

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN
December 7, 1979

The Assembly met at 10 a.m.

On the Orders of the Day

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

MR. G. TAYLOR (Indian Head-Wolseley): – Mr. Speaker, I'd like to introduce to you and through you to the members of this Assembly, a group of people in the west gallery belonging to the South Saskatchewan Coalition for Life. They've distributed materials on all the members' desks. I hope they enjoy their visit to our Chamber. I hope that their information they're supplying to the members brings success to the request. I welcome them here and wish them a very safe journey home today on our rather dangerous roads.

HON. MEMBERS: – Hear, hear!

HON. H.H. ROLFES (Minister of Health): – Mr. Speaker, I, too want to take the opportunity to welcome the people here today. Before, however, they have a safe journey back to their respective homes, they will have the opportunity of meeting with the Minister of health (Mr. Rolfes) to discuss various problems that concern them and myself. So I'm sure that they will have a very interesting day here today, not only in the House but I hope also in their meeting with me as Minister of Health.

HON. MEMBERS: – Hear, hear!

QUESTIONS

SGEA Strike

MR. G. TAYLOR (Indian Head-Wolseley): – My question is to the Premier (Mr. Blakeney). Premier, you are no doubt aware that a member of your Executive Council, the Minister of Highways, (Mr. Kramer) stated in Saskatoon that the SGEA (Saskatchewan Government Employees Association) is not negotiating in good faith. Would you agree that statements of this type made by members of the Executive Council are damaging to the sensitive bargaining situation and are preventing the possibility of an early settlement to this serious strike?

HON. A.E. BLAKENEY (Premier): – Mr. Speaker, I have not had an opportunity to see the report of the remarks of the hon. member for The Battlefords, the Minister of Highways (Mr. Kramer) and accordingly I am unable to comment on them directly. I will say that we very much wish that negotiations would proceed and would proceed successfully. It was our understanding that negotiations would not proceed in the press. There has, however, been a good number of comments from the side of the SGEA in the press and it may well have been that perhaps failure to understand the rules the same way we did, which led to the comment, if in fact the comment was made.

MR. TAYLOR: – A further statement on these comments, Mr. Premier.

MR. SPEAKER: – I'll take a question from the member.

MR. TAYLOR: – I further understand that the same minister called Larry Brown and the members of his executive, the grinch that stole Christmas. Will you, Mr. Premier, not agree to control such irresponsible and I call inflammatory statements by your cabinet members, which I'm sure are becoming stumbling blocks to any settlement in this strike?

MR. BLAKENEY: – Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Indian Head-Wolseley (Mr. Taylor) sets me a very considerable task if he expects that I'm going to be able to control all the comments of the members of our cabinet, more particularly the comments of the member for The Battlefords, (Mr. Kramer) who is a man of some independence of mind. I doubt whether he was giving a statement of government policy on who or what stole Christmas.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: – Hear, hear!

Handling of Highway Maintenance Problems During Strike

MR. D.M. HAM (Swift Current): – I'd like to direct a question to the Premier about the independent member for The Battlefords (Mr. Kramer). In light of your statements yesterday, Mr. Premier and to quote, that supervisory staff, other out-of-scope personnel and those within the bargaining unit reporting for work would attempt to handle highway maintenance problems and since again, Miss Sorensen of SGEA stated that the union would work if requested, in fact, have requests been made to the SGEA to work?

MR. BLAKENEY: – Yes.

MR. HAM: – Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Premier, I understand the Minister of Highways (Mr. Kramer) yesterday also stated (If you want to ask him, go ahead) that the Department of Highways would hire independent outside contractors to provide highway maintenance. Would you please inform the Assembly if this is your policy.

MR. BLAKENEY: – Mr. Speaker, I will allow the Minister of Highways to report on that matter of highways policy.

HON. E. KRAMER (Minister of Highways and Transportation): – Mr. Speaker, yes I think I will comment on . . . yes that is the member for Swift Current (Mr. Ham). I thought for a moment it was Barbie doll's big brother.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: – Hear, hear!

MR. KRAMER: – Mr. Speaker . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . I don't know whether the member for Qu'Appelle (Mr. Lane) is speaking or whether it is his turtleneck sweater flopping in the breeze. Is that your mouth moving or your sweater?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: – Hear, hear!

MR. KRAMER: – Yes, well, with regard to the question of whether or not the SGEA (Saskatchewan Government Employees Association) is prepared to provide help. We have asked them – yes, that was the question – we have asked them and it is documented. Ms. Sorensen said as early as last Sunday that they were prepared to consider it. On December 2 at 1 p.m. the RCMP called Leon Abler, area maintenance foreman, Regina, and advised that the valley hill on No. 6 north was in an icy condition.

The RCMP said they had been in touch with Dave Fry, SOI, Southey. Dave was willing to go back to work if he had union permission. Leon phoned John Lenson, shop steward at Southey. Lenson phoned the union in Regina and they did not think it was an emergency and did not give permission.

The same thing has occurred in Saskatoon. Saskatoon office asked the picket captains for eight operators at 10:30 a.m. to assist in salting of icy roads in the area. At 1 p.m. the union responded that they would not assist. I want to repeat that as of this morning the reports are the everything is being done and conditions are reasonably good. People should listen to the road reports.

The reports however, that have been coming out from CBC sources have largely been false and they are not getting the information from the Department of Highways or any other reliable source that I know of.

MR. HAM: – A supplementary, Mr. Speaker, I guess probably the Minister of Highways should inform his communications man, Mr. Hansen; he is the one who is giving the reports to the CBC. I heard him this morning myself. But would you kindly answer for us, Mr. Minister, and Mr. Premier, when you intend to take this strike and this road problem seriously?

MR. KRAMER: – We are taking the road problem very, very seriously. There are nearly 300 people working in the Department of Highways. They are working overtime and they are doing an excellent job. There have been fewer accidents in Saskatchewan in this last two weeks than there have been anywhere . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . per miles travelled, yes. I am answer the question Mr. . . . Certainly we would like to.

Now the other question was regarding the statement I made yesterday concerning contracts. I said, for the information of this House, that if there was an emergency where a major blizzard was to come in that we would put contingency plans into effect. First of all we would once again ask the union to do their duty according to the promises they made. Secondly failing that, we would put private contractors who are now standing by as well as municipal operators, so that the work can be done.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to remind this House at this time, that it was not so long ago we did not have the bare pavement policy. It was not so long ago when I sat on that side of the House asking . . .

SOME HON. MEMBERS: – Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: – Order, order. I'll take the next question.

Cornwall Centre

MR. P. ROUSSEAU (Regina South): – A question to the minister responsible for the Cornwall Centre. yesterday, I asked you a question which you half answered, and I'd like the rest of the answer today, if possible. That has to do with the financing of the project. I asked you what interest rates, and you gave me half the answer, which was a short-term of the bridge financing – what about the mortgage, the long-term financing, the interest rate and a length of time?

HON. W.E. SMISHEK (Minister of Municipal Affairs (Urban)): – Mr. Speaker, the interim financing (this is during the period of construction) will be at cost to us, which if the

money were to be arranged at the present time, would be in the order of 13.5 per cent to 14 per cent. During the period of construction, the draw down is to be between \$1.5 million to \$2 million per month as the construction progresses. The total amount that was agreed to is, I believe, \$35.4 million. Thereafter, we are to arrange for long-term financing. The time that the agreement was reached was in August of 1978. The long-term financing rates is 9.624 per cent.

Mr. Speaker, among the things that have to be recognized in that arrangement is the agreement itself – what we as a province get in return. In return we will get the lease agreement of \$450,000 a year. There will be the 9.625 per cent interest rate paid on the money, plus Mr. Speaker, the cash flow that we will be receiving. Under the terms of the agreement, we will be getting after the first year, a net cash flow of 51 per cent which, based on our calculation, Mr. Speaker, over a 35 year period will return as a minimum 12 per cent on the money that has been advanced.

MR. ROUSSEAU: – Supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Maybe you should go back to the drawing table or the drawing board and check your figures again, because first of all, you are talking about a ground lease of \$50,000 on your subsidy of 9.625 per cent interest rate. That in itself is a \$25 million subsidy, based at 12 per cent interest and some of it is higher than that today. You indicated that the project has already started, that the basement has already been dug. Would you please indicate to this Assembly what amount of money you have already advanced towards the project?

MR. SMISHEK: – Mr. Speaker, at this stage, other than the money that has been paid for the acquisition of the land site, there has been no money advanced to my knowledge.

MR. J.G. LANE (Qu'Appelle): – Would the minister now table this agreement and indicate as well, whether the cash flow estimates are in fact guaranteed cash flows and if so, who made the guarantees and what are the securities for those particular guarantees of the cash flow?

MR. SMISHEK: – Mr. Speaker, I indicated yesterday that we'll consider the possibility of tabling the agreements. There are at the present time some revisions being made to the agreement. In terms of guarantees, Mr. Speaker, certainly there is the guarantee of the payment of the rental lease for the ground lease agreement, \$450,000, we expect they will be honored. We certainly know the agreements that will be entered into between Chartwood and the individual retail operators and commercial operators will be honored for rent, and – based on the agreement thereafter – it will be no less than the rental rate per square foot or a percentage of sales whichever is the greater. I am sure that the retail operators who go there will honor their agreements. I am confident that Chartwood-Eaton's will honor their agreements based on our getting 51 per cent of the net return.

MR. LANE: – Supplementary to the minister.

MR. SPEAKER: – I'll take a new question.

MR. LANE: – New question to the minister. It was clear in your previous answer that in fact you are evading the very specific question, which is about the normal commercial practice to have guaranteed cash flows. You in fact do not have guarantees on the cash flow in this particular project. It is secondly, of a highly speculative nature because other than Eaton's (and you have refused to table a lease) that leasing has not yet in fact

started. Would the minister now be prepared to table the agreements as they stand to date? You can place in addendum to that particular agreement the areas that you are perhaps renegotiating, or changes. Will you table them today or will you continue to leave the obvious impression in the minds of the public that this is a sweetheart deal, a secretive deal for the people of Saskatchewan?

MR. SMISHEK: – Mr. Speaker, it is pretty obvious that the Tories are opposed to downtown revitalization. It is pretty obvious, Mr. Speaker, that the Tories if they were in power, would let the downtown cores of our cities and our town rot away; they would not come to the assistance of our urban centres. They would not co-operate with local governments to revitalize our urban communities as in the case of the city of Regina which is in desperate need of revitalization. We as a government entered into an honorable agreement with the city of Regina. We also discussed our proposals with the downtown merchants. We have had their support; we have had the support of the Chamber of Commerce; we have had the support and the co-operation of the city of Regina. This project will return at least \$1.5 million additional taxation revenue to the city of Regina. We believe it's a good deal for Regina; we believe it's a good deal for the province; we believe it's a good deal for the citizens of Regina and the province of Saskatchewan. When it is appropriate to table the agreements we will do so.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: – Hear, hear!

MR. ROUSSEAU: – Mr. Speaker, since the minister refused to answer the question posed to him and refuses to table the information which he has, will you at least indicate to us what area of revisions you are working on? What part of it: is it new finance, new amount, new interest? What is it? What area are you working on at this point for a revision?

MR. SMISHEK: – Mr. Speaker, there are changes which have to be made to the area of construction. I have mentioned already that one of the proposals which was there and the agreements to have a fruit store, have been altered. There are other technical questions. In terms of financing, in terms of rent, the \$450,000 is agreed to and that stands. Equally in the case of interest, that stands, Mr. Speaker. Now, at the moment, I know that my officials together with officials from Eaton's and Chartwood are dealing with the matter as well as the city of Regina.

SGI Agencies

MR. E.A. BERNTSON (Leader of the Opposition): – Mr. Speaker, I have here a copy of the Financial Times of London, September 10, 1979, in which there is an ad from SGI. My question to the minister responsible for SGI is, how many offices do you have in the U.K. and Western Europe and have you had any enquiries for new agencies as a result of this ad?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: – Hear, hear!

HON. W.A. ROBBINS (Minister of Revenue, Supply and Services): – Mr. Speaker, we obviously do not have any agencies in the United Kingdom but we do deal with Lloyds of London in terms of reinsurance and things of that nature. The ad was placed in conjunction with other ads from government departments with respect to an issue related to the province of Saskatchewan.

MR. SPEAKER: – Order, order! I am having trouble hearing the answer. I know the members of the opposition are as interested in hearing the answer as I am.

SaskOil

MR. BERNTSON: – Mr. Speaker, a question to the minister for SaskOil. In the same paper there is an ad from SaskOil. I wonder if the minister responsible for SaskOil could tell me how much frontier drilling he is doing in the North Atlantic, if, in fact, there have been any oil companies in the U.K. or western Europe offering pieces of their action for sale in the North Sea? I wonder if, as a result of this ad, the Crown corporation of SaskOil is attracting any new business from the U.K. or western Europe.

HON. J.R. MESSER (Minister of Mineral Resources): – Mr. Speaker, it is not contemplated that we will be doing any drilling in the North Sea; we certainly aren't at this particular point in time. But there is some very significant activity as far as oil is concerned in the province of Saskatchewan as far as wells drilled, within a modest 1 per cent or 2 per cent of the province of Alberta. There are certainly lots of companies interested in the heavy oil development of the province of Saskatchewan that are located outside the province of Saskatchewan. We do what a lot of other provinces do and that is publicize the kind of potential that now exists in the province of Saskatchewan and the level of resource development activity that is taking place in this province and we make no apology for it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: – Hear, hear!

Dairy Farms

MR. BERNTSON: – Mr. Speaker, there is also an ad in the same paper that has to do with milk for all it's worth. My question is to the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. MacMurchy). Can you indicate to this House how many new dairy farmers we have attracted from the U.K. or western Europe as a result of this ad and were they financed by FarmStart, were they set up on land bank? Can you indicate if there were any, what justification there is in that?

MR. SPEAKER: – Order, order! The Leader of the Opposition is putting me in a difficult position because the questions according to the rules must not be of a nature requiring a lengthy or detailed answer. It would appear to me the question the member has asked would require some rather extensive research to know whether FarmStart loans were required and consequently, I think if the member for Souris-Cannington, the Leader . . . order, order, order! . . . wants to rephrase the question in such a way that it can be answered under the rules of the question period, I'd be quite pleased to permit it.

