

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN
December 11, 1979

EVENING SESSION

Throne Speech Debate Continues

MR. R.A. LARTER (Estevan): – Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and first of all I would like to advise the members opposite, if they were to heed everything I say tonight then they could be in office for a long time. If they don't, they might only be there for three or four years.

I would like first of all, to thank the people of Estevan constituency for re-electing me as their MLA.

Mr. Speaker, I have in other years just touched briefly on my constituency but it is a large and vibrant constituency, so I feel that I do owe it to the people and the legislature to tell you a little bit about our community. I can assure these fine people that it is indeed an honor to represent them again in the legislature. Mr. Speaker, I live in a very active community and represent a very vibrant constituency. We are the power centre of Saskatchewan and the oil capital of the province. There may be some argument about that in the future, but right now I hope we still are.

I am sorry the Minister of Highways (Mr. Kramer) isn't here because I would like to thank the Minister of Highways and his government for the construction and oiling of highways in our area. Highway 18 has been completely rebuilt and oiled to Torquay. No. 47 has been rebuilt and oiled to the Lampman corner. This work has all been carried out in the past four years. We do have a 5.2 mile danger area on No. 47 north which has not been rebuilt. We would like to see the 11 miles into Lampman rebuilt as soon as your priorities permit. I notice the Attorney General (Mr. Romanow) writing it down so I'm sure he feels these stretches of road are priorities.

Lampman is located in the centre of some of the best farmland in the Southeast. A new hospital and the main street improvement program are in place. They are presently building a new curling rink. A 16-unit senior citizens' housing unit was started and slated for completion June 1, 1978. This of course is a CMHC (Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation), Saskatchewan Housing and local participation project. Manor Homes went broke during the construction. Poor design, poor engineering and construction have turned this senior citizens' home into a sham. Concrete froze as a result of being poured in 30-degree below weather. Poor, or very little inspection permitted these things to happen. As a result no action and a great deterioration has taken place every day.

SGI (Saskatchewan Government Insurance) and CMHC are fighting it out to see who is going to take the financial licking and in general people are lining up, not wanting to be responsible. I would urge Sask Housing to get involved, even though your responsibility does not start until construction is completed. It is in the best interests of Saskatchewan and certainly of the disappointed senior citizens of Lampman. I had to get that in but you'll be happy to know that I found out this afternoon that SGI has finally accepted the responsibility and they are going ahead with it. But I had already written it so I had to bring it up.

The town of Bienfait has had is problems in getting a doctor, but this government

through one of its recent program has permitted its modern hospital to revert partially to level IV care. We would urge that the Minister of Health (Mr. Rolfes) consider converting the Bienfait hospital entirely to level IV care.

Very little money would have to be spent and it would relieve a shortage of level IV – a situation that is very serious in the Southeast.

The Torquay Credit Union recently celebrated its 25th anniversary and I am very happy to say that my wife and I were there. This credit union is probably one of the most successful credit unions in Saskatchewan. It was built on community participation that crossed all political and religious lines and is still proving today that this community can survive because of people.

Midale, part of the oil fields, now has senior citizens' homes, new water back-up system and a modern hospital with good doctors. A new sports complex in the last few years that attracts not only local sports, but broomball and hockey and curling from outside of the area. The new pioneer museum is growing yearly.

The member for Quill Lakes (Mr. Koskie) . . . don't get your ego built up too high, I'm going the other way in a few minutes.

The city of Estevan, the energy capital of Saskatchewan, the oil capital of Saskatchewan – this is truly the most vibrant city in Saskatchewan. I have to take exception to the member for Wilkie (Mr. Garner) this afternoon. A person has to run full speed just to stay out of its many activities. The volunteer groups on every organization are beyond all comprehension. Estevan was the first city over the top for the past two years in Canada in the United Way. We're the home of the 1980 Saskatchewan Summer Games – this is a double honor of course with the celebration of Saskatchewan on our 75th birthday. We just had the ribbon cutting of our new curling rink. We are the home of the famed Estevan Bruins and Glory-Anne Carriere. I might mention that the Bruins are in town tonight. If you want some good entertainment after the budget speech . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . It is her singing of the celebrate Saskatchewan song on TV and radio that is helping us to get into our birthday mood for 1980.

Level IV beds are a real problem in the Southeast. Weyburn now covers all and of course I don't think I have to tell any of the members that the further you get away from your loved ones as they grow older the less and less you see them. Estevan is the centre of the Southeast and I would urge the Department of Health to review this critical level IV area in the southeastern part of Saskatchewan.

The Minister of Mineral Resources has stated recently that PCS (Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan) was going to play a role closer to the private sector in replacing and assisting communities as good corporate citizens. SaskPower is no different as long as the government operates it as a Crown corporation. Let them fall into the same category as other business in our community. Let us set up a tax base instead of grants so that SPC is truly sharing its part of the growth of Estevan, Coronach and other places where there are future projects.

Mr. Speaker, as resource critic there are many areas in which I must make comments in replying to the throne speech. It is not my intention to attempt to cover the point by point portions of the throne speech as they pertain to my areas as critic. Instead, I would like to give an overview of areas respecting SPC and give general coverage of mineral resources with our views on what is taking place and what should happen in the future

regarding these resources. Unfortunately I cannot reflect the professional point of view in my criticism but instead rely on consultations with management, employees and view of these people along with the views of the general public or the taxpayer as it were.

To start with, we today live with a situation here in the Legislative Building which I can see festering for many years. I am speaking of the strike of the SGEA (Saskatchewan Government Employees Association). Many times over the past four years I have offered comparison to the minister in charge of SPC of wage levels that this government through its Crown corporations has set, or as the minister says, has negotiated that we, in the private sector cannot compete with. Just as an example, this province will soon be at a minimum wage level of \$3.65 for the private sector. The lowest SPC worker in Estevan, is paid over \$8.00 per hours. Is there any wonder that the private sector cannot compete? Is there any wonder that SGEA is using the Crown corporations as a level and a leverage in negotiations on union demands for catch-up in wages?

It is our opinion that this government parallels the 11 years of the Trudeau government in losing complete control, not only in the growth of the bureaucracy but control of the public purse strings as well . . . (inaudible interjection) . . .

Mr. Speaker, when the Poplar River project was designed it was SPC's plan of a possible 1,200 megawatt power plant. The reasons behind it, of course, were very obvious – as this type of power plant could be built at lower costs than any other type of power plant in this province, and there is a heavy deposit of lignite coal available in the Coronach area. What bothers me and what should bother the taxpayers of this province is that in all the preliminary work leading up to the building of the power plant a minimum of consultation was entered into with the state of Montana. You might think I am rehashing something which took place and is now finished. But my main reason for bringing this matter up is – had the government and SPC and the Department of the Environment done their job on PR (public relations) and working with the Montana government the day that the plan was conceived, than perhaps (just perhaps) a 1,200 megawatt power plant would be a reality.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: – Hear, hear!

MR. LARTER: – Instead, like so many other things this government does, it reached the stage of confrontation and the negotiation stage was finished. By losing a possible other 600 megawatts with an inflation factor and the fact hydro power will cost SPC much more money than the thermal unit, the inability of the government to plan and negotiate in a businesslike manner will probably cost the taxpayers of this province hundreds of millions of dollars in extra power requirements for the future.

The story of the building of the first unit at Coronach has been one of confrontation – not only with the people of Montana – confrontation with the community of Coronach, confrontation with the R.M. of Coronach, and also confrontation with the farmers because of what was done to the water supply of many of the farms in the district. It is my opinion this government not only leads this country in the catchy phrase 'outrigation' but it also has a record of leading all the provinces in confrontation. The fact the minister in charge of SPC (Mr. Messer) made the remark, and I quote, 'It is not our obligation to abide by the laws of a foreign jurisdiction,' did nothing but add fuel to the fire. I do not believe even Mr. Messer believes this because if he did he might as well go ahead and build a 1,200 megawatt power plant. Don't you agree, Jack?

Mr. Speaker, the industrial advisory board for the state of Montana does have a real concern about the possibility of both air and water pollution. And whatever happens in this area, there are only certain levels permitted in the state of Montana as well. The reason they are concerned is that should the upper levels of environmental pollution be reached it would rule out any industrial development or possibly another power plant in that part of northern Montana and I think the minister knows that's their concern. So, it is not just what is going to happen tomorrow in a minor way but possibly in the future this could adversely affect them.

Mr. Speaker, in announcing the PCS (Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan) 10 year \$2.5 billion planned expansion, possibilities of a new mine, the minister also announced it was good-bye to the heritage fund and hello to more deficit budgets. The Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan announced in 1978 they had a profit of some \$10 million. The Premier mentioned the profit for the potash corporation in 1979 (and this wasn't news) was something in the range of \$45 million. I am afraid that as usual the Premier is only telling one side of the story, and that most of the money loaned to the potash corporation was interest free with no pay-back schedule, and therefore if this money had been left in the energy fund and if all the money it invested in potash were drawing even the minimum of interest it would have amounted to much more than the \$46 million the Premier brags about.

I would also say to the Premier that the 160 new jobs created in Saskatoon added 160 more people to the civil service of this province and the potash was being sold without these 160 people previously. So that means overnight we have approximately 1,660 new civil servants in this area with the mines and the Saskatoon head office. It is our opinion that you not only could have forced the potash expansion, but you could have taxed at a rate that would have brought much more money back in return without investigating one dime of the taxpayers money. This again proved that this government deals by confrontation, not by negotiations. The member for Souris-Cannington (Mr. Berntson), in reply to the Speech from the Throne, did cover in general some of our thoughts on the resource industry.

I must again make comment on the Premier's speech where he gleefully brags that he illegally collected \$500 million from the oil companies and then by passing Bill 47 retroactive legislation, he was able to use this blackmail in keeping 97 per cent of this \$500 million.

The member for Nipawin (Mr. Collver) pointed out a couple of years ago that had you used the Alberta formula, (this is, using your reversal on Crown lands and freeholders land) we would have come up with slightly less than the \$500 million in royalties. by negotiating with the oil companies as Alberta did, instead of the confrontation attitude which caused the CIGOL (Canadian Industrial Oil and Gas Limited) case. You could have come up with almost all of the \$500 million legally and at the same time, kept all of the oil companies working in Saskatchewan, instead of being chased out by Bill 42. Hundreds of millions of dollars would have been generated so that the \$500 million would have only been a portion of what could have been.

The Premier brags about the 1,000 wells that were drilled in Saskatchewan in 1979. I might say to the Premier that, once again, most of these wells are in the heavy oil fields involving a partnership between multinationals and SaskOil.

I say a sweetheart deal was made with Gulf of Canada and a gift of 500,000 acres of

drilling land was handed to them without tender – underneath the table without the oil industry or the people of Saskatchewan knowing just how good or how bad the deal was . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . It was a sweetheart deal, Jack, and you know it. The people of Saskatchewan do not know whether Gulf Oil paid \$5 or \$50 an acre. No one will ever know what kind of a sweetheart deal they made with Gulf until this deal is tabled in the legislature. Will you table it?

The medium and light drilling of oil as I have stated in the past is being done only by the companies so they do not lose their production credits. Do you agree? And it is being done in very low risk areas, in other words, in tie-in wells where there is proven oil reserves. Very little new exploration and very little deep hole exploration is being done other than the using of these production credits. Sometimes even SaskOil gets in on drilling one of these holes. I can tell you, Mr. Minister, that these companies, even with all your partnership deals and sweetheart deals, always deal with the multinationals. With all your smooth talk that you're still working hand-in-hand with the private sector, they are still very skeptical and still do not like the climate which you have created in this province. Here again, in the oil business, you have the power to tax as high as you want, to allow the private sector to develop our oil resources and still get the maximum amount of return of resource dollars for the people of Saskatchewan.

