

**LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN**  
**Fifth Session — Eighteenth Legislature**

**March 13, 1978.**

**EVENING SESSION**

**BUDGET DEBATE CONTINUES**

**MR. N. LUSNEY (Pelly):**— Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to get up and speak in support of this Budget, not because I am a member of the government which introduced the Budget but mainly because of the fact that while this country is faced with a troubled economy, this government has seen fit to try to stimulate our economy by putting some money into the hands of the people of this province rather than giving substantial grants to large corporations who would more than likely invest them in foreign countries like INCO did, and do nothing for the economy of Saskatchewan.

Mr. Speaker, putting money in the hands of the people will mean an increase in spending, therefore stimulating activity in retail trade, in industry, and creating moderate growth and prosperity in this province.

Mr. Speaker, in utilities, this government has stated that it will not allow more than an 8 per cent increase in telephone and natural gas rates even though the costs of purchasing natural gas from Alberta have gone up from 18 cents per 1,000 cubic feet in 1971 to \$1.23 in 1977, \$1.36 in February of 1978 and a further increase is expected in August, 1978. Mr. Speaker, power rates to residential and farm customers will be frozen. Insurance rates will be cut by 5 per cent. This is due mainly to the public acceptance of the seat belt legislation and a reduction in serious injury and large claim settlements — a program which the opposition has fought and criticized by using scare tactics and misinformation simply for the purpose of gaining a few votes, and having no regard to the health and safety of the people of Saskatchewan. Safety '77 has worked and the 5 per cent cut in insurance premiums proves it.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. LUSNEY:**— In regard to health, Mr. Speaker, this Budget proves that this government, under the leadership of Allan Blakeney, is concerned about the people of this province. In times when other governments are restraining or halting construction, this government is building three new hospitals and will expand others. One of the new hospitals is being built in my constituency, for which I am very grateful for this will mean better health care service for the people of north eastern Saskatchewan. Mr. Speaker, the Conservatives say that we are cutting back on health care services, and one may wonder what they would do to improve health care in this province. Since they haven't held power recently in Saskatchewan, one can only look at the policies they have in other provinces.

Let us take resource and industry-rich Ontario. It can't be pointed out often enough, Mr. Speaker, that in the Budget of this year they introduced a 37.5 per cent increase for health insurance premiums. A family of three or more in Ontario will now pay \$528 health premiums per year, or \$44 per month. At the same time the Conservative government of Ontario reduced mining taxes, no doubt as a reward for INCO and Falconbridge for shutting down some of their mining operations in Ontario. In addition to the increase in premiums, Ontario has increased its funds for hospitals by only 4.3 per cent. This will surely mean a substantial cutback in hospital beds in the province of Ontario, and these are Progressive Conservatives of Ontario. Maybe, Mr. Speaker, a

better name would be Regressive Conservatives.

Those are the benefits the Conservative Party has provided for the people of Ontario, and I am certain that the people of Manitoba will soon be made aware of the programs and services that they will be losing. Mr. Speaker, that is the philosophy of the Conservative Party in the provinces that they hold power in, and I would suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, and to the people of Saskatchewan that the Conservatives of this province are no different, and that we could expect the same kind of regressive policies if the Conservatives held power in Saskatchewan.

In agriculture, Mr. Speaker, an industry which almost totally affects my constituency directly or indirectly, I am pleased to hear that the livestock industry will receive an increase of some \$8 million. Funds for research will be increased by \$1.3 million; half a million dollars will be spent on marketing and processing; more than \$4 million will be provided for new programming. Last year we had \$1 million spent for improving grazing land. This year we have a 50 per cent increase to \$1.5 million for improving some 20,000 acres of grazing land. However, I do feel that in the future we should be looking at increasing our budget for agriculture.

The opposition, Mr. Speaker, criticized this government for not providing enough money in the Budget for agriculture, and I have already conceded that, but I do not think that the farmers want to be dependent on government grants in order to continue their operations. All the farmer is asking for is parity pricing. What the opposition should be doing is directing their criticism at Monsanto, Dow, Green Cross, John Deere and Massey corporate and all their other friends which increased their prices anywhere from 100 per cent to 300 per cent in the last five years while the farmers' products went down in price during the same period. But we are not likely to see their efforts directed in that direction because we know that the only industry either of the opposition parties believe in protecting is industry owned by large corporate investors and not individual farmers.

Mr. Speaker, when we talk about agriculture and farmers, we talked about food — a commodity that is necessary to sustain life on this planet and as long as we allow the price of everything to go up, then we all have a responsibility to allow the farmer a fair return so that he can continue to produce the items so vital to his existence.

Mr. Speaker, the senior citizens of my constituency and of this province, I am sure, will also be pleased with this Budget. There will be an increase from \$500 to \$650 for the Senior Citizens Home Repair program. Provincial pension supplements will be increased by 25 per cent. There will also be a significant increase in the number of level IV beds in Saskatchewan. The total senior citizens package contains added benefits of some \$11 million.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. LUSNEY:**— In addition, we plan to build 1,500 low cost units at a cost of some \$8.5 million. Some of these units will be constructed in my constituency and I know the senior citizens will be pleased with the consideration that this government has given to their needs.

Mr. Speaker, the reduction in personal income taxes will be welcomed by people in my constituency and I am certain by people in all Saskatchewan. The tax reduction will mean that a person with 2 dependants earning about \$13,000 will pay less income tax

in Saskatchewan than anywhere else in Canada. That, Mr. Speaker, does not take into account that Ontario pays \$528 per family for health premiums and the high cost of insurance premiums to a driver under 25 years of age in Ontario.

On top of the reduction in personal taxes, Mr. Speaker, the increase in the Property Improvement Grant will help reduce the tax burden on the homeowners and the increased grants to local governments should prevent any increases in property taxes. When we talk about taxes, Mr. Speaker, and the fact that the people of Saskatchewan have the lowest tax load, it is not something that happens by accident. It is the result of a competent and responsible government.

Both the Liberal and Conservative finance critics say that this government has burdened the public with a tremendous per capita debt. I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that either both members did not do their homework very well or did not intend to give the public the true facts. The facts, Mr. Speaker, are that in the New York financial circles, Saskatchewan is considered financially one of the healthiest provinces in Canada.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. LUSNEY:**— Saskatchewan is also considered as having one of the lowest per capita debts of any province except Alberta, which is quite solvent because of its vast oil and natural gas reserves.

Mr. Speaker, Saskatchewan's per capita debt is only about \$115 million, which is very low. The major borrowers in Saskatchewan are the Crown corporations but the money they borrow is used for capital construction projects, like building power plants, expanding our telecommunication services and developing our potash resource. Projects like Sask Power, Sask Tel and Sask Potash Corporation are considered as solid investments by the money lenders because the capital expenditures that these corporations make will generate revenue and pay their own debts requiring no tax money. That, Mr. Speaker, is why Saskatchewan has a good credit rating on the world money markets.

Saskatchewan is also in good financial health because our assets exceed our debt, much unlike Conservative-run Ontario which has borrowed more money than they are worth. Mr. Speaker, the Conservatives promise the people of Saskatchewan a real change and if it is anything like the Conservatives of Ontario, or now, Conservative Manitoba, I assure you, Mr. Speaker, it would be a real change but not one for the benefit of the people of Saskatchewan.

This Budget, Mr. Speaker, is designed to stimulate our economy and I am certain it is more apt to accomplish that than the Budget introduced in Conservative Ontario. Mr. Speaker, the opposition criticizes this Budget and insinuates that the minister and this government are incompetent. My interpretation of this Budget would be that this is a people-come-first Budget. When you compare the Budget of Saskatchewan with that of Conservative Ontario, which places heavier tax burdens on the people — provides a tax cut for large corporations and introduces a budget with a \$1.3 billion deficit, it is not very difficult to distinguish which government could be considered incompetent.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to be a member of a government that takes into consideration the needs of the people and introduces a Budget that is designed for the benefit of the people. Mr. Speaker, my support for this Budget is based on the belief that it will move

us further along the road towards building a better society for all citizens, the kind of society that the New Democratic Party and the CCF before it, have struggled long and hard to create, a co-operative and compassionate society where the supplying of human needs and the enrichment of human lives are the important goals; a society where private profit and corporate power take a back seat to meeting the needs of those who are still in want and insecurity; a society where there are decent pensions to allow older citizens to live in dignity and good health; where all children get a first-class education to properly equip them for a work environment and where there are enough jobs to employ the talents and skills of all people wanting to work, including the young. Mr. Speaker, a society where not just the rich and the powerful enjoy a happy and healthy life at an acceptable standard of living, but one where everyone is able to share in the good life.

Mr. Speaker, this Budget moves us further towards that society and I will be supporting it.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. N.E. BYERS (Minister of Environment and Telephones):**— Mr. Speaker, on rising to participate in this Budget Debate, I want to join in congratulating the Minister of Finance for the Budget he presented in this House last Tuesday. In a period when the plague of pessimism has penetrated most provincial capitals in this country, our Minister of Finance has charted a more optimistic course of continued good service to the people of Saskatchewan. While other provincial governments are virtually paralyzed by the economic situation confronting them, and respond by increasing taxes, cutting back on services and relying on business to stimulate the economy, we on this side of the House are proud of the accomplishments of this government and the new trails that will be blazed with this Budget.

I now want to discuss some of the programs administered by the department and Crown corporation for which I am responsible.

Mr. Speaker, the Environment Department is now five and one-half years old. During its brief history, the department has been generally low profile because the department's role has been, from the beginning, to serve primarily as a co-ordinating agency. As a co-ordinator, it has played an important role in research and the gathering of data about all kinds of environmental matters. On the other hand, the department is also a regulator agency, an important role which ensures that Saskatchewan's limited supply of water is used wisely, ensuring that all manner of pollution problems affecting air, land and water are resolved. Some branches responsible for hydrology and water rights, for example, have changed little. Others, responsible for air, water and land pollution control, operate within the same mandate as they did when the department was created but, through experience, are continuously improving the systems to alleviate problems, while at the same time developing methods to prevent future problems.