MR. BERNTSON: – A question to the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. MacMurchy). How many dairy farmers from the U.K. have we set up as a result of this ad?

HON. G. MR. MacMURCHY (Minister of Agriculture): – Mr. Speaker, I think that in a general way we can answer the hon. member's question by indicating to him that that paper is one of the world's leading financial papers. Secondly, Mr. Speaker, I think the hon. member knows that in Saskatchewan, we happen to have what is considered, not just North America's best display of livestock – the world's best display of livestock!

SOME HON. MEMBERS: – Hear, hear!

MR. MacMURCHY: – Mr. Speaker, I had the opportunity to host the international night of Agribition and to welcome delegations and visitors from all over the world, including England and Scotland. Mr. Speaker, I think that the dairy industry benefits in Saskatchewan and worldwide from such an ad and I think it's unfortunate the hon. member should raise the question in this Assembly as he has.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: – Hear, hear!

Cost of Advertisement

MR. BERNTSON: – Mr. Speaker, a question to the Premier. By our calculations, calculated with information from the Canadians representative of The Financial Times of London, this happy little document cost the taxpayers of Saskatchewan about \$60,000. How can you possibly justify that sort of expenditure, spent while you were on your little junket around the world, except to say that it was for purposes of self-aggrandizement while you were in London?

MR. BLAKENEY: – Mr. Speaker, our objective in advertising in The Financial Post and in taking trips which the hon. member is pleased to call junkets, is to advertise what we believe are the important attributes of Saskatchewan and to invite persons who may be interested to come here to invest money in Saskatchewan. It may well be that I cannot tell him what the immediate results are now. I recall very well the similar statements when I took a trip to China and the allegations that this was an unnecessary trip and I recall also the fact that 18 months thereafter, we had an order of potash from China in the order of \$20 million.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: – Hear, hear!

MR. BLAKENEY: – We are in the process of negotiating another order from China.

To come back to the European situation, we expect that there will be orders for Saskatchewan products. I spoke with millers in Britain; I expect there will be orders, not because I was there but because I reinforced it. Who can say, Mr. Speaker, whether any particular contact is a result of the ad. All I am saying is sequential with the ad and the visit, we now have visitors here in Regina, visiting Agribition from the Soviet Union. I don't know whether they read the ad. I do know I went to the Soviet Union on my junket, as he says, and I know that the Soviet agricultural people are here in Regina.

Mr. Speaker, the hon. member suggests that they are not here as a result of my visit. He is entirely wrong. They are here in specific response to my invitation and I am very sure that in good time, we will develop some important commercial contacts with those areas that I visited and where that newspaper circulated.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: – Hear, hear!

HON. R.J. ROMANOW (Attorney General): – Mr. Speaker, I would ask the indulgence of the members to go to orders of the day, the special order, and return to the other matters later this day.

MR. SPEAKER: – You have heard the request of the Attorney General to move down the order paper directly to special order and return later this day for the balance of the routine proceedings. Is that agreed?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: – Agreed.

MR. SPEAKER: – Special order.

HON. E. KRAMER (Minister of Highways and Transportation): – Mr. Speaker, there is a matter of urgent importance that I think I would like to raise very, very briefly.

MR. LANE: – Priority of debate?

MR. KRAMER: – Not priority of debate.

There was a statement made by Canadians Press, circulated right across this country, that an accident, a very, very unfortunate accident at Unity, where three or four children were killed, was a result of icy conditions. That is totally untrue. The RCMP reports states that this . . .

MR. SPEAKER: – Order, order! I think the proper place for the minister to raise that would be before orders of the day if he wishes to correct an error that has appeared in the press and we will go to special order.

ADJOURNED DEBATE

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).

MR. L.W. BIRKBECK (Moosomin): – Mr. Speaker, before moving into the context of my remarks, I would like just to take a moment. George McLeod, our member for Meadow Lake, this past summer suffered an accident while on parliamentary business. It resulted in a serious injury to his leg. Mr. Speaker, next week Mr. McLeod will be having an operation on that leg. I would like to, on behalf of the Assembly, wish George all the best on that operation and of course a quick recovery.

HON. MEMBERS: – Hear, hear!

MR. BIRKBECK: – Mr. Speaker, in my remarks in reply to the Speech from the throne yesterday, there were a few areas of concern that I would like to raise again in my remarks today. First, Mr. Speaker, my appreciation to the Moosomin constituency for the opportunity they have accorded me to take my place here in this, the nineteenth legislature, to put forward ideas and constructive criticism for the Government of Saskatchewan. I would like to assure them that I am acting in their behalf in areas of concern that are mutual between my constituents and myself. Some of those concerns, Mr. Speaker, are the improvements required for Highway 8 and Highway 48 within my constituency; they are the need for assistance to our small businesses; they are a need, Mr. Speaker, for a better working relationship between the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan and the Rocanville employees association, in order that the mine may continue to be the most productive mine in this province, and one of the better mines in Canada.

Mr. Speaker, the employees of the Rocanville division of the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan were once the best paid miners of the potash industry in Saskatchewan.

Today they are among the worst. They were the best paid when they were employees of the Hudson's Bay Mining and Smelting and they are now some of the worst paid miners since they are now employees of the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan. Mr. Speaker, surely employees of the Rocanville mines, producing 700 per cent more potash per employee than Lanigan and 35 per cent more potash per employee than Cory, are justified in asking for salaries from the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan, equal to those employees of the Lanigan and Cory divisions of the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan.

Other areas, Mr. Speaker, in our constituency, exist within the nursing home facilities. We have problems in those areas, Mr. Speaker, and as you would know I have been working on those problems. At last count, Mr. Speaker, we had 92 applications on hand at our nursing homes, 17 of which were chronic geriatrics and some 11 to 13 of those were in the hospital. Mr. Speaker, as members of this Assembly would know and the people of Saskatchewan would know, I conducted a survey of the nursing homes within the province of Saskatchewan, and I have now prepared a report on that survey. Mr. Speaker, the recommendations contained within our report will be presented to this government. It is my hope that in the interests of the people of Saskatchewan, and particularly our elderly and senior citizens, that these recommendations will be accepted and put into place so that all may benefit as quickly as possible.

Mr. Speaker, those are just a few of the problems that exist in the Moosomin constituency. Problems like that, Mr. Speaker, which exist within the province, surely have galvanized the Saskatchewan people to this government. Those are the problems that I will be addressing myself to, Mr. Speaker, as I said yesterday. I will not be addressing myself to the backbenchers of this government. I will not be addressing myself to the ministers of this government. Mr. Speaker, I will be addressing myself and my criticism of this government, where it is justified, to the captain of the ship and that is the Premier of Saskatchewan (Mr. Blakeney).

Mr. Speaker, as I said yesterday the throne speech fails to address itself to the people of Saskatchewan and to this Assembly in four fundamental areas. They are: (1) agriculture, (2) resources (3) taxation, (4) the labor problems.

Let me first, Mr. Speaker, deal with the problems we have in agriculture that this throne speech fails to address itself to. Mr. Speaker, the Speech from the Throne states clearly that orderly marketing and the crowrate are the basis of economic prosperity in our healthy rural communities of Saskatchewan. Mr. Speaker, that having been said by this government, how can they explain the loss of 6,000 family farms in Saskatchewan since the inception of the land bank program? How can they explain, Mr. Speaker, a population which remains lower than it was in the 1960s and farms, hamlets and villages which have disappeared from the Saskatchewan map?

Mr. Speaker, again with reference to agriculture and the problems contained therein that the throne speech has failed so miserably – let me ask the Premier of this Government of Saskatchewan why Saskatchewan farmers have the lowest development policy has resulted in a constant steady decline and deflated net income every year from 1975 to '78. Whereas in Manitoba and Alberta, farmers have experienced positive net income improvements in 1978.

Mr. Speaker, I ask the members of this Assembly and the people of Saskatchewan who should we blame? Obviously the answer to that question is the Premier of

Saskatchewan and his government.

Mr. Speaker, let me address my remarks to the second failure, that being in the area of resources. Members of this Assembly and the people of Saskatchewan should know the hon. Premier of Saskatchewan on March 1, 1972 stated, and I quote:

We will offer support for development but we don't believe that such development warrants massive ongoing public subsidies. We don't believe that it is necessary to pour millions of dollars of taxpayers' money every year into the development of our resources. We believe that much more could be done to promote industries based on resource development – but not based on resource development but rather on manufacturing goods for people here in the Prairie basin.

Mr. Speaker, the Premier stated very clearly – I won't risk our dollars. But he did and plans to continue to do so. This government is inconsistent in many areas. Let me say this: the current NDP government is full of contradictions and inconsistencies in philosophy and practice. They confess they want to protect our provincial resources from ownership by foreign multinationals. So how do they protect us, Mr. Speaker? By borrowing from foreign banks, paying Saskatchewan tax revenues out in interest to those foreign banks, paying for an exchange running at about 20 cents on every dollar borrowed on our devalued Canadian dollar to borrow these funds and to what end I ask? To buy back resources which are already ours.

Mr. Speaker, if we had sound economic policy emanating from this government let me list some of the benefits that would accrue to the people of Saskatchewan: a bountiful heritage fund that is managed for the real benefit of all the citizens of Saskatchewan, lower income tax; no health or education tax; lower public utility costs; lower energy costs; increased real farm incomes; population growth consistent with birth rates.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: – Hear, hear!

MR. BIRKBECK: – Mr. Speaker, let me tell the people of Saskatchewan what this socialistic economic nonsense has brought us. It has brought \$2.5 billion in public debt; school closing; direct billing; elective surgery line-ups; high taxes at all levels; inadequate environmental protection; fewer farms; unsatisfied and mistreated natives; rampant political patronage; persistent and ongoing strikes; under-financed and over-taxed rural and urban municipalities, centralized, unresponsive government; broken promises and no real heritage fund with little hope for change in sight.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: – Hear, hear!

MR. BIRKBECK: – Mr. Speaker, the province of Saskatchewan was built by people – by the people of Saskatchewan. It was not built by this government. This land of ours, this country, was defended in two world wars by people not by government. Mr. Speaker, I stand in defence of our pioneers, of the Saskatchewan which they built with the resources which God placed here, not government. Our pioneers would not have had their hard work undone by any government and, Mr. Speaker, nor will I.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: – Hear, hear!

MR. BIRKBECK: – Mr. Speaker, let me move now to the third failure contained within this throne speech – the third area which this government has failed to address itself to

– a very serious area, that being the area of taxation.

Mr. Speaker, there was a real tax squeeze on the citizens of Saskatchewan. The accumulative tax rate for the average Saskatchewan resident is now about 40 per cent. The average man or woman works from January to June just to pay his or her taxes and add to this 5 per cent provincial sales tax made up in part by a health tax and such necessities to family life as blankets and clothes, baby bottles, tables, chairs, stoves, beds and so on, Mr. Speaker. It's a tax across the board – a tax which affects little Nancy across the street in that apartment or your best friend, John, next door. Saskatchewan is hovering on the edge of an incredible economic potential and has been since 1905. The problem is that the policies of the current government tend to arrest this potential rather than to make it into real prosperity.

I find it incredible and totally unacceptable as I am sure, Mr. Speaker, do the people of Saskatchewan that we are still considered a have-not province. This is probably because the present government has not the economic policies or insight to turn us into a have province. Mr. Speaker, deficit budgets will not get us there, massive borrowing from foreign money markets will not get us there, and increasing public service will not get us there. The heritage fund which takes money from non-renewable resources to buy more non-renewable resources that we already own is not making a positive contribution to the future economic viability of Saskatchewan.

Mr. Speaker, is this management of our economy to the Government of Saskatchewan the reason that we, as individuals, must pay high taxation rates. This government has even suggested retroactive education and health tax as it realties to farm feedlots. Surely the people of Saskatchewan must curse the regressive tax burden propagated by this government, Mr. Speaker. I would suggest we tax the multinationals that work to develop our resource industries since it is within the government's constitutional rights to tax any corporation resident in this province. But, surely, Mr. Speaker, a tax on multinationals would be more justified than this government's investment into the resource field and subsequent tax on people to pay for it. I challenge anyone in Saskatchewan and in particular this government, Mr. Speaker, to attempt to tell me in this Assembly today that the people of Saskatchewan would prefer to accept a high tax load on their shoulders rather than a tax on multinationals. Mr. Speaker, I believe that this lack of direction and foresight in the area of taxation by this government is the reason that each and everyone of us as individuals in Saskatchewan must pay such a high tax rate.

Mr. Speaker, I see no relief for the taxpayers of Saskatchewan until this government is changed. This government has made a commitment to invest \$0.5 million in the uranium industry and that is before production of uranium even starts. It is the taxpayers of Saskatchewan again that must pay for this tremendous investment. I believe and the Progressive Conservative Party of Saskatchewan believes that it is wrong to tax producers and consumers to buy into the resource industry. Rather, we believe in taxing resource industries and therefore being in a position to help Saskatchewan farmers and families to attain a higher standard of living.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: – Hear, hear!

MR. BIRKBECK: – Mr. Speaker, in concluding my reply to the throne speech let me touch on the fourth area which this throne speech fails to address itself to. The fourth area of concern with this government is its weak attempt at addressing itself to the

problems of labor. Surely the people of Saskatchewan do not recognize this NDP government as a government that knows how to handle the labor problems that it is confronted with from time to time. Let me take this opportunity to remind the people of Saskatchewan that it was the labor unions that pledged their support to this New Democratic Party, their support at the doors and their financial support. Mr. Speaker, they even had little buttons with the slogan, You and me and the NDP, the perfect union. Surely, we are all aware that is not the case. The current ongoing strike by the Saskatchewan Government Employees Association demonstrates this government's inability to negotiate and exercise the full potential of the collective bargaining system. It's failure, Mr. Speaker, is causing suffering throughout our province.

As I stated at the outset of my remarks, I would be replying to the Premier. I hold the Premier of Saskatchewan responsible for the mismanagement of this province in the area of labor. Mr. Speaker, only the Premier should be held responsible for the current strike of the Saskatchewan Government Employees Association. It is this Premier and this government that is responsible for settling this strike.

