

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN
Third Session — Eighteenth Legislature
7th Day

Friday, November 26, 1976.

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

WELCOME TO STUDENTS

Mr. D.G. Banda (Redberry): — Mr. Speaker, it's a great deal of pleasure for me to introduce to you and Members of the House a group of Grade ten, eleven and twelve students from the Blaine Lake Composite High School, who are visiting us here today. They are accompanied by their teacher, Mr. Ralph Eliason and Mr. Neufeld, along with the bus driver, Mr. Wally Kacuiba, from Prince Albert. I understand that they visited the RCMP Barracks this morning and they were at the university. They will be attending the Session here for a while today and then are going to the Museum of Natural History. I certainly hope that the students have an educational trip and that they enjoy themselves here this afternoon.

I'm sure you will join with me in welcoming them and wish them a safe journey home.

Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

QUESTIONS

BORROWINGS BY PROVINCE

Mr. W.C. Thatcher (Thunder Creek): — Mr. Speaker, I would like to address a question to the Minister of Finance. The province will have borrowed by the end of March 31, 1977, an estimated \$318 million. Would the Minister indicate to this House the source of these borrowings, the country that they are coming from and would the Minister tell this House, whether or not this is the highest borrowings in the province's history?

Hon. W.E. Smishek (Minister of Finance): — Mr. Speaker, the Members will recall that in our tabling the Estimates, we also project, and it's included in the Estimates as I recall it, what the province may be borrowing. We have gone to the market three times since the Budget was introduced. We borrowed \$75 million in US funds in the Euro-bond market and just ten days ago we borrowed \$125 million in the US public market, for a total of \$175 million. In addition there is the usual source of borrowing that is available from the Canada Pension Plan, which is available to all the provinces. If my memory serves me right and don't hold me precisely to this figure, we have drawn on that fund to the tune of \$48 million, I think. This may not be the precise figure. The purpose of the borrowings in the Canadian market, the Euro-bond market and the US market was for Saskatchewan Power Corporation and for the SaskTel major capital projects that they have. I think that in the case of the Canada Pension Plan, a portion of the money went to the Saskatchewan Housing Corporation and other such capital needs, for direct Government purposes.

Mr. Thatcher: — Supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. I am sure the Minister is aware that there has been a two per cent drop in Canadian currency in the last seven days. And in view of the fact that the Minister has indicated that a very high proportion of the borrowings have been in US currency, is the Minister not alarmed at this point in time, that if this trend continues, what effect will this have on the province's financial situation?

Mr. Smishek: — Mr. Speaker, indeed we are not worried because as the Canadian interests . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order!

Mr. Smishek: — Mr. Speaker, we are not worried, because as we saw the differences that there have been between the US and Canadian exchange we were aware that because of the Bank of Canada rate coming down we immediately took advantage of a conversion of much of that money into Canadian funds, to make sure that there were no losses. The Hon. Member may not be aware, but if you take the experience over the last 25 years, 14 of those years the Canadian rate was better. I think the historic experience has been, and we do hedge our positions to ensure that there will not be losses.

Mr. Thatcher: — Supplementary. Is the Minister serious in telling this House that they have made such a decision of such major proportions affecting the people of Saskatchewan, on the basis of strictly historical reasons, going back 25 years? And will the Minister kindly tell us how he has hedged? The Minister's answer is incredible and you owe it to this House to tell us how you have hedged a two per cent drop in seven days and if it does continue, the ramifications are obvious? How have you protected, specifically, the interests of Saskatchewan?

Mr. Smishek: — Part of it, Mr. Speaker, has been through the conversion of that money into Canadian funds. The long-term experience as I have indicated to the Hon. Member has been to the advantage of Canada. In the current issue, it's a 30 year loan and surely there will be many, many changes over the next 30 years. It's not a loan that is repayable next year.

Mr. R.L. Collver (Leader of the Progressive Conservatives): — I have a supplementary question and to start with I'm sorry to counter my colleague for Thunder Creek, but the Minister may not be aware and the Member for Thunder Creek may not be aware, but the Canadian dollar has tumbled another three points within the last three hours and it is now at 98.5. On the \$200 million as the Minister is no doubt aware — I'll get to the question, I'll get to the question. This is a matter of urgency, Mr. Speaker. The \$200 million that were borrowed some ten or 15 days ago, the Minister has now lost within the last three hours, \$6 million worth of purchasing power. Is the Minister aware that there is speculation today within the last hour or two, there is speculation today on the street, in the money markets in Toronto, is the Minister aware that there is speculation on the money markets in Toronto that the Canadian

dollar will drop as low as 89 points and that this is being made aware to the Canadian people today?

Mr. Smishek: — Mr. Speaker, if I followed the financial advice of the Hon. Member, the Hon. Conservative Leader, then I suppose I'd be in the same kind of difficulty financially as he is these days.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Smishek: — Mr. Speaker, I did indicate to him and to the House that this is a 30 year loan and I have confidence in this country and I have confidence in this province.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Smishek: — I have confidence in our financial people and the advice that we get. History will show and prove that the borrowings that have been made by Saskatchewan, (we've had the odd little problem when the Leader of the Opposition was Minister of Finance and I'm not blaming him): but by and large the financial position of this province is excellent and the borrowings well secured and hedged in such a way and over an extended period of time, that there is no reason to worry about the borrowings that we have made.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Speaker: — Order! I want to caution Members about, under the guise of asking a question the Member says, "Is the Minister aware," and proceeds to make a statement which in fact is a statement rather than a question. I would caution all Members and I'm not referring to any particular Member now. I could name several who do that and I just want to caution them that they are not allowed to make a statement.

Mr. Collier: — Is the Minister suggesting by his latter statement that because the loans are a 30 year term that the interest payments on those loans are not going to be made currently every year and that as the interest payments on those loans are made, the status of the Canadian dollar is extremely important as it relates to the Province of Saskatchewan?

Mr. Smishek: — Mr. Speaker, certainly the interest will be paid and part of the principal. Mr. speaker, when one considers that today in the Canadian market the interest rate is in the order of ten per cent, I know that it was ten and a quarter or ten and a half just a matter of a few days ago. I know it has dropped, I don't know exactly what the rate is today but in face of the American market rates where we were able to borrow at 8.7 per cent which everybody recognizes is an excellent rate and as good a rate, Mr. Speaker, as good as anyone in this country was able to obtain and in fact better. There was also a preferred position in case of the Euro-bonds where the interest rate with a ten year loan was 8.6 per cent. So, Mr. Speaker, together with our method of financing and the sinking funds there is no reason to worry or to panic.

Mr. Steuart: — Supplementary, is he setting up a sinking fund loan?

Mr. Speaker: — Order!

Mr. Steuart: — He didn't answer the question.

Mr. Speaker: — Order! I heard the question and I am sure everyone else heard it. The Minister doesn't have to answer the question.

Mr. Steuart: — Give him a chance to answer it then. Is this a sinking fund loan?

Mr. Speaker: — I am doing that, if the Member would sit down. You should be sitting down. Order! I think it is quite clear that the rules under which this House operates in the Question Period are available to everyone. The Member asked the question, the Minister has the option of answering the question or not answering it and the Minister had an opportunity to answer the question and he obviously didn't take it.

Mr. S.J. Cameron (Regina South): — A supplementary to the Minister of Finance. Based upon the borrowings you have just outlined and the interest rates you have referred to, would you agree with me that the outflow in interest from the province per day is between \$90,000 and \$100,000?

Mr. Smishek: — Mr. Speaker, I don't know the accuracy of the figure. I would be prepared to check but I don't have the information at hand at the moment.

COAL MINES — ESTEVAN

Mr. R.H. Bailey (Rosetown-Elrose): — There is a story in the Regina Leader-Post as of November 24th and I would like to direct this question to the Minister in charge of the Saskatchewan Power Corporation. I would just like to read this one short statement before the question. It is in regard to the new coal operation in Estevan and it says:

Additional coal will have to be purchased from private companies until the 90 yard shovel is completed.

The question to the Minister in charge of SPC, in light of this announcement by an SPC official, has the Government notified the private companies of their intentions to cease purchasing the coal from their private operations?

Mr. J.R. Messer (Minister of Mineral Resources): — There have, Mr. Speaker, been discussions with the private companies in regard to what effect the purpose of its own mining shovel will have for the Estevan plant. It is expected that most of the coal that will be mined will be for an expansion in the generating capacity of the plant so that the private companies that are there now will not be adversely affected. Certainly there have been discussions and there will continue to be discussions in regard to the division and the

supply of coal.

Mr. Bailey: — A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Did not this same Minister assure this House since the beginning of this current calendar year that every assurance would be given to protect the private companies? The statement that is made in the November 24th issue of the Leader-Post by an SPC official seems to contradict your statement, Sir.

Mr. Messer: — Mr. Speaker, with all due respect to the Hon. Member there has been nothing brought to my attention. I expect there is nothing in the press statement that he bases his question on indicating that the companies are upset or are in any way being adversely affected. If the press release does relate to a company official or a spokesman of the company saying they are upset then I will undertake to pursue that but to my knowledge the companies have indicated no dissatisfaction. I would hope that the Member would get his facts straight before he undertook to misinterpret or mislead this House.

Mr. Bailey: — Mr. Speaker, in view of the response I should like to ask the Minister in charge of the Power Corporation to explain this statement then: “Additional coal will have to be purchased from private companies until the new drag line is completed.” Now if that doesn’t mean that they are phasing out I would like the Minister to interpret the statement.

Mr. Messer: — Mr. Speaker, the Member himself in quoting the article said, “additional coal”. He knows that if he talked to his colleague the Member for Estevan (Mr. Larter): that there is an expansion program being carried out at the thermo plant at Estevan and we are now consuming more coal as more generating capacity is brought into that plant. Additional coal will have to be purchased until our shovels are moved into place. That is not a cutback, Mr. Speaker, and I am sure the Member can understand that if he gives it some thought for the rest of the day.

COMMUNITY PASTURES — INCREASE IN CHARGE

Mr. E.F.A. Merchant (Regina Wascana): — I wonder if the Minister of Agriculture in light of the hard-pressed state of the cattle industry would reconsider the drastic increases in the charges being levied in the community pastures. The notices of these increases are just now being sent. The increases amount, Mr. Speaker, to 30 and 20 and 25 per cent in terms of the per season cost and the price per day per head, seven cents to ten cents. Is that not just an added bite to a hard-pressed industry?

Hon. E.E. Kaeding (Department of Agriculture): — Mr. Speaker, I think that the increase to ten cents was applied last spring. That’s not a new increase which is being applied now.

Mr. Merchant: — Mr. Speaker, the notices of assessment are just not

going and the industry hasn't paid. I wonder if the Minister would not reconsider these increases which were based on the cattle industry in the spring and the industry now is in much worse shape than the industry was in at the time when the increases were planned for whatever reason.

Mr. Kaeding: — Mr. Speaker, I think that would be rather difficult to do. I think you would recognize that a lot of people have already paid their leases for this year and we would have to be retroactive at all of those. We set the rates at the beginning of the year which we thought was a necessary rate to provide back to our department some of the costs which we incurred in running community pastures. And I can assure you that the costs which we are assessing to farmers are not the total costs of the running of those community pastures.

Mr. Merchant: — Does the Minister not agree that it is somewhat inconsistent for the Government on the one hand to have a \$32 million handout and on the other to be kicking the industry in the teeth with these dramatic increases?

Mr. Kaeding: — I can assure the Member that it would be very unfair for us to set up a subsidized rate for people who go into community pastures when it is not possible to put anywhere near all of the cattle in the province into those pastures. And we would simply be saying then to those people who could get in that we are going to give you a subsidy and for those of you who can't get in you are just going to have to make your own way. That wouldn't be fair, would it?

Mr. Merchant: — Final Supplementary. Would it not be more consistent for the Government to plan their fees on the community pastures in the same way as you deal with the grazing fees. The grazing fees go up and down depending upon the price of cattle at the end of the year so that in this year they have gone down by 44 cents per hundred. Would that not be more consistent to have both government programs work in a consistent manner, to go up and down based on cattle prices?

Mr. Kaeding: — Mr. Speaker, the rates are not set at the end of the season for that season. The rates will be set in the spring for next season. The rates last year were set for the 1976 season. The rates are not now being set for 1976.

SLOW DOWN IN ROAD CONSTRUCTION

Mr. Thatcher: — I should like to direct a question to the Minister of Highways and if I may preface my remarks by welcoming him back to the Legislature.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Thatcher: — The Minister has indicated that private contractors in road building construction should not make any plans for expansion in the coming two years. Would the Minister tell this House today whether or not in those remarks he was in effect telling this province to brace themselves for a coming economic

slowdown?