Mr. Speaker, on the uranium issue, I believe the member for Souris-Cannington (Mr. Berntson) covered it quite extensively in reply to the Speech from the Throne without getting into the nuts and bolts of it. My main concern is there are a large number of if's and, of course, I am speaking of the predicted future soft markets for uranium – the high-risk areas and the general grey areas that were not in the Bayda report. These last days, a new significant uranium find was announced in the Toronto Globe and Mail. This, again, will contribute to the future soft market of uranium. We do urge the government to do their job as governing and setting the rules by which the private sector operates and let the private sector develop our uranium industry with a minimum risk to the taxpayers of this province.

Mr. Speaker, it is interesting to note that in the Saturday, December 8 issue of the Leader-Post, the Premier is quoted as saying Saskatchewan is unfairly treated by the oil and gas tax system. I might say, Mr. Speaker, there has always been a confrontation attitude by this government when dealing federally with the oil and gas tax system of the federal government. There has been confrontation of potash tax with the federal government; confrontation with the potash companies; confrontation with the oil companies; confrontation in attitude of power development, not only with our neighbors to the South, but towards our own people of Coronach; confrontation with SGEA (Saskatchewan Government Employees Association); even confrontation with the municipal governments. Beyond a doubt, you are not concerned with people but only with political motives that will allow you to become more powerful, and by your actions have proven to the people of Saskatchewan that you are the master and not the servants of the people.

Mr. Speaker, I must make some comments on the imaginary heritage fund talked about in just about every speech given by members opposite. I say imaginary heritage fund because with four consecutive deficit budgets, with a \$2.5 billion debt load carried by the citizens of this province, with a \$2.5 billion proposed expenditure for the potash industry in the next 10 years, with the \$500 million committed to uranium mining, with well over \$300 million to the mid-1980s forecast for the heavy oil industry, with many more hundreds of million of dollars committed by this government out of the energy fund, then truly this heritage fund does become very unrealistic. It is our belief that this

heritage fund will have as assets, used holes in the ground.

Mr. Speaker, the member for Souris-Cannington (Mr. Berntson) stated in his reply to the Speech from the Throne that we do not believe in taxing producers and consumers to buy potash mines. Rather, we believe in taxing potash companies and helping Saskatchewan farmers and families have a high standard of living.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: – Hear, hear!

MR. LARTER: – Furthermore, the people of Saskatchewan would not have had to assume the risk they are at this moment assuming under the policy of the present NDP government. Mr. Speaker, let's tell the people of Saskatchewan the truth about the success of the NDP rural programs and policies. The Speech from the Throne boasts about the rising farm cash receipts in Saskatchewan due to strong world prices. First of all, it should be made perfectly clear to the public, Mr. Speaker, that the NDP can deserve to be criticized for trying to take credit for the world price increases when in fact they have absolutely no influence in the price of such things as wheat, beef, rape seed or other commodities traded in the world markets. The truth of the matter, Mr. Speaker, is that Saskatchewan farmers have the lowest, deflated net income the prairie provinces. The orderly marketing cornerstone of the NDP farm development policy has resulted in constant, steady decline and deflated net income every year from '75-78. Manitoba and Alberta farmers have shown a very positive net income improvement in 1978.

Now, Mr. Speaker, if world farm prices are going up and real net farm incomes are going up in Alberta and Manitoba, but they are falling behind in Saskatchewan, who can we blame? Not the opposition – the NDP. The one key item in the farm income picture that the provincial NDP is responsible for is farm costs. Ask any Saskatchewan farmer today what his key income problems are and he'll tell you the cost-price squeeze, not orderly marketing. The Saskatchewan NDP imposed an orderly sales tax on the majority of farm input such as grain bins, welders and other things designed mainly to maintain family farms. The Saskatchewan NDP threatens retroactive education and health tax on farm feedlots. Ask the family farms at Lanigan if the NDP even knows what a farm is, let alone what the problems are. I think you said that, didn't you? They curse the aggressive orderly tax burden propagated by this government.

The NDP government has raised the rent on leased land with no regard for land productivity. The NDP government has misallocated livestock in community pastures so pastures go unused while neighboring family farms sell cattle because of the lack of ranging facilities. The NDP purchased over \$100 million of land bank land from Saskatchewan farm families and has directly pulled \$250 million of accumulated desperately-needed family wealth out of the pockets of Saskatchewan people as a result of increased land values. Did you hear that, Gordon? The windfall gain goes into the pockets of the NDP government. That \$250 million of hard-earned family heritage can never be returned to the pioneers who built this province, and in the first place it's going forever into the potash holes of PCS (Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan). Did you hear that hon. minister?

Mr. Speaker, marketing legislation should encourage growth and not be used as a political tool to force people off the land and into the cities. The Premier has stated that this government is pledged to support the crowrates and will oppose schemes which transfer additional cost to the farmer. Not only has the Premier imposed hundreds of millions of dollars of additional costs onto the backs of Saskatchewan farmers, as clearly indicated by Statistics Canada data and the Saskatchewan squeeze on rural families, and not only is the Premier out of touch with agriculture in this province, but now, Mr. Speaker, our Premier has again compromised his principle and our reputation . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Is that the back door, Premier? . . . by proposing to negotiate to trade the crowrate for oil price concessions with the federal government. By introducing the crowrate into the bargaining negotiations over oil pricing in Canada the Premier has sat the stage to have the crow traded to western Conservative so that additional oil revenues can be dumped into the NDP bureaucracy. Now what do you think of that? Isn't that awful? As the farmers of Saskatchewan if they're willing to sacrifice the crow for more public uranium or potash expenditures now dominating the minds of this NDP government.

To quote the member for Souris-Cannington, if our Premier obviously does not understand even the most rudimentary aspects of agricultural life, how can the farmers of Saskatchewan trust him to pull a fair price on the value of the crowrate or as the member for Souris-Cannington says here, know where to spend the 30 pieces of silver when he has betrayed them? Where's he going to spend it? Mr. Speaker, I respectfully challenge the Premier's right and his credentials to bring the crowrate to the energy bargaining table. This might surprise you but I'm not going to support the motion.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: – Hear, hear!

HON. H.H. ROLFES (Minister of Health): – The member from Blaine Lake just asked me to tell all I know about farming. If I were to do that then my speech would be shortened by about the length that the member for Estevan should have been shortened by – by about 30 minutes. Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege this evening to speak for a few minutes on the throne speech and to give the members the privilege of listening to the Minister of Health for the province of Saskatchewan which is always a privilege for any member of health, because we are the trendsetters in that particular area. I know it's very difficult for the members opposite to have to defend their brothers and their colleagues in other provinces and what they are doing and I will further elucidate on those things, Mr. Speaker, this evening.

Mr. Speaker, first of all let me congratulate the member for Regina North-West (Mr. Solomon) for moving the Speech from the Throne, and also my colleague, the member for Cut Knife-Lloydminster (Mr. Long) who did an admirable job in seconding the Speech from the Throne.

Mr. Speaker, I also want to take this opportunity – not any length – thank the constituents of Saskatoon Buena Vista for placing their confidence in me again for the last time around, in 1975, and then again in 1978, under very trying circumstances the opposition tried to put in my way. I'm glad that particular election is over and the opposition has learned its lesson and won't try any of those tactics in the next one. Mr. Speaker, in that regard, I think the opposition should look at the statistics in that we were fortunate in one sense in winning every poll in my constituency, and I want to take this opportunity of thanking the people of Buena Vista constituency in Saskatoon.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: – Hear, hear!

MR. ROLFES: – Mr. Speaker, of course I want to give credit to the Premier (Mr. Blakeney) of the province of Saskatchewan. Because we had such an excellent leader, it was easy for most of us on this side to get re-elected and we look forward to the 1983 election, when we know he will be just as popular if not more popular than he was the last time around.

Mr. Speaker, I do want to address myself to just one comment made by the member for Wilkie (Mr. Garner). He was asking the Minister of Tourism and Renewable Resources (Mr. Gross) why he wouldn't complete the Meadow Lake Provincial Park. Mr. Speaker, as one who frequents the provincial parks quite regularly during the summer and during the winter time (when we go cross-country skiing), I can tell the member for Wilkie that if I had my druthers I would spend the money on provincial parks closer to the middle of the province rather than on the border of Alberta or on the border of Manitoba – where 50 per cent to 60 per cent of the Meadow Lake parks are used by Albertans. Mr. Speaker, the reason I have not gone back to the Meadow Lake Provincial Park is that to drive 250 miles and then find 60 per cent to 70 per cent of the spaces are used by Albertans irritates me a little, and I don't know why we want to subsidize Albertans in order to use our provincial parks. So I will ask the minister to possibly use his money in other areas.

Mr. Speaker, I do want to address myself to a few comments made by the member for Maple Creek (Mrs. Duncan). Let me first of all say I appreciate very much the tone of her speech, and the way in which she delivered it, and also the content of her speech. There are some things, Mr. Speaker, that of course I do not agree with and that's understandable since we philosophically disagree, I suppose, in the way health care services should be delivered in this province. Mr. Speaker, she said we were somewhat suffering from paranoia because we would not accept some of her suggestions.

Mr. Speaker, I'm sure she didn't suggest – I know she didn't suggest – we should put on hospital premiums or medicare premiums like they have in Alberta of \$180 or \$182 per year, or the full \$180 that people have to pay in Ontario, or the hospital deterrent fees that you have to pay in both Tory Alberta or Tory Ontario. I know she didn't suggest that but, Mr. Speaker, if a Tory in Ontario will do that and a Tory in Alberta will do that and the Socreds (which are really Tories) in B.C. will do that then I think if we don't accept the suggestions of the members opposite on many items, I think we have ample proof as to what would happen if they formed the government in the province of Saskatchewan.

Mr. Speaker, let me talk just for a few moments on the issue of native people. I think we all regret the plight of the native people not only in Saskatchewan, but throughout Canada. It must be remembered that for the most part the responsibility of native people – and I'm referring to treaty Indians off and on the reserve – is the responsibility of the federal government. Let's not kind ourselves that this has been the history, this has been the tradition, and this has been accepted by most other provincial provinces.

In part, it has been accepted by former federal governments. I want to just read to you a little article that appeared in the Leader-Post yesterday where it said: 'Indian social

woes are hurting children.' Mr. Speaker, I want to quote the following from the Manitoba health minister, Bud Sherman. Bud Sherman was responding to Judge Garson of Manitoba. Manitoba Health Minister Bud Sherman responded to Garson's criticism and I want you to listen, by accusing Ottawa of continually trying to abdicate its responsibility to treaty Indians. He was, of course, referring to the represent Ottawa Tory government. We'll respond, he say, when we have to, but we won't respond until we have to. Show us an absolute crisis at the last moment, and we'll respond Sherman said.

What I'm simply saying is – I'm not saying that Bud Sherman is correct, that he should respond only in the last resort, or only when there's absolute crisis – the provincial governments have taken a stand in the past and are taking a stand now and, hopefully, will continue to take the stand in the future, that the responsibility for treaty Indians off and on the reserves is the responsibility of the respective federal government in power at that particular time. We all regret as I said before the plight of native people. I am sure the Minister of Finance (Mr. Tchorzewski) will, when budget time comes around, have some announcements of our particular initiative in that area for native people in the province of Saskatchewan.

