

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN
Fifth Session — Eighteenth Legislature

March 13, 1978.

The Assembly met at 2:00 o'clock p.m.
On the Orders of the Day.

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

HON. W.A. ROBBINS (Minister of Revenue):— Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to introduce a distinguished guest visiting us from another province, Louie Lloyd and Mrs. Louie Lloyd are in the west gallery. Mr. Lloyd was president of Federated Co-operatives for a term, for a period in the early days he was active in the organization of the Wheat Pool, also active in organizing a number of consumer co-operatives and credit unions throughout the province. Mr. Lloyd is a brother of the late Hon. Woodrow Lloyd, former Premier of the province, former Provincial Treasurer, former Minister of Education. I would ask Mr. and Mrs. Lloyd to stand and be acknowledged and I hope everyone in the Assembly would give them the appropriate greeting.

HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

WELCOME TO STUDENTS

MR. W.J.G. ALLEN (Regina Rosemont):— Mr. Speaker, it is with a great deal of pleasure that I introduce to the House today a group of 60 Grade Twelve students from Martin Collegiate in my constituency. They are accompanied today by their teacher, Fred Steinenger. I am sure that all of us wish to welcome them to the House this afternoon.

HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

INTRODUCTION OF GUEST

MR. ALLEN:— While, I am on my feet, Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I might take the opportunity of introducing one other person who is in the Speaker's Gallery. I would like to introduce to the House Tony Yaremchuk. Tony is the manager of the Regina Low Income Housing Corporation in the city of Regina, the program that is providing much needed housing for low income people in Regina and I am sure we all want to welcome him this afternoon as well.

HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

QUESTIONS

BRYANT REPORT - PELLY BY-ELECTION

MR. S.J. CAMERON (Regina South):— I have a question for the Premier in his capacity as the minister responsible for the office of the Chief Electoral Officer. In the report that was filed last week, that is the Bryant Report, she made reference to a number of executive assistants and civil servants campaigning in the Pelly by-election, I wonder if the Premier could tell us who those people were and whether, in the course of their campaigning in Pelly, their salaries were continued to be paid by the government?

HON. A.E. BLAKENEY (Premier):— Mr. Speaker, I obviously do not have the names of all

the people who campaigned in the Pelly by-election. There are many, many people there and I am delighted that the hon. members have, as they say, most of them. I am sure if anyone of them puts a question on the order paper I would be happy to try to give you their names and if you could indicate what days they were campaigning, if it happened to be a working day I would be able to check the records to see whether or not they were receiving remuneration on that particular day.

MR. CAMERON:— Is it the policy of your government to continue to pay civil servants and executive assistants their regular salary when they are away campaigning for the NDP in a by-election?

MR. BLAKENEY:— Mr. Speaker, I just spent the weekend in Regina. I just spent the weekend visiting a good number of federal Cabinet Ministers, all of whom were, for the most part, absolutely surrounded by executive assistants. I would be amazed if I heard that they were not drawing their salary from the government of Canada. I would similarly be amazed if anyone could represent the particular activities as other than designed to forward the interests of the Liberal Party.

Turning now to the specific question of the by-election. The rules are clear that if someone is campaigning directly in a by-election then he does so on his own time. If he is performing his duties as an employee of the government he will be paid by the government.

MR. SPEAKER:— I will take a new question, the member for Estevan.

POTASH BOXCAR SHORTAGE

MR. R.A. LARTER (Estevan):— Mr. Speaker, a question to the Minister in charge of Sask Potash. I would like to make a short quote, Mr. Speaker, in order to bring it up to date. Regarding a potash boxcar shortage:

In quoting Gary Graham, Fleet Facilities Co-ordinator, for the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan, PCS, the corporation has been hard pressed to keep up with the shipping demand to this point but expects to fall behind. He also states, we cannot ship what we have sold.

Could the minister tell this House what emergent plans this government has made in order to fulfil contracts and future sales of Saskatchewan potash for the 1978 selling season?

HON. E.L. COWLEY (Provincial Secretary):— Mr. Speaker, I don't know from what the member is quoting but I can tell the member that the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan like all other potash companies in this province is and has from time to time experienced difficulty in getting enough freight cars to ship them on. It is particularly true at the height of the season in the US when spring planting in the US — there is always a great demand just prior to and during that season, there has always been the problem with freight cars. There was a problem last year at this time and I wouldn't be surprised if next year at this time there will be similar difficulties encountered.

I think the Potash Corporation and some other potash producers I know are looking at ways and means of getting potash closer to the market during off peak seasons. That involves of course storage and handling charges which one has to balance against

these.

I think, Mr. Speaker, if the member looks at the record of the Potash Corporation last year, it was as good and perhaps a little better than that of any of the other producers in this province and the particular problem which the member refers to is one which I am sure will occur next year. We are doing everything in our power obviously to get as many cars as we can available so that we can meet the demand that is there.

MR. LARTER:— Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Does the minister also know that Mr. Graham stated in this article that beginning April 1, there will be no cars available? What percentage of your sales will PSC have delivered by this point in time? Do you not agree that you have now entered private business against the private sector and you are going to experience all kinds of things like this in the rat race? Don't you think that the profit of Sask Potash is going to come up missing in action in this action budget?

MR. COWLEY:— Mr. Speaker, the percentage of sales that we expect to meet — the member asks a typical Tory question — percentage of what sales, what period, when, nothing like that, a general statement. I think I informed the member that the Potash Corporation like other potash companies in this province experiences at this time of year normally problems with getting enough cars to get potash to a market in a very short season. I expect we'll be in competition with the private sector not only now but in the future. I expect the Potash Corporation will do reasonably well in that competition. I think we'll be able to put forward a set of facts when the season is over that will show we've done as good a job as any of the other producers have in shipping potash to our customers in the United States. I think it is interesting to note that last year at this time the members opposite were saying we wouldn't have any customers. Now they are saying we've got too many customers.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:— I'll take a new question, the member for Kindersley.

HEAVY OIL PLANT

MR. A.N. McMILLAN (Kindersley):— A question to the Minister of Mineral Resources, Mr. Speaker. Over the weekend the federal Minister responsible for the National Energy Board and also the representative for the potential senior partner in the heavy oil upgrading plant, the hon. Allister Gillespie, said very clearly that the only delay in the go ahead of that heavy oil plant was the fact that the provincial government, apparently a significant minority partner, has refused to come to some grips with the new rates that are to be introduced under Bill 47. I would like to ask the minister responsible at this time if he can give us some indication firstly, when we can expect to hear what those new rates will be; secondly, if he can give us some indication of whether or not they will be somewhat more reasonable than the rates that were introduced under Bill 42?

HON. J.R. MESSER (Minister of Mineral Resources):— Well, firstly, Mr. Speaker, the only positive statement as I interpreted the remarks made by Mr. Gillespie was that if by chance a Conservative government should be elected federally there would be no heavy oil upgrading plant to consider at all.

More specifically in regard to the discussions that are going on between the province of Saskatchewan, the federal government and the private industry in regard to an upgrading facility, Mr. Gillespie did say that one of the factors that had to be resolved was the finalization of what position the province of Saskatchewan would take in regard

to royalties and how that related to the heavy oil that would be needed as a feedstock for the upgrading facility. It is not the major roadblock that is in the way of the final decision that is yet to be made in regard to that upgrading facility. We conveyed to this Legislature when we introduced Bill 47 that we would undertake to draft regulations; before we introduced those regulations we would undertake to convey them to the oil industry so that they would have the opportunity to comment on those regulations. That process is now being carried out. My officials in the Department of Mineral Resources are meeting with the oil industry this week and I would expect that when those discussions are concluded we would be able to some time in the near future introduce those regulations to Saskatchewan.

MR. McMILLAN:— Supplementary question. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the minister if he is currently negotiating or anyone in his government is currently negotiating a preferential set of tax rates under Bill 47 with any of the oil companies that might be interested in entering into a partnership with the provincial and federal governments for a heavy oil upgrading plant?

MR. MESSER:— No.

MR. McMILLAN:— One final supplementary, Mr. Speaker. I would like to ask the provincial government and the Minister responsible for Mineral Resources then if he is currently interested in negotiating with the private oil industry, an incentive under Bill 47 for the recovery of heavy oil by tertiary means?

MR. MESSER:— Mr. Speaker, the oil industry that is interested in and/or involved in the discussions in regard to tertiary recovery of heavy oil — No, we are prepared to recognize that is a different situation than the rest of the oil industry in Saskatchewan is confronted with and they, therefore, will be treated in a different manner.

FOUR YEAR UNIVERSITY ENGINEERING PROGRAM

MR. J.G. LANE (Qu'Appelle):— Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Minister of Education. A couple of years ago we had some controversy in the province of Saskatchewan with regard to the establishment of a four year engineering program at the University of Regina. My understanding is that the four year engineering program was to commence May 1 and has now been put off and has tentatively been scheduled now for January 1, 1979. One of the reasons I am given is inability to find staff. First of all, is the government aware of the fact that the four year engineering program will not be proceeded with this year as scheduled? What action is the government taking to assist the university in finding staff? One of the requirements, I understand, or one of the criterion or problems they are having is shortage of funds in getting adequate staff and what action has the government taken?

HON. D.L. FARIS (Minister of Education):— Mr. Speaker, once again the Opposition is raising matters which are internal university matters. We don't intend to interfere with the operation of the university in regard to such matters, particularly in regard to their recruiting staff. If the university comes to us for assistance, they shall receive such assistance. But I can tell you in regard to shortage of funds, that the university sector in Saskatchewan this year is receiving a higher percentage budget increase than any other province in Canada.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. LANE:— By way of supplementary. The minister has obviously indicated that even given the increase it is obviously inadequate. Can you tell me if the government is prepared to make any compensation to those, or pay any compensation to those students who had made personal arrangements to enter the four year program effective May 1, and because of the delay in the implementation of the program are forced to make new personal arrangements which may be costly and will they be given, has the government given any encouragement to the university to give priority to these students with additional compensation assistance to attend Saskatoon for their final two years, given the delay in the start of the program?

MR. FARIS:— Once again, Mr. Speaker, the member persists in interfering in this Assembly with the internal affairs of the university. The question which he is asking should be directed to the university. We do not intend to interfere with those affairs.

MR. SPEAKER:— Order, I will take the next question.

MOBILE HOME FEE

MR. E.F.A. MERCHANT (Regina Wascana):— A question to the Minister of Municipal Affairs who I am sure is aware of the fact that mobile home owners in Saskatchewan, all over the province in the various cities, now have to pay a license fee and a very high license fee was recently introduced in Regina, and I ask the minister, who no doubt is aware that though paying this high license fee they are not allowed to vote as rate payers and are sort of treated like second or third class citizens. Would the minister consider bringing forth amendments to the legislation to include people who pay taxes through licenses on mobile homes to allow them to pay as ratepayers, as everyone else does, particularly in light of the fact that this legislation would have the support of Mayor Cliff Wright in Saskatoon and has the support of your colleague Henry Baker and will be coming forth from the city council in Regina?

HON. G. MacMURCHY (Minister of Municipal Affairs):— Mr. Speaker, I am not quite sure that all mobile home owners are not identified as rate payers. I think there are mobile home owners who own property and therefore pay property tax and would be, in fact, ratepayers. I think there's a growing number of them. I think the hon. member raises the issue of those who are in trailer parks and so on. I think, with respect to the issue, I can only take notice of it. The hon. member will know that all urban legislation is now under review by an Urban Law Review Committee set up under the chairmanship of Greg Darychuk and matters of this nature are put forward to them for their consideration. Some of the matters they have commented on and have indicated that we should move with legislation at the present time when there will be changes in the Urban Municipality Act in this session. I'm not sure that that issue would be dealt with at this particular time however; it may be delayed until the Urban Law Review Committee completes its work.

MR. MERCHANT:— Supplementary, Mr. Speaker: Would the minister be prepared to put this proposition to that group? Would you also be prepared, in an effort to raise mobile home owners from sort of a second class taxpayer to a first class taxpayer, to also put to them the proposition of allowing mobile home owners some form of review similar to the court of revision? As the minister no doubt knows there's no appeal and it means that these people are not getting any kind of review other than what city council does. I ask lastly if the minister would not agree, and I now quote Mayor Wright, that the whole concept of ratepayers is out of the last century and that apartment dwellers and

mobile home owners, both of whom pay taxes indirectly, should be treated like other ratepayers and allowed to vote as a burgess?

MR. MacMURCHY:— Mr. Speaker, the broad issue of mobile home owners, if it's not before the Urban Law Review Committee, I will certainly make sure that it is brought to their attention. With respect to the broad issue of urban law, one of the purposes of the Urban Law Review Committee is to bring that legislation up-to-date.

BILL 43

MR. LANE (Sa-Su):— Mr. Speaker, a question to the Minister of Education. On January 3, 1978, in the closing days of the last session, the hon. member from Rosetown asked you the question in relation to Bill 43, quote: "Because of the size of the bill and the mammoth amount of discussion that is to take place, would the minister not think it advisable for the government to withdraw the bill, to make the amendments the government is going to make and then reissue or bring into the House at another session?" Your answer was, No. Have you had occasion to change your mind since then?

MR. FARIS:— No.

MR. LANE (Sa-Su):— A supplementary then. In other words, what you're saying is that you're going to be bringing the bill back in, in the form that it was introduced in the last session, without amendments. That's obviously what you're saying. Would you confirm that?

MR. FARIS:— No, that's not what I said then and it's not what I say now. If the member had been in the Legislature when the bill was introduced he'd recall that comments made inside and outside the House indicated that the process, the consultation would continue, that there would indeed be amendments to the bill.

MR. SPEAKER:— I'll take the next question, the member for Assiniboia-Gravelbourg.

SEDCO

MR. R.E. NELSON (Assiniboia-Gravelbourg):— Speaking in this Assembly on March 16, 1977, I suggested to you, Mr. Minister, that Western Press 1976 Limited of Moose Jaw would be the next financial fiasco in SEDCO. I understand the company, was, in fact, struck from the Companies Register on September 30, 1977. Will the minister tell us why it took nearly five months after the collapse, before the minister appointed a receiver for that company?

HON. N. VICKAR (Minister of Industry and Commerce):— Mr. Speaker, I can't give you any information as to why it took that length of time but I can tell you that Western Press is in operation.

MR. NELSON (As-Gr):— A supplementary, Mr. Speaker, could the minister at this time tell us if there has been a receiver appointed for that company?

MR. VICKAR:— To my knowledge, there was no receiver supplied.