Hon. E. Kramer (Minister of Highways): — No.

Mr. Thatcher: — Would the Minister, supplementary question, Mr. Speaker, excuse me. Would the Minister tell us in view of the fact that much of the planned work for 1976 was never tendered, would he tell us that he is in effect telling the Province of Saskatchewan he is closing down the Department of Highways?

Mr. Kramer: — No.

COW-CALF GRANT INSPECTORS

Mr. E. Anderson: (Shaunavon): — I should like to direct a question to the Minister of Agriculture, (Mr. Kaeding).

Could he tell me how many new personnel are going to be hired to do the inspections on the cow-calf grant and on the calf-cash advance that is announced?

Mr. Kaeding: — No, Mr. speaker, I can't give you a figure on that. It will depend upon how many applications come in and so on.

Mr. Anderson: — Supplementary, Mr. speaker. Would the Minister tell me how these personnel are going to be paid? Are they going to be paid on a contract per herd basis, or are they going to be paid per diem, or what mileage are they going to be paid for?

Mr. Kaeding: — I think, Mr. Speaker, it is based on so much per herd which they are inspecting and they will be expected to pay their own transportation and other expenses.

Mr. Anderson: — Supplementary, Mr. Speaker, could you tell me how much per herd is going to be paid?

Mr. Kaeding: — I am sorry I don't have the exact figure. I think it is something in the neighborhood of \$12 or \$13 per herd.

INCENTIVES FOR OIL DRILLING

Mr. D.M. Ham (Swift Current): — This is to the Minister of Mineral Resources (Mr. Messer). Is the Minister aware that since December of 1973, and in spite of the intended incentives under Bill 42, only three operators with the exception of SaskOil have been involved in deep drilling tests in southern Saskatchewan and that during the same three year period only nine such tests have been drilled?

Hon. J.R. Messer (Minister of Mineral Resources): — No, I am not aware, Mr. Speaker, but I am sure that there was considerable activity in other parts of the province.

Mr. Ham: — Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. It is unfortunate the Minister is not aware of it.

Is the Minister further aware that the expense of such drilling activity causes many service companies to leave Saskatchewan, and some services previously available in my constituency and the Estevan constituency (two examples): now have to be contracted as far away as Medicine Hat, Alberta?

Mr. Messer: — Well, Mr. Speaker, may I say that, No, I am not aware of those specific examples, but I should like to say that due to the negotiations carried out by the Government of Saskatchewan through the Department of Mineral Resources, with the new quota for oil exportation from Canada we have increased the percentage with the introduction of a special quota which will come into place January 1, where we will reduce the total amount of oil shipped out of Canada from 385,000 barrels to 305,000 barrels, but will establish a quote of 125,000 barrels of heavy crude. It is anticipated that for the Swift Current area, for the southwestern part of the province, that we should be able to increase the export from 20 per cent of capacity to something around 75 or 80 per cent. I'm sure, Mr. Speaker, that this will resolve the lack of activity that the Member is now concerned about.

Mr. Ham: — Mr. Speaker, I am wondering if the Minister can assure me and this House then that he will as much as in those words guarantee the return of service rigs to southwestern Saskatchewan?

Mr. Messer: — Well, Mr. Speaker, I cannot guarantee. I said that we have established, after negotiations with the Federal Government, a special quota which will provide for the export of a considerably larger volume of heavy crude oil which is in abundance in the area that the Member makes reference to.

I cannot guarantee that refineries in the United States, the most likely place that this will be exported to, will undertake to take up that quota, but it is certainly a much greater incentive than it has been up to this point in time.

PAYMENT OF MEDICAL SERVICES AND TRANSPORTATION

Mr. Merchant (Regina Wascana): — Has there been a change by the Ministry of Health in the Government policy by which medical services not available in Saskatchewan are paid for by the Government and transportation costs to and from the area where those medical services are available are also paid where those services are not available in this province?

Hon. W.A. Robbins (Minister of Health): — I am not sure I heard the question in total, Mr. Speaker, but I would say the answer is, Yes.

Mr. Merchant: — There has been a change in the policy? My understanding was that medical services and transportation costs were paid

by the Government. Are you saying that there is now a change in that policy?

Mr. Robbins: — No, I am sorry, I didn't hear your question correctly. I am saying the policy has not been changed and that transportation costs are on occasion paid.

Mr. Merchant: — Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Minister would comment on a situation of which he is personally aware, a young Reginian, 16 years of age, who is suspected of having a brain tumor, went to Alberta taking three chairs in a plane for a stretcher, nurses had to go with him. He was sent by Dr. Michael Spooner and Dr. Kumar and the Ministry of Health refused to pay the transportation costs or the costs of the CAT scan (the computerized X-ray): that has to be done in that province.

Mr. Robbins: — I am not aware of that particular situation. I shall look into it.

Mr. Merchant: — Mr. Speaker, a supplementary. Is the Minister suggesting that you have not been contacted personally by the . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order, order!

PROVINCE'S DAIRY INDUSTRY

Mr. L.W. Birkbeck (Moosomin): — Mr. Speaker, a question for the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Kaeding).

Is the Minister and his Government taking any positive immediate action to save this province's dairy industry from total extinction?

Mr. Kaeding: — Mr. Speaker, I think that the Member is aware that the dairy industry in this province is one of the industries which is probably the healthiest of all industries in agriculture in the province.

I recall a speech that he made in Yorkton just a few days ago when he indicated that the dairy industry was the healthiest of all industries. I am rather surprised that that question came from the Member.

Mr. Birkbeck: — Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. I will agree that the potential health of the dairy industry in this province is there, but my question is:

Mr. Speaker: — Order, order! I would ask the Member to hasten to the question because he is really debating the issue.

Mr. Birkbeck: — In light of the fact that in 1971 this province was allocated 15.6 million pounds of fluid milk quota, or industrial milk quota and because of a 22 per cent cutback by the Federal Minister of Agriculture we are now down to 8.8 and I think that's pretty serious. Now what is this Provincial Government going to do?

Mr. Kaeding: — Mr. Speaker, I believe that he is aware that the industry has available to it assistance through the FarmStart Program, which is available to all special industries and I think that we have supported the industry quite substantially in this province. We have had grants for conversions from ordinary cream production into milk production and I think that's the kind of support that the industry needs. If they haven't chosen to add on to their industry well I am sure that the farmers will make that decision themselves.

INTRODUCTION OF GUEST

Hon. E. Kaeding (Saltcoats): — Mr. Speaker, I should like at this time to ask for your indulgence. I understand that in the gallery there is the Commissioner of Agriculture for the State of North Dakota by the name of Myron Just and I should like him to stand if he is in the Speaker's Gallery.

Hon. Member: Hear, hear!

ADJOURNED DEBATES

ADDRESS-IN-REPLY

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion by Mr. Lange (Bengough-Milestone): and the proposed amendment thereto moved by Mr. Wiebe (Morse): and the proposed sub-amendment thereto moved by Mr. Larter (Estevan), for an Address-in-Reply.

Mr. R.E. Nelson (Assiniboia-Gravelbourg): — Mr. Speaker, I should like to join in the debate on the Throne Speech in this Third Session of the Eighteenth Legislature of Saskatchewan.

I should first like to congratulate the two new Cabinet Ministers on their appointments to the largest Cabinet ever in Saskatchewan. I was particularly interested in the change in the portfolio of Industry and Commerce and the Minister in charge of SEDCO. The new Minister is a successful businessman in his own right and let us hope he will get some practical business practices into SEDCO . . .

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Nelson: — . . . and possibly we can expect a substantial reduction in the lending losses that have been so common under the former Minister.

I am disappointed in the contents of the Throne Speech, but I am not at all surprised. Mr. Speaker, in the history of Saskatchewan we have never experienced a Government, nor a Cabinet, nor a Premier so arrogant. We have never had communities and individuals so mistreated, ignored and misled as this NDP Government is doing.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Nelson: — In the constituency of Assiniboia-Gravelbourg, which

I have the pleasure to represent, the people of Willowbunch were very much concerned when they heard the RCMP detachment may be moved from their community. I personally appealed to the Attorney General on more than one occasion to leave the RCMP detachment in Willowbunch, where it has been for over 90 years.

The population of Willowbunch has grown over the last few years and this year there are some 15 to 20 families that have moved into town. The Attorney General ignored all pleas from the citizens of that town. He made excuses and weak they were. The Attorney General claimed Willowbunch didn't have enough trouble. The area was too law-abiding.

Mr. Speaker, does this sound like a responsible MLA let alone the Attorney General of Saskatchewan? The Hon. Attorney General became very indignant when the citizens of Willowbunch suggested there would be more troubles and problems in the area if the RCMP were not there. He said he wouldn't buy that argument and wanted to hear no more of such reasoning. Hear more he did, and quickly. And it happened in Regina when the city police went on strike. Complete chaos. Within a week after the RCMP detachment were taken from Willowbunch, there was one break-in and another attempted, while our Attorney General refused to discuss this possibility just a few days before. Then he tells us his hands were tied. The RCMP wanted to move and he couldn't stop them. That's hogwash, Mr. Speaker.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Nelson: — If the Hon. Attorney General was honest with my constituents he would have told them he has the power to tell the RCMP where they will have detachments and where they will stay.

The citizens of Willowbunch were honest and fair people. They did not ask that Coronach not have a detachment of the RCMP. The people of Coronach asked for the RCMP, but not at the expense of Willowbunch. The Attorney General claimed there could not be detachments in both places because there would have to be an increase in staff and this couldn't happen.

Mr. Speaker, again our Attorney General was fooling the people. Already the staff has been increased in Coronach after the detachment was moved from Willowbunch. There were two RCMP in Willowbunch, there are now five on staff in Coronach.

Mr. Speaker, the toughest pill of all to swallow was when the Attorney General wilfully misled the citizens of my constituency, and in particular a young high school student who wrote him asking that the detachment be left in Willowbunch. And I want to quote from a letter from the office of the Attorney General sent to a high school student in Willowbunch. The letter is dated April 1st, 1976, in Regina, and I quote:

I write to acknowledge receipt of your letter dated March 29th, 1976, concerning the RCMP detachment at Willowbunch. Your earlier letter has also been brought to my attention. While I appreciate your concern, I am unable to provide you with further information at this time. It is because I consider this to be a matter of importance that it is still under consideration and no decision has yet been reached.

Thank you for making your views on this matter known to me.

Yours truly,

Roy J. Romanow, Attorney General.

Yes, Mr. Speaker, is it any wonder after reading this letter, which stated the matter was under consideration and no decision had yet been made, that this young student wanted some honest answers. In his other hand he held a road map, 1976 Saskatchewan road map. Yes, a map that had been sent to the printers in late 1975. A map that was on every MLA's desk in this Legislature early in the year, long before the Attorney General's letter of April 1st, 1976. Mr. Speaker, this map shows the locations of RCMP detachments in the province. It shows no detachment in Willowbunch and it indicates one in Coronach. The move of the detachment did not take place until June, 1976 — the decision was finalized in 1975. The Attorney General of this province misled and was not honest with the people of my constituency and I ask him to publicly apologize for his actions.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Nelson: — I also ask that the detachment be placed in the town of Willowbunch where the council have continually paid the province in the range of \$7,000 to \$8,000 per year for police service.

Mr. Speaker, on January 8th this year in the town of Coronach a fire levelled the school leaving only a part of it. It destroyed the library, the laboratories, the home economics rooms and many others. Nearly 11 months later in this area the students and teachers are crowded into small areas half the size of a regular classroom. They are without library, labs, home economic facilities, proper washrooms and many other items. Not a brick has been laid in the town to build a school. Yes, Mr. Speaker, this is in Coronach where the Government has predicted the population will triple and much of it in the next year.

Yes, the school administration is under jurisdiction of local governments, in this case the Borderland School Unit. I want to make it crystal clear at this time that the chairman and board members of this school unit are very able, devoted and conscientious trustees. They have been working frantically to get new classrooms and facilities into the area to accommodate the student population of the area.

The Department of Education of the Province of Saskatchewan has held up all progress and has refused to allow the board to proceed with the building of their school. I was, as was the Member for Milestone-Bengough (Mr. Lange): asked to go with the board to meet the Department of Education. We could hardly believe our ears when we were told after 40 minutes of futile discussion that some bureaucrat had been given orders that no building was to proceed until the cost per square foot was below \$50. There was no concern where the building was located, how large the building was, what type of construction, just the cost per square foot.