Let me cite another example of this government's failure to handle labor problems. Let me cite, Mr. Speaker, the case of the Rocanville employees association which is an independent association, organized by the employees earlier this year and certified as bargaining agent for the employees this year by the Saskatchewan Labour Relations Board. Mr. Speaker, this is an exclusively Saskatchewan organization with no connection to any multinational union. Mr. Speaker, this association is asking for parity with the Lanigan and Cory Divisions of the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan (PCS). Mr. Speaker, as employees of the Hudson's Bay Mining and Smelting Company, the Rocanville employees were the best paid with the best benefits. Now as employees of the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan they have become the worse paid with the worst benefits in the Saskatchewan potash industry.

Mr. Speaker, let me tell the people of Saskatchewan on behalf of the employees of the Rocanville association of the actions of this government, within two years following the takeover of the Rocanville mine by the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan. Mr. Speaker, the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan, a Saskatchewan government Crown corporation, unilaterally and arbitrarily removed the profit-sharing plan which Hudson's Bay Mining and Smelting had installed and thus deprived the Rocanville employees of an average of \$400 per year per employee. With recent increases in potash prices and thus greater profitability of potash mines, today's value of that benefit would be even greater than \$00 per year per employee. PCS replaced the profit-sharing plan with a dental plan at a cost of about \$200 per year per employee.

Mr. Speaker, the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan unilaterally and arbitrarily cancelled the housing assistance plan which had been instituted by Hudson's Bay Mining and Smelting and substituted nothing in return. Mr. Speaker, there would have been an indirect benefit, not only to the employees but to our community. This was taken away by the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan by the Government of Saskatchewan and I say by the Premier of Saskatchewan.

Mr. Speaker, PCS unilaterally and arbitrarily substantially reduced the scholarship program for employees' children which had been installed by Hudson's Bay Mining and Smelting and again substituted nothing in return.

The Rocanville employees association on behalf of these employees of the Rocanville Division of the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan suggest that these two actions

could possibly constitute unfair labor practices by the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan. Again, a provincial government Crown corporation contrary to the provisions of The Saskatchewan Trade Union Act.

Mr. Speaker, further by its own figures and when I say its own figures I refer to the Annual Report of the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan, the Rocanville employees produced 700 per cent more potash per employee than Lanigan; 35 per cent more potash per employee than Cory. And yet PCS insists that its Rocanville employees should be paid less than its employees at Cory and Lanigan. Mr. Speaker, all the employees in the Rocanville Division of PCS are asking for is 6.2 per cent increase per year. They are asking for a two-year contract commencing May 1, 1979, which would constitute a wage increase of 12.4 per cent. Mr. Speaker, the request of this independent association seems fair to me. What does not seem fair is that this government, the Premier and the minister responsible for the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan seem unwilling to pay the Rocanville employees the same salaries as they do the employees of Lanigan and Cory. Mr. Speaker, is that because Cory and Lanigan employees pay union dues to the Saskatchewan Federation of Labour and the locally based independent bargaining association, the Rocanville employees association do not? I ask you, is this the way the government forces independent associations to affiliate and become part of the multinational unions? Mr. Speaker, obviously this government does not know how to handle the government-management-labor relations.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the Assembly for this time to present my views, the views of the opposition and, I suggest the views of the people of Saskatchewan. Accordingly, I will be opposing the main motion and supporting the amendment.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: – Hear, hear!

MR. J.G. PEPPER (Weyburn): – Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I find it a rather tough act to follow after listening yesterday afternoon to the hon. member for Moosomin (Mr. Birkbeck) and again this morning. But I was always taught, Mr. Speaker, by my parents to whom I had a great deal of respect, that if you find it difficult to find some good or if you cannot find agreements in remarks made by a person, just say nothing about them at all. So, Mr. Speaker, I say it is rather difficult so I will make no further comments.

It is a pleasure for me to take part in this throne speech debate but before I turn to the main text of my remarks, I would like to say a few words about certain members of this Assembly.

Mr. Speaker, the mover and seconder of this motion deserve to be complimented on the thorough and the capable manner in which they led off the throne speech debate. The hon. member for Regina North-West (Mr. Solomon) and the hon. member for Cut Knife-Lloydminster (Mr. Long) follow in the footsteps of some pretty imposing figures in Saskatchewan politics. The former minister of agriculture, Mr. Toby Nollet, Mr. Miro Kwasnica and the hon. Ed Whelan, were all members of this Legislative Assembly during my own term in office. They were hard working and effective MLAs and, Mr. Speaker, their successors are maintaining that tradition.

I would like to say a few words about the member for Saskatoon Westmount (Mr. Brockelbank), if you will permit me. As you know, I occupied the Speaker's Chair for the first three days of this session and have from time to time occupied your Chair in past sessions, I have a keen awareness of the difficult and demanding job you perform on

each normal sitting day of this House. Mr. Speaker, I want to say you have performed your duties in such a way as to both enhance the high regard members have for Mr. Speaker and to maintain the quality of performance people have come to associate with the name Brockelbank.

I also want to congratulate the new members of the Executive Council. I know the members for Regina Lakeview (Mr. McArthur), Prince Albert-Duck Lake (Mr. Hammersmith), Morse (Mr. Gross) and the Quill Lakes (Mr. Koskie) constituencies because they bring to our provincial cabinet experience, enthusiasm and understanding. I wish them well in their portfolios.

I would also like to congratulate the newly-elected Leader of the Conservative Party of Saskatchewan and the Conservative leader in the Assembly, the member for Souris-Cannington (Mr. Berntson). I wish them well in their capacities as leaders of the opposition as we enter the 1980s, perhaps the 1990s as well and beyond and, Mr. Speaker, now it is towards the future that we should be looking as we enter this new session of the legislature.

People all across this province can see that there is a real optimism in Saskatchewan. People are confident about the future and Mr. Speaker, they have every right to be. Every economic indicator points to the direction of continued growth and economic stability. Every assessment of our health and social security system places our province way out in front of other jurisdictions. Every annual report of our government departments and Crown corporations proclaim with pride, Mr. Speaker, that Saskatchewan people and the organizations they have built are setting new records of performance and efficiency. Nowhere is this climate of confidence and success more evident than in my own constituency of Weyburn.

This afternoon, Mr. Speaker, I will be attending, along with the hon. Mr. Snyder (Minister of Labour), the hon. Mr. MacMurchy (Minister of Agriculture) and I believe the hon. Mr. Smishek (Minister of Municipal Affairs (Urban)), the laying of a cornerstone of a new provincial office building and downtown commercial redevelopment known as the Weyburn Square. The new mall will contain 28 commercial retail stores, including a 45,000 square foot Hudson's Bay Company department store. The mall is very quickly nearing completion with an official opening slated for March, 1980. The three storey provincial building which is also part of the complex, Mr. Speaker, will be completed in July, and will house such agencies as Sask Tel, the Power Corporation, the Crop Insurance Board, the department of education, tourism and renewable resources, agriculture, municipal affairs and a number of others.

At this time, I want to pay tribute now to the long hours of hard work put in by Her Worship, Mayor Butters, and the current and past members of the City Council of Weyburn in making the entire Weyburn square project a great success.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: – Hear, hear!

MR. PEPPER: – I also want to acknowledge the policy of this New Democratic Party government, Mr. Speaker, on urban downtown redevelopment. The Blakeney government is currently working on the massive Cornwall redevelopment in the core area of Regina. A major provincial project has just been completed in downtown Saskatoon and one is underway in Prince Albert.

I say to you, Mr. Speaker, in our society today, our cities are becoming more and more

areas in need of attention by senior governments. We have seen what can happen to the downtown areas in United States, cities like Chicago, Detroit and Cleveland, where in the 1960s urban decline made the downtown areas of those cities and others that are smaller in size – you would almost say unfit places for human beings to live. They soon become very degraded and this is not the way we want to do it here in Saskatchewan.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to be a part of a government that has a policy of making our cities clean, safe and beautiful places in which to live.

I am proud to be a part of a government that realizes there is more to Saskatchewan than the two largest urban centres and has extended to the people of cities the size of Weyburn the same kind of financial and technical support available as on the Cornwall Centre development here in Regina.

The new \$8 million downtown mall redevelopment in Weyburn is only a part of the improved provincial services available to the constituents of Weyburn riding.

Since being returned to power in 1971, the New Democratic Party government has made an effort to decentralize the operation of the provincial Crown corporations, the government departments and their agencies. I agree, Mr. Speaker, with that move. I do not see why people in the Weyburn area or similar areas should have to travel to Regina or phone long distance to deal with their own provincial government problems. That policy of decentralization has brought government closer to the people and that's what we want.

Since 1971, the following services have been made available in Weyburn:

1. A regional office of the Department of Agriculture was set up in 1974. It is one of six across the province that employees 15 to 20 people each;
2. A regional office of the Saskatchewan Crop Insurance Corporation has been set up in Weyburn to provide better and faster service for farmers;
3. A regional supervisor of the FarmStart corporation has been moved to Weyburn;
4. A land bank counsellor is now located in Weyburn.
5. Department of Culture and Youth has opened an office in Weyburn. Cultural, ethnic and amateur sports organizations now have better access to the services and grants available through that department;
6. The alcoholism commission has established an office in Weyburn;
7. Department of Education has opened a regional office in the city of Weyburn. Teachers and school board members have both used the services now offered local;
8. The South-East Region Community College has been established due largely to the work of local people. The province supplies field representatives and on average about 80 per cent of the operating revenue to each of the province's community colleges.

So you see, Mr. Speaker, these new offices and agencies are needed in the Weyburn area and in other areas as well because, like so many other areas of the province, our

population is on the increase. Between 1969 and 1979, the population of the city of Weyburn increased from 8,530 to 9,321 and according to Trade and Commerce magazine the population of the Weyburn trading area in the same 10 years, Mr. Speaker, went up from 43,000 to 50,000. So, Mr. Speaker, clearly the Blakeney government has been bringing the kids home.

The growth in the population is a reflection of the buoyant economy of recent years. The value of commercial and residential construction has been at record levels. In 1968, \$1.2 million of construction was undertaken in Weyburn. In 1978 the figure was \$7.7 million. Retail trade was worth \$13.8 million in 1968. Last year Weyburn stores took in \$54.7 million in retail sales. So you see, Mr. Speaker, the value of manufactured goods produced in Weyburn was worth \$1.5 million in 1968. Ten years later the value of manufactured products was worth \$8.5 million.

We have a Weyburn Credit Union. It is constructing a new \$1.7 million bank and office complex. The co-op association has just expanded its facilities to include a new home centre which retails lumber, home supplies and hardware. A major motor hotel in Weyburn has a \$1.5 million expansion announced and a new shopping plaza is being built in the northeast corner of the city of Weyburn. So you see, Mr. Speaker, the busy pace of construction, the brisk activity in the oil fields and the service industries has brought about a situation of full employment in the Weyburn area.

Mr. Jim MacKenzie, manager of the Weyburn Canada Employment Centre has said recently that the Weyburn district has work available in the construction and farm-labor areas and has a shortage of certain skilled craftsmen and tradesmen. So I ask you, Mr. Speaker, to look at the facts – full employment, a healthy retail sector, new construction by the business community, a growing urban and rural population, confidence in the future. The Weyburn constituency, like the whole of Saskatchewan has been reaping the economic and social benefits of two terms of New Democratic Party government.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I was extremely pleased to hear the throne speech announce a new capital grants program to provide further financial assistance to local governments. If we look back over the years to 1974 when the urban package was introduced, we see what a financial burden the Blakeney government has lifted from municipal governments and local ratepayers. The urban package included equalization grants, unconditional operating grants and the community capital fund. In 1977, the recreational and cultural facility grants program began and in 1978 revenue sharing started.

So, Mr. Speaker, I have many communities in my riding like Stoughton, Fillmore, Cedoux, Griffin, Tyvan, Colfax and others which have been able to undertake very worthwhile projects because of the Blakeney government's grant programs. All across Saskatchewan there are paved streets, water and sewer systems, new firefighting equipment, new skating and curling rinks, new street lights, and countless other civic improvements – thanks to the provincial government's increased funding for local governments.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I would like to say a few words on the subject of agriculture and specifically grain handling and transportation. In my constituency of Weyburn there is a committee at work in the Handsworth-Corning-Bernersyde are fighting to keep their rail service. The 39 permit holders at Handsworth delivered more than 294,000 bushels of grain to their elevator in the 1977-78 crop year. At Corning there are

permit holders. They delivered 860,000 bushels last year. A good deal more grain would be delivered, Mr. Speaker, if the railway would plough the snow and service the line all winter.

My own feeling on the subject of rail line abandonment is this, Mr. Speaker. If we allow the railways to close any more branch lines, we'll be faced with more plugged elevators at surrounding delivery points, deteriorating grid roads and highways, a substantial increase in farm size and a general decline in rural Saskatchewan. That's what can happen.

For too long the railways have been allowed to run roughshod over western Canada, and I say to you, Mr. Speaker, it is time that it is brought to an end.

I wonder, Mr. Speaker, if the boards of directors of our two major railways know the story of George Stephen, the first press president of the Canadians Pacific Railway. If not, they should get a book on Canadians history and read about this very interesting figure in our nation's past.

George Stephen, Mr. Speaker, came to Montreal as a penniless, 21 year old Scottish immigrant in 1850 and over the course of the next three decades built a huge business empire that included the Bank of Montreal and the Canadians Pacific Railway.

However, it was not for his financial wheeling and dealing that Stephen deserves to be remembered, but rather for his total commitment to hold up his end of the agreement to provide Canada with a railway from the Atlantic to the Pacific.

The private railway syndicate which George Stephen headed had the contract with the federal government to build the Canadian Pacific Railway across the Canadian Shield, the Prairies and through the Rockies to the Pacific coast. The value of the contract was apparent to Stephen and his financial backers. The new Canadian Pacific Railway Company has given millions of acres of land and millions of dollars of public money to finance the construction of the route. Once built, the railway would have a monopoly on all traffic and be extremely profitable.

However problems developed with the company's cash flow. The major backers had to reach deep into their own cash reserves. As the tracks stretched west into the difficult terrain of the Rockies, the Canadian Pacific Railway found itself in near bankruptcy several times. At one point Mr. Stephen pledged his own house in Montreal and all its contents in exchange for funds to keep the Canadian Pacific Railway solvent. Financial agents came and inventoried all his possessions – his art collection, also the family furniture, the linen, the china and even the silverware. He put it all up in a last desperate bid to keep his company afloat, to keep the railway crews laying track. Stephen himself described the move as simply absurd on any kind of business grounds. But it helped save the railway.