MR. G.N. WIPF (Prince Albert-Duck Lake):— Mr. Speaker, a question to the minister of the Department of Northern Saskatchewan. Last November 22, you stated that the DNS

did not have any final conclusions on other companies involved in the investigation by the DNS into the RRAP program which is a federal Residential Rehabilitation Assistance program administered and run by the DNS. Can the minister say today if there were other companies, other than the one that we mentioned last spring in the budget debate, involved in your department's investigation into the RRAP program for deficient work done?

MR. BOWERMAN (Minister of Northern Saskatchewan):— Mr. Speaker, I can't give the member for Prince Albert-Duck Lake a positive or clear statement with respect to the involvement of other companies. The matter is being investigated and is still, I believe, in the hands of the Attorney General's department and the investigators of the RCMP. Therefore, I have no further answers to give the member at this point.

MR. WIPF:— A supplementary, Mr. Speaker, I was talking about the investigation that your department held, not the investigation under the DNS. I was wondering if the minister would advise this Assembly why final payments were made to a company called Thompson Plumbing and Heating, prior to completion of work at the Cumberland House and are you now prepared to table the results of your investigation, the DNS investigation, into the operations of the RRAP program by the DNS. It has nothing to do with the Attorney General's department.

MR. BOWERMAN:— I am not prepared, Mr. Speaker, to table any document with respect to the investigations of the RRAP program at this point in time. When the investigations are concluded we'll make that decision at that point.

POLITICAL REFUGEES

MR. C.P. MacDONALD (Indian Head-Wolseley):— Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Minister in charge of Immigration and therefore, I would suggest it would probably be the Premier. I understand the Minister of Labour was on the radio this morning and that the province of Saskatchewan and I suppose other provinces, have signed an agreement with the federal government accepting more responsibility for the process of immigration into Canada and particularly into Saskatchewan. Last night I watched, and I think most Canadians watched, a very disturbing program indicating that some 50 families of both people from Korea and South Vietnam are being admitted into Canada and that Canada had done a greater job than perhaps any other nation in the world in looking after these unfortunate people. I would like to ask the Premier if the province of Saskatchewan has made a contribution in this regard. Are any of the South Vietnamese people that come to Canada under such unfortunate circumstances, have come to Saskatchewan, and is the province of Saskatchewan co-operating with the federal government in this regard?

MR. BLAKENEY:— Mr. Speaker, I do not know whether any people from South Vietnam or from Cambodia or generally from the Indo China Area have entered Saskatchewan. I rather doubt whether they would have been covered by any agreement which we will have signed with the federal government since the agreement was only signed a couple of weeks ago, the last week in February. I venture to think that the film which we saw last night was made before that agreement was signed. I doubt whether there is any strict association between the program which we saw on television last night and the agreement.

Our arrangement is that there will be a committee which will offer to the federal government advice with respect to people who may come to this province or may wish

to come to this province, we will have an opportunity to offer advice on whether or not the skills which they have are needed in this province. No doubt the custom, the longstanding Canadian custom of providing some haven for political refugees from various places, from South Korea or from Chile or from Hungary — we have many examples of that in the past — no doubt that will be continued and that, as in the past, Saskatchewan will play its share.

MR. MacDONALD:— A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. I think it is unfortunate that these families apparently have been coming to Canada for a lengthy period and that Saskatchewan has not participated in this program whether intentionally or unintentionally. Would the Premier indicate whether the province of Saskatchewan or the government would indicate a willingness to the federal government to participate in the immigration of some of these people from Southeast Asia and could the Premier indicate to the House what number or what kind of co-operation the provincial government or the government of Saskatchewan might be willing to offer to the federal government? Would they be willing to take the initiative and approach the federal government about the province of Saskatchewan being willing to participate in this program?

MR. BLAKENEY:— Mr. Speaker, we would be prepared to advise the federal government that we will participate along with other provinces in providing a haven for political refugees in accordance with the long-standing Canadian custom. I think that it has been Canadian custom. I think that it is not appropriate to indicate numbers since we have no idea what the next problem may be or where they may come from and in what numbers. We have in the past had people from Uganda, people from Chile, people from Hungary, people from other places who were seeking asylum outside the boundaries of their homeland. No doubt we will continue to offer the same sort of succor and I will ask the Minister of Labour who manages this arrangement with the federal government to advise them of our willingness to participate in the future as well as in the past.

WHEN WILL NEW EDUCATION ACT BE BROUGHT IN?

MR. H.W. LANE (Saskatoon-Sutherland):— Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Minister of Education. We have on one hand, No, the minister will not change or amend The Education Act and, No, it will not come back in the same form. Now putting aside either political sophistry or pure misrepresentation on the part of the minister, when will you bring the new act before this Legislature, when can we see it? Surely you are not expecting o just dump it on us at the last minute. Could you tell us the date at which you are going to be bringing in the new legislation?

HON. D.L. FARIS (Minister of Education):— In due course, Mr. Speaker.

MR. LANE (Sa-Su):— Mr. Speaker, on one hand we have the minister saying, he is not going to change it but it is not going to come in in the same fashion and that the act is going to come in in due course. Will the opposition be given any opportunity for either input or a chance to look at the kinds of things the minister has in mind?

MR. SPEAKER:— Order! Member for Regina South.

BRYANT REPORT — PELLY BY-ELECTION

MR. CAMERON:— Mr. Speaker, a question again of the Premier in his capacity as the minister responsible for the Chief Electoral Officer. In her report she indicated there was an allegation that a \$1,500 contribution had been made to the NDP by Mr. Leis in Runnymede; can I ask the Premier why there was no additional investigation of that allegation in addition really to asking Mr. Knight whether your party had a record of it. Why was Mr. Leis not contacted, why was his bank record not looked at to confirm or otherwise whether that contribution had been made and not reported?

HON. R. ROMANOW (Attorney General):— Mr. Speaker, perhaps I could answer very briefly. The procedure that was adopted in this matter I think was well set out for all of the members of the House. The Bryant Report which contained the allegation was referred to the Department of the Attorney General. The Department of the Attorney General through its prosecuting staff, the director thereof and in fact many of the other members involved then, it looked at all aspects of the report of which that was one aspect and made recommendations which I tabled to the House. On the basis of that report other decisions were taken.

STATEMENT

TELEPHONE RATE INCREASE

MR. BLAKENEY:— Mr. Speaker, I would like to make a brief ministerial statement. Following the Budget Speech which indicated that the increases in telephone rates would be 8 per cent there was a subsequent announcement from Sask Tel indicating that rate increases would be of the order of 8.2 per cent. I want to advise the House that I have asked the Minister in charge of Sask Tel to see that the rate increases by Sask Tel do not average more than the 8 per cent referred to by the Minister of Finance in his Budget Speech.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. R.L. COLLVER (Leader of the Progressive Conservative Opposition):— Yes, I would like to reply to that very brief ministerial statement pertaining to telephone rates and request of the Premier whether he would instruct the Minister of Municipal Affairs that in the light of the Budget Speech announcement that there would be no decrease in moneys for municipalities . . .

MR. SPEAKER:— Order, order!

MR. COLLVER:— On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:— What is your point of order?

MR. COLLVER:— My point of order is, Mr. Speaker, that I am replying to a ministerial statement by the Premier pertaining to an erroneous statement in the Budget that was subsequently corrected. I am not asking whether the Premier at the same time will correct another erroneous statement in the Budget? Surely I am entitled to do that.

MR. SPEAKER:— I think the rules of ministerial statements and responses thereto are quite clear — that the comments in response to the ministerial statement must be brief, specific and to the point. Now, the member by dealing with another issue is not being brief, specific or to the point, so consequently I gathered the member was referring to the Minister of Municipal Affairs.

MR. COLLVER:— Mr. Speaker, I was referring to an item in the Budget that was a promise — a very similar item to the 8 per cent item. In the Budget it said revenue sharing would be equal or no less than for any municipality. The government is including in its revenue sharing, a re-gravelling . . .

MR. SPEAKER:— Order, order!

MR. E.C. MALONE (Leader of the Liberal Opposition):— Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to see that the Premier has been able to bring his ministers together using his good office and that this discrepancy in the Budget has now been clarified and that we are being guaranteed only an 8 per cent increase in Sask Tel. I hope the Premier will be able to give us a similar assurance in days ahead that we are going to have only an 8 per cent increase in electricity rates and there will be no further increases in SPC. I would ask the Premier while I am on my feet as to whether he has been able to bring the Minister in charge of Saskatchewan Mining Development Corporation (SMDC) together with the Minister of Finance to determine whether \$40 million to be spent on uranium development . . .

MR. SPEAKER:— Order, order!

HON. R. ROMANOW (Attorney General):— Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I might, by consent of the members of the House, go directly to special order and revert back to the balance of the business for a later date. We have radio time. This has been the agreement among all parties.

MR. SPEAKER:— Order! The House Leader has requested that we go directly to special order and return later this day to the balance of the agenda. Is there agreement?

PRIORITY OF DEBATE

BRYANT REPORT

MR. S.J. CAMERON (Regina South):— Before the orders of the day, I would like to seek leave of the Assembly to move that priority of debate be given to the urgent and compelling need for this Assembly to discuss the decision of the government as expressed by the Attorney General not to undertake further inquiry into breaches of The Elections Act despite: 1. the Bryant Report which clearly shows inadequate investigation and even then prima facie evidence of offences having been committed, and 2. the report of the Director of Criminal Justice which contains several references for the need for further investigation and more information and the decision of the government in these circumstances not to lay charges despite the opinion of the Director of Criminal Justice that in several instances offences occurred. I move that, Mr. Speaker, seconded by Mr. MacDonald.

MR. SPEAKER:— A notice regarding this matter proposed for priority of debate was received in the Clerk's office at 11:26 a.m. for which I thank the hon. member.

I refer all hon. members to Rule 17(6) which states, ". . . the matter proposed for an urgent debate must be in order and of urgent public importance." The proposed matter is not in violation of Rule 17(10) and is of public importance. The vital question remaining to be answered is whether it is urgent for the Assembly to set aside all of its business to discuss this matter. The fundamental principle underlying Rule 17 was to

provide an opportunity within a proper framework of parliamentary procedure where none otherwise existed for the immediate discussion of any matter deemed to be of such urgency and importance that all of the normal or special business of the Assembly should be put to one side in order to provide complete right of way to a discussion of one specific particular subject. The conditions of this situation would not change if the Assembly waited for the normal two days for the proper notice in order to have a full debate. Since there is an opportunity within the proper framework of parliamentary procedure to debate this topic, I therefore rule that the matter is not urgent enough to set aside all other business of the Assembly today.

MR. MacDONALD:— May I speak to your ruling, Mr. Speaker?

MR. SPEAKER:— No. No, the member may not.

POINT OF ORDER ON QUESTION PERIOD

MR. J.G. LANE (Qu'Appelle):— Mr. Speaker, I have a point of order with regard to the question period that I prefer to leave until after radio time if I can, with leave of the House bring it up at that time, so that we can proceed?

MR. SPEAKER:— Is that agreed, that the point of order with regard to the question period be raised later?

MR. COLLVER:— Mr. Speaker, I have a point of order that I would like to raise later as well.

ADJOURNED DEBATE

BUDGET DEBATE

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Mr. Smishek (Minister of Finance) that this Assembly do now resolve itself into the Committee of Finance and the proposed amendment thereto by Mr. Penner (Saskatoon Eastview).

HON. E.C. WHELAN (Minister of Consumer Affairs):— Mr. Speaker, this Budget takes the tax load off the homeowner in the city of Regina. There is no other government in Canada on a comparable basis, in a positive fashion and to the same extent that considers the need to participate and relieves the homeowner taxpayer from onerous taxes. In the city of Regina, if you total what the government of Saskatchewan pays toward the cost of police work, our per capita in equalization grants this year totals \$6.82 million. Revenue sharing as announced in this Budget is approximately \$60 per capita and totals \$8.96 million. This is an increase, Mr. Speaker, of 31 per cent or \$2.14 million. This is a large figure but it represents a positive attempt to help each taxpayer in the city of Regina.

Money for operation of provincial facilities such as universities, hospitals, grants for city libraries, day care centres, the Centre of the Arts, city transportation, handicap transit assistance, education under the heading of schools, community colleges and other institutions represents a payment of \$755 per capita for every man, woman and child in the city of Regina.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. WHELAN:— Two of the highlights for Regina are approximately \$7 million to regenerate Regina General Hospital and Pasqua Hospital; \$220,000 to transport handicapped people. Some of the buildings that will be constructed in Regina to provide permanent office space instead of renting accommodation include the Saskatchewan Telephone Building and the Saskatchewan Government Insurance Office.

There are some interesting aspects of the future of the opposition parties on which I would like to comment. Mr. Speaker, first let us turn to the Liberal Party. Provincially two of their members for the city of Regina read the popularity polls for the Liberal Party last fall and hurriedly decided to rush out and get nominated and to begin campaigning for the next federal election. One is a relative, the member for Wascana (Mr. Merchant) and the other, the member for Regina South (Mr. Cameron) is a former employee of the Minister of Transport, the hon. Otto Lang. It's no secret that elected Liberals and others are disgruntled because the two members have abandoned their provincial leader because the opportunity looked great. Disgruntled Liberals are saying that Otto Lang doesn't need any more help and we don't need any more Otto Lang type representation. They are saying openly to the New Democrats in Saskatchewan that if you need some help, we will give it to you, we are not supporting the Otto Lang triumvirate. As a matter of fact, it is a wide open secret that the Liberals are having trouble among themselves over this predicament. And why shouldn't they, Mr. Speaker? The hon. member for Regina South and the hon. member for Regina Wascana were elected to represent the people of those constituencies. They are going to desert them and they are eventually going to get defeated and their performance is not much better, Mr. Speaker, than that of the hon. member for Qu'Appelle or the hon. member for Thunder Creek. So let's look at their chances.

What makes them think that the people of Saskatchewan or the federal constituencies of Regina East or Regina West would ever think of voting for a Liberal at this particular stage in our history. Just stop and look at where the country is. Consider the achievements of the federal government, Mr. Speaker. They have the highest unemployment rate in the history of this country, using their own figures and goodness knows how high it would be if they used the right ones. One million people depressed, demoralized, abandoned, and forgotten. Add to the one million their families and you probably have 3 million to 4 million people, Canadians who are humiliated, forgotten and living outside of society. The federal government's attempt to solve this problem is to step up their propaganda machine, have their Cabinet around with all their executive assistants and that's about all we are getting as a solution.