Mr. Speaker, such responsibilities are not necessarily high profile or spectacular, but they are essential in a modern industrial society. One such unspectacular effort is the enlargement of training programs for operators of municipal water treatment plants and sewage treatment facilities. Each year, the Water and Sewage Works Division of the Environmental Protection Service offers courses at which operators can upgrade their skills. I'm pleased to report that a good many municipalities and their operators have taken advantage of these courses and now have certified operators. The division

has also worked away steadily at a system of classifying treatment works, establishing operating standards to ensure that drinking water is pure and that waste water does not pollute. As I said, work of this type is not likely to draw headlines in the newspapers but in another area of concern, Mr. Speaker, the Department of Environment has evolved rapidly as experience reinforced the conviction of the government. The citizens want, not just development, but responsible development. Saskatchewan's economy, among the healthiest in Canada, is growing rapidly and growth brings pressure to bear on the environment. The policy of this government, expressed through this department, is to ensure that the necessary growth does not cause irreparable damage to the environment or threaten the health of the Saskatchewan people.

You will recall, Mr. Speaker, that two years ago this Legislative Assembly approved the establishment of an Environmental Impact Assessment Branch. A few months later, Cabinet approved an interim environmental impact assessment policy and screening guidelines. The purpose was to ensure inclusion of environmental planning by developers, both public and private, in the early stages of projects, along with economic feasibility studies, market studies, and so on. Part of the environmental impact assessment policy, which was started before this branch was formed, called for public inquiries whenever there was sufficient public concern about a proposed development.

Mr. Speaker, the number of major issues that have warranted public scrutiny has demonstrated, beyond a shadow of a doubt, the necessity and importance of an environmental impact assessment policy. Several major inquiries have been initiated by the government of Saskatchewan in the last year through the Department of Environment. In each case, this department has appointed the Board of Inquiry, given it a mandate to inform the public, to gather reaction, and to make recommendations to the government. The implementation of this government's commitment to the process of examining, in detail, large or significant development during the last five and one-half years, is a remarkable achievement.

Prior to the construction of the Gardiner and Qu'Appelle Dams, Squaw Rapids and Boundary Generating Stations, and Saskatchewan's pulp and steel mills, environmental impact assessment was unheard of. Today, the assessment of the impact of developments on the land, air, water and people is a part of life in Saskatchewan.

During the last year, the people of Saskatchewan have been consulted through boards of inquiry on a number of major development proposals.

The Cluff Lake Board of Inquiry, headed by Judge E.D. Bayda, is among the most outstanding and far-reaching inquiries in the environmental field ever attempted in Canada. The board was asked to examine all available information on the proposed Amok Limited uranium mine and mill at Cluff Lake, and its environmental, health, safety, social and economic effects. The board was also asked to seek public views on the other implications of expansion of the uranium industry in Saskatchewan.

Mr. Speaker, the cost of the Cluff Lake Board of Inquiry to date has been \$412,270. In addition, the government of Saskatchewan provided \$100,000 to organizations which lacked financial resources, so that they could carry out the necessary research for submission to the board. The board received approximately 400 briefs or written or oral briefs during its hearings. While we expect the report from Justice Bayda and his staff very, very shortly I want at this time to commend Judge Bayda, Dr. McCallum, Mrs.

Groome and her staff for what I think was a very capable undertaking, a very difficult task in this field.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the Churchill Board of Inquiry is another example. You will recall that this board's inquiry was preceded by a three year project to gather information on every aspect of the proposed construction of a dam and generating station at Wintego Falls. When the Churchill River Board was set up, some people said that the public had had enough of the Churchill River proposal, nobody would bother to make submissions. Mr. Speaker, the Churchill Board of Inquiry received 260 submissions. And if that is not proof of the support given by the people of Saskatchewan to the impact assessment policy, the faith of the people of Saskatchewan in the public inquiry process, then frankly I don't know what is.

In addition to these major inquiries, the Department of Environment set up the Poplar River-Nipawin Board of Inquiry which will be conducting its public hearings in Coronach and Nipawin in a few days. And in addition to these large public inquiries, my department, through the Environmental Impact Assessment Branch, has distributed impact overviews of a number of other smaller projects, advertised their availability and invited submissions. I refer to such projects as the dam and power station on the Charlotte River, the SPC proposal to build a power line from Condie to Wolverine, the Cochin Pipeline and additional loops planned by Trans-Canada Pipelines Limited.

Mr. Speaker, the effectiveness of the environmental impact assessment process and the public support it has received have clearly demonstrated the importance of the environmental impact assessment process. Therefore, the Environmental Impact Assessment Branch of the Environmental Protection Service will be upgraded in status. Starting in the new fiscal year, the branch will become the Environmental Impact Secretariat. The executive director will report directly to the Deputy Minister of the Environment. One of the requirements is an increase in the staff to five from the present three. But the budget for the Environmental Assessment Secretariat will be reduced to \$462,970 from \$615,410. This reduction is attributable to the fact that we do not foresee in the immediate future any public inquiries of the magnitude of the Bayda and Churchill River Boards and therefore it is not necessary to reserve funds at this time for the expensive process of public inquiries.

I would like to turn now, Mr. Speaker, to the continuing program to clean up the radon gas problem at Uranium City — a problem, I might add, which would never have occurred had there been an environmental impact assessment policy in effect 20 or 25 years ago. The clean-up is cost-shared by the provincial government and the Atomic Energy Control Board. The work is being carried out by Keith Consulting Engineers under a contract between that firm and the Atomic Energy Control Board. The Department of the Environment is co-ordinator of a large portion of the remedial work. Under the terms of the cost-shared contract the funds to be voted for expenditure, some \$325,000, will pay for the work done in the 1977-78 fiscal year. Last year was devoted to surveys and detailed investigations of the radon gas problem. In the year ahead, a large amount of remedial work will be undertaken. Investigations carried out last year indicate that the clean-up and remedial program will continue until 1981. This has been a expensive lesson, Mr. Speaker, and I mention it because it is the kind of exercise that need not occur in any future developments in this province. They need not occur because we have our environmental assessment policy in place.

Before I outline other major initiatives of my department, Mr. Speaker, I would like to give to the House the same assurance that has been given to the Department of

External Affairs, the United States Department of State, the state of Montana and the International Joint Commission regarding the SPC Poplar River Development. That is that my department has made available to all parties concerned all data, all assistance requested and will continue to co-operate fully in the future in the assessment of the impact of this power plant.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. NELSON (As-Gr):**— Thousands won't believe you.

**MR. BYERS:**— Well, Mr. Jamieson does. You should argue with him. Among the most important long-term projects for which my department is responsible is the Qu'Appelle Valley Agreement with the government of Canada. This program calls for the spending over a number of years of \$33,700,000 to improve the Qu'Appelle Valley. To the end of the 1977-78 fiscal year expenditures reached about \$8 million. In the year ahead the share of the Qu'Appelle program that will be borne by the Department of the Environment is \$649,980 which is an increase of \$150,000 from the 1977-78 Budget. Mr. Speaker, when the governments of Saskatchewan and Canada agreed to spend about \$34 million to improve the Qu'Appelle Valley for the benefit of all those who live there and all those who use it for recreation, the two governments must ensure that the investment is protected.

I would like to reiterate for the House the remarks which I made recently to the Qu'Appelle Valley Development Association, that a few self-serving speculators have led a vocal minority which is criticizing the six Special Planning Area Commissions which are responsible for land use planning and the review of development of proposals in the Valley. They have misrepresented the facts, but they will not be allowed to destroy the land use program and erode its basic principles. The Special Planning Area Commissions are not a front for the governments of Canada and Saskatchewan. Each of the commissions has controlling representation from local authorities. Each has a special responsibility to protect the future interest of all people in each area. These commissions have, in short, the power to change the development proposals for the Valley as they see fit. Mr. Speaker, land speculators in the Valley, and supporters outside the Valley should know that the Qu'Appelle Implementation plan insists on local action to the benefit of the local area.

Now, I'd like to spend a few minutes outlining some of the more important improvements planned for the year ahead in the Qu'Appelle Valley. Various projects are under way or planned to improve the quality of water in the Qu'Appelle system. One of the important programs will offer up to 100 per cent of the cost of relocating or rebuilding works that control pollution from livestock, such as dykes, drainage ditches and ponds. This is a five-year program starting at Buffalo Pound Lake and working down the Valley.

Another major program is disposal of waste from Moose Jaw. The City has decided that effluent should be treated and used to irrigate crops, and the department agrees that this is a better way than building an expensive sewage treatment plant, and environmentally sound. In the coming fiscal year, design of the Moose Jaw effluent irrigation system should be completed and construction started.

Flood protection works for Moose Jaw are proceeding. About \$1 million has been spent on the Spring Creek diversion system, which provides protection from floods for

residential and business parts of the city. Some dredging of the Moose Jaw River is planned, as well as removal or modification of some structures to reduce the flood hazard. We are also setting aside \$230,000 for the purchase of property in the flood plain at Moose Jaw. This is a program under which property owners sell voluntarily, and started in 1977.

Mr. Speaker, improvement of the Qu'Appelle River channel is one of the most important programs under the Qu'Appelle Agreement. It is the best key to the future of the Valley and the recreation and tourism development. Without control over flooding and lake levels, tourism and recreation in this beautiful Valley are in jeopardy. The estimated cost of the conveyance program is \$5.25 million, cost-shared between the Province of Saskatchewan and the Government of Canada.

