

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN
December 5, 1979

The Assembly met at 2 p.m.

On the Orders of the Day

QUESTIONS

SGEA STRIKE

MR. G. TAYLOR (Indian Head-Wolseley): – My question is to the Premier (Mr. Blakeney). In view of the tremendous disruption to business in this province, to government services in this province and to the general way of life in this province, will you, Mr. Premier, as the head of this government, bring the SGEA (Saskatchewan Government Employees Association) and the public service commission to the bargaining table to bring about an end to this drastic situation?

HON. A.E. BLAKENEY (Premier): – Mr. Speaker, I would like to report to the hon. member and to the House that we understand that negotiations are in fact taking place, that the conciliator has been in touch with the parties and we're optimistic that several contracts which are now taking place will lead to a resolution of the dispute.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: – Hear, hear!

MR. TAYLOR: – Supplementary question. It has been brought to my attention that part of the antagonism that exists in this situation is brought about because of a differential in pay between the SGEA employees and the employees of your Crown corporations. Would you, Mr. Premier, please explain the rationale for this difference in pay?

MR. BLAKENEY: – Mr. Speaker, that obviously is not a question I can deal with in the question period but basically the rationale is that the Crown corporations bargain on the basis of the industry comparisons. The employees of the telephone company generally bargain for wages which are similar to those paid to other telephone employees. Similarly, power employees bargain for wages similar to those paid out to other power employees. It is also the same with respect to potash and oil and the others. The usual standard is industry comparison and there are types of work which are done both in the potash industry and, let us say, the coal mining industry, but they're not paid at the same rate. Accordingly, it will be possible therefore to find employees of the Government of Saskatchewan, broadly speaking, who do somewhat similar work but who are paid different rates because their unions and their employers have decided that the appropriate comparison considering everything is the industry comparison rather than the wages paid in other government agencies.

Saskatchewan Activity in Federal Defence Contracts

MR. J.G. LANE (Qu'Appelle): – I would like to direct a question, I'm not sure whether the Minister of Industry and Commerce (Mr. Vickar) is still the Minister of Industry and Commerce or whether the new minister of the potash corporations is the member for industrial development, so whoever has the responsibility.

A recent report in the Globe and Mail indicates that Saskatchewan will have the least benefit from the national military fighter aircraft contract to be awarded, whether it

goes to McDonnell Douglas or General Dynamics. It certainly indicates that your department is off to a pretty poor start if you aren't able to do better than that report indicates. Would the minister indicate specifically how many jobs he expects Saskatchewan to have as a result of the contract (either manufacturer gets the award) and how much economic benefit will come to the province?

HON. E.L. COWLEY (Provincial Secretary): – Well, Mr. Speaker, I don't have those numbers at my fingertips but I'll certainly undertake to provide them for the member as soon as possible. If he is concerned about the amount of activity that is likely to come from federal defence contracts, I'd suggest he might contact some of his MPs in Ottawa or perhaps the Prime Minister and see whether or not he and Mr. Hnatyshyn can be of some assistance in getting more activity in Saskatchewan. We'd certainly, I'm sure, be more than willing to do what we can to assist the federal government to assist the various regions in Canada and make sure that we get our fair share, although it is, as the member will realize, fully their responsibility.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: – Hear, hear!

MR. LANE: – I thank the minister for making it quite clear to the public of Saskatchewan that the responsibility, the duty for getting jobs for the people of Saskatchewan is the duty of the official opposition and not his new department. I ask the minister, is the minister's statement that he has just given an admission that in fact he has made no representations on behalf of the people of Saskatchewan for jobs for the people of Saskatchewan from the award for the military jet aircraft? Having failed to make the representation on behalf of the people, will he now contact his federal counterpart and please do something?

MR. COWLEY: – Mr. Speaker, the contract, or the likely letting of the contract has been around for a long time and I suspect it will be some time before the member's colleagues in Ottawa will find enough money to let the contract. I want to say to the member that I have not personally made any representations on this particular contract. Obviously, we have met with our federal counterparts and made general representations with respect to economic activity that may be spinoffs of various things that the federal government is having done. I indicated to the member I would undertake to get the information to him. I suspect if we left it in the hands of the opposition to get jobs for Saskatchewan, that we'd be in rather sad shape, something like our counterparts in Manitoba are.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: – Hear, hear!

Condition of Highways

MR. D.M. HAM (Swift Current): – Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the Premier in the absence of the highways minister. Mr. Premier, yesterday during the question period, the Minister of Highways (Mr. Kramer) recommended the public of Saskatchewan limit their highway travel and exercise caution during the strike. Would you not agree his advice was inadequate and inappropriate in light of a school bus roll over yesterday in Saskatchewan involving injury to a number of students due to icy conditions?

HON. A.E. BLAKENEY (Premier): – No. I am not aware of the circumstances referred to by the hon. member. I'm not aware that they took place on a provincial highway and accordingly I am unable to comment on the hon. member's . . .

MR. HAM: – Supplementary question. Mr. Speaker, would the Premier not agree that supervisory staff are providing maintenance less than acceptable to public safety, and further incidents like yesterday are more probable?

MR. BLAKENEY: – My advice from the Minister of Highways is that the crews available are coping, that no crises as ordinarily defined are appearing and that the number of accidents during this period is not higher than it ordinarily is during this period or is not higher so far as one can measure, than in Manitoba or Alberta, where they are experiencing similar highway conditions.

SGEA Strike – Psychiatric Patients

MRS. J.H. DUNCAN (Maple Creek): – Question to the Minister of Health. Today the SGEA (Saskatchewan Government Employees Association) strike is almost at the end of its third week. In view of the fact that last Friday, Dr. Andre Masters, a psychiatrist at the Regina General Hospital, warned that 31 psychiatric beds were closed due to a shortage of nursing staff as a result of this strike, in view of the fact that Dr. Masters also expressed concern that a number of the patients discharged could be potentially dangerous either to themselves or to the public, has your department, through you, done anything to solve this serious situation.

AN HON. MEMBER: – . . . (inaudible interjection) . . .

HON. H.H. ROLFES (Saskatoon Buena Vista): – Mr. Speaker, I didn't know which rat was speaking over there . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . It's your question period, if you want to keep on nattering, go ahead. Mr. Speaker, I am fully aware of the situation at the General Hospital. I have checked with my officials and I am informed that there is no emergency situation, that they are coping fairly well with the situation at General Hospital.

MRS. DUNCAN: – Supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Minister I believe only seven beds in the 18-bed hospital are being used at this time. There is great pressure put on the Plains and the Pasqua. In view of the fact that continuity of psychiatric therapy must remain uninterrupted, why didn't you, as Minister of Health, have a contingency plan that was put in place on the first day of the strike? Or do you not consider psychiatric therapy or the whole scope of health an essential service?

MR. ROLFES: – Mr. Speaker, we do have a contingency plan if it is needed. It has not been needed at this particular time. I am informed by the staff that we are coping fairly well with the situation and I think that is due to the dedication of the staff. We will continue to work in that capacity. If the contingency plan has to be put in effect, we will do so.

MR. LANE: – Supplementary, to the minister. Would you table for this Assembly your so-called contingency plan? Does that contingency plan include calling back mental patients who have been released because of the strike? Give us the particular details of that contingency plan and make them available for the information of the general public.

MR. ROLFES: – Mr. Speaker, it is not in the public's interest, I think, at this particular time to release the contingency plan. I can assure the members opposite that everything is well in hand at the General Hospital, as it is at the Pasqua or at the Plains

and if the contingency plan has to be implemented we will do so at that particular time.

Permits for Ditching and Diking Farmland

MR. R.H. PICKERING (Bengough-Milestone): – Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Minister of the Environment (Mr. Bowerman). Mr. Minister it has been brought to my attention that many farmers are complaining about ditching and diking on farmland. I understand that before such projects are undertaken a permit is required from your department. Would the minister indicate to this Assembly if indeed there has been any substantial increase in permits released this year in comparison to last year?

HON. MR. G.R. BOWERMAN (Minister of the Environment): – Mr. Speaker, I don't believe it's the case that they require a permit to ditch in their own fields. To do private drainage there is no permit required. Therefore, I can't really answer the member's question as to the number of permits, or the increase in the number of permits or permissions granted, or otherwise for ditching on private property.

MR. PICKERING: – Would the minister not agree that there is actually a permit required for such ditching from one farmer to the next and as a result of the inefficiency of your department, neighbors are going against one another in the courts of Saskatchewan because of the problem?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: – Hear, hear!

MR. BOWERMAN: – Well, Mr. Speaker, the point that the hon. member attempts to make is that one farmer does not have the permission to drain water onto neighboring farmlands, and that is quite true. But the remedy for this is to seek civil action or to initiate civil action if he wishes to do that, or to take some remedy with his neighbor. The provisions of The Department of the Environment Act or The Water Rights act, or The Water Control act do not provide that authority now.

MR. PICKERING: – Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Minister what action if any is your department going to take as it relates to the illegal ditching and diking projects taking place throughout Saskatchewan?

MR. BOWERMAN: – Mr. Speaker, there has been under way for some time now a public review of a program for flood and drainage control. The finalization of this report and the decisions with respect to it have not been made at this point in time. We are hopeful that they will be in time for legislation in this session of the legislature, although I'm not committing ourselves to that legislation. But I'm saying the material has been brought forward. There have been public hearings. Some of those members across the way attended some of those hearings. I understand, but no final decision has been made with respect to bringing legislation before the House either in this session or the next, and what that legislation might be. But certainly there is an ongoing discussion, an ongoing plan, with respect to how to handle the flood and drainage problem.

Poplar River Power Project

MR. R.A. LARTER (Estevan): – Mr. Speaker, a question to the minister in charge of the Saskatchewan Power Corporation. Have you received the final IJC (International Joint Commission) report regarding the environmental impact studies at the Poplar River Power project?

HON. J.R. MESSER (Minister of Mineral Resources): – No, we have not, Mr. Speaker.

MR. LARTER: – Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Minister, if the report shows that SPC cannot live up to boron levels in the river or shows other detrimental effects or reasons why number two unit should be built, are you still going to build number two unit?

MR. MESSER: – Mr. Speaker, let's make it perfectly clear here what we have done and what we are prepared to do. There is nothing in the evidence that the IJC or any of the other consultants have provided to the government or to SPC that indicates that there are problems with boron or totally solids that cannot be contended with. In announcing the second generating unit at Coronach after agreeing to three significant delays in excess of a year, it was crucial that we put the project into place or suffer a shortage of power in the 1982-83 winter. We said that if there were other mitigating measures required, we would give fullest consideration to those and the plans of the second unit have taken into consideration the incorporation of such mitigating measures if they are needed.