The next aspect of the Liberal Party that is an embarrassment and a shame, Mr. Speaker, to every Canadian is the fact that scandal and corruption has become part of what is acceptable to their administration. Take your pick. I say there are so many scandals and so many investigations that radio time will not allow me to examine them. But to mention just a few, Mr. Speaker: the Skyshop scandal; the harbor dredging scandal; the multimillion dollar scandal regarding the sale of the Candu Reactors; the government's instructions to break into offices; to open letters and to eavesdrop. The same situation in the United States was investigated by a senate committee and they forced the president to resign. Scandal is part of the policy of this government at Ottawa. But they run ads every day on television suggesting, Mr. Speaker, that the working man might be cheating on unemployment insurance. If the working man does just cheat on unemployment insurance, taking their example I say he is a piker. He should get inside the Liberal Party and then he would find out how to get away with deals like the Candu Reactor multimillion dollar commission, Mr. Speaker.

They have the nerve to go around talking about how the Prime Minister can save this country. Mr. Speaker, this country began to break apart when he became Prime Minister in 1968. He has done such a magnificent, such a beautiful job, such an objective persuasive job dealing with the people of Quebec that they are about to vote on separation from Canada.

Finally, their operation of the financial structure of this country, with tremendous deficits, has been such a financial fiasco that the financial houses of the world have decided that the Canadian dollar is worth 89 cents or less. If you own a foreign-made car, you can add 12 cents on the dollar to the already high cost of parts. Yes, the financial houses of the world have put an estimate on the administration of the Canadian economy and discontinued our dollar and reduced it to a rate that is below anything previously known.

Then there are Conservatives running around in this province, who have been talking about how they might get elected. They make comparisons and say all sorts of nasty things about Saskatchewan and Saskatchewan's government. Yet the richest province in Canada, Ontario, where the Conservatives have been in power since 1943 just brought down its budget. They have a \$1.5 billion deficit. They got almost nothing from mineral royalties because the Tories are obviously financed by the mining companies and they have just raised the health insurance premium by 37.5 per cent for a family of three or more. The increase is \$44 per month and it amounts to a total of \$528 per year. In Ontario, the richest province in Canada, under the Conservatives, a deficit budget, no money from royalties and a whopping increase in health insurance premiums.

Let's have a look at the local Conservatives. The institutions of this Legislature are carefully built, their background, their history. These people who came here through the years who are elected to sit here have valued the procedures and the institutions we live by. They have been developed carefully and they respected the institutions and the rules of this House.

When Conservative members opposite were asked to appear before a committee of members of this House, elected by the people of this province, they called the committee a 'Kangaroo Court' and refused to appear. To refuse to appear before a committee of the Legislature exhibits a degree of contempt and arrogance that sets a record in the British Commonwealth going back hundreds of years.

The Conservatives make disagreeable, inaccurate statements that add up, in some instances, to outright falsehoods. For instance, the allegation of dirty hospitals and recently a member of their party made a charge regarding the Kamsack Nursing Home at the SUMA convention and it was an outright mistruth. Like his friends in this House this individual refused to withdraw or apologize. He added one more item to the list. He said he was joking. We heard the performance at the convention and it wasn't a joke, and it is not a joke to make charges based on a falsehood. My version of the SUMA convention is that the performance was angry, contemptuous, misleading and as a matter of fact downright untrue. The Conservatives say people will pay \$10 a day to get into a hospital. That statement is fair warning when you know what it costs to get into a hospital or to pay health insurance premiums in Ontario. The Conservatives pretend they are for the little people. What little people in Saskatchewan would like to pay \$528 a year in premiums and \$10 a day for a hospital bed? Yet the richest province in Canada, in the hands of the Conservatives, Mr. Speaker, just raised their health insurance premiums for a family to \$44 a month. That's a fair rental.

Let's turn for a moment to the province of Manitoba and let me warn the construction industry in Saskatchewan what they can expect from Conservative governments. Regardless of what the Conservatives say, blaring forth on radio and television for days, the Conservatives in Manitoba got elected. Sure they did and they said we were going to free enterprise. This is how Maurice Steele, president of the Winnipeg builder's exchange, and I have the clipping in my hand, this is what he says. This is how he sees the situation, Mr. Speaker. He is quoted in the February 1978 issue of Western Construction Trades Magazine, published in Calgary and he says:

The province's (and he is talking about Manitoba) contractors will have to look for jobs across the West because the construction industry in Manitoba faces the worst prospects for work since the mid 1960s.

The article says:

Fourteen and one-half per cent, more than 4,000 of the industry's 28,000 workers are currently unemployed and that the jobless rate among tradesmen may rise as high as 30 per cent or 9,000 this winter.

Mr. Steele is quoted further and this is not a New Democrat talking. This is the head of the construction industry in the province of Manitoba. He probably voted for the government there.

In addition to the general sluggishness of Manitoba's economy the local construction industry is suffering severely from a provincial government freeze on new building projects. The current hardship is a product of the fact that 65 per cent of Manitoba's construction dollar volume originates from the spending of governments or their agencies. The industry's woes (Mr. Steele says) are being compounded further by the temporary shelving of construction of \$37 million worth of new provincial buildings, a freeze on new health facilities and a reduction in providing grants to Winnipeg and other municipalities. All these things combine to create a sharp braking effect which will come close to bringing Manitoba's construction industry to its knees in the first quarter of 1978.

In the same article a leading spokesman for Manitoba's architectural profession says; "Few projects are on the drawing boards at the moment, a state that will further depress the province's construction industry six months from now."

Well, the Conservative government in Manitoba has 'freed' the contractors and the construction industry. They have shut down government construction. They have freed the working people who were employed in the construction industry. They are now free to go on unemployment insurance, free to go on social assistance, or free to leave the province. They have freedom of choice.

They freed the suppliers. They are free now to twiddle their thumbs. No longer do they have to supply lumber, nails, cement, window frames, furniture or the component parts of new buildings. Mr. Speaker, they have freed the economy of the province of Manitoba. There is nothing left, nothing to stop a downward slide in the economy that is picking up speed in the adjoining provinces. As long as the Tories are in power, they are free to collapse without any assistance. The civil servants who worked for the government are going to be laid off by the hundreds we are told, according to the

newspaper articles. These people too, Mr. Speaker, are free to eat snowballs if they like, free to go on relief, free to draw unemployment insurance, or free to leave the province. "Free enterprise", they said. What does it add up to, Mr. Speaker?

Let's look at the picture. The federal government bankrupt of ideas, rudderless, one million unemployed, the dollar plunging, now about to seek re-election. Provincially the traditional opposition of the Liberals is in a state of chaos and ineptitude. The other opposition party, the Conservatives, contemptuous of the traditions which we use to govern ourselves, ridiculing committees of this House, uttering slanderous, outrageous mistruths, speaking against grants for organizations like the YWCA and the YMCA, and grants to municipalities; at the same time they say they would reduce the tax burden. Dangerous in opposition, obviously arrogant, obviously irresponsible — if the people in this province aren't afraid of them — they should be.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. WHELAN:— We must be absolutely certain that the people of Saskatchewan are warned. One can hear in the background the creaking of the Bennett buggy, the financial collapse of the thirties, the cold-blooded killing of miners in the Estevan area. They haven't changed. Their spokesman may have, but, Mr. Speaker, the policies are exactly the same. With the Conservative performance in Manitoba, with people losing their jobs in necessary construction such as hospitals and schools; with the Conservative government in Ontario increasing hospital insurance; that government's failure to get any reasonable returns from resources. It is no wonder, Mr. Speaker, that senior citizens in this province, people on fixed incomes in this province, people who hear the criticism of grants in this province, have a justifiable fear that services that they have now will be taken from them; people who need services are genuinely worried. The alarm in this regard is continuous. The alarm is as a result of fear; fear that should the Conservative Party be elected they will lose their Hearing Aid Plan, they will lose their Drug Plan, they will lose the Dental Plan that we have for children. They will have to pay \$10 to get into a hospital bed, they will lose the money that is being provided for hospitals, Mr. Speaker, and other community services.

Mr. Speaker, the experiment in Manitoba and Ontario suggests that there is just and absolute reason to be afraid.

In the Budget Speech, reference was made to the government insurance agency, the Saskatchewan Government Insurance Office. More than a year ago we announced that \$500,000 would be spent on traffic safety during the year 1977. The program took many forms: poster and essay contests by school children, the road show, a carefully constructed moveable demonstration on defensive driving put together for public education. The convincer demonstrating the need for seat belts; the increase in defensive driving instituted a stepped-up program of grants to communities for safety; a safety bulletin to 6,000 key people in the province; a new handbook for young people, which I recommend to every automobile driver. This program has resulted in a reduction in injuries, a reduction in the severity of injuries, a reduction in the repairs per accident. As a result there is a surplus in the operation of SGIO. In some categories where the accident rate is heavy and where they have not earned a reduction, there will be no reduction. In most groups, for instance, the ordinary passenger vehicle owner will get a 5 per cent decrease or reduction. Some of the truck groups, for instance, for almost all of the 11,000 pound and over farm trucks, there will be a 10 per cent reduction in premiums; a 10 per cent reduction for lighter farm trucks in the older models and a 15 per cent reduction in rates for school buses and motor homes.

Because of adverse loss experience there will be no reduction on late-model light farm trucks, private trucks, trailers and motor toboggans and motorcycles. The adverse loss experience indicates that no reduction is justified.

We would like to commend the people of the province for their participation, for their acceptance of the traffic safety program, for their approval of the \$500,000 expenditure for the traffic safety program from the automobile accident insurance fund. At an early date, we will present the detailed reductions to the people of Saskatchewan.

Mr. Speaker, the Rentalsman comes under my jurisdiction. Because of the increase in housing accommodation, we have withdrawn from the jurisdiction — the Rentalsman has withdrawn his jurisdiction from the cities of North Battleford, Melville, Yorkton, Estevan and Swift Current. These centres are now subject to rental review and these cities objecting to a rental increase can apply to the Provincial Mediation Board for a review of their rental.

During the year the Department of Consumer Affairs introduced a new Warranties Bill. Portions of it have not yet been proclaimed. The act brings to the people of Saskatchewan the first specific consumer warranty protection legislation in Canada. Our discussions with the business people of Saskatchewan and a careful publicity program have been extensive and informative. The result is the new Consumer Warranties Law which is accepted by the business community and the consumer.

Mr. Speaker, this Budget is a responsible budget that will do the most good for the most people. It will provide employment, that will build facilities for the people of this province; facilities that are needed, that are necessary, that will be appreciated by generations to come.

The need of those who are in lower income brackets and those who need financial assistance are recognized in program after program. This Budget indicates that the province of Saskatchewan has a government that listens, that legislates for the people.

I have tried to warn the people of the province of the type of government we have at Ottawa and the kind of representation and the kind of policies we could expect from the members opposite based on their performance and judging from my own experience after having spent many years in this Legislature. I say we must recognize and urge the people to ignore the aspirations of political groups who are arrogant and contemptuous in opposition. In government they would be undemocratic, arrogant and contemptuous of the peoples' wishes.

There is no doubt Mr. Speaker, the opposition will have great difficulty explaining to the public why they voted against this Budget. Certainly, since the presentation of this Budget, by the Finance Minister, people realize the difference between this province and the provinces like Manitoba, Ontario and Alberta in their approach to the general economic condition that exists across this country.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. WHELAN: — Mr. Speaker, only Saskatchewan performs, only Saskatchewan listens, only Saskatchewan is budgeting to meet the situation.

This Budget is applauded by everyone from Saskatchewan Federation of Labour to

the Chamber of Commerce. It is the kind of Budget on which we could easily win an election.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. WHELAN:— This Budget must be demoralizing to the opposition. Mr. Speaker, I will support the Budget.

MR. W.J.G. ALLEN (Regina Rosemont):— Mr. Speaker, it is with a great deal of pleasure that I rise to participate in this Budget Debate. The people whom I represent in Rosemont constituency welcome this Budget, the Budget that puts money into the pockets of working people and helps them deal with the increasing cost of living. Saskatchewan's across-the-board tax cut will be \$160 this year. The tax rate has been reduced by five points to 53 per cent of the federal tax payable. We have added exemptions for dependent children of \$30 per child up to \$180. Our Property Improvement Grant in my constituency for home owners will be \$230 this year rather than \$200.

What this means, Mr. Speaker, is that a married taxpayer with two children earning \$9,000 a year or less will be paying no Saskatchewan income tax whatsoever.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. ALLEN:— Mr. Speaker, 22,000 of our lowest income earners will be stricken from the tax rolls completely. It means that a person earning \$13,000 a year or less will pay less income tax than anywhere else in Canada.

Mr. Speaker, this Budget is designed to create jobs, jobs for our young people. Over 4,400 new jobs will be created as a result of the stepped-up capital works projects of our Crown corporations and government departments. Youth Employment Service will be increased to \$1.2 million this year. Special emphasis will be placed on providing jobs for high school students for this summer. The Employment Support Program will be increased by 72 per cent with the aim of people working rather than receiving welfare.

Our senior citizens will be helped by this Budget, too, Mr. Speaker. Pension supplements provided will be increased by 25 per cent to \$25 a month for a single person, \$45 for a couple. Funds for the senior citizens Home Repair Program has been increased by more than \$3 million. The amount of the grant will be increased to \$650 and this grant will be renewable every five years. This is a tremendous program for our senior men and women. It helps them keep the dignity and independence of living in their own home. At the same time, it keeps down the cost of institutional care. This coupled with our new Home Care Program will be of a tremendous benefit to the men and women who have built this province, our pioneers.

For small businesses, the corporate tax rate is down from 12 per cent to 11 per cent. This has tremendous impact on the small business community. It shows, Mr. Speaker, this government's determination to help the small businessman grow and prosper in the province of Saskatchewan.

As far as utilities are concerned, telephone and natural gas rates will be no more than 8 per cent regardless of the cost to the corporation. The power rates will stay the same. They will be frozen. Just as an aside, I don't know how many people realize but in 1971

the Power Corporation bought gas from the province of Alberta for 20 cents per thousand cubic feet. Six or seven years later, today, we have to pay over \$1.20 for that same gas, over 600 per cent increase.

Perhaps one of the most welcome things in this Budget is the 5 per cent reduction in car insurance rates of SGIO. This comes as a result of a decrease in accidents and injuries as a result of this government's safety program.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. ALLEN:— Seat belts are working, Mr. Speaker. This is being reflected in the reduction of our insurance rates. Citizens of Saskatchewan, Mr. Speaker, will not soon forget that this program was opposed by the opposition parties. I want to tell the opposition, last year when we were bringing in the seat belt law I sent out a survey in my constituency asking people if they were in favor or against seat belts. Slightly more than 50 per cent said they were in favor. I sent out a survey this fall, after a year of seat belt operation. The results came back 75 per cent in favor of our compulsory seat belt law.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. ALLEN:— The public has come to accept this as being a sensible approach to safety and an effective method of keeping the costs related to injuries and accidents down for the people who utilize our government insurance.