While this Government buys potash mines in the hundreds of millions of dollars and builds unnecessary spacious government buildings all over this province, many in the range of well over \$100 per square foot, they deny a locally employed school

unit the right to decide to build a school in Coronach, an area where the population is rapidly expanding because of the Poplar River plant built by the Saskatchewan Power Corporation.

Mr. Speaker, I want to tell you how the Department of Education plans to give this unit board permission to build. Yes, they must get below \$50 per square foot. They must remove the shelves from the library, they must remove the lockers, they must remove the millwork from the construction expense. This is only done to reduce the cost per square foot. All these items were actually just transferred to another column, so that the Department could appear to be holding the line on building costs. Not one cent is saved in this manoeuvre, but what did happen was that the building project so vital to Coronach, was held up for several months. The real losers are the children of the Borderland School Unit who have been crowded into inadequate facilities waiting for government and government bureaucrats to stop fooling the public and allow locally elected people to make decisions.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Nelson: — The local board of this school unit are experienced, long-time trustees. They are very able and knowledgeable in their capacity as trustees. Mr. Speaker, it is scandalous when some bureaucrat tells these people they are lay people and they do not understand when the trustees question the unnecessary delay in replacing that Coronach school.

Mr. Speaker, I suggest to the Minister of Education (Mr. Tchorzewski): that he begin to run the Department himself. The bureaucrats in the Department are making the decisions. The Minister should give back to the trustees the right to make local decisions.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Nelson: — These people have been elected by ratepayers and are very much more capable and more knowledgeable on the local situation, than are the civil servants sitting in their spacious offices in Regina. Another example, Mr. Speaker, of a Minister who has forgotten what democracy is all about, is certainly the Minister in charge of the Sask Power Corporation.

For some two years, farmers and local governments in the Poplar River power project have been ignored and have received very shabby treatment. Expropriation is the order of the day with this Minister. Common sense and verbal negotiations could have obtained the necessary farm land for this project. The Minister in charge continually ignores and refuses to listen to reasonable requests. He lays down guidelines much too stringent and harsh for anyone to accept, then sends out civil servants to try to enforce them while he hides in his office in Regina or gets lost in some other part of Saskatchewan.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Nelson: — To date not a single farmer has been paid one cent through a negotiated agreement and the Minister will be using the expropriation process to obtain the necessary farm lands in the near future again.

Individual farmers have had their wells ruined by the pumping at the mine site and to date have not had a suitable water supply replaced. I questioned the Minister in this Assembly as well as in Crown Corporations Committee warning him of this problem and that it should be looked after, but it was to no avail. I would urge the Minister to have supplies of water available in the entire mining area because most wells are already affected. While there has been some drilling done and some monitoring as well, it has been too little and always too late. Leaving a farm without household water is unforgivable, but it is happening in the municipality of Hart Butte.

This, Mr. Speaker, is by no means the only concern in the RM of Coronach. For two full years the council has expressed its viewpoint to the Government, but it was to deaf ears. When the Member for Rosemont (Mr. Allen): was so proud of cheap hearing aids that were being made available, I suggest he give a few to the Cabinet of this Government, they are not listening to the anxieties of the people of Saskatchewan and certainly not to the people of my constituency.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Nelson: — What happened to Hart Butte municipality this spring? They were cut back some \$9,000 in grants, when in the name of restraint this Government transferred their fight on inflation to the backs of all local governments in Saskatchewan. But, Mr. Speaker, when they had the gall to cut back grants of a rural municipality that had been called upon to double its effort because of a government project, this was unforgivable.

This municipality has been robbed of much of its tax base through expropriation, the ratepayers of the area were forced from their homes on little notice, their pastures were expropriated and the fences were opened. Cattle had to be sold on a depressed market because of this ruthless action, farm homes were left without water. Roads have been ruined by the heavy traffic from the construction equipment. This Government ran roughshod over the municipal council and their long-standing rights.

The Premier of this province agreed to meet them but forgot to show. The Minister in charge of SPC couldn't find time to talk to this frustrated council. This RM had been forced to raise their mill rate to the highest of any municipality in our province.

In their frustration they asked for an immediate meeting with the Government of Saskatchewan to settle problems and to clarify the situation. Copies of a letter were sent to the Premier, the Minister of Municipal Affairs and the Minister in charge of SPC. The Premier answered saying the other two Ministers would be contacting them with respect to their problems. The Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. MacMurchy): answered saying, no doubt Mr. Messer will deal with the matter. And what of the Minister in charge of SPC, Mr. Messer? He went to the Leader-Post and assured the public, the problem wasn't serious and discussion would take place at an appropriate time.

The RM of Hart Butte No. 11 took the only route left to them, Mr. Speaker. They closed their roads to the project under construction until the Minister agreed to meet with them.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Nelson: — The Minister tried tongue-lashing this local government into submission, then sent his usual hordes of civil servants to the area, but to no avail. This council had been wronged and they were determined to get some justice.

Finally after the Minister wasted time needed on the project, costing Saskatchewan citizens thousands of dollars, he agreed to a meeting and the barricades were taken down. What has come of these meetings? The Minister has agreed to pay a portion of the bills of expenses SPC accumulated over the past two years, but of the future — nothing.

Yes, Mr. Speaker, seldom in the history of this province have we witnessed such abuse of the rights of individuals and of local government as we have seen here.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Nelson: — Seldom have critical situations been so completely ignored by Ministers of a government. So many things have been left in limbo. Many questions are left unanswered.

Why should a government pay thousands of dollars to try to clear fence lines and debris from the bottom of a lake when it could have been done before the water got there? Why were buildings left in the lake when they could have been removed or burnt before the water was there, again, an additional cost of thousands of dollars. When will this Government stop running roughshod over the rights of local governments?

In the Throne Speech we are told work is proceeding for a power project on the Saskatchewan River in the Nipawin area. I would at this time plead with the Premier and the Minister in charge of SPC to learn from their mistakes in the Coronach area.

Treat people as if they are citizens of a free country.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Nelson: — Consult and work with local authorities. Negotiate early and forget expropriation. Meet with concerned groups and don't ignore problems. Anticipate problems in advance and don't wait until it happens, for solutions. Clean the reservoir before the water is in it to protect the environment.

I would ask the Minister in charge of SPC to try to understand that the Coronach situation is not settled. There are hundreds of issues left unsolved and I offer him my assistance in helping.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Nelson: — Action is needed to prevent further confrontation in the area.

To the Member for Bengough-Milestone, who warned us of his fears of the cookie monster when he watches Sesame Street, I want to tell him there is a much more dreaded monster in our

midst. That monster is the Premier, the Cabinet of this province and their hordes of bureaucrats.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Nelson: — That monster is trampling the freedom and democracy in Saskatchewan and gobbling up the rights of individuals and local authority.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Nelson: — That monster is abusing and putting fear into the industrial section of our province. That monster with its greed for power is taking control of the lives of all Saskatchewan citizens. That monster, Mr. Speaker, must and will be sent to that bone yard mentioned by the Hon. Member for Regina Rosemont (Mr. Allen). It will be sent there in the next election by the people of Saskatchewan in favor of the Saskatchewan Liberal Party.

I will not support the motion, I will support the amendment.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. F.J. Thompson (Athabasca): — Mr. Speaker, fellow Members of the Legislative Assembly. It is a pleasure for me to congratulate the Government on the Speech from the Throne.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Thompson: — In these uncertain times, Saskatchewan people can be secure in the knowledge that they have strong, stable, responsible leadership.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Thompson: — It demonstrates again the deep concern of this Government that the best interests of Saskatchewan people are protected and developed in a manner that is fair and equitable for all the people in the province. It assures the people of this province of a continuing commitment to the best health care program in this country. In agricultural support programs, highway safety, cultural and recreational programs, education and resource policy, the thoughtful and dynamic leadership of this Government has once again clearly set out an intelligent and logical workable future for the people of this province.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Thompson: — It is with a great deal of pride that I also congratulate my colleagues, from Regina Rosemont and Bengough-Milestone for their excellent speeches in reply to the Speech from the Throne.

I should like to congratulate the two new Cabinet Ministers, the Hon. Member for Melfort (Mr. Vickar): and the Hon. Member for Arm River (Mr. Faris). I am sure they will make a worthwhile contribution to the Cabinet and to the people of

November 26, 1976

Saskatchewan.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Thompson: — I should also at this time like to congratulate the Uranium City Men and Women's softball teams for winning the North West Territories' championships.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Thompson: — I am also pleased that the Department of Northern Saskatchewan assisted in a \$4,000 travel grant so that the teams could travel to the Dominion finals in Quebec.

Mr. Speaker, I will now direct my remarks to the excellent record of the Blakeney Government in northern Saskatchewan. In particular, the constituency of Athabasca, which I have the honor to represent.

The northern housing program has been highly successful. To date, 490 units have been constructed. I point out that these 490 units are for public housing for the residents of northern Saskatchewan. By the end of the year 1977 the Department of Northern Saskatchewan will have constructed 625 for northern people.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Thompson: — I might also add at this time, Mr. Speaker, that over 90 per cent of the labor to build these 625 homes were northern native people.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Thompson: — The northern housing program in northern Saskatchewan is also carrying out a rural rehabilitation assistance program for the people of northern Saskatchewan. This I might add, Mr. Speaker, is another highly successful program.

I will now turn to a very important aspect of northern development — transportation. This year an amount of \$500,000 has been approved for airfield improvements. A sum of \$395,000 has been expended to date and it is expected that the full approved sum will be expended by the end of the year. These improvements have taken place at Pinehouse, Patuanak, Fond-Du-Lac and Camsell Portage. In addition to these major projects, minor improvements were carried out at Stoney Rapids and Wollaston Lake. This is another part of the philosophy of the Department of Northern Saskatchewan to de-isolate northern communities.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Thompson: — In addition, this Government has emphasized providing all weather roads to several previously isolated communities. The approved program for this fiscal year is \$3,216,000. This in turn will generate 106 man years of employment in northern Saskatchewan. The major projects include the road to Patuanak, the Pinehouse access road, the Stanley Mission access road and

the Stoney Rapids access road to Black Lake. Engineering on future projects is underway regarding access roads to Dillon-Michele village areas, Cumberland House to Sturgeon Landing and several resource roads.

Mr. Speaker, when I view the fantastic job being done by this Government in the area of transportation in the North, it brings to mind some comments concerning transportation made at the recent Progressive Conservative convention in Saskatoon and reported in the Star-Phoenix, and I quote:

Consideration must be given to building a railway through northern Saskatchewan to Uranium City according to a draft policy proposal study by Progressive Conservatives at their weekend convention in Saskatoon. The railbed could possibly be owned by the provincial government just as are the highways with the rolling stock owned by the railway companies or interests involved in northern Saskatchewan.

Obviously, Mr. Speaker, this must either be an attempt at a poor joke on the part of the Members opposite or they know no more about the geography of the northern half of this province than they do about management and administration of the service stations and hotel business.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Thompson: — Surely the Hon. Members opposite could not seriously consider such a proposal knowing such things as the fact that it is an area with cliffs running north and south along the north shore of Lake Athabasca which runs east and west, with 100 miles of mountainous rock. As well as this, the Hon. Member for Nipawin speaks in the House continually about local autonomy. This Government set up the machinery for local autonomy in northern Saskatchewan through the Northern Municipal Council. To date no person on that council has ever asked for a railroad. Perhaps the Hon. Member has visions of driving the last spike, Mr. Speaker.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Thompson: — I would suggest he stick to thumbtacks if this is all that he can propose for the North.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Thompson: — We have listened to the excellent record of Saskatchewan in resource development in the southern part of the province. I would like to take this opportunity to add to that excellent record, the achievements made in resource development in the North over the past year.

The Saskatchewan resource development program related to fisheries, continues to promote greater economic returns to the fisherman, more employment and ensure continued economic potential for the people of northern Saskatchewan.

The work of the Government has emphasized good conservation and sound management of the resources of the North. An increase has taken place in the sport fishing activity as well as in

commercial production this past summer. Increased commercial production can be attributed to a great extent to the province's contribution to the Fish Transportation Equalization Support Program, where fishermen are assured of the same price for their fish in northern points as the fishermen near Prince Albert.

This Government has granted a total of \$675,000 to this program, of which \$32,000 has been allocated to the transportation equalization program.

In forestry, the lumber market which has been in a slump since last winter is experiencing a gradual recovery. With stud prices increased approximately \$33 per thousand over last year, it is expected that the contractors from around Green Lake and Canoe Lake will provide upwards of six million FMB for the Green Lake mill as well as stud material for the Meadow Lake sawmill and the Prince Albert Pulp Company.

