mr. Deputy Speaker, this week the Tories and the Liberals have earned a title they deserve very well. They have worked hard for it. That title I suggest to you is 'the

wrecking crew'.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:— Hear, hear!

MR. GROSS: — Whether they're credited for the destruction of the crow rate or our branch lines, they will be remembered and they will go down in history as the key innovators in these areas. As pointed out in the throne speech, this government has declared war on the wrecking crew.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. GROSS: — We will do everything in our power to try and stop this from happening, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I want to turn to another issue that has been raised in this debate, and a great deal of time has been spent on it — the anti-government issue. Not only has it received the attention of this House, but the issue has been a centerpiece for Tory parties, provincially and federally. You might say its their main theme song — their battle cry.

It is another one of those issues where the position of the people opposite — if somewhat confused and more than hypocritical — reminds us (as the Premier suggested the other day) that western Canada is famous for its dinosaurs and they are not all dead — far from it.

I mean, I'm speaking of the issue of the government's role in the economy and, more particularly, that of public spending. We see on the order paper, Resolution No. 11, for the benefit of my member for Swift Current, which alludes to the Tory prescription for inflation. Last Friday in this debate we got what I predict will be the same speech we will get from the member when he moves his resolution.

The member for Swift Current, in not too elegant fashion, first proceeded to give a rehash of the John Birch Society's opening prayer. You might want to call it the Tory Swan Song. The average citizen gets up in the morning and turns on his lights, using power supplied by SPC, he says. Presto, government interference. He washes his face in water supplied by municipal water systems. Presto, more government interference Shame! He has a breakfast of egg and cereal and toast — presto, more government interference, according to the member for Swift Current.

Here's a clincher. He drives to work with written government permission on government streets with more government interference because he has to obey government-regulated traffic safety lights. More government interference! Terrible! I know it's terrible. This country has had it!

I'll come back to the business of these terrible streets, Mr. Collver but let me just say one thing; those remarks set out as clearly as possible the anti-social nature of the prairie dinosaur.

That wasn't enough, Mr. Deputy Speaker, for the member for Swift Current. No that wasn't enough. He didn't stop there; he talked about medicare. He heaped scorn on the medicare system today. He says it's government interference when government pays bills on behalf of sick and poor people. That's government interference. He calls paying bills on behalf of poor people government interference and government control.

I ask you, Mr. Deputy Speaker, is this the view of someone who supports medicare, premium free and deterrent free? I think not. Rather it is an archaic philosophy which sits at the root of an ultra right-wing view of government, so well portrayed from our philosopher friend for Swift Current.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I could understand why Tory members would not hold that view, even though I don't buy it. I could understand it because I'm reminded of a definition of what a Conservative is. He's someone who fights like hell to bring in what his grandfather fought like hell to keep out.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. GROSS: — Mr. Deputy Speaker, we on this side of the House don't buy that philosophy and I'm going to go on and tell you why and the records of this House will tell you why we don't buy it.

I invite members to review the balance of the Swift Current member's speech and establish in their minds what he really did say.

On behalf of his constituents he welcomed the new five-storey government office building. Ho, ho! We've got a change now in Conservative thinking — a flip flop in their attitude. On one hand he is telling us that we are controlling and interfering in the lives of people and on the other hand he is now telling us what a wonderful new five-storey government office building. He welcomed the new SGIO (Saskatchewan Government Insurance Office) claim centre, Mr. Deputy Speaker. He welcomed the new senior citizen's complex known as Heritage Towers. Great stuff — he praised the lighting that has been done on the Trans-Canada Highway; he welcomed these improvements. Not only did he welcome these improvements, Mr. Deputy Speaker, he also took credit for some of them. Then he reminded us (an almost unbelievable admission of Tory flip flop that this was more government control. That bit of mental gymnastics might have been enough for most, Mr. Deputy Speaker, but not for the member for Swift Current (Mr. Ham) because he is a mental giant — not enough for him, he then proceeds on with a shopping list — for as he calls it, he wants now more interference, more controls and more spending. This government, he insinuates, should have done more about getting Swift Current TV. Just as a side note, Mr. Deputy Speaker, maybe he should check with the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Collver) about his comments on clamping down on TV content. But he goes on — he wants more in the city of Swift Current. I don't blame him. This government should get an indoor swimming pool, we should get more lighting on the Trans-Canada . . . he wants more lighting on the Trans-Canada — 'so people can find their way off the highway', I quote. He says, and I quote:

It is imperative that either we install an overpass or indeed build an underpass for children on the Trans Canada . . .