Mr. Speaker, I was amazed to see the dismal diatribe of the financial critic of the Conservative Party as he tried to attack this Budget. I don't think he could believe that in times when other provinces in this country are experiencing difficulty because of a down turn in the economy that this government would be able to bring in a budget that would expand the economy, help the ordinary citizen, deal with the cost of living and provide much needed jobs for the people of Saskatchewan. The financial critic for the Conservative Party sees what is happening in Ontario and can't believe that we can do this in Saskatchewan. Well, the people of Saskatchewan should know why this is possible. It is possible because this government has had the courage to bring in a resource policy that benefits the people of Saskatchewan.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. ALLEN:— Roughly 25 per cent of our provincial revenues comes from the resource sector. This year the province will benefit to the tune of \$462 million.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. ALLEN:— If we compare this to the \$33 million or 7 per cent of the budget in the last Liberal year, we begin to understand how it is possible for our province to bring in a budget that helps all of its citizens.

Mr. Speaker, if we compare this record in resource management to probably the richest province in this country, Ontario, we see that where we get 25 per cent of our budget revenues from our resources, Ontario gets 1 per cent, Mr. Speaker. The health costs in Ontario are as high as they are here. The difference, Mr. Speaker, is that in Saskatchewan we receive these benefits without additional cost to the ordinary taxpayer.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. ALLEN:— In Ontario families are now paying \$528 a year for a health service that is not as comprehensive as the one that we enjoy in our province. We, Mr. Speaker, have superior health services as a concrete benefit from the resource policy of the NDP.

In resource rich Conservative Ontario the people must pay exorbitant premiums because their government lacks the courage to give its citizens a fair break from their resources.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. ALLEN:— Some political commentators have been speculating that this is an election budget. If it is, I welcome it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. ALLEN:— Regardless, Mr. Speaker, the lines are now being clearly drawn for the next election whenever it is called. On the one hand we have the New Democratic Party who believes in a co-operative approach to government, who believes that the vast majority of people will be better off working together to provide those things for themselves and their families that individually they would not be able to provide. I'll rate against the New Democrats a loose coalition of all those who oppose this principle, Liberals, Conservatives, the banks, the insurance companies, grain traders. These people believe, honestly, they believe, that a free market system, which the government stays out of, is the best for everybody. They feel that competition between small business in Canada and large multinational corporations is fair and in the interest of consumers and primary producers.

I read in the Humboldt Journal of October 27, 1977 an item on the Liberal Leader, Mr. Malone. I quote from that article:

Malone played down the idea that Cargill would harm Saskatchewan Wheat Pool. He said competition would not hurt the Pool. It might help them provide a more competitive service he said.

My question to you, Mr. Leader of the Liberal Party is this: Have you considered what the results of a Cargill monopoly would be? For the answer to that, perhaps you should talk to potato farmers in New Brunswick or Prince Edward Island, as I have, where McCain's has a virtual monopoly on their production. The answer, Sir, is serfdom for farmers. The answer is the death of one of the real success stories of working people working together co-operatively to provide for their and their family's daily bread, the Saskatchewan Pool.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. ALLEN:— Now the Conservative approach is basically the same. Let's look at what the Conservatives would do with our potash company.

Potash Corporation is owned now by the people of Saskatchewan. Every citizen of our province is an equal shareholder. The Conservatives say they will trade shares in this company in the open market and their leader says no individual will be able to hold

more than 2 per cent of the shares. Sounds reasonable, doesn't it. 50 x 2 per cent equals 100 per cent. Even management associates could figure that out. Fifty individuals or firms will own the potash corporation of Saskatchewan. Now I ask you, citizens of our province, students from Martin Collegiate, do you think you'll be one of the fabulous 50? Do you think you'll be one of the Tory's fabulous 50? I ask you in radio land, do you think you'll be one of the fabulous Tory 50? Not likely. Right now all the citizens of Rosemont share equally in the Potash Corporation. If the Tories were elected there would not be a single shareholder from my constituency.

Now we in the New Democratic Party, Mr. Speaker, have a different vision for Saskatchewan. It's a vision in which resources the divine province has so generously blessed us with will be shared equally by all of us, whether we're a pensioner in Pioneer Village, a student at Martin Collegiate, a railway man at the CPR, a nurse at the Pasqua Hospital or, indeed again, president of Management Associates, member of this legislature.

They, Mr. Speaker, they have a vision of society in which the strong and powerful will have dominion over the less strong and the less powerful, a society where working men and women will be at the mercy of decisions made basically by the corporate elite of this world. Now the INCO lay-off is the most dramatic illustration of this in recent times, 3,500 men laid off at Sudbury that will have to be supported by the rest of us; but there are lots of less dramatic cases. Let's look a little closer to home. Let's look at the lay-offs on the railways, Mr. speaker. I visited a family in my constituency just the other night. "My husband's worked for the CPR for 35 years. Many of his fellow workers have been laid off and he knows that his turn is coming. He's 55 years of age and still has children in school."

What do you tell a man, Mr. Speaker, who has given 35 years of his life to a company and then is summarily let go in the name of corporate efficiency and corporate profit? He always worked hard to provide for his wife and family; he doesn't envy Ian Sinclair, the company president, his job. You can say that unemployment insurance and welfare will be available to this family. I tell you, he doesn't want it. He's a proud man. He feels the same responsibility that Ian Sinclair does to provide for his family, by putting in an honest day's work for an honest day's pay. All he asks, Mr. Speaker, is to continue working at the CPR until he's able to retire.

The final irony, Mr. Speaker, of this story is that if he was able to work five more years until he was 60, he could retire with a full pension; however, if he quits or is let go, he has to wait until he's 65.

Now I invite you, Liberals, Conservatives, to visit this man and his family and tell him that unregulated free enterprise is the answer to his problem. Now, Mr. Speaker, I look forward to the opportunity of putting our record and our ideas for the future of Saskatchewan to the people at an election.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. ALLEN:— When all the side issues are cut away you'll find that the ordinary person in Saskatchewan is looking for one thing, security. The people decide whether they can feel secure with a government who says it is not interested in governing, who says for the working people of this province, you fend for yourself. You provide your own security. You pay for your medicare at \$500 or \$600 a year with the current fees. You fight the cost of living yourself; you deal with the forces of economic power in this

country yourself because we, the Conservative Party believe that very person in this country has the right to starve without government interference. Or, Mr. Speaker, the people will decide to continue with the government of the New Democratic Party, which says to the people, look we are all in this together and it makes more sense for us to work together to provide the security for ourselves and our families that we could not do if we went at it alone. This will be the underlying issue of the next election. I am confident that the people will choose Premier Blakeney and the New Democratic Party.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. G. McNEILL (Meadow Lake):— Mr. Speaker, it gives me a great deal of pleasure to join with my colleagues on this side of the House in supporting this Budget. I also want to congratulate Finance Minister, Walter Smishek, on his well written and well documented Budget Speech — the most recent example of his skilful and sensitive stewardship of our provincial economy. As you know, Mr. Speaker, I have the honor to represent Meadow Lake constituency in the northeast part of the province, a riding that stretches from the banks of the North Saskatchewan River to communities such as Pierceland, Goodsoil and Dorintosh near the Meadow Lake park, and from the Alberta border east to include towns of St. Cyr and Neeb, and south to St. Walburg and Paradise Hill. Some parts of my constituency, Mr. Speaker, are newly settled and other areas were populated during the depression when farm families from the southern treeless prairies moved north to escape the dust bowl. Wherever they came, Mr. Speaker, and whatever they chose to provide themselves with a livelihood, the people of Meadow Lake did not have it easy. Those of my constituency who chose farming had to claim their farms from the stubborn mixed woodlands, and every year have had to contend with late springs and early frosts that are part of the farming in our latitudes. Those who have taken up the raising of stock face losses of stock and young animals and even mature stock to violent weather and predators — something southern beef producers and other mixed farmers don't have to contend with.

Businessmen, because their stores are on the northern fringe of the settled portion of Saskatchewan, have increased transportation costs. Towns and villages, because they are newer than most communities in other parts of the province, have the expense of building new municipal services and facilities where other centres just have to renovate existing structures. In short, Mr. Speaker, the residents of the Meadow Lake riding are used to hard work and getting the value for the dollars spent because that is what is necessary to make a go of it. They know how necessary it is to have an efficient operation, because to have anything else would soon mean, not making a go of it.

Mr. Speaker, I have spoken to a good many of my constituents since the Budget Speech on Tuesday of last week, and they all have praise for this new Budget. It is the kind of approach to solving problems that they like to see. It is the kind of a document, Mr. Speaker, that reinforces the belief that most people in my constituency have, that they are better off being in Saskatchewan under an NDP government than anywhere else. Mr. Speaker, our provincial Budget was read on the same day as the province of Ontario saw its new budget unveiled. Tuesday, March 7, was all they had in common, however.

In Saskatchewan the Budget announced that the provincial share of the federal income tax was to be lowered by 9.5 per cent. There was an across-the-board tax cut for the third consecutive year that now amounts to \$160. In addition to that there is a new deduction of \$30 for each dependent child.

Mr. Speaker, the tax changes in the recent Budget will mean that the low and middle

income people of Saskatchewan will pay the lowest taxes in all of Canada. In fact, some 22,000 taxpayers will be removed from the Saskatchewan tax roll. In Ontario, the Conservative government had a tax cut too. Theirs amounted to \$5 million — not for the average taxpayer, Mr. Speaker, however, but for the mining companies.

The only tax cuts in Ontario that affected the average citizen were the removal of sales taxes from hotel rooms and storm windows — a tremendous comfort, I am sure, to the Ontario taxpayer. There were tax changes in Ontario . . . that did affect the average taxpayer though. Every family of three or more living in Conservative Ontario will, in the coming year, have to pay \$528 medicare premiums. A hike of 37 per cent over lay year. A similar increase took place last year in the Conservative Alberta, Mr. Speaker. Saskatchewan residents will know that there was no increase in medicare or hospitalization insurance in Saskatchewan. The New Democratic Party eliminated the \$72 tax three years ago and unlike the Conservative Party we in the Blakeney government have no desire to see medicare premiums or deterrent fees re-introduced.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. McNEILL:— Mr. Speaker, while I am on the subject of health care as it affects the people of Ontario, I want to tell the members of this House, the people of Saskatchewan listening on the radio and the people of Saskatchewan certain facts about the record of the Conservative government in Canada's largest province. I noticed in the recent copy of the traditionally Conservative Toronto Globe and Mail a headline reading: "Ontario to Hold Hospital Budget Rise to \$87 million, Smallest Since 1973." That is the smallest in terms of dollars spent, Mr. Speaker, not in the percentage terms. Total funds for hospital in Tory Ontario will increase only 4.3 per cent over last year when the increase was 7 per cent. In recent budgets the Davis administration in Ontario has made every attempt to starve health care delivery systems with inflation running in just under 9 per cent.

Maybe the members of the Conservative Party sitting opposite can tell the people of this province why we should think that the approach taken to health care by their brother Conservatives in prosperous Ontario would not be the same approach in Saskatchewan if they were ever elected to the government? Maybe, Mr. Speaker, the members of the Conservative Party sitting here in this House could tell the people of our province if we could expect to pay \$528 annually as medicare premiums, or have to pay \$7.40 per day deterrent fees on extended care beds as hospital patients of Ontario have, or a \$5 deterrent fee for admission to acute care beds as the sick people of Conservative Alberta have, or a \$4 per day deterrent fee on level 3 and 4 beds for long-term patients.

Mr. Speaker, I am going to remind my constituents to ask Conservative politicians in our part of the province these questions and others having to do with health care because we now have good quality service in the Meadow Lake constituency and I want to keep it that way.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. McNEILL:— No one on this side of the Assembly has talked about deterrent fees of \$10 a day for a hospital bed, as the Conservative MLA for Rosetown did. And no New Democrat has talked about treating visits to the hospital or the doctor's office as a taxable income to the patients as Joe Clark, the Leader of the federal Conservatives has. In fact, Mr. Speaker, the Budget Speech announced a new hospital in my constituency

in Paradise Hill, a very welcome addition to the medical facilities in the Meadow Lake constituency.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. McNEILL:— Mr. Speaker, that is an example of the very tangible benefits to the people of the Meadow Lake riding in this recent Budget, benefits like more nursing home beds in rural hospitals to add to the many nursing home units and senior citizens, low rental housing built since 1971. Senior citizens did well in this Budget, Mr. Speaker. There is an increase of 25 per cent in the provincial supplement to the old age pension, an expansion of the senior citizens' home repair program for elderly people.

My constituency, like the rest of the province of Saskatchewan, Mr. Speaker, has a high percentage of the population over 65, higher than most other provinces. I have often wondered why retired people stay here in our harsh climate for their later years. I think the answer has a lot to do with the kind of financial, medical and social service help that they receive from the New Democratic government of Saskatchewan, the help that amounts to \$20 million in this Budget in the new programs alone.

Mr. Speaker, farmers did well under this Budget too. The Property Improvement Grant for farms went up from \$330 to \$375. There will be a greater emphasis placed on rural housing, more money in livestock programs and a new swine research centre built.

Mr. Speaker, northern residents were pleased by the Budget Speech. Local municipal governments will have \$3.3 million this coming year compared to \$1.9 million last year. This money will permit local authorities to undertake the building of more sewer and water systems in northern communities, upgrade education facilities and build new public buildings to house modern services and generally make life better for the northern people. It used to be, Mr. Speaker, that the North was a forgotten, under-serviced rural ghetto where poverty, alcoholism and despair was widespread. The North was treated as a resource hinterland by wheelers and dealers like Ross Thatcher and Carl Landdegger. That is no longer true, Mr. Speaker. Now, northern people are included in the decision making that affects their lives. They have new respect for themselves and their part of the country. The best improvement in the North, Mr. Speaker, is in the calibre of representation the citizens have now chosen namely, Mr. Norm McAuley and my colleague Fred Thompson, who are two of the hardest working MLAs in the House and their hard work has brought these many things to the North.

Small businessmen have had their corporate income tax reduced by 12 per cent to 11 per cent, the second time in as many years that this has had a reduction. There is also a new group of four programs to assist small businessmen, including the Main Street Improvement Program and the Industrial Technical Assistance Program.