It is hypothetical at this time to assume what the final recommendation of the IJC may be and it is, I think, generally accepted that their conclusions will not be significantly different from the information they have made available to us up to this point in time.

MR. LARTER: – Final supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Minister, can you tell the Assembly, can you assure us that SPC knows to this date if they can handle the boron levels on number one unit?

MR. MESSER: – Mr. Speaker, within the laws of the province of Saskatchewan and of the Dominion of Canada, the answer is yes.

Department of SEDCO Property

MR. P. ROUSSEAU (Regina South): – Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the Minister of Industry and Commerce (Mr. N. Vickar), I would like to direct my question to the Premier and hope that he will be able to give me an answer.

Mr. Premier, yesterday in reply to my question the minister said that because SEDCO (Saskatchewan Economic Development Corporation) owned the 35 acre site on Winnipeg and 8th, known as the old General Motors property, he would not consider development of this site by the private sector. Since you have recently sold the property across the street, south from this site, to an Alberta developer for a commerce mall, will you not reconsider your position and put it up for public tender for development through the private sector and recoup at least some of SEDCO's losses?

MR. BLAKENEY: – Mr. Speaker, I speak for the hon. member who is unfortunately in Winnipeg attending the funeral of a member of his family. I think he is better able to answer the hon. member's rather particular question than am I. Accordingly, I will take notice and ask him to report.

Winery Development

MR. ROUSSEAU: – A new question, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Premier, it is our understanding that one of the tenants being actively considered for this development is a winery. Are you prepared to announce at this time if this is to be a new company coming to

Saskatchewan, or the Jordan St. Michelle company from Moose Jaw moving to Regina (which SEDCO has previously supported financially) or is the government now going into the winery business itself?

MR. BLAKENEY: – Mr. Speaker, I regret that I cannot assist the hon. member by answering his question. I will take notice and ask the minister to report.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: – Hear, hear!

MR. LANE: – A new question, Mr. Speaker. Would the Premier with the statement made yesterday by the Minister of Industry and Commerce (Mr. Vickar) that in fact the private sector should not have an opportunity to bid or develop that SEDCO property, given the position of SEDCO allowing private sector from Alberta to develop the property across the street?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: – Hear, hear!

MR. BLAKENEY: – Mr. Speaker, I will ask all hon. members to get the transcript to see what the hon. member for Melfort said, the Minister of Industry and Commerce. I believe that on a study of the record it will be found that the hon. member did not say what the member for Qu'Appelle (Mr. Lane) says he said. This I am sure is something that happens more than once in this House, but I will use this as a specific example. I believe what the minister said was that at this time they had not given consideration to the private sector developing it since they were obtaining a report on its potential for development. We may well have an opportunity to look at it. There is no point in arguing what the record says because the record will speak for itself. I do not agree with the statement of the member for Qu'Appelle (Mr. Lane). I do agree with the statement of the member for Melfort (Mr. Vickar).

SOME HON. MEMBERS: – Hear, hear!

Meewasin Valley

MR. R.L. ANDREW (Kindersley): – A question to the Attorney General. Recent press reports, Mr. Attorney General, indicate that you will be introducing immediately major amendments to the Meewasin Valley Authority. Can you confirm that, in fact, in this session major amendments are going to be introduced?

HON. R.J. ROMANOW (Attorney General): – Mr. Speaker, what I have indicated is that there are a series of amendments which will be proposed by the government as soon as possible. Whether they can make the fall session depends on a number of things such as the preparation of them. They have come only as a matter of a few days ago when the Meewasin Valley Authority had some representations from interested groups and then communicated to us. So I can't make that assurance because of the logistics of time and the difficulties of the strike and the like. But I have indicated that it's our intention to bring in amendments to take account of the objections of some of the people related to

the authority.

MR. ANDREW: – Mr. Speaker, I think the minister would be prepared to agree that these amendments are, to a large degree, as a result of a citizens' action group. As I understand, that citizens' action group, presently called River Edge Heritage Association, has proposed many of those amendments. Have you or members of your department been in contact with those people as to the proposed amendments they would wish to see?

MR. ROMANOW: – No, I have not, Mr. Speaker, for two reasons. First of all, that group seeks the destruction of the Meewasin Valley Authority. It publishes in the advertisements the repeal of the legislation. I want to tell the hon. member that I do not support the repeal of legislation, legislation which received, I remind the member for Kindersley (Mr. Andrew), the unanimous support of all members of this House when it went through clause by clause last session.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: – Hear, hear!

MR. ROMANOW: – I do support, however, the necessity to make changes to the legislation as a result of some of the submissions made by the so-called River Edge Historical Society or whatever they call themselves. I do intend, as time permits as I have indicated, to table them in the House for the early consideration of all members involved. May I conclude by saying that the appropriate mechanism of communication, I think, is the way it has been, namely between that agency and Meewasin Valley Authority, after all, we are in a partnership, or between any other group and the Meewasin Valley Authority as opposed to directed to the government.

MR. ANDREW: – Final supplementary. Mr. Speaker, I would ask the minister: is he aware of an almost parallel situation in the province of Ontario, in particular the Niagara Escarpment problem, where they had exactly the same problem back in 1977? They have just recently made substantial amendments to that act and substantially reduced the amount of land under its authority. Is the minister aware of that situation?

MR. ROMANOW: – I am not familiar with that situation detail but I do want to say to the hon. member, as I have said to the press and I repeat again, the boundary of the Meewasin Valley Authority was not drawn by the government or drawn by this legislature; it was, in the end sense, in the fact that the bill was passed by this House. The boundary was drawn by Mr. Ray Moriyama who was hired at a considerable cost – I think the figure was tabled in the last session of the House as \$100,000 – to do a study of the river edge, to do a study of the valley and the basin, the history of it. He made the recommendations that the boundary should be so included and it is so included in the legislation which was before the House, which you ably considered and the members of your caucus considered when you came before the . . .

MR. LANE: – The boundary is not in the legislation.

MR. ROMANOW: – Yes, it is in the legislation and you checked it at that particular time. So, all that I'm saying to the hon. member is that this is not legislation which has been done by the government. We have adopted the Moriyama approach. Now let me say, before I take my chair, in this area it may very well be that we need to cut down the scope of the boundary. I am not closing the door on that but I do want to say that it's a dangerous precedent for the authority, for the government to be drawing the boundaries. We haven't drawn them in the first instance and we'd want very substantial

reason to do them in the second instance. We may have to do that after full consultation by Moriyama and members of the public and the like. But I repeat again, the river in Saskatoon – if I may be permitted a last partisan comment – is truly one of the very exceptional things on a prairie site. If you want to repeal the bill, as Mr. Ham wants to do, I don't buy that.

Soft Drinks in Cans

MR. H.J. SWAN (Rosetown-Elrose): – Mr. Speaker, a question to the Minister of Consumer Affairs. I have had a concern raised by retailers in my constituency and other retailers within the province. Their concern is the high cost of the handling of soft drinks in bottles. My question is this, Mr. Minister: why does your government not allow the sale of soft drinks in cans?

HON. W.A. ROBBINS (Minister of Revenue, Supply and Services): – Mr. Speaker, my understanding is that the reasoning for not permitting the sale of soft drinks in cans is because of the environmental problem. They get thrown in the ditches and no one is going out to pick them up. Bottles can be picked up and returned for some sum of money. It is my understanding that that is the basic reason why the ban was put on the selling or commercial sale of soft drinks in cans.

MR. SWAN: – A supplementary to the minister. The only one that is discriminated against is the carbonated soft drink. You're selling Hi-C, V8 and all sort of other juices in cans and they're being littered around the streets. With the high cost of handling the bottles, many of the retailers are finding it is a real imposition on the profits which they are able to make. I am asking the government today to bring in an amendment that will allow people to sell carbonated soft drinks in cans in this province.

MR. ROBBINS: – Well, we'll certainly take your suggestion under consideration.

Clean-up Hazardous Materials

MR. G.S. MUIRHEAD (Arm River): – Mr. Speaker, a question to the Minister of the Environment. One of the more positive positions taken from the throne speech was the indication of amendments to The Department of the Environment Act. Mr. Speaker, I ask the minister if your government, in its promise of having a prompt clean-up of hazardous materials, means it will immediately take action to clean up all such past hazardous material?

MR. BOWERMAN: – Mr. Speaker, I think that the hon. member puts an inference on the throne speech which is not there. I think as well he is asking a question about the legislation which will come before this session at some future date. Therefore, rather than attempt to answer the hon. member's question by saying what is in the legislation, he will have the opportunity to view those amendments when they come forward.

ADJOURNED DEBATES

ADDRESS IN REPLY

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Mr. Solomon (Regina North-West) for an address in reply and the proposed amendment thereto moved by Mr. Berntson (Leader of the Opposition).

HON. A.E. BLAKENEY (Premier): – Mr. Speaker, when I adjourned the debate yesterday I had an opportunity to congratulate you on your safe return from the southern climes, from representing us at the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association in New Zealand. I had an opportunity, too, to congratulate and thank the Deputy Speaker, the member for Weyburn (Mr. Pepper) for his able services in your stead while you were absent on our behalf. I said at that time that we had great regard for the Deputy Speaker, and that we were pleased to have this opportunity to record the fact that we hold him in the very highest regard.

I want to tender my congratulations also to the mover of the motion, the hon. member for Regina North-West (Mr. Solomon) and the seconder of the motion the hon. member for Cut Knife-Lloydminster (Mr. Long). I was impressed by the contribution each made to this debate. I am proud that our party can attract people of that calibre. I know their constituents will be proud of them. They give every indication they will serve their constituents, this legislature and this province with distinction in the years ahead.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: – Hear, hear!

MR. BLAKENEY: – I said that I was particularly pleased with the events over the last three months which caused the mover of the motion to be with us as a colleague in this legislature. We won and won very handily a strongly contested by-election. I know that all of the parties fought that by-election and fought it hard. Both the Progressive Conservative Party and the Liberal Party had seasoned candidates. Unfortunately the campaign waged by the Conservative Party did not do them credit. On the other hand the reception given to that campaign by the people in the constituency did the voters a great deal of credit.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: – Hear, hear!