I say to you, Mr. Speaker, I wonder what the result would be today if we asked the men who control the Canadian Pacific Railway and the Canadian National Railway to take a page from Mr. George Stephen's book and make a similar sacrifice? Would Ian Sinclair, the chairman and chief executive officer of the Canadian Pacific Limited put up the title to his home, in an effort to maintain prairie branch lines? Would Robert Bandeen, the current president of Canadian National Railways, mortgage all his personal belongings to insure that the statutory Crow's Nest Pass freight rate remains in force? I ask you

those questions, Mr. Speaker. I say it seems very unlikely. It occurs to me that Mr. Bandeen's house and Mr. Sinclair's house and the contents are in no immediate danger at all. In fact, Mr. Bandeen and Mr. Sinclair have time and time again sent their representatives to petition and pressure the transport commission into allowing more rail line abandonment, and to have the federal government put an end to the Crow's Nest Pass rates.

Mr. Speaker, this is the kind of commitment which exists in the board rooms of our major railway companies today. The great acts of will power, of which the building of the CPR (Canadian Pacific Railway) is such a good example, will find no support there. And that is a sad, sad thing. So I say, Mr. Speaker, I think it is well to remember this page of history from Mr. George Stephen's book.

Now, Mr. Speaker, with more time than we have during this debate today, I would have liked to comment on the resource policy of the government, on the oil industry in my own area, on the vast improvements made recently to Highway No. 13 and 33 and those needed on Highway No. 35, and a number of other issues. I know my colleagues will be touching on other areas which I have not touched on, but I think I have said sufficient, Mr. Speaker, that you will know from what I have said I will be supporting the motion and voting against the amendment.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: – Hear, hear!

MR. D.G. BANDA (Redberry): – Mr. Speaker, it's a pleasure for me to take part in the throne speech debate, and I would first of all like to compliment my colleagues, the member for Regina North-West (Mr. Solomon), on the confidence he displayed in moving the address in reply, and the member for Cut Knife-Lloydminster (Mr. Long) on his presentation in seconding the motion. John Solomon and Bob Long clearly demonstrated on Monday that they while only newly elected members will have a long stay in the House and will certainly be forces to be reckoned with in the years to come.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: – Hear, hear!

MR. BANDA: – Mr. Speaker, I'd also like to take a moment now to make mention of another newly-elected member, this one in my part of the province. The people of Prince Albert and area recently went to the polls in a federal by-election. They displayed the kind of good political judgment they have always displayed provincially by electing Stan Hovdebo to the House of Commons.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: – Hear, hear!

MR. BANDA: – Mr. Speaker, I want to congratulate Stan as our new member of parliament for Prince Albert. Mr. Speaker, I also want to extend my congratulations to Mr. Grant Devine on his winning the leadership of the Conservative Party of Saskatchewan. While it's a little like being put in charge of the viper cages at the zoo, Mr. Speaker, I wish Mr. Devine a long and happy tenure as opposition leader. Mr. Speaker, I would also like to lend my voice to those of my colleagues in congratulating the new members of the Executive Councils, Mr. Doug McArthur, Reg Gross, Jerry Hammersmith, and Murray Koskie, who join the cabinet of one of the best and most progressive governments in North America.

Mr. Speaker, I'm pleased to be here today as the representative for Redberry constituency. It permits me to communicate to the government the support that exists

among my constituents for the measures announced in the Speech from the Throne. As for myself, I am proud to be part of a government that is prepared to provide greatly increased financial assistance to local governments with the new capital grants program; a government prepared to increase assistance to the elderly and handicapped by expanding the new homecare program, and a government prepared to insure health care is maintained throughout the province by making improvements to the hospitals in Saskatoon, the Battlefords, and Regina, and renovations to medical facilities in smaller communities such as the new hospital that was built in Borden, and the new level III care home that was built in Hafford in my constituency. Mr. Speaker, members will remember that during the last session a large group of senior citizens from Hafford travelled here to Regina and visited this Chamber for an afternoon. They enjoyed their visit to the historic building, and I want to thank Walter Smishek, John Kowalchuk, and Mike Feschuk for the kind words when they spoke to that group.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: – Mr. Speaker, the throne speech made several announcements which will be of interest to the senior citizens in my riding and across this province. It talked about expanding and developing the new home care program and I look forward to these developments. I would like to take a few minutes to discuss this government's continued progress in providing services to senior citizens, services in many cases which are also of benefit to shut-ins and the handicapped.

During the past session of the Saskatchewan legislature a bill was passed returning the school tax portion of the property taxes to senior citizens who were living in their own homes. During that session subsidies were raised for senior citizens in nursing homes receiving level II and level III care. These achievements are only the most recent in a long list dating from the election of the New Democratic Party back in 1971.

New programs for senior citizens started by the Blakeney government include the Saskatchewan Income Plan initiated in 1975 to provide decent financial security to senior citizens. The Blakeney government has also provided regular increases in subsidies to residents of nursing homes, hundreds of low rental units for senior citizens have been built; the hearing aid plan; the prescription drug plan; Saskatchewan Aids to Independent Living; the senior citizens provincial council and the office of the provincial gerontologist; larger community service grants for senior citizens; larger construction grants to nursing homes and improvements to the Saskatchewan Assistance Plan; all designed to give our senior citizens a better and more independent way of life. In 1971-72 the provincial government spent a total of \$5.5 million on services to senior citizens. In 1978-79 the services provided were worth in excess of \$137 million – an increase made without sacrificing the sound financial position this government has established.

I would just like to take a few minutes to talk about a few of the projects which have been completed and others which are going ahead in my own constituency of Redberry.

I am pleased to say that housing valued at over \$1.8 billion has been completed or is under construction in my constituency. The Saskatchewan Housing Corporation has provided over \$350 million or about 20 per cent of that total cost. This is money spent to keep rural Saskatchewan strong, Mr. Speaker, contrary to what those opposite recite of the doom and gloom in rural Saskatchewan. Under the residential rehabilitation program from November 1973 to August 1979, 177 loans were made for a total of over \$500,000. Almost half of that amount – \$248,190 was forgivable – more funds

to provide incentive to rural development. A total of 697 households have received senior citizens home repair grants from September 1973 to August 1979. The total estimated grant is almost \$300,000. These grants, Mr. Speaker, provide substantial help to senior citizens. This mean, in communities like Blaine Lake for example, over \$72,000 has been distributed through 167 grant. In Hafford, \$69,358 has been distributed through 161 grants – more spent on behalf of rural people.

There is also an impressive amount of highway construction under way in my constituency, improvements necessary to maintain a strong rural economy. Capital and maintenance grants for construction totalling just over \$7 million were budgeted for projects in 1979, Mr. Speaker. I won't mention all of those projects. There are too many.

Mr. Speaker, to do just to all of the programs stated in the last eight years which are of benefit to senior citizens would take more time than I have this afternoon. I would however like to point out that the funding for senior citizens services has increased by 25 times since the Blakeney government came into office.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: – Hear, hear!

MR. BANDA: – The kind of financial support to people-oriented programs has been made possible for really only one reasons, Mr. Speaker, and that's because of our resource policy of this government. I just want to say a few words about a part of that policy now, Mr. Speaker.

In 1977-78, the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan grew to be one of the largest producers of potash in North America and the largest potash exporter in the world. In '78-79, the corporation's gross sales exceeded \$210 million; up from \$107 million the year before. The potash corporation realized a net profit in 1978-79 of \$46.4 million and this, Mr. Speaker, after pouring \$48.9 million into the provincial treasury through royalties and taxes. That's a far cry from going broke, as we heard in the potash debate a few years ago from members opposite. In the summer of '79, expansions at Cory and Rocanville Divisions increased the potash corporation's production capacity by 500,000 metric tons. And on November 1 this year, that corporation announced plans to expand its production from 3.9 million short tons in '78-79 to an estimated 12.5 million short tons over the next 10 years, and investment of approximately \$2.5 billion in the Saskatchewan economy, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

The Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan not only provides, once again, the viability of public ownership, it reinforces the stabilizing effect public ownership has on the province's economic climate.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, the Conservatives in Manitoba, in Ottawa and here in Saskatchewan, keep talking about encouraging investment. And it is true if investment is up, the economy is healthy, working people have jobs and those with capital to employ have without obvious confidence in the government we have in Saskatchewan. If investment is down, the opposite is true. The business climate is poor, unemployment becomes a serious problem and potential investors who would otherwise be providing the finances necessary to expand businesses would certainly not be here. They would condemn the government for economic mismanagement and invest their money elsewhere.

So, Mr. Deputy Speaker, we arrive at the question, what is the Conservative's plan to

provide investment? Well, Mr. Speaker, it appears that their solution is raise the interest rates, then raise the interest rates, then raise them again. And what is the effect of this Tory policy, Mr. Speaker? It has hurt small businessmen by raising the cost of credit and reducing sales and it has hurt farmers who cannot afford to borrow money at the current prime rate of 15 per cent and worst of all, Mr. Speaker, these high Tory interest rates have thrown thousands of people out of work.

The Blakeney government is not afraid to invest in its own province keeping our provincial economy sound and avoiding the boom and bust cycles and massive unemployment other provinces very often experience, massive unemployment, Mr. Speaker, which is shown in the national unemployment rate. Recent figures released by Statistics Canada show that the national unemployment rate is high and is rising. From September to October of '79, it jumped from 7.1 per cent to 7.4 per cent. In Saskatchewan on the other hand, the October unemployment rate was 4.1 per cent; our rate has consistently remained at about half the national rate.

A sound economy is no fluke. It requires that a government be viewed often from outside its provincial borders as a good manager of the province's affairs. Mr. Deputy Speaker, it is well-known that the New Democratic Party administration in Saskatchewan has that reputation.

The subject of good managements, Mr. Speaker, brings to mind more than just financial judgment. A good manager is one who recognizes his responsibilities and fulfills his obligations. Mr. Speaker, there is one obligation that this government has not been allowed to fulfil. In 1977, a negotiated agreement was reached between the Indian people and the province of Saskatchewan and the Government of Canada to fulfil outstanding entitlements. We are awaiting leadership from the new federal government to proceed with a settlement according to the terms of that agreement. It is time for Mr. Epp (Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development) to start meeting his responsibilities as Indian affairs minister instead of acting like a provisional junior civil servant.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, Indian people are patient and reasonable. They are trying to settle entitlements in such a way as to avoid any hardship to users of Crown land. Indian people on many occasions have stated they don't want present users to be treated like Indians. Bearing in mind the Indian people want a settlement that is fair to all, there is no reason why the federal minister should not begin to discharge his responsibilities in fulfilling the 1977 agreement. Saskatchewan believes, as do the Indian people, that this long outstanding debt must be cleared up and settled once and for all. Surely the federal Minister of Indian Affairs, the trustee for Indian people, must begin to act without delay. We urge the federal minister and his government to work with Indian people and the Government of Saskatchewan to fulfil outstanding commitments and obligations. And I urge those members opposite, Mr. Speaker, to choose and try to work with the federal government and convince them to meet those obligations rather than to create confrontation with the departments and with the Indian people.

Saskatchewan I want to turn, for a few minutes, to discussing agriculture. I was very pleased to see once again in this throne speech that agriculture played a prominent part. Agriculture has always been a priority of the Blakeney government. That's a good thing, Mr. Speaker, because if western farmers had to rely on Ottawa, they would be in a sorry shape indeed.

Earlier this week, Mr. Speaker, the new Clark government marked its sixth month in office and look at the list of pronouncements in the area of agriculture. The Port of Churchill, which in an average year handled 25 million bushels of prairie grain, much of it from northern Saskatchewan, has been written off as a luxury. The statutory Crow's Nest Pass freight rates, which are worth over \$320 million a year to prairie grain growers have been put on the trading block. They are to be traded away, presumably in exchange for having the railroads abide by the provisions of the Railway Act, something which they should have been doing anyway for the last 50 years. And most recently in Manitoba where farmers are trucking flax out of quota, it's costing them \$1 a bushel, Mr. Speaker. It's a reality; it's not a scare tactic on behalf of members on this side of the House.

The quota system, which has, for more than 35 years, ensured farmers of a fair and equitable grain delivery system, is now to be abandoned, undermined by the back-room friendship of the Clark Tories and the grain barons of the Winnipeg Commodity Exchange. The allocation of box cares is to be taken away from the Canadian Wheat Board which allotted cares in a fair and non-partisan manner. Car allocation is to be surrendered to a former Alberta Tory politician who can use his power to dispense patronage and reward his political friends.

Country elevators, which are the backbone of our grain handling system, have been threatened with extinction. We know, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that grain elevators are the cornerstones of the economic activities that go in rural communities. But the new federal grain co-ordinator of the Tory government tells us that's baloney. He says rip the delivery points out, Mr. Speaker. That's Tory agriculture policy and it spells disaster for western farmers. The choice is clear: the Tories and their systematic attack on orderly marketing, the family farm and our way of life, and the New Democratic Party and our ongoing support for the family farm, protection of orderly marketing and continuing commitment to the preservation of the social fabric of rural Saskatchewan, I choose the latter, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: – Hear, hear!

MR. BANDA: – Mr. Deputy Speaker, I would like to express a few words of concern about the price increases which, I feel, are out of control. Overall prices went up 9 per cent in 1978. The cost of food went up even more, some 22 per cent. Supermarkets and other industries have been earning record high profits while we pay record high prices. In 1977, Weston food profits went up 85 per cent; department store profits went up 89 per cent – 89 per cent on one year, Mr. Deputy Speaker! International economic mismanagement has made things worse, the result being the falling dollar, even higher prices and a still unacceptable rate of unemployment. For every three cents in value that our dollar drops compared to the U.S. dollar, the consumer price index rises 1 per cent. Not only is this an issue related to consumers and the cost of living but it is also an agricultural issue. The reason for this 1 per cent increase in consumer price index is that Canada imports so much food, one-fifth of what we eat. Food is a very important part of the consumer price index, yet Conservative policies do not encourage agriculture. They hit farmers with higher rates and higher fuel prices. What is the Clark government's response to the runaway prices which Canadians face? The record of the Progressive Conservative government since assuming office has shown their political incompetence and deception.