Mr. Speaker, to paraphrase Napoleon very closely, Saskatchewan is a province of shopkeepers and small businessmen, who are the backbone of the commercial activity in our province. They, in turn, depend on the financial well-being of the farmers. When everything is functioning properly between those two groups, our economy is in good shape. Just this part year there have been problems of cash flow for beef producers; northern farmers who needed financial help to get grain dryers and extra combines to finish up. As with the long established programs in agriculture like the Farm Start and Land Bank that have worked so well, the Blakeney government extended well designed new programs to help see the farmers affected through this difficult period. Saskatchewan farmers can now depend on the NDP government.

The health of our rural economy has been of prime concern to this New Democratic government. One of the major reasons that we have a sound provincial economy today is the effort made in this Budget and previous budgets to lighten the tax burden. In addition to the \$52 million cut in personal income taxes, all car owners will get a 5 per cent reduction in the price of automobile insurance. Power rates have been frozen for one year.

Probably the best news for taxpayers was an announcement of the revenue sharing between the province and the municipalities. This new financial arrangement between the two levels of government will remain the largest increase in money paid to local authorities in the history of the province. Twenty-six million dollars will go to the rural municipalities, up from \$19 million last year. Towns and cities will get \$45.5 million, up from \$23.4. What that means to the average taxpayer is that his property tax need not go up in the coming year. Mr. Speaker, everybody who needed assistance got it in this Budget; farmers, small businessmen, car owners, senior citizens, ratepayers, everyone who pays utility bills. The New Democratic members of the Legislature were all pleased. I will be supporting the Budget, Mr. Speaker.

HON. D.L. FARIS (Arm River):— Mr. Speaker, I am going to reveal the secret behind this year's Budget. The 1978-79 Budget is good news for the people of Saskatchewan. It is good news for farmers, for small businessmen, for senior citizens. It is good news for young people and for children. What is the secret that allows such a good Saskatchewan Budget while other provinces are suffering? While retaining the lowest per capita debt in Canada our province now has the lowest income tax for low and medium income people, the lowest cost for health care, yet the greatest increases in services, health and education, for example, of any province in Canada.

The 9½ per cent reduction in the income tax rate makes us the sixth lowest province in Canada but when you add in the \$160 tax cut and the new \$30 tax cut for each dependent child, Saskatchewan now boasts the lowest income tax rate in Canada for families with incomes up to \$13,000.

Small businessmen benefit by the new 11 per cent tax rate and the property improvement grant increased to \$250. Farmers benefit by the increased property improvement grant of up to \$375 and by the continued policy of no tax on farm fuel. Homeowners will now receive up to \$230 in property improvement grants to ease the burden of school costs. There are no power increases, although the lowest rates in Canada are already being charged here in Saskatchewan. Natural gas and telephones will increase by no more than 8 per cent, a very fine comparison with recent rate increases in Manitoba and Ontario, of 15 to 20 per cent.

Car owners will be pleased by the 5 per cent decrease for car insurance. Safety '77 and

seat belts have reduced injuries and this saving is being passed back to the driving public.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. FARIS:— Many local government bodies will receive grant increases this year from 50 per cent to 100 per cent higher than last year in the first stages of revenue sharing.

But Saskatchewan citizens should not take these and many other benefits for granted. Conservative provincial governments across Canada have been increasing their tax burden on the average citizen. They have been cutting back on services, they have been giving away their natural resources which should be the basis for a better life for all. Recently British Columbia and Ontario brought in 7 per cent sales taxes, Conservative Newfoundland now enjoys a 10 per cent sales tax to go along with its 20 per cent unemployment and welfare figures.

The latest Ontario budget gives perhaps the most striking example of taxing the little people while passing the benefit on to the big corporations. While a family pays nothing for health care premiums in Saskatchewan, that same family if they had the ill fortune to live in Ontario would pay \$44 a month or \$528 a year in Conservative Ontario. \$528 a year!

But there is tax relief for some in Ontario. The giant mining companies — Inco and Falconbridge will pay lower mining taxes — some would argue as a reward for laying off thousands of workers earlier this year.

In fact with the benefits given big corporations they will now pay less in corporation income tax to the province of Ontario than is raised from the new \$528 health premium. Their Conservative government is shifting taxes away from big corporations, away from their resources onto the backs of the people of the province. This is also evident in the small grants given to Ontario hospitals, schools and municipalities.

Ontario hospitals will receive approximately a 4 per cent increase this year. They will be closing more hospitals and more hospital beds. In Saskatchewan we will be opening a new \$40 million University hospital expansion in Saskatoon. Four new hospitals are being opened in rural Saskatchewan. And we are rejecting Conservative and Liberal advice to close small rural hospitals. They call it "rationalization". Saskatchewan hospital grants will be more than 2.5 times the percentage increase of the Ontario increases.

Ontario schools and universities will receive grant increases of approximately 5 per cent. That will mean fewer teachers in rural areas. There are already over 8,400 unemployed teachers in Ontario. This number can be expected to increase to well over 10,000.

Saskatchewan schools, universities and community colleges will receive 10 per cent or more in their increased budgets. These will be the highest percentage increases in Canada. They will assure our children and our young people (particularly in the rural areas) that their quality of education need not suffer.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. FARIS:— Ontario municipalities will receive increases of less than 7 per cent — less than inflation. We know what that means. That will mean higher local taxes and lower levels of service. Compare that to the exciting new revenue sharing program in Saskatchewan. Our urban municipalities will share a 45 per cent increase. Many small communities in my Arm River constituency will receive increases of over 100 per cent. This will allow for increased services with the same or lower local tax rates.

There is one other important aspect of our Saskatchewan Budget that needs comparison with other provinces. Our government believes that people should have the right to work. It is silly and wasteful to have people sit around on unemployment and welfare. Most people want to work. Despite the fact that Saskatchewan has the second lowest unemployment rate in Canada we are taking action to see that new jobs are created now. An estimated 4,400 new jobs will be created by stepping up capital works projects. The capital budget for highways will increase by 18 per cent. Fifteen hundred summer jobs will be created to assist students. The Employment Support Program will be increased 72 per cent. This program has an 80 per cent success rate in helping people move off welfare into the work force — a unique program in Canada.

Again we must contrast this with the Conservative government in Manitoba. They have announced that they are going to hold the line on last year's hospital budget. Ask your local hospital administrator what that would mean in staff cuts. Education grant increases are rumored to be approximately half of that of Saskatchewan's. This will mean more unemployment as well as crowded classrooms. They have recently laid off several hundred people in their Tourism Department. People with trailers, campers, family picnickers, know what that will mean in Manitoba's parks next summer. There they also have plans underway to lay off staff in their home for the mentally retarded. They have not only cut back on people to work with children, with sick people, with the handicapped, they have also cut back on capital projects. This has resulted in thousands of laborers, tradesmen, architects, engineers and contractors being unemployed. This is not an accident. The new Conservative Premier, Sterling Lyon, has purposely cut back on construction. I quote from "In-Site" the house organ of the Manitoba construction industry. There they predict a mid-winter unemployment rate of 30 per cent for Manitoba tradesmen, the worst unemployment since the Conservative government of the mid 1960s. The president of the Winnipeg Builder's Exchange was quoted as saying:

Individual government departments in Manitoba are curtailing expenditures and paring capital outlays sharply. While each department cutback may not in itself appear to be of major significance in percentage terms, the accumulative effect of all department restraint has the same impact on the construction industry that a brick wall has on a car travelling 80 miles an hour.

How does this freeze work in Manitoba? Instead of advancing capital projects to create jobs as we have done in Saskatchewan, in Manitoba the Conservatives have shelved \$37 million worth of provincial government construction, and put a freeze on medical health facilities and reduced grants to Winnipeg and other municipalities. Mr. Steele sums up the situation by saying:

All these things combine to create a sharp braking effect which will come close to bringing to Manitoba's construction industry to its knees.

Mr. Speaker, that's Conservative employment policy in Manitoba.

This building contractor's words are reinforced by the President of the Architectural Institute of Canada. He states:

Recently I have heard that at least one Winnipeg architectural firm has laid off people, while two others are apparently going to do the same thing.

He goes on to point out that there are few projects on the drawing boards, which means fewer jobs in the construction industry six months from now.

Here we have the classic illustration of the Conservative knee-jerk reaction to unemployment. Their answer is to create more unemployment. Conservative governments in Ontario and Manitoba, indeed across Canada, are doing today exactly what they did in 1929.

In 1929 the Conservatives elected a lot of provincial governments and a federal government. And the result is written in history. Fifty years later we face the same problems, unemployment and a falling Canadian dollar and they come up with the same old answers — protracted restraint — shelving capital works, cutbacks. The very answer which will deepen and worsen the problem.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. FARIS:— 1929 - 1979. Surely, Mr. Speaker, we have learned something in 50 years. The people of Manitoba are paying dearly to relearn that lesson.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. FARIS:— We have seen how Conservative Manitoba is actually creating unemployment. We have seen how Conservative Ontario has shifted taxes away from the resource industries and placed them on the backs of the average family with a \$528 medicare premium and increased municipal and local taxation. These are the major points of contrast with Saskatchewan. Saskatchewan is creating jobs. Saskatchewan is shifting taxation away from individuals and families and placing it where it belongs, on the province's resources which belong to all of us.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. FARIS:— Mr. Speaker, this is the secret of this Budget. Saskatchewan can offer more programs and lower taxes because we have dramatically raised our share of revenue from natural resources.

In 1971 the former government received \$33 million from our unrenewable natural resources. In 1978 we received \$462 million from these resources.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. FARIS:— Both Conservative and Liberal oppositions have fought against our increased returns on oil and potash. They have both taken the side of the foreign corporations. Ninety-nine percent of Canada's oil industry is foreign owned. Nine out of ten of Saskatchewan's potash mines used to be foreign owned. Both opposition parties stated that they would tax the oil companies at Alberta rates. Mr. Speaker, that would cut our oil revenue in half. It would hand \$150 million a year to these foreign

owned giants.

Both opposition parties stated we should treat the potash companies the way they are treated in Conservative New Brunswick. That would reduce our potash revenues by over \$100 million a year, again handing that money to these foreign giants. Oil and potash policies as stated by the Conservative and Liberal Parties would cost Saskatchewan over \$250 million a year. It would cost a family of four over \$1,000 this and every year following. No wonder that wealthy industrialized Ontario charges each family \$528 medicare premiums, while we charge none.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. FARIS:— No wonder that Conservative Parties in Ontario, Manitoba and Saskatchewan are talking about medicare premiums and deterrent fees. No wonder these provinces cut back services while we improve ours.

You must obtain government revenue from somewhere. Our government believes that the resources were not put there by foreign corporations to be exploited for the benefit of foreign corporations. They were put there by God for the benefit of all the people. Your democratically elected government representing all the people, not just the wealthy few or the powerful, has a responsibility to be wise and prudent stewards of those resources. These resources belong to the people and the benefit should return to the people, to all of us. That is the secret of this 1978-79 Budget.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. FARIS:— Mr. Speaker, before I outline some of the specific considerations which have gone into the planning of the estimates for the Departments of Education and Continuing Education, I would like to place these money proposals in an historic perspective. Saskatchewan when it became a province in 1905 made a commitment to universal education for its children. A province-wide school system was developed to make elementary and secondary education accessible to all children in spite of the problems of geography and sparse population. Over the years the education system changed and evolved to cope with technical, economic and social change.

From 1905 to 1978 the world has changed profoundly and all of these major changes have had significant effects on the people of our province. The rate of change speeded up fantastically and was accompanied by a veritable explosion of new knowledge. In 1970 it was an accepted fact that the amount of knowledge in the world would double every 10 years. These amazing developments have had a major effect on the elementary, secondary and post-secondary education of our young people. Our schools can no longer impart that special package of knowledge that each person has to know and that package now becomes outdated in a very short time. Instead, our educational system must concentrate on the development of those skills which are required to collect, organize and use the information of the day. We can no longer be certain that our secondary and post-secondary educational institutions will be able to prepare our young people for life long careers. There's no guarantee that any particular career will remain the same, or for that matter, even continue to exist. Our world has become one where the only predictable factor is that more change will take place and at a more rapid rate. The word 'copeability' has become fashionable in educational circles. People must develop the ability to cope with these major changes in our constantly changing society.

Our budget estimates for elementary, secondary and post-secondary education have been established to allow the Department of Education and Continuing Education to continue to improve the support which they are able to provide to the schools, technical schools, the universities and to community colleges of the province, — support which encourages the flexibility which is essential if the needs of education in our rapidly changing world are to continue to be met according to the tradition that we have established.

In past years our major concern has been an expansion of facilities to accommodate an ever-increasing population of young people. However, this dramatic rise in population has peaked and is now levelling out and is predicated to decline in the next 15 to 20 years. Our present challenge is to concentrate our resources on qualitative improvements in our programming and to deal effectively with some of the problems decreasing enrolments have generated.

The budgets which are now being proposed for the Department of Education and Department of Continuing Education for 1978-79 do in fact meet this challenge. At the elementary and secondary school level, significant steps have been taken to provide increased support to school boards, particularly rural school boards who were beginning to be troubled by enrolment declines and high transportation costs. Increased grant support in this area will allow school unit boards to continue to provide a high quality educational service without substantial increases, if indeed any increase in local taxation. In spite of The Established Program Financial Act 1977 by which the Federal government discontinued its 50 per cent support of the operational cost of the universities, we've been able to maintain our level of support at these institutions. In addition, we will be maintaining a high level of program offerings at our technical institutes and will continue to adjust and expand these offerings on the basis of manpower training requirements.

Mr. Speaker, if I may, I would like to examine some specific highlights in each of these two departments.

First of all, the Department of Education. In regard to the Department of Education I would like to largely confine my remarks to major areas: First of all, grants to operating school boards and secondly, proposed program direction.

First let me say something about our proposals for school grants. As I indicated earlier, Mr. Speaker, school boards, in rural Saskatchewan particularly, have been caught in a double bind. Enrolments have been going down and, because of necessary consolidation of programs, the cost of transportation of students has been increasing. In short, the revenues have been declining and the expenses increasing. Ironically, some urban boards are also faced with declining enrolments in some of their urban core schools.