MR. BLAKENEY: – They rejected a campaign which I regret to say had heavy overtones of racism. They rejected it decisively. John Solomon was elected and the Conservative Party lost their deposit. And they richly deserved to lose their deposit.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: – Hear, hear!

MR. BLAKENEY: – I regard that not only as a victory for our party but also as a triumph for the democratic process.

I send my congratulations also to the new Leader of the Opposition, the member for Souris-Cannington (Mr. Berntson) on his selection for that office. I am sure he will discharge his duties with distinction, as he did so yesterday. As I pointed out yesterday it is not a job in which you can look forward to security or tenure. During the last ten years there have been no less than seven leaders of the opposition. As I said yesterday, and repeat again today, we hope this distressing trend is over and the member for Souris-Cannington will enjoy a long career as Leader of the Opposition.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: – Hear, hear!

MR. BLAKENEY: – I congratulate the newly chosen Leader of the Conservative Party in Saskatchewan on his election to that office. We will welcome him in this House if, and when, he is elected. I will not promise him any assistance in getting into this House. In any case I suspect members opposite will be able to offer him more assistance than will we and no doubt some are already being canvassed – very possibly the member for

Nipawin (Mr. Collver) or perhaps the member for Thunder Creek (Mr. Thatcher).

Mr. Speaker, as His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor said in the throne speech, we in Saskatchewan will be entering this new decade of the '80s in a special way.

In 1980 we celebrate our 75th birthday as a Canadian province. The events and celebrations of that year will, I believe, be a fitting way to kick off a decade which we look forward to with a great deal of optimism. I think it is fair to say that in those 75 short years we and our forebears have built a remarkable and unique province. Our pioneers faced nearly overwhelming forces in their efforts to wrench a living from a hostile land. They overcame those forces. Today we face problems of a different kind, less elemental problems but every bit as difficult, problems that have to do with defining and achieving the kind of society we want to see in Saskatchewan and in Canada during the next 75 years and beyond.

I am confident, with the support of our people and with the help of providence, we can meet our challenges just as did our ancestors.

In our Diamond Jubilee Year we have much to celebrate. I look forward to the many ways both individuals and communities will find to express their own views of the nature of our province.

We can celebrate, for instance, the fact that in our brief history we have built a society unique in Canada, indeed in North America, a society in which people of many cultures have come together in harmony. These people are as sturdy and self-reliant a group of people as to be found on the face of the globe. And they have worked together to build a strong set of institutions especially suited to our needs – our co-ops, our churches, our schools, our hospitals. Each bears the stamp of Saskatchewan, each contributes to a society which I believe is rooted in what we call the Christian virtues of sharing, giving, co-operating.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: – Hear, hear!

MR. BLAKENEY: – In the beginning, perhaps, these virtues were practised partly out of necessity. One did not survive a Saskatchewan winter without help. Now they are a way of life, a way of life we hope we can preserve, preserve against the mindless siren call of a society based only on consuming. We can celebrate our multicultural heritage, diverse in its roots, united in its dedication to equal respect for all. When we were struggling against nature to tame a raw land the enemy was clear, but now when we are struggling against other things, the natural greed which is in all of us, the enemy is not so clear. Our greed is disguised. Sometimes we call it a reward for initiative. Our unwillingness to share is blamed upon the law of supply and demand. To that great question at the very beginning of the Bible: am I my brother's keeper? Our answer must in the next 75 years continue to be yes.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: – Hear, hear!

MR. BLAKENEY: – Nor will we allow the doctrines of the modern-day economics without ethics to turn us from that true fact. We will certainly hear journals of economics quoted at us about how we should organize our society but I very much hope we keep in mind the tenets of the ethics and of the religion which we have brought over these 75 years, and do not depend on the dictates of journals of economics to decide what we should do in our society.

We have been greatly blessed and therefore we have great responsibilities. We can celebrate our great wealth of resources. In agriculture, forest products, wild life, minerals, we have the base to provide for each citizen a more prosperous, a more secure and a more satisfying life than was possible at any time in the past. We have the ability to use our material wealth for our ourselves, and for future generations in a way which will bring us credit, credit in a sense other than credit in our bank account.

We can celebrate the fact that we live in a country like Canada, a country which for all its faults is still respected around the world, a country not perfect but one which strives to be a model of democracy, a country which we believe is capable of embracing and nurturing the needs and aspirations of all people from every region. If we haven't reached a state of total accommodation, and we haven't, we are getting closer.

We could celebrate the fact that in Canada we are close to achieving a definition of national unity and local identity. A Canadian writer, Northrop Frye, has put it this way:

Identity is local and regional, rooted in the imagination and in the works of culture. Unity is national in reference, international in perspective and rooted in political feeling.

We think that in Canada we can encompass both. We believe we can be westerners and Canadians too.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: – Hear, hear!

MR. BLAKENEY: – I believe we can celebrate the fact that over the years we have had some good governments guiding the aspirations of the people of Saskatchewan. In those years this government and our predecessors have done what was possible to help our people fulfil their individual aspirations. We have helped too in setting rules so that those of us who are strong do not trample on those of us who are weak. Through government alone we can't achieve the perfect society and no one is asserting that, but we have tried and will continue to try to remove the worst cases of unfairness, to eliminate the gross discrimination and to work for the best possible balance between the rights of the individual and the good of the majority. This has been our aim, this will continue to be our objective as we move into what I believe will be a decade of progress and accomplishment. We can, indeed, celebrate Saskatchewan.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: – Hear, hear!

MR. BLAKENEY: – Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to talk a little bit about some of the elements of our society. I want to talk first about agriculture.

Saskatchewan has for the past eight years concentrated its agricultural programs on diversification and the results have been good. Along with diversification, we have worked on getting more young people into farming. The results here have been pretty good – 2,500 young farmers helped to be active farmers because land bank gave them an opportunity to get on the land.

MR. BLAKENEY: – Thirty-three hundred farmers have hog operations and beef operations and dairy operations and bee operations because of FarmStart.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: – Hear, hear!

MR. BLAKENEY: – Land bank and FarmStart farmers should know that the Conservative Party would scrap these programs. They offer, as the Leader of the Opposition did yesterday, mortgage guarantees. Mortgage guarantees at Joe Clark interest rates. Land bank farmers and FarmStart farmers should ask themselves whether they could survive. Not one in ten would survive if they had to pay bank rates, guaranteed or unguaranteed by a provincial government.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: – Hear, hear!

MR. BLAKENEY: – However, our diversification programs are designed not to replace the grain economy, but rather to balance the grain economy. In Saskatchewan's case, our main farm product has been and will continue to be grain. And suddenly in this year of 1979, we find that the very things that have made our grain economy so successful are under attack. We're finding our grain marketing and transportation system under attack in a way that has not been true for 30 years. So, Mr. Speaker, we find that once again we must turn our attention to grain if we're to keep our agricultural industry healthy.

The problem is not production. Our farmers are efficient producers. The great majority of them are efficient producers – not just the 20 per cent of them that the new Leader of the Progressive Conservative Party say we should keep. We, on this side of the House, believe that there's absolutely no justification for branding four out of five of our farmers as so unproductive that they ought to get off the land.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: – Hear, hear!

MR. BLAKENEY: – I say again that the great majority of our farmers are productive. Nor is the problem one of being able to sell Canadian grain. The Canadian Wheat Board assures us that we can sell 30 million tonnes of grain by 1985. This year we'll sell about 20 million tonnes, that's a 50 per cent increase. So the problem is not production. It's not sales. The problem is transportation.

The railways have allowed the grain transportation system to deteriorate to the point where grain sales are being lost again and again, not because we can't grow the grain, not because the board can't sell it, but simply because the railways can't – or won't – move the grain from farm to ship. We find it incredible that in a year when more than 40 per cent of the grain was left sitting on the farms, the Canadian Wheat Board had to turn down sales of \$450 million. We could argue that they'll make the sales next year, maybe the year after, but at 12 per cent and 15 per cent and 18 per cent interest rates, it's rather good to get the dollars this year and not next or the year after.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: – Hear, hear!

MR. BLAKENEY: – The situation was – and I regret still is – that the railways aren't moving the grain and accordingly, the wheat board can't open up quotas. During the summer it became clear that the situation was getting desperate. In spite of their plain legal obligation to do so, the railways simply were not and are not buying rolling stock. Our information is that the CPR (Canadian Pacific Railway) hasn't bought any grain cars since 1951 and CNR (Canadian National Railway) since 1946. Clearly, they've no intention of buying cars; they're holding up the farmers for ransom in order to try to

break the crowrates and I think we all know that. While they're doing this, they're threatening one of the West's absolutely key institutions – the Canadian Wheat Board. Just how many people are beginning to attack the wheat board was evident yesterday and I'll come back to that a little later.

We felt we couldn't stand by and let the Canadian Wheat Board's position be undermined by the railway companies. In order to support orderly marketing under the wheat board, we decided to invest provincial money to buy 1,000 hopper cars and turn them over to the Canadian Wheat Board. A hopper car holds about 3,000 bushels. One thousand cars which make a trip every, say, two and a half weeks, will move close to 60 million bushels of wheat a year; 60 million bushels of grain at an initial price of \$4.25 means over \$240 million, a quarter of a billion dollars, cash every year.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: – Hear, hear!

MR. BLAKENEY: – Now, Mr. Speaker, we've ordered those cars and if they can help save the wheat board and the crowrate, they'll be one of the best investments we ever made.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: – Hear, hear!

MR. BLAKENEY: – And what of the new federal government in Ottawa? From day to day it is difficult to discern where they stand but first indications are that they are determined to scuttle the operations of the board. The producers must have a right to choose, is a favourite line of the Minister of Transport (Hon. D. Mazankowski). To support his position the new federal minister has taken the power of car allocation away from the wheat board and given it to a new grain co-ordinator. How will this power be used? We don't know but the first words from the co-ordinator are anything but encouraging. He's talking about doing away with the crowrate, talking about doing away with quotas, Mr. Speaker. I heard a member opposite suggest he never did. I also heard the co-ordinator say that if the railways wanted the crowrate changed they would have to perform a little better. If that isn't a suggestion that the crowrate will be removed, or at least changed if the railways start doing what the law requires them to, I don't know what is.

Mr. Speaker, let me go on record one more time by saying that this government supports the crowrate. We will oppose with all the muscle we can muster any proposal which removes from western farmers the protection of a statutory grain rate.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: – Hear, hear!