This Government is also concerned with reforestation. In the spring and fall of this year 553,425 trees were planted in two locations, north of Green Lake and south of Cumberland House. Drag scarifications to ensure natural regeneration has been carried out on 750 acres and over 350 acres have been prepared to planting in the future. Over 70 per cent of the employees of the resource branch are of native ancestry. This has been, is, and will continue to be a primary goal of this Government in northern development.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Thompson: — The story of northern resource development, Mr. Speaker, is one that this Government can be proud of today. I listened with interest when the Premier mentioned in his remarks the other day that in the year 1970-71, the year before this Government first took office, the total revenues to the province from non-renewable resources was \$32.5 million, and that in 1975-76 these resources contributed \$304 million in government revenues.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Thompson: — An increase of \$270 million, a record all of Saskatchewan can be very proud of.

Northern Saskatchewan is a place where resource development is taking place. Much of the revenues earned from northern resources goes a long way to pay for the many and various programs this Government has initiated, expanded and upgraded in the North. It is very pleasing to me as a northerner to see that the North is paying its way and helping to mold a brighter future for this province.

Contrast this record with that of the Conservative Government of Ontario's sellout of their northern resources to the Reed Pulp and Paper Company. Mr. Speaker, 18,900 square miles of forest handed to one company by a Conservative Government, a company, Mr. Speaker, with the worst pollution record of any company in the Dominion of Canada, a company that has so polluted the English River system with poisonous mercury in northern Ontario that it will be generations before people will be able to eat the fish. One company given a licence by a Conservative

Government that is twice the size of any other company's total holdings in the province.

I find it interesting how the Opposition keep referring to the civil servants in Saskatchewan. I want to quote out of an article from the Leader-Post dated November 25, "Hiring Freeze in New Brunswick."

A freeze has been placed on hiring in most New Brunswick government departments, says JeanMarie Simard, President of the Provincial Treasury Board. Mr. Simard said New Brunswick has a large civil service, about 32,000 employees for a province of only 680,000.

That is a Conservative Government.

In Saskatchewan with a population of 925,000, we have 14,505 civil servants.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Steuart: — How many have you got?

Mr. Thompson: — 14,505, as of June, 1976. Can the people of northern Saskatchewan, Mr. Speaker, expect anything different from Conservatives here? Compare this sellout to the Reed Paper Company in northern Ontario by those champions of free enterprise with the record of this Government in northern Saskatchewan. It is obvious that the future of this province is best handled by a sensitive government such as this one.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Thompson: — Mr. Speaker, I now want to turn to communications. I want to congratulate SaskTel for what they have done in northern Saskatchewan.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Thompson: — Through SaskTel's northern communication program started in late 1972, SaskTel will have spent \$18.6 million by the end of 1977. In 1971, Mr. Speaker, there was not one community in the Athabasca constituency that had access to telephone service. Now thanks to an NDP Government, there is direct dialling in just about every community, both large and small. By the end of 1977 there will be phones even in the smallest communities.

Also thanks to SaskTel's microwave system, the CBC has installed TV equipment on the towers, and now the west side from Green Lake to La Loche have TV services for the first time in history.

Mr. Speaker, I would also like to congratulate SaskTel on the excellent choice of the front cover of the 1976 telephone book, on display here today. Mr. Speaker, this is a picture of the Clear Water Valley near La Loche, a place where Alexander MacKenzie explored for the North West Trading Company and called the most beautiful place in Canada. I am pleased to announce that a freeze is now in place in the Clear Water Valley, and this virtually assures that the Valley will remain in its

natural state.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, I will be opposing the amendments and will certainly be supporting the motion.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. G. McNeill (Meadow Lake): — Mr. Speaker, Members of the Legislature, I am pleased to be able to speak to you at this time, during the Third Session of the Eighteenth Legislature of Saskatchewan. My message today is to pass on congratulations and give thanks and offer recommendations on behalf of my constituents.

Let it not be forgotten that I am here to make sure that the people of the Meadow Lake constituency have a fair and regular representation in the business of the province.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. McNeill: — Since the 11th of June, 1975 election, at which time I was elected a Member of the Legislature I have been proud to represent the people who had the confidence to elect me.

Up until now, it has been an easy task for me to give good representation because for 11 years prior to the 1975 election, the people I represent today had very little or no representation that they could count on to present their case. As time passes, I am sure that my job will become more difficult once the people realize they have a voice in Regina. I only hope that I will be able to continue to fulfill the needs of my constituents.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to express admiration and respect for David Lange, the Member for Bengough-Milestone who moved the Speech from the Throne and Bill Allen the Member for Regina Rosemont who made a credible seconder to Mr. Lange's motion. It is gratifying to know that we have young, energetic and capable Members who can complement and add flavor to our already excellent Cabinet.

Recently, when Mr. Blakeney announced two new appointments to his Cabinet, I am sure he must have had a difficult decision to make, because of the many backbenchers who have qualities which are necessary to make a sound and responsible Cabinet Minister.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. McNeill: — Mr. Speaker, I wish to give my personal congratulations to Dr. Don Faris, Member for Arm River and Norm Vickar, Member for Melfort. Don Faris with his humanitarian beliefs and warm approach to the public, will do well with the Department of Continuing Education. The department which is now in the hands of Mr. Faris is an exciting and fairly new portfolio, where people are dealt with on a personal level. The people of the grassroots areas dictate what happens and may this continue to be the case. Don't allow bureaucracy to take hold and ruin a department that is functioning as it should.

Mr. Speaker, Norm Vickar with his good business sense and many years of experience as a manager of private business has

all the necessary tools to make the Department of Industry and Commerce work. As a former mayor of Melfort, I am certain he understands the needs of the industry in rural Saskatchewan. Mr. Vickar is likely the best possible choice for the portfolio to which he was appointed.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. McNeill: — To the Hon. Don Faris and the Hon. Norm Vickar, I wish you the best of luck and continued success in all your endeavors.

Mr. Speaker, people throughout the Meadow Lake constituency have asked me to congratulate Mr. Blakeney and his colleagues on the fine job they have done in carrying out the business of Saskatchewan, as well as implementing a wide array of programs for the benefit of the residents of this province. There are a few provincial happenings that I should like to give honorable mention to: the cow-calf program which will give a grant of \$50 per cow to the cow-calf operators who qualify under this program. This is no remedy to the devastating situation, but it is good provincial help in a situation which should have been cleaned up by the Federal Government. October 29, 1976, marked a great day in Saskatchewan history, and that was the purchase of the Duval Potash Mine near Saskatoon, and was the first major step in Saskatchewan of people acquiring control over their own resources. Ever since the first discovery of potash in 1943, Saskatchewan residents have been getting ripped off by the foreign owned corporations, and I am pleased to see that now the financial gain from most of Saskatchewan resources will stay within the province, to benefit the people who live here . . .

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. McNeill: — . . . and should have control over their own destiny.

The Saskatchewan Recreational Cultural Facilities Grant Program which was announced recently by the Hon. Member for Humboldt makes another promise of the New Deal 1975 come true. This grant will provide valuable assistance to rural constituencies that are often left without facilities because of the lack of financial support, \$26 million can go a long way when you think there was nothing available prior to this grant. For example, if the Meadow Lake area decide to build a curling rink and their application was approved, the grants under this new program could mean as much as \$100,000.

Everybody in Saskatchewan wants a better selection on television as soon as possible, but many are puzzled by the controversies surrounding the introduction of cable television. If cable television is controlled by private operators, as Ottawa says it should be, it will never be seen outside of the major urban centres in this province. The Saskatchewan Government is determined that television should serve all the people of this province, not those in big urban centres. That is why we agree that it is important to establish it now, the right of the people of this province to expand and develop cable television so that all may share in the returns of quality and province-wide television service.

I mention these provincial programs because they seem to be the most significant to the people in Saskatchewan in my area.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the people in Saskatchewan for seeing fit to construct a 20-unit senior citizens villa in Loon Lake. The approval of another 20-unit senior citizen villa in Pierceland. In Goodsoil, a six-classroom addition to the school, which was badly needed is under construction at the cost of \$460,000.

In the area of transportation, Mr. Speaker, the Meadow Lake people now have the finest airport in this section of the province, with a hard-surface access road from the town to the airport. Road construction and improvements over the past year in the constituency have doubled to what the Liberal representation was able to deliver in 11 years. It is also fitting to mention the assistance that has been provided for industries to start in northwestern Saskatchewan.

While speaking about my constituency, I think it is only fitting that I acknowledge the flexible and the co-operative staff of the Saskatchewan Forest Products. At the town of Meadow Lake there is a planer mill which employs about 25 people from the town and the surrounding areas. The employees of this mill received letters that their services would no longer be required as the mill was closing. As you can imagine, Mr. Speaker, the uproar from the disillusioned employees. So when they contacted me, we immediately asked the top officials of the Saskatchewan Forest Products to come to Meadow Lake so that the town and the employees could present their case. As requested the representatives of the Saskatchewan Forest Products came to us so that they could learn our side of the situation. And after lengthy sharing of information and firm debating it was decided that the closing of the mill was premature, and it would remain open for possibly another three years and possibly longer.

Mr. Speaker, this is an excellent example of the attitude and willingness to listen on the part of the corporations which are set up by the Blakeney team. The administration has a feeling for people who count. They do not try to save by holding on to their original decisions, they listened, they agreed and changed their decision because of the clarification on the situation they possibly did not fully understand.

Mr. Speaker, I should like to pass out some other congratulations which I feel are due and deserve recognition. First, I wish to congratulate Mr. Lane, the Liberal, pardon me, the Conservative Member for Qu'Appelle. He should be credited with the ability to recognize a lame duck that can no longer serve a useful purpose in its flock. Mr. Lane being a Member who is concerned with conservation and environment, I am sure realizes that as in nature, a lame duck must be removed from its nest. And as a co-operative Member he is more than willing to accommodate and fill this vacancy.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank Mr. Collver, the Member for Nipawin, for showing the people of Saskatchewan that he has some sound accounting practices up his sleeve. The sound accounting practices which the Progressive Conservative Leader offered would run a deficit of \$1.8 million to the province. I don't think we can really use this though, because in Saskatchewan, we have had governments which have offered and met balanced budgets for more years than Dick Collver has lived in Saskatchewan.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. McNeill: — Of course if the province did run a deficit, Mr. Collver could likely balance it by chipping in some money from his consulting firms.

Mr. Speaker, my final condemnation goes to the duet of Anthony Merchant, the Member for Regina Wascana and Theodore Malone, Member for Regina Lakeview. After years of effort the NDP no longer have to try to disorganize the Liberal Party, they are finally doing it themselves. I hope the Member for Regina Lakeview will forgive me, but I must throw my support behind Mr. Merchant, for if he wins the leadership of this race the Saskatchewan Liberal Party will be surely split and become disorganized and lie down and die. When residents of Saskatchewan go to the polls in the next provincial election there will be only two parties to vote for.

Mr. Speaker, my goals for the Meadow Lake constituency are fair and within reason. It is my hope that the Provincial Government will work with me to realize these goals.

Prior to the next provincial election, I will work toward having Highway No. 4 surfaced from Glaslyn to the southern boundary of the Meadow Lake Provincial Park, so that residents and tourists may travel on a safe highway.

At present the economic life of the Meadow Lake constituency is 75 per cent agriculture. It is my hope in the near future we can complement this economy in this northwestern Saskatchewan area by some increased industrial base and therefore almost eliminate unemployment in that section of the province.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. McNeill: — Being less specific, I promise my constituents that I will work toward expanded support to cow-calf operators, who have been in a less than desirable situation for the last couple of years because of the Federal Government's inability to act on the situation or maybe it's a case, they don't know it's happening.

On agriculture, I urge the Government to use their discretion and not increase agricultural leases to farmers and ranchers at a time when the agricultural picture is far from bright. The cause of this is mostly through Otto Lang and the ineffectiveness of the Federal Government.

At the introduction of the next provincial budget, I will fully outline the needs of the Meadow Lake constituency and what my approach and recommendations are to each of these goals.

On behalf of my constituents, Mr. Speaker, I will relay their wishes to the Provincial Government. At present, the messages I get from my constituency are, ask the province to tell Ottawa that we oppose inland terminals. What we want is order restored to our once organized grain marketing system and that we desperately need a federal beef stabilization program, because no matter what the province does, we need the help of our country as a whole. It is only a short term solution to pay out grants to cow-calf operators, the cure must come when the Federal Government takes us seriously and stops importing cheap beef.