During the election the Tories said they would reverse the Liberal government's do-nothing stance on rising prices. The economy was touted as the major concern during

the campaign, yet economic matters were not even included in the list of government priorities for this fall session. The Clark government's incompetence and lack of concern about the issue of rising prices was best illustrated when the new Minister of Finance approved a recent increase in the interest rates by the Bank of Canada. Perhaps, Mr. Speaker, he confused it with the popularity of their party in the recent Gallup poll. This was the tenth interest rate increase in the last eighteen months and the third since Clark took office.

Mr. Speaker, members opposite, if they don't want to cripple the family farm as they so talk, they had better do something about the federal government in Ottawa and its agriculture policies and its economic policies.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to talk about many more subjects that relate to my constituency but I see that my radio time is moving on. I just want to end by saying that we in Saskatchewan have something to be proud of. We have a government with records to be proud of. Mr. Speaker, I choose the NDP route. I will support the main motion and oppose the amendment.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: – Hear, hear!

MR. P. PREBBLE (Saskatoon-Sutherland): – Mr. Deputy Speaker, it is an honor for me to rise in this House on behalf of the people of Saskatoon Sutherland constituency and speak in support of the throne speech.

I would like to join other members in congratulating the mover and seconder of the throne speech for their thoughtful remarks and for the fine contribution they have made to this debate. Their comments not only demonstrated their personal competence but also the strong record of this government in improving the day to day lives of people in Saskatchewan. My colleagues have dealt very comprehensively with many of the initiatives that have been taken in recent years. Our government can point with pride to the recent expansion in health services, the expansion in the children's dental care program and the establishment of home care program services to assist senior citizens to stay in their own homes rather than having to go into an unfamiliar nursing home situation. I am delighted to see that this throne speech calls for the expansion of the home care programs so that meals on wheels, home nursing care and other services will be extended to benefit more and more Saskatchewan people who are in need of this support.

In general, I am proud to see the continuing commitment of this government to expand health care services at a time when Conservative governments in other parts of the country are putting health-care on the chopping block. Mr. Speaker, services such as medicare and the expansion in health services have been possible in considerable part due to our government's resource policies. In the near future I hope these resource revenues will be used to fund new initiatives that I feel are very much needed.

One program of special importance is the establishment of a comprehensive day care program in Saskatchewan which would provide quality day care service to all women, with the first priority being support for women who are working or who are engaged in education training of some kind or who are single parents. Mr. Speaker, 35 per cent of Saskatchewan women are active in the work force and it is estimated that at least two-thirds are working out of necessity. Several studies are now showing that women are very frequently having to continue the large majority of their responsibilities for domestic work and child care at home, in addition to any job they may have to assume.

Now I think that this puts considerable stress on many women and on many families. Inadequate day care service also limits women to the types of jobs they can hold down for they must often find something very close to home, and often something where responsibilities are not too heavy because of the additional domestic responsibilities women are still having to assume. Thus, many women often find themselves in lower paying jobs when in fact their talents really justify much better wage levels. I think, Mr. Speaker, that a major commitment in day care would be one of the best social and economic investments this government could make. It would be one of the most valuable support services for Saskatchewan families that this government could put in place. I believe our government should begin by providing day care services to its own employees and to the university and technical schools as an example to the private sector.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I want to say to the Minister of Social Services (Mr. Koskie) that I very much welcome the review of day care services announced in the throne speech and support him strongly in his efforts to expand community and parent participation in the day care field.

I also look forward to the new steps planned by the workers' compensation board to encourage safer working conditions in Saskatchewan. On January 1 the new workers' compensation legislation will come into effect. This should improve rates of compensation for many injured workers who in the past have found their compensation earnings eroded by inflation. I want to say, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that I believe our next step in the field of workers' compensation should be to include farmers and farm laborers under the act so that they too may receive coverage in the event of injury on the job. There are 18,000 farm laborers in this province and I think that a government with a progressive record of labor legislation, as we have, has a responsibility to protect the income of those who are injured while working on farms, who after all are the backbone of our economy.

There are also many areas where Saskatchewan's extensive insurance system still needs improvement. One of the most urgent is the inadequate coverage now given to homemakers in the event that they are injured in an automobile accident. In contrast to persons who are working, and in the event of injury receive benefits for up to two years, homemakers are entitled only 12 weeks of benefits. This situation is clearly inadequate and should be rectified so that homemakers receive the same benefits as all wage earners.

In fact, Mr. Speaker, I hope that before our term of office is up, we shall see introduced in this legislature a program of universal sickness and accident insurance. We all know that our friends and neighbors are frequently injured or suffer sickness, and yet their health problem is not necessarily directly related to an accident at work or an injury while driving their car. Yet in many cases, the accident or sickness may have resulted from stress and body strain over years of working on the job or in the home. The loss of income is just as real, yet at present, coverage is not provided. This source of insecurity, namely what to do in the event of an injury that is not directly work related and thus not covered by income compensation, is a problem our government should commit itself to resolve for the benefit of all Saskatchewan people. I am confident that we will take action in this area.

Mr. Speaker, I would now like to address myself to the resource policies of our government. Many of the current health and community service projects our government has undertaken have become possible because of increased resource

revenues that our policies have obtained for the people of Saskatchewan. The source of funding for some of the new social programs I have suggested would again in part be our resource revenues.

Perhaps the most important long-term benefit of our resource policy is that Saskatchewan people are finally gaining more control over the Saskatchewan economy. Saskatchewan people are making more of the investment and management decisions. Revenues are staying in Saskatchewan and being reinvested in Saskatchewan. I believe our government's investment in potash and oil is one of the major reasons Saskatchewan is not experiencing the economic difficulties of most other provinces.

The Conservatives told us the private companies would pull up stakes and go elsewhere but they are still here, except that now they are here on our terms – terms set by the people of Saskatchewan. And those terms are, Mr. Speaker, that a large portion of the resource revenues from development go to the people of Saskatchewan. When I look at resource-rich Ontario under a Tory government and then when I consider that Saskatchewan collects more than 10 times as much revenue from resource development as Ontario does, I understand the full implications of the money we would have lost if Saskatchewan was being governed by a Conservative Party.

Mr. Speaker, I look forward to the day that Saskatchewan will control 50 per cent or more of the potash industry. In fact I hope that it will be much more than 50 per cent, Mr. Speaker, and I hope that we will initiate a major public investment in the development of heavy oil resources as well. I am convinced, Mr. Speaker, that public investment should be the cornerstone for protecting the public interest in new resource development initiatives in oil and potash. Attempting to regulate the private sector when large multinationals are involved is often ineffective and thus, public ownership is the only effective vehicle. Under regulation, the large companies will sometimes refuse to pay their taxes as the private potash companies have clearly demonstrated or they will hide their profits in federal tax writeoff schemes as companies like Shell Oil have demonstrated in not paying a single penny in taxes on profits of \$150 million this past year. The multinationals can channel their profits for reinvestment outside the country, as INCO (International Nickel Company of Canada Ltd.) has demonstrated in Sudbury layoffs, and as can be seen by the lack of Canadian research and development done in sectors of the economy dominated by foreign firms.

In contrast public ownership allows profits to go to the people of Saskatchewan and allows those profits to be reinvested in the public interest. It provides potential for occupational health and safety regulations to be implemented in the most direct way possible by those who set the standards in the first place, and who should therefore be most committed to seeing them achieved. The potential is also there for health and environmental standards to be upheld without a large monitoring bureaucracy. These are many of the benefits that public ownership offers, and it is for these reasons I would welcome a major government initiative in the oil industry in Saskatchewan. Moreover, all steps possible should be taken to expand our oil refining capacity, so that we can price and refine our own oil, guarantee a supply for Saskatchewan people, and sell it at prices below the rising Canadian price for oil.

I want to turn for a few minutes to health and environment protection in the resource sector and say, Mr. Speaker, that I do not in any way view public ownership as an assurance that health and the environment will be fully protected. The potential for excellent protection through public ownership is there, but the end result is dependent

on the attitude of the Crown corporation involved. Eldorado Nuclear for example is a federal Crown corporation under a Conservative government at the present time, and yet it merely displays the principles of capitalism being applied to a publicly owned company. Witness radioactive waste leaking from Eldorado's uranium refinery disposal site into Lake Ontario. Witness the failure of Eldorado to take prompt action in limiting hazardous chemical emissions from its Port Hope refinery site. Witness the failure of Eldorado to undertake a health study into the effects on Port Hope residents of radioactive gas exposure despite concern by local doctors of a seemingly high incidence of concern in the Port Hope area. Eldorado Nuclear's record is not only a good example of the fact that public ownership in and of itself does not assure health and environment protection, but it should serve as a clear warning to the Saskatchewan government of what we can likely expect from Eldorado Nuclear's performance if they should be allowed to construct another refinery just outside of Saskatoon. I am opposed to the location of that refinery, Mr. Speaker, near Saskatoon or for that matter in any part of Saskatchewan, but particularly in any area close to a populated centre or agricultural centre.

Just as federal Crown corporations have fallen far short of the mark, the Saskatchewan Mining and Development Corporation has also fallen short. Even if one accepts the decision to proceed with uranium expansion, a decision I disagree with, it is surely time the corporation adopted tough guidelines refusing to sell uranium to any country that has not signed the non-proliferation treaty. It is time to deal in a concrete way with the proper disposal of uranium mill railings in northern Saskatchewan, which under current methods of disposal will be a permanent source of radioactive contamination for the next 80,000 years. I urge that corporation to adopt a new policy of separating radioactive wastes out from the rest of the uranium mill tailings during the milling process, and burying the radioactive materials so they will be kept out of our environment permanently.

I also urge SMDC (Saskatchewan Mining and Development Corporation) to adopt tougher standards with regard to radiation exposure to workers. I believe the new evidence on the hazards of low level radiation clearly calls for a five-fold improvement in radiation exposure standards. Such an improvement should be taken into full consideration in the design and construction of the proposed Cluff Lake and Key Lake mines which SMDC has a share in. If this government is to put people ahead of profits, as it does in so many other areas of policy, I believe such initiatives are mandatory.

In this regard, Mr. Speaker, I want to comment the Minister of the Environment (Mr. Bowerman) on his plans to introduce environmental impact assessment legislation and legislation to require the immediate clean-up of chemical spills. This legislation promises to put Saskatchewan in the forefront of environmental policy. However, the real test of the environment impact assessment legislation will be whether it merely places existing environmental policy into a legislative framework or whether it becomes a foundation for the adoption of new principles for the protection of the environment. I have confidence that it will at least be a beginning in doing the latter, Mr. Speaker.

I hope that among the new principles will be six that I feel particularly strongly about. The first is full public access to information obtained from the monitoring of emissions and other forms of environment pollution. The second is provision of greater public input in establishing detailed terms of reference for environmental inquiries. The third is the need for an extension to the current 30-day limit public interest groups usually have to analyze assessment reports that have often taken years to compile. The fourth is

for increased emphasis on considering not only environmental but also the social impact of major resource development projects. Fifth, Mr. Speaker, I hope the new legislation will place the onus of proof on the proponent of the development to prove his project is safe rather than the existing structure which by its nature, puts the burden of proof on those questioning the development to prove it may be harmful.

Finally what I most hope for in the new legislation, Mr. Speaker, is a provision that will no longer leave us dependent on the private companies to do the studies on whether the environment will be damaged from a certain kind of development. That, Mr. Speaker, has all the same pitfalls we experienced when we left it to the private oil companies in 1973 to tell us there were over 350 years of conventional oil supplies in Canada when in fact, there were more like 40. The environmental impact assessment studies should be completed by an independent agency, contracted by the government, with the government in turn charging the proponent of the development for the costs involved. Only then will we have an independent research work which we can have some confidence in. The new environmental impact assessment legislation will not only be important in setting guidelines for any uranium development that might regrettably proceed, but it will also be important in helping to regulate the development of our heavy oil reserves along the Alberta-Saskatchewan border.

The commercial opportunities offered by heavy oil development are indeed exciting as my colleague, the member for Cut Knife-Lloydminster (Mr. Long) will certainly attest to. However, without very tough standards limiting pollution from chemical wastes, sulphur dioxide and nitrogen oxides, a great asset could become a liability for many Saskatchewan people. We have heard a great deal in the news these past few weeks about the problems of acid rain being experienced in eastern Canada. Precisely the same problem could face Saskatchewan if prompt action is not taken.

Acid rain is formed when sulphur dioxide emissions which can be blown hundreds of miles on the wind, mix with precipitation and fall in the form of rain. Such pollution could cause widespread damage to Saskatchewan's forest resources, lakes and fisheries. To my knowledge agricultural land would be in far less danger since terrain south of the DNS (Department of Northern Saskatchewan) has a great natural buffer to acidification – a much greater buffer than does land to the north of the DNS line. Acid rain could thus threaten such valuable Saskatchewan resources as the Clearwater Valley and the Meadow Lake Provincial Park.

Saskatchewan has the example of Ontario as a warning where the lack of action under a quarter of a century of Tory government has resulted in 140 dead lakes, with some 5,000 lakes being threatened.

The acid rain problem for Saskatchewan is complicated by two factors, Mr. Speaker. First much of the problem will come from the Alberta side of the border. The first tar sands project is already emitting over 100 tons per day of sulphur dioxide and most of that is blowing Saskatchewan's way. The Cold Lake heavy oil plant will release an estimated 70 tons of sulphur dioxide per day and pump millions of gallons of waste water each day into either the Beaver or the North Saskatchewan River.

The second complicating factor is that the sources of pollution will all be close together. It is one thing to have one plant releasing 70 tons of sulphur dioxide per day. It is quite another to have five or six plants each releasing such pollution levels, but there is a very good chance that five or six plants will in fact, be built in close proximity. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I believe it is essential for Saskatchewan to seek pollution

standards, not only for individual plants but for the Alberta-Saskatchewan heavy oil region as a whole.