MR. BLAKENEY: – Mr. Speaker, that position hardly needs restating, but as long as the opposition in this House, along with their federal counterparts, continue to chip away at the crowrate and undermine the concept of orderly marketing through the wheat board, we will continue to restate it. Yesterday in this House we heard a forthright attack on the whole concept of orderly marketing and on the wheat board in particular. We heard the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Berntson) say that orderly marketing was bad, that the wheat board was bad. To use his words, any state-run marketing mechanism was bad. The wheat board and its quota system were blamed for low productivity by Canadian farmers. If there was ever any doubt where the Conservative Party stands on the Canadian Wheat Board, it was answered yesterday. He outlined the Conservative policy. Instead of quotas if we have to limit marketing, if we can't sell all the wheat we

can grow, don't have quotas, take land out of production. We should pay farmers not to grow grain. This way you don't need quotas. And indeed you don't. So say the Tories. We should have another LIFT program (Lower Inventory for Tomorrow), that's what he is advocating. So say the Tories. Take land out of production; that way you won't need quotas and you'll get high production per acre. At a time when there's a real prospect of food shortages the Conservatives, in their blind opposition to the wheat board and the quota system, suggest that we take land out of production so we won't need quotas. Surely that's the most irresponsible policy we have ever heard argued in this House.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: – Hear, hear!

MR. BLAKENEY: – Narrow, doctrinaire Conservatism can go no further than to suggest that we deliberately curtail grain production by taking land out of production so that we won't need to have the wheat board quota system. We support the wheat board. We support the quota system. Only a Conservative – and I suggest a blindfolded Conservative – could not see that to remove the quota system is to threaten small farmers. But perhaps, Mr. Speaker, I'm wrong. Perhaps they see well what their policy would do. Perhaps it's a key step along the road of getting rid of those four out of five farmers that the Conservative leader says are unproductive. Mr. Speaker, that may be their vision of agriculture in the 1980s but it's not ours. We see the family farm as the key to rural Saskatchewan and we see the Canadian Wheat Board and the quota system as the very bulwark of the family farm.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: – Hear, hear!

AN HON. MEMBER: – Who introduced the wheat board?

MR. BLAKENEY: – Mr. Speaker, the member opposite asks who introduced the wheat board and I will say to him that the Bennett government of 1930 to 1935 introduced the wheat board. It is a measure of the brand of conservatism we have now that R. B. Bennett was too radical for them, and they want to go back to the days before R. B. Bennett!

SOME HON. MEMBERS: – Hear, hear!

MR. BLAKENEY: – Mr. Speaker, I will turn to the crowrate issue. What would the removal of crow cost the Saskatchewan producer? Let me give you a couple of examples. For a community like Carrot River the crowrate is 23 cents a hundredweight to Vancouver. The rate for domestic feed grain to Vancouver is not 23 cents but \$3.28. If the grain moving out of Carrot River moved at domestic rates, it would cost the producers at those points \$5.5 million extra. There are 375 permit book holders – that means an extra \$15,000 a permit holder at Carrot River if the crowrate goes. For the community of St. Benedict with 90 permit book holders, 600,000 bushels handled, there is an extra cost to those farmers of \$11,700 if we use the domestic rate and not the crowrate. For producers at Harris, west of Saskatoon, the figure is \$15,000 extra per farmer. Mr. Speaker, we're not talking about slight increases in rates. This is a little more than pocket change – \$15,000 a farmer. The increases to the individual producer, if the crowrate went, would be more than the average salary of most Canadians.

But according to the Conservatives, the CPR needs the money. Mr. Speaker, there is not a shred of evidence that even if the railways got those huge increases in rates, their

service would be any better. Down in the United States, they pay three or four times the crowrate and their railways system, in moving grains, is not a bit better than ours. There is no reason to believe that the destruction of crow will solve our grain handling problems. Even if we get the transportation system rolling, even if we could protect the marketing system that has given us our prosperity, we're still going to have some problems in the 1980s and I think we should acknowledge that.

If the wheat board can sell its 30 million tonnes, we will have to find out whether we can produce that much more grain. Can we produce 40 bushels where we produced 28 in the past? Can we do this without harming the land or by using massive amounts of pesticides and chemicals? We're going to have to look at these problems – some of them mentioned by the member for Souris-Cannington (Mr. Berntson), like soil salinity, new methods of crop rotation, new methods of weed control – and overshadowing of those problems is the cloud of ever rising energy costs and energy supply. As a province we must face these questions. As a people, I think, we have the intelligence, the will and the resources to answer them. Agriculture is still our number one industry. It will continue to be so. That's why we must face these challenges: rail transportation; protecting the wheat board and orderly marketing; a 50 per cent increase in grain production; rising energy costs; and future energy supplies. Only if we deal with these problems can Saskatchewan farmers face the future with full confidence.

Mr. Speaker, this province has paid its dues to confederation. Right now, in this year 1979, the federal government will be taking, in export taxes from Saskatchewan oil, about \$400 million and using that money to keep down energy costs in eastern Canada. That's reasonable because we're all Canadian. But we, in Saskatchewan, have a right to get something in return from our federal government. I outlined this at the energy conference last month. For one thing, we have a right to expect a firm guarantee of the crowrate.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: – Hear, hear!

MR. BLAKENEY: – Mr. Speaker, this was promised explicitly during the campaign. I heard Mr. Hnatyshyn make that promise on the radio. It will be found in their campaign literature. We expect that promise to be honored and we expect the opposition in this legislature to stand with us in demanding that the crowrate be protected.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: – Hear, hear!

MR. BLAKENEY: – We have a right to a railways system which moves our grain. Mr. Mazankowski (Minister of Transport) has promised this. We expect him to act, act decisively and act soon. The future of our grain economy depends upon the federal government honoring its commitments.

I don't know where the opposition stands on these issues and we will look forward to finding out, finding out during the course of this session. I say, Mr. Speaker, so do the people of Saskatchewan look forward to finding out. I don't know where the opposition stands, but I can tell you where this government stands on these issues – in the battles ahead, we stand shoulder to shoulder with the farmers of Saskatchewan!

SOME HON. MEMBERS: – Hear, hear!

MR. BLAKENEY: – Mr. Speaker, I turn now to the area of resources. For the past several years, I have stood in this House and talked about the resource policies of this

government. I have outlined our policy objectives respecting non-renewable resources and I've explained how well this policy is working. Several times in the past, I have recounted the various conflicts we were engaged in either with the federal government or the private resource companies or both, over who would ultimately control the development of our resources. In words of one syllable, I have carefully explained to members opposite why we did not believe that it was a good idea to turn our resources over to Exxon, to Imperial, to Gulf, to Shell and let them decide how our resources would be developed. In spite of their pleas that mother Exxon knows best, the government ignored their suggestion that we allow the resource companies and the federal government to make all of these decisions. And, Mr. Speaker, we're glad we ignored that advice and so are the people of Saskatchewan glad we ignored that advice.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: – Hear, hear!

MR. BLAKENEY: – Mr. Speaker, I'm going to talk about resources again today, but sadly for the sake of excitement in the Assembly, I must report to the opposition that there's not much going on in the resource field – except success. The blizzard of legal actions started by the resource companies have been dealt with. The disasters so freely predicted have not occurred. There may be other attacks on our policies in the future and if there are, they will be defended as vigorously as we have defended them in the past. I can assure them of that. We won't yield to the opposition, those men of little faith who have urged us so often in the past to give up, to give up in a fit of fear. We'll fight in the future as we have in the past. Even the federal government seems to have agreed that the non-renewable resources of Saskatchewan do indeed belong to the people of Saskatchewan and as I say, this is not good news for those interested in fireworks. All I can say to the MLA for Nipawin (Mr. Collver) or Arizona as the case may be, is that it's a pity for them that things turned out so well.

Although this report may be less dramatic than those of previous years, I am happy to tell you what has transpired in the resource area in the last year. For instance, I am happy to report that we expect government revenue from non-renewable resources to be up again this year, up from the \$35 million of 1971, up from the \$450 million last year. We expect that in 1979, these revenues will reach \$520 million.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: – Hear, hear!

MR. BLAKENEY: – I am happy to report that thousands of people are employed as a result of non-renewable resources, many of them natives in the northern part of our province, a total in fact of 8,500 directly employed and many more thousand indirectly employed. I'm happy, too, to report that the activity in almost every single non-renewable resource is at an all time high which will certainly mean more revenue and more jobs in the years ahead. The Minister of Mineral Resources (Mr. Messer) will have an opportunity to report more fully during the session on this level of activity.

Most of all, Mr. Speaker, I am happy to report that our resource policy is working and working well. It is guaranteeing a fair return to the people of Saskatchewan in dollars, in jobs, in future security. We set out on that road in 1971 and events have proved it was the right road. We might have known it was the right road, because the Liberals and Conservatives fought us at every step of the way. Pretty good evidence that you're on the right track when they oppose. But the results, the dramatic results, are even better evidence. We should pause to shed a tear for the old-line parties. They fought and still fight every move by our government to be a partner in resource development. And they

did it again yesterday, opposing point-blank government ownership of any part of the resource industry. And meanwhile their corporate friends, for whom they make this plea, are agreeing that joint ventures with government are frequently a very good idea. It's tough to be a free enterpriser who is so hard-lined that he is to the right of the resource companies. Times change, ideas change, people change – but not all the people. Members opposite still have their feet firmly planted in the last century.

Mr. Speaker, the Conservative Party simply cannot believe that a policy which puts the people of Saskatchewan ahead of the profits of the multinationals will work. They didn't believe it could be done. They said so. And now they don't want to admit the plain fact. Members opposite hate to be confused with the fact – nevertheless I propose to give them a few facts. The member for Regina South (Mr. Rousseau) is shaking his head. I can hear it from here.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: – Hear, hear!

MR. BLAKENEY: – Mr. Speaker, I want to talk particularly about oil and potash. I'll not have a full opportunity to deal with uranium and coal and natural gas and some other resources. I will seek another occasion in this House to report on these matters.

Let me begin with oil. I mention oil with some pride, because year after year opposition spokesmen have told the public that our government had frightened away the oil industry in this province. No doubt we will hear the same prediction this year from the member for Estevan (Mr. Larter). No doubt he will predict that we are driving out the oil industry, as he did last year and no doubt, no doubt he will be wrong again.