November 26, 1976

It is gratifying to know that support for the New Democratic Party has grown by leaps and bounds in the Meadow lake constituency.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. McNeill: — I'm sure that this is true throughout the province.

It seems a puzzle to me that some people who are puzzled are the party diehards who support the Liberals and the Conservatives. There is no puzzle to the New Democrats. They can see there is no alternative. The Liberals are torn by a two man leadership race. In a race for the leadership, when more than one person runs, it is supposed to strengthen the following and the support of the party, but no such case applies here for the Saskatchewan Liberal Party.

Through immature and irresponsible attitudes and tactics, a tool of unity has resulted in the first step in the staircase of destruction for them.

For years there were only two real forces in Saskatchewan, the NDP and the Liberals. Now that the Progressive Conservative force has been organized, any Liberal follower who leans a bit further to the right than his party has dictated is now supporting the Conservatives. Also, even though the Progressive Conservatives are gaining support, that same support soon becomes disillusioned by the degrading leadership and the party's indecision about a platform.

What alternatives do the people of this province have other than to support the New Democratic Party? I think we could gain support without a fine program, the one which we have, and will continue to have, just because the other parties are showing up so poorly.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I will be supporting this motion and opposing the amendment.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. G. MacMurchy (Minister of Municipal Affairs): — Mr. Speaker, in rising to speak in the Throne Speech Debate I want to congratulate the Member for Bengough-Milestone (Mr. Lange): and the Member for Regina Rosemont (Mr. Allen): on their contribution to the debate in moving and seconding the Address-in-Reply.

I also want to congratulate my colleagues for Arm River (Mr. Faris): and Melfort (Mr. Vickar): on their appointments to the Cabinet.

I have worked with both of them, in particular, Don Faris, who was my legislative secretary in Education and who is now the first Cabinet Minister from Arm River constituency. And the constituents in Arm River are proud of their MLA, their new Cabinet Minister, and rightly so.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. MacMurchy: — Mr. Speaker, yesterday we

listened to the Conservative Leader, to a speech so full of generalities that it could only be described as unbelievably dull and boring. Even after one and a half hours the Member for Nipawin remains an unknown quantity in Saskatchewan political life. The Member for Nipawin plays with words, words about freedom, words about free enterprise, words about rights, words that sounded to me like a hand-me-down from the days of the late Ross Thatcher.

It was all rhetoric, Mr. Speaker, but beneath all that rhetoric, what is the Conservative policy? Admittedly, it is difficult to look at the Leader of the party in Saskatchewan because he refuses to discuss the policy. Even the Conservative convention was not sure what policy was. But make no mistake about it, there is Tory policy. On those things that mean the most to Saskatchewan people, there is Tory policy. There always has been Tory policy and all we need to do is have a look and let's have a look.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. MacMurchy: — Today, Mr. Speaker, the price of wheat is down \$1.50 to \$2.00 from a year ago. Every farmer needs the best guarantee he can get that money from the sale of grain is returned to him and not siphoned off by the private grain trade.

Our orderly marketing system under the Canadian Wheat Board provides the guarantee. Saskatchewan farmers look to see who supports the Wheat Board and who supports the grain trade.

Mr. Speaker, I want to refer this House to events in Parliament at Ottawa one month ago. Parliament was debating the federal Throne Speech and our NDP Members moved an amendment calling for marketing under the Canadian Wheat Board. This amendment in support of orderly marketing was moved by Lorne Nystrom from Yorkton and seconded by Les Benjamin from Regina Lake-Centre.

Mr. Speaker, in the vote on this vital issue, orderly marketing was rejected by the combined votes of the Liberals and every Conservative Member to a man, but it's right here.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. MacMurchy: — I'll be tabling this document and other documents after I finish speaking.

Who says there is no Conservative policy on anything? Here is the record, it shows clearly the Tories are willing to sell orderly marketing down the river when it suits their needs. The Member for Nipawin may huff and he may puff, but his party's recorded choice is against the Canadian Wheat Board.

What about inland terminals, the country elevators, the rail lines serving them? I've often wondered, does the Conservative Party have two speeches and two policies, one for use in speeches to the Palliser Wheat Growers down here on the Regina Plains and a cover-up speech for the people up North? Why did the Member for Nipawin yesterday, fail to mention his policy on the "At and East" freight rates and unit trains?

Our policy in the NDP and in this Government is clear, we stand for an efficient country elevator system and we oppose

inland terminals.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. MacMurchy: — Now the Liberals stand for repealing the freight rates and shipping grain from inland terminals, as the Member for Thunder Creek has often indicated. But again, we must look to the record to find where the Conservatives stand. You have noticed, Mr. Speaker, yesterday, the Tory Leader referred, repeatedly, in glowing terms to the Alberta Conservative Government. Let me read from the presentation of the Hon. Dr. Hugh Horner, Deputy Premier of Alberta, to the Hall Commission two months ago in Saskatchewan:

The Conservative policy is this and I quote:

The Alberta Government supports the concept of inland terminals on the basis of increased competition, improved grain-handling and further rationalization of an outdated elevator system.

And I have it right here. Mr. Speaker, that's pretty plain English. The Conservatives stand for inland terminals.

Now I ask the question, Mr. Speaker, how are inland terminals about to operate? How is it that they are able to undermine our farmer-owned country elevator system?

The vast majority of farmers do not support inland terminals. They recognize the value of their own local elevator and branch line to their community. They recognize the value of their community to Saskatchewan. But if inland terminals are given special treatment then the farmers can be forced to abandon their home points and haul to the terminals. This special treatment is already under way. The "At and East" rates are being abandoned and unit trains will be used to haul grain to Halifax and St. John. Inland terminals will load grain while country elevators stay plugged. By allocating more box cars and hopper cars to terminals, greater advantage is given the terminals over the country elevators. By using new handling tariffs and credits, again the inland terminals gain an advantage over our country elevators.

I ask, Mr. Speaker, what does the record show about Conservative policy on these issues? Do they stand with our farmer-owned elevators or do they in fact stand against them? Mr. Speaker, again I read from the submission made by the Deputy Premier, the Hon. Dr. Hugh Horner of Alberta at Saskatoon and I quote:

We request that the Commission make assurances that handling tariffs, initial box car allocations, and credit for export standard grain to port terminals are structured in a way so as to facilitate new and existing firms willing to risk the building of inland terminals.

Once again, Mr. Speaker, in plain English and in print, the Conservatives have sold out our farmer-owned elevator system.

I want to say to the Conservatives opposite, if you really believe in local control, why do you not stand up and defend our locally owned and locally controlled elevators and the branch lines that serve them?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. MacMurchy: — Mr. Speaker, this is an unbelievable position when one looks at just who the Tories are asking special treatment for. There are three private inland terminals on the prairies, one is at Weyburn, one at Rosetown and one at Elm Creek. Rosetown and Elm Creek are owned by Cargill Corporation and grain from the Weyburn terminal is under contract to Cargill.

Mr. Speaker, Cargill is the ninth largest private corporation in the United States. It is a huge monopolistic company, a company powerful enough to widen the Mississippi River so its grain boats could go inland and bypass the seaports. It is powerful enough to rent trains, tracks, cabooses, locomotives to move grain at its own rates to load on these boats. I ask you, does Cargill Corporation sound as if it needs special favors? Oh, but they have some problems. Perhaps like the Member for Nipawin, Cargill could benefit from some good sound legal advice.

In 1963 this friend of the Tories was convicted of manipulating the Chicago Grain Exchange to create high prices for its products. In 1973 Cargill was found to be collecting an extra 57 cents a bushel through subsidies on grain sold in foreign markets. Cargill simply sold the grain to its wholly owned subsidiary in South America, which in turn sold to another subsidiary in Geneva, which held it until the world price had gone up and then they sold it to Russia for a handsome profit. As far as the Investigators could find out, the grain never left the ship on which it was originally loaded. Recently Cargill appeared before the United States Senate, which was looking into false information supplied in an effort to influence prices.

The American Agriculture Department revealed a discrepancy of eight million bushels at Cargill terminals, the farmers had been given short weight. I've heard of skimming, but never to the extent of eight million bushels. But if you can believe it, it has not stopped there. Civil actions are now under way to try and recover for the United States Government, losses as a result of short weighing and misgrading of grain bought from Cargill by the US Government to send for relief under the Food for Peace Plan. For shame, Mr. Speaker.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. MacMurchy: — These sound like horror stories my father used to tell me from the 1920s, but that is what we are in for if the Conservative proposals are ever given a chance to be implemented. You may think that this sort of thing could never happen here, that it's not possible, but, Mr. Speaker, it has already happened. Just a few days ago inspectors of the Wheat Board and the Canadian Board of Grain Commissioners shut down the Cargill inland terminal at Elm Creek. They seized the books and the documents for investigation and Cargill had only been open for one week when that action was necessary.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. MacMurchy: — Mr. Speaker, make no mistake there is a Progressive Conservative policy and record proves it is a policy of support for the free enterprise grain trade.

Mr. Speaker, I want now to turn to the most basic issue of all, the question of the survival of the Crow's Nest rates on grain. These freight rates have been fundamental to the development of rural Saskatchewan and our agricultural industry. The only break in the whole discriminatory policy of federal governments toward Saskatchewan are the Crow's Nest Pass rates.

To quote Dr. John Archer, an eminent Canadian historian and past president of the University of Regina:

The Crow Rates have come to be part and parcel of the concept of Confederation in Saskatchewan, part of the trade-off that permits high tariffs to benefit one region and statutory rail rates to protect another.

The Liberal Party is in favor of changing the Crow's Nest rates. Our Federal Minister of Transport has taken this position and he's been supported by Liberals across the aisle.

But let us now examine the Conservative policy on the Crow's Nest rates on rapeseed. Well, Mr. Speaker, rapeseed is one of the newer crops in the West. It is grown by many farmers in the northern and central part of our province. In 1961 the Conservative Government allowed raw rapeseed to be shipped on the Crow's Nest rates which are about one-quarter of the regular rate. But they did not allow rapeseed products the same benefit even though flour and malt, the products of wheat and barley, did receive it. For years the rapeseed industry has tried to have this error corrected and rapeseed granted full grain benefits. All three prairie governments backed this effort — at least until spring this year.

I want to refer this House to a telegram I received from the Deputy Premier of Alberta, the Hon. Dr. Horner. This telegram starts out like the speech of our own Conservative Leader from Nipawin (Mr. Collver). It starts out saying the Crow's Nest rates should not be tampered with and I quote:

We are absolutely opposed to any alteration of the statutory rates on grain and grain products.

Now, Mr. Speaker, that sounds very impressive, but a little farther down in the article, the Alberta Minister says in fact he is prepared to see the Crow's Nest rates not only not extended to rapeseed meal and oil, but also taken away from all raw rape shipped for domestic use in Canada and again, I quote:

We believe that you have the necessary legislative power now to change this — to order the railways to ship grain and grain products (and by this I mean rapeseed and rapeseed products): at statutory rates for export positions and to allow them to charge their so-called compensatory rates on the domestic movement.

With this one telegram the Conservative Government of Alberta broke the united front of the West and sold our rapeseed industry down the river. Mr. Speaker, I invite you to compare this doubletalk from Alberta with the actual words used by the Member for Nipawin in a news release. I will read from an article headed, "Collver Defends Crow Rate", in the Tisdale Recorder of June 16 and I quote:

. . . It is our opinion that the Crow Rates are not to be tampered with until an assessment of the freight rate structure is completed via the reports of the Hall and Snavelly Commissions.

Some defence of the Crow's Nest rates. I repeat, ". . . not to be tampered with until . . . ". The rapeseed producers of Saskatchewan, indeed, all farmers, are not happy with the mumbling and the shuffling of the Conservatives, with their attempt to paper this issue over with a flurry of press releases.

I have here an article from the Nipawin Journal, dated June 2, 1976. The headline reads: "Western Crushers Oppose Horner's Proposals". It starts out and I quote:

Western Rapeseed Crushers are united in their opposition to the latest proposals for rapeseed product freight rates made by Alberta . . .

The rapeseed industry has made its position crystal clear, yet the Conservatives in this House have not made it clear which of their many flip-flop public statements we are to believe.

Yesterday in this House the Member for Nipawin again used those words about not tampering, and I raise the question, what does he really mean? Does he mean what he wrote in his comments in the Tisdale Recorder? Does he mean he stands with the Conservative Government in Alberta? Why did he say nothing about rapeseed yesterday, when this issue is so important in Saskatchewan and is so important in his own constituency?