. . . (inaudible interjection) . . . No, I'm not against that Gary, not at all.

Now, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I don't know if that is a complete shopping list . . .

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: — Order please. I am finding it very difficult to follow the speaker and I ask all members on both sides of the House to try to confine their . . . They will all have equal opportunity to speak when the time arises . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Order!

March 5, 1979

MR. GROSS: — I think the members opposite should shape up. Now, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I don't know if that was his complete shopping list, perhaps he can give us the rest of it when he moves Resolution No. 11 — Or is it proposition 13? I wouldn't want to be misinterpreted, Mr. Deputy Speaker. I am not for one moment suggesting that the requests are not reasonable or legitimate from the member for Swift Current (Mr. Ham). But I say to members opposite you can't have it both ways . . .

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. GROSS: — . . . the battle cry for cutting back has to be matched by a clear and precise statement as to where you would cut back and where you wouldn't cut back — not a shopping list, Mr. Ham. Nor is it good enough to say as you did in the election campaign, we'll chop a few political hacks and save hundreds and hundreds and hundreds of millions of dollars. You know that's baloney and the people of Saskatchewan know that's baloney! I say to you tell us where you are going to cut, how much you are going to cut, get out an estimate book and show us the facts.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. GROSS: — I said, Mr. Deputy Speaker, the position of the people opposite on this issue was characterized by the member for Swift Current (Mr. Ham) who was talking out of many different sides of his mouth at the same time. I wouldn't want to make that statement without backing it up, nor would I want my neighboring MLA to think I was singling him out. I went through *Hansard* the other day for since we have been sitting. I don't know if I got every item — I am sure there are some that I have missed — but I put together a list of close to 50 goodies that have been offered to the people of this province by the party opposite. I want to take some time, here, to put them on record so that we have one collection of facts so we don't have to labor through *Hansard* to make our own lists.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, this big, bad government, is like the big, bad wolf, according to the member for Arm River (Mr. Muirhead). On page 152, he says we should fix up saline soil and I agree with him that maybe that is a good idea. I ask the member for Arm River — at what cost and who pays? He also goes on to say that we should pour out dough for supergrid without any guidelines. He says, chuck the guidelines. We don't need any planning. That is the member for Arm River and his plans for supergrid.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I say to members opposite, perhaps you should have a couple of days set aside in your caucus meetings so you can sit down and do a little bit of brainstorming, so you don't come out with such ridiculous statements. Surely the Tory caucus is not saying no guidelines for supergrid!

They go on, Mr. Deputy Speaker. They tell us that we need more money for capital funding for municipalities. The member for Rosetown-Elrose (Mr. Swan), on page 33 and again in his remarks last Friday, was told by the minister that there is a new program being worked out with local government and there are nearly \$19 million left to be allocated or spent in old programs in the meanwhile.

In respect to rural schools and declining enrolment, the member for Indian Head-Wolseley (Mr. Taylor) says on page 175 that we should expand the services, look at alternate patterns of instruction, dream up a few ways to justify the spending. Well, Mr. Deputy Speaker, maybe we should, but I say to members opposite you can't have it both

ways. And what about local boards? Is no responsibility to be placed on them, Mr. Deputy Speaker? I doubt it.

Did the member for Indian Head-Wolseley say we should chop the services of the department in Regina, because of his leader's remarks on page 63, when he seems to decry the fact that part of the education budget was used for central services only? Does the member for Wolseley agree with his leader? Oh, no, he doesn't agree with his leader. On page 137 he tells the Minister of Education to get cracking and put in a program to bring gifted children back to Regina, to the central facility for one month, the month of May — not January or February, but the month of May — to stimulate them because we, as teachers out in the country, can't handle it.

AN HON. MEMBER: — Do you disagree with that?

MR. GROSS: — No, I don't disagree with that necessarily. I say maybe we should do that. Maybe it is a good idea. Have you talked to your local board or your community college yet? I ask him.

Page 107 — the member for Indian Head-Wolseley again. He is full of good ideas, Mr. Deputy Speaker. The Department of Education . . .