Work planned for the last year for Round and Crooked Lakes was delayed because it has not been possible to reach agreement with Indian Bands in the area for easements. Work will be deferred on these two lakes until easements have been negotiated, but other work on the channel will proceed in the year ahead. In the lower Qu'Appelle, obstructions in the main channel will be removed, and some loops cut out. And there will be a start on channel improvements downstream from Katepwa Lake.

Mr. Speaker, grants to cities under the Water Pollution Control Assistance Act will be increased in the coming year to \$500,000 from \$75,000 in the 1977-78 fiscal year. As you know, the government is pleased to provide some assistance to cities to help them upgrade or improve sewage treatment facilities consistent with our water quality management program. During 1978-79, major expenditures will be related to a new sewage treatment facility for the city of Yorkton, estimated to cost about \$2.4 million, and the remainder is largely designated for the city of Regina for construction of their primary sewage treatment facilities. The policy under this act is to provide to cities 10 per cent of the capital cost of primary and secondary treatment facilities and 15 per cent to advanced or tertiary treatment facilities.

Mr. Speaker, I want to comment on at least one program under way in Sask Tel communications. In November 1976, all hon. members will recall that I announced that the government would act on a promise in the "New Deal 75" by launching a voluntary program to assimilate the rural telephone companies. At that time there were some 704 rural telephone companies serving 50,000 subscribers. The response to the Voluntary Assimilation Program is really overwhelming. In 1977, the first full year this program was in operation, 33,603 farmers in 460 rural companies ignored the warnings of the Conservative Leader that this government was exercising more control over their daily lives and voted for the NDP Voluntary Assimilation Program. Of the 704 Rural Telephone Companies representing over 50,000 subscribers existing in October 1976, as of March 1, 1978, 515 companies representing 38,695 subscribers have voted to accept the voluntary assimilation program. Just over 200 independent rural companies remain who serve about 16,000 subscribers.

Mr. Speaker, these farmers did not complain of the loss of individual freedom nor the destruction of their fundamental liberties as the cable plows in 1977 replaced cracked cross-arms, sagging wires and petrified posts with 4,753 miles of buried wire and cable in 77 companies. And in 1978, over 6,500 miles are scheduled to be buried under the voluntary assimilation program. The Conservative financial critic for Thunder Creek may scold this government for borrowings by Crown corporations like Sask Tel to create new jobs and provide a modern communications system. But the farmers of Saskatchewan I think are much wiser than the hon. member for Thunder Creek. They



regard the investment of \$8 million in 1977 and \$8.3 million in 1978 to rebuild the rural phone system as a positive action by a provincial government that is concerned about their needs and desires.

Mr. Speaker, the roar of cable plows on windy hills near acrid marshes may threaten the Conservatives' prospects for getting re-elected, but the farmers do not regard the voluntary assimilation program as the government encroaching upon the farmer. They regard this program as a positive action by a responsible and responsive government. Responsible by investing today for the farmers of today and tomorrow and responsive by investing in the best communications equipment available. Mr. Speaker, there are many other programs that will be undertaken by this government in the coming year; we will continue to improve and build on. I know, however, there are other members who want the opportunity to participate in this debate. I want to say in conclusion, Mr. Speaker, that I will be opposing the amendment and voting in support of the main motion.

**MR. L.W. BIRKBECK (Moosomin):** — Mr. Speaker, I thank the member for Kelvington-Wadena for closing down early and giving the rest of the members of the Legislature an opportunity to say a few words on the Budget Debate. I am rather pleased that I am following the member for Kelvington-Wadena because all I have to be concerned about is the fact that I have buttons on my suit coat. I was a little worried for a while that I may follow the member for Pelly because I thought well how would I follow an act like that and I thought about it and I thought that the only thing I can do to really adequately and accurately follow that act would be to say nothing. And after all, I had put some thought to it and I didn't want to go to those extremes. But, Mr. Speaker, just to make a comment or two regarding the remarks of the member for Pelly, he spoke of the Crown corporations and how good they were. Of course he was very consistent with the NDP ideological approach of, well, condemning those old multinationals. He failed though when he was speaking about the Crown corporations and suggesting that their financing was long term loans and for future projects which were going to provide energy and jobs for Saskatchewan residents. The one thing though that the member failed to point out was that it's the people of Saskatchewan that are responsible for those outstanding loans. The government has taken on that responsibility and the government is in fact the people, and if he is consistent with what he is saying, and I question whether he is when he says "Well, we are the people's party", he should know by now there is only one party in Saskatchewan that is truly the people's party and that is the party of the Progressive Conservative Party of Saskatchewan. He suggested the move towards more expenditures on the Department of Agriculture and I think that the Minister of Agriculture should take heed because the member for Pelly sitting right behind him, it may be possible that he plans to move up a row or two there so I have to agree with the member for Pelly in that regard at least that definitely we need to have more spending in the Department of Agriculture. Mr. Speaker, if I might get back to the context of my comments tonight, I would like to say that it is with great pleasure that I rise today to join in the debate on this Budget prepared by the Minister of Finance and presented to the Fifth Session of the 18th Legislature. Mr. Speaker, it is also with a great deal of pride that I take the opportunity to present views and concerns on behalf of the constituency I represent. The Moosomin constituency has provided for me this honor and privilege.

Mr. Speaker, let me comment briefly on the constituency of Moosomin. The comments I will have to make will very clearly outline to you, Mr. Speaker, why my concerns are of special importance to the Moosomin constituency and of course to myself as a resident of the Moosomin constituency and the one my children will have for the expansion of

their opportunities I hope they will have as future residents of Saskatchewan.

Mr. Speaker, the Moosomin constituency is in so many ways like Saskatchewan as a whole. It contains some of the richest farm lands in all of Saskatchewan, it contains the most modern potash mine possibly unsurpassed by any other mine anywhere in the world. The town of Moosomin itself is the most progressive and conservative for that matter of any town on the Trans-Canada between Regina, Saskatchewan and Brandon located in Tory Manitoba. Other towns like Kipling, Whitewood and Wawota are growing and vibrant. This constituency is vibrant and alive in spite of this province's government which is by no means by its policies attempting to provide stimulus for growth of individual aspirations of the private sector as it relates to small business, secondary industry, or its agricultural industry which is the heart of this constituency, as it is for all of Saskatchewan, and of recreational opportunities as well.

Mr. Speaker, this constituency is rich in natural resources like rivers and lakes — the Qu'Appelle Valley, the Kenosee Park and Pipestone Valley which provide habitat for wildlife and recreational opportunities for many residents. There are other resources like high quality gravel for road constructions and even moderate supplies of oil.

Mr. Speaker, it is a great constituency. I am proud to represent it as representative most parts of Saskatchewan and it is one way or another.

Mr. Speaker, all of this and through blind economic times like our province has never known and what do we get? — another deficit Budget provided by none other than the \$2 billion dollar man and his androids.

Mr. Speaker, let us take a look at the effect of the \$2 billion man and his androids, who have been programmed for deficit financing, long-term borrowing like we have never known and total expenditures like we have never known, for the provision of programs and programs and programs and yet more programs.

The Minister of Agriculture, in his reply to this Budget Debate spoke of those many programs. He went on and on and on and talked about them. Incidentally, I might bring it to the Minister of Agriculture's attention, he did make comment about a program that he had introduced regarding a grain drying assimilation program. He might note that about a week before his press release on that I had one that advised that the Minister of Agriculture would do just that, to have a co-ordinating program using our agricultural representative offices. As the Minister of Agriculture is aware of that I thought he might send me a letter or something, just between the two of us and thank me for the good idea. But I might tell you I didn't get any note from the Minister of Agriculture, not even a telephone call.

Mr. Speaker, the member for Saltcoats (Mr. Kaeding) and the member for Humboldt (Mr. Tchorzewski) expounded on these many programs when they were ordered to their feet by the mastermind, that of the Premier. Some of these programs are worthwhile. Others are designed to help people who have been stripped of their incentives by this government — the incentives to help themselves.

Mr. Speaker, the Progressive Conservative Party of Saskatchewan will provide the people of Saskatchewan with the incentives to help themselves in order that they will no longer be a burden to society, in particular to the working people of our province. Mr. Speaker, God helps those who help themselves and this NDP government helps

those who don't or won't. A Progressive Conservative government will help those who cannot and I might add that as loud as that government whip may yell, he never makes any sense. He can blabber all he likes but you know your mouth never gets any smaller so just keep talking. Mr. Speaker, when you read over the Budget Address by the \$2 billion dollar man, you very quickly see what he has said. He is saying that he and his superiors know better what is best for us than we know ourselves.

We in the Progressive Conservative Party of Saskatchewan have more faith in the worth of the people of Saskatchewan as individuals than does this NDP government. As a Progressive Conservative agriculture critic, I find it almost impossible to criticize or commend the government on this Budget since it is obvious they thought it unnecessary to take into consideration our biggest industry, that of agriculture.

There is one item of particular significance. The hon. Minister of Finance stated on page 4 of the Budget that the enormous stimulus provided through our economy in recent years as a result of unprecedented prosperity in the agricultural sector has now tapered off. He also says on page 6 that lower grain prices and rising farm costs meant that both farm cash receipts and realized net farm income were down in 1977. While farm cash receipts should be higher, farm costs will be higher as well, and realized net farm income may decline. The former Minister of Agriculture said basically the same thing in 1974-75, Debates and Proceedings on page 101, when he introduced the Farm Cost Reduction Program. Our Minister of Agriculture, the member for Saltcoats, has discontinued this program. Mr. Speaker, thousands of farmers are asking why. I say, shame on the Minister of Agriculture who would strike yet another blow at our farmers who are facing economic peril like never before. I say, Shame! Shame on the Minister of Finance, our now famous \$2 billion dollar man, who would prepare a Budget for Agriculture that is increased by less than \$4 million for this budget year over last. By taking rising costs, inflation, costs of borrowing, etc., into consideration, the projection budget for agriculture is in reality, a decrease.