Mr. Speaker, let me now turn to health care and some of the aspects of health care as they relate to my department. NDP governments in Saskatchewan have historically been committed to providing the people of this province with quality health care. Since 1971 in particular this tradition has taken us far beyond basic hospital, medical and public health services. In the last nine years, (and I want you to listen, Mr. Member for Moosomin (Mr. Birkbeck) and Mr. Member for Souris-Cannington (Mr. Berntson)), our government has made significant progress in meeting health care needs which were previously ignored. While other governments are content to rest on their laurels, NDP governments have never been satisfied with this lacklustre approach. The NDP in this province has a well-earned reputation for looking ahead to see what still needs to be done. It is this forward looking attitude which resulted in the new health care programs in the mid-1970s – program such as children's dental plan, our prescription drug plan, our hearing aid plan and aids to independent living. Where do you find a combination of these programs, Mr. Speaker, in any other province in this nation? You simply don't find them.

All of these programs, Mr. Speaker, have three common characteristics; they were urgently needed; their high utilization rates are a firm indication of this need; and they are efficiently run and singularly cost effective. Approximately two-thirds of the population actively benefit from the drug plan. Our children's dental plan has 84 per cent utilization rate and the per patient cost of running it last year was less than 50 per cent of the Manitoba plan. Mr. Speaker, presently there are plans under way to move into the area of dental services for adolescents and I hope that sometime in this coming year that I will be able to make further announcements in this particular area.

Mr. Speaker, one area that the member for Maple Creek (Mrs. Duncan) spoke on again as she did last year was on the plight of senior citizens in this province. Nowhere in this nation, nowhere are senior citizens better off than they are in the province of Saskatchewan. Absolutely nowhere.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: – Hear, hear!

MR. ROLFES: – Mr. Speaker, in this province senior citizens have benefits from the Saskatchewan Income Plan, over \$8 million. Senior citizens have community service

grants of over \$4 million. Subsidies to special care homes are well over \$12 million; Mr. Speaker, a home care program this year over \$9 million. We have a senior citizens home repair program, I believe over \$5 million. We have a home pack program, Saskatchewan Hearing Aid Plan, Saskatchewan Prescription Drug Plan, Saskatchewan Aids to Independent Living. Mr. Speaker, in last year's budget, the former minister of health announced at that time that we would also implement additional assistance to special care homes of \$300 per month, up to 10 per cent of the level III care. (I see the member for Qu'Appelle (Mr. Lane) is back and we'll have to put up with that irritant for a while yet, Mr. Speaker.)

The school tax rebate program was implemented this past year. In this province (not like Alberta, not like Ontario) there are no medicare premiums. There are no hospital deterrent fees. Mr. Speaker, if you add up all of these programs, you are well over the \$200 million figure for senior citizens in this Premier and yet the members opposite say that senior citizens in this province are in a serious plight.

Mr. Speaker, let me talk a little bit about health spending. I love this particular aspect because the comparisons are just beautiful compared to other provinces. Since 1971, the health care budget for this province has increased by \$300 million, a 169 per cent increase. That is a 19 per cent increase on the average per year – 19 per cent. The minister of New Brunswick just recently announced that hospitals in her province would get no more than 6 per cent, Mr. Speaker.

AN HON. MEMBER: – What kind of a government have thy got in New Brunswick?

MR. ROLFES: – Mr. Speaker, what kind of a government? I believe it is a Tory government. Last year the Government of Manitoba announced a 2.9 per cent increase for hospitals. What kind of government? A Tory government. Mr. Speaker, last year the Ontario government announced a 4.69 per cent increase for hospitals in Ontario – another Tory government.

Let me give a few more statistics. Conservative Manitoba – funding for health care has dropped 23.5 per cent since 1975. Conservative Ontario – over the next three years 1,172 beds will be closed in Metro Toronto alone. Across the province of Ontario another 900 beds will be closed. Hospitals in Ontario are held to 4.5 per cent budget increase in 1979-80.

Mr. Speaker, I have another little caption here – I don't think the opposition can see it, but it's from Saturday, December 8 Leader-Post – do you know what it says? Russell may close small hospitals in Alberta. Dave Russell happens to be the Minister of Health for the province of Alberta. That's right – a Tory government. It says here rich Alberta is going to close small hospitals in Alberta. It says here Russell said Wednesday, he would close some small hospitals in 1980.

Mr. Speaker, I just have a few moments left. I want to spend just a few moments in direct billing. Direct, billing, Mr. Speaker, is a problem, not only in Saskatchewan, but is a problem right across Canada.

MR. BERNTSON: – That's the first time you've ever admitted that.

MR. ROLFES: – If you've read my speeches on it, I indicated, Mr. Speaker . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . you had your say, why didn't you make some valuable contributions when you were on your feet, then you wouldn't have to make them now?

Mr. Speaker, however . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . that's the place where you should be – behind the rail and a little bit further.

Direct billing is a concern of all health ministers and I believe of all people in Canada. But I want to indicate that in Ontario, for example, 18 per cent of all doctors are extra billing at this particular time. Forty-two per cent of doctors in Alberta are extra billing. Here it says 42 per cent of doctors in Alberta direct bill and this is . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . It says practice of doctors of billing patients. No, no, this is I believe the Leader-Post. Mr. Speaker, it's 42 per cent in Alberta, 18 per cent in Ontario and let me say that here in Saskatchewan we have a total of – the last figure – 4.5 per cent of the total billing is direct billing. Four and a half per cent was the latest figure that I received from the Department of Health of all the bills that are submitted to MCIC (medical care insurance commission) that are extra billing. Having said that, Mr. Speaker, direct billing is still a problem in this province. I think we must come to grips with it. I have stated time and time again to the Saskatchewan Medical Association that I would prefer to do it through discussion and consultation. I would hope they would recognize it is a problem for the Minister of Health and a problem for our government. I would hope we don't have to use legislation, although that option must be available to the Minister of Health and to the Government of Saskatchewan.

Mr. Speaker, my time is up. I would like to have spent some time on rehabilitative services and on the task force that I recently appointed. I would like to have spent some time on the adolescent psychiatry program that I announced – a million dollar program that I announced last week for the city of Saskatoon. There are other areas that I would like to have spent some time on, for example the initiatives that we're taking in the Department of Health in preventative services. I hope by next year at this time that I will be able to present a new program on how to help people prevent illness rather than to intervene after people become ill.

Mr. Speaker, as I said, my time has come to an end. From what I have said you can well ascertain that I will be supporting the major motion. I will oppose the amendment put forward by the opposition, which I wish I could have voted on last night but I wasn't able to be here. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: – Hear, hear!

MR. G.S. MUIRHEAD (Arm River): – Mr. Speaker, it is with pleasure that I rise to speak once again in this House.

AN HON. MEMBER: – It's a pleasure to have you here.

MR. MUIRHEAD: – Thank you. It's a pleasure to be here.

I wish at this time to think the people of Arm River constituency for their continuous support and encouragement. Mr. Speaker, I would like to congratulate and welcome the member for Regina North-West into the legislature. I wish him every success. I would also like to thank some of the cabinet minister for their co-operation in resolving a number of constituency requests this past year. In my reply to the throne speech last session I requested assistance from the Minister of Health for a hospital problem at Outlook; the Minister of Agriculture for a land bank problem at Elbow, the Minister of Municipal Affairs and many others too numerous to mention.

I must mention and enlarge on a problem at Outlook. Mr. Speaker, I would like to just

explain this a little bit. I attended several hospital board meeting in Outlook during the past two years. They were having a financial problem because the department was lowering their bed-hospital quota resulting in a deficit which the Outlook community would have to bear. Finally, I made arrangements for a representative of the Outlook hospital board to meet with the minister. From this meeting we thank the minister for raising the quota one bed instead of decreasing it. This was some help and we hope in 1980, with further co-operation, to help the situation more. Mr. Minister I thank you for not going the route of your first suggestion – to raise the tax mill in order to cover the financial deficit. I would like to thank these respective minister for their co-operation. Now, Mr. Speaker, enough bouquets.

Mr. Speaker, I must attack the Department of the Environment and it is such a large task I just don't know where to start. I was sure the cabinet minister wouldn't be here to listen to this but I'm sure his colleagues will get the message to him. If this department were rated between zero and one hundred according to other departments of environment in North America, this department would have to be rated at zero, the bottom of the barrel. Let us reminisce over the past – PCB (polychlorinated biphenyl) spill at Federal Pioneer, power transformers with PCB in them at various places throughout Saskatchewan, weed spray cans, fertilizer bags, poisonous herbicide cans lying all over this province in farmers' sloughs to wash into our drinking water supply during the spring run-off or heavy rains. Mr. Speaker, I must add here, I feel that when a farmer goes to buy his herbicides, he should pay a deposit on these cans and be refunded when he returns them, just like we do with the pop bottle or a beer bottle like the minister for Saskatoon says.

Now this is at least a suggestion to help.

Mr. Speaker, these are only a few items where environment has failed in its responsibility to the citizens of this province.

Mr. Speaker, on June 11 of this past summer I received a call from some reporters advising me of high-level PCBs in the Regina drinking water and they asked me if I wished to comment as environment critic. My only comment at the time was that this was a most serious situation and was best left to the Department of the Environment and city of Regina water management. However, Mr. Speaker, as time went on the Department of Environment failed to advise the people of Regina of the situation at hand. The public only heard what came from the press, who I might add did a remarkable job of searching out the truth and advising the people of Regina as best they could.

Mr. Speaker, I tried and I gave this matter all the patience I possibly could. But the silence of the Department of the Environment, the eight MLAs from Regina, including the Premier and the mayor of Regina, and also I must add, the two MLA from Moose Jaw, angered me and I could keep still no longer. I discussed this situation my colleague from Regina South, Paul Rousseau, and a decision was made that we must interfere and take matters into our own hands.

About July 1, Mr. Speaker, I contacted Mr. Mang of the city water department and had him explain the situation to me. He was very co-operative and said this was a most serious situation. I also contacted Mr. Fast, the only one in the Department of the Environment that was anywhere on the scene, who was also very co-operative.

Mr. Speaker, I also discussed this matter with Dr. Mathias who also said this could be a

most serious situation. His main concern was how long the people had been drinking the water with this level of PCBs. He also stated that from the date of June 11, 1979 and for a three month period following, would be the limit the human body could consume the water. I might add Dr. Mathias was also very co-operative.

Mr. Speaker, at this time I was receiving calls from the press from all over the province as I was the only one giving political guidance. Mr. Speaker, I could see the press was very annoyed at the Minister of the Environment for his silence. My statement to the press at that time was the same as it is now. Mr. Speaker, I say keep politics out of this very serious matter. We are dealing with the lives of people.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: – Hear, hear!

MR. MUIRHEAD: – All I expected of environment was honesty. My experience in matters such as this is to inform the people of the truth and they will accept it. Environment's silence only lead to panic. (I'll take a swallow of this stuff right now.) Ahhh!

Mr. Speaker, your government, under the direction of the Hon. Mr. Blakeney, chose it's route to bring this most serious situation to an end. They chose the route of dishonesty. The only way out of this embarrassment was to lie to the people of Regina and say there never were any PCBs found in the water. They made up the fairy story that the paint was flaking off a tap and falling into the test bottle.

Mr. Speaker, I would advise that the members opposite listen very carefully because they know nothing about this situation. They have never been in Farrel pumping station and most of them don't even know where it is. You see, Mr. Speaker, this tap was painted ten years ago with paint containing a level of PCBs. What a joke, Mr. Speaker! What a way to fool the people!