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. GROSS: — . . . Just wait, there are lots of expenses with them. The member for Indian Head-Wolseley again displayed his wonderful new ideas. He says the Department of Education should adjust its curriculum. He says, don't talk about philosophy, talk about more important areas — sex, drugs, alcohol and smoking. To him that's more important than the philosophy of some of the educational programs we have today. Well, Mr. Deputy Speaker, maybe we should, but again I point out that there are means to effect the changes that the member for Wolseley (Mr. Taylor) is talking about. We have local boards who have it within their power to make philosophical changes in the areas that he had mentioned — sex, drugs and alcohol. We have local teachers out there who can recommend changes in the education act. There are provincial resources today, Mr. Deputy Speaker, the public health regions and the programs they have related in their areas. They have programs through the Alcoholism Commission to effect the changes he is talking about, but the member for Wolseley conveniently forgets about that. He doesn't take the time to go find out if that is possible. Oh yes, he comes into this House and makes a few speeches and heaps piles and piles of criticism on this provincial government and says, as in his other big speeches out in the country, telling the people out there and broadcasting the fact that we are spending piles and piles of money worthlessly . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Mr. Member for Nipawin (Mr. Collver), I suggest that you ought to keep an eye on that man because he is one of the last of the big time spenders in this province . . .

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. GROSS: — . . . and flies philosophically right in the face of the programs that you are trying to institute in this province.

The member for Arm River (Mr. Muirhead), Mr. Deputy Speaker, is another subject area. He says we need more money for the Outlook Union Hospital. I wonder, Mr. Deputy Speaker, in October if he was out and around the country selling that theory that we should be spending more money on hospitals? Did he say, you know folks, it's our

March 5, 1979

senior governments that have the money and the dough for our hospitals? Did he tell also about the federal government who have cut back hospital spending with the endorsement of the Tory lunk heads as well in Ottawa? Did he tell them that, Mr. Speaker? No, he didn't. Or did he dig out the member for Nipawin's speech about how you can do more and spend less? Did he dig out that speech? A solution to the problem of wanting to spend more money on hospitals is like what the member for Nipawin might want to do. I suggest what he probably would do is hire management associates and they'll show you all you need to know and how you'll never feel the difference.

In page no. 33 of *Hansard*, Mr. Speaker, the member for Wolseley (Mr. Taylor) again, wants more staff for the Lakeside Nursing Home in Wolseley. Page no. 174 — let me quote.

Surely this government would see its way clear to help the people of Broadview establish a much needed senior citizens nursing centre . . .

That's the member for Wolseley again, Mr. Speaker. The boys opposite ought to keep an eye on him because he's again spending money.

Page no. 176 in *Hansard* — another real good, new idea is coming up, Mr. Speaker, from the member for Wolseley. We should start taking a look at medical centres in rural areas, he says. We could have physiotherapists, optometrists, psychologists and dentists operating out of these medical centres. I say to the member, have you ever heard about health care service centres in this province? We opened them up almost four and five and six and seven years ago.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. GROSS: — We opened up health care service centres where the Thatcher government formerly closed hospitals, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. GROSS: — I asked the member for Indian Head-Wolseley (Mr. Taylor) had he ever heard about the vicious attack on those health care service centres that was launched by the member for Nipawin (Mr. Collver) during the estimates last year? But there is more, Mr. Deputy Speaker, they talk about more control, more interference, page 72. The member for Estevan (Mr. Larter), wants more government control. This is a doozer, Mr. Deputy Speaker. He wants the government to control the rate at which snow melts in the spring and the rate that rain falls in the summer.

AN HON. MEMBER: — Yes, and that is a good idea.

MR. GROSS: — . . . and he is telling . . . (inaudible interjection) . . .

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: — Order, order! State your point of order.

MR. LARTER: — Mr. Deputy Speaker, this member for Morse (Mr. Gross) doesn't know what he is talking about.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: — Order, order, that is a point of order.

MR. GROSS: — Page 72 knows what it is talking about in the *Hansard*. Page 72 very clearly says . . . and I asked the member for Estevan (Mr. Larter) to go and read it. He says we must control the rate at which snow melts in the spring, and the rate that rain falls in the summer. Read it, page 72. He tells us not only to do that, but get cracking. And keep the folks back there in the Souris Basin right up to date, and right up to snuff — hour by hour. But while you are doing that, he also tells us, don't interfere. No government control, we'll look after our own in good time, he tells us. He says, don't interfere with us, but if we have needs for insurance claims and compensation spending — be happy to throw it out, but don't spend any more money — be happy to pay out claims, but don't spend any more money.