In order to cope with these problems and others, we're proposing some increases and some changes in the distribution of the foundation grants to school boards. The aim of our proposed distribution of foundation grants, Mr. Speaker, has always been to

distribute, as equitably as possible, our grant allocations to the various school jurisdictions in the province. This year we propose to provide \$203,296,600 in grants to support the elementary and secondary schools in the province, an increase of nearly 11 per cent. Within this total we have strengthened the support to rural boards to assist in dealing with the problems of declining enrolments and increased transportation costs. The 1978 recognized per pupil rates for the different categories of students have been increased approximately 14 per cent to \$647 at the kindergarten level, 14.5 per cent to approximately \$1,200 in Division I and II, 12.5 per cent to approximately \$1,350 in Division III, and 10 per cent to approximately \$1,625 in Division IV. These are average percentage increases because there is a differential between increases to rural boards and urban boards. The higher percentage increases at Division I and II represent an attempt to compress the range of recognized rates. In the past, the use of a uniform percentage rate to all levels has increased the dollar differential between Division I and IV. This year we will be reducing this spread. Such a step recognizes that elementary school costs have been increasing at a more rapid rate than secondary school costs, primarily because of the increasing number of highly qualified teachers now working in elementary schools. In addition, Mr. Speaker, we're proposing an 11 per cent increase in the rate recognized for each comprehensive school student in the province. That new rate will be \$1,801 per student.

The sparsity component in the foundation of grants formula will be significantly increased to provide increased assistance to rural school boards for attempting to maintain quality educational programs in sparsely-settled areas. Grants to school units to compensate for enrolment drop and sparsity of population will be increased by over \$4 million. This represents a 75.8 per cent increase from 1977. This same sparsity provision will, in 1978, be extended to non-unit and town schools. This, coupled with adjustments for enrolment drop, will provide an additional \$87 thousand to non-unit and town schools.

The rates recognized for transportation of students in rural Saskatchewan have been increased, in an overall sense, by 14 per cent. This represents an increase of 12 per cent in their per pupil rate and an increase of 16 per cent in the mileage rate. Similar increases will be provided in the rates recognized for urban transportation. The recognized rates for designated handicapped students have also been increased about 11 per cent, both for instructional costs and room and board and transportation costs. This represents a continuing significant commitment to the provision of appropriate educational programming to handicapped children. These recognized rates, which for severely handicapped children are roughly four times the rate recognized for normal Division I and II children, allow school boards to provide for the needs of most handicapped students. This is a reflection of this government's continued commitment to the development of special services for those students who need them. Our special education services rank with the very best in North America.

The Department of Education will provide grants to school boards to assist in financing approximately \$20 million worth of capital construction next year. This grant support will assist school boards in maintaining and upgrading their physical facilities and will also continue to provide support to our provincial construction industry.

In regard to program direction, Mr. Speaker, over the past year the department has maintained its good record in program development. Our curriculum development has become more systematic. Rather than work on a number of areas we have chosen to concentrate on a few quality areas. I am particularly pleased with the Division 1 and 2 health programs which have been developed. We are now placing our emphasis on

deliberate and careful implementation.

As a department, we have continued to emphasize basic skill development on the part of the student, and not at the exclusion of a strong emphasis on the development of a feeling of self worth. Grant emphasis has been placed on the development of Saskatchewan and Canadian resource materials, and considerable support given for multicultural programming.

In 1978, Mr. Speaker, without any increase in staff or new budget allocations, we intend to initiate a number of new directions in departmental programs. Some of these are: 1. To establish a major project in testing to see how well we are doing in basic skills. This will be followed up with a program to improve evaluation techniques so that we can make a better job of dealing with standards, and at the same time, help teachers to diagnose the problems of their individual students. 2. The department will be examining strategies for providing extra challenges for gifted pupils. 3. A new curriculum guide for educable mentally handicapped students will be implemented. The objective of this curriculum guide is to assist teachers in providing special opportunities for these students to develop basic competencies in life skills, functional academic skills, and vocational skills. 4. The department has named an important program policy committee to assist the department in a review of all of its program policies and to identify directions and priorities for program development. This committee is part of a much larger thrust by the department, designed to facilitate increased communication with parents and teachers and communities. As I have said, these are just a few highlights.

In addition, we plan to engage in curriculum development in limited areas to look at teacher supply and demand, Native education, French language education and many others. We are doing this with existing staff and existing operational budgets, Mr. Speaker.

In regard then to the Department of Continuing Education, the government established the Department of Continuing Education in 1972 with a mandate to develop within the province an integrated and comprehensive system of adult educational opportunities which would be accessible to all people in the province. This involved the establishment of the universities commission and bringing the technical institutes under the purview of the department. In addition, a unique community college system was introduced in the province.

Mr. Speaker, in relation to continuing education, I would like to deal with three areas. First, community colleges; secondly, universities; and thirdly, technical institutes. I believe the record of the college speaks for itself. Last year from July 1, 1976 to June 30, 1977 a total of 85,653 people participated in 8 6,018 classes at 652 different locations throughout Saskatchewan. The average registration was 14.2 participants for each class. There was continued emphasis on decentralization of adult learning opportunities, with 69 per cent of our college registrations in rural areas. I hasten to point out that these statistics relate to only the community college regions south of the Department of Northern Saskatchewan administrative district. Depressive as the statistics are, the achievements of the colleges do not all lend themselves to computer printouts. The colleges are becoming increasingly reflective about quality of instruction. In-service training is conducted to better equip local committee members in their functions; workshops are being held for local instructors; board members have requested a manual which is currently being developed. A personnel development committee has been set up to stimulate and co-ordinate in-service education for staff

members. Such developments are indicative of the maturation process that is inherent in education.

The learners too, are maturing in their requests. In the early years of the colleges, of college experience, many tended to identify their learning needs simply in terms of social demand classes. Now the emphasis is shifting to a broader content and to learning events of longer duration. By way of comparison, two years ago the average duration of a class was 25 hours. Last year the average duration for a class was 39 hours. Some 40 per cent of community college time is being spent on basic literacy and adult education. All of these achievements were accomplished last year with a budget of \$4.3 million — a remarkable bargain. This Budget allocates \$4.7 million to Saskatchewan community colleges. This is a 10 per cent increase over the previous year and is based largely on the colleges' greater involvement in technical and vocational oriented programs. It should also be noted that the department subvote for community college administration is reduced by approximately \$100,000. This recognized the reduced need for department supervision and maturation of college boards and staff.

The current budget for community colleges reflects a continued commitment to provide educational opportunities in all areas of the province, a levelling off of start-up costs and some restraint in government spending.

The second area I want to cover is university support. The single largest block of the department's budget is that set aside for university support. We are proposing that \$77.12 million will permit continuance of current programs and some new program growth. As you are aware it is the responsibility of the universities commission to allocate these funds between the two universities. The commission is responsible for receiving statements of need from the universities for operating grants and recommending to the department the total level of consolidated support required by the university sector the next year. As well, the commission has responsibility for overall university sector planning. This program monitoring and development role is approached from a dual point of view — that of a funding body and that of a planning and co-ordinating body. It is a consultative process among the universities, the commission, the department and other institutions.

The universities' capital grant level this year will be approximately \$12.2 million, including a carry over from last year. The major projects for 1978-79 are the campus centre at the University of Saskatchewan, additions to the engineering building, completion of the dental clinic and commencement of the expansion of the Western College of Veterinary Medicine.

The government has been pleased with the initiative of the Federation of Saskatchewan Indians and the University of Regina in reaching a federated agreement for an Indian college providing university level education. I should point out that the province and the Federation of Saskatchewan Indians both maintain that the funding of Indian education is a federal responsibility. Continuing discussions are being held by the province, the FSI and the federal government in order to put the Saskatchewan Indian Federated College on a firm financial footing.

Thirdly, the institutes — the programs offered by the technical institutes and vocational centres are determined by a number of factors, including provincial manpower requirements, occupational trends and the vocational needs of the people of the province. The process of manpower needs identification is complex. Fluctuations in

economic activity, the proliferation of new professions and the time lag between program identification and production of graduates compounds the process.

In view of the projected levelling off of full time enrolment, the institutes have reached a point where careful planning for future growth is a pertinent issue. Last year a number of program consolidation measures were undertaken by the institutes. At the same time the institutes were faced with the opportunity to expand their extension programming to meet the needs of industry, business and the community. By way of example, Kelsey Institute of Applied Arts and Sciences will offer a water well option in its Water Science Program. Agricultural diversification requires larger and more reliable sources of water. Saskatchewan Technical Institute will expand its Electrical Construction and Maintenance Program due to the large number of apprentices seeking journeyman status in the field and due to increased demand for pre-employment training. Saskatchewan Technical Institute is developing an eight month program in agricultural mechanics on a modular basis. This program, to be offered through community colleges, will provide the young farmers with the opportunity to update their skills in selected areas by taking two or three week modules of courses that previously could only be taken by travelling into the technical institute. These courses can now be delivered out into rural Saskatchewan.

From July 1, 1976 to June 30, 1977, the last year for which figures are complete, the three institutes had a total enrolment of 15,804 students of whom 8,592 were extension students. This is an indication of the extent to which institutes and community colleges have been able to integrate and co-ordinate their efforts. In addition to maintaining high standards in content and instruction, the institutes must further modularize programs so that they are mobile enough to meet the needs of adults remote from institute centres.

Our specific funding proposal for the institutes for the next year is \$19.6 million. This level of funding should ensure the continued provision of highly skilled technical manpower to meet the needs of the Saskatchewan labour force. Included in this amount is \$130,000 in operational grants for Kelsey Institute of Applied Arts and Sciences for expansion of welding and farm mechanics programs. Also included is \$300,000 for Wascana Institute of Applied Arts and Sciences for development of agricultural program centres in Lebret and Regina.

Mr. Speaker, the proposed budgets of the Department of Education and Continuing Education reflect our government's high priorities in education. In terms of departmental administration both departments have adopted a hold-the-line, non-expansionary position. This has not, however, been allowed to result in a restriction or reduction in programs. Additional money has been allocated to those people who are directly providing the educational services in the province. Through these increased grants to local school boards they will be able to maintain and improve our high quality of educational service without significantly increasing the property tax burden.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to speak in support of an excellent Budget.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. G.N. WIPF (Prince Albert-Duck Lake):— Mr. Speaker, rising today to speak on the action Budget of 1978-79 is like buying a ticket on the Titanic. I guess it could have been exciting if the end result had not been so disastrous. This Budget plus the last two have all been deficit budgets and as a result has caused our province to sink further and

sink further into debt with the captain and his crew from across the floor yelling all is well, we're not on the bottom yet.

Mr. Speaker, we hear it's time for restraint, it's time to hold the line on wages and spending and on and on we go and these are the statements from the members across the floor. And yet they do not apply these words of wisdom to themselves with a 12 per cent increase in spending this year by this government. Yet we see working people — farmers, nurses and everyone else who is trying to make a living held down by this government as the working people go about their quest for enough money to live on. The Blakeney government motto of 'do as I say little man, not as I do' becomes more evident each day and also with each irresponsible deficit budget that is brought down. I feel sorry for the speakers from the NDP side over there who have been forced to read speeches written for them by speech writers who had to leave BC and Manitoba in the last few years, speech writers who are trying to establish a place in Blakeney's kingdom and as their speeches are read we hear the members singing praises to the Budget that now has put the province of Saskatchewan \$2 billion in debt. Speeches of all the free services the NDP has brought in that have not only put this province \$2 billion in debt but the interest alone on that debt will be about \$200 million annually for the taxpayer of Saskatchewan. Interest on this debt is equal to about four times the budget for agriculture in Saskatchewan in 1978 and 1979. We hear the members opposite praise this type of poor planning in deficit budgets that will cost each man, woman and child in this province about \$200 a year just to pay the interest on this huge debt that this government has chosen to hang around the neck of each citizen of this province. And the member for Regina-Rosemont just said that the NDP are supplying security to the people of Saskatchewan. Well, that's some security, \$2 billion of debt.

Mr. Speaker, the story of the Titanic in comparison to the story of Saskatchewan sinking into debt with the guidance of the Blakeney government and Captain Smishek at the wheel makes the Titanic sound like a nursery rhyme. All of this has taken place while the economic waters of Saskatchewan were as buoyant as they have ever been. Yet we hear government members calling out in the dark, all is well, our heads are still out of the water. \$2 billion in debt and he stills yells, all is well. Only an NDP government in Saskatchewan and a Liberal government in Ottawa could justify that kind of sick logic. Mr. Speaker, our finance critic delivered one of the finest replies to a budget that has ever been heard in this Assembly. People all over Saskatchewan listened and understood what he was saying as he gave the Progressive Conservatives stands on it. At times he agreed with the government and at other times he told you in no uncertain terms that you were wrong. That was the language of common sense. Common sense solutions to problems of today. Problems caused by this government's thrust for power for the sake of power only. Common sense policies and approaches to problems were needed and were spelled out by Colin Thatcher. Not the attack approach which the NDP uses to all in opposition to its ideals and philosophies of state control, state ownership and total and complete socialism for the Province of Saskatchewan.

Mr. Speaker, that Christmas vacation in Cuba by members opposite must have been very fulfilling to some and I imagine the so-called meetings and workshops that were held with the officials over there were encouraging, probably to those opposite who believe in that type of state control government. However, may I tell you, that just because a few of you sitting opposite along with the Prime Minister of our country believe that Cuba is a good place for a refresher course in centralized governments or state controlled governments, it does not mean that it's good for Saskatchewan or for Canada. You are welcome to your beliefs along with the federal Liberals, however, let the rest of Canada and Saskatchewan think for itself.

Mr. Speaker, talking about Trudeau and the federal Liberals I'd be remiss in not mentioning the eleven feds to my right. Members of the big green Xerox machine committed to the floating dollar, high unemployment, high inflation due to scandal ridden, centralist party of Trudeau and his government in Ottawa. And as everybody in Saskatchewan is aware after this weekend the Trudeau party's election campaign was at the expense of all Canadian taxpayers in Saskatchewan. They were in the province for only one reason and that was to blitz Saskatchewan in an election campaign to bolster the Liberal party's image in the West. This federal Liberal party spends the taxpayers' money in the same fashion as do the NDP. There is no difference. Both believe in huge deficits, centralized power, careless spending and yes, even the same vacation spots.

Mr. Speaker, I was surprised to see the two federal Liberal candidates still in their seats here today. I thought for sure that the members for Wascana and the member for Regina South would be gone with Otto Lang and Trudeau for a look at Ottawa today. However, it is good to see you both here trying to show that there are still MLAs in pursuing that image until Trudeau calls them to him.

Mr. Speaker, there are signs in the past and again in this Budget that the NDP are listening to the PCs. The first sign was in 1973 when Dick Collver called for the removal of hospitalization premiums. Of course the minister of Health at that time claims that this could not be done and they laughed the same way as they do now. However, the minister finally realized that the Progressive Conservatives are right and after about six months were forced to do what the new Progressive Conservative leader at that time had said and the NDP removed the hospitalization premium, unfortunately it took the Lakeview by-election to force this government to move.