Mr. Speaker, let us take a look at some of the expenditures projected for agriculture for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1979. When you go down the items you will see that administration is up. When we look at assistance to general agriculture interests, that's down. Communications, personal and personnel in-training statistics — all of these, up. There is one that's good and that is the amount of money that the government has put into planning. It has increased the amount of money in planning and research and we welcome that increase. But other items like 9 and 11, direct assistance, those items are down. You go back to other departments here there are a number of high positions — 156 in item 13; 31 in Family Farm Improvement Branch. All of these are up, but you look at grants for control of pollution from intensive livestock operations, this is down, but this is understandable because we don't have any new cow herds in this province. In fact we have three times the kill off of cows in this province of anywhere in this country. When you follow through the Estimates that is what you find all the way through. When you get to the end and you add it up you will find that about 15 per cent is allotted to positions to pay salaries for people to administer the many programs.

**AN HON. MEMBER:**— They are good programs.

**MR. BIRKBECK:**— They are good programs. Some of them are, yes, some of them are. I have already said that. The Minister of Agriculture obviously sitting there and reading and he wasn't listening because I have already said that there are some of these programs that are good. The problem is, of course, that he doesn't understand that we are eating a lot of it up in administration.

Mr. Speaker, when I arrived in my office this morning I received another letter, one of many, from other constituencies. This constituent of Morse was disturbed because there is no pressure being applied to the government to pave the way for better returns for agricultural products. This constituent of the Morse constituency asked why there was \$300 million for potash mines and comparatively no money for agriculture, which produces such high returns to government. He expressed concern over high electrical rates, high insurance premiums for farm half tons. This man had even more concerns. He asked why the heavy oil plant at Lloydminster was not brought into production. He feels it should move quickly into production for long-term benefits, energy for the future plus job opportunities. Well now, there is a lot of chatting going on over there again. We are talking about the Lloydminster heavy oil plant. Thank goodness that the Premier of this province listens to the Leader of the Progressive Conservative Party once in a while. When he was telling you people that we should be up there developing that heavy oil plant, the development taking place on the Alberta side, sure let it suck our resources out under that imaginary line — oh, you are feeling bad there, I know you are — you can chitter and chatter all you like but you know you are losing and we know we are winning . . . (interjection) . . . yes, I'll get to the medicare premiums.

Mr. Speaker, this constituent feels that farmers are tired . . . (interjection) . . . Well now, Mr. Speaker, I don't know — I am just going to say something here and I wouldn't want the government or the Liberal opposition, for that matter, to miss it. This constituent says that he feels farmers are tired of feeding the NDP and the Liberals with cheap meat and cheap bread. Mr. Speaker, this letter tells the story of the Progressive Conservative Party in Saskatchewan. People no longer have trust or faith in NDP and Liberal politicians or their policies. The phones are ringing, letters by the sack full, and meeting halls are packed. The Progressive Conservative Party in Saskatchewan keeps growing as more and more people turn to us, as the only alternative party, to provide a government for the people of Saskatchewan; a government designed to meet the concerns and needs of the people; a government we can all trust and one which will not play politics with our tax dollars.

Mr. Speaker, we need to re-emphasize a number of arguments our party, the people's party, the Progressive Conservative Party of Saskatchewan, has been making with consistency since 1975. We believe government spending must be held in check. They have increased some 12 per cent and yet, over the past two years, they have told everyone else to restrict themselves to 7 per cent or less. We disapprove of deficit financing. It cannot go on forever. Sooner or later the people of Saskatchewan will have to pay the bill. We believe this government's inability to balance the budget during Saskatchewan's best economic years provides they will never balance it over a period of good and bad years, but will continue to increase the per capita debt far beyond any economic hope for the residents of Saskatchewan.

Our only hope may lie in the hope that we are flanked by two Progressive Conservative governments whose economic growth rate is better, on projection, than Saskatchewan and very soon the people of Saskatchewan will opt for a Progressive Conservative government here as well.

Mr. Speaker, let me take a few moments to drop a few comments for the Minister responsible for Consumer Affairs. His speech, from the very outset, in my opinion, was the absolute height of ignorance. He grasped desperately for anything to discredit the Progressive Conservative Party of Saskatchewan. He only brought about discredit to himself. The Speaker's Gallery was full of fresh, young, intelligent minds of a visiting

class of Regina students. Mr. Speaker, they looked on in awe as the member for Regina Northwest moaned on, dealing in half-truths and innuendos — shame on this member.

Mr. Speaker, let us take a look at the subject of health care in this province and the costs there. The minds of this NDP government are now so twisted. They are so concerned about the Tory tidal wave sweeping Saskatchewan that they cannot see their own hospital costs. They are too concerned with Tories here and in other provinces. Mr. Speaker, health costs in Saskatchewan are now approaching \$.5 billion. They are \$435 million. When they get to be \$.5 billion, that's going to be \$500 for every man, woman and child and I don't think that's too difficult to figure out, with a population of 1 million. Now then, you've got that — I hope that you have that in your heads; you've got \$435 million, you divide it by 1 million, you get roughly \$400 — okay, \$435 for every man, woman and child. Now then, children don't work; people in prisons don't work; there's a lot of people — hospital patients — they don't work; senior citizens aren't working. Now, when you take all the people into consideration that are not working, not earning money that they would have to pay taxes on, then what is the figure? What is the figure that Saskatchewan people, the working people of this province, are paying for a health service plan in this province? I'll tell you.

**MR. FARIS:**— No premiums.

**MR. BIRKBECK:**— No premiums, no premiums. Well, I don't know how the Minister of Education can be so dense. I just fail to understand it, Mr. Speaker. There is a man that is all ready, he is just — he is conned by his own programs.

**AN HON. MEMBER:**— Let's hear a little more.

**MR. BIRKBECK:**— Well, I might add that the member for Kindersley (Mr. McMillan) looks a little better from that side of the House, you know. He is always yapping away over here and I'd rather if he were yapping away over there. I could see him better.

The Progressive Conservative Party of Saskatchewan believes that the numbers of people hired and paid by our government must be very closely managed. Today, the Premier, in the words of the Leader Post, slammed the Progressive Conservatives in Manitoba and I quote: "Premier Allan Blakeney has condemned the Progressive Conservative government in Manitoba for laying off several hundred civil servants in northern departments."

Let me explain to the Premier, who unfortunately is not here tonight but I am sure one of you will carry my message to him, that the lay-offs in Manitoba were, to a large extent, construction contracts that were fulfilled and not renewed. There were also extra people on staff that were laid off to avoid a duplication of services. More importantly, Mr. Speaker, the former Premier, Mr. Schreyer, in fact, by way of a press release in a Manitoba paper only a few days ago, agreed that part of the lay-offs were justified.

Now, Mr. Speaker, our Premier should really get his facts straight, because he sure looks foolish disagreeing with the former NDP premier. Once again, I quote:

The Premier spent the bulk of his forty minute speech outlining mistakes of Liberal and Progressive Conservative provincial governments across Canada.

Well, there are quite a few Progressive Conservative governments across this country

but I don't know if there are an awful lot of Liberals. There's one or two, I think, left. Three? Is that it? The three smallest provinces. Yeah, that's fair.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I want to point out that in 1964-71 performance to the Liberal Party, this is the Premier speaking again:

The government in Saskatchewan is a major reason why the Liberals should never be returned to power here.

Now, why your Premier would show any concern whatsoever of Liberals being returned to power in Saskatchewan is beyond me. Well, that's obvious when you look around. You don't see too many of them in here tonight either, because they don't want to hear the truth. There aren't too many Liberals left and the Premier knows that the only way that he's going to save his government is to remove that stumbling block, a stumbling block to the Progressive Conservative Party in this province and that's the Liberal Party. I just want to assure through you, Mr. Speaker, to the Premier, that he need not worry about Liberals. And he knows it and it's nothing more than a big bluff that he's playing.

Mr. Speaker, the Manitoba Progressive Conservative government is attempting to hold the line on government spending. That is something this government knows nothing about. Now, I hear that the government members over there always saying, "Yes, when you get into office there'll be massive lay-offs of people in this province." And you know, as well as I do, that what a Progressive Conservative government does in one province or another is not necessarily going to be what it will be doing here in Saskatchewan. We in the Progressive Conservative Party of Saskatchewan, will assess very closely, how we spend the dollars of Saskatchewan taxpayers. We believe business and job opportunities must be created in Saskatchewan. The unemployment figures used by this NDP government are far from accurate. People who leave our province for employment in the Tory lands of Canada are no longer a part of the Saskatchewan provincial statistics and therefore, cannot be counted. We are the only area in North America whose population has declined in the last forty years and, Mr. Speaker, I say shame on any government that drives people away to other parts of Canada.

Mr. Speaker, to say that Premier Blakeney or Prime Minister Trudeau should be returned to power, in light of the prevalent economic peril, high inflation and unemployment is like calling an arsonist to put out the fire. Our most hon. member for Prince Albert-Duck Lake placed praise on our financial critic, the member for Thunder Creek and, Mr. Speaker, I would not like to miss an opportunity to tell this government once more that the words of our finance critic should be closely adhered to, words of wisdom, well chosen, sound in every way, advice this government will regret in the very near future.

Mr. Speaker, again I want to reassure the people of Saskatchewan that we are committed to reductions of the provincial sales tax in order to ease the burden on low income families and encourage growth in our small business sector in particular in rural Saskatchewan. Although, Mr. Speaker, the family of Crown Corporations is providing a good service to Saskatchewan residents, one sure has a difficult time to see why the Saskatchewan Power Corporation must increase its net profits by 180.5 per cent in one year. We, in the Progressive Conservative Party of Saskatchewan insist that utility rate increases be rolled back, or at the very least, be not increased any further. The people of Saskatchewan cannot afford to pay these indirect taxes, taxation without representation. Our Crown corporations are yet another area in which a Progressive Conservative government would have a most favorable effect on behalf of the people of

Saskatchewan.