The member for Nipawin (Mr. Collver). Mr. Deputy Speaker, the chief, over there, wants disclosure laws — and he wants them right now. No fooling around, not tomorrow, not the next day, right now. Well, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I hope we get them, and I hope the member for Nipawin will see them as well and I hope they are rigorous, Mr. Deputy Speaker. I hope they are rigorous because of his own situation. I want to ask him, how can he be asking us for more rigorous laws in conflict of interest when he has to stack up his own deplorable record? How does he stack it up against the drive against more government interference? How does he stack it up against his own admission on page 81 that it is going to cost money? How does he stack it up against his own blind trust brain wave he developed a couple of months ago? How does he stack it up against the answers given to the press in the now famous, 'return from Arizona' press conference when they asked him if the public has the right to know what his business affairs are, and what his business dealings are? Mr. Collver is now asking us for conflict of interest legislation, when three or four months ago, in that press conference he said the public hasn't the right to know. Stack it up, Mr. Leader of the Opposition. And, I ask you if it isn't just a desperate grasp for headlines for the leadership pretention bid?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. GROSS: — Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am prepared to spend the rest of the afternoon here exposing the phony double talk about government interference and government spending.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. GROSS: — Last Friday, there was a member for Rosetown who said that we should put up more financial assistance for the livestock industry and also to ensure that the receipts don't fall below the cost of production. He says don't spend any more money what ever you do, stay away from supply management, stay away from that evil curse in western Canada — marketing boards. After all we know that it was orderly marketing for the grain industry that destroyed that industry — the Canadian Wheat Board. That's Tory logic, that's the kind of logic that this House is being subjected to Mr. Deputy Speaker.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, last Friday, the member for Regina South told us to put up a higher share of level three nursing care costs. He didn't say that he would lay off the harping about the welfare budget or he didn't say that he would advise the member for Qu'Appelle, Mr. Lane, that he would lay off the harping on the welfare budget, to the contrary. In fact, the record will show that the member for Qu'Appelle did not say that and, the member for Regina South has continued in his program, in his favorite sport,

bashing welfare recipients. He became an expert of it during the 1978 campaign.

What about the member for Bengough, I ask you Mr. Deputy Speaker? He asked us to set up a task force to study the state and development of athletics and sport. He said never mind the costs. He said never mind whether we concern ourselves with general physical fitness or physical health. Perhaps, he says we should only provide money for the few, the athletically inclined.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: — Now, I ask the members and I ask the member for Morse to please restore order. I know that in the throne speech we have ample room to speak and to make our remarks about many different things. I would try to deal as carefully as we can with any definite member unless we have the facts and if the member has stated that it was not stated. I would believe that the member must have substantiation for his remarks.

MR. GROSS: — Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker. We do have substantiation for the remarks. Substantiation is in *Hansard* — read it, page 151.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: — Order, order! State your point of order.

MR. R.L. COLLVER (Leader of the Opposition): — The member for Bengough has asked the member for Morse to withdraw his unsubstantiated attack . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . well, if he didn't then I am. I'm asking him to withdraw. I was in this Assembly, Mr. Speaker, when the member for Bengough made his remarks; the member for Bengough said he did not state what the member just said he said and therefore I ask the member for Morse to withdraw his allegation and apologize.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: — Order. Two members may disagree I suppose as to what they think the statement is that has been made and how it has been made and so forth. I do not think that either can ask them to withdraw as such but I ask them to confine the remarks . . . (inaudible noise).

MR. COLLVER: — I asked you to make a ruling on this to examine *Hansard* for what the member for Morse said and to make a ruling on this.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: — I say he said he would substantiate it by *Hansard*; that is good enough for me. Carry on with the debate please.

MR. GROSS: — Mr. Deputy Speaker, the member for Rosetown the other day was telling us that we need more incentive for industry and I agree with him. The member for Maple Creek, Mrs. Duncan, said what about the pittance of only \$100,000 for the Year of the Child? That is the member for Maple Creek. All these little programs mean more money and more government control and more government interference. There is a dandy, Mr. Speaker, on page 70 — the member for Wilkie. He says and I quote, 'How much longer are we going to have to wait' — get this, Mr. Deputy Speaker — 'mandatory firearms safety training program'. Mr. Deputy Speaker, how much would you think it would cost for this kind of a program? Did he say as I'm sure he did during the campaign, this is more compulsion. Oh no, Mr. Deputy Speaker. He said there are 31,000 voters out there and we Tories wanted to get on the board of those 31,000 voters.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I have another quote, another interesting comment from . . . I have another interesting quote from the Chief, from Mr. Collver. He says and I quote:

I praise the Premier for increasing and making the commitment to increase agriculture research.

But, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am surprised, I'm shocked because we're so used to hearing him say, how much is it going to cost? We're so used to him pushing the panic button. We're so used to hearing him tell us that we should batten down the hatches because those guys are spending like wild again.

On page 178 of Hansard, Mr. Speaker, our friend from Wolseley again said he wants the government to take a look at building 85 miles of railroad so we can haul gravel to Regina. Now, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that might be a good idea. I would be pleasantly surprised if he can get that one by the railroad companies and the Canadian Transport Commission (CTC). I would be pleasantly surprised if he would even show up at a CTC hearing in his area to save a line, branch lines that are going to be abandoned. If his performance is anything like the performance of the Tory politician in my area, notably the member for Swift Current and our Tory member of parliament from Swift Current, they don't even show up to help fight and save their branch lines in their areas.

You know, Mr. Deputy Speaker, page 16 for Estevan tells about some more really good ideas on how we should be spending more money and more energy.

AN HON. MEMBER: — What page was that?

MR. GROSS: — Page 16. The member for Estevan tells us that we should spend money to convince the people of Montana — get this, Montana — we should spend money to convince the people of Montana that their air and their water is O.K. Did he express the concerns that might be with the added necessity to spend more money by SPC to do this, costs that would be reflected in SPC rates? Not him, Mr. Deputy Speaker. He joins the howl about the power rates because he figures they are too high when he knows that they are one of the lowest power rates in all of Canada.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. GROSS: — One thing I find interesting, Mr. Deputy Speaker, is that they all want highways. The member for Swift Current (Mr. Ham) had his shopping list; the member for Rosetown (Mr. Swan) had his and all the rest of the Tories had their shopping lists, yet the Minister of Co-operation (Mr. Robbins) tells you they don't want to spend any money. I will not enumerate all the proposals on highway spending. The member for Meadow Lake (Mr. McLeod) says he wants to build more and spend less. The member for Wolseley (Mr. Taylor) says he wants to fix up No. 48 Highway on the Trans-Canada, nothing less than four lanes wide and pave it to the border. Maybe the member for Wolseley should get together with the member for Swift Current. He seemed to think there was something wrong with government operated roads. Maybe the builder from Wolseley and the former businessman from Swift Current could get together and get a little project going. We can have a little private enterprise on those two lanes, Mr. Deputy Speaker, then. They can build it; they can hire a contractor; they can even set up toll gates. Mr. Deputy Speaker, they should do that to see how it works. It is just about as sensible a proposal as building railroads by private enterprise. Why not have some good old-fashioned, pioneering spirit as mentioned by the member for Arm River (Mr. Muirhead).

On page 177 of *Hansard* (this is the member for Wolseley again) he says: 'Look at all the

March 5, 1979

wasteland we have in this province. I've got lots of area in my constituency.' I suggest the members never mind the sloganeering about land grab or birthright or any of those things, he tells us to look at all the wasteland. He said that we should be considering proposals to do something with that wasteland. He tells us that he has an idea and it's a dilly. He says that we should be growing deer on that. He says that we should build a few compounds and we can now get a good deal on deer in New Zealand at \$2,000 a piece and that we should be going ahead with that proposal. That's exactly what we need I think, Mr. Deputy Speaker. Perhaps it would work, I don't know but again more government control and more government spending. The members on this side of the House want to know if we are going to have a deer marketing board.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. GROSS: — The member for Wolseley also puts out press releases. He's good at putting out press releases. He tells us that there is need in this province for more safety provisions, that we need more school bus safety. He never mentions in his press release it is going to cost more money and who is going to pay for it — local boards, provincial government, federal government, who?