In April 1979 a test showed enough PCB level to frighten water officials. On June 11, 1979, the tests went up to a frightening level. The test by July 11 dropped some. Why, Mr. Speaker, did the test drop? Was it because the paint conveniently knew when to drop off the tap? Or did the test of PCBs drop because pump number three was shut off on June 21? For your information Mr. Minister (if you were here), pump number three comes directly from the reservoir at Farrel pumping station. Mr. Speaker, anyone with any thinking powers would realize that PCBs did not enter the water from paint on a tap. The only people who believe this outrageous story are just a few dedicated reds in the city like the Mr. McLeods who often sit in the gallery and must have a direct line to our hot line programs.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: – The PCBs came directly from the old dumping ground of Saskatchewan Power where transformers with PCB content in them for a coolant were repaired for at least 25 years. This dumping ground is directly beside the Farrel water reservoir, Mr. Speaker, the statements . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . I thought I had a loud voice but I can't quite make it. Mr. Speaker, if the statements I have made are not factual, the someone please prove to me why the opposition to government was denied samples of water at Farrel pumping station, and also denied samples of soil when the test holes were dug in the Saskatchewan Power dump yard. Mr. Speaker, when your government decided to take the route of the Blakeney tap, no more were people like Mr. Fast co-operative. No more.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, on July 30 I received special bottles from the Can Test Labs, Vancouver; the arrangements having been made by the federal Department of the Environment. Mr. Speaker, I was promised a sample of water from this station on this date, but only because five members from the press were with me. We met at the Farrel pumping station at 11 a.m. but once again we were refused a sample. At this time – the people opposite seem to think this is a joke. PCBs in the drinking water of Regina, and I'm assured that is no joke. Now don't laugh, this is no joke.

At this time, Mr. Speaker, I can see that the city of Regina water and maintenance crew, including Mr. Bill Mang, no longer had any power whatsoever in their own station. We were told by Mr. Fast to come back at 3 p.m. and we would receive our samples. The press were very patient and I wish to thank them for returning at 3 p.m. We finally received a sample out of the flaky tap. Environment filled their bottles and one for me. I believe, Mr. Speaker, the four hour delay was to turn on the right pump so the test would turn out right. I also went to the General Hospital to request a sample. The administrator very willingly gave me a sample. Now, Mr. Speaker . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . well you wouldn't know, the flaky tap story your government so conveniently made up. I rule out for three reasons:

1. Refusal to give me samples of water and soil; these samples were also refused several times; the member for Souris-Cannington (Mr. Berntson), the critic for health was refused a sample; Paul Rousseau, the member for Regina South was refused a sample; we were chased out.

2. Results from the Can Test Lab were the same at Farrel pumping station as they were at the General Hospital, and I now want to table my evidence in my text.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: – Hear, hear!

MR. MUIRHEAD: – They were identical – the same. This rules out your story about the flaky, little tap dropping paint into the bottle.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: – Hear, hear!

MR. MUIRHEAD: – Number three – now explain this one. Going back to my conversations with Dr. Mathias about his announcement to the press that there were levels of PCBs in mothers' milk. Dr. Mathias told me this was of great concern. But, Dr. Mathias soon withdrew his announcement to the press about the mothers' milk with levels of PCB as a miscalculation. I don't blame the doctor for changing his mind and going along with the environment theory because, Mr. Speaker, maybe you would too if you thought you might lose your job. I say to the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Urban) (Mr. Smishek not to take my water request lightly but to co-operate with us, the opposition, and with the new Mayor of Regina, Mr. Schneider and the Mayor of Moose Jaw, Mr. Taylor, and we will . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Are you saying that you don't want to co-operate with all these people?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: – Hear, hear!

MR. MUIRHEAD: – Just listen to what I have to say. I'm saying if you would co-operate with us, the opposition, and with the new Mayor of Regina, Mr. Schneider, and the Mayor of Moose Jaw, Mr. Taylor, we will make the water of Regina and surrounding area fit to drink and smell. Mr. Speaker, the two mayors met last week to discuss the

water situation and are definitely looking to the government for assistance on behalf of approximately 200,000 people. But I presume, the Minister of Municipal affairs (Urban) will take the wishes of these 200,000 people lightly as he did his own constituents and the city of Regina in regard to the PCBs. Your main concern is not safe, clean water but large downtown developments in order to fatten the pocketbooks of your NDP friends in the East.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: – Hear, hear!

MR. MUIRHEAD: – You said, Mr. Minister, you could not recall who recommended the Chartwood group for the downtown development but I hear it was Mr. Broadbent, your leader at the federal level looking after his eastern interests. He was looking after his eastern interests to the tune of nearly a \$250,000 windfall.

Mr. Speaker, when his recent 5,000 gallon oil spill at Federal Pioneer flowed over the soil where the PCBs were buried and ended up with 500 parts per billion of PCBs in the oil it was proof positive that every time there was a flood or run-off of any kind, PCBs would have been washed throughout the city of Regina. So, Mr. Minister on behalf of the citizens of Regina and to safeguard any credibility that could possibly be left for the Department of the Environment, please immediately have the buried PCBs at Federal Pioneer hauled away from the city of Regina. You did not need legislation to have the oil hauled away, so you do not need legislation to have the PCB-contaminated soil hauled away.

Now, wrapping up my criticism of environment, I just have one more thing to say. I am sorry that the minister is not here but I'm sure that his colleagues will get this message to him. I say to the hon. Minister of Environment (Mr. Bowerman), you are an honorable man and I just ask you to do one thing for me and the people of Saskatchewan.

AN HON. MEMBER: – Resign. Do the honorable thing: resign.

MR. MUIRHEAD: – No, I'm not going that far. I'm just saying, please put people before politics and money.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: – Hear, hear!

MR. MUIRHEAD: – Work with me instead of against me and we could together improve the environmental hazards of this province and most importantly, the quality of drinking water which must be the most important thought in the minds of your government because you won an election a year ago by making a statement that I agree with wholeheartedly that people are the most important resource in this province. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, if people are the most important resource then water must be second because people cannot live without water.

Now when the Minister of Health (Mr. Rolfes) was speaking, I was interrupted and had a phone call. This phone call was from a member of a co-op in the town of Davidson. He was a very disturbed man last night when he heard Mr. Cody on the radio riding on the backs of these co-ops. I looked through (that's why I was late coming in here) to see what Mr. Cody had to say and I was very disturbed, Mr. Speaker. He quoted the member for Souris-Cannington (Mr. Berntson). But this is what you people do. You twist around when you quote. He said the other day in this House, the hon. Leader of the Opposition,

Mr. Berntson, stood before us and condemned the government for honoring the co-operative movement by holding a special week in its honor. Now, why did you twist that around because he did not say that. What we don't want you to do is to sell our NDP philosophies through co-op schools and churches. Then he says I plan on making it my business to tell every co-operative person in Saskatchewan that the Tory opposition stands against this week of recognition. Well, if he is only going to talk to the NDP co-op people throughout the province, it is not going to take him very long because most of the co-op and pool people in the country vote for us – the Progressive Conservative Party of Saskatchewan.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: – Hear, hear!

MR. MUIRHEAD: – Mr. Speaker, I have a word for the Premier or the captain of the ship as he should be called. Why do you have your boys call us the nickname of Palliser so often when we stand up to speak? Why Mr. Premier, don't you associate us with co-ops or pools? Mr. Speaker, I say to the Premier that this game of his is all over. Tommy Douglas started this propaganda and you Mr. Premier, have made a beautiful job of carrying it through. You have associated yourself and your party with the Saskatchewan Wheat Pool, co-ops, credit unions and now you're trying it on our churches.

Mr. Speaker, I want it on record in this House. I am speaking on behalf of a large mass of people in this wonderful province of Saskatchewan who cannot be here to speak for themselves. I am saying on behalf of these organization that this is not a mutual feeling. For example, I will use the Craik rural pool. Out of 224 voters, the NDP received 47 votes. The Saskatchewan pool handled some 48 per cent of the grain last crop year. So use your mathematics and figure how many wheat pool members support the Progressive Conservative Party. The town of Davidson is a co-op oriented town and always has been. There are five polls located in that town and the Progressive Conservative won all five.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: – Hear, hear!

MR. MUIRHEAD: – Mr. Speaker, we see the same picture all over rural Saskatchewan. The NDP government associates itself with co-ops, Saskatchewan pools and credit unions, but I assure you, Mr. Premier, that a large number of these organizations do not want to associate themselves with you. I just want to read you a little article out of the Pool View by Lorne Harasen. It's very interesting.

Co-operatives are a form of free enterprise – perhaps the freest form of enterprise there is.

Then further down he says:

Suggestions that co-ops are an example of socialism are utter nonsense.

Mr. Speaker, I tell the Premier I want the freedom of choosing the business of my choice, the grain company of my choice, the church of my choice without being affiliated with any political party for doing so. If I can get my pocketbook out here. It's so full of co-op credit cards I can hardly get it out. I have in my pocketbook membership cards for the Saskatchewan Wheat Pool, Craik Co-op, Davidson Co-op, Davidson Credit Union, Sherwood Co-op, Regina, and the Palliser Wheat Growers. I use them all. I hope some of you members opposite use yours . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . All

the same thing. There's where the member here laughs. Palliser, Wheat Pool – they're the same thing. They're all people of the province of Saskatchewan and politics should stay out.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: – Hear, hear!

MR. MUIRHEAD: – Mr. Premier would you please quit using people who associate themselves with organizations of their own choosing, holding them out as being members of the NDP, when in fact the majority of the people who belong to these organizations do not support you and the NDP. You have only to look at the results of many elections past and see that more people voted against the NDP than voted for them. Please cease and desist from using people who are now sick and tired of being used. Even the labor officials who publicly endorsed your party in the last election are now out on the streets telling you they too are finished with the NDP and no longer want you or your colleagues to publicly state that all labor supports the NDP.

I want the Premier and his colleagues to clearly understand that the farm organizations, the co-operatives and labor are capable of running their own business with freedom to do, say and think as they please without you. Mr. Premier, telling them they have to be NDP in order to do so.

Mr. Speaker, the Premier made remarks in his speech the other day that were utter nonsense. He skirted around the fact that our young people are leaving this province by giving the percentage that coming in from out of province. The Premier failed to report the people leaving the province outnumber the ones coming in. Our NDP province has led the nation in a loss of farmers – it continued to show declining net farm income while Manitoba and Alberta net farm income has improved. In Saskatchewan urban and rural people have lower per capita incomes than Manitoba and Alberta. In fact our people have incomes below the national level. We have lost the livestock feeding industry and the packing and processing industry. We ship our children and calves to Alberta, feed the calves with our feed grain, our children do the processing in Alberta, then we transport the beef back here – our expense, our dollars. We have also had the highest level of tax in the prairies.

Mr. Speaker, while we are discussing the Premier I will add this. The NDP Premier should be ashamed to show his face in this province for taking the crowrate to the national energy bargaining table.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: – Hear, hear!

MR. MUIRHEAD: – This NDP non-farm Premier has already taken \$250 million of land wealth from our farmers to put into his kitty and now wants \$350 million more from crow to be put into the NDP resource pot to be rebated at election time. I can see it all now. The crow goes into the land bank to buy more farmers out to go around toward paying for potash and around we go, again and again and again, one big circle, around and around again.

Mr. Speaker, I would like the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. MacMurchy) to explain to me some day the slick piece of business he did with respect to hopper cars. He takes the money out of the taxpayers of Saskatchewan to buy these hopper cars while trying to con the farmer into thinking they are for his benefit. Mr. Speaker, I wonder if there were a boat waiting for potash or a boat waiting for wheat, which would get the priority? If I were a betting man, if the truth could be known, your government would give priority to

the potash, which I would remind you is a product the railroads do make a profit on transporting. Mr. Minister, you have already upset the operation of the crowrate by subsidizing the railways in the name of the farmers, supposedly purchasing hopper cars in order to maintain the crow . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . of course I'm not against hopper cars!

MR. ENGEL: – Our hopper cars.