Then there were grants to the municipal governments in this Budget. However, Mr. Speaker, as usual, the government showed again that they will not turn the reins over to the local government and would control the grants by selecting a tax base which will be used for these grants. Why, Mr. Speaker, why does this government not use a share of all revenues they receive and give the municipalities a grant system that will be fair and will truly reflect the provincial economy and allow the local government to reflect that in their local plans.

I listened also to some of the speeches by the members of the Liberal party and find too that they have picked up our policy and are trying desperately to understand it and try to make it work. That's called Xerox, yes. The most interesting thing of all was the Liberal leader when he decided to use our policy of zero based budgeting. However, for over two months last year he called it the zero budget, the poor chap didn't even realize that he was wrong. However, now we see the Liberal machine has learned the right name but like the government opposite, it does not know how to handle it or how to make it work. Well let me tell you folks, we'll show you how this all works after the next general election.

The NDP and the Liberals have been trying to adopt some of our policy and take it as their own, reminds me of a dog chasing a car, when he catches it, he just does not know what to do with it.

Mr. Speaker, my time is fairly limited here today, however, when we look at the deficit budget, the third in a row it makes me wonder who the Minister of Finance has had for his advisors. Three deficit budgets during the best years the Saskatchewan economy

has ever had. It makes me wonder if the people of Saskatchewan can afford this spendthrift fire sale government any longer and in my humble opinion the people of Saskatchewan cannot afford to keep the NDP around after the next election and the province cannot afford the decentralized concept of a Trudeau boss Liberal government in Saskatchewan either. This Liberal government is a party that believes you can do anything you want from forgery to anything else that the human mind can conceive and it's O.K. as long as you admit it in public.

Mr. Speaker, the \$2 billion debt that hangs on the necks of the present and future citizens of Saskatchewan, \$2 billion of debt for our children and our grandchildren, \$2 billion worth of debt with an interest rate of about \$200 million a year just to pay the interest will cost every man, woman and child in this province over \$200 a year and never touch the debt. Can we afford an NDP government and more potash mines or deterioration in our Medicare system, lack of growth and investment in Saskatchewan and the interest in the oil exploration in our province is just about finished?

Let's take a look for a minute at the statistics of 1978 for February 25th, from Oil Week, up to the end of February 1978, the terrible Tory Alberta that only drilled 124 holes, Saskatchewan was right behind them with four. The rigging activity and old Tory Alberta was sitting over there, they had only done 256 and Saskatchewan was right behind them with 10 and this is progress. This is supplying security as the member who spoke before said for Regina-Rosemont. Yet the minister goes on because he believes he and his colleagues, he believes that they have fooled the voters in Saskatchewan and told them they will have an extra \$85 in their pocket each year. This government can't tell the truth about our debt and still face the voters. They have to go outside the province for issues and hide behind them.

Mr. Speaker, that \$2 billion debt must be explained to the people of this province and I am sure that as responsible citizens, the voters of Saskatchewan will be asking each MLA about this \$2 billion debt the NDP has hung around the neck of each individual in our province. This Budget reflects more government, more bureaucracy and more debt and it becomes clearer that the NDP has put potash ahead of people. It became clear when Mr. Randy Nelson, member for Yorkton, stood up on January 3 while one of our members was speaking and he brought forth the backbenchers' policy on medicare and I quote, this is what the member said: "Let's cut out hospitalization." That is what the NDP member said. Let me assure you that as long as there is a Progressive Conservative in this House you will never fulfil your dream. You will never cut out hospitalization. I challenge you to go to T.C. Douglas, the man who fought so hard to get that in here and tell him what your stand is now.

Mr. Speaker, once again we hear the government and the Liberals attacking the Conservatives, attacking because of only one thing and that is because in the next general election they are going to see a complete replay of the Manitoba election. Each member of this Assembly knows it, because, Mr. Speaker, we are the only pro-Saskatchewan party in this Legislature. All of our members are pro-Saskatchewan MLAs, none are looking to Ottawa for the future. To a man we stand here and are going to stay as MLAs of Saskatchewan. That is why the voters of Saskatchewan will change the government of Saskatchewan after the next election. It will be bye-bye Blakeney and the boys. Mr. Premier knows it and he is now preparing for his move to federal politics, right on the heels of the two Liberal MLAs who have already announced their intentions or should I say their hopes or wishful thinking of a seat in Ottawa with Mr. Trudeau. However, I believe the Premier will have more luck in becoming the national leader of the NDP when he leaves provincial politics after the next election than will the

two temporary MLAs who sit to my right.

Mr. Speaker, my time is just about up. I would like to have spent more time on this, however, I will be supporting the amendment.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. R.E. NELSON (Assiniboia-Gravelbourg):— Mr. Speaker, in rising to speak on the Budget Debate in this Fifth Session of the Eighteenth Legislature of Saskatchewan, I can't help but express amazement at how the Minister of Finance and this government expect the people of the province to swallow the juggling in this Budget.

Just a year ago we were subjected to an increase of provincial income tax from 40 per cent to 58.5 per cent. At that time he called it a slight increase. Now when it is decreased to 53.5 per cent, still 13.5 per cent over 1976 it is called a substantial decrease. The minister failed to tell the whole story when he announced that there were no increases in the residential power rates. He did not mention that those rates had been increased 57.2 per cent since 1975. A decrease should have been in order.

The minister failed to tell the whole story when he said the natural gas increases would be 8 per cent in 1978. He did not mention that gas has been increased 93.7 per cent since 1974 and that the 8 per cent increases would bring it to 101.7 per cent since that time and a substantial decrease should have been given.

Probably the most unfair increase of all is the promised 8 per cent on telephone rates. In the last two years there has been a profit of \$37 million in Saskatchewan Telecommunications. The citizens of the province should have been given a decrease last year as well as again this year.

What the Minister of Finance is really doing is using these Crown corporations which have a monopoly in their field to indirectly collect revenue to keep the \$45 million deficit from being a deficit of over \$100 million. He is certainly collecting a utility tax on all the citizens of Saskatchewan.

The government tries to take credit that the policy of seat belts was the reason for the better revenue in the car insurance business. They failed to say that one year ago the huge increases in the licence premiums had been camouflaged by spreading the renewal dates throughout the year. I fail to see where the restricted and more careful driving habits caused by the severe weather conditions which result in less bent fenders should be credited to buckling up.

Again this year the Saskatchewan government is ignoring the rural and ignoring the agricultural industry in our province. While farmers have been keeping Canada and Saskatchewan in a decent trading position with the rest of the world, the Minister of Agriculture as well as the government completely ignores these people. The agriculture share of the new Budget is 3.1, the lowest in Saskatchewan history. The government has written off the farmers and agriculture industry in this province. There aren't many votes left out there on the farm and the government has chosen to ignore them.

Mr. Speaker, if the government is interested in creating jobs in Saskatchewan, if they are interested in starting new industry, if they are interested in expanding the tax base of Saskatchewan, why, in heavens name, did the Minister of Agriculture not develop the

irrigation at Outlook. It is over 20 years since the federal government spent hundreds of millions of dollars on the Saskatchewan River Dam.

A sugar beet industry, a sugar refinery and much other development should have been a reality long ago. If the Minister of Agriculture is not prepared to demand money to develop industry and agriculture at Outlook then he should resign or let someone else get on with that job.

Mr. Speaker, something that was noticeable and missing from the Budget Speech the Minister of Finance gave, was any mention whatsoever of the proposed Grasslands Park to be developed in southern Saskatchewan.

I would like to go back to June 29, 1977 at 9 A.M. when the hon. Adolph S. Matsalla, Minister of Tourism and Renewable Resources had a press conference in Regina and told the media some things regarding the Grasslands National Park.

The minister stated he was pleased to announce that morning the provincial government had given its conditional approval to the government of Canada to proceed with a park in southwestern Saskatchewan. The minister went on at length to say why the government had decided to go ahead with the park and, in fact, mentioned many of the conditions that would be brought about when the agreement was officially signed.

I want to deal, firstly, with the statements from the minister that said the decision and the official signing would be done in 1977. On many occasions the minister postponed and put off that date when he was questioned saying it would be coming in the very near future. I wonder if the minister realizes just what he has been doing to this fine group of ranchers and farmers within that park area?

For nearly 20 years the ranchers and farmers in that area have lived in fear of losing their ranches, their farms and their very livelihood. They have not been able to plan their future, they have not been able to make plans for their children. Young people, in many cases, have left home not knowing if there was a future for them there. They had no idea when this government would come and take and expropriate and they had no idea of what to expect. They were not able to properly plan their operation, not knowing if that operation would be there tomorrow and if it were, if it would be taken from them. They have witnessed this government of Saskatchewan when they ran roughshod over their neighbors at Coronach. They witnessed the expropriation and the hardship the citizens of Saskatchewan in that area went through. Many of these people in the park area wanted to build new homes. They have not been able to do this not knowing what their future was.

I want the minister of Tourism and Renewable Resources, who is responsible for parks in Saskatchewan, to put himself in their position and he should realize what he is doing to these people. Some may be left with portions of their operations; some may have to move entirely from the area. Yet the minister stood up on June 29 in Regina and said the operation would go ahead. He gave Parks Canada permission to go out and start negotiating for the necessary land. That was nearly one year ago and nothing has yet happened.

Now these people did not request a park. In fact, a huge majority of the people concerned were very much opposed to having a grassland park in that area. At the

hearings that were held regarding the proposed park, they used their democratic right to express clearly that they did not want a park. I might add that the particular hearings board was carefully selected by the government of Saskatchewan and much of that board was very biased toward a prairie park in that region. When the results of the hearing came in, when the committee gave their report, the ranchers and farmers, strong believers in democracy decided they would bow to the majority decision and bitterly accepted the decision of that board.

Yet, what is the minister and the Saskatchewan Government doing to them? They have been given a few estimates, a sparse bit of information and being told nothing of what their future is in that area and how far in the future a park will be.

The minister has been saying nothing. He has gone into hiding as far as the park is concerned and has been grossly unfair with the citizens of my constituency as well as the citizens involved in the constituency of my colleague from Shaunavon. I condemn this government and I condemn the minister for not doing their job. Some years ago this government signed the memorandum of intent on the proposed Grasslands Park with the federal government. While I cannot blame the present minister for that action his seatmate who was in the House was certainly the guilty party. I will, however, say that as late as June 29, 1977 the present minister in charge agreed on an agreement on behalf of the government of Saskatchewan, an agreement with Parks Canada that agreed that the government of Saskatchewan and Canada would share equally in the oil and gas development within the core areas of the proposed park. In other words, they agreed to share the cost of exploration within the 72 sections of the core areas only. They also agreed that the petroleum products or otherwise found and developed would be shared equally from that core area.

While that particular part of the agreement could be accepted by the people of Saskatchewan, the other part of the agreement for which both ministers are equally guilty cannot be accepted by any citizen of the province of Saskatchewan and should never have been put in the agreement in the first place.

Mr. Speaker, that part of the agreement states that if any gas or oil is discovered in the outer area of the part, which is nearly 300 sections, will be shared equally with the province of Saskatchewan and the government of Canada.

Now the real ringer in the case is that the province of Saskatchewan would pay the entire amount of exploration in that outer 300 sections.

The government of Canada would not be called upon for one cent for exploration, yet this government was prepared to give them half of anything that was found.

One would wonder whether these ministers had their celebration before the signing of the agreement rather than after. Mr. Speaker, errors of this kind prove incompetence on the part of this government. I would suggest to the minister, immediately to arrange a fair agreement with both parties involved in that park with regard to the gas and oil exploration. If there is to be a park then I ask the minister to stop dragging his feet. If there is not to be a park, then have the decency to go to these people and say so, so that they know and can live without fear in the future.

Mr. Speaker, another minister who has certainly shown gross incompetence is the minister in charge of the Sask Power Corporation.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. NELSON:— On numerous occasions in this Assembly the minister refused to answer questions or to give full and proper information when he was asked to do so in question period, on the problems that have gone on in Coronach to do with the Poplar River Power Project.

Since day one that project, the people living in that area have complained of lack of communication with the minister and they have not been able to get full information when they sought it.

The residents of Montana as well and the Montana government have complained on numerous occasions of not being able to get full information from the Saskatchewan Power Corporation. This minister has been flirting with an international incident, just a few weeks ago, when he failed to give full and proper information to the International Joint Commission studying the Poplar River Power Project. It was not until that commission called for a halt in the construction at Coronach as well as the pumping of the underground water, that that minister decided to give further information which should have been given to the commission much earlier. This type of nonsense must cease if the government of Saskatchewan is to have any credibility with the citizens of Saskatchewan. In the Coronach region, the minister has completely lost all credibility with the farmers, with the local governments and with the citizens in general. Because of the minister's bungling, Saskatchewan Power Corporation can look for a very poor relationship for the many years to come in that region.

With many Saskatchewan projects, power projects coming up in the future, I suggest to the Premier that he either instruct that minister to cut the arrogance and start communicating with the people or to replace him. That minister, along with his cohorts from Municipal Affairs and Highways have nearly bankrupted the local governments in the villages and RMs of that area and all because of lack of communication, of lack of understanding and of an arrogant attitude on the part of this government. Just before the new year, we witnessed the striking down of Bill 42. That bill was brought in by the Attorney General. So all these so-called senior citizens, senior Cabinet ministers of this government have shown gross incompetency. Is it any wonder that the Premier appears tired and is greying prematurely and is not anxious to go into another election.

Mr. Speaker, after the next election, the Liberal government will begin by not plundering the Crown corporations to put money in the general funding of this province. A Liberal government will balance the books in this province, not bring in these huge deficits as the Minister of Finance has done. A Liberal government will give fair levels of taxation and will not juggle them from year to year because of election gimmicks as this government has done. A Liberal government will treat international commissions with respect and honesty and will also respect governments of other countries. A Liberal government will inform the people of Saskatchewan on any future plans and will give them information when they ask for it. A Liberal government will treat local governments fairly and with justice so that they can again trust in the government of our province. A Liberal government will recognize the agricultural industry in Saskatchewan and show it the respect and the interest necessary to develop it and to enhance it to become greater than it already is. A Liberal government will not ignore that industry and will not ignore farmers as being done at the present time.

Yes, Mr. Speaker, there will be a brighter day in Saskatchewan after the next election

under a Liberal government. We in the Liberal Party will not be purchasing industries that are already in the province. We will encourage the development of our resources so that new jobs can be developed in Saskatchewan, for Saskatchewan people. Mr. Speaker, I will not be supporting the motion. I will be supporting the amendment.