Does he say, Mr. Speaker, with his Alberta colleague, that he is prepared to sell western products cheaper to our American neighbors, or to Japan or to Africa or to Korea, than he is prepared to sell it to our fellow Canadians? Is this the policy of the true western party — it sounds to me it's un-Canadian and it is un-Canadian at a time when never before we should all be Canadians.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. MacMurchy: — Mr. Speaker, let me now turn to the question of municipal affairs and local government.

This House listened quietly and carefully to the Tory Leader tell us of his total, absolute and complete devotion to the idea of local government. He carried on at some length without once spelling out a specific thing what he would do to shift powers to municipalities. Mr. Speaker, that kind of talk is cheap. I am prepared to stand and defend in the House of any place to defend the record of our NDP Government, because while the Tories talk motherhood, this Government has been taking action. I challenge the Tories to give me examples where a council has lost the power it had before we took office in 1971. I can show them many examples where local government has more authority, more flexibility, more opportunity under this Government because we have put our money where the Tories have only put their mouths.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. MacMurchy: — This Government brought in

the Community Capital Fund — \$47 million in grants which the councils may spend on any capital project they wish. We have Operation Mainstreet, an opportunity to oil the streets of dozens of small towns. We introduced the unconditional per capita grant of \$20. We have decentralized dozens of Government offices into smaller centres — community colleges, SaskTel offices, Land Bank, Crop Insurance, Human Resources, Department of Education, the Farm Machinery Institute, the Water Supply Board, Business Assistance branches and many more, all putting new people in the community and making government more accessible.

We have built new hospitals, new gymnasiums, new senior citizens' homes and new housing projects. This year a \$26 million fund for recreation centres was introduced.

All of these NDP advances are part of what Members opposite attack as big government spending. Big spending, big government. What would happen to those programs if Conservatives were ever given the chance to drastically cut budgets? Mr. Speaker, the Tories talk about local government and while they talk, this new Democratic Government is at work solving the problems. I will gladly compare their theories with our action any time.

Now let us take a look at one of those Tory theories about local government. I have here a clipping from the Leader-Post of November 15, reporting on the Progressive Conservative convention. The clipping says the party brass presented the convention with one of their theories on decentralization. This theory, Mr. Speaker, is worthy of any bureaucrat; in fact, I think it is a classic example of bureaucratic, marble-mouth nonsense. The proposal of the Conservatives is to create something called "horizontal administrative communication areas", and I quote:

... the committee wants to see power decentralized and horizontal administrative communication areas encouraged, with local authorities interacting with each other.

Mr. Speaker, under the disguise of decentralization, the Conservatives are proposing to set up a new local government. Is it above the municipal council, to take away some of its power and, in fact, to erode the basis of municipal governments? I hope in Last Mountain-Touchwood constituency they name the first administrative office, wait, I had better get this right, horizontal administrative communications area after me, and the first one over in Arm river after the Hon. Dr. Faris. And we could interact between one another across Last Mountain Lake. We might have to build a bridge but we could interact.

Mr. Speaker, I want to ask the Conservative Leader, has he consulted with Charlie Mitchell, the president of SARM on this? Has the Saskatchewan Association of Rural Municipalities agreed to these horizontal governments? Mr. Speaker, has he consulted with the Saskatchewan Urban Municipalities Association? Has he consulted with the president, Tom Hart? Do they want to be placed under the control of this Tory theory?

Mr. Speaker, this Government does consult with SARM and with SUMA and we do it regularly. I do not hear them talking about this child's fantasy of government. I hear them talking about revenue sharing, about ways to protect the local taxpayer from inflation. Local government is not interested in theory, they

are interested in dollars.

I am pleased to be able to tell the Legislature that our Government has asked the former Deputy Minister of Municipal Affairs to take on a special task of reviewing local finances and recommending alternatives. As a result of this work, we expect to be able to implement a revenue-sharing system to give local government a share of provincial income in this term of office.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. MacMurchy: — Mr. Speaker, the Tories talk and the NDP Government delivers.

Let me turn to the area of education and the power of school boards. Opposition Members talk about the so-called erosion of school board power under this NDP Government. I am prepared to admit that salary bargaining has been taken out of the hands of the local school unit boards. But, Mr. Speaker, it was not the New Democrats who took bargaining away from the school unit boards — it was the Liberal Party and the Liberal Government that did it for the Liberal Party and the Liberal Government brought in area bargaining, back in 1968. Area bargaining took negotiations away and gave them to a new artificially-created level of authority. I think those Liberals beat you Tories because that new level forced school boards to communicate horizontally, the same way our Tory Members want to force municipal councils to do now perhaps. Well that horizontal bargaining area didn't work, they failed to get results from either the trustees or the teachers and in 1971 when we took office we had a mess to clean up created by the Liberal Government and we cleaned it up.

One of the chief problems of area bargaining was the interference of the Department of Education under the Provincial Liberal Government, and the attempt by both the Saskatchewan School Trustees' Association and the Saskatchewan Teachers' Federation to co-ordinate the control negotiations on a provincial basis. Mr. Speaker, our Government has put an end to the mess of area bargaining. We have put all three groups at the same bargaining table and we are getting results. The Teacher Collective Bargaining Act cleaned up the mess, and gave us a practical system, one that is now working. I have no hesitation in saying New Democrats are proud of provincial bargaining for teachers and we stand by it.

It is very interesting to see the Conservatives, the so-called party of local control, they didn't have the stomach to run on a platform of local bargaining. They are afraid to come out and say what they really believe. They are afraid because they know that this NDP Government works and opposing it openly will cost them votes.

The New Democrats are also proud of the way this Government abolished the rigid controls forced on school boards in 1969. We have introduced a new formula for school grants that is based on a dollar allowance for each student and not on a pupil-teacher ratio as the Liberals required. We have made school grants unconditional, to be spent by the school board as it sees fit, and not as demanded by compulsory budget reviews under the Liberals. We have put trustees on curriculum committees so they may have a direct voice in developing school programs. We have put money into education — grants more than doubled under

our NDP policies. This infusion of funds has given our students a greater choice of programs than at any time before, and it has held school tax increases well below the cost of inflation.

Mr. Speaker, in the field of local government relations, the Liberal Members opposite stand condemned by their record. The Conservatives offer theories and rhetoric, but only this Government has shown by our actions that we can deliver the goods.

Mr. Speaker, I say to the Member for Nipawin (Mr. Collver): that the people of Saskatchewan are not looking for words, they support the huffing and the puffing and the theories and the pious attitudes and more important they are not prepared to look at a party that refuses to stand on its own party policy. They are looking for policy and they are supporting more and more the Blakeney Government, a government that has given solid, sensible, reliable leadership, a government that the people know where we stand and therefore where they stand, and that means respect, and most important of all, the people of Saskatchewan are supporting us more and more because they know that this is a government that can be trusted.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. MacMurchy: — Mr. Speaker, I will oppose the amendment and I will be proud to support the main motion.

Mr. D. M. Ham: (Swift Current): — Mr. Speaker, will the Minister permit a question? Mr. Minister if the people of this province are supporting the NDP, why did you spend the last 30 minutes attacking the Conservative Party?

Mr. MacMurchy: — Mr. Speaker, I thought it was time that the Members of this Assembly and the people of Saskatchewan knew the facts, so I delivered the facts.

Mr. R. Katzman: (Rosthern): — Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join the debate on both amendments and the motion. But first let me congratulate the mover for his ability to talk about everything but the Throne Speech. And for the seconder to show the total irresponsibility of the Members on the other side because his Throne Speech would be considered below the belt in the boxing world.

First of all, Mr. Speaker, let me congratulate the two new Ministers, Dr. Faris and the new Minister of Industry and Commerce, Mr. Vickar. I am certain the second will do very well at his new post. We all must take note, when asked why he wasn't running for the mayor of Melfort, he informed the press that he was getting a Cabinet appointment. Perhaps he forced the Premier's hand a bit. Perhaps not, but I am sure the Member for Regina-Victoria took note, a rather nice piece of manipulation. He seems to be taking off in the same position and the same manner the former Minister did.

Now our former Minister of Industry and Commerce, who is also our former Minister of Agriculture left behind him a good record of threatening, shoving down the throats of the people

and doing as he pleased with everything he touched. Some prefer to call him Mr. Mess-up. I prefer to call the Minister, hatchet man. He comes into a department and heads roll. If you don't think the way he does, you are on the way out. So start looking elsewhere.

Let's take a look at a problem in my constituency, this great seat of Rosthern. Certainly we have all heard about some kind of uranium processing or refining or some kind of plant that will be built there. Let's get our facts straight.

First of all this MLA informed CFQC that he understood SEDCO was trying to acquire land for a uranium processing plant on behalf of Eldorado. Well, when the Minister said he had no comment, the Minister was caught. The next day in the Federal House a Progressive Conservative MP asked a question of Eldorado, and yes, we were informed that SEDCO was negotiating on behalf of Eldorado. Fine, I have no argument with industry coming into Saskatchewan. I welcome industry into my constituency. But now we find out it is a uranium refinery. Fine. What do we know about it? Only what we see in the press and the Port Hope situation on television. Obviously the conclusion is, talk to the environment people and see what they can tell us. So out come the environment people and tell us this is what will happen, beware of this and beware of that. Obviously I am concerned. And my constituency is concerned.

Environment people say, grass doesn't grow, trees die, and it affects cows' milk when the cows eat the grass near the plant. Dairy men are concerned. If this is what it is, we don't want it.

Through some good negotiations and a little bit of arranging, I am pleased to say that farmers were invited to go to Port Hope. By the way, courtesy of Eldorado. The SEDCO men also join them. The first thing they noticed when they arrived at the plant was that the grass was growing, trees all around, and there is a dairy farmer who says, everything is A Okay. Maybe these fellows from the environment weren't quite telling us what is right and what is wrong. Maybe we should believe these people from Eldorado. They have already proven two things we were told in Warman that were wrong. So the farmers have an open mind which that Government does not have.

Then they take the people to see a graveyard. Eldorado shows on their radiation detectors that radiation is higher there than in the Port Hope plant. Well, we all know how many graveyards are in the country. We had better worry about it.

They are told that even potash reacts higher than the safe levels in the Port Hope plant. The tour continues. But take these two points the Eldorado pointed out and check them with a mining engineer and we are told, Mr. Speaker, that trace minerals are in tombstones and other minerals are inert and there is nothing to worry about. But uranium is active and that we should be concerned.

Being laymen, I am sure most of us here are not experts in the field. We start to wonder. Experts tell us one thing and another expert tells us other things. And a third group of experts tells us something different. Whom do you believe? Who is telling the truth? That is the dilemma that the people in Rosthern and around Saskatoon have. If you do not know the truth, then what is the best way to handle it? Obviously not

to tackle it. So, that we will all know the truth, we hear a fancy announcement, 'Eldorado is going to do a study and get rid of our fears'. But you know there is an old story that goes, 'he who pays the piper, quite often calls the tune'. Therefore can we trust Eldorado to give us the facts? Can we trust the facts that will come out of the study? Who knows?

Let's backtrack when the Minister said, no comment. A couple of days later he said, yes, they were negotiating on behalf of Eldorado. This Member requested a meeting with the Minister and the farmers involved, so that we could get to the truth of the matter. Meanwhile the Minister's staff, good hard-working civil servants, out to do the job their Minister has instructed them to do, and that was to buy up the options for the land. They go to farmer number one and say, we would like to buy your land. We will offer you X amount of dollars and a one-year's option. We will give you ten per cent down, at the end of the year if we do not pick up your option you can keep the money. Or if we pick up the option we will pay you the rest. Interesting. Then they go to the next farmer, they offer the same deal. But tell him that his neighbor down the road has just sold them an option. Interesting. But farmers in western Canada aren't like farmers in some other country. They talk to their neighbors. Farmer number two picks up his phone and says to farmer number one, did you sell? Farmer number one says, no. They told me you did. Now the plot thickens. Here the story goes with little half truths. Not total facts, which that Government is famous for. You have got to sell they say. We need the land, you must sell. We are going to build it next door to you if you don't sell. So you might as well sell.

Well, Mr. Minister that is what your men were instructed to tell the people. Where does the blame lie? Right at the former Minister's level. Because it is a known fact that in that Government all orders come from the top down.