The member for Nipawin (Mr. Collver) puts out a press release as well. They are good at press releases. The member for Nipawin put out a press release on January 18. He has another new bright idea. He says we need a program to teach people how to ride snowmobiles — nothing less than \$135,000. He says never mind the cost. He says, pass it on. He says the administration of this program would be simple; it would be a cost-sharing proposal. He went on in his press release to elaborate what that cost sharing was. In conclusion, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I know I haven't listed all the examples that could be listed when it comes to cataloguing the Tory promises for more spending and more government. The list that I quote has only come up since last Friday. I ask the minister in charge of the finance department if he wouldn't mind doing me a favor. I'm sure members on this side of the House and on that side of the House, would like to have all these programs that I enunciated and all the programs enunciated by the Tories in their '78 election campaign . . . I would like to see him price them out. I would like to see the estimate that we would have if we were to do the things that the members opposite want us to do. We would like to see the estimate of their campaign promises.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, the people of this province are tired of the double talk and the flip flop. It may come as a surprise what the government has to do in order to run a government. It has to look at the financial resources at hand and set priorities. Some of the ideas advanced by the members opposite, as by members on this side of the House, may very well be great ideas. But for them to get done is another thing, Mr. Deputy Speaker. The constant theme over there has been don't put all the money that we have in this province into investments for our future. They don't like SMDC (Saskatchewan Mining Development Corporation); they don't like PCS (Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan); they don't like Saskoil; and they don't like Sask Minerals. They forget, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that these are assets owned by the people of this province. They are productive assets and unlike roads or unlike hospitals, they now and will in the future continue to pay the way for our future generations.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. GROSS: — Mr. Deputy Speaker, we soundly reject the notion advanced by the Leader of the Opposition that we should spend money today and not worry about tomorrow. We also reject the notion as I think he does as well, if you examine his

arguments, that these are worthless assets, that they're just holes in the ground. Mr. Deputy Speaker, I ask you if they are worthless assets or they're just worthless holes in the ground, why was he going around in the 1978 election campaign offering shares in holes in the ground? We think for our part, the government has a responsibility to scrutinize spending carefully, particularly in these economic times when we have to be sure that our own house is in order by taking efficiency into account. In that way we believe government can free up a lot of other money for other uses. We can take the money for building lasting assets for the future and for what we stand for as this government. We for our part believe that a dollar prudently spent by the government is a good dollar spent and by anyone else's standards it circulates just as well. It may even be better if we guarantee new jobs or guarantee the existing jobs we have here in this province. Mr. Deputy Speaker, we have been operating on those beliefs and we will continue to operate on those beliefs. We have been doing that and not a lot of flip flopping or double talking to the people of this province. The people of Saskatchewan are tired of the flip flop and double talk and on October 18 they told us to go back for another four years.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. GROSS: — Mr. Deputy Speaker, I agree with the people of Saskatchewan after they have spoken on October 18, and I will therefore support this government and its throne speech.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS

Energy Conservation Challenge

HON. N. VICKAR (Minister of Industry and Commerce): — Mr. Deputy Speaker, under Orders of the Day, I would like to refer to a little incident that happened last weekend in the town of Melfort. Back in February the 15th of this year, the town of Melfort was challenged by the town of Kentville, Nova Scotia, which is similar in size to the town of Melfort, to an energy conservation program lasting three days. The town of Melfort accepted the challenge and, due to the co-operation of the Saskatchewan Power Corporation (SPC), the Saskatchewan Conservation and Energy Branch, the Saskatchewan Research Council, the Universities of Saskatoon and Regina, the Energy, Mines and Resources branch as well as the involvements of local people, I'm glad to report, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that the town of Melfort was victorious in the energy conservation program by saving at least 18 per cent less power than was normal during the course of the year. I would like to go on record, Mr. Deputy Speaker, in commending Melfort on its efforts and also commending the Saskatchewan Power Corporation on its efforts in assisting Melfort to do that which they set out to do. I would like to read into the record the following statement:

That this Assembly congratulate the town of Melfort for accepting the challenge from the town of Kentville, Nova Scotia to a three-day energy conservation program and further that this Assembly congratulate Melfort for winning the three-day contest by conserving approximately 18 per cent less energy than normal. Further, that Melfort be used as an example to the rest of the province that if there is a will there is a way and that the Saskatchewan Power Corporation be commended for its help to Melfort in demonstrating the Government of Saskatchewan's stand on its conservation

March 5, 1979

policy.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

POINT OF PRIVILEGE

Instructions re Ministerial Statements

MR. J.G. LANE (Qu'Appelle): — Mr. Deputy Speaker, before the orders of the day, I would like to raise a point of privilege if I may and that is I would like, Mr. Deputy Speaker, to give to this Assembly some direction as to the form of ministerial statements and the type of procedure because we had discussed this in previous Assemblies as to where the line was to be drawn. I think it would be in order for all members to have their minds refreshed as to what is a ministerial statement and what isn't and the rights of the Assembly in that regard.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: — I can only say to the members of the Assembly that I took that as a ministerial statement and when I called for that I see no reason to . . .

MR. VICKAR: — Mr. Deputy Speaker, I only rose on orders of the day and I think that's what my statement was made on.

The Assembly adjourned at 5 until 7 p m.