Such standards will require the construction of expensive scrubbing equipment on each plant. Our government must first set tough standards we are prepared to adopt for our own plants and then must negotiate the adoption of these same standards with the Alberta government. I can assure you, given the record of the Alberta Tories, that will not be easy.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to close the section of my remarks dealing with environmental policy by congratulating the Minister of the Environment (Mr. Bowerman) on his recent decision to ban 2-4-5 T. In doing so he has removed the risk it poses in causing cancer, defects and miscarriages during pregnancy. Its ban is a move I regret the federal Conservative Party has not yet seen fit to adopt at a national level.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to turn briefly to agricultural policy. I want to commend the Minister of Agriculture for his courage in standing alone against the federal government and the railway companies to defend the crow rate and the Canadian Wheat Board on behalf of Saskatchewan farmers. One area of agriculture I would like to have seen more attention given to in the throne speech is the need for Saskatchewan to become more self-sufficient in agricultural production. The large majority of our vegetables consumed in Saskatchewan are imported and I am convinced that this need not be so.

I want therefore to outline three policies that I believe would greatly increase the amount of vegetables grown in Saskatchewan. I believe our government should provide assistance on the initial capital construction of large greenhouse operations built near manufacturing and resource development facilities that exhaust large amounts of waste heat. Thus greenhouses could be built next to potash mines, natural gas transmission facilities, oil and coal generating stations, brick factories and other similar operations. Waste heat from these facilities would be used as the major heat source for the greenhouse operations, allowing several acres of greenhouse vegetables to be grown on some sites. The province should also provide support to local vegetable growers who would be willing to expand their production to meet winter demand. This could be done through assistance in establishing increased storage facilities for vegetables throughout the winter, and through assistance in establishing year-round facilities for farmer's market operations in major urban centres throughout Saskatchewan.

I would like to see a permanent year-round location for the farmers' market in Saskatoon. Such a location would ensure local growers of a weekly market for their vegetables throughout the winter months and thus be an important incentive to expand production.

Mr. Speaker, I want to turn in this final section of my speech to several major urban questions which are of special concern to my constituents in Saskatchewan Sutherland.

First, and of greatest importance is the construction of the 42nd Street bridge which will be of great benefit to people in my constituency. While I fully support the construction of the bridge, Mr. Speaker, and am hopeful that our government will be able to provide some additional special funding for its construction, I continue to be in disagreement with the current proposal to run the expressway connection to the bridge

right next to the residential area in old Sutherland. I am extremely anxious to see the location of this expressway moved considerably further to the west so that there is a good buffer zone between the expressway and the residential neighborhood within my constituency.

I feel the current proposal would damage the quality of life for people living next to the expressway. noise pollution from heavy truck traffic would become a significant problem. I am also concerned about increased levels of air pollution, particularly lead. In light of recent research in Boston showing the negative effects of even extremely small increases of lead in the body, I am most concerned that the expressway not be located too near to people's homes. I am hopeful, Mr. Speaker, that upcoming discussions between myself, other provincial representatives, the city and the university will help to resolve the difficult problems surrounding the routing of this expressway, problems that I know are appreciated by all parties involved.

As all members of this House will realize, the Meewasin Valley Authority, whose legislative mandate was given the unanimous approval of this House, is under some criticism in Saskatoon and outlying areas. I remind all members of the comment made to this House during the throne debate stating that our caucus is concerned with the Meewasin Valley Authority. We are pleased with the idea. We think the project is far reaching and a general expression that the Conservative caucus is fully behind the initiatives taken by the government to set up the Meewasin Valley Authority. A statement that was made by the hon. member for Rosthern . . . (inaudible interjection) . . .

As far as our caucus is concerned, we are pleased with the idea, the project and its far-ranging thrust. Page 1949, April 23 of last year, a statement by the hon. member for Rosthern (Mr. Katzman) . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . and when we look at the vote, the vote that was taken on the various sections of this bill, we see the sections that are now under controversy – section 46 agreed to by all members, section 50 agreed to by all members as amended.

It is my view, Mr. Speaker, that the work of the Meewasin Valley Authority is central to the preservation of the river bank and the river valley. I believe it is the most promising means we have of protecting and improving the quality of life for citizens in and around Saskatoon.

Mr. Speaker, it is not possible to control undesirable developments along the river bank unless an authority exists that has the power to stop these developments. It is not possible to develop ecological preserve areas or recreational areas unless the authority has the power to purchase land and if necessary on rare occasions expropriate a power that should always be used very cautiously, but is sometimes necessary and a power that was agreed to by the opposition when they supported this piece of legislation. I want to say, Mr. Speaker, that the master plan for the river valley as it now exists is only intended to be a broad vision, the details of which can be readily changed. These details should only be implemented after the fullest consultation with local residents to take account of any concerns they might have. The authority will play a central role in protecting fragile areas such as Cranberry Flats and Beaver Creek from overuse and will help relieve the problems of many farmers who constantly have persons walking over their fields, by developing specific recreational areas along the river where persons will be encouraged to come instead of crossing a farmer's grain or potato field.

Mr. Speaker, I believe most Saskatoon people understand that it is not possible to protect and enhance the river bank and at the same time have an authority with no real power over land development. The authority must be given power if we are to stop highrises along the river, parking lots along the river, large feedlots along the river or large-scale subdivision development and land speculation along the river. Perhaps a few of the persons opposing the authority have some of those land development interests in mind, but such plans would clearly not benefit the broader community. It is certainly not the intention of the authority to prevent normal household and agricultural improvements, or to infringe with any frequency on the transfer of land. Thus while I realize some amendments are needed to clarify this fact, I am anxious to ensure that the ability of the authority to protect the river valley is not weakened significantly. I want to add that we are talking about a river valley and not just a river bank, which helps to explain why the control zone is wider than might seem necessary at first glance, Mr. Speaker. I want to say I am behind the objectives and general legislative powers of the Meewasin Valley Authority 100 per cent.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: – Hear, hear!

MR. PREBBLE: – I want to touch briefly on two other important issues in closing my remarks this afternoon. The first is the need to improve and expand housing accommodation for people now living in very poor quality apartments in sections of downtown Saskatoon. Some of these apartments are in sections of downtown Saskatoon. Some of these apartments appear to be a fire hazards. Some may eventually be closed and used for alternative developments, in which case I am worried that the residents will have few places to rent a comparable apartment at a comparable rate downtown. I know, Mr. Speaker, that the Minister of Urban Affairs and of Saskatchewan housing (Mr. Smishek) is very concerned about urban housing for lower income people in downtown areas. I want to urge him to act as quickly as possible to provide low cost apartment accommodation in downtown Saskatoon to meet the needs of many persons who have long been neglected.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I want to say that as the demolition of the Capitol Theatre this past weekend demonstrates, the resource boom has brought many negative consequences with it. Among them are the rapid increase in the price of downtown commercial land and the destruction of previous heritage sites, which become exceptionally expensive to preserve in the face of unrealistically high land prices. This rapid increase in the price of land downtown is making it more and more difficult to initiate developments in the downtown area that are intended for people instead of simply for profit. As we prepare to celebrate our 75th anniversary as a province, I believe it would be indeed fitting for our government to introduce comprehensive heritage legislation that would provide a means by which we would protect the craftsmanship and aesthetic beauty of many of our older buildings which will otherwise quickly fall under the wrecker's ball. As part of this heritage legislation, it is urgent that our government includes special financial assistance and legislative power for use in downtown areas, which would provide for the integration of heritage sites into new developments so that the most valuable parts of downtown heritage structures are maintained. I can think of no better way to demonstrate that we are serious about honoring the past as well as planning for the future.

Mr. Speaker, I think when you look at the record of our government, the proposals we have to initiate in the coming session as outlined in the throne speech, there can be no doubt that there is no cause to support the amendment at all. Therefore, I will be opposing the amendment and supporting the main motion. Thank you.

MR. H.J. SWAN (Rosetown-Elrose): – Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege this morning to rise and speak in this session of the nineteenth legislature and to say thank you to all of the people in my constituency who have worked so hard to put me here. They have been a strong support to me throughout the past year. Many of the people whom I have met since I have become elected have become very, very close friends, friends in the truest sense. They are friends who will stand behind you at all times. I appreciate the backing that I receive as I move from place to place within the constituency and talk to people. I appreciate the openness people have and the way they come to me with their needs. I have established a constituency office in Rosetown and find that, as I meet there many Fridays, the people in the constituency are coming with their needs and it's an opportunity for me to serve people. I believe this is one of the areas that, as a member of the legislature, I value the most.

The Rosetown-Elrose constituency is mainly an agricultural constituency and most of the business depends upon agriculture for its livelihood. This year, 1979, has been a very dry season indeed and many of the areas of that constituency have had poor crops, in the north extremely poor and in the south about average. Now the crop quality was good but when you experience a drop in volume and continually rising operation costs, it has not been an exceptionally good year for people in the farming industry. This will have its effect on the small businesses as well since they depend almost entirely on the business generated by the agricultural industry. Low prices during the 1978-70 crop year combined with the slow movement of grain caused many farmers and businessmen to borrow for operating needs.

In the throne speech, the government says that the 1970 crop yields were down about 25 per cent but the farm-cash receipts increased because of good quality and strong world prices. Now, these facts may be true but the two do not related. The 1979 crop, for the most part, is in storage on farms. Cash receipts for 1979 related to the 1978 crop and the good prices received for livestock in the early part of 1979. Now the livestock prices have declined and the federal government income stabilization plans has paid out the largest ever payment during this 1979 year. This does not show to me that all is well in the agriculture industry. When the income stabilization plan pays, it pays because the income for the past year does not meet the average income for the last five-year period.

This year farmers found that grain movement was slow, transportation was a problem, the labor disruptions on the ports caused delays at times. The world price for grain had declined in the latter part of '78 and the net cash receipts of the agricultural industry are down. This is not the rosy picture that is being painted by this government in its throne speech. I believe that this government has to look more realistically at what is happening in the agricultural industry if the industry is to do well.

During the past several years inflation has run at a fairly high rate of increase each year and these inflationary rates are starting to place a very heavy burden on the people who must of necessity live in old folks' homes. This year in Rosetown there was need for a major increase in the monthly rate that is charged to each resident in the old folks' home. When I say a significant increase it amounted to about \$150 per person per month, and when there are two people in the home that is a fairly heavy burden. When you are looking at the income of an old timer it is actually beyond his reach. This increase was brought about because of the inflationary costs in the past few years: the high cost of food, heat, light, power, water, the new tax structures that have been introduced. All of these costs rising are forcing our old people into very, very difficult straits indeed.

I believe that this government is going to have to take time to look at the needs of people and not continue to look at the expanding of the control and authority as they are now doing. I believe it is time this government looked at providing assistance to these people to cover the costs that in fact are there in levels I, II and III, and to provide a decent standard of living for all people in the province.

Another major concern that has been expressed is the need for a level IV care home in the town of Rosetown. I do not believe that this is a concern only of the people of Rosetown but rather it is a provincial concern affecting many communities throughout the province. The Swift Current level IV service is the one that is designated to supply service to the people from Rosetown and from the general area around Rosetown. Now the distance between Rosetown and Swift Current is approximately 100 miles. If a family member is moved to Swift Current for care then it places a significant burden on the people in Rosetown to drive that 100 miles frequently to visit their family members. I believe to isolate older people from their families is a very cruel blow indeed. This year I had one request for a patient to be moved from the Rosetown hospital to a level IV care home in Saskatoon, and it was with some difficulty that I was able to arrange that move. Another one who wanted to go the same direction was not permitted and had to go the Swift Current route. Now Rosetown generally does not use Swift Current as a trading centre. They use Saskatoon as their main trading centre when they have need of leaving home to buy things. To go to Swift Current in almost every case necessitates a special trip. Many of the young people from Rosetown who have obtained employment away from their home community are working in Saskatoon or other areas in that general direction. If their grandparents or their parents are moved to Swift Current, again it makes it very difficult of these young people to communicate with their relatives.

I believe it is time the government gave very serious consideration to developing a level IV care home in the Rosetown area itself. I believe that this is a need in many of the communities around this province. I don't propose that you should have level IV in every small centre but rather you should have level IV in the main trading centres in the province.

Another area that has given me concern is in dealing with one person in my constituency needing to move into level III care. The cost of level III today is a very considerable cost. This person expressed the concern that if she were to move into level III and have to pay all of the costs from their own family income that it would almost mean the loss of the family farm to the next generation. The cost of level III care would eat the capital assets of the family in a very short period of time. This lady does have a son who would like to farm but is not quite old enough at this point in time. Her husband is not old enough to retire. The farm itself is not large enough to support the farming operation and to support the lady in level III care. The advice that the lady was given is what really is my concern. She was advised that if she would go through legal separation with her husband, then social welfare would pick up the cost of her care in level III. I do not think that is a fair way to solve the problem. You take away the family tie and you really cut the person loose and they feel completely lost. I believe that this government must look at this type of concern. Must people separate from their husbands or wives in order to be provided with the necessities of life? I think that this is completely unfair and is a direction that must be turned around and that rather we must encourage the family unit to stay as a family unit.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

MR. SWAN: — I've had letters recently from people waiting for beds for selective surgery. These people have waited, in many cases, six months and more. The concern they express to me is this: that they've been in Saskatoon, walked through the University Hospital, City Hospital and St. Paul's Hospital and find that there are many beds that are actually empty. Yet they are denied the privilege of using one of those beds. The government health budget saw fit to cut back the number of beds that are allowed to be used in order to balance the budget. If you were a person needing surgery, I think that you would look at it quite differently. Waiting six months or a year seems to me to be a rather unfair way of balancing the government's budget.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. SWAN: — I think that if surgery is needed and prescribed by a qualified physician, the bed is not filled by someone else, if the surgeon is willing to do the work, then the government is not fair in holding back the use of the beds.

It's commendable for this government in its throne speech to say that it is committed to improving health care facilities. But facilities that are not available to people are not really that valuable to anyone.

I would like to say thank you to the Government of Saskatchewan for the construction of Highway 15 from Milden to Sovereign. Although the complete topping is not on at this point in time, the highway construction has been mainly completed to Sovereign. The construction looks good and the construction firm that was employed to do the work (when they were living in the town of Milden) obtained what I considered to be very worthwhile recognition from the community. I would like to report that I have received a letter and the Minister of Highways (Mr. Kramer) also received a letter commending the Kay's Construction Company for the way that they worked on the highway and for the dignified way that they lived in the community and were a credit to the community while they were there. This is not always the case with construction crews but I think this speaks well for this particular crew.