Mr. Speaker, I'm sure that I could on for hours and hours condemning this government for its actions in recent years. There are areas in which you deserve commendation and that would be in the areas of some tax cuts. At least you're not taking all the people's money. You're giving them a small pittance back. But the fact still remains, this Budget is not accurate in its context. You are taking more from the people, you're taking more from the people than you've ever taken before and you give them a little bit back and make a big flair about it. You think that's going to pacify them but I'll tell you, Mr. Speaker, and to this government, the people I talk to are very concerned and they're very aware that anything that you as a government give them, is their own tax dollars. So the day and age of fooling the people out there, is long gone. It cannot be done anymore and since you've presented that same kind of a Budget, Mr. Speaker, I want to tell you, that I cannot support this Budget. I will support the amendment.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**HON. A.S. MATSALLA (Minister of Tourism and Renewable Resources):**— Mr. Speaker, to begin my remarks in this important Budget debate, I wish to do so by congratulating my colleague, the hon. Minister of Finance for bringing forward a budget truly reflective of this government's intent to recognize the economic realities within Canada and within our province of Saskatchewan. I also want to congratulate him on the fine and effective manner in which he developed his Budget address. The member for Regina North East, our Minister of Finance, has very ably demonstrated a clear understanding of how best for a government to manage the financial affairs of our province. This management is aimed to give the Saskatchewan citizen the greatest value and service for the tax dollar. I have every confidence that the citizens of Saskatchewan will recognize this and show their appreciation for it by giving the Minister of Finance and this government their full support and co-operation. The Budget before us, Mr. Speaker, did not come by chance, nor is it beyond realism. The Budget is a result of sound financial planning and good management of Saskatchewan's resource and taxation revenues. For this to happen, Mr. Speaker, requires good, effective, strong leadership. This New Democratic government and the people of Saskatchewan, Mr. Speaker, have this kind of leadership in our Premier Allan Blakeney. Not only does Premier Blakeney stand tall as our Premier of Saskatchewan but he is one of the tallest in recognition and respect of his leadership by the entire Canadian nation.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. MATSALLA:**— Not only am I proud of our Premier, Mr. Speaker, but I know you are. The people of my constituency in Canora, the citizens of Saskatchewan and many Canadians across our nation express their interest and appreciation in the able manner Premier Blakeney represents Saskatchewan and Canada at the First Ministers' Conference. Saskatchewan and Canada need the Blakeney leadership because it is committed to give Saskatchewan the best it has and at the same time concern itself with resolving the problems of Canada in a broad sense, in the interest of Saskatchewan and in the interest of Canada as a whole. At conferences other provinces look to Saskatchewan's position and what our Premier has to say.

The Toronto Globe and Mail, September 20 edition, points out it has been New Democratic Premier Allan Blakeney of Saskatchewan who has been in the forefront of working toward the proper response to the national unity crisis. To quote from the same

March 13, 1978

issue of the Globe and Mail:

In major speeches in Calgary, Toronto, Montreal, Mr. Blakeney has gone further than any other English Canadian politician in defining the current dilemma and searching for answers.

Last month at the First Ministers' Conference in Ottawa, Mr. Speaker, it was again Premier Allan Blakeney from Saskatchewan who came up with a program to cure the country's unemployment crisis.

The Toronto Star, February 14, 1978 issue, indicates there was leadership from Saskatchewan Premier Allan Blakeney on the vital issue of a program to cure the country's unemployment crisis. I quote:

He urged Ottawa and his fellow provinces to embark on a massive program of government investment to create jobs.

The projects, as Blakeney made clear, make economic sense. They will directly stimulate other productive activities and reap considerable benefits for the economy for years to come. Moreover, in the years ahead when unemployment is lower it will cost a lot more to build these projects.

In the case of energy projects, delays will mean Canadians will have to find billions of dollars to import oil instead. As Blakeney put it, the choice is between 'jobs today, energy tomorrow' and 'no jobs today, no energy tomorrow'.

The same news article expresses concern with positions taken by other provincial leaders and Prime Minister Trudeau in their solutions to relieve the serious unemployment problem facing Canadians. I quote from the article.

It's important that premiers such as Bill Bennett of British Columbia, Peter Lougheed of Alberta and Sterling Lyon of Manitoba, along with Davis and Trudeau recognize this. They are the ones voicing do-nothing policies.

Yes, Mr. Speaker, the Liberals and Tories continue to say, let government get out of the way and let private enterprise do the job of developing the economy and creating jobs, seemingly totally unaware of the fact that 50 years ago when private enterprise had a completely free hand, we got into the largest and the worst depression of the dark days of the dirty thirties.

Mr. Speaker, this New Democratic government approaches financial planning on a long-term basis. In good years, money is set aside so that we have something to fall back on when the economy slows down. Since 1972 Saskatchewan's economy has been on the upswing. This government foresaw a slow to moderate economic growth rate for the previous fiscal year and for 1978-79. These slow growth years are times when government makes use of the accumulated surplus cash reserves to continue to expand services without having to make general tax increases, as a matter of fact, make significant tax reductions as was done in this Budget.

Let us just briefly make a comparison of this Budget and that of Conservative Ontario which was brought down the same day.



Ontario's health insurance plan premiums increased by 37.5 per cent to \$44 a month or \$528 per year for families and \$22 a month or \$264 a year for single persons. Funds for Ontario hospitals in this year's budget were increased 4.3 per cent. Last year's increase was 7.09 per cent and that resulted in cutbacks. I ask, how severe will the cutbacks be this year? We will wait and see.

In contrast, Mr. Speaker, we have no health premiums. Saskatchewan's Budget provides for construction of three new hospitals and renovations at numerous others, a large increase in the number of level IV care beds for nursing home patients and there is a 25 per cent increase in the provincial supplement to old age security benefits.

Ontario's mining taxes were unnecessarily cut when total government revenues from all sources in Ontario amount to only .2 per cent. In sharp contrast, Mr. Speaker, total revenues from all resources amount to 25 per cent in Saskatchewan.

The Ontario Mortgage Corporation is being wound up and that eliminates the only positive action that had been taken in the housing field.

Saskatchewan, Mr. Speaker, is doubling the rural housing program from 400 to 800 units for a total cost of \$7.6 million. We are extending the Home Renovation Assistance Program at a cost of \$6 million and we are introducing a small builder assistance program.

Regarding municipal grants, Mr. Speaker, Ontario's transfers to municipalities and school jurisdictions were increased by 6.5 per cent — running well behind inflation.

In Saskatchewan, revenue sharing to hold local mill rates will add almost \$20 million to local government revenues. This represents a dramatic 45 per cent increase in one year, Mr. Speaker.

Our government is deeply committed to preserving and enhancing the quality of life in all areas of Saskatchewan — in cities, in towns, in villages, as well as in the rural communities in the South and the many settlements in the North.

The government is constantly fulfilling its commitment through the co-operation and participation of Saskatchewan communities in various social programs. I speak with confidence when I say the people of my own constituency of Canora are appreciative of the benefits they receive from government programs. Let me cite a few of the program benefits. Grants are made available for construction and operating senior citizen activity centres in ten communities in Canora constituency. Thousands of dollars in grants and commitments were made available under the province's community capital fund to assist with street improvements, water and sewer main extensions and street lighting. Neighbourhood improvement programs were undertaken in Sturgis, Preeceville and Canora.

The Cultural and Recreational Facilities Grant Program provided assistance to communities for improving their local and recreational and cultural facilities. Mr. Speaker, \$180,000 was committed for a seed cleaning plant in Canora. Over \$840,000 went out to farmers in the constituency under the Beef Industry Assistance Program. Canora constituency is only one of the many constituencies in the province that benefited from the many programs implemented by the government. Community program participation demonstrates that government and people can work together in an effort to meet community needs.

Mr. Speaker, Saskatchewan's Renewable Resources and Tourism industries are important aspects of our provincial economy. Wise management and development of the fisheries, wild life and forest resources and the tourism industry, has over the years provided many social and economic benefits to the people of this province.

Through increased tourism promotion, Saskatchewan is moving to the forefront of the travelling public as a tourist destination area. The old myth that Saskatchewan is a pass-through province is being dispelled as more and more tourists are being diverted off the Trans Canada and the Yellowhead Highways to enjoy some extra time in this province. Our tourist promotion programs are enjoying a high profile in a highly competitive market despite physical restraints in budgets. As well, the private sector has taken an increasing interest in the tourism potential of this province through major initiatives from this government and my department.

One of the programs which is especially newsworthy is the Community and Regional Tourism Development Program which is in essence, a new approach to the development of the travel industry on a regional basis. The purpose of this program is to alleviate a number of problems facing the travel industry in Saskatchewan. Essentially, the problems identified were a lack of joint promotional activities and opportunities and a lack of local participation in tourism oriented associations, agencies and communities.

The program, Mr. Speaker, which was introduced last summer is in my judgment, developing soundly and is receiving support from local and regional tourism interest. During the next year it is my belief that the presence of these organized associations will make themselves felt, both in the public and private sectors. Mr. Speaker, six regional travel associations are now in place. All employ a full-time manager except for one which is in the process of hiring a full-time manager. Five of the associations have been incorporated under The Societies Act and all have boards of directors composed of varied local tourism interests such as accommodation and food service facilities, vacation farms, Chambers of Commerce and local government.

Funds are provided through two grants, Mr. Speaker. A matching grant for administrative purposes providing \$3 for each dollar collected by memberships and other means of support to a maximum \$15,000, and now a matching marketing grant of \$5,000 per region to regions for carrying out a marketing promotional program which may include the production of regional travel brochures, exhibits and other promotional material.