In this fiscal year oil royalties, after deducting all payments made to the oil companies, will be close to \$300 million. Three hundred million dollars in one year and keep in mind, Mr. Speaker, that most of that money, certainly more than half of it, is money that the opposition says we should have left with the oil companies. The opposition fought our royalty rates and declared that they confiscated the fair profits of the oil companies. They said in this House, over and over again, that we should be applying the Alberta rates. No one can deny that; it's on the record. We should be applying Alberta oil royalty rates which would have cost the people of Saskatchewan hundreds of millions of dollars. They demanded that we give this money to the oil companies – money which would amount to more than the total investment of the Government of Saskatchewan in potash. They said they wouldn't invest oil money in potash and they're right. They're right; they would have given all that money to the oil companies and they wouldn't have had it to invest.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: – Hear, hear!

MR. BLAKENEY: – As of December 31 last, Saskatchewan had about 500 million barrels of light and medium crude. That represents perhaps 10 or 12 years' supply. That doesn't mean we are going to run out of light and medium crude in 10 or 12 years but it does mean that the amount of oil production of light and medium crude will steadily go down in this province, as it has been going down and will go down in Alberta. The fact must be faced that in western Canada the supply of light and medium crudes is going down. With the price of oil moving closer to world levels, the government revenue might well increase even though production drops. We in Saskatchewan have something more than light crudes and medium crudes. We have, like Alberta, an ace in the hole. As you know, Mr. Speaker, we have very significant reserves of heavy oil in a large area centred in Lloydminster. Our most recent estimates

conservatively place the ultimate recovery at 15 billion barrels to 20 billion barrels. Now that doesn't mean that we will recover all of that or half of that or even a quarter of it using current conventional technology. So there is intense research activity going on to discover ways of recovering more of these reserves than we now do.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to say that a major portion of this research and development in heavy oil is being done by Canadian companies – Canadian companies developing a Canadian resource for the good of Canadians – companies like Husky Oil, owned by Alberta Gas Trunk, Petro-Canada, SaskOil. These are among the principal players in the Lloydminster area. I am pleased at this fact because I have said repeatedly over the past few years that there can be no long-term solution to our economic problems in Canada; our balance of payments problems, our slumping dollar, unless Canadians own the lion's share of our basic resources.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: – Hear, hear!

MR. BLAKENEY: – In Saskatchewan we are demonstrating that we can make progress, real progress in developing Canada, by Canadians, for Canadians. Unlike members opposite, Mr. Speaker, we believe that Canadians can do it for themselves.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: – Hear, hear!

MR. BLAKENEY: – The interest of oil companies in exploring for oil is usually measured in two ways – revenue received from the sale of Crown oil lands and the number of wells drilled. Both of these measures indicate that oil companies are very interested in exploring in Saskatchewan. For instance, last year, in 1978-79 we received about \$23 million from the sale of Crown oil rights. To this date in this year we have received about \$43 million and before the year end we expect this to reach \$50 million – more than double the previous all-time record of last year.

Mr. Speaker, if we are frightening away the oil companies, if we are pushing them out of this province, they are certainly leaving a lot of money here in their haste to get out.

If we look at the other measure of interest, the number of wells drilled, we find the same impressive numbers. Let me further depress the members opposite by telling them that the number of wells drilled in Saskatchewan has increased dramatically in recent years. The last ten years it has gone up and up. The 1979 figure will be over 1,000 wells drilled in this province in one year.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: – Hear, hear!

MR. BLAKENEY: – Now, Mr. Speaker, with conventional sources of oil beginning to taper off we expect our reserves of heavy oil to become increasingly attractive if the formidable problems of extraction and upgrading can be overcome. As these problems are overcome we will be looking at a heavy oil upgrading plant which will be able to convert this heavy oil into a light crude suitable for manufacture into gasoline and other light end products.

This plant, when it is built, will be a very expensive plant and it won't be built until it can be proven to be economically viable. We feel, however, that the day is rapidly approaching when world oil supplies and prices will dictate that such a plant be built.

In short, action in the oil patch continues at record levels and taxes are coming in in record amounts – record activity, record revenue and no tax giveaway policy as pressed for by the opposition.

They said we couldn't have both taxes and high levels of activity. By saying that, Mr. Speaker, they maintained their perfect record. They are consistent, Mr. Speaker, consistently wrong.

Mr. Speaker, I want to say a few words about potash. It has been a good year for potash. The whole Saskatchewan industry has operated at capacity. Saskatchewan has firmly established itself as the greatest potash producer in the western world.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: – Hear, hear!

MR. BLAKENEY: – New markets have been developed, prices have been firm, expansions are proceeding at two mines to increase productive capacity. The value of potash produced set a record by a wide margin. The Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan owned by the people of Saskatchewan has had its best year. The people of Saskatchewan have reason to be proud of what the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan has accomplished in four years. Members opposite have said and still say we should never have been involved in potash. They have said and still say we should leave this valuable resource to the private sector, to the international mining companies. I hope they have studied the 1979 annual report of PCS as at the end of June.

In that report, Mr. Speaker, you will find some interesting facts – some audited facts – not the dire predictions of doom we hear so often across the floor. Fact: for the year 1978-79, PCS recorded a profit of more than \$46 million.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: – Hear, hear!

MR. BLAKENEY: – A profit after royalties and taxes were paid to the province and to the municipalities – royalties and taxes which are totalling \$49 million – profit which stayed in Saskatchewan and was used to finance expansions to be owned by the people of Saskatchewan. Now that is good news for Saskatchewan. It is good news who will get the new jobs which are created by those expansions.

Yesterday the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Berntson) said there is a fundamental difference between their potash policy and ours, to which I say, indeed there is! Take royalties. When we came to office, the government, for which the member for Qu'Appelle (Mr. Lane) was an officer, was collecting in royalties \$2 million a year. That's right, \$2 million.

This year we will collect not \$2 million, but I would estimate \$120 million. So that, Mr. Speaker, is a fundamental difference. Even today the Progressive Conservative Government of New Brunswick has a potash royalty rate which is only a fraction of ours. There, the lion's share of the revenues will go to the resource companies. Here it goes to the people of Saskatchewan. That's a difference – a fundamental difference and the people of Saskatchewan say vive la difference.

The member opposite says, does that mean our taxes will go down? I say this; it means our taxes will not go up to the levels they are in New Brunswick. It means they will not go up to levels which are paid by citizens in New Brunswick because their government is

not recovering from their resource as much per ton as we are recovering from ours.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: – Mr. Speaker, the head offices of the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan in Saskatoon directly employ more than 160 people. This is in addition to the 1,500 people employed in the various PCS mines. Many of these 150 jobs are top jobs – jobs that used to be in Toronto or London or Los Angeles or New York. We are proud Saskatchewan young people are getting a crack at these top jobs here in Saskatchewan where their families are.

Fact: in a hungry world with an ever-expanding population, the available arable land will have to produce 40 per cent more food than it does now. The only way this can be done is through the increased use of chemical fertilizer.

Fact: Saskatchewan has 40 per cent of the worlds' reserves of potash. Thus it is inevitable that much of the potash fertilizer needed to produce the necessary food will have to come from Saskatchewan. That means more jobs for Saskatchewan workers, more revenue for Saskatchewan people.

The New Democratic Party used to have a slogan – Potash – let's grow with it. Well, I think we have done that. All of Saskatchewan has done that. We will continue to grow with PCS. We will continue to grow as that corporation takes the lead in expanding the mines to keep our share of the world market. Yes, Mr. Speaker, the future of the potash industry looks bright, especially bright for PCS. We are working toward our announced goal of control of 50 per cent of the province's potash production. We are looking forward to the increased benefits to the people of Saskatchewan which potash will provide – the increased jobs and revenue, increased spinoffs into secondary industry in the service sector. The private sector is doing well. They are producing and they are paying their taxes. They have not closed their mines. In fact, I expect in a year or two that we are going to hear a new complaint from the private sector that we are holding them up from expanding their mines. The very people who, a year or so ago, said they were going to be forced out of the province will, I predict be saying they would like to expand and we are not permitting it. We will see, Mr. Speaker, whether or not we do not see that reaction from the potash industry. The opposition, Mr. Speaker, fought us on potash tooth and nail. As between the people of Saskatchewan and the multinational resource companies they unhesitatingly sided with the companies.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: – Hear, hear!

MR. BLAKENEY: – And they are still doing it. They are still claiming that PCS (Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan) is a bad investment. I say they are wrong. I say the facts prove they are wrong. Thanks to the opposition PCS has had a pretty rough birth but I say PCS is now young and growing and robust. It's healthy and strong and the time has now come to hand out the cigars!

SOME HON. MEMBERS: – Hear, hear!

MR. BLAKENEY: – Let me report briefly on two other matters. First, Mr. Speaker, it gives me a great deal of pleasure to report to the House today that the Minister of Mineral Resources (Mr. Messer) has completed new resource payment agreements with all potash companies in Saskatchewan; all have signed. One of the conditions of these agreements is that companies will withdraw from all litigation against the

government relating to the reserve tax and prorationing. The agreements are currently in escrow pending the completion of the withdrawals expected in a matter of days. Potash revenues, past and future, have been secured, Mr. Speaker, by the most secure constitutional method we could find and the lawsuits are disposed of.

Second, Mr. Speaker, let me refer to some of the past debates in this House over the matter of Bill 42 and the CIGOL (Canadian Industrial Oil and Gas Limited) judgment. You recall the dire consequence predicted by some of the members opposite – \$500 million Saskatchewan would have to pay back to the oil companies! Bankruptcy for the provincial treasury! Mr. Speaker, we said we would not pay that money back. We said it belonged to the people of Saskatchewan. We said if they wanted the money back they could give us back the oil. We passed the oil well income tax, again bitterly opposed by members opposite, bitterly opposed!

SOME HON. MEMBERS: – Hear, hear!

MR. BLAKENEY: – . . . because they were once again siding with international oil companies. And after having passed that act over their opposition we began negotiating with the oil companies. Mr. Speaker, today we have secured more than 97 per cent of the Bill 42 revenues through agreements with the companies.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: – Hear, hear!

MR. BLAKENEY: – We expect most of the balance to fall into place shortly. We have kept our word, Mr. Speaker, \$500 million worth and Tory glee has turned into Tory glum. And that, Mr. Speaker, is what has happened in Saskatchewan's resource field this last year. No fireworks, no confrontation, no lawsuits, just plain old record levels of activity, record revenues and record success. No headline news at all, just good news for the people of Saskatchewan.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: – Hear, hear!