I would like to encourage the Minister of Highways to place in the highway program next season the completion of Highway 15 from Sovereign to the junction of Highway 4. When this highway is complete it will be a very useful link in the highway system between Highway 11 at Kenaston and Highway 4 just three miles south of Rosetown. This is a heavily travelled area and will be very much appreciated by all firms supplying services in that area.

The construction of Highway 4 from Rosetown to Biggar has also been pretty much completed and I would like to say thank you for that.

There is a request from the rural municipalities of Canaan No. 225 and Victory No. 226 and the hamlet of Demaine that the road connecting Beechy to Highway 42 and leading to the Riverhurst Ferry should be taken into the highway system. I raised this concern a year ago and I believe that this is a road which should be looked at and looked at very seriously. In the near future I will be endeavouring to arrange a meeting with the Minister of Highways to discuss this road with the people concerned. It is a road which has been needed for a long time and I believe it is a project which should have been looked at many years ago. I would encourage the Minister of Highways to plan, in his highway program, to add this piece of road this season.

I would like to express a concern to you today about the highway traffic board. This year I have been receiving complaints about the operation of the highway traffic board from people wanting to have school bus driver endorsement on their driver's licences. They are experiencing delays of up to six weeks. They make an appointment and go to the testing centre and write the written test, then they must make the second appointment for their driving test. In many cases there are three weeks between these two tests. Because of distance each of these tests will cost the person about one-half a day of time and will also require driving the distance twice, which is very expensive to them. This is an inconvenience to the driver, to the school system and a waste of scarce and expensive energy. This is another area which the government could look at for the conservation of energy and better service to people.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to touch now, briefly, on the field of education. It would appear to me from reading the throne speech, that you intend to do something for the native students in our province. Yet when I look at Friday night's paper, the Leader-Post, I see the Minister of Education (Mr. McArthur) has withdrawn the pre-school program for natives which had been begun by the Regina Public School Board of Education and tells them instead that there will be a program coming in 1980. It makes me wonder what this government is saying and what they intend to do for the native people. What better way is there to start a program than to introduce it into the school system and have it thoroughly tested and then use that part of the program that has been proven to work well.

I think the Regina Public School Board of Education has many times gone out ahead of the field to try to explore new ways of accomplishing things in education.

The Head Start program which was begun here in Regina in September was a good example of this. Now to find, after a program has been in operation for about three months, the Minister of Education, without even so much as having a look at the program or sending any of his people in to see how it was operating, has declined funding for the program – to me it is unbelievable.

I wonder, really is this government interested in doing something for native people? Are they really interested in providing education for native students, or are they mainly giving lip service and letting the children stay at home, uneducated and without the opportunities that are so freely available to others in our society?

Another area in education which has given me some cause to wonder is the need that the government now sees of taking students to look at what co-ops are doing in the communities in Saskatchewan. Co-ops have been in the communities for many years. We are not back in the '20s any more; we're heading into the '80s. If the co-op movement has not grown up enough at this point in time for it to educate the people around it of the advantages of the co-op movement, then I think, indeed it is not saying very much to the co-op movement. I have been a member of this co-op movement all of my life. I have supported the co-op, worked on boards of directors, have been involved in the co-op movement since I was a very young boy.

The needs of the co-op have been tested very well and I don't believe that the program you are proposing is necessary. I believe if you would keep your hands out of the co-op movement and give them an opportunity to move forward on their own, they will do it, do it proudly and serve their people very well.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: – Hear, hear!

MR. SWAN: – I was a little surprised as I listened to the remarks of the Premier of this province this week. I listened to him paying tribute to a number of his colleagues who are working with him. I commend him for paying tribute to these people but I wonder when a person like the former member for Regina North-West, who has served able in this House for many years, didn't even rate a comment from the Premier. He was passed off as a discarded rag and not given any recognition at all.

AN HON. MEMBER: – Same thing to Henry!

MR. SWAN: – And I think also yes, in the case of the former mayor of the city of Regina, he has served this city well . . .

SOME HON. MEMBERS: – Hear, hear!

MR. SWAN: – . . . and he did not even rate a remark. I believe that the Premier did not do a service to his colleagues by singling out a few and neglecting the ones who have been with him for many years. I wonder, is the Premier of this province going to continue his vicious attack on individuals? He has been making attacks on two of the members on this side of the House and he's done it two days in a row. Is this the way in which the Premier serves people? I believe that anyone in the position of Premier of a province should be able to rise to a higher level than this and to serve people.

I read with interest the new release the Premier put out just a few short weeks ago when he was discussing the oil prices in Ottawa. He suggested that he was willing to put the crowrate up as an item of trade and that he would actually barter with the crowrate in exchange for oil rates. Still the same Premier when he gets up in his speech to reply stands there in his holier-than-thou attitude and extols all the values of his government and the great things which they are going to do and how they are the protectors of the crowrate. I find these two stances are very difficult to understand and very difficult to bring together under one man's hat.

Mr. Speaker, I would like briefly to refer to the health field. The Premier of the province, time after time, has made derogatory statements about the way the Government of Alberta is operating its affairs. He refers to the \$180 that people must pay to have health care in the province of Alberta. But not once did he refer to the fact that Alberta has no education and health tax, that Saskatchewan indeed pays 5 per cent education and health tax on almost every item that they purchase and the only exceptions is food. I believe that if you were to look at what the 5 per cent adds up to for each individual and how much that 5 per cent will amount to in the course of a year, that one might find indeed that the \$180 paid in Alberta is a very small sum in comparison to what is being paid here in this province. You talk about free health care to people. Look at the way the Saskatchewan government throws money around and I believe that you will find that health care in this province is far from free. It is costing people in excess of \$80 million yearly, that's not free.

The people of Alberta have a number of other benefits that we don't seem to be able to have. When I go into the province of Alberta and I fill my gas tank with fuel, it costs me 20 cents per litre less than I pay here at home. I think indeed that's a very good benefit to the people in Alberta. When it comes time to pay their income tax, their income tax is many percentage points lower than what we pay in this province. The service to people

is good.

MR. SPEAKER: – Order, order, order, order!

I can see we're going to have to go into night sittings as there are so many people anxious to get into this debate. If we can do it in an orderly manner with the member for Rosetown-Elrose (Mr. Swan) making his contribution now and the other ones making theirs later, I'm sure we can accommodate everybody before our time runs out. Member for Rosetown-Elrose.

MR. SWAN: – Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I appreciate getting the floor once again. It's a little bit hard to get from these fellows at times.

I was referring to the income tax area and I'm sure that the people in Saskatchewan are not, perhaps, paying more income tax because their incomes are lower; they don't have as much money to pay it on. But on the little bit they do receive, they pay a much higher percentage than the people in Alberta. When you combine all of these factors, I think you will find that the province of Alberta is faring pretty well under the Conservative government. When the opportunity is here again for the people of Saskatchewan to make their selection, I'm sure that they too will look to the Conservatives to provide honest and fair government to this province and do away with the NDP and its threats to people. When the opportunity to vote comes on Tuesday, I will be pleased to support the amendment to the motion and to vote against the motion itself.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: – Hear, hear!

MR. R. KATZMAN (Rosthern): – Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

First of all, I must thank my constituents for allowing me to be here and return me to speak on their behalf in this Legislative Assembly. It's unfortunate they could not be here today to watch the dean of the House place his feet upon his desk with total disrespect for this House. It seems that the government in the question period, follows the same method of totally disregarding questions and not following the rules we are here to follow for the betterment of the people of Saskatchewan. Mr. Speaker, we are aware of what the throne speech did and did not say. It left many things totally ignored. First of all, I would like to speak about the uranium question and how it affects my constituency. The second portion of my speech will involve the MVA (Meewasin Valley Authority), the authority in Saskatoon with the concerns respecting the river bank. It seems that the original concept and what has happened today are quite different. Time will tell what the end result will be. The third area I would like to discuss in my speech will be a button that I used to see around this Chamber area and around the province of Saskatchewan and I quote what the button said. It said, "Me and the NDP, a perfect union." I look out as I walk each day into this Legislative Assembly and I ask what happened to that tie?

First of all, Mr. Speaker, the uranium issue. In January the hearing on the proposed refinery will be held. Concerns will be raised by people from the area and from outside the area on the record and past performance of Eldorado Nuclear and why it should not be trusted, and why that corporation should not be allowed to develop a uranium refinery. There will be others who will say just the opposite and both side will have facts to back up what they say. It has been interesting to noted that three years ago the Government of Saskatchewan said it was not interested in getting into nuclear reactors, power plants. Yet on page 56 of the Regina Leader-Post, December 3, 1979,

the general manager of Sask Power indicated that they are interested in going into a 700 milliwatt nuclear development, and are presently discussing it with the two neighboring provinces of Alberta and Manitoba. I wonder what that indicates? First of all we hear, at their national convention, the NDP passed a resolution against the further expansion of nuclear reactors in Canada. Then we find that the NDP government in Saskatchewan is considering building a nuclear reactor, and I quote December 3, 1979, page 56, Regina Leader-Post. It is obvious that the government does not know where it is going in the nuclear issue and in many other cases.

First of all we have the Regina Manifesto and I think you've all read it several times – it's your nightly – well, that's their nightly bed story. Before they go to bed, they have to read the Regina Manifesto. And then we have the 1972 statements by the Premier (Mr. Blakeney); that we will not invest public money in resource industry. Well here we go again, the Premier's just not sure where he's going. Yes, now . . .

You know the member for Saskatoon Centre (Mr. Mostoway) is always known for his quips and his short, snappy statements in the House. It is unfortunate that he had to ask the minister responsible for SGIO, earlier, if one of the schools in his own constituency was opened or closed. He doesn't even know that, so how does he know that's happening in the House? We now have the truth of the matter, as I was saying earlier, the proof of the pudding. Even though Mr. Blakeney says one thing one day (because it suits him and I refer to 1972) he is totally an irresponsible premier because even though he makes a promise today, he breaks that promise with this actions tomorrow.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: – Hear, hear!

MR. KATZMAN: – Is that man to be blindly followed and trusted?

AN HON. MEMBER: – No, no way.

MR. KATZMAN: – Oh, but listen to what the members from the other side think! The members on the other side follow him blindly like a flock of sheep. He takes them wherever he will go and it is interesting to watch that every time the lead sheep gets into trouble, the number two sheep moves up and takes the brunt of the problem and I refer to the Attorney General (Mr. Romanow). It is interesting to note that the Premier (not being able to handle the debate of this House) comes and goes as he pleases and only when he is expected to speak. We have seen him lose his temper in this House, throw down his books on several occasions and stomp out.

It is most interesting how I've watched this government since I've been elected, flip flop around the nuclear reactor issue. I believe the hon. member for Saskatoon-Sutherland (Mr. Prebble) was at that meeting at the University of Saskatchewan when the former minister of Northern Saskatchewan made the comment at the University of Saskatchewan, Saskatoon, that you had our vote in 1978 on the Warman refinery. And as far as he was concerned, it was approved. That comes from the present Minister of the Environment (Mr. Bowerman) and Mr. Prebble was there in the audience and in that debate when the statement was said. Mr. Speaker, time will only tell if we will receive a Warman refinery whose final product will not be used in Canadian reactors but will be used in the American-style reactor and very readily used in the dreaded bomb.

There are many question that must be considered in the decision. Do we or do we not go ahead with the massive development in uranium? There are moral issues on both

sides but let me quote from the Leader of the Conservative Party (Mr. Devine) at the convention in Saskatchewan when he said:

The mothers of Cambodia do not need uranium. They need food and respect and a chance to live a life that we in this country have had the privilege of having since our forefathers came here.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: – Hear, hear!

MR. KATZMAN: – The second item I said I would refer to was the Meewasin authority in Saskatoon. The authority was originally developed for the maintaining of the future of the river bank in the Saskatoon area. The concepts and the plans have gone beyond the original idea. I quote from the Attorney General's (Mr. Romanow) speech dated April 23, 1979. For the Attorney General's information, I believe the year is 1946. He suggests that there was a special group told to check into this and in the recommendations included in the report was the recommendation that a river edge authority be established similar to the Wascana Centre Authority in Regina. I quote from the minister who moved the bill's seconding speech. He said (later on in his speech):

This act has, in many ways, been patterned after The Wascana Centre Act, a piece of legislation that has operated well for over 17 years.

He further goes on to say in his speech:

While the owners of this property will not be affected in most respect, with respect to their property.

That's another quote of his.

Later on his speech, he indicates that the powers of this bill reflect many of the same powers which are in the urban and rural municipalities acts. It is interesting as you continue through his speech. Just where he closes, he mentioned that the act, once again is patterned after the Wascana Centre Authority, but modified to meet specific situations reflecting Saskatoon and Corman Park area. Then speaking later in the same debate I . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . I will help the minister. Rather than his doing the research, I have done it for him.

What was the comment of the Conservative Party with me as spokesman? Oh, there are some people over there who are worried! The key line of the whole statement that I made (and for the Attorney General's benefit, refer to page 1949) says we are pleased with the idea. I repeat, Mr. Attorney General (and I still believe that is the way this caucus feels) we are pleased with the idea.

We . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . I just heard somebody over there yell we voted for a bill. Well, that makes me want to look into some of the Attorney General's comments, during both the second reading and the committee of the whole. (Unfortunately, I didn't think I was going to get into them. They're down on my desk, but I think I can remember them.) He informed me that the only reason he couldn't give me a detailed map that was big enough to indicate all of the land on schedule A was because if he stated to unroll it on the desk here, it would end up some where in front of the Legislative Building. For that reason, even though he had the map with him as we got into the committee of the whole, he was unable to show me a clear effect on a map that was legible rather than just a small map. As I say, you will find that whole discussion in this committee of the

whole on this bill.

MR. ROMANOW: – I have the committee of the whole right here.

MR. KATZMAN: – I see the Attorney General has come prepared . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . You know, Mr. Attorney General, we may have to stop the clock if we get into a lot of discussion, but as long as you're prepared to do that, I don't mind responding to the arguments that are coming across the floor. You know the member for Kindersley (Mr. Andrew) is tripping in to help me out a little here. I cannot resist the one line that he is giving me and that is, I understand that in Saskatoon yesterday (and the minister can probably correct me if I'm wrong) there was the lending association which suggested its hands are tied because of the authority . . . (inaudible interjections) . . .