MR. MUIRHEAD: – Yes, just exactly what the minister said, or what the member from the back said – quote him! Our hopper cars – not to haul wheat, to haul potash!

SOME HON. MEMBERS: – Hear, hear!

MR. MUIRHEAD: – Mr. Premier, I am astonished that you fired one of your senior cabinet ministers and did not make mention of his contribution in your throne speech, and also made no mention of your colleague, Mr. Baker (Regina Victoria), for his many years of service to the city of Regina.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: – Hear, hear!

MR. MUIRHEAD: – And now Mr. Baker, on behalf of our caucus, we wish to honor you and thank you for your many years of service to this city.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: – Hear, hear!

MR. MUIRHEAD: – Mr. Speaker, I say to the Premier that his senior more right wing thinkers of the party must be very worried because they are being replaced by the red backbenchers of the party. Mr. Speaker, I wish to advise the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. MacMurchy) that you were blasting on television the other night that the Neil report about the Holdfast rail line has never been put into place. I wish to advise the minister that I have proof he is entirely wrong and please do not worry about the Holdfast rail line because it is in my constituency and they will get what they need.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: – Hear, hear!

MR. MUIRHEAD: – Doug Neil and I are responsible to this date that this line will stay in the permanent network. I am sure you will get what you need, and that is an early retirement after the next election.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: – Hear, hear!

MR. MUIRHEAD: – Mr. Speaker, I wish to congratulate the new Leader of the Progressive Conservative Party, Mr. Grant Devine. I am assured he is the man who will debate Mr. Blakeney right out of the province of Saskatchewan just like the late Hon. Ross Thatcher, with one debate, finished Tommy Douglas's political realm in Saskatchewan.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: – Hear, hear!

MR. MUIRHEAD: – Mr. Speaker, I will not be voting for the motion. Thank you.

MR. J.G. LANE (Qu'Appelle): – Mr. Speaker, it gives me pleasure to join in the throne speech debate. I would like to follow the tradition and comment the mover and

second. There's a bit of tradition, that perhaps they are not aware of, that the Premier often looks to the mover and seconder as his source for future cabinet appointments. That hasn't always been successful, because last year a couple of the guys bombed out and didn't get the promotion that normally follows. I note the new member for Regina North-West participated in this with hopes in the cabinet policy but let me assure the member for Regina Centre, that he doesn't have to worry.

The member for Regina North-West, I congratulate on winning the by-election. The government took some pride in that. The interesting thing about that by-election is that it was the lowest percentage popular vote turnout of any by-election in the recent history of the province of Saskatchewan, and that's with the great NDP effort, organization and what not bringing the mass of voters to the polls.

Let me assure the hon. members that if the election hadn't been called during a leadership campaign, we would have ensured a much higher popular vote turnout.

Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Regina North-West – I suppose we add it up to being somewhat naive, he's a new member in the House – I'm going to suggest to him, that one of the things he may want to do is discuss with the Minister of Health, pro tem, Regina North-West where he's going to stop direct billing. He made a campaign promise to this effect. He made a nominating convention commitment to the people of Regina North-West. He spends some time on direct billing, what a great problem it is, and then we go to page 55 of Hansard, where he says that the Conservatives have been exaggerating the problem of direct billing – that it's only 2 per cent of the doctors. It is a little inconsistent and completely contradictory to the statements just made by the Minister of Health who said it was about 18 per cent. Your health figures are following the long tradition of the NDP. They aren't worth the paper that they're written on.

Mr. Speaker, the new member again – and I'm sure it's naive and I know he doesn't mean it, (it's obvious this wasn't cleared; it wasn't cleared with the Minister of Labour; we know it wasn't cleared with the Premier; we know it wasn't cleared with the Deputy Premier; we know it wasn't cleared with anybody else on the government side except for the Minister of Highways) when he so proudly states how he was so happy to rely on the wisdom and the experience of Eiling Kramer. Now is that not a sign of a very naive individual, a new member. You're all entitled to a mistake, but I know if you could see from this side the snickers that are going on in the front bench over your misplaced confidence in the Minister of Highways.

Mr. Speaker, things have changed an awful lot since some of us got elected. For one thing, I would like to join with the member for Arm River and although we have our differences of opinion, I would like to join with him and on behalf of our caucus, join with many thousands of people in thanking the member for Regina Victoria for his contribution to the city and the political life of the city of Regina.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: – Hear, hear!

MR. LANE: – As I say, we have often had our differences but sir, your contribution I'm sure will be well remembered and long remembered by many people in the city.

The other thing that shocked me, as a complete change of what's happening in this city, was to read the shocking, shocking news in the Leader-Post the other day, dealing with the member for Weyburn (Mr. Pepper). Now the member for Weyburn has a long

tradition in his personal beliefs but to find out that he donated a bottle of rye out of his personal stock to the cornerstone in the new Weyburn Centre, I think is a significant change in what I have been led to believe about the member for Weyburn. So, as I say, things change and shocks always occur in politics. Let me tell you that's one of the most shocking things that I have seen.

Mr. Speaker, the Premier attempted – and I think the word is ‘defends’ in the headline of the Leader-Post December 6 – Blakeney Defends Policies on Agriculture and Resources. They didn't put the addendum and the proper one that he didn't defend them very well, and he didn't defend them very accurately. Some things he didn't mention or he mentioned only in passing. I think the status he placed on the particular area, and I am referring in particular to the environment, indicates the concern with which the Premier really holds the environment of Saskatchewan. He starts off, and this is one of the funniest, strangest statements . . . I know the new member for Regina North-West (Mr. Solomon) will really take note of this. I know that the member for Saskatoon Sutherland (Mr. Prebble) will have picked up very readily the statement of the Premier where he is trying to do a comparison of the record of this government and he backs up his claim for his environmental regulations being strengthened by public hearings and how proud he is of the record of the government opposite. His one piece of evidence was the example of a power line from Squaw Rapids to The Pas, Manitoba – an environment impact study was held in Saskatchewan to determine the effects of the line, but no such similar legislation was held in Manitoba. The interesting thing about that, for the new member for Regina North-West, is in fact there was a study held in Saskatchewan and do you know what the Premier did with it? He threw it out the window. He told the SPC (Saskatchewan Power Corporation) it didn't have to follow the Nikiforuk study. In fact it was a matter of some debate in this Assembly, as the member responsible for Sask Power at the time, weaselled and skimmed and skated around as he tried to justify his government's refusal to follow the environmental impact study. And let me tell the hon. member that it is a lot worse for the public to set up and give them some outlet they are supposed to rely on and then in fact pull it away from there and say to heck with the environmental impact study – to heck with any assessments. We don't need them; we don't want them. That's a lot more dangerous and that's a lot more morally dishonest than anybody not having a study in the first place. But that's typical and you'll get used to it. You'll get as used to that as attempting to rely on the wisdom of the member, the Minister of Highways (Mr. Kramer).

The Premier, as a matter of fact, and we'll give you his record on the environment – the Premier or the executive council when the Bayda report was tabled – did a press release. Let's listen to one of the great quotes, one of the great quotes of all time. ‘The northern environment will be protected,’ says Allan Blakeney. ‘Standards will be adopted to do this not only while mining is going on, but long after it's ceased.’ What happened? We drain a lot of lakes in the North? That's protecting the environment? That's the real record of the government opposite. It builds a road, the Key Lake road, without any regard to environmental impact, without any public hearings, without regard to the environment of northern Saskatchewan. And that is the real record of the government opposite when it comes to the environment.

How true the United Church is when it says on its latest report – and I'm sure some members opposite would listen to the statements of the United Church:

We're dissatisfied that the government has chosen to pursue the immediate goals of provincial revenue, short term jobs at any cost and profits for a foreign-controlled nuclear industry at the expense of the real needs of the

people of this province and the life and culture of northern communities.

In fact your environmental procedure, your environmental record may well be the most morally bankrupt of any government in Canada because you stand on one side in moral righteousness saying you're going to protect your environment and in fact under the guise of that moral righteousness you carry out an unwarranted rape of the northern environment. That's the real record of the government opposite.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: – Hear, hear!

MR. LANE: – Let me tell some of the members opposite – you've heard a bit of an indication tonight about the government's record on the PCBs (polychlorinated biphenyls) – of the great cover-up of PCBs. Now the hon. member wasn't in the House at the time – the new member – so he probably wasn't aware of the PCB spill. The reason he isn't aware of it, of course, is that this government tried to cover it up for a couple of years. As a matter of fact, another indication of how Machiavellian the Premier is, he went so far as to support the former minister of the environment on the issue of the PCB spill. He backed him to the hilt. He touted to the public that the minister of the environment was doing a tremendous job and we all saw the subsequent dumping at a public crucifixion of the former minister of the environment after his long service. It proved I think that in fact the opposition was quite correct in its criticism, that the opposition was 100 per cent right on its proof that the government had defaulted on its obligation to protect the environment. I'm going to tell the hon. member and this may shock him, coming in as a naive young man, why this government covered up the PCB spills for a couple of years, why it hid from the public of Saskatchewan the PCB spill, why it refused to give the indication and the evidence to the people of Saskatchewan, and to the opposition critic. I happened to get a copy of the contributors to the New Democratic Party. That's the one filed nationally; I think you've all seen it. You've all read it with wonder and amazement. On page 205 when we look at the contributors, we find one \$2,000 contribution from Federal Pioneer Limited. I say to you that is why you covered up the PCB spill and that is why you deceived the public of Saskatchewan. That is why you misled the public. That's why you hid the PCB spill. That's why you tried to minimize the danger and that is today why you are covering up the danger and why you refuse to take any action to protect the citizens of Regina from a serious environmental hazard.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: – Hear, hear!

MR. LANE: – \$2,000 is all it takes to buy silence. All it takes is \$2,000 to get headlines: 'PCB spill said safe in the short term.' That's the headline; that's what you're saying. That's the story you're touting. I say to the hon. member that you may have been naive when you came in here but you'll get a little bit more of the truth tonight. You'll find like I say that relying on the Premier is about as effective as relying on the wisdom of the Minister of Highways (Mr. Kramer). No one else does it. I don't know why you would.

Mr. Speaker, the Premier defended the government's agricultural policy. Now, hear, hear – one lone hear, hear says that someone else is attempting to get a cabinet post. What happened? He defends it saying that they're well and good. What does the former minister of agriculture say? He says the farmers aren't happy with our agricultural policy. He says that the government will take the election results as a sign it should reassess its NDP agricultural policy. That's what the dumped minister of agriculture said in the Western Producer, November 2, 1978, as he had a quick assessment of the provincial election. He says the farmers of Saskatchewan are unhappy about the

income problem, low price of grain, the high cost of input. That's what the former minister of agriculture said.

The Premier, of course, say they don't have a problem. The Premier says the problem in agriculture is one of transportation and not production. He forgets all about the high cost of farm input. He forgets that relative farm incomes have suffered and are now the lowest in western Canada under the actions of the government opposite. That's why. You know the Premier is as naive as you were dealing with agriculture when he tried to defend the policies. Let's look at the evidence which has been tabled, that of the three prairie provinces Saskatchewan is the only one to have a reduction in farm-related net income in the last year – both Manitoba and Albert increased farm income in real terms.

This was the only province with an NDP government and it's the only one that the farmers of western Canada are suffering under. That's the true record. Let's take a look at how they are going to solve this. First of all we had the Premier's answer; he says there isn't one. It's all a matter of hauling the grain and we'll have the whole problem solved. He forgets some of the other commodities that apply.

Let's look at one of the well-hidden policies of the government opposite when it comes to solving farm income problems . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Oh, a lot of you haven't heard about this, particularly you city guys. You haven't heard the secret policy of the government opposite as articulated by the former deputy, now a member of the cabinet, when he says the Government of Canada should nationalize farm credit. That's what he advocated – nationalizing farm credit. That's in the Western Producer of August 15, 1974 and that's your stated policy. He doesn't deny it; he thinks it is a great policy.