MR. BLAKENEY: – Mr. Speaker, let me touch on another couple of matters. I listened to the Leader of the Opposition yesterday. I listened in amazement. On most matters I felt he was ill-informed. But on questions of environment, I thought he was totally misinformed. In the Speech from the Throne we said that our environment assessment procedures were Canada's most open and most comprehensive. The Leader of the Opposition said that they were the most secretive and the most closed in Canada. Those were his words.

Let me cite just two instances to show how wrong he is. In the last few months a power line was built from Squaw Rapids, Saskatchewan, to The Pas, Manitoba. It was built on both sides of a provincial border. In Saskatchewan we had an environmental impact study; we had public hearings; we had a report and as the result of the report, the route of the line was changed. In Manitoba the same line was built without any hearings of any kind at all. I ask the people of Saskatchewan to judge which policy – for a line which went for Squaw Rapids to The Pas – is more open and which policy is more secretive and more closed. Is it NDP Saskatchewan or Conservative Manitoba?

Example number two: recently in Saskatchewan a uranium mine – The Cluff Lake or Amok mine – was approved after the most complete environmental hearings ever conducted by any province in Canada. Recently, in Ontario, a nuclear power station, a

nuclear reactor – the Darlington Power Plant – was approved without any public hearings at all.

Now this is not a mine but this is a nuclear reactor. Again I ask the people of Saskatchewan to judge which policy is more open and which more secretive – NDP Saskatchewan or Conservative Ontario.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: – Hear, hear!

MR. BLAKENEY: – I say again, Mr. Speaker, Saskatchewan has the most open and most comprehensive environmental assessment procedures in all Canada. We're proud of that we're going to make them even better.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: – Hear, hear!

MR. BLAKENEY: – Just before I turn to a couple of other items I want to state briefly a word on pensions. The Speech from the Throne speaks of pension legislation and no government in Canada has given more attention to pension legislation than has ours in recent years. Magazines and business papers are full of stores about the upcoming crisis in Canada on pension plans, stories about the country's inability to pay the pensions which we have promised. Our government has taken firm steps to see that that does not happen in Saskatchewan, to provide the funds for the pensions which we are promising our employees. For example, our workers' compensation plan is fully funded and that's a far cry from worker's compensation plans in many other provinces in Canada.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: – Hear, hear!

MR. BLAKENEY: – Our public service and our Crown corporation and our teachers plans, the new plans, guarantee that the pensions we promised are fully funded as to 100 per cent. And that is unique in Canada. Our pensioners will depend not on the good will of any future government for their pensions, but rather on the cash that is now being paid by their government and themselves. They will know that when their time comes to retire, the cash is there for them.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: – Hear, hear!

MR. BLAKENEY: – Mr. Speaker, I want to say a few words about the dispute now in progress between the Government of Saskatchewan and the Saskatchewan Government Employees Association. Members will know that those members of the public service who are in the regular civil service withdrew their services something over two weeks ago. The public service commission has been carrying on negotiations on behalf of the government. Both the commission and the union have been co-operating with the mediator, Mr. Sig Walter, but to date no resolution of the dispute has been arrived at. The Government of Saskatchewan has bargained freely with its employees for more than 30 years. That is an outstanding record unequalled in North America.

Collective bargaining, Mr. Speaker, has its roots in history. Hundreds of years ago British courts decided that people had a right to withdraw their labor, to bargain from the terms of their labor and to withdraw that labor if they were dissatisfied. In more recent times the right of working people to get together and bargain as a group has been

recognized. That bargaining together, when employees come together to bargain as a group, is what we call collective bargaining. And if working people are to be free to bargain collectively, they must also be free to withdraw their labor. These principles are well established and they cause little difficulty where the employer is in manufacturing or commerce. There is a difficulty where the employer is providing important services to the public and that, too, is acknowledged. In some cases the government may have to intervene to take away the worker's right to withdraw his labor. This, too, is recognized in every country of the world. But the rights of one group should not be taken away unless the rights of the majority are seriously threatened. I have said on other occasions, this should not be done lightly. The matter must be serious and the danger to the public must be a clear and present danger. Particularly is this the case, where the employer is also the government.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: – Hear, hear!

MR. BLAKENEY: – Accordingly, our government has no present intention of introducing legislation to terminate the current work stoppage. Before doing that we would have to explore alternatives. We've instructed the public service commission to continue the bargaining process. We seek a solution at the bargaining table. If vital services are seriously curtailed, we will clearly have to consider taking such steps as are reasonably open to us to provide these services. This may be controversial, epithets may be hurled. But, it would appear to me to be preferable to curtailing by legislation, the right of public employees to withdraw their services. This is only speculation. For the government's part I repeat, we seek a settlement at the bargaining table and are hopeful that that settlement will not be long delayed.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: – Hear, hear!

MR. BLAKENEY: – Mr. Speaker, in the past few years there have been a great number of headlines and much public controversy over resource policy, and I've alluded to that already earlier in my remarks. Recently agriculture and transportation have taken over the public awareness. There's been so much comment and public controversy about resource policy and agricultural policy and farm policy, that we sometimes forget the achievements of this government in an area that has been and still is our prime concern: our social programs; our health programs; our advances in labor relations and housing development; our contribution to increased educational opportunities. All of these programs do not cause great public controversy. They're not as controversial because the people of Saskatchewan generally support them. They support them, Mr. Speaker, and they get a little bit touchy when the Conservative Party starts talking about dismantling the finest set of social programs in Canada.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: – Hear, hear!

MR. BLAKENEY: – Each time a Conservative member opens his mouth to call dental care for children an unnecessary frill, the public reacts negatively. Each time the member for Thunder Creek (Mr. Thatcher) talks darkly about the need for deterrent fees the progressive label that the Conservatives attach to themselves becomes even more of a joke. Every time the member for Nipawin (Mr. Collver) talks about shifting the responsibility for our social program onto the backs of the municipalities, New Democrats breathe a little easier, because they know that the public does not agree.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: – Hear, hear!

MR. BLAKENEY: – Conservatives have no programs of their own in these areas; they can only say that it's an individual's responsibility when he gets sick. They can only say that it's your own fault when you get old so that you should look after yourself. I know why the members opposite get upset when we compare Saskatchewan to Tory provinces, why they say that comparisons are odious. Well, Mr. Speaker, if you are a Conservative in the area of social policy, comparisons are odious. Comparisons tell us that if you live in a province with a Conservative government you can expect reduced services at higher costs. Comparisons tell us that under a Conservative government you had better be wealthy if you plan to be sick. In Conservative Ontario an average family pays \$450 a year in health premiums, and keep in mind that Ontario is more healthy than Saskatchewan and they are still closing down hospitals. They have fewer hospital beds per thousand people than we do. In Alberta, Mr. Speaker, you can use your cheap gasoline to drive around looking for a hospital bed after you've paid your \$180 a year in medical premiums. Last year in Manitoba, the Conservative government increased its health and social services budget by a whopping 2.9 per cent – about one third the inflation rate. In Saskatchewan our social policies don't necessarily make headlines, but they do make a difference, a big difference in the quality of life for every citizen of this province.

Let me review just a few things that this government has done since 1971 for the welfare of people. We've always considered our senior citizens a resource to be nurtured, rather than a problem to be shunted aside. We think that they've got some other problems besides their loneliness. That's why we in 1971 began to increase the construction of special-care homes for the elderly, that we more than tripled the salaries of employees who work in nursing homes – and I ask all members to check those figures – so that good care could be provided. We've dramatically increased the grants to special care homes. This year they'll be at the level of about \$29 million. But for many senior citizens there's an area of even more importance and that's staying and living in their own homes in their own communities. We're moving to make this goal possible for as many senior citizens as is possible to do. To do this requires action by several departments of government, several different kinds of action. The senior citizens school tax rebate which we introduced to cut still further the cost of home ownership is welcomed. There's the senior citizens home repair program. The new province-wide home care program which is making nursing and homemaking and meals-on-wheels and homemaking services available to those who otherwise might need care in a special-care home. There's a community services program which has a network of 350 senior citizens activity centres where seniors can meet with the friends and plan useful projects. There are transportation programs which fight isolation and support independence by making it possible for the elderly to get out of their homes and attend to the affairs of daily living. For the benefit of all citizens but particularly for the elderly we've introduced a prescription drug program. We've

offered at greatly reduced cost, hearing aids, braces, wheel chairs. We have the senior citizens benefit program which pays out cash each month in addition to old age security payment and the guaranteed income supplement to those qualified senior citizens. We believe that our senior citizens are a group who deserve the best care possible so that their retirement years are free from worry. We intend to continue to honor our commitment to our senior citizens.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: – Hear, hear!

MR. BLAKENEY: – In sum, Mr. Speaker, these are programs by which our government can be judged. I say to the senior citizens of Saskatchewan, and to the members opposite, look what has been done. Judge us by our actions. By their fruits shall we know them. Much has been done, more will be done. We are proud of our record – a record, we say, unequalled in Canada.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: – Hear, hear!

MR. BLAKENEY: – In education we have given massive support to our school systems. In terms of people's incomes we have probably cut property taxes for school purposes in half. And ask your farm constituents about that. Ask what they paid as a percentage of their incomes in 1971 and ask what they paid as a percentage of their incomes in 1978 after deducting homeowner grants and property improvement grants in each case. The pupil-teacher ratio has dropped and dropped dramatically. The number of students who in 1971 were taught by four teachers are now taught by five. Grants to universities have increased greatly and for any three-year or four-year period you want to pick, since 1971, they compare very favorably in percentage increases with other provinces, particularly Conservative provinces. We've greatly expanded the technical institutes and as the throne speech indicated, we have made their programs applicable to today's economy. For university and technical students we've set up and widened our bursary program and there wasn't a bursary program of any kind when we came to office in 1971. We've established a Department of Continuing Education to administer our community college system, a system which is unique in Canada. Through our community colleges any group can request that a particular class be brought to any community in the province so that the peculiar educational needs of a particular community can be filled. I'm happy to say that our community colleges are flourishing and that many of our citizens are renewing the joy of learning. That's what we could recommend to members opposite, that they request a class in the realities of the twentieth century.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: – Hear, hear!

MR. BLAKENEY: – Looking at members opposite though I think it might put quite a strain on the teachers.