Mr. Speaker, there are many people who are not convinced that tourism is a very important industry in our province. I believe the travel industry in Saskatchewan has a great potential but there is a need for greater development of tourist and recreational facilities. We cannot expect development unless we can make the business community and the general public understand that the industry is important and that it needs their involvement. Currently, close to 80 per cent of the people travelling in Saskatchewan are our own residents. The other 20 per cent is comprised of 15 per cent non-resident Canadians and 5 per cent Americans. Our concern, Mr. Speaker, is not that we could be crowded out. Our concern is, why is it that there are so many Saskatchewanians who travel outside of Saskatchewan and how can we persuade Saskatchewan residents to travel and holiday here in Saskatchewan.

In the past, Mr. Speaker, we have tended to think of tourism as a matter of building and maintaining parks, camp grounds and other similar recreation areas. While this is an important part of tourism, the fact is that the tourism industry comprises a whole inventory of accommodation and dining services, transportation and other related travel services, including promotion which all serve the need of the traveller. Through the regional approach, Mr. Speaker, a community is drawing upon its vast number of travel industry resources. The Board of Trade, the Chamber of Commerce, the municipalities, business men, recreation sites, museums and the various community events. Local people become members of the regional association and become involved. They have an opportunity to fully participate in development and promotion of tourism for the region. Co-ordination and pooling of efforts will allow communities to take better advantage of the benefits of tourism. Local organizations are dealing with local people and hence there is a better understanding of what tourism is and what it means to them as part of a community.

What we eventually hope, Mr. Speaker, is to see the development of a regional co-ordinated travel industry that will serve first, the region, and second, the province as a whole. There is also a major role for government to play in the development of the travel industry and to this end my department has developed major programs of promotion and development of the travel industry.

Our information and answering service is one of the most sophisticated in Canada. Including written and telephone inquiries, it handles approximately 100,000 inquiries in a year. As well, a computerized letter-writing program provides for the servicing of all inquiries within 24 to 48 hours. Our distribution program sends out about 3 million pieces of literature covering all informational requirements of travellers to travel agents, motor clubs, Chambers of Commerce and Canadian government offices of tourism across the country, United States and abroad. Along with this, Mr. Speaker, we have attended a number of sports shows more than ever before, and Saskatchewan Showcase, a travel display and information trailer, all help to introduce Saskatchewan to potential visitors as a holiday destination.

Information centres located on key travel routes encourage travellers to stop and explore Saskatchewan. As well, this year for the first time we have attended the Montreal sports show and we have produced and begun to distribute Saskatchewan's first French language invitation. I believe this brochure and its distribution is a step forward in promoting travel in Canada in a bilingual way as well as contributing to national unity.

Mr. Speaker, at the federal-provincial tourism ministers' conference earlier this year, the Saskatchewan government supported increased flexibility of advance booking charters. While the federal government has introduced a low cost Canada travel package, Saskatchewan has been virtually excluded from the program with the net effect being that most of Canada including Saskatchewan people, have low cost options to travel in Canada this coming year. However, with no offering in Saskatchewan, Mr. Speaker, Canadians do not have the opportunity to visit Saskatchewan.

Major development in Saskatchewan's travel industry such as a new custom bus tour service offers itinerary planning and follow-up detail to senior citizen groups, school classes and many other organized groups.

With this and other initiatives by this government in the tourist industry, Saskatchewan

March 13, 1978

definitely has something to offer to the traveller — something that will tie in very nicely with the Low Cost Canada Program.

Mr. Speaker, my staff reviewed the packages offered on CP Air, VIA Rail and Air Canada Programs. It was a great disappointment to us that the only way Saskatchewan is represented is by the VIA Rail overnight stop and a reduction rate at the Bessborough and Saskatchewan Hotels.

Furthermore, Mr. Speaker, I am extremely disappointed at the way the Tour Package Program was developed. There was a complete lack of consultation with my department and yet Saskatchewan people in part are contributing towards the \$400,000 to airlines for promotion through the Canadian Government Office of Tourism. Mr. Speaker, I am making strong representations to the federal Minister of Industry and Commerce, Jack Horner, on this pointing out to him the lack of Saskatchewan presence in low-cost travel packages for Canada. I am still awaiting the minister's reply.

I want to make it clear, Mr. Speaker, that I am not opposed to the principle of a Tour Package Promotion Program. I believe it is a good idea and I believe that it is one way of giving our tourist industry a boost. But my criticism lies in the way the details of the program have been developed. I believe that each and every province of Canada is important and each and every province has its special characteristics which could contribute more fully to the overall tourist industry in Canada. When we talk about national unity, and then proceed to lessen the importance of one province from another, we are working against ourselves and we are not going to get the optimum dollar value out of the tourist industry.

Mr. Speaker, during the past year there have been a number of innovative programs initiated by this government dealing with the fisheries and wildlife resources with emphasis continuing to be on habitat protection.

A new Habitat Protection and Development Division has been set up within my department having the responsibility of protecting wildlife habitat located on Crown lands. It is also concerned with protecting the waterfowl resource from the destruction of wetlands. This new section of the department, Mr. Speaker, will provide input into the many faceted programs of the Department of Agriculture and the PFRA with respect to development on agricultural Crown land and its relationship to fisheries and wildlife.

During the year, work has been completed on a report of the economic importance of Saskatchewan's sport fisheries in conjunction with the federal Fisheries Department. In the report, some very enlightening facts about fishing were brought to light which demonstrate the importance of our fisheries resource to the economy of this province. The report is based on 1975 and shows that there were 243,000 active anglers in Saskatchewan of which 58,850 were under 16 years of age. More than one-half of the non-residents who came to Saskatchewan to fish were from Canada. Most were from Alberta and Manitoba. The balance were from the United States.

In 1975, Mr. Speaker, more than 2 million angler days were recorded — an average of 11 angler days per licenced angler and they spent more than \$36 million on their sport. Mr. Speaker, because of the evident economic importance of this resource, the Fisheries Branch undertakes extensive studies to provide a sound basis for policies and programs which will ensure continued economic, recreational and social benefits from

this resource.

The economic importance of commercial fishing is also a major consideration particularly in northern Saskatchewan. Where both commercial and sport fishing take place, there is often a conflict of whether or not both or one or the other should be considered.

Mr. Speaker, to properly manage the fisheries resource it is necessary to maintain a balanced harvest. To accomplish this we must on most lakes establish a method of harvest that would result in a balanced removal of commercial and game fish. If this is not applied, the balanced harvest will not be achieved. We believe in the multiple use of the fishery and under proper management there is room for both sport and commercial fishing and both can work to the advantage of each other.

Mr. Speaker, I would now like to take a few moments to discuss the Landowner — Wildlife Assistance Program introduced this year to compensate farmers for losses due to deer depredation and to assist organizations to help wildlife.

The program is twofold:

- 1) It will financially assist property owners who are experiencing wildlife damage to agricultural crops; and
- 2) It will aid organizations that wish to assist wildlife in critical situations during the remainder of this winter.

The Property Owner Assistance Program concentrates on damage prevention techniques such as fencing, relocation of hay and feed stacks, repellants and scaring devices, and a purchasing of small amounts of hay to use as lure crops at alternate feeding sites are also considered.

The amount of money payable under this program is 75 per cent of the value or damage incurred and no compensation is paid for claims of less than \$100.

Mr. Speaker, the Wildlife Assistance Program provides a maximum of \$500 assistance grant to organizations that are interested in projects which would help wild birds and mammals survive this winter.

We believe that wildlife in Saskatchewan belongs to and is the responsibility of all citizens. Therefore, all of us should share in compensating landowners from having to suffer full financial loss in sustaining wildlife throughout the winter.

Mr. Speaker, some of the opposition criticized the program for not going far enough to providing 100 per cent compensation and for encouraging organizations to help wildlife survive the severe winter. I want to remind the opposition, Mr. Speaker, that the former Liberal government had no such compensation program whatever and that this government is doing as well or better than Conservative provincial governments in Canada.

The program encourages the landowner to protect his property as much as possible and it encourages the initiative or private associations and organizations, particularly wildlife federations, to carry some of the responsibility for protecting our wildlife. I would have thought the opposition would support us fully on this program rather than

criticize the government for destroying private initiative. It is quite evident and no surprise that the opposition, if they are not sure what side to take, then the least they can do is to play politics with the program.

Another criticism, Mr. Speaker, that has come to light is that the conservation officers who are the major contacts for the program are not qualified to make a fair and complete assessment of all claims. I would just like to say that I have the fullest confidence in the conservation officers to make this judgment. In many cases where there is doubt as to the value of the hay and crop that is lost, crop insurance adjusters and agriculture representatives are consulted. The combined effort, Mr. Speaker, should result in the property owner getting a fair settlement.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to now turn your attention to another area of the department which will be receiving a greater emphasis in the future — and that is forestry.

Much progress has been made in recent years in industrial development, proper utilization, management and restocking of our forests. But new forest developments in other parts of the world are making it more difficult for our industry to compete. Reforestation, wood supply, slow growth and transportation costs are some of our serious concerns. At the Federal-Provincial Forestry Minister's Conference held earlier this year, Saskatchewan, along with other provinces, made strong representations to the federal government for assistance in forest research and protection and in reforestation programs. In Saskatchewan we have stepped up our programs to ensure a solid resource base for the forest industry; however, we need increased involvement by the federal government in these expanded programs, if we are to realize the full economic benefits from our forest resource.

The aspen resource in Saskatchewan is largely unused and it will take some time to overcome the technical and economic difficulties in making it marketable. It is my hope that the federal government will provide some assistance in this area as well.