Today it is a fact the options have been purchased. We are told the price is an average of \$500 an acre. I was very tempted once again to wonder how the Government got \$500 an acre average when some quarters of land were sold for well over \$105,000. Did the Government of Saskatchewan sell its half section for less than the farmers received? Do we now see the Government of Saskatchewan subsidizing Eldorado by taking less money for their land than was paid for the other land purchased? If so, why? Why is this Government subsidizing this project. Do we hear an announcement about the additional land this Government bought. What about this additional land? I have heard no comment on it yet. What purpose is it for? We have heard no comment on that yet. Once again let me go back a bit.

That Minister during the last election campaign fielded a question in the Warman community hall, while he was campaigning for the NDP and its candidate in that area. He was asked by a constituent, when will the Government create the community pasture promised when the RM of Warman turned over many quarters of land that had gone for taxes? When will the Government give the people of this area the community pasture they were promised? The Minister's answer was, that the Government would soon be making an announcement about that. Very typical. I haven't heard any announcement, except that the two quarters of land have gone to Eldorado.

Mr. Minister, your Government, the people handling it, on

behalf of your Government and the Federal Government of Ottawa have not been totally truthful with the people of the Warman area, or the people of Saskatoon. Even your own political party is concerned with the steps you are taking on this issue.

It is interesting to note that even one Cabinet Minister did not know you were securing land in this area for Eldorado. Let's talk about safety standards. What safety standards will be used? Will there be single scrubbers, double scrubbers, will there be purifiers, single or double? Will the waste material be dumped in this area or taken back to the area from which it came? What is the danger of radiation, what is the danger of mechanical breakdown? What effect will it have on the area? I don't know the answers and no one in this House knows the answers. Because none of us are qualified experts in this field.

But the people who are supposed to know the answers do not agree on the safety of this plant. Some experts say, if you are scared of this plant, don't have your teeth x-rayed. It is just as bad. Some people say that with all the promises in the world there is no guarantee that this plant will be safe. There is no guarantee in anything in this world, Mr. Speaker, except death. And even taxes are not guaranteed because some people have not been fortunate enough to have made enough to have to pay taxes. So what does the layman do?

We all get out of bed every morning and we take a chance when we walk out the door, that we may be hit by a car, a bus, or slip and break our necks. This is a gamble we are willing to take. We have some control over it ourselves. But are we willing to take the gamble on what can go wrong with this plant if it is constructed in this area? I am told by people in the know that Eldorado chose this location and it was the prime location. I am told by people from Eldorado that the area will benefit. That the tax benefits will be great. It will be a boon to our community. Very interesting. If it is a boon to our community will it be considered a boon to our community 20 years down the road? Or will we have another Port Hope?

Let me also make some comments about this Minister. This Minister on June 11, wrote the Meadow Lake Chamber of Commerce and told them that the proposed Eldorado plant might possibly be located there. Mr. Minister, I do not know what you were thinking, both you and I know the Warman area was the prime location picked by Eldorado. Eldorado people spent many hours and days and weeks at the university deciding what land would suit them best, prior to any movement. This was not a sudden decision. It was a calculated decision and then this Minister has the gall as he did with the hog producers to shove this thing down the throats without any discussion with the people of the area.

As you know, uranium mining is an important industry in northern Saskatchewan. What about the huge transportation costs to bring uranium or yellow cake as it would be processed down from the North by trucks to this plant. Why not put this plant beside the raw resource and keep it all in one corner. That way those who choose to go there and work choose to do so knowing all the risks. Consider putting the plant at the source of material. That way your total hazard will be in one spot. But, no, that is not the plan. Because we all know you can't get top scientists to work up there. They want better living conditions. They want better environment for their children. They want better education, so they want it in the South.

I notice the Premier is not crying for this industry to go to Moose Jaw or Regina as he usually does. I notice the Minister is putting it up in a constituency that is both federally and provincially not held by the NDP. I wonder why he doesn't want it for Moose Jaw or Regina? When Saskatoon did all the negotiations for a tractor plant, Mr. Blakeney said, if you don't go where I want you to, you don't get our money. But Saskatoon did the leg work, Mr. Speaker, not the people of this Government. But you were determined it would go to Moose Jaw. Why are you not crying for this plant for Moose Jaw? Your Minister could have made sure it went to Moose Jaw, not Saskatoon or Warman.

Mr. Speaker, the Progressive Conservative Party of Saskatchewan demands a full enquiry about the environment and with public participation of residents in the area before any further action is taken by this Government on this project.

Mr. Speaker, let me now move to another area, the area of labor in the Province of Saskatchewan. Yes, Mr. Speaker, let's look at labor in this province. The unrest we all know about. We have had something called price and wage controls. Very interesting. The price and wage guidelines. The guidelines say that this is all we can raise your wages by: "A" plus two, plus some other figures. Fine. All other prices will go through this board too, government sector, of course. Private sector is the Federal Government's business. There will be exceptions. Power will go well over the guidelines; gas will go well over the guidelines. For an example, the water that is sold to the people in my constituency by the Water Supply Board. But labor was told, so much and that is all. We are going to be tough. Was that your policy during the election? No, I say, Mr. Speaker, no. That wasn't even a federal policy, but one party had the intestinal fortitude to stand up and say in the federal election that that was what was needed, a 90 day or a 30 day freeze until this country could be straightened around. That's a lot different from permanent controls, but it appears that that's what we have got.

We had a government elected in Ottawa. One that promised it would have nothing to do with controls, not even a contingency plan, and just like the fellows to the right of me they would say anything because power at all costs is the most important thing on their minds. Power at all cost.

Let's look across now at the Government, Mr. Speaker. Do they believe in power at all costs? I wonder. Certainly they may not know about the Liberal plan. I am certain that Mr. Trudeau does not tell Mr. Blakeney, the same as Mr. Blakeney does not tell me his plans. But Mr. Blakeney, labor is mad at you. You are not their good friend. You promised free collective bargaining and now you are out to destroy it. That is no good. Labor will turn on you and who will be your friends — the farmers, you lost them a long time ago; the people who worked for the CCF in this province, will they come back to you? I suggest not, Mr. Speaker. Your former labor friends will not support you, but ah! maybe the union bosses will. Maybe the paid employees of the union who were out rattling doorknobs for you during the election, managing campaigns for you during the election. But where will the average union employee be? The average worker? He will be out supporting the Progressive Conservative Party in Saskatchewan, because he has had his fill of this Government, because he and she have learned that this

Government says one thing and does the opposite. And the last government of this province was no better.

What choice do the people have? Only one. To go with the party that stands for the rights of all of our people, your leader who is committed to lesser government in your everyday life, that is the working people's hope. Let me say right here and now, as an individual who was very much involved in the union movement, that I have talked to my brothers and sisters within the union movement and what I say is a fact. They are tired of a government that takes only the one side, or only the other one. They are tired of a government that allows individuals to be on staff who do not carry their weight. They are tired of legislation that is not both fair to them and their employers, Mr. Minister of Labour (Mr. Snyder). That is the position of labor in this province. Last year there was a bill suggested in this House that would guarantee a large portion of the union if they did not have it in their contract the right to call on the executive on a decision of strike or withdrawal of services. The union bosses shook. They were scared. Somebody is going to take away some of their power. So the union bosses went to their friends — the government, who made sure that the bill was a laughing stock. What happened? It was an Opposition bill so it was done away with.

Let's take another Opposition bill for an example — Litter Control. Wine and whiskey bottles refundable. Done away with. Now the NDP has suggested, Katzman had a good idea. Let's put in a resolution, and guess what? It got approved.

Mr. Minister, what will you do this year? will you bring in a new story that says it isn't costly any more, that we can afford it? We have to clean up the ditches, or will you accept the defeated bill because it is going to be brought back in again this year. Yes, Mr. Speaker, labor, I believe, is going to come to the Progressive Conservative Party of Saskatchewan because they see in it the only chance for fair labor legislation. They see a chance for a man to be paid for what he does and what he knows, not who his friends are. He sees the right to come to work with pride and dignity and honor. He sees within the Progressive Conservative Party the right to work and better himself and his family, not the right to be kept in his place. He sees within the Progressive Conservative Party a fair and a just reward for a fair and just day of work.

Mr. Speaker, I deplore the past performance of this Government in many areas of labor. This Government is now pushing politics to the workers through the Department of Labour. This is one of the things that is not required in the labor force today. This is one of the things that is causing unrest, Mr. Minister, in the labor force today, and causing poor productivity. Politics within labor is not necessary. We are waiting for your amendments with great fear and hesitation.

It is interesting to mention here, if you have ever taken and supervised a group of men who are working, it is interesting to note that those that are given guarantees, plus an incentive for additional production, pick up the challenge and take home a large pay cheque, while those who do not pick up the challenge take home the guarantee.

There are methods today in industry that allow those individuals to move ahead, to make a better standard for themselves and their families, and that must be legislated to make sure. It

must be legislated to make sure that those who are incapable to make the second effort also have a fair and just living for themselves and their families. But it is not fair to allow a situation to exist that will allow the unwilling workers to ride on the backs of those who are willing to work. That is wrong. Labor has had enough of that.

Mr. Speaker, the time is running short, and if we do not change the road that this Government is taking there may be no other time to change.

Maybe the new bill should go back for rewriting so that it will do what it is supposed to do, what it is supposed to do for the best of the working people of Saskatchewan and the citizens of Saskatchewan.

Mr. Speaker, I shall be supporting the subamendment but will be opposing the motion.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. W.H. Stodalka (Maple Creek): — Mr. Speaker, it's a rather difficult position to be the last speaker on a Friday afternoon when everybody is sort of interested in getting out of this Assembly and going home. It is also difficult as we have had some very forceful presentations in this Assembly this afternoon. The Member for Assiniboia-Gravelbourg (Mr. Nelson): telling us how it is down there in Coronach and how it is in Willowbunch. I wasn't able to stay around this afternoon to listen to one of the Members opposite. I had lost a portion of my speech and spent half an hour looking for it. Luckily enough I was able to find it. I heard the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. MacMurchy): and again he gave a very colorful presentation here this afternoon. His themes are usually the same, the Crow's Nest rates and the railways and their problems. I believe this was followed this afternoon by the Member for Rosthern (Mr. Katzman). The one thing that I find absolutely amusing about him is this theme that the Conservatives have on centralization. From my observations in this Legislature in the last year it is very, very hard for me to visualize the Leader of the Conservative Party letting any control slip from his hands. It seems to me that he has been able to muzzle those fellows over there for a year and a half and I just can't see how he would ever, ever turn any powers loose to anyone but himself.

Mr. Speaker, the Throne Speech was both lengthy and empty. I have never witnessed an occasion when it took so many words to say so little. Many of the programs referred to in the Speech had previously been announced in prior news releases. One really wonders what purpose the Speech from the Throne serves when legislation is announced prior to that Speech.

I should like to congratulate the Member for Milestone-Bengough (Mr. Lange): and also the Member for Regina Rosemont (Mr. Allen): on admirably trying to justify that Speech. I also wonder if the Member for Milestone-Bengough did not talk about railways, multinationals and Mr. Lang, what he would talk about.

Of the many Members who have made significant contributions to this debate, there is one in my mind which stood out. I refer to the presentation of our Leader, the Member for Prince Albert-Duck lake (Mr. Steuart). His natural wit . . .

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Stodalka: — . . . and colorful delivery complemented the appreciative and thought-provoking speech which he delivered. the Member for Prince Albert-Duck Lake in the last five years has given his party faithful, colorful and enlightened leadership. We, in our party, are proud to have served under him.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Stodalka: — My next remarks will be directed to the Member whom I had hoped would be in the House this afternoon. Since the last sitting in this Assembly, I am sure the Members opposite have noticed the pleasant change that has taken place in the area in which I sit in this Assembly. The good-looking young man who used to sit beside me, is gone. He has been replaced with a capable and able young lady, the Member for Wilkie (Miss Clifford): . . .

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Stodalka: — . . . a Member who will loyally serve those who worked for her election; a Member who is loyal to her party and to her electors; a Member who will stay and will fight when the chips are down; . . .

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Stodalka: — . . . a Member who will not replace her idealism with opportunism; and a Member who frowns on political expediency.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Stodalka: — I am proud to have a Member such as the Member for Wilkie for my seatmate.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Stodalka: — Yesterday, Mr. Speaker, in this Assembly I questioned the Minister of Social Services (Mr. Rolfes): who is not here this afternoon. I wish he could be here as I have a few remarks I should like to make to him.

Mr. Speaker, yesterday in the Assembly Question Period considerable discussion took place concerning the new \$50 fee being requested from parents of retarded children, parents of retarded children who stay in group or foster homes because suitable training and educational facilities are not located in their home town. The Minister kept harping that this was not a change in policy.