A lot of good that's going to do to the farmers. That's going to cut down his choice of income; that's going to cut down his source of credit; that's going to eliminate where he can go to get credit. In fact that attitude is going to do what your policy deliberate set out to do and that is to make the farmers more and more dependent upon government for survival, instead of their own abilities which every other government in Canada recognizes and attempts to enhance and build up, but not this government. Then we have the former deputy minister of agriculture indicating and articulating the belief and the policy of the government opposite that it's going to restrict farm size. I'll tell you what restricting a farm size is going to do under your government. It's going to, as I say, add more and more to your long-term policy of making and forcing the farmers of Saskatchewan to depend on the government and the government alone for survival and again, not on their God-given abilities. That's the attitude that's causing the farmers of Saskatchewan to reject you, In fact, the former minister of agriculture was quite right when he said the farmers are unhappy with your policies because you're out of touch with them, and I think the hon. members know it.

We have some strange situations developing. The first time – and again I am a little surprised that the press didn't pick this up, after all the ads we had some time ago about how the government opposite is going to save the crowrate. We had some time ago (and I don't know what happened to it; I wouldn't want to subscribe to the position that in fact it was a short-term political goal or policy or promise that you made) something about a crowrate retention policy. Now you know that's flown away like the crow does. You don't hear about that one any more do you? You don't hear about the crowrate retention policy from you boys anymore. I'll tell you why, because there has been a

subtle and hidden changing of policy. You are no longer the supporters of the crowrate.

The Premier of Saskatchewan goes down on the energy pricing policy and is the first Premier of this country to put the crowrate as a negotiating item on the bargaining table for an energy pricing agreement. And in fact, a quote from the Premier's press release that in return for these lower prices (he's talking about energy pricing) Saskatchewan would export some benefits. They want the full federal protection in maintaining the crowrate on export grain. No longer a crowrate for the farmers. It's not changing; now the crowrate is on the table.

AN HON. MEMBER: – . . . a telephone call from Joe Clark because Horner's in Ottawa and he want your help.

MR. LANE: – Let me tell you if it were a telephone call, you're not the member over there that would have the brains to pick up the phone.

What I would suggest to the hon. member . . .

AN HON. MEMBER: – You would think it was our ears ringing!

MR. LANE: – You probably walked into a low door; that looks like it has happened a few times to you before.

Here is the true policy of the government opposite. they want to restrict the size of the farms. All that happens is the former minister of agriculture says not right now because it is not politically opportune. But that's a policy. That's a policy that he has set and that is a policy that he has articulated around this province – more money to the land bank to increase the number of government farms; nationalization of farm credit so that in fact – hear, hear, says the Minister of Mineral Resources (Mr. Messer), the member for Kelsey-Tisdale.

I would like this read into the record, Mr. Speaker, that when I indicated that it was the policy of the government to nationalize farm credit, the member for Kelsey-Tisdale said hear, hear! I surely would like to see how the farmers in that riding take that particular policy when they get word of it.

Then we have the Premier indicating the only problems in agriculture are ones of transportation, ignoring the farm input problem and the reduction in net farm income. He is now putting the crowrate as a negotiating and bargaining time on a national energy policy – the first in Canada, the first NDP Premier and the first Premier in the province of Saskatchewan to take such a stand and have such a complete reversal of previous policy. All of these taken together, Mr. Speaker, have one goal. They only have one logical result and that is more and more farmers wholly or partially dependent upon the government for survival and upon the government for income. That is a policy we in this party will oppose and will oppose strongly and will oppose force fully and will oppose with every bit of strength we have. We believe that with a proper climate and with proper support from the government, the farmers of this province can stand on their own two feet and can make their own management decisions and make sound decisions that will enhance the family farm and will strengthen the family farm.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: – Hear, hear!

MR. LANE: – So the Premier again attempted (and again, very weakly I might add) to defend the government's position on industrial growth. Now he didn't do too much because he thought the government's industrial strategy now depended on resource revenue. It's a pretty significant turn-around. I, and members opposite over there, can recall the government opposite taking more strongly to the people of Saskatchewan in 1971 the sell-out of the resource industry how we shouldn't be relying on our resource industry; how we shouldn't get them in because of the sell-out (the sell-out to Parsons and Whittemore). We can all remember that great campaign issue in 1971 and let me tell you, the firm commitment the Premier of Saskatchewan (Mr. Blakeney) made after the 1971 election when he said:

. . . that our resources will soon be attractive enough that we can develop them without massive subsidies. Without the massive public subsidies which were poured into pulp mill developments . . .

That's what he said in 1971. You know, the so-called subsidy to pulp mill development is a drop in the bucket to the subsidy in the sell-out to Chartwood developments and Timothy Eaton.

AN HON. MEMBER: – A jot in a tittle.

MR. LANE: – A jot in a tittle, I think, are the Premier's words. But let me tell you the real cornerstone of the Premier's development in industrial strategy as set out. You won't believe the words. I know the members opposite will have a difficult time. Let me assure you, if you refer to Hansard, 126, March 1, 1972, it's there in black and white. I know you don't believe it. I'm going to let you have a guess. Which premier presently of the province of Saskatchewan said the following:

We don't believe that it is necessary to pour millions of dollars of the taxpayers' money every year into the development of our resources.

AN HON. MEMBER: – Ross Thatcher.

MR. LANE: – No, the present premier. I ask you, which present sitting premier said that? You'll never guess. It was fighting little Al from the Maritimes. Fighting little Al said:

We don't believe that it is necessary to pour millions of dollars of the taxpayers' money every year into the development of our resource.

Now let me tell you. Does that hold true with your investments in uranium? Does that hold true with your investments in potash? Does that hold true with our investments in the mining sector generally? Does that hold true with your investments in forest products? Of course it doesn't. In fact every item of the Premier's industrial strategy as laid out in 1971 has in fact been a failure and he has failed on every single cornerstone or every single area of that industrial strategy. He also said how he was going to help agriculture and boy he's sure done that – and I've been through that. He indicated what he was going to do . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . I know industrial is too big a word for the member for Saskatoon Centre (Mr. Mostoway), but you've heard this speech before and I'm sure you enjoy hearing it again . . . that he was going to develop an industrial strategy to make sure we had industries that were going to service the prairie base. None of the big grandiose scheme anymore, nothing like potash and nothing like uranium development. He promised us and assured us that he wasn't going to do

that. Let me tell you than in fact under the government opposite, the manufacturing sector has fallen from being 15 per cent of our gross provincial product in 1972 and – check your own recent Economic Review, 1979 – to 11.9 per cent, a reduction of over 3 per cent in the manufacturing sector contribution to our gross provincial product. In fact, the Premier's industrial strategy to serve the prairie basin has in fact been a total and an abject failure.

What is the real record of the government's and Allan Blakeney's industrial strategy? It has been a record of poor and unwise investment by SEDCO (Saskatchewan Economic Development Corporation). It has been typical announcements such as the failure of Fleury Industries and Fibre Form Industries and Pro-Star Mills. It has been typical that the only industry the government opposite feels confident to invest in is the hotel industry and you have some indications of your success rate on that.

You can't even collect a long, outstanding account receivable and the guy has been sitting right here waiting for you to come around. He will write out a cheque. The member for Moose Jaw North (Mr. Skoberg) will be happy to pay the bill. You don't even come to ask him to pay the account receivable. That's typical. If he needs a good lawyer, the hon. member knows that they are all on this side and he should have figured that out a long time ago.

The real reason that this government's total industrial strategy as laid out point by point on a firm moral commitment to the people of this province, the reason that it has failed is because the government opposite in its blind socialist attitude doesn't understand the entrepreneurial spirit and doesn't understand private sector management . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . And you are a prime example to the hon. members. The hon. member served on a business committee and look at how that helped the member for Regina Rosemont (Mr. Allen). He has had a much more rapid climb to the front benches than has the member for Assiniboia-Gravelbourg (Mr. Engel).

Now, the reason is that the government opposite doesn't understand and doesn't recognize the fact that the private sector management and the entrepreneurial skills are not something that you can do through government. They are not something you can impose by government; they are not skills that you can teach through the bureaucracy; they are not skills that you can do through SEDCO; they are not skills that you can impose upon people or inculcate in people through a new department of industrial development. I say to you that that is another waste of time because you don't understand what management takes. You don't understand what it takes to have a successful business. You don't understand the work and the sweat and the skills involved in building up a successful business. That's why you can't relate to small businessmen, and that's why in fact any industrial strategy you have is doomed to failure as has the one you set out in 1971.

We say, in fact, Mr. Speaker, that things haven't changed that much since 1944. In fact this province still is forced to rely on agriculture and is forced to rely on international needs for your natural resources. Otherwise we have a band economy and a down turn in the economy. There hasn't been a successful government that has been able to create the manufacturing base and the industrial base that, in fact, will cushion the people of Saskatchewan from the vagaries of international markets on our resources and our agricultural commodities. I say to you that your general policy, the Premier so feebly attempted to defend, is no different than the policies and strategies that we have had since 1944. You haven't learned a thing.

I say, and the Conservative Party says, that it is time to welcome and invite and recognize the contribution that the private sector can make to this province. We, in fact, should be saying to the private sector, come on in. build a manufacturing base, build a manufacturing industry in this province. We welcome you; we encourage you; we don't kick you; we don't attack you, because we know a strong private sector will do more to give farmers the security of good income they so vitally need, and a strong manufacturing and industrial sector will in fact give security to those involved in the resource industry. And above all, a strong manufacturing and industrial sector would give to all people of this province the financial security we so vitally need, and there's not other way to do it. Because today, after all those great resource policies of yours, the farmers of Saskatchewan have a reduction in their farm income and are falling behind the other prairie provinces. It's proof and proof positive that the mere taxing of resources doesn't solve the problem. All it does is make government bigger. I can't support that type of strategy. No Conservative can support that type of strategy, and no common-sense, thinking individual can support that strategy which has been doomed to failure, which has been proven to be a failure, and which has been a failure since it was outlined in detail by Allan Blakeney in 1972. I will not support the throne speech.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: – Hear, hear!

MR. R.J. ROMANOW (Attorney General): – Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. My first words must be words of congratulation to the mover and the seconder on their excellent presentation in the Speech from the Throne debate. I think all members have stated, and I believe genuinely stated, that both of these members have acquitted themselves in the best standards of the Legislative Assembly of Saskatchewan, and I would like to extend my congratulations to them

SOME HON. MEMBERS: – Hear, hear!

MR. ROMANOW: – I want to, Mr. Speaker, also congratulate the member for Qu'Appelle (Mr. Lane) for what I think was a valiant attempt to try to rally the forces of the opposition in debate. I think it was a valiant attempt, Mr. Speaker, given the present political circumstances of the Progressive Conservative Party in Saskatchewan and in Canada, given the present political circumstances of the budget which was announced – and I'll be saying a few words about that in a minute or two – this evening, by the new Progressive Conservative government headed by Joe Clark, and the Minister of Finance (Mr. John Crosbie).

I do want to, however, correct the member for Qu'Appelle on one point – when he said that somehow the encasement of a bottle of whiskey by the member for Weyburn, (Mr. Pepper) was an exceptional thing for the member for Weyburn. Now I want to tell the member for Qu'Appelle (Mr. Lane) that he was the only guy we could trust on this side to encase the full bottle of whiskey, and not a portion thereof. Just to make sure that future historians would know what it was all about.