Reforestation, Mr. Speaker, is of prime importance. Our forests are harvested much faster than they are renewed and this cannot continue. A great deal of progress has been made here. Production at the forest nurseries has increased from 2.75 million trees in 1973 to more than six million in 1977. Facilities have been expanded at the Prince Albert and Big River Nurseries and new nurseries are being developed near Chitek Lake and MacDowall.

Mr. Speaker, the fact that we have slow and difficult growing conditions here is all the more reason for a more aggressive reforestation program. All of our forest operators will have to contribute more to the reforestation program. It is expected that some 7.7 million trees can be planted by the Forestry Branch by 1979. Forest nurseries will produce 12 million trees by 1980, and by 1985 17 million will be needed to keep up with the anticipated rate of forest harvesting. With increased production of nurseries, Mr. Speaker, reforestation will obviously increase. Contract planting will be encouraged to provide opportunities for local people to develop business and create local employment opportunities. There is an urgent need for more and better research. We need research which would cover improved growth, fibre quality, and greater resistance to the elements of nature, if we are to keep pace and remain competitive with the coastal forest areas. Mr. Speaker, we must move towards more intensive forest development. In the meantime, we must do the best we can with the resources we have. Our objective is to obtain the best possible value from forest production through

efficient cutting operations and elimination of waste. This government recognizes that in recent years there has been an increased level of industrial activity in our forests. It should follow therefore that there is a need for more field staff to provide the essential management and supervision techniques. I am hopeful that we can accomplish this within the next year.

In order to achieve the objective of our forest policy, Mr. Speaker, conflicts within and without are almost inevitable. The work of reconciling these conflicts and establishing balance is no easy task. But it has to be faced by the industry, and the governments as well, if we are to get the most out of our forest resources. The importance of our forest industry in the overall economic and social well being of our province is great. In 1973, 3,580 people were employed in forest based industries and the value of forest products was \$74,683,000. In 1977, there were 4,092 employees and the value of forest products increased to \$122,484,00. The plywood plant, sawmill operations, the pulp mill and treating plant have all produced real value for Saskatchewan in terms of jobs and provincial revenues.

Mr. Speaker, from the mid-1960's to the mid-1970's visitations to Saskatchewan Provincial Parks increased from 1.8 million to 3.5 million. Along with the great number of visitors annually, a definite trend towards delinquent and violent behaviour became apparent with consequence deterioration of the environment and atmosphere in the parks. Following the 1976 summer holiday season, with damage to park property amounting to some \$50,000 with 600 prosecutions from Moose Mountain Park alone, and an unprecedented number of visitor complaints of lack of security in campgrounds, of noise and lack of control of vehicles in parks. My department identified measures required to improve the situation and obtain approval to expend up to \$900,000 to implement a security program.

Mr. Speaker, initially concern was expressed about the seemingly large number — 16 additional permanent positions were requested. However, enforcement of the park regulations requires experience and maturity of judgment as well as legal status under The Provincial Parks Act. To implement the program it was necessary to revise the park regulations; many sections were amended and some new sections were added to more clearly define responsible conduct and provincial park objectives. The more significant changes provided for:

- (1) Installation of control gates at campground and park entry;
- (2) Closure of picnic areas at 10:00 p.m.;
- (3) Maximum length of camper stay and other campsite occupancy requirements; and
- (4) Control of vehicles and designation of travel corridors.

Throughout the summer a public information program was carried out through press, radio and television to ensure that the public was aware of the program being implemented and the reasons for it.

The capital expenditures provided for street lighting, electric control gates, traffic control lights, trans-receiver and other equipment for patrol units. Specialized equipment such as motorized snow toboggans and small patrol vehicles were also acquired to permit greater officer mobility.

March 13, 1978

My department does feel that a positive impact of this program has been recognized by many of the three and one-half million park visitors as they were able to enjoy their visits in an atmosphere of peace and security this past season. Damage to public facilities due to vandalism has been reduced; preliminary estimates indicate that such damage would not exceed \$20,000 in 1977, down some \$30,000 from 1976. Threats to personal safety were also prevented.

As with most new programs, we initially experienced some difficulties; some park visitors indicated certain officers were over-zealous; however, through training programs we do expect to have a highly acceptable program in place this coming year.

Mr. Speaker, I would ask all members of the House to think seriously for a moment about the Budget before us.

When one stops to realize the high level of government service which is available to our people, and at the same time realize the limited tax base of our province, and a population of less than one million people, one should ask — how is it all possible?

Services in the North, our health and education programs, agriculture assistance, government insurance and a host of other programs, all cost money. And yet moneys to finance these programs are not derived from the imposition of onerous taxation policies. How is this possible?

But this isn't all, Mr. Speaker. Leadership by this New Democratic Party government has resulted in one of the lowest unemployment rates in Canada. Our population is on the upswing. Our economic growth is regular and significant and our credit rating rates with the best.

Mr. Speaker, all this is possible because we have a commitment to long-range financial planning. This government does not work from one election to the next. We are committed to the orderly development of this province and our 'plan of action' is having positive results.

Mr. Speaker, this Budget is part of this plan of action. I would like to repeat by saying, the Budget is an excellent Budget. It is the right thing at the right time. I know the people of Saskatchewan support it. I would ask members opposite to join this government in supporting responsible fiscal proposals which truly reflect the economic and social realities of this great province.

Mr. Speaker, I will not be supporting the amendment but I will give my full support to the main motion.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. E.F.A. MERCHANT (Regina Wascana):**— Good news, Mr. Speaker, as this will take eight minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I propose to discuss this evening with the House premium savings bonds. This is a concept which is a good concept and it has not been adopted in North America. I would suggest to members that it would be a useful addition to our current lottery schemes.

Mr. Speaker, premium savings bonds exist in Great Britain, the Republic of Ireland and



New Zealand in a modified form and they also exist in Norway and Sweden and in some smaller jurisdictions.

**AN HON. MEMBER:**— . . . socialist plan.

**MR. MERCHANT:**— Yes, Mr. Speaker, it is a socialist plan. Holders buy premium savings bonds in the post offices and I am sure that our members, at least, have never even seen them. Bonds are usually small. The example I am now showing the members is the 10 pound British bond. New Zealand and the Republic of Ireland issue these bonds in small denominations as small an amount as \$5.

Mr. Speaker, rather than pay interest as such to each bondholder the interest is, instead, paid out to a few big winners in monthly draws and the draws distribute the interest earned by the bonds and governments, as I understand it from contacting the British and Irish governments, and pay about 4 per cent so that the government benefits by the low amount of interest. The prizes in some jurisdictions are non-taxable improving the real rate of return on the investment. But most important, holders of premium savings bonds don't suffer the loss of their money as do purchasers of lottery tickets.

Members will recall, Mr. Speaker, that I have had a couple of criticisms to make of the lottery system, the lottery system which I think has an effect of encouraging people to believe that they are going to win something that they are not. But, at least, with the premium savings bond concept it satisfies the win big desires of the public and at the same time no one loses their investment in the process.

Premium savings bonds are redeemable at par at any time like Canada Savings Bonds and savings are encouraged in the process. I am not, Mr. Speaker, displeased with the operation of lotteries. The money now being distributed to support cultural and recreational groups is well used. I think I would maintain those lotteries but I believe that it would be useful to supplement those kinds of schemes with the premium savings bonds, which could be brought in either at the national level or the provincial level.

There is a risk desire, Mr. Speaker, in us all and I believe that we would be better to use the big win desire to encourage more savings rather than to encourage spending, which develops unfounded expectations and to some extent builds on the dreams of the disadvantaged.

Britain, with its operation of the premium savings bonds concept and approximately \$55 million, has had sales since 1956 of some \$5 billion and about \$3 billion remains in their scheme. The government has the advantage of massive savings in interests; savings are encouraged and the government borrows at home from its own citizens and doesn't face the problem of exchange fluctuations when they have to repay the bonds.

New Zealand, with a population of three million, started their premium savings bonds program in 1970. Their sales to date are approximately \$250 million and about half of that, approximately \$125 million is still invested.

The Republic of Ireland, Mr. Speaker, has had gross sales of about \$200 million and, again, approximately \$100 million remains in their plan .. Obviously you need some help with this scheme; I wouldn't wave them around as the RCMP will be in to arrest you.. Mr. Speaker, paying about 4 per cent in interest with about a quarter of 1 per

cent of the gross moneys on deposit going to administration (that is approximately the payout and the cost of administering this scheme) leaves a very large profit available to Canadian governments and it is a large profit that is being earned now by foreign governments.

As members will know bond issues in small denominations, which were found to be practical during the war because interest was withheld, are not practical under our current schemes because of the expense in administration and the expense in paying out interest. The advertising requirements to sell bonds in small denominational amounts also makes those small bonds almost prohibitively expensive in administration.

Premiums savings bonds avoid most of those problems. Few of the bonds are cashed. Interest need not be paid to all of the holders but only the prize winners and they largely advertise themselves.

I do not believe that the introduction of a premium savings bond scheme would detract from the present success of the lotteries program. I believe it would enhance the earnings of the lotteries and that these additional moneys could in part be used in the same way to help support cultural activities. Once a premium savings bond program is in place it tends to become a means of raising money that works almost in perpetuity. So, for instance, in Great Britain that \$3 billion continues to grow and never really disappears from its usefulness to the public treasury. It is not, I suggest, in the least far fetched to present this kind of a scheme in this Legislature and suggest that it is the kind of proposal that governments should be looking at. It is in fact an important part of the financial planning of quite a number of governments and should be receiving very serious consideration and in this nation. It is for all of those reasons, Mr. Speaker, that I choose in the Budget Debate which is a sort of a free wheeling discussion available to members, to mention this proposal in the House as I hope to have an opportunity one day to mention it to the national government.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. E. ANDERSON (Shaunavon):**— Mr. Speaker, it is with some trepidation that I rise to speak in this Budget Debate.