I could mention programs which aid low income workers such as the family income plan. In this year, payments under this plan have increased to \$50 per month per child. Now, that's a payment for a low income worker who is out there earning as much as his market capacity, capacity in the market place will allow him to earn, doesn't want to go on welfare, doesn't want to do that. We are paying him \$50 per month per child so that he can maintain his independence. I could mention programs which aid those on welfare in finding employment, such as the outstandingly successful employment support program, our native employee and training program, the new work project to assist the disadvantaged and handicapped. I could mention programs such as our legal

aid plan, the provincial inquiry centre – all of these are new since 1971; offices such as the ombudsman, the human rights commission, the rent review board, all of which provide assistance to those who find themselves in some particular need, none of which existed before 1971. All the people of Saskatchewan have an opportunity to benefit from these programs. Ask the people of Saskatchewan if these programs are frills.

We have moved to make our legislation to protect working people the best in Canada by a wide margin – a new and trail blazing workers' compensation act, occupational health and safety laws unparalleled in North America, minimum wages that are the highest in Canada, a new and fairer trade union act, provision for technological change. Canada's best maternity leave. Canada's best holidays – three weeks after one year, four weeks after 10 – Canada's best . . . and I could go on.

Mr. Speaker, it has been said (and justly said) that the quality of society can be judged by the care it provides its needy and disadvantaged. We have not achieved perfection, nor will we. But I believe my partial list of this government's programs show that we have not forgotten those famous words of J. S. Woodsworth: 'what we desire for ourselves, we wish for all.' In celebrating our good fortune as citizens of Saskatchewan let's keep that in mind as the measure of the society we strive to build.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: – Hear, hear!

MR. BLAKENEY: – Mr. Speaker, let me say a few words about Canada. In earlier debates, I have outlined the grave difficulties faced by this country as a result of the election of the Parti Quebecois government in Quebec. I have talked about the problems we perceived. I have also said that all people in Canada must approach discussions about Canada's future in a spirit of compromise, a spirit of understanding. This does not mean the legitimate interests should not be pursued. It does not mean the legitimate grievances should not be redressed – far from it. It means that in order to achieve a redress of a grievance in one region, it might be necessary to recognize legitimacy of a grievance in another region. Understanding tolerance, compromise, these are the attributes necessary for a just nation. They are the concepts that need to dominate our leaders if this country is to be healed. These are the principles which must guide both the head and the heart as we seek to build a new Canada.

I say, Mr. Speaker, the head and the heart because both are involved in this process of soul-searching which is going on now in Canada. Our head may tell us that we should be tough when dealing with our brothers and sisters in other parts of Canada. We have legitimate grievances here – yes, we do – and many of them are unresolved. For years we bore the brunt of a national policy that made us sell cheap and buy dear. Our head tells us now, with our resources offering us an opportunity to escape from the boom and bust of the past, that we should bargain hard, as hard as we can, and the devil take the hindmost. But our hearts won't allow such a callous approach to our country.

Throughout our history, our people have always been proud to be Canadians. Even when they were dealt the crushing blows of the depression, they never wavered in their support for our country. And so our approach to the problems of today must reflect the work and dedication of our settlers from yesterday. It must reflect their iron will to overcome obstacles, their iron will to build this region. Yes, but it must also reflect their affection and respect for this new nation they were forging, this new nation from coast to coast. I believe we in Saskatchewan have been doing that. We have told the other

people of Canada that we are prepared to change the old confederation bargain. Indeed we've gone further than that. We have told them that in some areas it must be changed. But at the same time we have tried to understand their problems, tried to compromise where they thought it was vital that we do so.

The last nine months have seen a reduction in federal-provincial bargaining on matters concerning the constitution and national unity. The federal election campaign and the installation of a new government necessarily brought a slowdown in activity. I am pleased to say that the new government has agreed to retain the continuing committee of ministers on the constitution, that committee has met on a number of occasions. It is again co-chaired by a federal representative and a provincial representative, a representative of the 10 provinces. The Hon. Mr. Jarvis is the federal co-chairman. I am honored to say that my colleague, the Attorney General (Mr. Romanow) was again selected by his provincial counterparts to represent all the provinces as the provincial co-chairman.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: – Hear, hear!

MR. BLAKENEY: – There is wide agreement that he has served in an outstanding way; served not only this province but this country in a manner which does him great credit. It is a tribute to him that he has been asked to continue by all his colleagues. There would in the ordinary course of rotation have been a change. There was general agreement that if the progress of the work was to continue in the best way, it would be best if Mr. Romanow continued in that post. Mr. Romanow has been referred to in our province as Canada's young JFK . . .

MR. ROMANOW: – I'm getting older all the time!

MR. BLAKENEY: – . . . apart from the fact that he is getting older all the time as he says. I think, Mr. Speaker, that this would make him the first Ukrainian speaking Irishman in North America!

One of the issues arising in the current constitutional review is the manner in which the interest of registered Indians and other people of native origin could best be protected for constitutional or legal means. The Attorney General has been in the forefront of these deliberations and I know will be in a position to report to this House on these matters at an appropriate time.

I have continued for my part to outline the position of the Government of Saskatchewan and, I believe, the people of Saskatchewan respecting the upcoming Quebec referendum and the Parti-Quebecois proposal for sovereignty association which was recently published. Following the publication of their white paper on this topic the four western premiers consulted and issue a joint statement. I want to quote from that statement. It is a fairly long quote but I do so because it is our statement of what we believe the position of western Canadians is in all four provinces of western Canada. I quote:

At Brandon in 1977 and at Prince George earlier this year, the western premiers rejected the concept of Quebec independence with economic association. While recognizing that major changes in the federal system are clearly necessary the western premiers believe that sovereignty association is neither in the economic interests of western Canada nor in the broader interest of Canadians as a whole. The western premiers agreed that there is

nothing contained in the white paper on sovereignty association issued last week by the Quebec government that would in any way cause them to alter their views.

In rejecting sovereignty association, however, the western premiers made it plain that they are opposed to the status quo in Canadian federalism and are committed to working towards constitutional changes within the framework of confederation. In the past the federal system has proved very flexible and has been able to accommodate a great deal of change. The premiers are convinced that the aspirations of Quebecers can be accommodated within that system. The premiers emphasized that Canada is embarking on a new and challenging era, one which can provide Quebecers and all Canadians with a rewarding and prosperous future. The western premiers are confident that in a spirit of good will all Canadians can continue to build on our strengths and accommodate our inherent diversity to ensure that Canada's full potential will be realized. The western premiers invite the province of Quebec to share actively in that process.

It is useful that I state again the position of our government. Shortly put we are prepared to see changes in the Canadian constitution. Indeed, we are firm in demanding changes in the Canadian constitution. We are not, however, prepared to commit ourselves or our government to enter into any negotiations the precondition of which is that one province will separate from Canada and thereafter negotiate an economic union. I think any such commitment by our government would be both unwise and futile – unwise, because sovereignty association as proposed would not be in the best interests of Saskatchewan – futile, because I believe that if any province of Canada separates no government of Saskatchewan will be in a position to commit the people of Saskatchewan to entering into close economic ties with the separating province.

I believe that the animosity generated by separation would be so great that successful negotiation of close economic ties immediately thereafter would be improbable in the extreme. Believing that, I think it is foolish for any government of Saskatchewan to suggest that we could in any good faith enter into negotiations the precondition of which was that Quebec or any other province would separate from Canada and then we would negotiate an economic union. I am not suggesting that we would be hostile to the new nation. I am just saying that the circumstances of the separation would be such that we would have great difficulty having relations between the new nation and the remainder of Canada on the same level as they are with the United States for example, let alone any close economic or customs union.

I say this not to threaten or cajole. Certainly Saskatchewan is in no position to do either. I simply state the facts. Those facts, I suggest will be obvious to anyone who examines the economic disadvantages to Saskatchewan of sovereignty association and to anyone who considers the strong emotional commitment of Saskatchewan people to a continuing, united Canada.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: – Hear, hear!

MR. BLAKENEY: – Mr. Speaker, I commenced my remarks by pointing to the bright future which beckons for Saskatchewan in the 1980s. I end them with a statement of concern for Canada but also with a commitment to use all the influence we have on the side of a strong and united Canada.

We really are a fortunate people, with an opportunity to create a future for ourselves here in Saskatchewan unequalled on the face of the globe. We will not do this by being afraid to risk; we will not do this by leaving the task to others; we will not do this by saying to people of this province, there is a great challenge, let us look around the world for someone who can help us with that challenge. We will only be worthy of that future if we, as a community, plan what should be done to build our society and then do it ourselves. Because the throne speech holds out that vision and because the amendment is rooted in negative timidity in the problems of the future rather than the challenges and the opportunities, I, Mr. Speaker, will oppose the amendment and support the motion.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: – Hear, hear!

MR. P.P. MOSTOWAY (Saskatoon Centre): – Mr. Speaker, I want to say a few words today and I will resume tomorrow. I will want to adjourn the debate later on.

I wanted to congratulate a number of people. First of all I want to congratulate the newly elected member for Regina North-West (Mr. Solomon) for a tremendous victory. I want to congratulate the mover and the seconder for tremendous jobs and I want to congratulate the Leader of the Opposition. I won't pass judgment on the quality of his speech, but I thought he gave it all that he possibly could and I think he should be congratulated.

I also want to congratulate the Premier – that never hurts – on his excellent talk.

Now I want to get into a few little things. First of all, I would like to talk about the recently held Tory leadership convention. You will notice, Mr. Speaker, that I will not stoop so low as to call them Progressive Conservatives. I am going to be honest and call them ye old Tories. You know if you think Tory, well then let's call yourself Tory – certainly nothing progressive about them. But I noticed that they had three candidates there. They had one man who said, look, we'll run Saskatchewan as a business. He says, I've got plenty of business experience. You know, something like the cash register – you ring it up and that's the way he's going to operate with people. And of course they rejected him. Then another man – and a good man he is – he said, look, I'll give you honesty and integrity and they rejected him too.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: – Hear, hear!

MR. MOSTOWAY: – Well then, they did settle for another gentleman, who does not sit in the House and I'm wondering if he is here or not. You know, Mr. Speaker, I never know if in order to see him I should have a telescope or a microscope. It's difficult to say. But at any rate, he mouthed pearls of wisdom and all kinds of principles and ended up with the remark, the NDP under his thumb. I want to warn you gentlemen that if you ever get under his thumb, watch for the claw.

Well without going into detail, suffice it to say that when a politician has to mouth these words of pearls of wisdom and family, etc., etc., beware of him. We all believe in the family We all believe in God. We all believe in Christian principles. And that's not a monopoly that is held by you people over there.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: – Hear, hear!