MR. ROMANOW:— Mr. Speaker, you will recall earlier this day we agreed to come back to at least a portion of the orders of the day to deal with some points of order which have been raised. I would suggest that with the consent of the House we deal with those now and after we have dealt with them, we come back to the continuation of the debate on the Budget Speech.

MR. SPEAKER:— Normally, we would be taking the balance of the orders of the day later on this evening, however, there has been a request to do it at this time. Is the House in agreement? I'll take the points of order which were raised previously; I'll take the member for Nipawin.

MR. COLLVER:— Before orders of the day, I would like to introduce to you and through you to this Assembly a gentleman from the province of Manitoba, a member of the Legislature from the constituency of Radisson, Manitoba, Mr. Abe Kovnatz, who is visiting here with us. I hope we will all join in welcoming Abe and hope that his visit here has been enlightening, if not a learning process.

MR. LANE (Qu'Ap):— To raise a point of order, Mr. Speaker, I am somewhat concerned I might say, about the question period as is indicated today, and perhaps you can restate your ruling. The inconsistency that I noted today was that the party to my right was, in every case, when it requested or indicated a second supplementary, granted the same in every single case when it requested, to ask a second supplementary, it was granted. In the case of the Conservative caucus, every time it requested a second supplementary, it was ruled out. Now, Mr. Speaker, I think that a restating of your ruling on supplementary questions would be in order so that we are all of the same mind in this case.

MR. SPEAKER:— Order, order! I think the granting of supplementaries has to do with the importance and quality of questions in some cases.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:— I will note from observing the record that I made today of the question period, the first person that was allowed a question was not given a second supplementary. The second question was asked by the member for Estevan and he was not allowed a supplementary because there didn't seem to be urgency in his question, in my view, and the matter was getting into debate. As I go down the record, I find that other members were denied second supplementaries, both in the Liberal and Conservative groupings. So as a consequence, I think the question period was quite well balanced today, even if I do say so myself.

MR. LANE (Qu'Ap):— Further to the point of order, Mr. Speaker, would it not be proper to make your decision as to the quality of the question at the time of the question and not later supplementaries when the government seems to be squirming a bit.

MR. SPEAKER:— I don't make my judgment on whether the government is able to answer the question or denies an answer to the question.

The question of the equality of the question or the urgency of the question is based solely on the question and if it isn't apparent to me that the question is of urgent public concern, I am liable to not allow a supplementary. I may even interfere with the asking of the question at some time. But there are relatively few times that I interfere with the asking of the first question.

MR. CAMERON:— There are two kinds of supplementaries, Mr. Speaker. The first, Mr. Speaker, is a supplementary asked by a member who asks the initial question. I was permitted today, when I asked the first question, to ask only one supplementary in respect of it and I wonder why, Mr. Speaker, generally when a member asks a question he is not permitted two supplementaries.

Now the second kind of supplementary is a supplementary by a member who asks and who sort of rides on another member's question. This is what you might call sort of a scavenger supplementary and I appreciate the member for Qu'Appelle — he's an expert in that respect that's the kind of supplementary usually, Mr. Speaker, that the member for Qu'Appelle would want to ask. But I ask you seriously why do members not generally get two supplementaries to their own question?

MR. SPEAKER:— I make a judgment as to the urgency or the importance of the question. If I am wrong then the member who was asking the question has the opportunity to come back later in the question period with another question on the same subject, if he still considers it to be very important. I will pretty well take questions again on the same issue because that happened today. I took questions on an issue it was education — and it was raised later on and I took another question, I believe it was the member for Saskatoon-Sutherland. I came back to him again and he still thought it was important although, at the time that I ruled him out of order, I had in my mind ruled him out because it lacked urgency at that point. Does that take care of the points of order?

MR. COLLVER:— Mr. Speaker, I would just like to make a brief comment about your suggestions and the kind of quality of your interference in the question period.

Most of us and most of the people of Saskatchewan have had an opportunity recently to witness, far more than any of us were able to before, the question period in the House of Commons in Ottawa. I think if you will note there Mr. Jerome very, very seldom interjects or interferes in the question period, very seldom. That is true.

MR. ROMANOW:— Not true.

MR. COLLVER:— That is true. Very, very seldom does he become involved in determining whether or not a matter is of urgency or whether a matter is not of urgency. I ask you, Mr. Speaker, if you are going to involve yourself as, for example, today in almost every Progressive Conservative questioner in a judging as to the urgency of the matter from the Progressive Conservatives that is being asked of the government; are you not becoming a participant in questioning period, which would have a tendency perhaps to negate your role as adjudicator of the question period? Certainly, if you examine the situation in Ottawa, I think you would find that there was very much less interference with question period by the Speaker there than there is here in Saskatchewan.

MR. MacDONALD:— Mr. Speaker, rarely do I agree with the Leader of the Conservative

Party but on this occasion I must agree with him. In watching Ottawa, I find two things that are relatively different than our Legislature, not that that makes them right and us wrong. Number one, there rarely is any interference by the Speaker in the question period. Well, when I say rarely, I'm not saying emphatically always. You know, if the Attorney General wants to speak on this point of order, he can get up. The second thing, Mr. Speaker, that I notice is that questioners are given much more latitude in a preamble. I think in our House, if you timed the responses of the minister and timed the question of the opposition you would find that in most cases it would be five to one, particularly when the Minister of Environment gets up. Mr. Speaker, only once that I can recall in the last 20-30 sittings of the session have you stopped a Cabinet minister in his response. And yet, very rarely, does the questioner go by without it and I just bring that up . . .

MR. SPEAKER:— Order, order! The member is making general accusations and blanket accusations which at the time that they occurred, it would seem to me that that's what the member's making, at the time they occurred, they should have been brought to the attention of the House. I have interrupted ministers for lengthy answers and I make no apology for interrupting them and I'll continue to interrupt them if they give answers that are substantially in excess of what I believe reasonable. Now, I don't pattern what I do in the Chamber on what is done in Ottawa . . .

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:— . . . because I was, Order, order! I was directed by this House to not do that, and the members of the opposition and the government had a hand in that, because they adopted a set of rules for this question period and I could send the member a copy of page 9 of the interim report of the Special Committee on Rules and Procedures March 12, 1976 wherein it states quite clearly:

Questions must be brief and to the point; they must be of sufficient urgency and importance to require the attention of the House. They must not give information, but they must seek information. The answers and the questions must not be lengthy or detailed. The questions must not be hypothetical.

I know members and ministers from time to time transgress these rules. I do the best I can to keep them close to the rules and I think I'll attempt to do that in the future and if members have specific complaints rather than generalizations I would take them at the time they arise and be quite willing to deal with them.

MR. COLLVER:— Mr. Speaker, I would like to just add one further thing for your consideration. The Rules Committee and the committee that designed that document that you just read from, generally speaking, in their report to this Assembly patterned their ideas after the question period in Ottawa since it was a change, if you will recall, from the question period which was in the Saskatchewan Legislature before, which allowed three questions and two or three, I believe, supplementary questions to each question and it was limited to that, and two, wasn't it two supplementaries? Yes, but Mr. Speaker, if I might just say that that was the case with reference to the committees' report to this Legislature. Now if you choose to interpret the committee's statements and the report and the suggestions that they made before in this particular way that you become a participant in the question period and I must suggest to you, Sir, with respect that in participating in the question period you may give the impression to anyone who is a casual observer that you might not be fair in adjudicating between a government member and an opposition member. That could happen . . .

MR. SPEAKER:— Order, order! I think I have the gist of what the member is stating and the member is clearly stating that he is inferring that I am not adjudicating the question period properly. Now, if the member wishes to prove that point he will rise on points of order when they occur, otherwise he will not make blanket accusations. I will say to the member for Nipawin that I eagerly await any inference in the report that was tabled in this House that we should pattern ourselves on the House of Commons. Any statement or inference in that report, I want him to produce it for me at a later time. You can send it to my office or table it in this House. I'd be quite willing to review the report and my understanding of the report.

Having dealt, I think, sufficiently long with this, I do want to raise one point before I . . . do you have a further point of order?

MR. CAMERON:— I wanted, Mr. Speaker, to address some small additional comment to the question of order raised by the member for Nipawin. I want to join with my colleague in indicating my own agreement with the point made by the member for Nipawin. It was my understanding throughout that the rules that we have here are patterned after the rules that apply in the House of Commons, essentially they are the same rules. The question, Mr. Speaker, is in their application, whether they should be applied here in the same way as they are there. I am under the clear impression, too, that more latitude is given in the House of Commons, Mr. Speaker, that what is given here. Mr. Speaker, to reinforce the point I make in practical terms is that today was the first opportunity I had to question in regard to the Bryant report and the report of the Attorney General. Mr. Speaker, you will recall on Friday, neither the Attorney General nor the Premier was here. I consider that to be a matter of importance as most people do, and yet, Mr. Speaker, I had a chance to ask only one supplementary in that important area today. I don't complain about that, I merely use that as an illustration, Mr. Speaker. I think the point taken by the member for Nipawin is a good one and that we ought to have a little more latitude in respect of the supplementaries that we ask.

MR. ROMANOW:— Mr. Speaker, no one from this side has been heard. I was a member — so far as I know that committee is still existing — still a member of that Committee on Rules. I do say, Mr. Speaker, to the Leader of the Liberal Party and the Leader of the Conservative Party that my understanding of the rules which you have read as guidelines, or these guidelines with respect to question period were agreed to unanimously. The Leader of the Conservative Party says in a seated position that somehow we agreed to Ottawa in the minutes. I invite the Leader of the Conservative Party, I invite the member for Regina South to give us examples of following Ottawa or not. We have tried to pattern, Mr. Speaker, that Rules Committee and question period after Westminster, not necessarily Ottawa. I do not argue as one member of this House that the kind of latitude that we see on television of the House of Commons is something that we should be modelling ourselves after as parliamentarians here in Saskatchewan. I say to the contrary, Mr. Speaker. The simple fact of the matter is that the question period is exactly what those words indicate, to ask questions of government, not to give information. The biggest difficulty that the boys opposite have, Mr. Speaker, if I may before I take my seat, is that they do not ask questions. They embroider their questions with comments and political stances and, somehow, say that that is the Ottawa procedure. If it is, I for one am glad the committee did not accept that position.

MR. SPEAKER:— Order, order! I think we are getting into an unfortunate precedent of

debating points of order and debating the Speaker's statement on the question period. It was agreed at the start that the Speaker would have to use his own judgment in the question period as to the urgency or importance of a question.

Now the member for Regina South (Mr. Cameron) cites that the questions about the Pelly by-election are quite important. Well, he had a question and a supplementary at the first of the question period and he apparently thought it was still important and he had another question at the end of the question period. Now, he got two questions today. Maybe he should have more. Maybe the members in this caucus should stay in their seats and let the member for Regina South get up and follow through on this important issue if he thinks it is important. But I was allowing the member for Wascana (Mr. Merchant) and I was allowing the member for Kindersley (Mr. McMillan) and the member for Assiniboia-Gravelbourg (Mr. Nelson) and the member for Indian Head-Wolseley (Mr. MacDonald) to rise to their feet because I thought they might have something important to contribute to the question period. I think that is a decision that is up to the individual caucus and if they feel that issue should be pursued and pursued solely as the issue of the day then they should have their members sit down and let the member for Regina South pursue it.

MR. MacDONALD:— On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:— If it is a new point of order I will take it. If it is the same issue I am going to look at it as closed.

MR. MacDONALD:— I believe it is a new one, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, what I want to say is this. As far as I am concerned it was at your invitation that points of order be brought up after the question period is over. It is not the intent of the point of order, I don't believe today or at any other time, to implicate or to imply unfairness on the Speaker's part. I think it is important that members of the opposition bring to your attention and to the attention of the members of the House what they consider to be application of the rules of the House, that they do not believe are, in general, applied equally to both sides of the House whether by accident or whatever it may be. So all I want to point out, Mr. Speaker, it was not an insinuation of your fairness or unfairness. I do think that members on both sides of the House should be able to get up and make an observation without it being suggested that we are imputing any motives to you, Sir, or to anybody else in the House.

MR. SPEAKER:— Order! I think the Attorney General will allow me to make my points here. I will accept the member's word that he was not imputing that I was improperly governing the question period. However, I invite the member to check the record. It is written down and if he can get the Hansard, have a look at it and perhaps I'll have a look at it too and we'll decide in our own minds if there was an imputation of that nature there. Now, I want to conclude this particular point because I think we've dealt with it quite thoroughly and I had one point that I wanted to raise before orders of the day which I didn't want to raise earlier today because I didn't want to interfere with the close timing that we tend to try to observe at that time of day. This has to do with Commonwealth Day. Members may have seen the Commonwealth Day poster which is posted on each of the bulletin boards outside of the side entrance doors, and I just want to draw attention to Commonwealth Day at this time. The Commonwealth is a group of 36 nations in seven regions of the world. There are about 900 million people involved in the Commonwealth and these in turn are represented by about 8,000 representatives. The officers of this association are the Right Honourable Ripton MacPherson

March 13, 1978

Member of Parliament who is a Speaker of the House of Representatives in Jamaica; the Vice-President of the association is Mr. J.R. Harrison, Member of Parliament and Acting Speaker of the House of Representatives in New Zealand; the Chairman of the Executive Committee is the Honourable Datuk Moosa Hitam, who is the Minister of Education for Malaysia and the Treasurer of the organization is Mr. Neil Martin, Member of Parliament for the United Kingdom. The Ministers of Education have agreed that the second Monday in March, which is today, would be observed as Commonwealth Day and this was for the purpose of allowing students in the Commonwealth countries to focus their attention on the Commonwealth and the heritage that we have, and to learn more about the Commonwealth of Nations. With regard to our own particular branch the members will be aware of the fact, at least the executive members will be aware of the fact, that tomorrow will be the executive meeting of the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association, this branch. And the Annual Meeting and Supper of the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association will be held on Wednesday, March 22nd, 1978 and I believe that if you have not received a notice, you will today or tomorrow and I might say at this time that we've confirmed that Dr. Maurice Foster who is the President of the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association, Canadian Branch, has agreed to be our guest that evening. That's on a Wednesday evening so we'll have an opportunity to get together, have a brief review of Parliamentary Association activities and give Dr. Foster an opportunity to speak to the Parliamentary Association. That is the statement on the Parliamentary Association.

The Assembly recessed from 5:00 o'clock to 7:00 o'clock p.m.