MR. SPEAKER: – Order, order! I notice the Attorney General (Mr. Romanow), who is in his seat, has not been in the debate as yet and there will be an opportunity and the member for Qu'Appelle (Mr. Lane), who is not in his seat, has not been in the debate either and there will be an opportunity for him to speak on his feet at his seat. For the time being, I think we can listen to the member for Rosthern (Mr. Katzman) because I have recognized him.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: – Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: – I certainly want to hear what he has to say.

MR. KATZMAN: – Thank you, Mr. Speaker, first of all. I suggested earlier to the Attorney General that we may have to stop the clock so that we can finish the business of the House. I don't intend to shorten my speech, even though I have had lots of assistance in making it longer. The Attorney General comes with another comment – I just want to keep you honest. That's how the people of Saskatoon feel right now about this whole bill. They'd like to keep the Attorney General honest, so I must repeat a statement that he said. I cannot resist this opportunity – I have to go back – the owners of private property will not be affected. He wants to keep it truthful and on line and I suggest that he continue that . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . I don't know what he meant. In fact, I'm having doubts now if I can ever take the Attorney General's word as he steps in to this House after this bill. I've respected the man all my life as a friend. Let us get back to the Meewasin again.

The principle that was stated in the report that the minister referred to is still correct – that the heritage and the keeping of the land surrounding the Saskatoon river bank (South Saskatchewan River) should be kept for the privilege of those in the future.

The city of Saskatoon through the years has done that as best it could and in most cases has been able to do that. I realize that the city of Saskatoon came to the Attorney General asking for a provincial motion of some type that would assist them in doing what they wanted to do in the protection of the river bank. It's also interesting to note that even those who today in Saskatoon are passing around a petition against the MVA (Meewasin Valley Authority) have, in that petition, that they are still in favor of the original concept of the development of the river bank . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Once again the Attorney General and his little parrot behind him have come forward to say, I'm for it but I'm against it.

It's interesting to watch – tell the Attorney General he should listen to some of the

speeches made by the Premier of this province and one that reflects crow presently, and we've had a bit of discussion in the House about that today when the member for Redberry (Mr. Banda) gave his normal statement about the crow. But for the first time things have changed, member for Redberry. We have your province out suggesting he is willing to trade it. He took it to the bargaining table not me – no member of this Conservative caucus and if you want to check further, when he made the comments about the Alberta government taking it to the table – read what they said, and he accused them. He has said the same thing and using his own words, he has not taken it to the bargaining table, nobody else. The Premier, the little man that you follow like sheep – I'm wondering if we can really trust that little sheep. I can't resist the Attorney General again. He says to me what does Joe 28 say? Well, at least Joe 28 has the guts and the intestinal fortitude to stand up and say what he thinks even though people like yourself like to mistrust him. Maybe he doesn't worry about the polls. He worries about the future generation of the country. Not like you – can't we win the next election? – all you worry about is can you win and can you not win? Let's worry about future generations, not just political power.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: – Hear, hear!

MR. KATZMAN: – Oh, Mr. Attorney General, we could maybe go until 5 o'clock this afternoon by stopping the clock at one minute to one. Mr. Attorney General now makes the comment suggesting that he will do as he pleases. You know, we've known that in this province for many years . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . no, no, no, you said it, Mr. Attorney General. I didn't hear any quotes put around it. You said that you would do as you liked whenever you wanted in this province. I think that has been what's happening.

Mr. Speaker, let me get back to my speech. I originally started and refer to the third part I said I was going to speak about. The third portion of my speech is about a little button I used to see around but haven't seen down in the legislative cafeteria. I haven't seen any of the SGEA (Saskatchewan Government Employees Association) people wearing it any more and I kind of wonder about it. The button said, 'Me and the NDP, the perfect union.' The member for Saskatoon Centre (Mr. Mostoway) says hear, hear! Yes, I may agree that he and the NDP may be perfect but I don't think it's the best thing for the people of the province of Saskatchewan.

Mr. Speaker, there are 11,000 people out pounding the bricks and as one who has been out on the bricks, I now what it feels like. It seems that the government is into a family feud, an argument between themselves and their little union boss friends who were busily passing around that little button and I quote "Me and the NDP, the perfect union."

You now people in the past have said many, many things about labor legislation in the province and some might like to say more as somebody in front of me has just indicated. Let me give you an opinion of a person prior to his being in politics. Let me refer to myself prior to being involved and being elected as an MLA as I watched both the Thatcher government and the Blakeney government when I was involved within a trade union. Let me state while I was there it was obvious where the bias was. I used to refer to it and I brought it into this House and in my way I would like to say to it, it's a pretty tough football game when your team comes on the field and it sees the referee wearing the colors of the other team. I quote, 'Me and the NDP, the perfect union.' The bias seems to be there no matter how the referee calls the game and as the game goes on he will be mistrusted and mistrusted even more. Therefore, it is important that the Department of Labour and its officials must not be involved and must also appear not to

be involved.

We have a very ticklish case in hand. The case is that this time it is the employer, I refer to the NDP government, who is also the referee and therefore in a very ticklish situation. But if the little button that everybody wore earlier is correct, and I quote, 'Me and the NDP, a perfect union,' there should be no problem in solving the problem; it's just a family dispute. Let's look back in history and we only have to look a short way – to the 1973, 1975, 1979 election of what political party in the province of Saskatchewan? That's right, the NDP. We have major strikes by SGEA following their election. I wonder why? Yes, I think we could go back to that quote, 'Me and the NDP.' They are looking to be paid off.

Now one thing has bothered me all through this strike – if the unions were really serious and wanted to have some clout with this government, what would they do? They would take away their financial support of the NDP. Now in a dispute between myself and the Minister of Labour (Mr. Snyder) in this House, I indicated that the NDP gets 15 cents per worker per month towards its coffers. Well I was corrected by the minister and he told me it's 25 cents. It has been raised 10 cents, for the information of the member for Rosemont (Mr. Allan).

It seems interesting that rather than use this money to support the strikers, they are supporting the NDP – the people who run the government they are striking against. So, Mr. Minister, I wonder if we just have a family feud . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . I have a few more pages I would like to cover, Mr. Speaker.

The member for Saskatoon Centre (Mr. Mostoway) says we'll get some bellows. Well, there is a big bellow in himself!

Mr. Speaker, occupational health is part of the Department of Labour which they boast about – how it is important and is the forerunner in Canada. I would agree with them. But I also suggest that it is interesting to note that today the Government of Saskatchewan sits idly by when it becomes its duty to look after labor legislation. It is totally sitting idle while the SGEA (Saskatchewan Government Employees Association) is out on strike.

Mr. Speaker, due to the fact that we had some rather interesting going back and forth between the Attorney General (Mr. Romanow) and myself, I will cut my speech just a little shorter. I will only go to one more comment, about the November 5 or November 6 (depending if you get the morning or the evening paper) issue of the Stair-Phoenix, where the labor department is studying banning court injunctions against strikes. I wonder if this is another pay-off from the government to the people who financially support them. They suggest that if you go on strike, we won't let the courts interfere. We are above the courts. Then we have to look back at the Premier, at the NDP national convention, where he makes the suggestion (and as a premier and a lawyer I would think he would know that parliament is supreme in Canada) that one of his friends with the postal union violated a bill in the federal House and should be exempt from punishment because he is one of his friends. He forgets that the law are equal to all and they must remain that way or we could have some serious problems, as we see in other parts of the world.

Mr. Speaker, I will be pleased to stand and support the amendment to this motion. But the past record of this government and the lead sheep and all his followers do not allow me the privilege of being able to say I could support their motion.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: – Hear, hear!

MR. C.O. WHITE (Regina Wascana): – Mr. Speaker, in rising to join the debate, I want first to congratulate you on your return from abroad. I am sure you served this Assembly well while you were away. I want to congratulate a number of members of the House as well for various reasons. First of all my new desk mate for his victory in Regina North West (Mr. Solomon), he is right here.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: – Hear, hear!

MR. WHITE: – I had the pleasure of helping John Solomon in his campaign and it was quite a campaign. Perhaps one of the people to thank for John's victory is the member for Indian Head-Wolseley (Mr. Taylor) whom I don't see in his seat. He tells us that he sent 50 to 62 Conservative to work in the constituency and my experience in Regina North-West led me to believe that people who meet Tories don't vote Tory. I don't know if the member for Indian Head-Wolseley intends to be in the House for a second term, but if he does he should change some of his workers.

I also want to congratulate my former desk mate, Jerry Hammersmith (Prince Albert-Duck Lake) on his appointment to Minister of Northern Saskatchewan; the member for Regina Lakeview (Mr. McArthur) to Minister of Education and Continuing Education; the member for Morse (Mr. Gross) to Minister of Tourism and Renewable Resources; and the member for Quill Lakes (Mr. Koskie) to the Minister of Social Services. They are all very accessible individuals and do excellent work.

Now I would be remiss if I didn't congratulate certain members on the opposite side of the House, namely the members for Souris-Cannington (Mr. Berntson) and Indian Head-Wolseley (Mr. Taylor), on their elevations. And I want to congratulate the new Leader of the Progressive Conservative Party for his election as leader.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: – Hear, hear!

MR. WHITE: – I have a little wish for him as well. May he occupy his present seat for many years to come.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I have a number of other things to say. I want to say a few words about education and agriculture and perhaps even make a few comments on the former speaker's speech, particularly where he had reference to the Meewasin Valley Authority on Monday. Just let me run over a few of the things he said last year when debating the second reading of the bill. He had this to say:

I would thank the Attorney General for allowing me to be part of the planning of this authority to having some input. I thank him for being allowed to talk with the consultants about some of my concerns and taking some of the ideas which I recommended, which I now see coming with the program.

A bit further on he said:

Let me first of all indicate that as far as our caucus is concerned on the Meewasin Valley Authority we are very pleased with the idea. The project and its far ranging ideas, as you indicate 100 years . . .

And a bit later:

It will be a betterment to the people of the area and the community.

Time is running on, Mr. Speaker, and I'll wait until Monday. I, therefore, beg leave to adjourn debate.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: – Hear, hear!

Debate adjourned.

POINT OF ORDER

House Procedure

MR. KATZMAN: – Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day I would like to bring up a point of order. Earlier in the day after the House Leader had made the motion and it had been passed to move to special order of the day. I would like to know how and why the Chair recognized the member for The Battlefords after we had gone to special order?

MR. SPEAKER: – It's difficult to determine what members are going to rise on until they begin to speak on the particular issue. I believe, if I recall correctly, the member for The Battlefords, the Minister of Highways (Mr. Kramer), stated he was rising on a . . . I believe it was a point of order of some urgency, and at that point I allowed the member to go ahead. Later on in his so-called point of order I determined that it was not of urgency and was a matter that should have been dealt with at this point on the agenda. As it happened, the member had concluded the point that he was making, and we moved onto the next order of business. Now the members will take this as an opportunity to renew their allegiance to the true points of order, and true points of privilege, and only raise them at the proper time. I thank the member for Rosthern (Mr. Katzman) for raising the matter at this particular time, and I would admit that the member for The Battlefords (Mr. Kramer) was in fact out of order at that time . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Order, order! If the member has a different point of order I'd be glad to hear it.

MR. J.G. LANE (Qu'Appelle): – I'd like to speak to the point of order. You have now ruled him out of order . . . (inaudible interjection) . . .

MR. SPEAKER: – Order!

MR. LANE: – . . . based on your ruling that you have just given as to the statements of the Minister of Highways (Mr. Kramer), in fact it leads logically to the conclusion that the Minister of Highways has spoken in the debate and has lost his right to speak. Is that not correct?

MR. SPEAKER: – No, I don't regard it as such. Are there any other points of order? The member for Rosthern (Mr. Katzman).

MR. KATZMAN: – Not being a lawyer I may be out of order, but let me understand your point of ruling today. You were suggesting that the member for The Battlefords (Mr. Kramer) suggested to you he had something of important urgency and, therefore, you recognized him? Is that what you're saying? If so, isn't that a violation of the present

rules? I am totally confused. We passed a special motion saying that we were going to a special thing. You are saying now in your statement to me that you allowed him to speak because it was of urgency? But that's against the rules we have passed in this House.

MR. SPEAKER: – As I said when I made my statement, I'd encourage all members to review what are points of order and what are points of privilege, a point of order is in order at any time that there is a point of order to be raised. Not only that, the member for The Battlefords (Mr. Kramer) said it was a matter of urgency. I believe it was a point of order of urgency, and a point of order is in order at any time. If a member has a point of order I wish they would raise it. It happens that the member for The Battlefords was out of order and I've already stated that. I thought what I said was perfectly clear but apparently the member for Rosthern (Mr. Katzman) hasn't grasped what I said.

MR. LANE: – I wonder, Mr. Speaker, on a point of order if Mr. Speaker would consider the matter of a member having spoken during special orders on his debate. Having sat down, the normal practice in the House is that you then have lost your right to speak. In this case it was special orders. Your ruling that he was out of order indicates that, and he has in fact lost his right to speak. Would the Speaker kindly consider that particular aspect?

MR. SPEAKER: – Order. Allow me to simplify it for the member for Qu'Appelle (Mr. Lane) and all members of the House. Suppose that the member for Saskatoon Sutherland (Mr. Prebble) is speaking in the debate, and someone rises during his speech and say, Mr. Speaker, a point of order . . . Order, order. The member would be perfectly within order. Now the members may be arguing the point that the member for The Battlefords (Mr. Kramer) didn't say point of order. My recollection is that he said either point of order or point of privilege. Now I will not specify whether it was one of the other, but if it was either one, he has an opportunity to rise if it's a point of privilege or a point of order. Then he has to state what it is. If it's a point of privilege he states it; if it's a point of order, then we deal with it, regardless of whether a special order has been called, whether somebody is speaking, or whether we are between two items on the agenda. A point of order is always in order and it is my recollection that he either said point of order, or point of privilege.

MOTION

Special Committee of Rules and Procedures

HON. R. ROMANOW (Attorney General): – Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day I would like to move, seconded by the member for Saltcoats (Mr. Kaeding) by leave of the Assembly:

That the name, Mrs. Duncan, be substituted for that of Mr. McLeod on the list of members comprising the special committee of rules and procedures and that the substitution be effective retroactive to September 1, 1979.

Motion agreed to.

The Assembly adjourned at 1:15 p.m.