**MR. MOSTOWAY:**— After you have heard . . .

**MR. ANDERSON:**— That's true. It is obvious by the Budget that it's a combination of a re-election budget and a budget to prop up you might say a party that knows it's on the way out and doesn't know just who's going to take it out. It is very interesting to see the little goodies handed here and handed there, not with really an economic sense but only with political sense which I admire. You give 25 here and 10 there. It minds me of a sailor out on the night in the brothel region, you know you fill your 10 bucks here and 10 bucks there. Interesting. ( . . . interjection . . . ) Very true.

The Budget itself, Mr. Speaker, shows that the NDP has never learned much in the years in office. That's true. The increases of this so-called Budget is going to generate such vast amounts of work, all in government buildings, all in buildings that really will not supply a continuing type of growth to the province. It will be a one shot deal that they hope will get them through the '79 election and I doubt that it will.

It is interesting to know, for instance in agriculture, the increase in the Budget is largely

made up of increases in administration costs, very little in capital spending. It is also very interesting in this government that uses the slogan, "jobs today and energy and what not tomorrow", to note that in the agriculture budget under irrigation the spending has decreased \$300,000. This is doubly interesting when we sit with the Diefenbaker Dam in the south Saskatchewan irrigation project being unused.

It seems also interesting to see that we have a government here that it is very interested in purchasing land under the Land Bank. It doesn't increase production, it doesn't put any more farms in for young people, it puts it into government control. We sit on irrigable land in this province, 50 per cent greater than the province of Alberta and we don't develop it. You go west with me in Taber we find young farmers making a good living raising potatoes and sugar beets on quarter section farms. We sit here and we don't develop anything and yet this government says it wants to put the young farmer back on the farm.

**MR. MESSER:**— What is the subsidy? What is the cost?

**MR. ANDERSON:**— Yes, what's the cost of the government buildings, what's the cost of the Coronach dam that you can't even build because you haven't got enough gumption to go down and deal? But you sit here but you won't even go down and deal with the provincial government. What's the cost of that? It would be much better to be putting it into the irrigation project that you could get going, I would say.

**AN HON. MEMBER:**— We're going to send the troops to get you.

**MR. ANDERSON:**— Certainly. We look at this government and we look at its highway budget and we see that there is no new highway construction planned except what was already on the order paper. We are sitting on a highway system that is old, deteriorated and you haven't got the guts that the federal government has in their improving the rail line system. You are sitting here doing piecemeal, willy nilly work and then you prattle on that you want to have the rural area in agriculture booming. You can't boom much on the roads that we are driving on and you can't get much industry out in the country and you are not going to get many people wanting to live there.

**MR. FARIS:**— Are you running again . . .

**MR. ANDERSON:**— Oh, it wouldn't be very difficult to beat whatever you are going to put up against me, I don't think, so I might take a crack at it.

The highways are very, very important to the life of our agriculture and small towns. We sit with the government who says that it wants to keep our rural areas alive and how well it does it, how well it does it! It moves the ag reps in my area into the largest centre, congregates them in Swift Current. We find the SPC, the Crown corporation that would never do what a private enterprise company would do and think of profits only, moving their DROs into centralized areas, moving in from small towns where it's important, moving operators that have children in school . . .

**MR. MESSER:**— Are you for or against?

**MR. ANDERSON:**— I'm against it, yes, very much against it. I think you should be too, Mr. Minister. You would find it is very enthusiastic down in my area to find our operators in an area of 1,200 square miles are sitting back at Maple Creek, Shaunavon

March 13, 1978

and Swift Current. They are sitting 100 and some miles away from the operator and you're pulling the operator out of Climax. I find that very interesting. I hope you can explain that to the people at that meeting because they are very interested in your explanation.

**AN HON. MEMBER:**— . . . Those kinds of meetings . . .

**MR. ANDERSON:**— Oh, we're having one. It was called at the suggestion of the last NDP member, in fact, Mr. Kusiak. I think he would enjoy hearing your reason for pulling his DRO (deputy returning officer). I'm looking forward with interest, believe me.

**MR. MESSER:**— You aren't sure of your position?

**MR. ANDERSON:**— Oh yes, I'm quite certain of my position. I believe in keeping the small town alive in the rural area and not centralizing our . . . .

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. ANDERSON:**— I'm more interested in your position on it, Mr. Minister. I'm very interested in your position on having the MCIC pay level IVB care in hospitals. I'm very interested on that, those who want to designate . . . . I'm very interested in your compassion for the old aged pensioners in my area who didn't want to live in cities, who wanted to raise their families in small towns and on the farm and now when they are dying you are moving them, Mr. Minister, into Moose Jaw, into Regina, into Battleford and you tell me that it's economics. I always thought the NDP was 'people first' but I find in your case it is economics first.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. ANDERSON:**— I am very interested in that stand, Mr. Minister, the compassion it shows. I find that you are quite willing to put capital expenditure in Battleford, into Swift Current, into Regina, while we have pensioners that need level IVB care moved and in the last year the ones that have moved into Swift Current from my area in Shaunavon had a life in there of 22 days. You can check that statistic. We are sitting now with 50 people who can't be put into Palliser but the beds are available in our area and this minister says that economically we can't do that, they are numbers, move them, it doesn't matter.

I'm interested in your stance. I think that your budget that you hope will prop you up isn't going to prop much if you don't start straightening your act out and getting back into business for the people like you keep prattling you're for. Certainly I'm looking forward to the next election. What you have been doing in my area makes it almost easy to get re-elected.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. ANDERSON:**— I am interested in the Minister of Tourism and Renewable Resources who says he has such a grand program where he saves 75 per cent of costs to a person who takes 100 per cent loss — who says that he won't pay anybody that's a small operator and loses less than \$100 worth of feed, not this minister who is for the small farmer!

I am also interested in this government trying to explain that any organization that has a

compassion for the wildlife in this province will go out and feed them. But the very government that collects hunting licences, that sets the hunting seasons — who knew this hunting season would be cold and fogged out? They didn't get their kill, it's obvious in their computer print-outs. Now they say, we won't feed that wildlife. If you want to with your compassion go out and get the feed and feed them, we'll pay you 75 per cent of that cost. That's very compassionate.

I find it very interesting the way you set your drug plan up. Your drug plan causes . . . You could have used the Manitoba scheme, it took very little bookwork. You had to bring up some bureaucratic scheme which takes a small druggist with a drugstore and he and his wife who are running it have to fill out these blasted books and can't afford to do it. So what happens — you drive the small druggist broke. We've had two of them shut down in our area because of the administration costs. Wonderful plans! I don't know where you dream them up. I tell you, you better learn if you want to get re-elected or elect members in the rural areas. You better get out and see what you are doing to your rural areas.

It's very interesting in my constituency to find we have no public transportation. We did have years and years ago but right now there's not a bus, there's not a way of getting out of the area. This government here talks about the rural areas, wanting to keep people in the small towns. I'd like to know how you are going to keep the people in small towns when you have old age pensioners who can't drive and you won't take the time to sit down and put in a bus route down there that would put them out. No, it's economics, economically it's not good. You're as bad as Bell Canada, the people you battle against. You're as bad as the CPR that you battle against. You are as bad as the private hospitals in the United States, Mr. Minister of nursing homes. . . .

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. ANDERSON:**— I find it a little sickening to find a government who ran a platform, 'New Deal for People'. It's a new deal all right but boy we didn't think we were going to get that deal.

**MR. MOSTOWAY:**— You know, Sonny, if you had any charity you would . . .

**MR. ANDERSON:**— That's the NDP policy. That's funny that charity. . . . I find that's an NDP policy that charity should always be on the other guy, no charity for myself. It's a policy that says we all share with the guy down to me but not below. I find that very interesting and very true.

I also find that you are going to put in your Heritage Fund. I would like to give you a few suggestions on your Heritage Fund. When you are considering this Heritage Fund I would strongly suggest to this government that you remove the royalties on oil, gas and fertilizers that are used in this province. If you can collect them as you do all your taxes, Mr. Robbins, then you can give them back by keeping your homeowner grant. You don't have to leave without that. If you weren't so scared of multinationals you would think of that, but you are paranoid. I think that if you set your Heritage Fund and you really mean that you want to help the municipalities with your cost-sharing, you better distribute 25 per cent of this fund to municipalities with no strings attached — a good place to do it with your Heritage Fund. I think if you started using your Heritage Fund what you better learn to do is to invest in businesses that are not now operating in Saskatchewan. This has a strange effect of expanding your work base, expanding your income. It is much better than buying something that is already there. I know it is a hard thing to visualize,

March 13, 1978

Sir, but it is a fact.

**MR. MOSTOWAY:**— . . . should we invest in something that is dead, Sonny?

**MR. ANDERSON:**— Well, you do quite often, I notice that. I can think back when I was a kid of many things that are dead and then I find many live things that you invested in that are dead now, too, yes and then dying fast. So then it really doesn't matter that you invest in it because you will kill it pretty quick anyways. I really can't give you much advice there.

**MR. MOSTOWAY:**— O.K. Tell us we are going to invest in the Liberal Party.

**MR. ANDERSON:**— It might be the best investment you have ever seen, Paul, the way you guys are doing it.

I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that any funds in the Heritage Fund should be used to improve the quality of life, certainly in the rural areas.

I suppose that you have gathered by my remarks, Mr. Speaker, that I will not support the motion. I will support the amendment.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. J.A. PEPPER (Weyburn):**— Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure for me to have the opportunity to participate in this debate, because, Mr. Speaker, this Budget reflects a number of principles and important principles. It tells the people of Saskatchewan quite a bit about this government and its approach to the affairs of the province. For these reasons, Mr. Speaker, it will take me some considerable length of time to complete my address, so, Mr. Speaker, at this time I would like to beg leave to adjourn the debate.

Debate adjourned.

The Assembly adjourned at 9:06 o'clock p.m.