I also want to congratulate the new Leader of the Progressive Conservative Party, Grant Devine, on his election. It was quite an interesting leadership race to say the least. I found the convention – I'm trying to state this as objectively as I can, albeit I might have a small degree of bias built into my remarks – a convention which was remarkably devoid of any kind of substance or statements on issue, or policy positions . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . No, not like the one in '68 – to the contrary. The one in 1970, the one that the hon.

member refers to . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . yes, the Waffle was there in 1968 and in 1970, and that leadership race of 1970 the hon. member refers to was a leadership race not only where the personalities, I think, engaged the delegates – if I may say so – but the issues of the day were fully debated on all aspects of the Saskatchewan economy from agriculture to the economy.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: – Hear, hear!

MR. ROMANOW: – . . . and I want to tell you that we maybe didn't have as spectacular parades, featuring the Muppets song and dance and their displays at the leadership convention, or displaying the Stetson hats that the members opposite wore there . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . we didn't have any of that, Mr. Speaker. I guess we were a dull convention by circumstance.

I wish I could hear the hon. member for Qu'Appelle (Mr. Lane) but his voice has a nasty habit of coming across in that same dull, boring monotone, Mr. Speaker, whether he is standing up and speaking or sitting down and speaking. I do not think that he does most of his best thinking while he is sitting. I don't know what that tells you about the anatomy of the hon. member for Qu'Appelle.

Mr. Speaker, the leadership race of the PC Party here was one which was quite an interesting spectacle. Here we had the witness of Graham Taylor (Indian Head-Wolseley) campaigning on whatever good idea that Paul Rousseau (Regina South) would come up with and Paul Rousseau campaigning on trying to make his own ideas sound like his own rather than like Graham Taylor's ideas. And the winner, Grant Devine, well he campaigned on everyone, Mr. Speaker, from Winston Churchill to John Diefenbaker to Peter Lougheed to Sterling Lyon, even to God himself, Mr. Speaker. It was a most interesting leadership race to say the least.

I find, Mr. Speaker, that what's interesting about leadership races is not so much own the election are conducted and who wins, but I think another interesting aspect about leadership races is what happens to the party and the organization of the party after the leadership is completed. And so we see, Mr. Speaker, the new leader organizing the party in such a way as to appoint, and I may say in a very surprising way but I'm very pleased by it, the member for Souris-Cannington (Mr. Berntson) as the Leader of the Opposition. He didn't pick the number two man who fought an admirable campaign for the leadership of the PC Party. He didn't do that. He didn't have enough confidence in the number two man who ran against him in that opposition at the leadership race to appoint him in effect, his deputy of the caucus. He didn't even consider the number three man, Mr. Speaker, the member for Regina South (Mr. Rousseau) who I think also is a very admirable person. The member for Regina South, I think, made one of the better speeches during the course of that leadership race. I think the best speech was given by the hon. member for Qu'Appelle (Mr. Lane). The member for Regina South delivered a very good address himself, but not as good as the member for Qu'Appelle. I find it very strange that in the reorganization of this party we have the election or the selection or if you will the divine appointment of the member for Souris-Cannington, someone who as far as I know was not even involved in the leadership race. I wonder what the reason for this could be? I thought about it for quite some time and couldn't come up with an answer. Luckily, Mr. Speaker, somebody from Grenfell by the name of Ervin W. Wolfe provided an answer for me. I don't know who Ervin W. Wolfe is. I suppose the member for Indian Head-Wolseley (Mr. Taylor) would know who Ervin W. Wolfe is, and I suspect that Mr. Grant Devine knows who Ervin W. Wolfe is as well. But there's an interesting letter in the Leader-Post dated November 26, 1979, and I think that Mr. Wolfe, it's safe to say by the tenor of this letter, supported somebody other than the winner, Mr. Devine, because he writes this:

We didn't want a leader who got all kinds of money to spend on his campaign from multinational corporations or from multinational trade unions because we believe, in the old saying that he who pays the piper calls the tune.

How right Mr. Wolfe is. There's a little bit more if you'll listen to this. You probably haven't read the letter the member for Rosthern (Mr. Katzman). The letter says:

If the delegates at the PC convention voted for Mr. Devine just because he put on a slick flashy show and because he spent a small fortune, then God help the PC Party of Saskatchewan. The last thing we need in this province is another premier who only knows how to spend money foolishly. We are fighting to get rid of one now who is squandering our heritage on high interest rates that fatten the coffers of the American money lenders.

I like this sentence the best:

Hopefully the delegates looked beyond the slick promotional material and chose Devine for something more than because they saw four 20-foot pictures of him on the Bessborough Hotel.

by the way, may I say that I hope that it's something more than those four 20-foot pictures in the Bessborough Hotel because I'd like to congratulate Devine on his win – not Mr. Devine or the new leader – and I certainly wish him success. Knowing some of his kingmakers in this camp I think he has a formidable task ahead of him, Mr. Wolfe writes. If he can whip them into line and keep them under control then he will be a great leader, says Ervin W. Wolfe of Grenfell, Saskatchewan. How true, Mr. Speaker, Mr. Wolfe's comments are.

How true it is that if he can keep the kingmakers and those multinational corporations and multinational trade unionists who apparently gave the contributions to Mr. Devine in his leadership campaign . . . if as Mr. Wolfe writes he can keep them under control there might be here a great leader. But I want to say there are others that Mr. Devine has got to keep under control, and I see about three or four of them sitting in the front rows of this party right now all with little . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . No, no. I tell the hon. member for Arm River he's one guy that I wouldn't even attach those motivations to. But I do want to say that if I were Mr. Devine I wouldn't also worry only about the kingmakers in his camp, I'd worry about those very able and talented men like the Leader of the Opposition. I think he's perhaps a little bit too loyal to Mr. Devine. That might be a little bit of an explanation for his selection.

But I say to Mr. Devine that what he'd better look for is the member for Indian Head-Wolseley (Mr. Taylor), and the man he has to keep his eye on most carefully is the member for Qu'Appelle, the new president of the PC Party in the province of Saskatchewan (Mr. Lane). I want to tell you, Mr. Speaker, that I have a lot of respect for the member for Qu'Appelle. He's an able debater; he's a tough guy; he has an intelligent mind and he's ambitious. I want to say, Mr. Speaker, that Gary is in the front lane. Mr. Grant Devine is trying to find the lane and Eric Berntson is trying to keep all those boys on the same lane. It's going to be a wonderful job if they achieve that objective, and I bet you a dime to a dollar come next year that they will not succeed. That party is going to self-destruct in the year that is before us.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: – Hear, hear!

MR. ROMANOW: – I also got an interesting sidelight as to the way the caucus broke down. I think the Premier makes the point that it's interesting that nobody in the caucus, so far as I know, supported the hon. member for Indian Head (Mr. Taylor) and I find that a sad commentary on the PC Caucus. I don't find that as a commentary on the member for Indian Head, because I think he too has been performing very well in the House. Not one publicly declared for the member for Indian Head. Not one declared for the member for Regina South (Mr. Rousseau). Five pledged their open support for Devine. These are identified in a recent poll as Bob Andrew, that tough, young, up-and-coming newcomer in the Progressive Conservative Party (we're shaking in our shoes waiting for him to come up); Eric Berntson, the member for Souris-Cannington (I think that's all right, that's consistent with his approach and philosophy); Ralph Katzman for Rosthern, Saskatchewan; Jim Garner for Wilkie, Saskatchewan – the report of back alley conversations and dealings as I found out this morning, and Bob Larter for Estevan said that they support Devine. Well I think that's fair enough. I think the member for Estevan and the member for Moosomin (Mr. Birkbeck) are all in that kind of a camp in that kind of a posture which is consistent.

But really I like the comment of all in the Saskatoon Star-Phoenix of October 30, 1979 which talks about this recent poll. It says Larry Birkbeck, Moosomin, expressed disgust for caucus members going public on whom they support. He accused the members of arrogance in assuming their support would influence delegate voting patterns. Well I want to tell the hon. member for Moosomin that I too express disgust at the fact that not one of the colleagues in the PC caucus saw fit to support two of their own colleagues who ran in the legislature. I don't believe that that's a fair representation of the kind of job that they've been doing in this House. I too express disgust as the member for Moosomin does but I think the member for Moosomin has a political lesson to learn. As much as he may carry idealism with respect to the PC Party it is still, as Ervin Wolfe says, the kingmakers, the fund raisers, the multinational donators and those in the front rows in the caucus who make the kings and pick and choose the leaders of the PC Party and not the grass roots boys that he tries to represent.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: – Hear, hear!

MR. ROMANOW: – Well, Mr. Speaker, today is an exceptional day for all of the people of Canada. I say that the member for Qu'Appelle (Mr. Lane) did an exceptional job and I believe that. Take a look at the political situation. The Progressive Conservatives are, according to the recent Gallup poll of two weeks ago, at 28 per cent of the popular support in all of Canada, the only area . . .

MR. LANE: – It's a little higher than the NDP.

MR. ROMANOW: – Yes, it's higher than the NDP. The NDP is at 23 per cent and I want to tell the hon. member for Qu'Appelle that we went up from 18 per cent to 23 per cent and the Progressive Conservatives dropped from 36 per cent to 28 per cent.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: – Hear, hear!

MR. ROMANOW: – The only area, Mr. Speaker, where the PCs are ahead is in the prairie region – 43 per cent to 31 per cent roughly is the figure. The breakdown is in general terms. If you take out of that the Alberta Progressive Conservative weight and translate that to the province of Saskatchewan, I say the PC caucus in this province is in

dire political straits and is on the verge of beginning political disintegration. Tonight, Mr. Speaker, John Crosbie sealed the fate of these boys opposite politically. Oh, the hon. member opposite may laugh as they go whistling by the graveyard. Take a look at this kind of a budget, Mr. Speaker: excise tax on gasoline, 25 cents now for all Canadians; cigarettes, 2.5 cents per package of 20. By the way, I want to say on the gasoline excise tax \$2.5 billion raised for the federal Progressive Conservative Party in order to reduce their budget deficit. Mr. Speaker, an excise tax on every Canadian who burns gasoline in his car; they're going to use it so they can fund their deficit in the federal government. That's 2.5 billion each and every year and that's going to increase, Mr. Speaker. That's in the budget. Two and a half cents on cigarettes, liquor tax excise of 11 cents; wine 13.3 cents; beer, one cent a bottle; corporate income tax, Mr. Speaker (I tell this to the hon. member for Qu'Appelle) a 5 per cent surtax on the corporate income tax right across the board.

The hon. member says, am I against that? I want to tell the hon. member that when I see 15 per cent and 16 per cent Joe Clark interest rates on top of a 5 per cent surtax for our small businessman, you're doggone right, I'm against that!

SOME HON. MEMBERS: – Hear, hear!

MR. ROMANOW: – I'm against that, Mr. Speaker, but I know what the hon. member for Qu'Appelle stand for. He's for it. The members opposite are for 15 per cent and 16 per cent interest rates. They're for the 5 per cent corporate tax right across the board involving the small businessmen in Saskatchewan and the prairie provinces. Then, Mr. Speaker, an oil price increase which goes something like this: \$4 per barrel this year, 1980, and \$4.50 each and every year to 1984, which will mean obviously a very substantial increase as well in the price for gasoline and the price for fuel for all Canadians.