MR. MOSTOWAY: – I want to talk about the Regina North-West by-election. I had the

opportunity of visiting there one day and I found it a very pleasurable experience. I did notice a few Tory MLAs apparently campaigning around there. You can always pick them out. You know, they've got the beady eyes – well, not all of them. Of course, I have to admit that those present in the House don't fall into that category. But you know the thing that really amazed me is that a political party could stoop so low as they stopped during the Regina by-election. I had people who constantly asked me, is it possible that members of the legislature can stoop so low? And I had to in all honesty say yes.

Now I want to mention a couple of things relative to the recent Gallup poll that was taken in Canada, which shows that Tory popularity has taken a nose dive. The people of Canada are just absolutely fed up with everything. Like, we're going to move the embassy over to there, but we're not going to really move it. We are going to jack up the price of oil, but we are not really going to and we just really don't know. And Mr. Lougheed has a lot of clout. We'll have to consult with him – and naturally they should, but it looks to me like he's going to be wielding the final club. I say that that's not the way it should be. If we had a government in Ottawa that had some backbone, that took some action . . . I think maybe if anyone has to wield a club it should be Mr. Clark, but he's not prepared to do that. And he is suffering for it because they told me that on the popularity polls or the Gallup pool they are down to about 28 per cent. That was taken before the ex-prime minister tendered his resignation as leader of the party. I'm sure that it must be at about 18 per cent now.

Now, the Leader of the Opposition was talking about businesses dying in Saskatchewan. Well, I don't know where you've been. You must have had your head in the sand, because I can tell you one thing – there is prosperity in the air. You can smell the prosperity in Saskatchewan. You can see it . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Yes, you can even smell the prosperity. All you have to do is come to Saskatoon and you will see a building boom. You have a building boom in Regina. You have a building boom in practically every major urban centre in Saskatchewan. If you fellows don't know that, it means that you simply haven't been around.

Now, let me just relate a little story to you, and this concerns a businessman in Saskatoon who retired about a year or two ago. He never supported our party before in the past. When I campaigned, I knocked at his door – very hospitable he was. He said I am going to support you this time, and I said thank you very much. Well, he said, really it is the party I am supporting. I could understand that. Anyway, he related this story to me and it is something that can be and is relayed by many, many businessmen in Saskatchewan. He said for years and years I fought the New Democratic Party and the CCF party, and finally I realized it. You know, I made some money and that is what business is all about – enough so that my wife and I can retire. He said, I never realized why I made the money. I made the money because the people of Saskatchewan have been so prosperous, particularly since 1971, and during the 1940s and 1950s when Mr. Douglas was the premier. And he said, it finally dawned on me. He said, I'm lying in bed one evening. I'm thinking this out and it all fits together. He said, I owe my prosperity to the CCF government and the NDP government.

I'll tell you another thing. All you have to do is walk down the streets of Saskatoon in the business section and you ask those businessmen if they don't feel the prosperity. Now, I will grant you that a number of them certainly don't support our party but I have yet to run into one who is negative and will not admit there is prosperity in the air and that it is all over. If you are denying that, I say that is a bunch of hogwash, that you haven't really gone out and tested the people and talked to them.

You are talking about people leaving. We have 950,000 people in this province and gaining monthly. It will soon be one million and you keep referring to the 1930s. We all know why in the 1920s and 1930s there were over one million people in that day and age. It was because there were so many small farmers and they had to be small at that time because they weren't mechanized. Some of them are still around.

Now you are talking about all kinds of people leaving. The Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Berntson) says he looked in the telephone book and he saw all of these young people of 18-25 years of age had left. Well, I'm just wondering what people of 18-25 would be doing with telephones. If they have telephones, it is very unusual for people 18-25 to have telephones. It just shows there is prosperity in that particular town you were talking about. So I just want to say, Mr. Speaker, that the kind of negativism that we hear from those people is sickening. It is turning off the people of Saskatchewan.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: – Hear, hear!

MR. MOSTOWAY: – I'll tell you what, Mr. Speaker. It is so bad that I have had to include in a newsletter, a little space telling the thousands of newcomers to Saskatoon and area where to go to get their medicare cards because they are wondering. And when they go down there (they get the forms at city hall) and they find out they don't have to pay, they say well it's not like Alberta where you have to pay. If you want to talk about the other provinces, for example, you never mention the medicare premiums that you pay in, say, Alberta. You don't mention the dental care program we have here. Let me tell you that I was at a conference about two years ago at which we had members from all of the provinces including Alberta. The members from Saskatchewan said yes we have a little bit of revenue in this province as all other provinces have and we have opted for a dental care program. You know what the members from Alberta said? They said we believe in cheaper gas as opposed to healthy teeth for our youngsters. That is the route they have chosen to go and nobody is denying them that, but you never mention that. You never mention the fact that say a 20 or 21 year old will have to pay about \$600 in insurance to drive his car in Edmonton or Calgary. You never mention that at all.

And now I want go on to another subject – senior citizens. You're talking about senior citizens. The hon. Leader of the Opposition says that senior citizens have no right to live alone. Well, I'll tell you one thing, I'll take you to some senior citizens who do live alone and if you tell any one of them that they should not be living alone, you are going to suffer the consequences. I hope there's another hospital bed vacant some place because you'll need one. And if you're suggesting that you want to see all the senior citizens rounded up and put into some sort of a communal home or some institution, then you're going to pay the price.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: – Hear, hear!

MR. MOSTOWAY: – The hon. gentleman mentioned something about the social studies curriculum. You know that there's input from all kinds of citizens on revisions to the social studies curriculum. I happen to teach social studies and it does . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . you do? So what does that prove? I say that if you teach social studies, it means you majored in social studies like I did and that's a mark of intelligence. I'm simply saying that to revise curriculums from time to time is a good move. Nobody is opposed to it. Parents aren't opposed to it, nor are teachers. What's wrong with revising the curriculum? I know what's wrong – because they want to mention something there about the co-op movement and you fellows have always really hated the co-op movement.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: – Hear, hear!

MR. MOSTOWAY: – Oh yes, you're talking about political patronage in the co-op movement. You have a . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . well certainly if you can buy . . . yes, I know many of you deep down really are co-op members but somehow when you appear here you seem to be against the co-op. Well then why don't you say so? Why do you always attack the co-op movement? Since 1971 (that's when I entered the legislature) I've never heard you say a good word about the co-op movement and the people who run it, control it and the people who own it . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . well, could you blame me? I mean after all . . .

SOME HON. MEMBERS: – Hear, hear!

MR. MOSTOWAY: – After all, have a little bit of compassion. Now, in so far as resources are concerned, well, I'll not bother mentioning the oil, the 1,000 oil wells that were drilled last year. I want to say a few words on potash. I recall when we brought in the potash legislation a lot of people were wondering about that legislation. Yes, they openly questioned us and said, is it a good move? Two years later the percentage of those people who were wondering, or who were opposed, fell and now you can go to any citizen in Saskatoon and area, because that's the area I'm concerned with mainly, and they will tell you it's a good move. And I'm simply saying that . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Are you leaving now Eric? Well, fine. You'll be able to pick up some choice words tomorrow that I'll have. And I'm simply saying that our move in potash is accepted by the people of Saskatchewan as being the only sensible move and I tell you another thing – that other provinces are considering doing the same thing. But isn't it funny? You know, we make a move in potash and we get criticized. But Mr. Lougheed, the darling of the boys opposite, when he makes a move relative to energy, oh boy, that's fine. No problem. I don't know how many faces you fellows wear – I just see a new one there.

Uranium – you mentioned uranium. Well, it's a well known fact that you fellows have gone on record in this House as favoring the expansion of the uranium mining and want the refining of it to be totally controlled by private interests. You're on record as having said that . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . what's wrong? . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . We wanted to lower the level – well, I won't go into that.

Mr. Speaker, I want to get on to another topic. This is given to me by a good Tory friend of mine, an honest businessman. There aren't too many Tory businessmen but I have no reason to suspect they aren't good men. But anyways, he felt a little offended and he felt very slighted.

AN HON. MEMBER: – Name names, table them.

MR. MOSTOWAY: – I'll give you the name. He got this article in a letter. It's called 'Boardroom Reports – Management Magic'. Good Tories they are! They're not located in Saskatchewan. Apparently it's in Ontario.

AN HON. MEMBER: – Not many businessmen are, Paul.

MR. MOSTOWAY: – No, no. I'm not saying that at all. But this outfit has put out a report and says, look, you can get this little booklet free. Here are some of the points they mention. Four ways to get out of an ironclad lease. If you carpet the office now, your

company gets investment tax credit. What not to tell an insurance adjuster, and how you can win tax deductions for money spent on hobbies and getting to work and mistakes a telephone company makes, etc., etc. A tale the IRS will make for less tax than a company owes. Respectable bankruptcy, how a troubled company can file under chapter 11 and come out healthy. How to list the cost of your daughter's wedding for tax purposes. All I am simply saying is that this kind of garbage coming out of Ontario . . . This kind of garbage hits the garbage cans of most of the businessmen of Saskatchewan. I'm just wondering how a business establishment from Ontario can send out this kind of nonsense, this kind of trash which is urging people to be dishonest. But thankfully the businessmen of Saskatchewan are honest.

I have one other little thing I want to mention . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . It's like a pack of hyenas. I want to touch on the innuendo, the state farm, this red scare bit. I want to tell you fellows you're treading ground when you talk in that manner, such as the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Berntson) did the other day. You see, I don't know where your ancestors came from and I don't really know where the ancestors of these people came from but the majority . . .

AN HON. MEMBER: – I'll bet you don't know where yours came from, Paul.

MR. MOSTOWAY: – All right, are you telling me that my mother can't tell me where my ancestors came from? Is the hon. member saying that? No. I know you're not. I don't really know where they came from but I do know they came from Europe and that kind of nonsense to which you fellows are always referring – the red herring, the scare – is starting to get to me. It's almost as if people who come from say central Europe or eastern Europe are second class citizens, almost as if they're not to be trusted – and I'm telling you, you're going to pay dearly for that in the next election because I'm going to make darn sure that those people . . . they make up approximately one-half of the population of this province.

AN HON. MEMBER: – Racist!

MR. MOSTOWAY: – Yes, that's exactly what you fellows have resorted to. In so far as Saskatoon Centre is concerned, I have a few words I want to say on the constituency tomorrow, but at this time, Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to adjourn debate.

AN HON. MEMBER: – Hear, hear!

Debate adjourned.

The Assembly adjourned at 4:15 p.m.