Mr. Speaker, I suggest that by playing with words the Minister was attempting to mislead this Assembly. The fact is that the department practice has been changed, changed from a situation where no fee was charged, to requesting parents to pay \$50 per month. Mr. Speaker, this has created a situation where it is financially more advantageous to keep a child

institutionalized and this is simply not good enough. A child must be placed in an environment that affords all possible opportunities that are necessary for his improvement. the situation is even more ironic when you consider what happens when the child reaches his 16th birthday . . .

The Speaker interrupted the debate and the question being put on the subamendment, it was negatived on the following recorded division:

Yeas — 5

Collver
Bailey

Birkbeck
Ham

Katzman

Nays — 31

Pepper
Thibault
Bowerman
Smishek
Romanow
Snyder
Kramer
Lange
Kowalchuk
MacMurchy
Mostoway

Larson
Kaeding
MacAuley
Feschuk
Faris
Cowley
Shillington
Vickar
Skoberg
Nelson (Yorkton)

Allen
Koskie
Johnson
Thompson
Banda
Stodalka
Wiebe
Penner
Cameron
McMillan

The debate continued on the motion and the amendment.

Mr. Stodalka: — Mr. Speaker, I would just like to conclude my remarks about the \$50 fee being charged to the parents of these retarded children by asking the Minister to reconsider the case and to treat all parents fairly.

Mr. Speaker, the Family Income Plan, a plan to supplement families with low incomes was introduced by the Government prior to the last election. How are eligible recipients identified by this particular plan? The fact, Mr. Speaker, is that there is a means test actually administered to parents to see whether or not that these parents are eligible to receive the benefits underneath the plan. Yes, Mr. Speaker, a means test, which is something the Members opposite used to say was absolutely inappropriate, entirely wrong and very distasteful and yet we find them using it themselves.

I have no quarrels with the philosophy of the plan, but as an MLA have become very disturbed over the way it has been administered. The plan as it is presently operated is not only imposing hardships on individuals, but is building a lack of trust in government.

There is no way you can make thousands of admitted overpayments and not impose a hardship when trying to collect these overpayments. Even more amazing, I was reading a report in which one of the Minister's executive assistants admitted that several thousand overpayments had been made, and then in the same breath stated that the department was satisfied with the way in which the program is being run.

Mr. Speaker, we all fully realize that extra payments

result because of incorrect estimates of income, which in itself may be one of the weaknesses of this plan. Just imagine how hard it is for a farmer or for a rancher to estimate what his income is going to be for the coming year. But even if your department insists on a program based on estimated income, why did it take so long to notify recipients of the overpayment?

I personally was involved in one request for repayment that extended over 1974, 1975 and 1976, before notification for overpayment had been received. A period of three years.

I began to wonder if that delay probably resulted because 1975 happened to be an election year in the Province of Saskatchewan.

Mr. Speaker, in one case a recipient after estimating his income, sent his monthly pay cheque stub in to your department, faithfully each month. He felt that because of this procedure any necessary changes in regard to payment would be made. Mr. Speaker, two years later that person was requested to pay a refund of over \$600 and yet each month he had sent into the department a cheque stub indicating what his income was going to be for that particular year. Is that what you call a well administered plan? This was a young married man with a family. He didn't have the funds and even repayment scheduled over a period of time is going to be extremely difficult for this individual and this particular family.

Another case involved a family that was requested to return over \$1,500. This man was so disillusioned, that he said it was the last time that he was going to be sucked in by those government programs.

Mr. Speaker, you cannot expect every resident of Saskatchewan to be knowledgeable about government programs. Programs must be designed simply with the elimination of pitfalls that can cause unnecessary hardships. The Government created a situation in which admittedly thousands of these hardships occurred, by creating a situation in which it will admittedly take several months to get information about the number and amount of the overpayments out of a computer. It is indeed alarming to have one of the Minister's staff state that they were happy with the way in which the program is being run. Mr. Minister, changes are necessary and I urge you to consider them.

Next I should like to move to a topic that is peculiar to our area or the area of southwestern Saskatchewan, namely the Cypress Hills Provincial Park. The use of our provincial and regional parks is increasing extensively. For example, in 1966 there were 90,000 visitors to Cypress Hills. By 1975 there were 240,000 visitors to Cypress Hills. Officials predict that by the year 1980 there will be one million visitors per year converging upon the Cypress Hills plateau. That's more than the population of the Province of Saskatchewan. This plateau includes both the Alberta and Saskatchewan provincial parks, plus the National Historic Park at Fort Walsh. A combination that really is one recreational area with the Alberta park adjacent to the west block of our own Cypress Hills Park, which in turn is abutted by Fort Walsh.

Because both the Saskatchewan and Alberta Governments recognized the pressure that this increased usage would bring, both

governments had a consultant's firm prepare a master plan. The purpose of the master plan was to establish detailed policies for the long term development, management and use of the park resources and visitors' activities. I presume it was no coincidence that the same consultant's firm, Lombard North Limited, was employed by the two governments to prepare the master plan for each park. The final result being two plans, one for each provincial park, which in fact is really one plan for the entire area.

A closer examination of the consultants' recommendations reveals that the plan is really only a part of a proposed series of parks extending from the proposed national grasslands park in south central Saskatchewan across southern Saskatchewan into southeastern Alberta. Recommendations for the proposed national park and the provincial parks are highly similar. controversial recommendations concerning proposed linkage roads, and the elimination or reduction of grazing privileges are evident and related.

During the summer and fall, I attended public hearings instituted by both governments. The purpose of the hearings was to allow public input before the two governments made any final decision. The hearings differed in format in that the Saskatchewan approach was to allow the public to respond to the recommendations of the consultant's firm with no suggestions from the Department of Tourism and Renewable Resources as to what their final decision would be.

In the Alberta hearings, department officials had declared their positions on the various recommendations before the public hearing. This bold approach resulted in a real roasting for the civil servants who were present.

Mr. Speaker, we in Saskatchewan are still waiting to find out what decisions your government has made considering these recommendations. Some of the Government's decisions regarding the consultants' recommendations could prove to be highly controversial and divisive.

First, the matter concerning the elimination or the reduction of grazing privileges within the park. Any decision to eliminate or drastically reduce grazing in the area will be hotly disputed. No evidence has been presented that indicates that present grazing policies are damaging that environment. In fact, long-term residents will tell you that grazing offers advantages to the environment. Not only do the cattle aesthetically belong to the area, but are beneficial in fire prevention. Beneficial to the extent that huge supplies of dead grass are not allowed to accumulate and beneficial because the rancher serves as an unpaid firefighter.

Add to the foregoing the economic returns received from the cattle industry and I suggest that the Minister should avoid the pitfalls of any suggestion of removing grazing or drastically changing the grazing regulations for the area. If he does not believe me, ask the Government of Alberta about the roasting that they received by over 430 people at the Medicine Hat hearing. Ask them about the bus load of angry ranchers who followed the hearing as it moved to Lethbridge.

Secondly, there is the problem of establishing a suitable and satisfactory road network for the entire area. Of the numerous alternatives that have been suggested, the present grid

road from Maple Creek to Fort Walsh is certainly the route accepted by most people in the area.

Mr. Speaker, here we have a case of the Federal Government and Provincial Government each having a park. There is the west block of the provincial park plus the national historic park at Fort Walsh. Yet, Mr. Speaker, who is asked to maintain the road leading to these parks? These two parks have been operational for many years, with the only access to the area being a grid road that is maintained by the LID and the municipality.

These local taxpayers are tired of paying the maintenance costs precipitated by the tourist trade. The time is long past due for a change. With the ever increasing traffic, this dusty road is extremely dangerous. We had one traffic death this year due to the dust on that road. There is no doubt that unless something else is done, there are going to be more serious accidents on that road.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, many of the residents of southwestern Saskatchewan are extremely concerned about the direction the consultants' report will take with reference to Cypress Hills Provincial Park. The consultants keep referring to activities they regard as being appropriate to what they call the "Cypress Hills Experience." They seem bent on choosing activities that are appropriate to "wilderness areas".

The consultants indicate that such activities as tennis, dancing, baseball, swimming in a pool are not appropriate activities for that park. It is their opinion that these facilities should be located in the communities that surround the park. Mr. Speaker, this recommendation is entirely impractical and uneconomical.

First of all, very few of the surrounding communities could afford to develop, maintain and operate the facilities with the limited funds that they have available to them. Secondly, visitors to the Cypress Hills use and appreciate the recreational facilities within that park. Just ask them, they'll tell you they do. Rather than eliminating these facilities, we should be talking about improving them and expanding them.

In concluding my remarks about the park, I would only ask that the Minister and his officials, when they have finally made some decisions as to what direction that they think that that park is going to go, will come out into the area, Maple Creek, Swift Current, and let us know what your recommendations are. Let us have some input into the matter before you reach any final decisions as to what is going to happen in Cypress Hills Park. We're just as interested in protecting that park, as any of you are here, as any of the residents in southwestern Saskatchewan or in all of Saskatchewan.

I want to make a few remarks about hunting. Saskatchewan is a sportsman's paradise with its many fresh water lakes and bountiful game. Because we are now ending the hunting season and it is uppermost in the minds of many, I have received a number of suggestions that I would like to present to this Assembly.

First of all, the licence draw for big game. To illustrate the suggested change that should be considered, I should like to cite an example of an actual case. Two areas were opened for elk hunting in Saskatchewan this year, one in the east and one

in the west. There could have been others but those are the two that I'm referring to. A hunter residing in the western zone applied for a licence and was drawn for the eastern zone. He was living amongst the elk in the west and was expected to travel across the province to do his hunting in the east. The matter was further complicated by the fact that he was a working man and the season was only one week long. It is rather obvious how much easier and cheaper it would have been for him to hunt near his own home. Surely it would be administratively possible to allow hunters to submit their application based on the area in which they reside.

The second think I would like to say are a few things about goose hunting. You can tell some of my friends are hunters. It is my understanding that the Minister will shortly be receiving a petition concerning the regulations for goose hunting. Interested persons are asking that you revert back to the policy of only having morning shooting and that pit shooting only be permitted. Present conditions of hunters lying along fence lines or in stone piles destroying the many hours of preparation by the pit shooting hunters certainly is not acceptable.

A second and disturbing practice is apparently taking place along the South Saskatchewan River. The Member for Kindersley and myself have both received numerous complaints about airplanes being used to spread the geese along the South Saskatchewan River. All reports indicate someone is trying to force these geese in an easterly direction.

It is hoped that you and your department would check into this matter and certainly it would not seem to be an environmentally sound practice to meddle with the flyways established by these geese.

Land use. Conscientious hunters have been trying to educate their colleagues for years to respect the property of landowners. Yet each year a small percentage of hunters cause problems serious enough to cause more landowners to put up more 'no hunting' and more 'no trespassing' signs.

Landowners have told me they do not like to pose their land and they do not like the expense that it incurs as well as the patrolling. But they constantly live in a field of fire, of losing their livestock and of seeing their property uprooted and cut up. I am afraid that unless something is done to rectify this situation, the sport of hunting will deteriorate even further. Furthermore, tension between hunters and landowners will definitely increase.

Recently an official of the Department of Agriculture outlined a reimbursement plan for landowners who permit hunting on their premises. The payments were to be financial primarily by the fees charged for hunting licences. My initial impression of the recommendations were that they deserved serious consideration.

Mr. Speaker, I am afraid that unless something is done immediately, we will see hunting problems arise and continue to arise. None of us would like to see the situation where only the privileged can hunt. Many hunters and landowners have indicated to me that they would like an opportunity to present their cases to the Department of Tourism and Renewable Resources. I would, therefore, like to suggest that the

Department of Tourism and Renewable Resources hold a series of public hearings to give those affected an opportunity to express themselves and their opinions.

It is further suggested that these hearings be held in locations where hunting is most intense. These hearings would invite interested persons to present their opinions, and they should be held over a short period of time and certainly should not be too costly to have. If all parties are given an opportunity for input, I am sure that the present situation cannot only be resolved, but the hunting can be improved.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, there are a few good pieces of legislation in the Speech from the Throne. I refer to such things as the Consumer Products Warranty Act, the White Paper on Education, the Cultural and Recreational Facilities Capital Fund Act, and the Snowmobile legislation. But, Mr. Speaker, there is a lack of action contemplated to get our oil industry moving, a lack of legislation to encourage secondary industry and a lack of concern for people on fixed incomes.

Mr. Speaker, because of these and other deficiencies, I will not support the motion but will support the amendment.

I beg leave to adjourn the debate.

Debate adjourned.

The Assembly adjourned at 5:25 o'clock p.m.