Now, Mr. Speaker, let's just continue on with this budget. These aren't my figures, these are the figures of that gentleman, John Crosbie, the jolly Minister of Finance who figures he can whip off by a quick witticism all of the problems of the province of Saskatchewan and the people of Canada. He thinks that simply a flashy little comment with an engaging Newfoundland accent will dismiss the serious problems that face all Canadian. Here's what he says, Mr. Speaker. He predicts the growth rate of Canada to be about 1 per cent in 1980. then he says that because of his economic strategy the growth rate is going to increase from 3.5 per cent to 5 percent (get this) over a four year period from 1981 to 1985. If we're lucky, we're going to grow by 3.5 per cent to 5 per cent; that's what the Minister of Finance of Canada forecasts. He says this budget is going to produce – he regrets it's going to produce – unemployment of 8.25 per cent by his own predictions, Mr. Speaker. I say the unemployment rate is going to go up to 9 per cane and perhaps even 10 per cent due to the Tory budgets by the time they are finished with the working man and woman in this country. He says it's a regrettable development in the economy of Canada.

He says his predictions are that the rate of inflation in 1980 is going to increase to 9 per cent – the rate of inflation. He doesn't say this but you look at the statistics at the back, and the year after that the rate of inflation is going to rise to 11 per cent. Mr. Speaker, this budget by the Clark government, the Clark-Crosbie government, by the PCs, is a budget which is determined to do one thing. They want to reduce the deficit on the backs of the working men and women, the farmers, and the small businessmen of Canada and it should be rejected.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: – Hear, hear!

MR. ROMANOW: – There are many things which are ironic in this world, Mr. Speaker,, but I see something else in this budget which is going to affect all the people of Saskatchewan and Canada in this Speech from the Throne. The Minister of Finance (Mr. John Crosbie) tonight predicted that the government expenditures are going to rise by no more than – what do you guess, Mr. Speaker? – 10 per cent. That comes from a cost-cutting, hard-hitting, budget-reducing, efficient, business-like government. Do you know something, Mr. Speaker, they are not going to keep government expenditures down to 7 per cent or 8 per cent or 9 per cent. No, they are going to keep government expenditures to 10 per cent. That's a figure which is higher than when Prime Minister Trudeau was in office, Mr. Speaker, 10 per cent a year. This budget is going to slash in very significant ways the budget expenditure increase to 10 per cent.

Mr. Speaker, I say that this budget calls for taxation and more taxation. It calls for inflation and more inflation. It's going to drive the farmers, with high interest rate at 15 per cent, 16 per cent, right up against the wall. It's going to drive the small businessman up against he wall. Mr. Speaker, it is going to drive unemployment to astronomical heights. It is a rejection and a betrayal of all the things that the PC government was elected to do.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: – Hear, hear!

MR. ROMANOW: – Mr. Speaker, I say the election of the Clark government is a fraud on the Canadian people. I make that accusation today. I tell you, Mr. Speaker, I've taken an inventory here of the federal Progressive Conservative promises. I have a list of at least 88 promises that I could identify, made during the last provincial election, during the last federal election campaign. right off the top is the mortgage deductibility. Now they are going to implement that. The cost is going to be . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . I'll make a word on that in a minute. The cost is going to be \$1.5 billion on the public purse. Mr. Speaker, from a Minister of Finance who says that his number one job is to reduce the deficit. He is going to add \$1.5 billion to the deficit on mortgage deductibility, on a program which is tailored in many ways to help the advantaged Canadians and not the average, middle and lower income people in the provinces of Canada.

He has fulfilled the promise, but he also made a promise, Mr. Speaker, on personal income tax cuts in May of 1979. That's what he said, Personal income tax – nothing in the first budget; capital gains tax on publicly traded shares of Canadian-controlled companies will be abolished – nothing; capital gains tax will be indexed generally – nothing; Canadians will be able to invest up to \$5,000 tax-free in small business – nothing; a research and development tax credit for corporations – nothing; tax breaks for artists and firms in cultural fields – I don't know if he offered that or not, but if he did it's going to be a big break of \$5 million to the artists.

Mr. Speaker, you go down the list of promises of this Progressive Conservative government, whether it's in the budget area of whether it's in the moving of the embassy to Jerusalem, and I tell you, you go down 88 promises and you can't find more than three or four that the government is fulfilling. And all the ones that they're fulfilling are the stupid ones like selling Petro-Can and giving away their resources.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: – Hear, hear!

MR. ROMANOW: – I said, Mr. Speaker, that selling Petro-Can was the fulfillment of a

stupid election promise. There could be nothing more stupid than that. The Minister of Finance (Mr. John Crosbie), the Minister of Energy (Mr. Ray Hnatyshyn) and the Progressive Conservatives and the member opposite from Regina South (Mr. Rousseau), say the sooner it gets done, the better it is for Canadians. I tell you the 28 percent reflects that exact mentality. What Clark is going to do is sell off the profit-making portions of Petro-Can and leave the Canadians saddled with all the debt portions of Petro-Can.

Here we are, Mr. Speaker, in an energy crisis in this world. Here we are facing 25 cent increases in the excise tax. We are trying to find self-sufficiency by 1990. We're giving about \$35 billion more by this increase to the multinational oil companies. At least that's what Clark is doing over the next four-year period – \$35 billion to the multinational oil companies. On top of that he is going to sell Petro-Can and punish the people of Canada in that circumstance as well. I say, Mr. Speaker, that a federal government that undertakes that kind of a posture . . . (inaudible interjection) . . .

MR. SPEAKER: – Order. I know the members are getting anxious to have the vote and decide this issue, but until that time arrives, I wish they would give the speaker who is on his feet some consideration. I know the debate has been rather boisterous at times. I have tried to warn members that they should keep it in check, but it gets to the point where I'm having difficulty hearing. I have to draw to the members' attention that we should bring ourselves to order. The Attorney General.

MR. ROMANOW: – Mr. Speaker, I was making my point on Petro-Canada and I think I have made the point. I can't put it more ably than the member for Saskatoon Mayfair (Mr. Dyck) did earlier today in his speech. They're doing all the stupid things. Those are the promises that they are keeping. They're not doing any of the promises which ought to be a benefit.

This is a lost opportunity – this election in May 1979. The Canadians wanted a change. For the first time in 16 years we elected a Progressive Conservative government. What a wonderful challenge to come to grips with the major economic and social problems facing this country. I ask the members of the press and public to stand back and to take a look objectively in the six or seven months of the Clark regime at the promises kept, the promises that are broken and how they sum up in coming to grips with the country's concerns.

Do you know, Mr. Speaker, that this is from the Toronto Star, October 28, 1979 – the president of a research company said the series of increases in interest rates – listen to this – mean that 874,000 Canadian families who could have afforded a \$60,000 mortgage on a \$66,000 home will no longer qualify. Mr. Speaker, nearly 900,000 Canadians cut out from the privilege, the right, their right to own a home by Clark economic policies.

And now on top of this a budget which is obviously inflationary, a budget which is obviously going to drive many of those people out on to the bread lines looking for work that will not be found. On the bread lines – the hon. members are laughing at that. The hon. members say that 8.25 per cent is something to be laughed about. Well, I say, Mr. Speaker, they can laugh but I don't laugh at that and I don't think the people of Saskatchewan are going to laugh at that kind of a callous approach to this management of our economy.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: – Hear, hear!

MR. ROMANOW: – Mr. Speaker, we are faced with a major problem as Canadians. We have slow growth; we've got inflation; we've got unemployment. Where's the game plan by the new Clark government to tackle those problems? Is it just merely rhetoric about business-like governments and relying on the private sector?

I say to you, Mr. Speaker, there is a misguided reliance on something called the private enterprise which has got Clark in the 28 per cent hole that he's in. It's rhetoric only. Mr. Speaker, because of that slavish devotion, we've got contradictory policies on energy, on Crown corporations, no policy on economic development, no strategy for regional employment or manpower and immigration at all, none whatsoever. Mr. Speaker, what we've seen is an impressive array of disjunctive and inconsistent initiatives. Look at them – privatization of Petro-Can; government spending of the kind that I have talked about; unemployment insurance; monetary policy. All of these are inextricably linked to other major problems that we as Canadians face. Foreign ownership, he doesn't deal with that problem; foreign capital flow, doesn't say a word about that in the budget; decline in a secondary manufacturing, loss of research and development, wide regional disparities which could only be exacerbated by this budget – none of these issues address by the Clark government.

Mr. Speaker, I want to say one thing. Let the people of Saskatchewan know that a Progressive Conservative in Saskatchewan is the same as the Progressive Conservative in Ottawa, is the same as the Progressive Conservatives everywhere.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: – Hear, hear!

MR. ROMANOW: – Mr. Speaker, A Tory is a Tory is a Tory. When they start putting on this kind of a performance of reneging on promises, when they start putting on this kind of an approach of callous indifference, then I say it's time for the people of Canada to throw them out of office and give a party a chance that will govern . . . (inaudible interjection) . . .

Mr. Speaker, I had so much more to say about the new leader's policy on energy – Mr. Grant Devine's statements on energy. But there will be other appropriate times to do that as the opinion polls mature and settle in, as this budget sort of matures and settles in. I will have lots of time to do that, Mr. Speaker.

I wanted to talk about intergovernmental problems. The member for Last Mountain (Mr. MacMurchy), the Minister of Transportation did an outstanding job today on the crowrate and transportation and the fact that it's under attack by the PCs; on communications, an outstanding intergovernmental problem, giving us more of a say on cable and pay TV, liquor advertising. We have some assurances by the new government that they are going to act. The time to act is now. We want to look at questions of the Regina weather office. They're now in office. It's time now to act, to re-install the meteorologists of the National Hydrology Institute in Saskatoon, which cost Saskatoon 400 jobs because Sinclair Stephens came in and posed the idea of a National Institute of Hydrology.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I find those are outstanding intergovernmental issues that need further resolution. But let me say this to the PC opposition as I close my remarks, and it's epitomized by this very dull performance by them during this session and they know the political problem that they are in. I ask the press and the members to consider, they split two provincial by-elections in Newfoundland, one that they should have won. They held

on to one and lost two in Manitoba. They lost two federal by-elections. They barely hung on by three votes in Barrhead, Alberta, the seat of Hugh Horner and they ran third, losing their deposit in Regina North-West and they are 28 per cent.

Mr. Speaker, members of the House take a good look because you're not going to see them for very long. I support the main motion.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: – Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: – Order. It being 8:30 p.m. it is incumbent upon me under Rule 13(4) to now take the vote on the main motion. The main motion is that an Humble Address be presented to His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor as follows. Will the Assembly take it as read?

There has been a request for a recorded division.

The question being put on the main motion.

I would ask the member for Kelvington Wadena (Mr. Byers) to absent himself from the Chamber since he came in after the vote was under process. I can give the member a citation if he wishes to cover the situation.

Motion agreed to on the following recorded division.

YEAS – 34

Blakeney	Shillington	Matsalla
Pepper	MacMurchy	Lusney
Allen	Mostoway	Prebble
Smishek	Banda	Long
Romanow	Kaeding	Nelson
Messer	Kowalchuk	Thompson
Snyder	Dyck	Engel
Robbins	Feschuk	Poniatowski
Baker	Vickar	Lingenfelter
Skoberg	Rolfes	White
McArthur	Koskie	Solomon
Gross		

NAYS – 14

Berntson	Rousseau	Muirhead
Birkbeck	Ham	Katzman
Larter	Swan	Duncan
Lane	Pickering	Andrew
Taylor	Garner	

MR. R.J. ROMANOW (Attorney General): – Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Minister of Municipal affairs (Urban) (Mr. Smishek):

That the said address be engrossed and presented to His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor by such members of the Assembly as are of the Executive Council.

Motion agreed to.

MR. ROMANOW: – Mr. Speaker, I move seconded by the Premier (Mr. Blakeney)

That the Assembly will, at the next sitting, resolve itself into a committee of finance to consider the supply to be granted to Her Majesty and to consider the ways and means of raising the supply.

Motion agreed to.

The Assembly adjourned at 9:38 p.m.